

Chapter 5

The Educational Benefits of Diversity: Evidence from Multiple Sectors

by Jeffrey F. Milem
University of Maryland

Above all, merit must be defined in light of what educational institutions are trying to accomplish. In our view, race is relevant in determining which candidates “merit” admission because taking account of race helps institutions achieve three objectives central to their mission—identifying individuals with high potential, permitting students to benefit educationally from diversity on campus, and addressing long-term societal needs (Bowen and Bok, 1998, p. 278).

The mission of an institution of higher education tells us what a college or university is about, what it values, what it holds to be true. Educational policies, programs, and practices emerge from the mission of the institution (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates, 1991). Few would disagree with the assertion that higher education institutions have a unique responsibility to develop in students the knowledge, skills, and competencies that they need to be active members of society. In an increasingly diverse country that is inextricably connected to a larger “global” community, we must reconsider what it now means to be an active and productive member of society. As colleges and universities have recognized and responded to these trends, their mission statements have undergone a process of rather dramatic transformation. Increasingly, institutional mission statements at colleges and universities across the country affirm the role that diversity has in enhancing teaching and learning in higher education (Alger, 1997).

Administrators (e.g., see Bollinger, 1997; Rudenstine, 1997; Shapiro, 1995), academics (e.g., see Astone and Nuñez-Womack, 1990; Duster, 1993; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998; Smith and Associates, 1997; Tierney, 1993), and national educational associations offer compelling arguments about the ways in which diversity expands and enriches the educational enterprise through the benefits that it

provides to individual students, to colleges and universities, and to our society and our world. In a statement endorsed by the presidents of sixty-two research universities (including eight Ivy League institutions and more than thirty public research universities), the American Association of Universities argued:

We speak first and foremost as educators. We believe that our students benefit significantly from education that takes place within a diverse setting. In the course of their university education, our students encounter and learn from others who have backgrounds and characteristics very different from their own. As we seek to prepare students for life in the twenty-first century, the educational value of such encounters will become more important, not less, than in the past.

A very substantial portion of our curriculum is enhanced by the discourse made possible by the heterogeneous backgrounds of our students. Equally, a significant part of education in our institutions takes place outside the classroom, in extracurricular activities where students learn how to work together, as well as to compete; how to exercise leadership, as well as to build consensus. If our institutional capacity to bring together a genuinely diverse group of students is removed—or severely reduced—then the quality and texture of the education we provide will be significantly diminished (Association of American Universities, “On the Importance of Diversity in University Admissions,” *The New York Times*, April 24, 1997, p. A27).

Yet, as the momentum for diversity reaches unprecedented levels on campuses across the country, institutional leaders find that they must respond to attacks that are levied against something that has been identified as being a central part of the educational missions of their campuses. Moreover, it is becoming apparent that decisions about campus diversity for many campuses will be made in courtrooms rather than in classrooms or boardrooms. This is not to say that the higher education community can or should have no role in influencing these decisions. Legal challenges to the use of race in college admissions require that attorneys, policy makers, scholars, and institutional leaders across the country search for empirical evidence that documents the benefits of diversity and provides evidence of persistent discrimination and inequality in higher education. This is not an easy task. When members of these diverse communities come together to discuss strategies for addressing these issues, they quickly learn that they probably do not speak the same language when it comes to diversity. What is compelling evidence in support of diversity in the eyes of a social scientist, or a college president, or a dean of students, may not meet the standards of evidence that are applied by an attorney or a supreme court justice.

Goodwin Liu (1998) offers a persuasive argument for “why, as a *legal doctrine*, educational diversity should qualify as a ‘compelling interest’” (p. 383). This manuscript thoughtfully argues for “placing the diversity rationale squarely within the existing norm of equal protection doctrine. In other words, it is an effort to legitimize an educational policy in the language of constitutional law” (p. 383). Liu does this by illustrating how the remedial and diversity rationales for affirmative action do not differ substantively in any ways that would make either more constitutionally “compelling.” However, a key provision in defending the diversity rationale in court cases which challenge it involves the ability of an institution to provide a “strong basis in evidence” to support the assertions that are made regarding an institution’s interest in educational diversity.

As a starting point, it seems reasonable to require a university invoking the diversity rationale to define and substantiate the educational needs that its admissions policies purport to meet. To meet this requirement, a university could not simply offer broad assertions about the need to improve racial understanding; it would have to articulate why a racially diverse student body is vital to the specific school, department, or educational program in which affirmative action is used (Liu, 1998, p. 431).

The value of diversity in higher education is also being questioned in the court of public opinion. While the public generally lends its support to democratic ideals of fairness, equity, and equality of opportunity, the debate over affirmative action is constructed in a way in which vocal portions of the public argue that affirmative action violates the very principles that led to its creation. Chapter 3 of this volume (by Shana Levin) provides us with valuable insights into why this may occur. The approval of ballot initiatives in California and Washington, and, efforts to bring similar initiatives to the ballots in other states, indicate that many in our population do not understand the value of diversity in colleges and universities nor do they understand the ways in which diversity enriches our individual and collective experiences.

As perhaps at no other time in our history, scholars from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds have the opportunity to demonstrate the ways in which their research findings provide evidence of the educational outcomes of diverse institutional environments. As this body of research evidence continues to build, it will help to insure that the benefits of diversity are located at the center of the educational enterprise. This chapter illustrates how scholarship that documents the value of diversity in institutions of higher education, from a variety of disciplines and perspectives, can be used to inform and enhance the argument for diversity on campus. Classic and contemporary research are used to inform the debates surrounding affirmative action and other policies that are designed to create and maintain diverse learning environments.

In developing this chapter, I have conducted a multidisciplinary analysis of the research literature, and examined studies that help to increase our understanding of the benefits of diverse colleges and universities. The discussion in this chapter regarding the benefits of diversity uses a three dimensional framework that considers the ways in which diversity benefits: (1) individuals, (2) institutions, and (3) our society. *Individual benefits* refer to the ways in which the educational experiences and outcomes of individual students are enhanced by the presence of diversity on campus. *Institutional benefits* refer to the ways in which diversity enhances the effectiveness of an organization or institution. *Societal benefits* are defined as the ways in which diversity in colleges and universities impact quality of life issues in the larger society. Examples of these include the achievement of democratic ideals, the development of an educated and involved citizenry, and the ways in which groups who are underserved in society are able to receive the services that they require.

This chapter has drawn from research and writing in the areas of critical race theory, economics, education, feminist studies, health policy, law, medicine, organizational behavior, organizational effectiveness, psychology, social psychology, and sociology. Table 1 provides a summary of the findings of this analysis within these three dimensions. It is hoped that this approach provides persuasive evidence regarding the ways in which diverse college environments benefit us all. Or, in the words of the legal community, this information is meant to demonstrate that diversity is a compelling

interest for institutions of higher education and for members of our increasingly heterogeneous society.

. . . the attack on affirmative action, coming as it does out of tremendous anxiety in a changing world, is an opening for a more progressive vision (Lawrence and Matsuda, 1997, p. 278).

Individual Benefits

A great deal of the research in higher education traditionally has examined the ways in which individual students grow and change while in college (see for example, Astin, 1977, 1993; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). In recent years, more of this research has focused on the ways in which racial dynamics on campus influence student outcomes. The most abundant research evidence supporting arguments for the continued use of affirmative action in college admissions exists in the area of how *individuals* benefit from diversity. *Individual benefits* refer to the ways in which the educational experiences and outcomes of individual students are enhanced by the presence of diversity on campus. Research evidence regarding the individual benefits of diversity suggests that diversity enhances student growth and development in the cognitive, affective, and interpersonal domains.

This educational benefit is universal in that all students learn from it, not just minority students who might have received a “bump” in the admissions process. Indeed, majority students who have previously lacked significant direct exposure to minorities frequently have the most to gain from interaction with individuals of other races. The universality of this benefit distinguishes the diversity rationale from the rationale of remedying discrimination, under which minority students received special consideration to make up for past injustices to their racial group (Alger, 1997, p.).

Before discussing the evidence that documents the ways in which diversity benefits individuals, it is important to define what is meant by diversity. In the context of this discussion of individual benefits, there are two primary types of diversity. The first, structural diversity refers to the numerical and proportional representation of students from different racial/ethnic groups in the student body (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999). A second type of diversity is characterized by the interactions that students have with difference. Within the category of diverse interactions, students are influenced by the interactions that they have with diverse ideas and information as well as by the interactions that they have with diverse people. These types of diversity are not mutually exclusive. In fact, students are most frequently exposed to diverse information and ideas through the interactions that they have with diverse people. The impact of each type of diversity is enhanced by the presence of the others (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999). Gurin (1999) argues that structural diversity is a necessary precursor for diverse interactions to occur. Diverse ideas and information have entered the academy largely due to the presence and efforts of diverse people (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 1997; Milem, 1997, 1999). Likewise, it is impossible to interact with diverse people if they are not represented in the environment (Gurin, 1999).

Outcomes of Diversity

In considering what the outcomes of diversity are for individuals, it is helpful to understand what is meant by outcomes. Patricia Gurin (1999) suggests a helpful method for describing diversity-related outcomes. Gurin proposes three major types of outcomes that are influenced by campus diversity.

Learning outcomes refer to active learning processes in which students become involved while in college, the engagement and motivation that students exhibit, the learning and refinement of intellectual and academic skills, and the value that students place on these skills after they leave college. *Democracy outcomes* refer to the ways in which higher education prepares students to become involved as active participants in a society that is becoming increasingly diverse and complex. Gurin (1999) suggests that three major categories—citizenship engagement, racial/cultural engagement, and compatibility of differences—characterize democracy outcomes. Citizenship engagement refers to students' interest and motivation in influencing society and the political structure, and, to students' participation in community and volunteer service. Racial/cultural engagement refers to students' levels of cultural awareness and appreciation and their commitment to participating in activities that help to promote racial understanding. Compatibility of differences refers to an understanding by students that there are common values across racial/ethnic groups, that group conflict can be constructive when it is used appropriately, and that differences do not have to be a divisive force in society. The last category of outcomes discussed by Gurin is related to *the ability of students to live and work effectively in a diverse society*. Specifically, this refers to the extent to which college has prepared students to be successful in their lives after college and the extent to which the college experience is successful in breaking a pattern of continuing segregation in society. To the categories of outcomes described by Gurin (1999), it is helpful to add two other types of outcomes. The first reflects the ways in which students perceive that diversity has enriched their college experiences. These can be labeled as *process outcomes*. Measures of student satisfaction, perceptions of campus climate, etc. are examples of outcomes that are included in this category. A final type of outcome reflects the *material benefits* that students accrue resulting from their attendance at diverse colleges. The most obvious example of material benefits would be higher wages.

The Research Findings

In his national longitudinal study of college impact, Alexander Astin (1993) found that an emphasis by faculty on diversity in courses had positive effects on increased racial understanding and overall satisfaction with college. Villalpono (1994) reports similar findings regarding the relationship between satisfaction and the extent to which faculty included racially/ethnically diverse materials in their courses. This finding held for White students as well as for students of color. Moreover, Tanaka (1996, cited in Smith and Associates, 1997) found that a more supportive campus climate had positive effects on sense of community, cultural awareness, commitment to promoting racial understanding, and overall satisfaction with the college experience. Similarly, Gilliard (1996) found that perceptions of a supportive campus climate were important to the success of Whites and students of color.

In studies of the impact of college on racial attitudes and views of White men and women, Milem (1992, 1994) found that students who had participated in more frequent discussions of social and political issues, who had talked more frequently about racial/ethnic issues, who had socialized with someone from another racial/ethnic group,

who had attended a racial awareness workshop, and/or who had enrolled in ethnic studies courses were more likely to report increased levels of racial and cultural awareness, greater commitment to the goal of promoting racial understanding, and more liberal racial attitudes. Pascarella, Whitt, Nora, Edison, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996) reported a positive relationship between racial and cultural awareness workshops and students' openness to cultural, racial, and value diversity. These workshops positively influenced students' views regarding the value of diversity on campus. Moreover, White students who attended these workshops were more likely to perceive the racial climate on their campus in ways that were more closely aligned with students of color on campus. In a related finding, the climate for diversity is likely to be improved by encouraging participation in these workshops (Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, and Nora, 1996). Finally, Pascarella et al (1996) report evidence that participation in racial and cultural awareness workshops led to measurable gains in critical thinking for students at the end of their first year of college.

In another study using this data set, Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996) studied changes in students' openness to diversity and challenge after the first year of college. As expected, a student's level of initial openness to diversity and challenge was the strongest predictor of his/her subsequent openness to diversity. In addition, there were aspects of the college experience that predicted openness at the end of the first year. The extent to which students perceived that their college was nondiscriminatory, participated in racial and cultural awareness workshops, and interacted with diverse peers all predicted greater openness to diversity and challenge. On the other hand, participation in intercollegiate athletics, membership in fraternities or sororities, and enrolling in mathematics courses all led to decreases in openness to diversity (Pascarella, et al., 1996).

In an extension of this study, Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, and Nora (1998) examined factors that predicted openness to diversity and challenge after the second and third years of college. They found that precollege openness to diversity, sex (being female), age (being older), perceptions of a nondiscriminatory racial environment at the college, participation in racial or cultural awareness workshops, having diverse student acquaintances, and engaging in conversations with other students in which diverse ways of thinking and understanding were emphasized predicted openness to diversity and challenge after the second and third years of college. Only one variable served as a negative predictor of the outcome. As in the study of openness to diversity after the first year, this variable measured the number of mathematics courses students had taken. The authors also explored the extent to which conditional effects were found in this study of which two are worth noting. First, the net effects of college on openness to diversity differed for men and women and for white students and students of color. Specifically, patterns of involvement for men and women predicted openness to diversity and challenge differently. Higher levels of participation in clubs and organizations served as a positive predictor of openness to diversity for women, but were negative predictors for men. While perceptions of a nondiscriminatory campus racial environments were positive predictors of openness to diversity for both white students and students of color during the third year of college, the impact of these perceptions was stronger for students of color than for white students. These results reinforce findings from other studies regarding the important relationship between campus racial climate and student outcomes (e.g. see, Astin, 1993; Hurtado, 1990, 1992; 1994a, 1994b; Gilliard, 1996; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999; Kuh, 1993; Smith, 1995; Smith and Associates, 1997).

Recent research done on the impact of a curriculum enhancement project in a sequence of human development courses adds to our understanding of the impact of exposure to diverse ideas and information. This study found that curricular and pedagogical interventions increase students' openness to diversity and their critical thinking skills (MacPhee, Kreutzer, and Fritz, 1994). This study evaluated the impact of efforts to "infuse multicultural content" into the courses of eight departments by a group of faculty in a College of Applied Human Sciences. "The purpose was to promote cultural pluralism and social equality by using instructional materials that are appropriate for diverse students and that are integrated rather than supplementary" (p. 705). Further, these efforts by the faculty were coordinated to modify a specific sequence of courses. Three rationales were provided regarding the importance of this sequencing of classes. First, the authors argue that this conveys to students that this information is essential to their understanding of human behavior. Second, repeated exposure to this information is likely to reinforce these important lessons. Third, by making these issues central to the curriculum of the profession, minority students are less likely to feel marginalized and stigmatized, which is likely to increase their identification with their profession.

Qualitative and quantitative research methods were employed in the study. The findings of the quantitative analyses suggested that student attitudes toward outgroups (particularly the poor) were broadly influenced by the transformation of the curriculum. They also found small, but statistically significant, changes in the racial attitudes of students. The qualitative analyses revealed three primary findings. First, students appear to have mastered a number of critical thinking skills. Second, levels of ethnocentrism among students declined. Finally, students were able to distinguish between poverty and ethnicity as developmental risk factors (MacPhee, Kreutzer, and Fritz, 1994).

Gurin (1999) provides additional evidence regarding the ways in which diversity enhances the learning outcomes of students. Students who reported higher levels of contact with diverse ideas and information and diverse people were more likely to show growth in their "active thinking processes" which were represented by increases in measures of complex thinking and social/historical thinking. In addition, students who had greater exposure to diversity were more likely to show higher levels of intellectual engagement and motivation. Students who had greater exposure to diversity were likely to report that they had higher post-graduate degree aspirations. The analyses also showed exposure to different types of diversity had different relative impact on students based upon their racial/ethnic background. While White students were more likely to benefit from exposure to diverse ideas and information *and* exposure to diverse peers, African American students were most likely to benefit from their interactions with diverse peers. Moreover, there was evidence that African Americans experienced positive learning outcomes when they were exposed to close friends of their own race. In other words, for African American students to fully benefit from diversity, they must have contact with diverse peers as well as interaction with same race peers.

Much attention has been given to the findings of a recent study by William Bowen and Derek Bok (1998) of Black and White students at institutions that employ selective admissions policies and what these findings tell us about the use of affirmative action in college admissions. There is a perception held by many opponents of affirmative action programs that students of color who are admitted under these programs are less qualified (or even unqualified) than other students. However, the analyses in this book provide persuasive evidence that should dispel this myth. The Black students in this study were highly qualified for admission and the success that they exhibited provides persuasive proof of this. Specifically, Black students who were likely to have been admitted through affirmative action in admissions at the sample of selective institutions in this study

exhibited high levels of success across a variety of outcomes. Moreover, the findings of this study provide evidence indicating that the students who attended these institutions were influenced positively by the campus diversity they encountered while in college (Bowen and Bok, 1998). Black students who attended these schools “had strong academic credentials when they entered college, . . . graduated in large numbers, and . . . have done very well after leaving college” (Bowen and Bok, 1998, p. 256). For undergraduates, nearly 75 percent of the Black students who entered the institutions in Bowen and Bok’s sample graduated from college after six years. Also, the more selective the institution, the higher the completion rate for Black students. These figures exceed by a wide margin the average graduation rates for NCAA Division I institutions for Blacks (40 percent) and for Whites (59 percent). Black students who attended selective institutions in the Bowen and Bok (1998) study graduated from law, business, and medical schools at a rate of about 90 percent.

Black students who attended selective institutions were five times as likely as all Black students nationwide to earn advanced degrees (professional degrees or Ph.D.s) were. Black men in the entering cohort of 1976 reported average annual incomes of \$82,000. This represents twice the earnings of Black college graduates from across the nation. Black women graduates of these institutions earned an average of \$58,500 which is 80 percent more than all Black women graduates (Bowen and Bok, 1998). However, earnings for Black men and women graduates were less than their white peers who graduated from this group of selective colleges. The findings of multivariate analyses conducted for the study revealed that Black men were likely to earn less than their white colleagues were after controlling for the effects of grades, college majors, and socioeconomic status. While Black men and women who attended selective institutions earned more than Blacks who graduated from other institutions, the findings from the Bowen and Bok study replicate findings from other studies that indicate a persistent and troublesome earnings gap between Black and white college graduates.

In another study related to the material benefits of attending diverse “high quality” institutions, Daniel, Black, and Smith (1997) examined the relationship between college quality and the wages of young men. Not surprisingly, the authors found that attending a higher quality college increased the wages of young men who attend them. Moreover, these “returns” were significantly higher for Black men than White men. However, there was a finding from the study that some might find somewhat surprising. The results of the study indicated that attending colleges with relatively diverse student bodies increased the earnings of Black and White men who attended them (though the returns were somewhat higher for White men).

Many have argued that the status of campus race relations are poor citing low rates of social interaction and claims that segregation of various racial/ethnic groups is increasing on college campuses (Altbach and Lomotey, 1991; Bunzel, 1992). However, a growing body of research suggests a different picture of racial dynamics on campus. Black and white students in the Bowen and Bok (1998) study reported that they highly valued the racial diversity of their college or university. Nearly half of white respondents (46 percent) and almost 60 percent of Black respondents in the 1976 cohort indicated that their college had helped extensively in developing their ability to get along with people of different races and cultures. These proportions increased substantially among members of the 1989 cohort (63 percent of whites and 70 percent of Blacks).

Other studies provide a richer and more illuminating picture of the status of cross-race interaction on campus. Researchers found that while White students interpreted ethnic group clustering as racial segregation, minority students viewed this behavior as a means of cultural support within a larger unsupportive environment (Loo and Rolison,

1986). While Chicano, Asian American, and African American students reported widespread and frequent interaction across race/ethnicity in various informal situations (i.e., dining, roommates, dating, socializing), White students were least likely to report engaging in any of these activities across race (Hurtado, Dey, and Treviño, 1994). Bowen and Bok (1998) indicated that nearly six out of ten Whites in their sample of students reported that they “knew well” at least two Black students while about one quarter reported that they “knew well” at least two Latino students. Similar to the findings of Hurtado, Treviño, and Dey (1994), Black students in the Bowen and Bok (1998) study were much more likely to report that they had friends from other racial/ethnic groups. Nearly 90 percent indicated that they knew well at least two White students and 54 percent reported that knew well at least two Latino students.

The benefits of cross-race interaction are readily apparent. The extent to which students interacted cross-racially was influential in determining the amount of acceptance students reported for people from other cultures, the rate at which they participated in community service programs, and the amount of growth they exhibited in other areas of civic responsibility (Bowen and Bok, 1998). In similar findings, involvement in more racially diverse environments and activities led to higher levels of cultural awareness and acceptance and increased commitment to the goal of improving racial understanding (Milem, 1992, 1994; Sax and Astin, 1997). Conversely, the absence of interracial contact clearly influences students’ views toward others, support for campus initiatives, and educational outcomes. White students who had the least social interaction with someone of a different background were less likely to hold positive attitudes toward multiculturalism on campus (Globetti, Globetti, Brown, and Smith, 1993).

Another study revealed that socializing across race and discussing racial/ethnic issues have a positive effect on students’ retention, overall satisfaction with college, intellectual self-concept, and social self-concept (Chang, 1996). Chang (1996) found that maximizing cross-racial interaction and encouraging on-going discussions about race are educational practices that are beneficial to students. However, when the effects of increased structural diversity for students of color are considered without involvement in these activities, students of color were likely to report less overall satisfaction with their college experience (Chang, 1996). Thus, increasing *only* the structural diversity of an institution without considering the influence that these changes will have on other dimensions of the campus racial climate is likely to produce problems for students at these institutions. Moreover, Chang’s study shows that the larger the representation of racially diverse students at an institution, the greater the likelihood that students will be engaged in these experiences. In an extension of this research, Chang (1997) found that structural diversity (as represented by the enrollment of students of color at an institution) was an essential ingredient in providing opportunities for this interaction to occur. In short, as an institution becomes more structurally diverse, the greater the likelihood that students will have opportunities to socialize across racial groups and to discuss racial issues. As this likelihood increases, the campus environment is likely to become more supportive of diversity-related practices.

Gurin’s (1999) work builds on these findings. In her analyses of a national longitudinal data set, Gurin found that higher levels of structural diversity increased the likelihood that students would have the opportunity to be exposed to diverse people and diverse ideas and information. Specifically, students who attended more structurally diverse institutions were more likely to enroll in ethnic studies courses, attend racial/cultural awareness workshops, discuss racial/ethnic issues, socialize across race, and have close friends in college from other racial backgrounds.

Many of the studies cited in this section support the important role that peers have in influencing student learning. The idea of peer and/or reference group effects is a theoretical cornerstone of many of the studies of college impact beginning with Newcomb in 1943 and continuing in to the late 1960s (Milem, 1994, 1998). In recent years, we have seen renewed interest in assessing the effects of peers on a variety of student outcomes (e.g., see Astin, 1993; Chang, 1996; Dey, 1988, 1991, 1996, 1997; Milem, 1994; 1998; Weidman, 1979; Whitt, et al, 1998). The findings summarized above point to the important role that peer groups, and specifically, a diverse group of peers, plays in shaping positive learning outcomes for students. Clearly, the findings of this research suggest that any actions taken to reduce the numbers of students of color on college and university campuses will have a powerfully negative effect on the opportunity that students have to learn from one another.

. . . as educators, we are compelled to understand that students’ hearts and minds may be impacted most by what they learn from peers. This is precisely why the diversity of the student body is essential to fulfilling higher education’s mission to enhance learning and encourage democratic outcomes and values (Gurin, 1999, p. 147).

Research on School Desegregation

The findings of many desegregation studies indicate that minority segregation that occurs in educational settings tends to be perpetuated over stages of the life cycle and across institutional settings (Braddock, 1985). Braddock, Crain, and McPartland (1984) assert that “school desegregation is leading to desegregation in several areas of adult life” (p. 261) including college, social situations, and in jobs. Their analyses indicate that desegregation changes the attitudes and behaviors of Whites and Blacks. This can be found in attitudes that reveal diminishing racial stereotypes and lessened fears of hostile reactions in interracial settings among White adults who were in desegregated settings as children.

Braddock (1985) points out that “one of the most important aspects of racial segregation is its tendency to perpetuate itself” (p. 11). Compelling research evidence shows that this pattern holds true for majority and minority individuals. The results of changing desegregation patterns are becoming more evident, with resulting patterns of behaviors and interactions that have implications for college and work environments. For example, there is research evidence that suggests that segregation in elementary and secondary schools is perpetuated in college. Braddock (1980) and Braddock and McPartland (1982) found black students who had attended desegregated elementary-secondary schools were also more likely to attend desegregated colleges. Evidence indicates that early school desegregation and community desegregation patterns tend to promote adult desegregation in work environments (Braddock & McPartland, 1989). This was especially true for Northern Blacks where the relationship between school and community desegregation was less confounded. Braddock, McPartland, and Trent (1984) found that Blacks and Whites who attended desegregated schools were more likely to work in desegregated firms than were their peers who attended segregated schools. In an extension of this earlier work, Braddock, Dawkins, and Trent (1994) found that Whites who had attended desegregated schools were more likely to work in environments with Black or Latino coworkers. Moreover, Black and Latino students who attended desegregated schools were more likely to work in environments where they had White coworkers.

In related findings, Braddock and Dawkins (1981) found that Blacks who had attended desegregated high schools were more likely to receive better grades in college than were Blacks who attended segregated high schools. Similar findings in another study show a greater likelihood of persistence in college among those Blacks who attended desegregated high schools (Green, 1982). Despite these findings regarding the positive impact of desegregation, it is important to note that segregation at the high school level in communities in this country is increasing (Orfield, 1996). This suggests that college may be the first (and only) chance that many students have to encounter and interact with someone from a different race or ethnicity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999). Recent research findings indicate that high levels of engagement with diversity in college lead to engagement with diversity after college.

Diversity experiences during college had impressive effects on the extent to which graduates in the national study were living racially and ethnically integrated lives in the post-college world. Students who had taken the most diversity courses and interacted the most with diverse peers during college had the most cross-racial interactions five years after leaving college. This confirms that the long-term pattern of segregation noted by many social scientists can be broken by diversity experiences during college (Gurin, 1999, p. 133).

Summary

A review of the research regarding the individual benefits of diversity suggests that there is an important relationship between an emphasis on diversity and important student outcomes. Simply put, there are numerous ways in which individuals benefit from their interactions with diverse information and ideas and diverse people while they are in college. Research indicates that cross-race interaction has positive impacts on a range of important outcomes and that the greater the structural diversity of an institution, the more likely that students are to engage in these types of interaction. The importance of developing increased openness to diversity is intimately connected to aspects of the institutional and societal outcomes of diversity that are discussed later in this chapter. This openness is central to the development of crosscultural competence and is also an essential element of what it means to be an educated citizen in a multicultural society. Student views of the campus racial climate influence other outcomes of significance. The importance of climate issues will be further addressed later in this chapter.

In summarizing the individual benefits of diversity, it may be helpful to consider how these benefits fit within the five major categories of outcomes discussed at the beginning of this section. Clearly the research evidence indicates that greater exposure to diversity leads to growth in democracy outcomes. Students who have been exposed to greater diversity are more likely to show increases in racial understanding, cultural awareness and appreciation, engagement with social and political issues, and openness to diversity and challenge. They are more likely to exhibit decreases in racial stereotyping and levels of ethnocentrism. Students who interacted more with diversity in college exhibited more liberal racial attitudes four and nine years after entering college. Moreover, greater engagement with diversity while in college leads to growth in civic responsibility. This can be seen in increased commitment to the goal of helping to promote racial understanding, greater involvement in community and volunteer service, and higher levels of involvement in community action programs.

There are also a number of ways in which the learning outcomes of students are enhanced by their interaction with diversity in college. Students who engaged in more

interactions with diversity while in college show greater relative gains in critical thinking and active thinking. They are also more likely to show evidence of greater intellectual engagement and academic motivation. Students who interact more with diversity while in college show greater relative gains in intellectual self-concept and social self-concept. Finally, higher levels of interaction with diversity in college predict higher levels of retention and increases in the degree aspirations of students. African American students who interact more with diversity while in college are more likely to pursue and obtain a graduate or professional degree after completing their bachelor's degree.

The research evidence indicates that interacting with diversity while in college breaks the cycle of perpetuation of segregation that is widely prevalent in our society. Students who attend institutions with higher levels of diversity and report high levels of interaction with diverse people and diverse information are more likely to live and work in desegregated environments after leaving college. Interacting with diverse ideas and diverse people while in college encourages students to continue these behaviors after leaving college. Gurin's (1999) findings suggest that this pattern is particularly strong for Whites. This finding has added significance when we consider that college is likely to be the first time that students will have the opportunity to be educated and to live in a racially diverse setting.

The research findings also suggest that process outcomes, or outcomes related to the overall college experience of students, are enhanced by campus diversity. Students who interacted with diverse people and diverse ideas while in college reported higher levels of satisfaction with their collegiate experience. Moreover, students who interacted with diversity while in college were likely to report a greater sense of community while in college. Greater interaction with diverse people and ideas also served to decrease the gap in views of the campus climate frequently found between students of color and White students. This suggests that greater interaction with diversity in college helps students to develop the ability to understand and appreciate the perspective of groups other than their own.

An emerging body of research suggests that students who attend more diverse colleges are likely to enjoy greater material benefits than are their peers who attend less diverse institutions. This is particularly true for students who attend highly selective institutions. Research findings from the Bowen and Bok (1998) study indicate that African American men and women who attended selective institutions are likely to make much more money than their peers who attended less selective institutions are. In a study of the impact of college "quality" on men's wages, the findings indicate that White and Black men who attended more racially diverse institutions were likely to earn more money than their peers who attended less diverse "high quality" institutions. Based upon the many findings summarized in this section, it is clear that diversity benefits individuals in a variety of important ways.

Institutional Benefits

In the previous section of this chapter, the ways in which individuals benefit from their experience with diversity were discussed. The research evidence also indicates that institutions or organizations may also benefit by greater diversity within the institution or organization. The institutional benefits of diversity refer to the ways in which diversity enhances the effectiveness of an organization or institution. Regrettably, there has not been much empirical analysis about the ways in which colleges and universities are

influenced by the diversity that exists on campuses. However, there is an emerging body of research that provides some evidence about how diversity affects colleges and universities. Moreover, research done in the private sector provides rather compelling evidence about the ways in which diversity enhances organizational effectiveness.

The leadership provided by the private sector in studying these questions is certainly no accident. Businesses realize that if they are to be competitive both “globally” and at home, they must find ways to address the challenges and maximize the opportunities that increased levels of racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity present them. This section begins with a discussion of findings from a study of the impact of increased globalism on the human resource needs of organizations. This is followed by a discussion of research that has been done regarding the impact of diversity in organizational settings. Finally, this section concludes with a discussion of emerging research that provides some evidence about the ways in which faculty diversity affects institutions of higher education.

Preparing Workers for a Global Economy

A recent report by the RAND Corporation (Bikson and Law, 1994) provides important information regarding the human resource needs that are a result of a rapidly developing global economy. Officials from sixteen multinational corporations and sixteen higher education institutions from cities in four geographic regions (Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Houston/Dallas areas) were interviewed in this study. These sites were chosen because of evidence indicating that “they appeared to be aware of and actively responding to an increasingly global economic environment and are thus likely to be on the cutting edge regarding issues of globalism” (p. vii).

The study addressed four primary areas: the ways in which globalism was understood by these corporations and colleges; the human resource needs presented by these views of globalism; the things that colleges and corporations do (or can do) to prepare workers who meet these human resource needs; and the things that still must be done to produce a workforce that is competitive in a global economy.

The corporate and academic communities were in general agreement regarding their views of globalism. First, they believe that economic activity has moved from a “local” domain to an international or “global” domain. Moreover, in order to be effective, this economic activity must be highly adaptive to local conditions. These changes have created a need “for fast, flexible responses to opportunities and challenges” which press for operational changes in organizations. Finally, in order for all of this to occur, employees must be trained to perform effectively to meet these challenges and the demands that they generate (Bikson and Law, 1994).

Bikson and Law (1994) reported that the academic and corporate communities shared consensus about how this movement toward globalism impacts the human resource needs of corporations that want to remain competitive in the global economy. The authors suggested four types of human resource needs that result from their research. *Domain knowledge* includes knowledge in specific subject matter areas. The study’s findings suggested that colleges currently produce graduates with strong domain knowledge. However, citing concerns about the preparation of students in K-12 education, some respondents raised concerns about whether colleges and universities will be able to continue to do this. *Cognitive, social, and personal skills* are not being developed well in students in the opinion of the corporate leaders who were interviewed. Cognitive skills include decision-making, problem solving, and learning how to learn. Social skills include an ability to function effectively in workgroups with others of diverse backgrounds. Personal skills include flexibility and adaptability, openness to new

ideas and approaches, empathy regarding the perspectives that others may hold commitment to high quality work, and innovativeness. *Prior work experience and on-the-job-training* involve the opportunity for students to apply their domain knowledge and social and personal skills in work settings while in college. *Crosscultural competence* was identified as the most critical human resource need created by globalism. This type of competence crosses the other three categories. “It involves some domain knowledge (in relation to other cultures) as well as social skills and personal traits that enhance crosscultural communication and cooperation” (Bikson and Law, 1994, p. x).

The need for organizations to have a workforce that has crosscultural competence is most salient to the issues and themes discussed in this chapter. The authors suggest that crosscultural competence has an attitudinal and a cognitive dimension to it.

Crosscultural competence, then, chiefly entails a widened knowledge base plus openness and adaptability to different cultural perspectives—and the willingness to learn whatever else is needed to deploy domain skills effectively in new contexts (including, perhaps, functionality in another language). Although these sound like the sorts of prerequisites universities are well-suited to fulfill, they are what corporations find in shortest supply among entry-level candidates” (Bikson and Law, 1994, p. 26).

The findings of this study indicate that many students do not get enough exposure to other cultures to learn how to work effectively with individuals who are different than they are. These differences manifest themselves in the norms, beliefs, values, and assumptions that students hold (Bikson and Law, 1994). Colleges must find ways for students to communicate regularly across communities of difference so that they are able to develop fully the crosscultural competencies identified by corporate representatives as being essential to the global competitiveness of their organizations.

Bikson and Law (1994) assert that crosscultural competence is a skill that is also essential to working successfully with a diverse domestic workforce. “The need to understand and interact with individuals from different backgrounds is location-independent. Moreover, a number of companies have moved to make diverse work groups a part of the way they do business everywhere” (p. 25). The authors argue that unless colleges do a better job of developing these skills and competencies in native students, corporations are likely to look increasingly at international students educated in US institutions to meet their human resource needs (Bikson and Law, 1994). These students benefit from the excellent domain knowledge that is presented in colleges in the United States while also demonstrating levels of crosscultural competence by functioning successfully as bicultural people during their studies in the United States. Moreover, these students are bilingual (and frequently multilingual).

Finally, Bikson and Law (1994) argue that if colleges are to meet the challenges that are presented by an increasingly global economy, they will have to make changes in many areas including the curriculum, extracurricular activities, enhanced faculty development, and innovative cooperative ventures with other colleges and universities around the world as well as with private industry (Bikson and Law, 1994). The authors make specific recommendations about opportunities that currently exist that can help in meeting these needs.

Colleges should make better use of the cultural diversity already available in their student bodies and localities to cultivate global awareness and crosscultural competence . . . Colleges should provide faculty with incentives (and, if possible, with resources) to develop new courses or adapt existing

courses to address globalism. Faculty currently receive strong signals that the only relevant performance criteria are publication records and teaching evaluations (p. xiv).

The authors suggest that students “should use the cultural diversity of their own campuses and localities to develop crosscultural competence” (Bikson and Law, 1994, p. xv). Clearly, if used properly, diverse colleges and universities provide an environment for learning that can be helpful in providing students with the critical skills and competencies that are required in an economy-both domestic and global-that needs workers who can demonstrate that they have cross cultural competence.

Learning from Research on Diversity in Organizations

In a review of the impact of cultural diversity in organizational settings, Taylor Cox (1993) suggested that three types of organizational goals are achieved by managing diversity effectively. These include goals pertaining to moral, ethical, and social responsibility, legal obligations of organizations, and economic performance goals. Cox (1993) cited research evidence indicating that a relationship exists between the affective and achievement outcomes of individuals and dimensions of diversity (gender, race, and age). Specific outcomes cited include job involvement levels, employee turnover, promotability ratings, and levels of value congruence. Cox asserted that properly managing diversity leads to lower turnover rates, greater use of flextime work scheduling, and greater work team productivity. Organizations that properly capitalize on their diversity should enjoy a competitive cost advantage (Cox, 1993; Reskin, 1998).

Five factors emerge as indicators that diversity enhances organizational performance. These include: (1) attracting and retaining the best available human talent, (2) enhanced marketing efforts, (3) higher creativity and innovation, (4) better problem solving, and (5) more organizational flexibility (Cox, 1993; Cox and Blake, 1991).

Women and non-white men continue to increase in proportional representation in the available work force across the United States (Judy and D’Amico, 1997), Europe, and the world (Cox, 1993). In the United States, whites’ representation in the workforce will decrease from 76 percent in 1995 to about 68 percent in 2020. While Asian Americans show the greatest proportional growth in the population, Latinos show the largest growth in absolute numbers and will account for 36 percent of the total population increase between 1990 and 2020 (Judy and D’Amico, 1997). Moreover, these changes will be felt more dramatically in particular regions of the country. For example, in California, 42 percent of the population will be Latino, 18 percent Asian, and 33 percent white (Judy and D’Amico, 1997). Hence, for continued organizational success and viability, organizations must be successful in hiring and retaining workers from diverse groups.

At the same time that the workforce is becoming much more diverse, so are consumer markets. At present, people of color represent more than \$500 billion in consumer spending in the United States (Cox, 1993). Research indicates that sociocultural identity affects buying behavior. Having a diverse organization facilitates selling goods and services in an increasingly diverse marketplace. There is great public relations value in being identified as an organization that manages diversity well. A diverse workforce can help organizations to identify the ways in which culture affects the buying decisions of consumers. Research indicates that people from minority groups are more likely to do business with representatives of their own cultural group (Cox, 1993).

Research evidence supports the idea that diverse work teams promote creativity and innovation (Cox, 1993; Reskin, 1998). Organizational diversity has been shown to enhance productivity by better utilizing workers’ skills (Reskin, 1998). Kanter’s (1983) study of innovation in organizations found that the most innovative companies

deliberately establish heterogeneous work teams. In this study, Kanter noted that more innovative organizations were more likely to have done a better job of combating racism, sexism, and classism in the organization. They also were more likely to employ women and non-White men.

Nemeth's work (1986, cited in Cox, 1993) indicates that minority viewpoints can stimulate consideration of previously unconsidered alternatives in work groups. In a related study, after holding constant ability levels, heterogeneous work groups were judged to be more creative than groups that were more homogeneous (Triandis, Hall, and Ewen, 1965 cited in Cox, 1993). Research indicates that a great variation in attitudes, beliefs, and cognitive functioning exist based upon characteristics of race, gender, and age (Cox, 1993). Moreover, Cox cites work done with colleagues (McLeod, Lobel, and Cox, 1993) indicating that ideas generated in a brainstorming exercise by racially diverse groups of Asians, Blacks, Whites, and Latinos generated ideas of the same quantity, but of higher quality, than ideas generated by racially homogeneous groups.

By citing evidence regarding the "group think" (Janis, 1982) phenomenon, Cox's (1993) synthesis of research indicates that diverse groups are more likely to do a better job of problem solving than are more homogeneous groups. Because of the tendency for homogeneous groups to be inordinately concerned with maintaining cohesiveness, they are more likely to be victims of this problem. Nemeth (1985 cited in Cox, 1993) and Nemeth and Wachter (1985 cited in Cox, 1993) found that groups with minority members were more likely to generate higher levels of critical analysis in problem solving than were groups that were homogeneous. Cox (1993) argues that "culturally diverse workforces have the potential to solve problems better because of several factors: a greater variety of perspectives brought to bear on the issue, a higher level of critical analysis of alternatives, and a lower probability of group think" (p. 35).

The final organizational benefit of diversity identified by Cox (1993) has to do with evidence of greater organizational flexibility in organizations that have a greater representation of racially diverse members. Research evidence suggests "that members of racial/ethnic minorities groups tend to have especially flexible cognitive structures" (Cox, 1993, p. 35). Moreover, Cox (1993) contends that the process of managing diversity itself is likely to lead to greater organizational flexibility.

In addition to the many benefits that accrue to more diverse organizations, Cox (1993) identifies a set of problems that may result as organizations make efforts to diversify themselves. Diversity can lead to lower levels of cohesiveness in groups. Cohesiveness is much easier to achieve in groups that are more homogeneous. While cohesiveness has been shown to lead to higher levels of morale and better communication, there is no evidence that cohesiveness enhances work performance (Cox, 1993).

Organizations that are more diverse also tend to have less effective communication. Because of greater difficulty in communications, members' anxieties may rise, conflict may increase, and members may feel less comfortable with membership in the group (Cox, 1993). Similarly, theory and research in race relations suggests that conflict increases as the presence of minorities increases in a given organizational context (Blalock, 1967). These findings suggest that organizations must be purposeful and deliberate in their movement to diversify. In the end, Cox (1993) asserts that the advantages of more diverse organizations far outweigh the disadvantages.

In certain respects then, culturally diverse workgroups are more difficult to manage effectively than culturally homogeneous workgroups. In view of this, the challenge for organizations . . . is to manage in such a way as to

maximize the potential benefits of diversity while minimizing the potential disadvantages (Cox, 1993, p. 39).

The Institutional Effects of Diversity in Higher Education

In a case study of a higher education institution that documented the organizational changes that occurred as it engaged in a process of transformation from being monocultural to multicultural, Bensimon (1995 cited in Smith and Associates, 1997) identified a number of organizational attributes that aided in this transition. These included strong institutional leadership, the creation of a new institutional mission statement, the appointment of women and people of color to the president's cabinet, the appointment of Black and Latino faculty members, and a commitment to multicultural curricular transformation. These findings are similar to those of other recent national studies that have linked curricular change, diversity in leadership, institutional commitment and mission, and levels of community to institutional effectiveness (Musil, García, Moses, and Smith, 1995; Nettles and Hudgins, 1995; Sedlacek, 1995 cited in Smith and Associates, 1997)

The Impact of a Diversified Faculty

There is an emerging body of research that helps us to understand the ways in which a more diverse faculty in colleges and universities influence the educational endeavor. Perhaps most germane to this discussion are the ways in which teaching and learning are enhanced by the inclusion of a diverse faculty.

Research on factors that influence the types of teaching methods used by faculty indicate that faculty background characteristics contribute greatly to the learning process (Easton & Guskey, 1983; Kozma, Belle, & Williams, 1978). Milem and Astin (1992) found gender to be a positive predictor of student-centered teaching practices. The researchers investigated science faculty's teaching techniques and found that women faculty in the sciences were more likely to utilize active learning techniques such as class discussion, student-selected topics and student-developed learning than men faculty in that field. In a related study, Milem and Wakai (1996) found the race and gender of faculty were important predictors of the likelihood that faculty would use student-centered approaches in the classroom. They found that women, as well as faculty who were African American, Native American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican, were more likely than their other colleagues to use feminist pedagogy in the classroom. In a related study, Milem (1997) found a similar pattern of relationships between race and gender and teaching related outcomes. Specifically, women and faculty of color were more likely to use active learning techniques in the classroom, to include the perspectives of women and racial/ethnic minorities in the curriculum, to engage in research on issues of race/ethnicity, and to attend workshops designed to help them incorporate the perspectives of women and racial/ethnic minorities into the curriculum of their courses. Statham, Richardson and Cook (1991) examined gender and university teaching and found female professors to be more likely than male professors to encourage students' input and independence, and to view students as active collaborators in the learning process.

Other faculty characteristics that may influence teaching methods include academic rank and social status. Statham, Richardson and Cook (1991) found that assistant professors were more likely to adopt participatory teaching practices than full professors. Mulkey's (1972) study on social status and innovation among scientists found that low status or young scientists were more likely to be academically innovative since deviation from social norms posed little threat to their careers. In researching social status, Merton

(1973) considered “outsiders” of an institution as individuals having lower status and being frequently frustrated by the social system. Merton asserted that outsider status provides individuals with special perspectives and insights that may lead them to inquire into problems relevant to their group and may cause them to develop unique solutions. Similarly, Hill Collins (1986) has written persuasively about the insight and perspective offered by those who have “outsider” status within colleges and universities.

As teachers, “outsiders” may be more likely to be sensitive to classroom dynamics that are taken for granted by insiders. Gumpert’s (1987) study of the emergence of feminist scholarship supports the notion that personal status (being new, marginal or an outsider to a field of study) may influence reform efforts. The group Gumpert identified as “Pathfinders” were feminist scholars politically active during the women’s movement. They tended to remain peripheral to mainstream academic life since the academy’s traditional values were contrary to their own political and intellectual agendas. Outsider status may have provided the pathfinders with a unique perspective that enabled them to work for innovative reform. The tendency for the pathfinders’ outsider status to facilitate their work for reform may also be applicable to other under-represented groups such as faculty of color.

Furthermore, there is support suggesting that professors’ teaching practices are influenced by their professional interest in feminist issues. The research, writing and promotion of feminist pedagogy have primarily come from scholars who are committed to feminist issues. Klein (1987) states that feminist pedagogy developed from the work of women who were active politically and academically in feminist issues and transferred their activities directly from the feminist movement to their classrooms. In their introduction to *Gendered Subjects*, Culley and Portuges (1985) assert that practitioners of feminist pedagogy are aware of the ways in which traditional pedagogy may reproduce discriminatory, even destructive, attitudes and expectations about women. Therefore, they are likely to use their knowledge of feminism to restructure and revitalize the ways in which knowledge is acquired, sanctioned and perpetuated.

In a recent study of the impact of a diverse faculty on the research, teaching, and service missions of the university, Milem (1999) found that being a woman or a faculty member of color were important factors in predicting different outcomes related to the diverse missions of the university. The findings of this study provide empirical evidence that supports the assertion that the inclusion of women and people of color as faculty members in higher education enriches the three primary missions of the university (teaching, research, and service). Race and gender served as significant predictors of the use of active learning methods in the classroom. These methods have been shown to positively influence the learning process for students. Moreover, the use of active pedagogy provides students with an opportunity to interact with others who are different than they are in their classes through class discussions, collaborative learning methods, and group projects. Research suggests that these activities contribute to a more supportive campus climate for diversity and lead to positive outcomes for the students who are involved (see e.g., Astin, 1993; Chang, 1999; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999; Smith and Associates, 1997). Moreover, a diverse faculty provides students with a greater opportunity to encounter readings and research that address the experience of women and members of different racial/ethnic groups. This is another form of “interaction”- an interaction with diverse ideas - that can lead to positive outcomes for students. Moreover, for students of color, this provides them with an opportunity to see aspects of their experience represented in the curriculum. This interaction with diverse course content provides all students with opportunities to understand the experience of others who differ from them in various ways.

Regarding the research mission of the university, faculty of color and women faculty expand the boundaries of what we know through the research that they do. Specifically, they are much more likely than white faculty are to engage in research that extends our knowledge of issues pertaining to race/ethnicity and women/gender in society. Finally, the findings of this study suggest that faculty of color and women engage in service related activities with greater relative frequency than their other colleagues do (Milem, 1999). These findings suggest that students who attend institutions with higher proportions of women, faculty of color, and/or who are feminists are more likely to find faculty who are student-centered in their orientation to teaching and learning. They are also more likely to find a curriculum that is more inclusive in its representation of the experiences and contributions of women and racial/ethnic minorities in society. Finally, they are more likely to find faculty who are actively engaged in research on issues of race and gender.

The nature of the organizational climate at colleges and universities can also shape the teaching and learning enterprise (Austin, 1996; Berger, 1997; Berger and Milem, in press; Bowen, 1977; Finkelstein, 1984; Milem, 1997). Organizational climates are valuable to examine when assessing college environments because they are proximal to individual experiences and therefore have the potential to influence personal behaviors (Dey, 1991). Mauksch (1980) suggests that institutional climate is linked to teaching practices because it provides faculty with the social norms for teaching.

Astin (1993) found that student-oriented climates produce more positive student outcomes than almost any other environmental variable (Astin, 1993). In a study of the impact of diversity on college and university faculty, Milem (1997) found that measures representing different components of the institutional climate for diversity at colleges and universities were significant predictors of teaching outcomes. Specifically, if faculty perceived other faculty at their institution to be more student centered in their pedagogical approaches and/or to place greater value on diversity, these faculty were more likely to report that they had employed active teaching methods in the classroom, modified their curriculum to insure that the perspectives of women and racial/ethnic minorities were represented, attended faculty development sessions designed to assist them in incorporating these issues into the content of their courses, and engaged in research on issues of race/ethnicity. These findings indicate that the organizational climate matters and that the climate is shaped directly and indirectly by greater representation of women and people of color on the faculty (Milem, 1997).

Summary

A recent study by the RAND Corporation indicates that colleges and universities are producing students with high levels of domain or technical skills. However, the results of this study indicate that college graduates lack crosscultural competencies, which have been identified by leaders of multinational corporations as a primary human resource need for workers in an increasingly diverse domestic and global economy. Racially and ethnically diverse campuses provide a perfect environment within which students can develop these badly needed competencies.

Research on the organizational impact of diversity suggests that, when managed correctly, diversity benefits organizations by helping to attract the best available human talent, enhancing marketing efforts, increasing creativity and innovation, improving problem-solving abilities, and improving organizational flexibility.

In research on the impact of a diverse faculty in higher education institutions, findings indicate that women faculty and faculty of color enhance an institution's ability to achieve the primary missions of research, teaching, and service. Moreover, emerging

evidence suggests that an organizational climate that values diversity can positively influence the use of student-centered practices in the classroom.

Societal Benefits

The societal benefits of campus diversity are defined as the ways in which diversity in colleges and universities impacts quality of life issues in the larger society. Perhaps of most prominence here are the ways in which a diverse workforce and diverse student enrollments contribute to the achievement of democratic ideals of equity and access, the development of an educated and involved citizenry, and the provision of services to groups in our society who are badly underserved.

This chapter examines these issues by discussing research that has been conducted in four broad areas regarding how diversity advances societal outcomes. The first part of this section begins with a summary and discussion of a recently completed review of research literature pertaining to affirmative action in employment. The second part of this section considers what the return on investment is on money that is invested in federal financial aid programs. The third part of this section discusses findings regarding levels of involvement in civic and community service by Black students who attended the selective institutions in the Bowen and Bok (1997) study. Finally, the discussion of the societal benefits of diversity concludes with an examination of the health care crisis that exists in low income urban and rural communities and evidence that indicates that physicians of color have been uniquely willing (and able) to provide service to patients in these areas.

Research on the Impact of Affirmative Action in the Workplace

The tension between affirmative action and merit is the inevitable result of the conflict between our national values and what actually occurs in the nation's workplaces. As long as discrimination is more pervasive than affirmative action, it is the real threat to meritocracy. But because no one will join the debate on behalf of discrimination, we end up with the illusion of a struggle between affirmative action and merit (Reskin, 1998, p. 84).

Although many Americans would prefer a labor market that never takes race or gender into account, as long as employers and employment practices routinely discriminate against minorities and women, the choice is not between meritocracy and affirmative action, it is between discrimination and affirmative action (Reskin, 1998, p. 93)

On behalf of the American Sociological Association, Barbara Reskin (1998) recently completed a review of the research literature regarding the impact of affirmative action programs in employment. This review of research indicates that affirmative action programs have increased the representation of minority men and women in the workforce. Moreover, evidence suggests that affirmative action in employment has led to greater access to professional, managerial, and craft occupations among minority men and women (Reskin, 1998). Evidence also suggests that affirmative action in employment has lessened wage discrimination in our society. Carnoy (1994 cited in Reskin, 1998) estimated that at least one third of the earnings gains for African American and Latino workers during the 1960s can be attributed to declines in wage discrimination resulting from anti-discrimination legislation and affirmative action programs.

Reskin (1998) summarized findings from a number of studies that compared outcomes for firms with and without affirmative action programs. These studies suggest that opportunities for White women and African American men were much greater at firms that practiced affirmative action than at firms that did not. Moreover, other studies indicate that employment discrimination is less likely to occur in firms and industries that actively promote affirmative action in employment. Research evidence suggests that occupational segregation has steadily decreased over the past three decades (Reskin, 1998). Reskin summarizes these findings by asserting that “by preventing discrimination, affirmative action has opened thousands of jobs to women and minorities that discrimination had formerly closed to them” (p. 54). While the decline in occupational segregation has been accompanied by a decline in wage disparities, these disparities do still exist.

Affirmative action programs in employment have been shown to have a positive impact on individual workers by raising the career aspirations of minorities and women (Reskin, 1998). In the same way in which some people respond to a perception that they have limited opportunities in a given field by lowering their aspirations, research indicates that they will *pursue* opportunities in fields that they perceive to be open to them (Kanter, 1977; Reskin and Hartmann, 1986; Markham, Harlan, and Hackett, 1987; Jacobs, 1987; Cassirer and Reskin, 1998 cited in Reskin, 1998). By reducing the perception that discriminatory barriers block access to certain lines of work, affirmative action curtails self selection that minorities and women engage in with some jobs and/or promotions (Reskin and Roos, 1990 cited in Reskin, 1998).

One of the criticisms levied by opponents of affirmative action is that it causes the beneficiaries of these programs to engage in a process of self-doubt regarding their abilities and qualification for the jobs that they have received (Steele, 1990 cited by Reskin, 1998). However, research evidence suggests that stigmatization by others is a much greater risk than is self-stigmatization. Moreover, research indicates that employers can greatly reduce the risk of stigmatization by providing accurate information regarding how their affirmative action programs work (Reskin, 1998).

There are a number of things that we can learn from research done on the successful implementation of affirmative action in employment. Key among these are the organizational attributes that facilitate success in the planning and implementation of affirmative action programs. The commitment of an organization’s top executives to eliminating discrimination is critical (Shaeffer and Lynton, 1979; Beilby and Baron, 1984; O’Farrell and Harlan, 1984; Vernon-Gerstenfeld and Burke, 1985; Thomas, 1990; Konrad and Linnehan, 1995 cited in Reskin, 1998). By formalizing employment practices in a way that reduces subjectivity and cronyism, employers are able to draw upon more diverse talent pools (Reskin, 1998). Firms must develop personnel practices that are perceived to be fair by all employees. As part of this, successful firms educate employees regarding their employment procedures (Leonard, 1994, cited Reskin, 1998). Firms with equal employment opportunity or affirmative action offices were much more likely to be involved in affirmative action recruiting (Reskin, 1998). The existence of affirmative action goals seems to facilitate equity, regardless of whether the organization actually meets the goals it sets for itself (Leonard, 1985 cited in Reskin, 1998). However, the most effective institutions are those that monitor their progress toward achieving their goals. As a part of this monitoring and assessment process, institutional effectiveness is increased in those firms that have a means for providing both positive and negative sanctions to managers with responsibility for meeting organizational goals regarding affirmative action (Reskin, 1998).

Much of the resistance to affirmative action programs comes from those who perceive that they are at risk of being penalized somehow by affirmative action. One of the most frequent criticisms of affirmative action is that it involves “reverse discrimination”. Reskin’s review of research suggests that “reverse discrimination is rare both in absolute terms and relative to conventional wisdom” (p. 72). Steeh and Krysan (1996 cited in Reskin, 1998) found that only 5 to 12 percent of Whites indicated that they felt that their race had cost them a job or promotion. Conversely, more than one third of the African Americans surveyed reported similar beliefs. However, between 66 percent and 80 percent of Whites (compared to one quarter of African Americans) surveyed during the 1990s reported that they thought African Americans with lower qualifications were given jobs or promotions over “more qualified” Whites (Taylor, 1994; Davis and Smith, 1994; Steeh and Krysan, 1996 cited in Reskin, 1998).

Data from the EEOC indicated exceptionally low proportions of reverse discrimination charges in employment. Only four percent of the discrimination claims filed with the EEOC between 1987 and 1994 charged reverse discrimination (Norton, 1996 cited in Reskin, 1998). Moreover, of the cases that actually made it to court between 1990 and 1994, only two percent charged reverse discrimination (US Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, cited in Reskin, 1998). “Finally, allegations of reverse discrimination are less likely than conventional discrimination cases to be supported by evidence” (Reskin, 1998, p. 73).

In the conclusion to the monograph, Reskin argues that while affirmative action in employment has been successful, the evidence does not suggest that it is time to end affirmative action. Despite the progress that has been made, affirmative action programs in employment remain necessary.

Despite the impact of anti-discrimination laws on job integration and the good-faith efforts of many employers to diversify their workforces, the strength of habit in people’s ways of thinking and organizations’ ways of doing business means that more concerted efforts are necessary to eliminate discriminatory barriers. Weakening or ending affirmative action at the very least would slow the progress that minorities and women have made in entering the economic mainstream. The erosion in the relative economic standing of African Americans during the 1980s stemmed in part from the hiatus in affirmative action enforcement. Without government pressure for affirmative action, cronyism will reign supreme, and those protected by affirmative action as well as others who lack the right connections will stand to lose. Eliminating affirmative action will increase job discrimination based on sex and race and the wage gap between white men and other groups (Reskin, 1998, p. 92).”

Return on Investment of Financial Aid

Without a doubt, since its inception, financial aid has facilitated the enrollment of more diverse students on college campuses. In reviews of the research regarding the impact of student financial aid, researchers found that financial aid generally does what it was created to do — it increases access to higher education (St. John 1991a; Stampen & Fenske, 1988). Financial aid increases the probability that students will attend college. While all forms of aid have been found to be positively associated with the decision to attend college when *all* students are considered, not all forms of aid have been found to be equally effective in promoting access for students from historically disadvantaged backgrounds. Aid packages with loans have been found to be less consistently significant

in facilitating access for minority applicants than they are for white applicants (St. John, 1991a). In a study of the high school class of 1982, St. John (1991a, 1991b) found that the enrollment decisions of low-income students are price responsive to grants but not to loans, while middle income students are more price responsive to loans than to grants. Several researchers suggest that increases in federal student grant funding would be the most efficacious way to promote minority access in the short run and should also be an essential element of any long term strategies devised to increase both access and persistence (St. John, 1991b; Astin, 1982).

Another way to consider the value of federal financial aid programs is to consider how our society may benefit from the long-term investment of federal funds in the students who receive them. St. John and Masten (1990) used human capital theory to provide a framework for determining what the return on investment is for each federal dollar that was spent on student financial aid for students from the graduating high school class of 1972. In this study, the authors suggest that the money that students receive from federal aid sources be viewed as a form of investment. The return on this investment is defined as the increased tax revenues that can be attributed to the gains in educational attainment that result from the investment of these federal aid dollars. The authors created a series of econometric prediction models that were based upon the concept of cash-flow ratios (Windham, 1979 cited in St. John and Masten, 1990) to calculate a range of returns on investment. The “Worst Case” model indicated a return on investment of \$1.40 while the most “Optimistic” model indicated a return on investment of \$28.80 for each dollar of federal aid money invested. Applying the model that used the most reasonable economic assumptions and also provided an adjustment for the effect of background factors in predicting income, the authors concluded that each dollar invested in student aid during the 1970s yielded a return of \$4.30. In other words, for every dollar that was invested in federal aid programs during the 1970s, this created an additional \$4.30 in tax revenues that otherwise would not have been collected.

This return on investment of federal funds is substantially higher than what the authors calculated the government would have received if they had invested this money in a bank. Hence, “student financial aid is a profitable area of public investment, perhaps more profitable than any other way the federal government can use its funds . . . Therefore, the failure to invest in student financial aid is short sighted, if not foolish, given the high level of federal debt that will confront future generations” (St. John and Masten, 1990, p. 20). The increased diversification of higher education makes sound economic sense for our society. Greater access to higher education, especially through programs such as federal financial aid, produce greater tax revenues that may help to “ease the debt burden for future generations” (St. John and Masten, 1990, p. 21).

Civic and Professional Involvement

Bowen and Bok (1998) argue that one of the central goals of higher education institutions is to educate students who will become good citizens. Hence, many institutions of higher education select their students based upon a belief and expectation that their students will go on to give something back to society through their involvement in professional, social, and civic organizations. Furthermore, the authors argue that in recent years, these institutions have extended their belief in the value of this mission to the need to diversify their student bodies. Institutions of higher education have come to understand their obligation to educate and to develop an expanded pool of “[b]lack and Hispanic men and women who could assume leadership roles in their communities and in every facet of national life” (Bowen and Bok, 1998, p. 156).

In their study of Black and White students who attended institutions with selective admissions policies, Bowen and Bok (1998) found that Black students who attended these institutions were likely to be widely involved in civic and community activities. Findings from analyses of their 1976 cohort of students indicated that Black students were more likely than their white peers were to be involved in community and civic organizations. Moreover, Black men were much more likely than white men were to be involved in leadership positions in organizations with a civic focus. This was especially true in organizations focusing on social service, youth, and school related activities. Black women were more likely than white women were to report that they held leadership positions “in community, social service, alumni/ae, religious, and professional groups” (p. 160). Finally, Black students were more likely than White students were to report that they held multiple positions of leadership in different civic and community organizations.

The findings from the 1989 cohort in this study suggest that students become involved in service activities early on. Patterns of involvement of the 1989 cohort were quite similar to students from the 1976 cohort. Even though these students were not at a point in their personal or professional lives where they were “settled in a community” (p. 162), over 40 percent of Black men reported that they were involved in community service and 12 percent reported serving in leadership roles (a rate that was three times higher than white men). The authors report that “the percentages for the [b]lack women are equally impressive” (p. 162). Multivariate analyses of these data indicate that there was an indirect relationship between attending the most selective institutions and being involved in leadership positions in community and social service organizations. While Black students who attended the most selective institutions were more likely to be involved in leadership positions, this was explained largely by the fact that these students were more likely to have obtained advanced degrees than their peers were at other (less) selective institutions.

Black students who obtained advanced degrees were more likely than their white peers were to be involved in community and social service organizations. This holds true for lawyers (21 percent Black involvement as compared to 15 percent for whites), physicians (18 percent for Blacks as compared to 9 percent for whites), and most dramatically for Ph.D.s (33 percent for Blacks as compared to only 6 percent for whites).

The [b]lack alumni/ae of these schools have already demonstrated a marked tendency to “give something back” through participation and leadership outside the workplace as well as within it. This civic spirit, revealed through actions taken rather than good intentions expressed, and demonstrated over time through volunteering in schools, neighborhoods, museums, and civic associations of every kind, is surely one important indicator of “merit.” (p. 192).

Benefits Accruing from the Diversification of the Medical Profession

Producing a physician work force that reflects this country’s rich diversity is important not only for reasons of social equity, but also to ensure the delivery of health care that is competent both technically and culturally (Nickens, Ready, and Petersdorf, 1994, p. 472).

The health care crisis faced by residents of low-income communities and low-income communities of color, specifically, is striking. This crisis is due largely to insufficient access that people who live in these communities have to health care

providers. The national average for physician to population service ratio is 1 physician for every 387 people. However, more than 2,700 areas in our country have been identified as having a shortage of health professional coverage. These areas average 1 physician for every 3,500 people or more (Health Resources and Services Administration, 1995). Approximately one person in five in our country lives in an area designated as having insufficient health care coverage. These areas are found in rural and urban settings across the United States. In low income neighborhoods in Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and New York, the ratio of physician to population can be as high as 1 physician for every 10,000 to 15,000 people (Ginzberg, 1994). When the physician to population ratios in underserved communities are contrasted with these ratios in affluent communities; the differences that can be seen are staggering. While low income people of color in Los Angeles face a physician to population ratio of between 1 to 10,000 or 15,000, residents of Beverly Hills, California enjoy a physician to population ratio of 1 physician to 25 or 30 people.

Living in poverty dramatically increases the likelihood that a person will live in an area that has been designated as having insufficient health care coverage. In 1995, 11.2 percent of Whites in our society lived at or below the poverty level. The figures for Blacks and Hispanics¹ (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1998) were dramatically higher. Census data estimate that nearly one in three Blacks (29.3 percent) and Hispanics (30.3 percent) lived in poverty in 1995. We see even greater disparities when we examine the poverty rate for children who were born in 1995: 41.5 percent of Black children and 39.3 percent of Hispanic children were born into families at or below poverty level while 15.5 percent of White children faced being born to similar economic circumstances.

Statistics reported by the Bureau of Census (1998) tell us something about the consequences of this crisis, particularly regarding the effects that it has on people of color in our country. These data reveal that the infant mortality rate for Black children in our country remains significantly higher than for White children. In 1995, for every 1,000 births that occurred, 16.22 Black male babies and 13.74 Black female babies died before they reached the age of one year. Conversely, only 6.98 White male babies and 5.55 White female babies faced a similar fate. Moreover, White children can expect to live significantly longer lives than Black children do. The life expectancy for White men in 1995 was 73.4 years as compared to 65.2 years for Black men. For white women, the life expectancy was 79.6 years as compared to 73.9 years for Black women (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1998). These data clearly document the need for better medical care to underserved communities in our country.

The medical community has extensively utilized research to document the societal value that has accrued from the participation of racial and ethnic minorities in their profession. There has been a long history of underrepresentation of minorities and women among the ranks of physicians in our country. In regard to the preparation and training of Black physicians, it was not until 1974 that the number of Black medical students in other medical schools exceeded the enrollment of students at Howard University and Meharry Medical College (Gray, 1977).

The Association of American Medical Colleges recognized the need to actively support and encourage the enrollment of underrepresented students in medical school when it launched its Project 3000 by 2000 program in the early 1990s. This program has the goal of doubling the enrollment of underrepresented minority physicians by the year 2000. A central goal of this program has been to increase the number of physicians from underrepresented groups to meet the health care needs of the most underserved

¹ This label for Latinos is used because it is the label that is used in Bureau of Census reports.

populations in our society (Nickens, Ready, and Petersdorf, 1994). As part of this program, the AAMC recognized that a first step in addressing the health care needs of low income communities and low income communities of color was to train more physicians of color. An emerging body of research evidence indicating that physicians of color are more likely than White physicians to provide care for these underserved populations supported this recognition.

Keith, Bell, Swanson, and Williams (1985) have been widely cited as the first group of scholars to provide empirical evidence that supports the assertion that minority physicians were significantly more likely than their white counterparts to provide health care to populations in our society who need it the most. This was reflected in the type of medicine that minority doctors practiced as well as in the geographic area in which they practiced medicine. Nearly one third more minority doctors chose primary care specialties than did nonminority physicians (55 percent to 41 percent). Moreover, physicians of color were more likely to practice in areas that had been designated as health-manpower shortage areas by the federal government. In fact, minority physicians were twice as likely as nonminority doctors were to practice in these areas (12 percent vs. 6 percent). This geographic pattern was found for all of the medical subspecialties included in the sample (not just primary care physicians). Finally, minority graduates were more likely to have Medicaid recipients as patients than were nonminority graduates (31 percent for Blacks, 24 percent for Latinos, and 14 percent for whites). Based on their findings, the authors argue that “by increasing the number of minority physicians, affirmative action programs have substantially improved access to care among minority populations” (Keith, et al, 1985, p. 1523).

Recently, Komaromy, Grumbach, Drake, Vranizan, Lurie, Keane, and Bindman (1997) used data from the AMA masterfile to build upon the findings of Keith, et al (1985) in their study of the practice patterns of physicians in California. The researchers used U.S. Census data to determine the demographic characteristics of the areas in which these physicians practiced medicine. The goals of the study were threefold. First, the study analyzed the distribution of physicians and how it related to the demographic characteristics of California communities². Second, the study examined the relationship between physicians’ race or ethnic group and the characteristics of the communities where these physicians located their practices. Finally, the study considered the relationship between the race and ethnic group of physicians and the racial or ethnic distributions and insurance status of patients.

The study findings indicated that areas with the worst physician to population ratios were found in urban areas of poverty with high proportions of Black and Latino residents. Poor urban areas that had low proportions of Black and Latino residents had nearly three times as many primary care physicians as areas with high proportions of Blacks and Latinos. The salience of race in availability of health care is further illustrated by the fact that communities with high proportions of Black or Latino residents were four times as likely as others to experience a shortage of physicians, regardless of level of community income (Komaromy, et al, 1997).

Latino and Black physicians were more likely to locate their practices in areas with the greatest need for primary care doctors. They also tended to be located in poorer areas than those of white physicians. Black physicians practiced medicine in areas where the mean percentage of Black residents was five times greater than those where other

² For the purposes of their study, the authors defined areas with shortages of primary care physicians as those with fewer than 30 office-based primary care physicians per 100,000 population.

physicians practiced. Similarly, Latino physicians practiced in areas with significantly more Latinos.

Finally, Black physicians cared for six times as many Black patients as did other physicians. Latino physicians cared for three times as many Latinos as did other physicians. These findings held in multivariate analyses after controlling for the fact that greater proportions of people from these groups lived in the areas where these physicians practiced. Black physicians were the most likely to care for patients who were insured by Medicaid (45 percent of their patients as compared to 18 percent for white physicians, 24 percent for Latino physicians, and 30 percent for Asian physicians). Latino physicians were more likely to provide care to patients without insurance (9 percent as compared to 3 percent for Black physicians, 4 percent for Asian physicians, and 6 percent for white physicians). Black and Latino physicians play an essential role in providing health care for poor people and members of minority groups (Komaromy, et al, 1997).

Other recent studies report similar findings. Cantor, Miles, Baker, and Barker (1997) found that minority and women physicians were much more likely to serve minority, poor, and Medicaid recipients than were nonminority male physicians. Moreover, while there was a weak relationship between socioeconomic background of the physician and the tendency to serve these populations, race and sex were the strongest and most consistent variables that predicted physicians' decisions to practice in these areas. Through the use of a longitudinal sample, the authors assert that physicians' decisions to practice in these areas are likely to remain stable over time.

Xu, Fields, Laine, Veloski, Barzansky, and Martini (1997) examined data from a national sample of physicians who graduated in 1983 or 1984 and found that after controlling for gender, family income, residence, and National Health Services financial aid obligations, primary care physicians from underrepresented groups were more likely than nonminority physicians to care for medically underserved populations (defined in this study as the mean percentage of patients with Medicaid and poor patients in the physicians' practice). Findings from this study reveal that over half of the Black physicians and one quarter of the Chicano/Latino physicians indicated that they had National Health Service obligations as compared to only 10 percent of their white and 8 percent of their Asian American colleagues. One could argue that an obligation to the National Health Service (and not race/ethnicity) accounts for the findings regarding a greater likelihood of service to underserved populations. However, after controlling for the effects of this obligation in multivariate analyses, race/ethnicity of physicians remained as significant positive predictors of service to underserved populations.

Similar findings are reflected in analyses of national data from the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC, 1994). In 1993, 40 percent of students graduating from medical schools who were members of underrepresented minorities (Blacks, Mexican Americans, mainland Puerto Ricans, and American Indians) indicated that they planned to practice medicine in underserved areas. Less than 1 in 10 (9 percent) of other medical school graduates expressed a similar desire. Nearly 6 in 10 medical generalists from underrepresented groups reported that they planned to practice in these areas as compared to just 24 percent of other graduates who were preparing for generalist careers.

Moy and Bartman (1995) explored the relationship between the race of physicians and the likelihood that they would provide care to minority and medically indigent patients. This study provided a different twist on analyses of these questions by being the first of its kind to use data gathered from a nationally representative sample of patients using the 1987 National Medical Expenditure Survey (NMES). The study sought the answers to three related research questions. First, were nonwhite physicians more likely to provide care to racial and ethnic minority patients? Second, were nonwhite physicians

more likely to provide care to medically indigent patients? Finally, did nonwhite physicians provide care to patients who were sicker? The findings of the study provided affirmative responses to all three questions. Racial and ethnic minorities were more than four times as likely to report that they received care from nonwhite physicians than were white patients. Moreover, patients who were low-income, Medicaid recipients or non-insured were more likely to receive care from nonwhite physicians. Finally, patients who reported that they were in worse health, had visited an emergency room, or who had been hospitalized were also more likely to report that they received their care from nonwhite physicians. These findings held in multivariate analyses that controlled for the effects of physician sex, specialization, and workplace and geographic location.

Each of the studies that has been profiled point to the important role that physicians of color play in addressing the health care needs of the most medically underserved communities in our society. Physicians of color are significantly more likely to pursue medical specialties that address the needs of these people and to locate their practices in areas that will serve the medically underserved. Moreover, the saliency of race in predicting service to these communities holds even after controlling for the effects of socioeconomic status, gender, and National Health Service financial obligations. Hence, any plans to alter affirmative action to focus on economic disadvantage or to eliminate it altogether would further imperil the people who live in the most medically underserved communities in our country. As was discussed earlier, this includes one in five Americans.

In spite of this compelling evidence and the calls for increased enrollment of students of color in medical schools, obstacles to the goal of parity in the population of physicians have occurred with recent changes to affirmative action policy in California and similar threats in other states. Between 1990 and 1994, 5 of 10 medical schools that produced the highest percentage of underrepresented students were in California. Four of them were public institutions and University of California campuses (San Francisco, Davis, San Diego, and Irvine). The other was Stanford University. The impact of Proposition 209 and the Regents decision (SP-1) on the enrollment of students of color at medical schools at the University of California campuses have been dramatic.

Of the remaining five campuses that produced the most physicians of color, three were HBCUs—Meharry, Morehouse, and Howard. The two remaining campuses were the University of Illinois and the University of Michigan. Legal challenges to affirmative action in undergraduate and graduate admission are currently pending against the University of Michigan. How the outcomes of these cases will affect the enrollment of students of color at the University of Michigan’s medical school is yet to be determined.

Summary

The findings of the research in the four broad areas discussed in this section of the manuscript indicate that there are appreciable ways in which our society benefits from increased diversity. Research on the outcomes of affirmative action in employment is helpful to our understanding of the value of affirmative action in higher education. Reskin’s (1998) review of research indicates that affirmative action in employment has led to decreased job discrimination, decreased disparities in wages, decreased occupational segregation, increased occupational aspirations for women and people of color, and greater organizational productivity. Moreover, contrary to the assertions of many critics of affirmative action, Reskin found little empirical evidence that affirmative action leads to self-stigmatization on the part of those who benefit from affirmative action. Finally, Reskin (1998) found that evidence supporting charges of reverse discrimination are “rare both in absolute terms and relative to conventional wisdom” (p.

72). Hence, affirmative action in employment has made hiring practices more equitable and has increased access to occupations for women and people of color.

While federal financial aid programs were initially created to increase access to higher education for students from historically disadvantaged background, research indicates that expanding opportunities for access to higher education also makes good fiscal sense. Investing in the education of students from low-income backgrounds provides a significant return on investment of federal financial aid monies. St. John and Masten (1990) calculated that every dollar of federal aid money invested in members of the high school class of 1972 yielded a return of \$4.30 in increased tax revenues that were not likely to have otherwise been collected. There are few investments available that can produce such a high rate of return in such a short period of time.

Research evidence suggests that students of color benefit our society through their high levels of involvement in service to community and civic groups and through their service to medically underserved populations. Bowen and Bok (1998) found that the African American students were much more likely than White students to be involved in community and civic organizations and to be involved in the leadership of these organizations. Studies of practice patterns of physicians indicate that doctors of color are more likely to practice medicine in areas with populations that have the greatest need for health services in our society (low income urban and rural locations, locations with high populations of people of color, populations that rely on Medicare for their health insurance, and populations that do not have any health insurance).

Organizational Forces that May Make Diversity Difficult to Institutionalize³

In her manuscript summarizing the impact of affirmative action in employment, Reskin (1998) indicates that much of the race and sex discrimination that exist in the workplace are a function of the ways in which these firms do business. To illustrate this concept, Reskin offers two examples of factors that contribute to employment discrimination. The first occurs when employers rely heavily on informal networks to recruit their employees. The second occurs when firms require job credentials that are not necessary to do a job effectively. Reskin (1998) suggests that “structural discrimination persists because, once in place, discriminatory practices in bureaucratic organizations are hard to change” (p. 35). Reskin argues that bureaucratic organizations develop an inertia that tends to preserve these practices unless the organization is faced with genuine pressures to change itself.

This discussion of the role of organizational inertia in the business sector suggests that similar forces may exist in colleges and universities. This is particularly true when we consider that colleges and universities, like many private businesses and firms, are highly bureaucratic organizations. Hence, we must consider whether there are things that colleges and universities do as organizations that impede their efforts to centrally locate diversity as part of their institutional mission.

While the American higher education system is large, diverse, complex, and decentralized, it is at the same time remarkably homogeneous (Astin, 1985). This homogeneity can be seen in comparable approaches to undergraduate curriculum, remarkable conformity in the training and preparation of faculty, and similar administrative structures. Most educators view the higher education system from an institutional perspective as opposed to a systems perspective. This tendency toward an

³ This section of the manuscript relies heavily on the work of Dey, Milem, and Berger (1997); Milem, Berger, and Dey (1998); and Berger and Milem (in press).

institutional perspective often leads to the implementation of policies and practices that weaken the system as a whole (Astin, 1985).

Astin (1985, 1989, and 1991) argues that there is a tendency among higher education institutions to place too heavy of an emphasis on accumulating resources and enhancing their reputations. Astin asserts that excellence in American higher education has been traditionally equated with the academic reputation of an institution and/or with the resources it accumulates. In this traditional view of excellence, resources are measured by money, faculty, research productivity, and highly able students. Astin suggests that this traditional view of excellence results from the hierarchical nature of the higher education system.

A related perspective on these processes can be found in the concept of institutional isomorphism, first introduced by David Riesman (1956), also known as "institutional homogenization" or "institutional imitation" (Jencks and Riesman 1968; Pace 1974; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Astin 1985; Levinson 1989; Hackett 1990; Scott 1995). In a discussion of the problem of institutional homogenization, Riesman observed "There is no doubt that colleges and universities in this country model themselves upon each other . . . All one has to do is read catalogues to realize the extent of this isomorphism" (Riesman, 1956, p. 25). He depicted the higher education system as being an "academic procession" which he described as a snake-like entity in which the most prestigious institutions in the hierarchy are at the head of the snake, followed by the middle group, with the least prestigious schools forming the tail. The most elite institutions carefully watch each other as they jockey for position in the hierarchy. In the meantime, schools in the middle are busy trying to catch up with the head of the snake by imitating the high prestige institutions. As a result, schools in the middle of the procession begin to look more like the top institutions while the institutions in the tail pursue the middle range schools. Ultimately, institutional forms become less distinctive, relatively little real change occurs in the hierarchy, and the system of higher education struggles to move forward. Jencks and Riesman (1968) suggest that strong economic and professional pressures drive isomorphism in higher education and conclude that homogenization occurs faster than differentiation.

These forces have led to the development of a highly refined status hierarchy in higher education comprised of a few well-known institutions at the top, a bigger group of institutions with more modest reputations in the middle, and the biggest group consisting of institutions at the bottom of the hierarchy that remain virtually unknown outside of their geographic region (Astin, 1985). Astin (1985) argues that the greatest consequence of this status hierarchy is conformity (Astin, 1985; Bowen, 1977; Riesman, 1956). This conformity is found in the institutional homogeneity described above. Another consequence of the institutional hierarchy is that it tends to create a great deal of competition among institutions for resources (as described above) "and for a higher place in the hierarchy as revealed in reputational surveys" (Astin, 1985, p. 12). Research indicates that the single best predictor of an institution's place in the hierarchy of institutions is its selectivity (or average score of the entering freshman class on the SAT) (Astin and Henson, 1977). Hence, it is easy to see why there are strong incentives for institutions to view their students as a resource that can be used to enhance an institution's reputation.

When students are viewed as educational resources that can enhance an institution's reputation, and not as the focus of the educational enterprise, there is great pressure to make institutional admissions policies more selective. Decisions to seek applicants with high standardized test scores are not made for on any compelling pedagogical or educational reasons. Rather, based upon this traditional view of

excellence, institutional leaders believe that higher standardized test scores bolster the institution's reputation, which in turn, will cause more students to want to apply to the institution (Astin, 1985). Faculty and administrators come to view selective admissions policies as being essential to the maintenance of academic excellence or standards. Hence, institutions and institutional excellence come to be defined more by the "quality" of the people they admit and not by the educational experience that people have while attending the institution (Astin, 1985).

This narrow view of educational excellence puts pressure on institutional leaders to place inordinate significance on standardized tests in the admissions process. When standardized test scores are used by institutional leaders as a means for enhancing their institution's reputation (i.e., "the average SAT score of our entering class is . . ."), test scores are clearly being used in a way that they were not intended. Using test scores in this manner serves to reinforce in the minds of constituents that test scores are the primary, or even the only, indicator of merit or quality. This view of merit is clearly antithetical to the definition of merit that is proposed in this manuscript.

The Importance of Thoughtful Institutional Responses to Diversity

Probably fewer areas of higher education and campus life in the recent past have had more attention paid to the policy dimension than has the issue of race on campus. Evidence of this can be found in policies and programs related to college admissions, financial aid, affirmative action, discrimination and harassment, and desegregation. Yet, at the same time, probably no area of campus life has been so devoid of policy initiatives than has the campus racial climate at individual institutions (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998).

While this chapter has cited research and writing from a variety of sources that provide evidence of the many benefits that result from diverse college campuses, the focus of this discussion has not been on the importance of the institutional context(s) in which these benefits have been accrued. Having a diverse campus, in and of itself, does not guarantee that the educational benefits summarized in this chapter will accrue to students, to the institution, or to society. "Often neglected in the debate about diversity is the fact that achieving a racially diverse student body *by itself* is not sufficient to bring about desired educational outcomes. How that diversity is managed matters greatly" (Liu, 1998, p. 438). Later, Liu (1998) argues that "it is a mistake to understand the diversity rationale only as an issue concerning admissions rather than as an issue implicating broader institutional policy" (p. 439)

Thus, to establish a "compelling interest" in educational diversity, a university must demonstrate clear, consistent internal policies and practices designed to facilitate interracial contact, dialogue, and understanding on campus (Liu, 1998, p. 439).

Recent manuscripts document the importance of the institutional context in shaping student outcomes and provide a framework for conceptualizing and understanding the impact of various dimensions of the campus racial climate. This framework was first introduced in a study of the climate for Latino students (Hurtado, 1994) and further developed in syntheses of research done for policy-makers and practitioners (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998, 1999).

When considering the climate for diversity on campus, Hurtado, et al (1998, 1999) argue that most institutions focus usually on only one element of the climate, the goal of increasing the numbers of racial/ethnic students on campus. While this is an essential goal that institutions must achieve, it cannot be the only goal. There are other elements of the climate that require attention and constitute key areas for focusing diversity efforts.

Hurtado, et al (1998a, 1998b) argue that central to the conceptualization of a campus climate for diversity is the notion that students are educated in distinct racial contexts. Both external and internal (institutional) forces shape these contexts in higher education. The external components of climate are comprised of two domains representing the impact of *governmental policy, programs, and initiatives* as well as the impact of *sociohistorical forces* on campus racial climate. The *institutional context* contains multiple dimensions that are a function of educational programs and practices. These include an institution's *historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion* of various racial/ethnic groups, its *structural diversity* in terms of the numerical and proportional representation of various racial/ethnic groups, the *psychological climate* that include perceptions and attitudes between and among groups, as well as a *behavioral climate* dimension that is characterized by the nature of intergroup relations on campus.

Hurtado, et al (1998, 1999) conceptualize the institutional climate as a product of these dimensions. These dimensions are not discrete, rather, they are connected with each other. For example, a historical vestige of segregation has an impact on an institution's ability to improve its racial/ethnic student enrollments, and the under-representation of specific groups contributes to stereotypical attitudes among individuals within the learning and work environment that affect the psychological and behavioral climate. In short, while some institutions take a "multi-layered" approach toward assessing diversity on their campuses and are developing programs to address the climate on campus, most institutions fail to recognize the importance of the dynamics of these interrelated elements of the climate.

Specifically, Hurtado, et al (1998, 1999) assert that many institutions pay attention only to increasing the structural diversity of their institution. When this happens, the outcomes of increased diversity are not necessarily positive. Race relations theory tells us that as the representation of minorities increases, the likelihood of conflict also increases. By paying attention to all aspects of the campus racial climate, colleges and universities are able to use this conflict in ways that are purposeful and to create positive educational experiences for students. This framework, and the many studies that are cited to illustrate it, indicate that institutional leaders must make thoughtful and deliberate decisions about how diversity adds to the educational mission of their institution. While Gurin (1999) argues correctly that structural diversity is necessary for other types of diversity to occur (diversity of ideas and information and diversity of interactions), increasing structural diversity alone is not sufficient for the benefits of diversity to transpire. Instead, actualizing the value-added educational benefits associated with diversity requires active engagement in institutional transformation (Chang, 1999). One of the conditions necessary for institutional transformation, for example, is the institutional commitment to and cultivation of diversity by institutional leaders. In short, it is becoming increasingly clear that only when the necessary conditions are in place, can colleges and universities fulfill their mission to serving the "compelling interests" of the individual, the institution, and the society.

Table 1
Summary of the Educational Benefits of Diverse College and University Campuses

Type of Benefit		
<p><i>Individual Benefits</i></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Improved racial and cultural awareness ❖ Enhanced openness to diversity and challenge ❖ Greater commitment to increasing racial understanding ❖ More occupational and residential desegregation later in life ❖ Enhanced critical thinking ability ❖ Greater satisfaction with the college experience ❖ Perceptions of a more supportive campus racial climate ❖ Increased Wages for Men who Graduate from Higher “Quality” Institutions 	<p><i>Institutional Benefits</i></p> <hr/> <p align="center">Benefits to Private Enterprise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Cultivation of workforce with greater levels of crosscultural competence ❖ Attraction of best available talent pool ❖ Enhanced marketing efforts ❖ Higher levels of creativity and innovation ❖ Better problem-solving abilities ❖ Greater organization flexibility <p align="center">Benefits to Higher Education of Faculty Diversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ More student-centered approaches to teaching and learning ❖ More diverse curricular offerings ❖ More research focused on issues of race/ethnicity and gender ❖ More women and faculty of color involved in community and volunteer service 	<p><i>Societal Benefits</i></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ More research on the Effects of Affirmative Action in the Workplace ❖ Higher levels of service to community/civic organizations ❖ Medical service by physicians of color to underserved communities ❖ Greater equity in society ❖ A more educated citizenry

References

- Alger, J.R. (1998). The Educational Value of Diversity. *Academe*. 20 (January/February, 1998).
- Altbach, P.G. and Lomotey, K. (ed.) (1991). *The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Association of American Medical Colleges (1994).
- Astin, A.W. (1977). *Four Critical Years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Astin, A. W. (1982). *Minorities in American Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving Educational Excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A.W. (1991). *Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Astin, A.W. (1993). *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A.W. and Henson, J.W. (1977). New Measures of College Selectivity. *Research in Higher Education* 6(1), 1-9
- Astone and Nunes-Womak (1990). *Pursuing Diversity: Recruiting College Minority Students*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Press.
- Austin, A. (1996). Institutional and Departmental Cultures: The Relationship Between Teaching and Research. *New Directions for Institutional Research* 90, 57-66 San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bensimon, E.M. (1995). *Creating an Institutional Identity Out of Differences: A Case Study of Multicultural Organizational Change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Berger, J.B. (1997). *The Relationship Between Organizational Behavior at Colleges and Student Outcomes: Generating a Quantitatively Grounded Theory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Vanderbilt University.
- Berger, J.B. and Milem, J.F. (In press, 1/00). Organizational Behavior in Higher Education and Student Outcomes. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, J.C. Smart (ed.). New York: Agathon Press.
- Bielby, W.T. and Baron, J.N. (1984). A Woman's Place Is with Other Women: Sex Segregation within Organizations. in B.F. Reskin (ed.) *Sex Segregation in the Workplace*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Bikson, T.K. and Law, S.A. (1994). *Global Preparedness and Human Resources: College and Corporate Perspectives*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Blalock, J.M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Bollinger, L.C. (1997). *Climate and character: Perspectives on Diversity*.
- Bowen, H. (1977). *Investment in learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, W.G. and Bok, D. (1998). *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Braddock, J.H. (1980). The Perpetuation of Segregation Across Levels of Education: A Behavioral Assessment of the Contact Hypothesis, *Sociology of Education*, 53, 178-186.
- Braddock, J.H. (1985). School Desegregation and Black Assimilation, *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, (3), 9-22.
- Braddock, J.H. and McPartland, J.M. (1989). Social-Psychological Processes that Perpetuate Racial Segregation: The Relationship between School and Employment Desegregation, *Journal of Black Studies*, 19, (3), 267-289.
- Braddock, J.H., Crain, R.L., and McPartland, J.M. (1984). A Long-Term View of School Desegregation: Some Recent Studies of Graduates as Adults, *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1984, 259-264..
- Braddock, J.H. and Dawkins, M. (1981). Predicting Achievement in Higher Education, *Journal of Negro Education*, 50, 319-327.
- Braddock, J.H. and McPartland, J.M. (1982). Assessing School Desegregation Effects: New Directions in Research, in *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, Volume 3*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Braddock, J.H. and McPartland, J.M. (1989). Social Psychological Processes that Perpetuate Racial Segregation: The Relationship between School and Employment Desegregation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 19, 267-289.
- Braddock, J.H., Dawkins, M.P., and Trent, W. (1994). Why Desegregate? The Effect of School Desegregation on Adult Occupational Segregation of African Americans, Whites, and Hispanics. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*, 31(2), 271-283.
- Braddock, J.H., McPartland, J.M., and Trent, W. (1984). *Desegregated Schools and Desegregated Work Environments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. LA.
- Bunzel, J.H. (1992). *Race Relations on Campus: Stanford Students Speak*. Stanford, CA: The Stanford Alumni Association.
- Cantor, J.C., Miles, E.L., Baker, L.C., and Barker, D.C. (1996). Physician Service to the Underserved: Implications for Affirmative Action in Medical Education. *Inquiry*, 33, 167-180.
- Carnoy, M. (1994). *Faded Dreams: The Politics and Economics of Race in American*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cassirer, N.R. and Reskin, B.F. (1998). The Effect of Organizational Context on Women's and Men's Attachment to Their Jobs. Department of Sociology, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Chang, M.J. (1996). *Racial Diversity in Higher Education: Does a Racially Mixed Student Population Affect Educational Outcomes?* Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Chang, M.J. (1997). *Racial Diversity: A Compelling Interest for Higher Education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM.
- Collins, P.H. (1986). Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems*, 33 (3), 514-532.
- Cox, T.H. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research & Practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cox, T.H. and Blake, S. (1991). Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness, *The Executive*, 5(3), p. 45-56.
- Culley, M., & Portuges, C. (Eds.). (1985). *Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Davis, J.A. and Smith, T.R. (1994). *General Social Survey* [MRDF]. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center.
- Dey, E.L. (1988). *College Impact and Student Liberalism Revisited: The Effect of Student Peers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Dey, E. L. (1991). *Perceptions of the college environment: An analysis of organizational, interpersonal, and behavioral influences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Dey, E.L. (1996). Undergraduate Political Attitudes: An Examination of Peer, Faculty, and Social Influences. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, (5), 535-553.
- Dey, E.L. (1997). Undergraduate Political Attitudes: Peer Influence in Changing Social Contexts. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, (4), 398-413.
- DiMaggio, P., and W. Powell, 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160.
- Duster, T. (1993). The Diversity of California at Berkeley: An Emerging Reformulation of ‘Competence’ in an Increasingly Multicultural World. In B. W. Thompson and Sangeeta Tyagi (Eds.), *Beyond a Dream Deferred: Multicultural Education and the Politics of Excellence*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Easton, J. & Guskey, T. (1983). Estimating the effects of college, department, course, and teacher on course completion rates. *Research in Higher Education*, 19, 153-158.
- Feldman, K.A., and Newcomb, T.M. (1969). *The Impact of College on Students, Volume 1*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Finkelstein, M. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Gilliard, M. D. (1996). Racial Climate and Institutional Support Factors Affecting Success in Predominantly White Institutions: An Examination of African American and White Student Experiences. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Ginzberg, E. (1994). Improving Health Care for the Poor: Lessons from the 1980s. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271: 464-467.
- Globetti, E.C., Globetti, G., Brown, C.L., and Smith, R.E. (1993). Social Interaction and Multiculturalism. *NASPA Journal*, 30 (3), 209-218.
- Gray, L.C. (1977). The Geographic and Functional Distribution of Black Physicians: Some Research and Policy Considerations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 67(6), 519-526.
- Green, K.C. (1982). *The Impact of Neighborhood and Secondary School Integration on Educational Achievement and Occupational Attainment of College Bound Blacks*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gumport, P. (1987). The social construction of knowledge: Individual and institutional commitments to feminist scholarship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Gurin, P. (1999). Expert Report of Patricia Gurin, in *The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education*. *Gratz et al. v. Bollinger, et al.*, No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.) *Grutter et al. v. Bollinger, et al.*, No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Hackett, E.J., 1990. Science as a vocation in the 1990s: The changing organizational culture of academic science *Journal of Higher Education* 61: 241-279.

-
- Health Resources and Services Administration, (1995). Selected Statistics in Health Professional Shortage Areas of December 31, 1994. Rockville, MD: HRSA, 1995.
- Hurtado, S. (1990). *Campus Racial Climates and Educational Outcomes*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, No: 9111328.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The Campus Racial Climate: Contexts for Conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education*. (63), 5, pp. 539-569.
- Hurtado, S. (1993). The Institutional Climate for Talented Latino Students, *Research in Higher Education*, 35 (1), pp. 21-41.
- Hurtado, S., Dey, E., and Trevino, J. (1994). Exclusion or self-segregation? Interaction across racial/ethnic groups on college campuses. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Hurtado, S. (1994a). Graduate School Racial Climates and Academic Self-Concept among Minority Graduate Students in the 1970s. *American Journal of Education* 102(3), 330-351
- Hurtado, S. (1994b). The Institutional Climate for Talented Latino Students. *Research in Higher Education* 35(1), 21-41.
- Hurtado, S., Dey, E.L., and Trevino, J.G. (1994). *Exclusion or self-segregation? Interaction across racial/ethnic groups on college campuses*. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., and Allen, W.R. (1998). Enhancing Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity Through Educational Policy and Practice. *The Review of Higher Education*. 20th Anniversary Edition 21 (3).
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., and Allen, W.R. (1999). *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Campus Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity*. ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Reports Series.
- Jacobs, J.A. (1989). Long-Term Trends in Occupational Segregation by Sex. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, p. 160-73.
- Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1968). *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Judy, R.W. and D'Amico, C. (1997). *Workforce 2020: Work and Workers in the 21st Century*. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 965-989.
- Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The Change Makers*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Keith, S.N., Bell, R.M., Swanson, A.G., and Williams, A.P. (1985). Effects of Affirmative Acton in Medical Schools. A Study of the Class of 1975. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 313(24), 1519-1525.
- Klein, R. D. (1987). The dynamics of the women's studies classroom: A review essay of the teaching practice of women's studies in higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum*. 10(2), 187-206.
- Komaromy, M., Grumbach, K., Drake, M., Vranizan, K., Lurie, N., Keane, D., and Bindham, A.B. (1997). The Role of Black and Hispanic Physicians in Providing Health Care for Underserved Populations. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 334(20), 1305-1310.
- Konrad, A.M. and Linehan, F. (1995). Race and Sex Differences in Line Managers' Reactions to Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Interventions. *Group and Organization Management*, 20, p. 409-39.

- Kozma, R., Belle, L., William, G. (1978). *Instructional techniques in higher education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Kuh, G.D. (1993). Ethos: Its Influence on Student Learning. *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 22-31.
- Kuh, G., Schuh, J.S., Whitt, E.J., Andreas, R.E., Lyons, J.W., Strange, C.C., Krehbiel, L.E., and MacKay, K.A. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and personal development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawrence III, C.R. and Matsuda, M.J. (1997). *We Won't Go Back: Making the Case for Affirmative Action*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lawrence III, C.R. (1995). Race, Multiculturalism, and the Jurisprudence of Transformation. *Stanford Law Review*, 47, 819-847.
- Leonard, J.S. (1985). What Promises are Worth? The Impact of Affirmative Action Goals. *Journal of Human Resources*, 20, p. 3-20.
- Leonard, J.S. (1994). Use of Enforcement Techniques in Eliminating Glass Ceiling Barriers, Report to the Glass Ceiling Commission, April, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.
- Levinson, R.M. (1989). The faculty and institutional isomorphism. *Academe* 75:1, 23-27.
- Libby, D.L., Zhou, Z., and Kindig, D.A. (1997). Will Physician Supply Meet U.S. Needs? Projections for Reaching Racial Parity of Physicians to Population. *Health Affairs*, 16(4), 205-214.
- Liu, G. (1998). Affirmative Action in Higher Education: The Diversity Rationale and the Compelling Interest Test. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*. 33, 381-442.
- Loo, C.M. and Rolison, G. (1986) Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominately white university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 58-77.
- MacPhee, Kreutzer, and Fritz (1994). Infusing a Diversity Perspective into Human Development Courses, *Child Development*, 65 (2), 699-715.
- Markham, W.T., Harlan, S.L., and Hackett, E.J. (1987). Promotion Opportunity in Organizations: Causes and Consequences, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 5, p. 223-87.
- Mauksch, H. (1980). What are the obstacles to improving quality teaching. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 2(1), 49-56.
- McLeod, P.L., Lobel, S.A. and Cox, T.H. (1993). *Cultural Diversity and Creativity in Small Groups: A Test of the Value Congruence Process and Its Relationship to Individual Outcomes*. Unpublished working paper, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Merton, R. (1973). *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Milem, J. F. (1992). *The Impact of College on Students' Racial Attitudes and Levels of Racial Awareness*. Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA. Ann Arbor: University Microforms International (UMI), Order Number 9301968.
- Milem, J. F. (1994). College, Students, and Racial Understanding. *Thought & Action* (9), 2, 51-92.
- Milem, J.F. (1997). Key Educational Outcomes of Diversity for College and University Faculty. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Publishing Group.
- Milem, J.F. (1998). Attitude Change in College Students: Examining the Effects of College Peer Groups and Faculty Reference Groups. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69 (2).
- Milem, J.F. & Astin, H. (April, 1992). *Science faculty: Culture, Roles and Pedagogy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

- Milem, J.F. & Wakai, S. (1996). *Understanding How Faculty Teach: Facilitators and Inhibitors of Student-centered Pedagogy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Milem (1999). *The Importance of Faculty Diversity to Student Learning and to the Mission of Higher Education*. Paper presented at American Council on Education Symposium and Working Research Meeting on Diversity and Affirmative Action.
- Moy, E. and Bartman, B.A. (1995). Physician Race and Care of Minority and Medically Indigent Patients. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273(19), 1515-1520.
- Mulkay, M. (1972). *The social process of innovation: A study in the sociology of science*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Musil, C.M., García, M., Moses, Y., and Smith, D.G. (1995). *Diversity in Higher Education: A Work in Progress*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Nemeth, C.J. (1985). Dissent, Group Process, and Creativity. *Advances in Group Processes*, 2, p.57-75.
- Nemeth, C.J. (1986). Differential Contributions of Majority and Minority Influence. *Psychological Review*, 93, p. 23-32.
- Nemeth, C.J. and Wachter, J. (1983). Creative Problem Solving as a Result of Majority versus Minority Influence. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, p. 45-55.
- Nettles, M.T. and Hudgins, C. (1995). An Evaluation of Philip Morris Companies, Inc. Tolerance on Campus: Establishing Common Ground. Colby College and Northern Illinois University.
- New York Times (April 24, 1997).
- Norton, E.H. (1996). Affirmative Action in the Workplace, in G. Curry (ed.), *The Affirmative Action Debate*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- O’Farrell, B. and Harlan, S. (1984). Job Integration Strategies, in B.F. Reskin (ed.) *Sex Segregation in the Workplace: Trends, Explanations, and Remedies*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Orfield, G. and Eaton, S.E. (1996). *Dismantling Desegregation : The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. New York : New Press.
- Pacarella, E.T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L.S., and Terenzini, P.T. (1996). Influences on Students’ Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 174-195.
- Pace, C. R. (1974). *The demise of diversity: A comparative profile of eight types of institutions*. Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E.T., Whitt, E.J., Nora, A., Edison, M., Hagedorn, L.S., and Terenzini, P.T. (1996). What Have We Learned from the First Year of the National Study of Student Learning? *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 182-192.
- Reskin, B.F. (1998). *The Realities of Affirmative Action in Employment*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Reskin, B.F. and Hartmann, H. (1986). *Women’s Work, Men’s Work: Sex Segregation on the Job*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Reskin, B.F. and Roos, P. (1990). *Job Queues, Gender Queues*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Richardson and Cook (1991).
- Riesman, D. (1956). *The academic procession. Constraint and variety in American higher education*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Rudenstine, N.L. (1997). The Uses of Diversity. *Harvard Magazine* 98 (4), 49-62.
- Sax, L.J. and Astin, A.W. (1997). The Development of ‘Civic Virtue’ among College Students. In J.N. Gardner and G. Van der Veer (eds.) *The Senior Year Experience: Facilitating Integration, Reflection, Closure, and Transition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaeffer, R.G. and Lynton, E.F. (1979). Corporate Experience in Improving Women’s Job Opportunities, Report No. 755. The Conference Board, New York.
- Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sedlacek, W.E. (1995). Using Research to Reduce Racism at a University. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 33(3), 131-140.
- Shapiro, H.T. (1995). Affirmative Action—A Continuing Discussion—A Continuing Commitment, in the *Princeton Weekly Bulletin*, October 16, 1995.
- Smith, D.G. (1995). *The Drama of Diversity and Democracy*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- Smith, D.G., with Gerbick, G.L., Figueroa, M.A., Watkins, G.H., Levitan, T., Moore, L.C., Merchant, P.A., Beliak, H.D., and Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Springer, L., Palmer, B., Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., Nora, A. (1996). Attitudes Toward Campus Diversity: Participation in a Racial or Cultural Workshop. *Review of Higher Education*, 20(1), 53-68.
- St. John, E.P. (1991a). The Impact of Student Financial Aid: A Review of Recent Research, *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 21, (1), 18-32.
- St. John, E.P. (1991b). What Really Influences Minority Attendance? Sequential Analyses of the High School and Beyond Sophomore Cohort, *Research in Higher Education*, 32, (2), 141-158.
- St. John, E.P. and Masten, C.L. (1990). Return on Investment in Student Financial Aid: An Assessment for the High School Class of 1972, *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 20, (3), 4-23.
- Stampen, J.O. (1985). Student Aid and Public Higher Education: Recent Changes. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Stampen, J.O. and Fenske, R. H. (1988). The Impact of Financial Aid on Ethnic Minorities, *Review of Higher Education*, 11 (4), 337-353.
- Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. (1991). Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Steeh, C. and Krysan, M. (1996). The Polls—Trends: Affirmative Action and the Public, 1970-1995, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60, p. 128-58.
- Steele, S (1990). *The Content of Our Character*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tanaka, G.K. (1996). *The Impact of Multiculturalism on White Students*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 57(05): 1980A.
- Taylor, M.C. (1994). Impact of Affirmative Action on Beneficiary Groups: Evidence from the 1990 General Social Survey, *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 15, p. 143-78
- Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T., and Blimling, G.S. (1996). Students’ Out-of-Class Experiences and Their Influence on Learning and Cognitive Development: A Literature Review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 149-162.
- Thomas, B. (1990). Women’s Gains in Insurance Sales, in B.F. Reskin and P.A. Roos (eds.) *Job Queues, Gender Queues*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Thomas, G.E. and Brown, F. (1982). What Does Educational Research Tell Us about School Desegregation Effects? *Journal of Black Studies*, 13, (2), 155-174.
- Tierney, W.G. (1993). *Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Triandis, H.C., Hall, E.R., and Ewen, R.B. (1965). Member Heterogeneity and Dyadic Creativity. *Human Relations*, 18, p. 33-55.
- U.S. Bureau of Census, (1998). Current Population Reports, P60-198. Washington, DC.
- Vernon-Gerstenfeld, S. and Burke, E. (1985). Affirmative Action in Nine Large Companies: A Field Study, *Personnel*, 62, p. 54-60.
- Villalpando, O. (1994). *Comparing the Effects of Multiculturalism and Diversity on Minority and White Students' Satisfaction with College*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Tucson, AZ, ERIC Clearinghouse, ED 375721.
- Wasserstron, R.A. (1977). Racism, Sexism, and Preferential Treatment: An Approach to the Topics. *UCLA Law Review*, 24, p. xxx-xxx.
- Weidman, J.C. (1989). *Undergraduate Socialization: A Conceptual Approach*. in Smart, J.C. (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Higher Education, Volume V*. New York: Agathon.
- Whitt, E.J., Edison, M.I., Pascarella, E.T., Terenzini, P.T., and Nora, A. (1998). *Influences on Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the Second and Third Years of College*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Windham (1979)
- Xu, G., Fields, S.K., Laine, C., Veloski, J.J., Barzansky, B., and Martini, C.J. (1997). The Relationship Between the Race/Ethnicity of Generalist Physicians and their Care for Underserved Populations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87(5), 817-822.

Evidence from Multiple Sectors. by Jeffrey F. Milem. University of Maryland. A area of how individuals benefit from diversity. Individual benefits refer to the ways in which the educational experiences and outcomes of individual students are enhanced by the presence of diversity on campus. Research evidence regarding the individual benefits of diversity suggests that diversity enhances student growth and development in the cognitive, affective, and interpersonal domains. There are some very positive benefits that can be hard from having a more diverse workforce. Let's discuss eight amazing benefits to individuals and employing companies. Many recent studies have shown that increased cultural diversity in the workplace can lead to greater profits for the organisation. A 2013 survey undertaken by think tank, Center for Talent Innovation, found that 48 per cent of companies in the US with more diversity at senior management level improved their market share the previous year, while only 33 per cent companies with less diverse management reported similar growth. 48 per cent of companies in the US with more diversity at senior management level improved their market share. higher education in order to maximize these benefits and better prepare students for the diverse and multifaceted world they will be living in, and eventually leading. The purpose of this paper is to summarize the major methods and ways of approaching this type of research so that other institutions and organizations may initiate their own effective research programs to study the educational benefits of diversity in the most appropriate and valuable fashion. Several research designs will be explored, and other practical considerations for initiating such research are discussed. Baez (2004) found three distinct types of studies on the educational benefits of diversity in the literature. The first is the empirical study that verifies the educational benefits of diversity. Thus, workplace diversity is not just a politically correct fad - it is a serious competitive advantage. The research even showed that you can outperform your competitors and achieve greater profits! So, let's see other benefits as well! What are the benefits? Here is the list of the top 10 benefits of diversity in the workplace: #1: Variety of different perspectives. Diversity in the workplace ensures a variety of different perspectives. Since it means that employees will have different characteristics and backgrounds, they are also more likely to have a variety of different skills and experiences. 8. Milem, Jeffrey F. "The Educational Benefits of Diversity: Evidence from Multiple Sectors." In *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities*, edited by Mitchell J. Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones and Kenji Hakuta, 126-169. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003. 9. Smith, Daryl G. and Associates. *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1997. 10. Astin, Alexander W. "Diversity and Multiculturalism on the Campus: How are Students Affected?"