Teaching Value in Diversity: On the Folly of Espousing Inclusion, While Practicing Exclusion

MARCUS M. STEWART
MARCY CRARY
Bentley College

BETH K. HUMBERD
Boston College

Our experience of common approaches to teaching diversity suggests that while we espouse to teach *inclusion* in order to yield the potential workgroup and organizational value associated with diversity, we may be in effect teaching *exclusion*, perpetuating the practice of making distinctions between perspectives that are sanctioned and valued, and those that are not. We explore ways this inclusion–exclusion conundrum emerges and is reinforced, potential inherent dangers, and strategies to yield more inclusive diversity courses.

In their essay, "Pluralism and the Problem of Variety" Glynn, Barr, and Dacin (2000: 726–734) point out that the ascendancy of pluralism evident in the cultural complexity of our organizational lives has not yet been fully realized in our theories of work and organization. Nor, we contend, has it been fully realized in our pedagogical practices in the diversity classroom, where we as instructors are challenged by the pluralism of views held by students. While many of us have learned how to design and teach "Managing Diversity in the Workplace" courses in our business schools over the last 2 decades, one of the significant ongoing challenges of this kind of pedagogy is the need to facilitate conversations that would be characterized by Stone, Patten, and Heen (1999) as "difficult." They are conversations that typically include differing perspectives on legacies of oppression, differing viewpoints of how the world works, strong

feelings, and identity challenges from within ourselves—as well as from other members of the classroom. In these classroom conversations, we find it very difficult to fulfill our commitment to inclusion of the full range of student perspectives, particularly when these viewpoints counter our own closely held values of social justice.

Organizational diversity advocacy, discourse, and pedagogy draw heavily on the premise that there is value added or represented by diverse perspectives (cf., Cox, 1994; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Nkomo & Stewart, 2006; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In other words, the expression and consideration of diverse perspectives can enhance group and organization creativity, decision making, problem solving, and strategy generation, rendering performance advantages relative to groups and organizations composed of relatively homogeneous perspectives. It is now well established that the presence of diversity—individuals with varying perspectives based on different life experiences, cultural, or sociodemographic backgrounds—itself is not sufficient to generate performance gains (Lawrence, 1997; Roberson, 2005; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In order to yield benefits associated with diversity, diverse individuals and perspectives must be effectively integrated into workgroup and organizational processes, thus there is emerging emphasis on the concept of

inclusion. Inclusion is related to the removal of barriers that block employees from using the full range of their competencies and skills and is linked with an employee's ability to fully and effectively contribute to a workgroup or organization (Roberson, 2005). Taken together, the ideas that (a) diversity is potentially valuable, and (b) to yield that value, workgroups and organizations must establish inclusive behaviors, processes, and cultures, are the thrust of diversity pedagogy.

The diversity literature and pedagogy suggest that while we espouse to teach *inclusion* in order to yield the potential value associated with diversity, we may be in effect teaching *exclusion*, perpetuating the practice of making distinctions between dimensions of difference that are sanctioned and valued, and those that are not. The inconsistency between pedagogical approaches to diversity and the underlying theory that there is value inherent in diversity—value that is reaped from the consideration of diverse, perhaps even disparate, perspectives—may pose considerable costs to both instructors and students, including diminished student learning and skill development, and the creation of a party line or further promotion of a culture of political correctness (cf., Ely, Meyerson, & Davidson, 2006), among other outcomes.

The first two authors of this article experienced our own pedagogical differences as we teamtaught both undergraduate and graduate diversity courses over the last 3 years, and together have well over 30 years of diversity teaching and training experience. The writing of this article created an opportunity to articulate and sort through our different attitudes and perspectives about what should be happening in our diversity classrooms. We had the opportunity to invite one of our former MBA students, a financial analyst in the human resources department of a Fortune-500 company, to join us as a third author, adding her perspective from a corporate context in addition to being a student navigating the conversational dynamics in our classroom. We continue to engage in disagreements about which pedagogical outcomes should be of more concern to us, but we share the central objective of optimizing the likelihood of creating a classroom space in which all students feel equally welcome to join in with a full spectrum of perspectives they hold toward diversity issues. We are asking ourselves how we can effect more direct engagement of the full spectrum of social perspectives, including those that are discriminatory, in the diversity classroom and more effectively contribute to everyone's learning and development.

Our purpose here is to address a critical question that emerges when one considers the theoretical premise underlying "value in diversity" and the nature of diversity teaching: "Are we falling prey to a Kerr-ian folly?"[1] That is, are we hoping for one outcome—enhanced student skills of being inclusive while operating in a diverse environment—while teaching and reinforcing, in effect, exclusion by choosing not to dedicate time engaging and learning about and from prevailing perspectives not necessarily perceived as in line with the value-in-diversity perspective? We address this question by first considering common approaches to teaching diversity and inclusion. We then consider the ways in which diversity pedagogy can be inconsistent with the underlying premise of value in diversity, factors reinforcing this approach, and some inherent dangers and consequences that result. We conclude with a discussion of strategies to help facilitate more inclusive approaches to teaching diversity and address the inclusion–exclusion conundrum.

THE MANAGING DIVERSITY COURSE

University level diversity courses are often understood to be an ideal situation for learning about diversity and developing competency with issues related to diversity. Educational settings allow for discussing difficult or challenging topics, asking questions, making mistakes, and experimenting with different modes of behavior in a low stakes environment, relative to organizational contexts, wherein individuals' livelihoods are dependent upon the performance of their jobs (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Nemetz & Christensen, 1996). In addition, traditional-aged undergraduate students may not have established attitudes and expectations related to diversity issues to the same extent as older individuals. Diversity management competence relates to an individual's awareness and knowledge of how culture and other aspects of one's group identity inform human behavior in- and outside of work, and the interpersonal skills necessary to effectively work with demographically diverse others (Avery & Thomas, 2004). Diversity classes seek to develop students' competence with regard to working with differences in the workplace, and their ability to create, sustain, and operate in an inclusive environment.

Recent reviews of the literature on diversity pedagogy indicate that for several reasons (e.g.,

---

[1] In reference to Steven Kerr's (1995) notion of confused reward/motivation systems, wherein the behavior being rewarded is incongruent with the behavior desired, from which we have drawn on Professor Kerr's title phrase "On the Folly of Rewarding for A, While Hoping for B."

familiarity, expediency, legitimacy), courses have tended to adopt common or shared approaches to facilitating the development of diversity competence (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Boisnier & Williams, 2007; Day & Glick, 2000; for sample diversity course syllabi see the website for the Gender and Diversity in Organizations division of the Academy of Management). These approaches include focus on a number of common themes and content areas, including values and beliefs, perception and stereotyping, self-awareness, and cross-cultural communication. It is also common for diversity courses to include modules dedicated to discussion of specific demographic groups and topics such as women, ethnic minorities, sexual orientation, and equal employment opportunity legislation.

Our review of commonly used methods of raising awareness and attempting to improve students' diversity competence suggests that a significant portion of diversity course resources tend to present or otherwise inform students from the points of view of minority, out-group or underrepresented groups. In other words, the perspective often adopted or presented in lecture, readings, and other mediums by which content is delivered, is that of "the other," or underrepresented social group members, and not without good reason. The idea underlying this approach is that this will (a) optimize exposure to the realities of oppression in society and the workplace; (b) increase the support for these undervoiced perspectives to be shared by members of the underrepresented or low status social groups in the class; and (c) help individuals in positions of high status and unrecognized privilege to be aware of, and thus able to help counter and avoid reinforcing the prevailing social and organizational elements of the status quo that are linked to social injustices. However, as highlighted in the literature, and learned firsthand by many of us as diversity students and instructors, this approach of highlighting nondominant group perspectives and experiences can evoke feelings of resentment and defensiveness among students and minimize the likelihood of learning or attitude change (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Boisnier & Williams, 2007; Nemetz & Christensen, 1996; Pendry, Driscoll, & Field, 2007).

THE INCLUSION–EXCLUSION CONUNDRUM

A closer look at mainstream diversity pedagogy reveals a paradox. Emphasis on the perspective and experience of lower status or underrepresented social group members, to the exclusion of cultural perspectives that are seen as inconsistent with value in diversity—what we refer to as "counter" attitudes or perspectives, such as anti-affirmative action arguments, or negative views regarding the value of affinity groups in organizations—may contradict the very idea of inclusion, as well as the underlying concept and theory of value in diversity. In other words, prevailing approaches to teaching diversity and inclusion may merely be recasting the line of demarcation to be inclusive of, and find value in, differences associated with ethnicity, sex, age, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, culture, and the like, meanwhile excluding, and implying there is no validity in, or value to be reaped from perspectives that may be associated with sexist, racist, homophobic, and xenophobic attitudes, among other viewpoints that challenge a pro-diversity social justice agenda.

Emphasis on the perspective and experience of lower status or underrepresented social group members, to the exclusion of cultural perspectives that are seen as inconsistent with value in diversity—what we refer to as "counter" attitudes or perspectives, such as anti-affirmative action arguments, or negative views regarding the value of affinity groups in organizations—may contradict the very idea of inclusion, as well as the underlying concept and theory of value in diversity.

We do not mean to suggest or imply that prevailing methods of teaching diversity have not yielded successful outcomes. Indeed, there is evidence of success with regard to current approaches to teaching diversity (reviewed below). In addition, our intention is not to advocate, or suggest advocating for, discriminatory attitudes. We are operating out of the assumption that there is value in expression of a full spectrum of perspectives (that there is value in diversity), and that if we feel the need to stifle that expression, we have more work to do as faculty members and facilitators of our classroom discourse. We are suggesting direct engagement of discriminatory perspectives to affirm with students that these are in many cases popularly held views, to help foster discussion about the sources and content of these attitudes, and to facilitate analyses of these attitudes and perspectives in direct juxtaposition with the attitudes we

are proponents of, specifically pro-diversity and pro-inclusion.

Theorizing related to teaching diversity indicates that a more complex and nuanced approach may be necessary to maximize learning outcomes for all students. For example, Garcia (1994) points out, "Put simply, learning about diversity and valuing difference challenges students with moving from a relatively egocentric and cognitively simple state to a more other-centered and cognitively complex way of viewing themselves and the world in which they live." A critical developmental step in building students' capacity to engage a fuller complexity in their understanding of diversity issues (i.e., move beyond "rigid dualism") requires that they be able to identify the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors they have internalized, and take perspective on them. Unequivocally criticizing or excluding from course materials certain attitudes that are widely held and often based on messages from parents, peers, religion, media, and personal experience—such as resistance to affirmative action and preference for traditional gender roles—can have the effect of putting students on the defensive, rather than enabling and encouraging thoughtful consideration of the attitude.

Counterattitudes that are reflective of sexism and racism are treated in much of the popular content for diversity classes. Videos such as ABC *Nightline's* "Fairer Sex," and *Harvard Business Review* pieces such as "Dear White Boss" (Caver & Livers, 2002) and "Was It Really About Race" (Connor, 2000) indeed describe and depict racism and sexism in action. Indeed, ABC *Nightline's* "True Colors" goes so far as to include incidents of racism enacted among African American/Black individuals (a Black car salesman who ignores a Black customer). However, we seem to generally relegate exposure to attitudes such as racism to the lens of the offended, disempowered, or lower status perspective. As a result, the premises and rationales that underlie many sexist and racist attitudes and why they are so prevalent and persistent are often left unexamined. Presumably we attempt to address what we perceive as the most important counterarguments by addressing issues such as the effects of childhood socialization, and the prevalence and nature of stereotypes. But, we may effectively preempt majority group students' sharing of more specific opinions and perspectives that are honed out of what they perceive to be valid life experiences of their own (e.g., a White male relative who was not hired into a local police force but had a high test score; their understanding of real male–female differences that underlie the rationale for sex-role expectations; loyalty to a partic-

ular reading of the Bible regarding sexual orientation, etc.). Evidence of this dynamic was found in a recent study conducted by Boisnier and Williams (2007), where results indicated that there are many questions considered "taboo" by management students in diversity courses—questions they would not ask in class for fear of being perceived as ignorant, racist, or otherwise unaware.

Before considering strategies to help address the apparent paradox of espousing inclusion while teaching exclusion, we examine factors underlying and reinforcing common approaches to diversity teaching.

FACTORS REINFORCING CURRENT DIVERSITY TEACHING

The design of diversity courses and choice of content tends to be based on a number of assumptions about the audience and prevalent business norms (cf., Avery & Thomas, 2004). For example, at many colleges and universities students come from homogeneous backgrounds and thus have had little exposure to different or diverse others. For these students, their knowledge of and attitudes toward different others may be a function of portrayals and stereotypes in popular media. Thus, these courses are designed to expose students to perspectives that they have less or no previous exposure to, with the assumption that students are already familiar with prevailing stereotypes, status hierarchies among social groups, et cetera, from the perspective of the dominant culture. Research on stereotyping supports this assumption (cf., Devine, 1989; Fiske, 1998; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002).

Another important factor underlying the design and content of diversity courses is the presumed intellectual development of the intended audience. Traditional-aged, undergraduate students can tend to be intolerant of difference because they often hold a rather narrow view of the world—what some call "rigid dualism," wherein all matters are perceived as either right or wrong (Avery & Thomas, 2004; Perry, 1968). Individuals who have not advanced beyond this developmental position may interpret different "others" or perspectives as "less than" or wrong, which can foster resistance to countermessages and impede development.

OUTCOMES ASSOCIATED WITH PREVAILING APPROACHES TO TEACHING DIVERSITY

There is evidence of the success of prevailing approaches to diversity instruction. Some studies have found that students who have taken a diver-

sity course report more favorable attitudes toward diverse others (e.g., less racism/sexism) than students without such a course, who have been found in some studies to develop worse or more critical attitudes toward diversity during their college/university experience (Henderson-King & Koleta, 2000). For example, with a sample of 250 undergraduates, Hogan and Mallott (2005) found that students who completed a diversity course that included a module related to race and gender issues reported lower prejudice toward Blacks. Other research has also found greater sensitivity and decreased prejudice and stereotyping among students participating in cultural awareness workshops (cf., Avery & Thomas, 2004: 384 for a review of this literature).

In short, we believe that diversity courses and instructors have been successful in creating a stimulating learning environment for many students, comprised of a rich offering of readings, interesting experiential exercises, homework assignments, and class discussions. Both undergraduate and graduate diversity classes usually are lively and spark interesting engagements. We believe many students coming out of the course have moved forward on the learning objectives. As a result of the course the students have been involved in conversations, and exposed to ideas and perspectives that may be quite different from their own. For many students, regardless of their attitudes and experience with diversity, this is the first time they have been involved in such discourse, perhaps particularly in a structured setting. Course evaluations and qualitative feedback affirm the value and impact of the course and thus the success of prevailing approaches.

As successful as we have been collectively as teachers and proponents of diversity and inclusion, there are also moments and sessions wherein students have offered very little resistance to the perspectives up for discussion. This response can give the impression of unanimity with regard to sociopolitical experience and attitudes, raising concerns that students are toeing a perceived party line. Indeed, an ongoing source of discontentment for both faculty and students revolves around the issue of what gets talked about, spoken, or given voice to in the classroom and what remains unsaid. We contend this is related to the central issue under consideration, the notion that even as we espouse to teach inclusion of different others with the understanding that there is value to be gained from multiple, diverse perspectives, in effect, we also practice exclusion—excluding perspectives that may run counter to the "value-in-diversity" premise.

CHALLENGES OF TEACHING DIVERSITY WITHOUT EXCLUDING

Our concern is that, based on our beliefs as faculty and our operations in the classroom, we may shut down or otherwise curtail contributions from students that hold attitudes toward diversity and issues related to diversity (e.g., social policy) that differ from our own. We may leave students holding counterattitudes feeling guilty or defensive. As a function of position and status, faculty members are leaders of class discussion and designers of the syllabus, and thus exert disproportionate influence on the norms that emerge in the classroom. We may be juggling what Kegan and Lahey (2001a) refer to as "competing commitments" insofar as we want to be inclusive in our teaching, but at the same time are committed to not propagating or offering support for perspectives that espouse exclusion or discrimination, such as sexism, racism, xenophobia, homophobia, and the like (cf., Baker, 2004). There is the critical question of whether the expression of views such as homophobia creates a hostile environment for those who belong to the relevant out-group (i.e., gay men, lesbian women), or those who hold a different perspective, and the extent to which this diminishes the contributions and experience of those individuals. Certainly this is a strong possibility, but would seem to be dependent upon the way in which such a perspective is introduced or expressed and the perceived intent behind it.

Teachers, trainers, and consultants who work with issues of diversity in the college classroom, corporate training, and organizational settings have reported on their experiences of encountering "resistance" to their curriculum and their respective strategies for working with the range of negative emotions evoked by the course work (e.g., Avery & Thomas, 2004; Gallos, Ramsey & Associates, 1997; Kirkham, 1989). For example, Kirkham (1989) discusses how to explore students' underlying challenges about the legitimacy of diversity as a business school topic, given that many majority group students are unaware of the realities of ingroup/out-group dynamics in society and the workplace. Avery and Thomas (2004) report on other teachers' strategies to respond to both silent and confrontational students in the diversity classroom, including Karp and Sammour's (2000) suggestion that faculty learn to surface, honor, and explore student resistances to examining what students may see as sensitive and taboo subject matter.

But now we are wondering, is there an additional kind of resistance that has emerged as a

result of students' previous exposures to "diversity training?" Increasingly it is the case that students entering our diversity classrooms have already experienced diversity training sessions either in their previous educational institutions or in their workplaces. Many are already well versed in the terminology of diversity, inclusion, and concepts such as the "business case" for diversity. For example, at our university, all students who participate in freshman orientation are exposed to the value-in-diversity perspective, and this message is then reinforced in mandatory for-credit freshman seminar courses. It is our experience that some students seem to roll their eyes when it comes to discussing "diversity." We wonder if this skepticism or cynicism comes out of students' anticipation that this training is in effect a "reprogramming" for political correctness rather than an inclusive, authentic learning experience. It is clear in many cases that by the time students enroll in a diversity class they often have preconceived expectations regarding diversity course content, and have established opinions about it. Ironically, in some cases the resistance we find ourselves encountering may be from those who were not affirmed by their prior exposure to the messages of value in diversity and inclusion. In these cases, the resistance to diversity instruction may be partially the result of prior diversity training.

According to research on status and status characteristics (Forschi, 2000; Humphrey, 1985; Sande, Ellard, & Ross, 1986), it is safe to presume that in general, students coming into a classroom assume that professors are experts in their relevant field of study or interest. As a result, students may go on to assume that the views expressed by their diversity instructors must be the correct or appropriate perspective, which can limit students' motivation and ability to challenge what is being discussed. Students are also expected to respect professors, thus, it can be out of the ordinary for students to challenge professors' views, especially on such emotionally charged issues that affect individuals from different races, gender, and cultures in very different ways. It can be difficult to break the formal teacher–student status relationship as we know it.

Additionally, assumptions about what professors must/should believe contribute to students' perspectives and compliance with a perceived party line. For example, if professors are visible members of a minority group (African American, female, etc.) some students may make assumptions about what the professor believes, and may be less likely to make claims that counter any perspectives that these professors make in relation to their visible membership. Without the conditions in place for open, frank discussion, it may be exceedingly difficult, for example, to find a student that is willing to challenge an African American professor's comments about discrimination against Blacks regardless of his or her own beliefs. It should be noted, however, that the presumption of favorable status or expertise may not be conferred equally on all faculty, particularly ethnic minorities and women. For example, several studies have found that the presumption of competence is not bestowed equally upon men and women professors (Basow, 1995; Brady & Eisler, 1999; Das & Das, 2001; cf., status characteristics theory, Forschi, 2000). Thus, it is indeed possible that ethnic minorities and women may be challenged more than other professors even when teaching diversity.

Finally, the classroom environment and educational experience can be understood as extensions of students' personal or professional lives, and there may be real and perceived costs associated with making a bad impression among classmates or potential future colleagues. Thus, the stakes can be perceived as high and politically correct behavior as paramount. Considering this, it makes sense that students would enter the diversity classroom expecting that they must act and speak in a manner that is considered informed, politically correct, or in line with the value-in-diversity ideal. This may be especially true with MBA students who have experience in organizations, where normative behavior—withholding expression of counter-diversity attitudes—may have been communicated and modeled as the preferred standard.

POTENTIAL COSTS

Unintended consequences may emerge from our pedagogical intentions and efforts to highlight the presence and power of identity privileges. We may be, in effect, privileging some perspectives over others in the discourse of the class. In our attempts to counter the effects of dominant groups in our society within the classroom, we may appear to be primarily focused on creating safety for those traditionally marginalized in society—e.g., the one lesbian or gay person, the few people of color, international students in the classroom, or others not in majority or in privileged positions. This is effective in facilitating some kinds of learning for some individuals in class, but may also mean that ultimately, only a minority of students and voices are validated through our discourse. In effect, we may be giving "home court advantage" to one group of people, perhaps making others in the classroom feel like unwelcome visitors

(see Kegan, 1994, for a discussion of developmental perspectives on dealing with differences).

Neglecting to take proactive steps to affirm the existence and coherence of counterattitudes and perspectives can leave some students feeling guilt, shame, or personal culpability. Feeling defensive or guilty can be a natural part of the learning process and journey in diversity work for some, but should not be the end-state. When we consider the experience of students on our campuses, many of us as diversity scholars would be appalled at the idea of an ethnic minority, female, or gay student being marginalized and made to feel excluded to the point of adopting a passive or party-line stance as the result of in-class experience (content and pedagogical approach). Turning this analysis on ourselves, leaving (majority/dominant group) students in a state where they are stuck in their feelings of defensiveness or guilt because they have internalized counterattitudes, whether informed by significant conscious effort and thought or not, seems short sighted, and may be hypocritical.

Another potential cost to consider is whether the silencing of these counterperspectives gets in the way of students' preparation to engage these very issues in the workplace or "real world." We know that counterperspectives are prevalent among the general populace, which begs the question: "If we can't discuss and attempt to derive an understanding of the motivation and reasoning behind them in a diversity course, then when and where can we discuss these perspectives?" In preparing to manage all types of individuals and attitudes in the workplace, it is valuable for students to be exposed to and made aware of a more representative range of perspectives.

Finally, to the extent that students consciously pick up on this new party line and perceive the selective notion of inclusion being taught, our pedagogical choices may also jeopardize our credibility as perceived by the students. In other words, if we have not exhibited willingness to incorporate something that diverges from what we personally believe, our exclusive notion of inclusion may seem hypocritical to the students. Students may question what specifically their professors are afraid of or avoiding. Not acknowledging what to some may appear to be an elephant in the room may increase students' cynicism about the class and the instructors' espoused valuing of diversity.

STRATEGIES FOR MOVING TOWARD MORE INCLUSIVE DIVERSITY INSTRUCTION

Recent thinking and discourse with regard to diversity pedagogy has produced a number of frameworks that describe both processes and course climate(s) optimal for the development of diversity competence (e.g., Avery & Thomas, 2004; Boisnier & Williams, 2007; Chan & Treacy, 1996; Gentile, 1995; Higginbotham, 1996; Kegan, 1994; Kirkham, 1989; Meacham, 1995). Critical elements for the development of diversity competence include facilitating (1) students' abilities to describe and take perspective on their relevant attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors; (2) open or frank discussion among students from, and about, their relative perspectives; and (3) positive intergroup interaction in the context of the course. Constructing an effective blend of challenge and support in these learning communities is a demanding art. Going forward, we think it is important to learn from the works of scholars and practitioners who have been focused on ways of creating the conditions for strong learning communities in which members listen and speak in ways that foster understanding.

A plethora of exercises and approaches (e.g., ice breakers, rules making, boundary setting, check-ins, simulations, etc.) are tailored to establishing introspection and perspective taking and an open and supportive learning environment in diversity course contexts. For example, books by Cox and Beale (1997), Adams, Bell, and Griffin (1997), and many others are rich sources of approaches (experiential exercises, etc.) to delivering diversity course content. Avery and Thomas (2004) provide an excellent summary of a variety of "tools" diversity educators currently use in classrooms to promote the development of diversity management competency. Building on this prior work, we describe seven strategies that may help us as faculty to address the inclusion–exclusion conundrum and create an optimally inclusive conversational space with that important blend of support and challenge, regardless of the philosophical or pedagogical approach one might take to diversity instruction.

1. Clarifying Expectations

At the outset of the course, clarifying expectations is critical to prepare students for a more personally involving, interactive, experiential course. A point should be made to bring out in the open the value to be derived from exploring all perspectives, perhaps especially the controversial ones, and the demands this makes of us as a learning community. The fact that the value derived from diverse perspectives is only reaped when all individuals are empowered to contribute their perspectives, and when all perspectives are included in class discourse, can be explicitly communicated via multiple means (instructor re-

marks, syllabus, etc.) For example, Professor Blake-Beard's syllabus for her "Cultural Diversity in the Workplace" course (available on-line at the Academy of Management's Gender and Organization division's website for teaching resources) explicitly acknowledges the difficulties of having conversations about cultural diversity and provides the students with a suggested "mind-set" and ground rules for engagement in the class. For example, one rule states:[2] "We are all guilty of some degree of cultural ignorance concerning another group or class of people. No one in the class knows everything there is on issues related to cultural diversity, so it is expected that we come to class with an open mind."

With the appropriate framing/explanation from the professors at the outset, the stage can be set to engage in more heated discussions while students still feel like a safe environment has been created, and that sharing their unique perspectives—whether consistent with any specific course reading/resource, instructor, or other student—will be affirmed, and perhaps rewarded (e.g., via class participation, teacher recognition, etc.). This is consistent with Parameswaran's (2007) urging that faculty be ready to directly address issues of power in the classroom and create processes for involving the students in various aspects of the course, thus empowering them to be critical consumers of their educational experiences. Setting these expectations is part of creating a classroom contract, but we also know that actualizing these guidelines is still a tall order for all, including the faculty.

2. Using Tools to Increase Student Self-Reflexivity To Help Them Think About and Question How They "Know"

Finding ways to get students to think about how we come to "know" or "believe" things is a critical step in encouraging more open inquiry in the classroom (Day & Glick, 2000; cf., Gentile, 1995 for

good reading on "Ways of Thinking About and Across Differences"). Among available resources are tools like Chris Argyris' Ladder of Inference (described in Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994: 242), which helps to highlight the processes used in making sense of our environments and encourages self-reflectiveness and self-questioning, which are requirements for living within changing, complex, pluralistic systems. Getting students to understand that what they see as "hard data" may in fact be a result of their selective perceptions and may thus differ from other peoples' views of reality is a critical tool for building our capacities to welcome differing viewpoints in the classroom. Introducing them to the concepts and research on implicit cognition and the notion of "implicit bias" is a powerful way to illustrate that we "do not always have conscious, intentional control over the processes of social perception, impression formation, and judgment that motivate . . . actions" (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006). Empowering students to become more proactive and curious about how we socially construct our in-groups and out-groups and how to counteract these normal tendencies when they become discriminatory in a harmful way toward others is a core strategy to help address the inclusion–exclusion dynamic in the classroom.

Young and Davis-Russell (2002) provide helpful recommendations on how to create a climate for good multicultural inquiry in the classroom, which include suggestions for teaching students about the differences between answer-driven versus inquiry-driven questions, and ways of encouraging students to be curious about and to investigate underlying contexts and assumptions of knowledge claims. Chio and Fandt (2007) present ways of using cameras with students (through the use of Photovoice) to help them recognize the socially constructed nature of what and how they know.

3. Modeling: Faculty Sharing Own Biases

Faculty modeling of introspection and sharing of recognized shortcomings with students can demonstrate to students that we are all continually exploring our own biases and prejudgments as we sort through the various diversity situations we encounter. Being prepared as faculty to be open with students about our own biases and shortcomings related to diversity gives concrete evidence of our constant learning in this field, so the classroom can become a more even ground and open environment for discussion and learning together. For example, while students may be hesitant to question issues related to race

---

[2] Dr. Blake-Beard suggests students remember that (1) Together we are here to learn about very complex issues that have plagued society, in one form or another, since the beginning of civilization; (2) We all will have some type of prejudice against some thing, group, class, or individual; (3) We all have experienced some level of prejudice; (4) We are all guilty of some degree of cultural ignorance concerning another group or class of people. No one in the class knows everything there is on issues related to cultural diversity, so it is expected that we come to class with an open mind; and (5) We are not here to victimize one another because learning about race, gender and other differences occurs more readily in a supportive environment, where there is a climate of openness and trust. For this reason, we will try to discuss honestly our experience and feelings without fears of being judged, stereotyped or categorized by our colleagues.

when one of the instructors is a visible member of a racial minority, if minority faculty share that they have also been socialized to be cautious or aware around other minorities, perhaps even members of their own "in-group," can be quite powerful (similarity for women sharing negative messages they've been socialized with around working with other women). Or, if we have asked students to take the Implicit Association Test on-line, starting the discussion by sharing our own IAT results is helpful for illustrating how challenging it can be to address issues of discrimination.

Through this kind of role-modeling and personal sharing we can establish and keep in mind that we are "fellow travelers" in this learning with students in our classrooms (Spelman, 1994) and that as diversity instructors, we may be at best, "the most advanced student in the class" (McKendall 1994), yet still "works in progress." This also serves as a reminder to students that diversity learning is an ongoing developmental process and can be reinforced by sharing models for racial/ethnic identity development, including those for dominant group members (e.g. Whites, heterosexuals; e.g., Block, Roberson, & Neuger, 1995). This may help counter students' perceptions that the professors' perspectives are the "correct" ones because they are the diversity experts.

We note that successful implementation of this step likely requires that we as faculty attend to our own ongoing personal and professional development, building our capacities to manage the "heat" that is inherent in the diversity classroom. Many authors describe approaches to faculty and management development and personal change (e.g., Ely et al., 2006; Kegan, 1994; Kegan & Lahey, 2001a & b). Others have focused on ways to increase our capacity to facilitate classroom conversations that embrace "dialectical differences," such as letting go of some of our needs to control and pre-structure interactions in the classroom (e.g., Baker, 2004; Isaacs, 1999; Kolb et al., 2002).

4. Including Focus on Multiple Identities and Dominant Group Experiences

Highlighting the reality that we are all members of many different identity groups that vary in levels of societal status is a way of getting students to see and get interested in their own experiences of being insiders as well as outsiders. One teaching strategy we use in our course is to discuss what it is like to be left handed versus right handed, a relatively benign and nonthreatening group affiliation, and then have the students examine the common patterns of experiences that underlie the insider versus outsider positions within any social identity group, such as age, sex, and religion.

A key here may be to focus more on how we experience and manage our multiple group memberships. Pointing out that while in U.S. organizational contexts Whites and White males may generally be dominant or high-status social groups, White women simultaneously experience and must navigate their membership in the relatively low-status gender group (females, relative to males). Similarly, Black men may be stigmatized due to membership in a low-status ethnic group, yet benefit from being members of the higher status gender group. For example, an interesting question to pose is what it must be like to experience the double jeopardy of being Black and female, yet have the status associated with high education and high-status institutional affiliation (Stanford University and the White House) experienced by current U.S. Secretary of State, Condoleeza Rice. White men also experience and navigate the dynamics of being "in" and "out" with regard to their many social group memberships such as religion (i.e., Christianity is high status in the context of the U.S.), age (i.e., a premium on youth), height (i.e., tall is preferable to short), weight (i.e., thin is preferable to "fat"), education, profession, attractiveness, familial status, political affiliation and other important dimensions of status demarcation.

Exploring how we work from our low-status and dominant group positions may help students move beyond the common experiences of feeling guilty or shamed, and to understand more fully the reality of low-status group membership and how to mobilize themselves as activists from their *insider's* position. Relevant work in this area has been conducted by Ancona, Kochan, Scully, Van Maanen, and Westney (2005), who consider the notion of "active bystanders" and how to respond to common feelings of powerlessness. Providing materials that give examples of dominant group members' contributions to working to promote diversity issues (e.g., the role of organizational ally groups in addressing discrimination around sexual orientation) may help address students who feel excluded from diversity class discourse based on their dominant identities. This may be instrumental in helping students within their majority group identities to take perspective on their experiences and viewpoints, and help drive home the point that diversity is a relevant issue for everyone, not just members of certain (low-status or oppressed) groups.

5. Making Use of "Counter-Readings"

Although challenging to implement for a variety of reasons, including some of our own emotional reactions (Baker, 2004) and competing commitments (Kegan & Lahey, 2001b), making regular use of readings, cases, and student experiences that counter the dominant perspectives found in typical diversity course material may be helpful in several important ways. For example, scholars such as Shelby Steele, Richard Herrnstein, and Richard Murray, and public figures such as Ward Connerly and Rush Limbaugh are often mentioned or referenced as representative of counter or subversive perspectives in diversity courses, but these perspectives are seldom studied from their own vantage point. Rather, they are considered from the view point of "the other" or oppressed. Reading articles or watching videos framed in the dominant or counter view can have the immediate and direct effect of affirming students in class who may hold these views, or are aware of these views through their parents and peers. This affirmation can have several positive effects, including fortifying students' resolve or courage to express and share their perspective on those views.

Having even a single article or other resource in a given course module (e.g., race, sexual orientation) that addresses diversity issues from a counter perspective can help to put students who hold a similar attitude on more equal footing with students whose perspectives are being fortified by the bulk of class material (pro-diversity). Course materials stacked in favor of the pro-diversity perspective invert the broader societal status dynamic, putting students from minority and underrepresented social groups in the higher status position in the context of the class. However, *equal* status among participants is an important precursor and condition for positive intergroup contact and interaction (for analysis, see Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005) in diversity classes and on college and university campuses (Avery & Thomas, 2004).

Other methods of introducing representation of perspectives (pro-diversity and counter) can be to delegate responsibility to students, such as assigning students the task of identifying or contributing readings and other resources they find to be representative of a counterview. Students can also be assigned the role of "devil's advocate" for selected discussions to ensure that different viewpoints will be aired and engaged. Inviting faculty and guest lecturers to represent counterviewpoints is also known to be extremely effective for communicating and validating diverse perspectives, and may be preferable to relying on students to represent counterviews in some cases (see Avery & Thomas, 2004, and Waterman, Reid, Garfield, & Hoy, 2001, for expanded discussion of this point). Direct exposure to counterviews can also help prepare all students to deal with counterattitudes and perspectives when they are in professional situations or organizations. We should not presume that because students are in the social minority that they are aware of prevailing rationales and arguments in favor of the status quo.

6. Attending to Our Own Ongoing Professional Development: Building on Our Capacities to Manage the Heat in the Diversity Classroom

It is important that we take opportunities to get a good blend of support and challenge for our own personal and professional development to increase our abilities to be self-reflexive in our teaching practices. Ely et al.'s (2006) suggestions for management development or Kegan and Lahey's (2001a) framework for personal change can be applied to ourselves as educators. Opportunities to step back and take perspective on our most basic assumptions about what good diversity teaching is, and to question ourselves about our own blind spots and areas of defensiveness are important for continued learning and growth.

Going forward, we have more to learn from the works of scholars and practitioners who have been focused on ways of creating the conditions for strong learning communities—in which members listen and speak in ways that foster understanding. For example, Ann Baker's (2004) analysis of "undiscussables" focuses on ways to increase our capacity to facilitate classroom conversations that embrace more "dialectical differences," including learning to let go of some of our needs to control and prestructure interactions in the classroom. For example, Baker discusses her experiences with online class discussions and their potential for more inclusive dialogues. Bell and Golombisky's (2004) article on "Voices and Silences in Our Classrooms: Strategies for Mapping Trails Among Sex/Gender, Race, and Class" has rich descriptions of the challenges of empowering students from both nondominant and dominant groups to fully engage in the classroom and offer teaching strategies to address pedagogical dilemmas. William Isaacs' (1999) work on "Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together" offers explicit guidelines for creating successful dialogue (vs. debate) and getting out of the all too frequent conditions in which we get "caught in our own preconceptions, disguising our feelings and fears, and hiding our meaning." The Public Conversa-

tions Project (www.publicconversations.org) provides guidelines and manuals for convening and facilitating constructive conversations about particularly divisive issues.

7. Teaching and Learning as a Team

Although not always feasible from a resource standpoint, creating a diverse teaching team gives us the advantages of building from each others' strengths and giving and receiving feedback. We can learn from the differences in how we engage students. A diverse teaching team is also a very powerful model for students and is often noted as one of the aspects of the course they really value. Ensuring that there are sociopolitical differences represented on the team can also enrich the classroom discussions. This strategy has the potential of affirming a wider array of students in the class, and also of representing/providing counterstereotypical and disconfirming experiences (e.g., having a Black and a White professor, and/or having a male and a female professor, talking openly about racism/sexism together). However, a teaching team can also exacerbate the problem of exclusion, a perceived party line and culture of political correctness. Demographic diversity among faculty may help some students to identify with the teaching team, but lack of diversity with regard to sociopolitical perspective (e.g., shared support for affirmative action, family friendly HR policies, etc.) can doubly reinforce students' concerns about voicing anything other than politically correct attitudes. In this case, much of the potential value of a teaching team can be lost, and expectancy confirmation processes with regard to political correctness and inclusion can be reinforced.

CONCLUSION

What we are encouraging here is more exploration of what it takes to create an inclusive conversational space in the classroom that is consistent with the principle underlying the theory of value in diversity, and addresses, to the extent possible, the inclusion–exclusion conundrum. As discussed above, the challenge to us as teachers of diversity courses, and as students of diversity pedagogy, is how to create the environment in which counter- or alternative views can be aired with the right combination of support and challenge. When our material, ideas, or pedagogy are challenged by students, we need to be able to create conditions for taking perspective on our own opinions, values, beliefs—in order to make sure that we are not being trapped within our own ideologies unknow-

ingly. Just as important, awareness of the possible effects of the inclusion–exclusion conundrum informs us that when our material, ideas, and pedagogy are *not* challenged by students, we must similarly be able to create conditions for taking perspective on the opinions, values, and beliefs that those in the classroom are appearing to hold in common. What are the viewpoints or perspectives that we consider to be "out of bounds" or not acceptable for airing in our classrooms? What are we sanctioning as "legitimate" and "nonlegitimate?" And, why? It seems important to us that we get curious about and interested in our own resistances and possible implicit biases in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. 1997. *Teaching for diversity and social justice.* New York: Routledge.

Ancona, D., Kochan, T. A., Scully, M., Van Maanen, J., & Westney, D. E. 2005. Bystander awareness: Skills for effective managers. In D. Ancona, T. A. Kochan, M. Scully, J. Van Maanen, & D. E. Westney (Eds.), *Managing for the future: Organizational behavior and processes,* 20–29. Mason, OH: South Western Publishing.

Avery, D. R., & Thomas, K. M. 2004. Blending content and contact: The roles of diversity curriculum and campus heterogeneity in fostering diversity management competency. *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 3: 380–396.

Baker, A. C. 2004. Seizing the moment: Talking about the "undiscussables." *Journal of Management Education,* 28: 693–706.

Basow, S. A. 1995. Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 87: 656–665.

Bell, E., & Golombisky, K. 2004. Voices and silences in our classrooms: Strategies for mapping trails among sex/gender, race and class. *Women's Studies in Communication,* 27(3): 294–329.

Block, C. J., Roberson, L., & Neuger, D. A. 1995. White racial identity theory: A framework for understanding reactions toward interracial situations in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 46: 71–88.

Boisnier, A. D., & Williams, L. V. 2007. Taboo questions about diversity: What do management students really want to know? Paper presented at the *Annual Academy of Management Meeting,* Philadephia, PA.

Brady, K. L., & Eisler, R. M. 1999. Sex and gender in the college classroom: A quantitative analysis of faculty-student interactions and perceptions. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 91: 127–145.

Caver, K. A., & Livers, A. B. 2002. Dear white boss. *Harvard Business Review,* 80: 76–81.

Chan, C. S., & Treacy, M. J. 1996. Resistance in multicultural courses. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 40: 212–221.

Chio, V. C. M., & Fandt, P. M. 2007. Photovoice in the diversity classroom: Engagement, voice and the "Eye/I" of the camera. *Journal of Management Education,* 31(4): 484–504.

Connor, J. C. 2000. It wasn't about race. Or was it? *Harvard Business Review,* 78: 37–39.

Cox, T., Jr. 1994. *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T., & Beale, R. L. 1997. *Developing competency to manage diversity: Readings, cases and activities.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Das, M., & Das, H. 2001. Business students' perceptions of best university professors: Does gender role matter? *Sex Roles,* 45: 665–676.

Day, N. E., & Glick, B. J. 2000. Teaching diversity: A study of organizational needs and diversity curriculum in higher education. *Journal of Management Education,* 24: 338–352.

Devine, P. G. 1989. Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 5: 5–18.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. 2005. Beyond the optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist,* 60: 697–711.

Ely, R. J., Meyerson, D. E., & Davidson, M. N. 2006. Rethinking political correctness. *Harvard Business Review,* 84: 78–87.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 46, 229–273.

Fiske, S. T. 1998. Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey, Eds., *Handbook of social psychology,* 4th ed, vol. 2: 357–411. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. 2002. A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 82: 878–902.

Forschi, M. 2000. Double standards for competence: Theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 26: 21–42.

Gallos, J. V., Ramsey, V. J., & Associates. 1997. *Teaching diversity: Listening to the soul, speaking from the heart.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garcia, J. E. 1994. Reflections on teaching diversity. *Journal of Management Education,* 18: 428–431.

Gentile, M. C. 1995. Ways of thinking about and across differences. Teaching note #9-395-117, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston.

Glynn, M. A., Barr, P. S., Dacin, M. T. 2000. Pluralism and the problem of variety. *Academy of Management Review,* 25(4): 726–734.

Greenwald, A. G., & Krieger, L. H. 2006. Implicit bias: Scientific foundations. *California Law Review,* 94(4): 945–967.

Henderson-King, D., & Kaleta, A. 2000. Learning about social diversity. *Journal of Higher Education,* 71: 142–164.

Higginbotham, E. 1996. Getting all students to listen: Analyzing and coping with student resistance. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 40: 203–211.

Hogan, D. E., & Mallot, M. 2005. Changing racial prejudice through diversity education. *Journal of College Student Development,* 46: 115–125.

Humphrey, R. 1985. How work roles influence perception: Struc-

tural cognitive processes and organizational behavior. *American Sociological Review,* 50: 242–252.

Isaacs, W. 1999. *Dialogue and the art of thinking together.* NY: Doubleday.

Karp, H. B., & Sammour, H. Y. 2000. Workforce diversity: Choices in diversity training programs and dealing with resistance to diversity. *College Student Journal,* 34(3): 451–458.

Kegan, R., 1994. *In over our heads: The mental demands of everyday life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. 2001a. *How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. 2001b. The real reason people won't change. *Harvard Business Review,* 79: 85–92.

Kerr, S. 1995. On the folly of rewarding for A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Executive,* 9: 7–16.

Kirkham, K. 1989. Teaching about diversity: Navigating the emotional undercurrents. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review,* 13(4): 48–55.

Kolb, D. A., Baker, A. C., & Jensen, P. J. 2002. Conversation as experiential learning. In A. C. Baker, P. J. Jensen, & D. A. Kolb (Eds.), *Conversational learning: An experiential approach to knowledge creation:* 51–66. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Lawrence, B. S. 1997. The black box of organizational demography. *Organization Science,* 8: 1–22.

Meacham, J. 1995. Conflict in multiculturalism classes: Too much heat or too little? *Liberal Education,* 81, 24–29.

McKendall, M. 1994. A course in "work-force diversity:" Strategies and issues. *Journal of Management Education,* 18: 407–423.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review,* 25(4): 706–725.

Nemetz, P. L., & Christensen, S. L. 1996. The challenge of cultural diversity: Harnessing a diversity of views to understand multiculturalism. *Academy of Management Review,* 21: 434–462.

Nkomo, S. M., & Stewart, M. M. 2006. Diverse identities in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord, (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational studies:* 520–540. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parameswaran, G. 2007. Enhancing diversity education. *Multicultural Education,* 35: 51–55.

Pendry, L. F., Driscoll, D. M., & Field, S. C. T. 2007. Diversity training: Putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 80: 27–50.

Perry, W. G. 1968. *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roberson, Q. 2005. Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group and Organization Management,* 31: 212–236.

Sande, G. N., Ellard, J. H., & Ross, M. 1986. Effect of arbitrarily assigned status labels on self-perceptions and social perceptions: The mere position effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 50: 684–689.

Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., & Smith, B. J. 1994. *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization.* NY: Doubleday.

Spelman, D. 1994. Our roles as teachers of diversity. *Journal of Management Education,* 18: 438–440.

Stone, D., Patton, B., & Heen, S. 1999. *Difficult conversations: How to discuss what matters most.* New York: Viking.

van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. 2007. Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 58: 515–541.

Waterman, A. D., Reid, J. D., Garfield, L. D., & Hoy, S. J. 2001. From curiosity to care: Heterosexual student interest in sexual diversity courses. *Teaching of Psychology,* 28: 21–26.

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research: In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* 20: 77–140. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Young, G., & Davis-Russell, E. 2002. The vicissitudes of cultural competence: Dealing with difficult classroom dialogue. In E. Davis-Russell (Ed.), *California School of Professional Psy-* *chology handbook of multicultural education, research, intervention and training:* 37–52. CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marcus M. Stewart (PhD, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) is an assistant professor of management at Bentley College. His current research focuses on diversity, leadership, social justice and career management, and has been published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology, Personnel Psychology, British Journal of Psychology, Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and several edited volumes.

Marcy Crary (PhD, organizational behavior, Case Western Reserve University) is an associate professor of management at Bentley College. Her research interests include diversity dynamics in organizational systems, diversity pedagogy, transitions in the "third phase" of life, and the emotional underworld of knowledge integration/creation.

Beth Kroner Humberd earned her MBA at Bentley College and is currently a doctoral student in the organization studies department of the Carroll School of Management at Boston College. Her research interests include the management of diversity in organizations, individual identity in the workplace, and career choices.