Published in final edited form as:

Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol. 2011 July ; 17(3): 243–251. doi:10.1037/a0024036.

Toward Ethnocultural Diversification of Higher Education

Gordon C. Nagayama Hall,

Department of Psychology and Center on Diversity and Community, University of Oregon

Charles R. Martinez Jr.,

Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity, University of Oregon

Mia Tuan,

Center on Diversity and Community and Department of Education Studies, University of Oregon

Timothy R. McMahon, and

Center on Diversity and Community, University of Oregon

Jennifer Chain

University of Oregon

Abstract

Attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification in higher education mirror attitudes toward paying taxes. Dissenters are opposed to paying taxes or to ethnocultural diversification. Passive Supporters value the benefits of taxes or ethnocultural diversification, but pay taxes or engage in diversity efforts only when required to do so. Active Supporters pay taxes or support diversity efforts even if they are not required to do so. Mandatory approaches to decrease the resistance of Dissenters to ethnocultural diversification may be necessary, whereas compelling voluntary approaches may be useful to mobilize Passive Supporters. Solutions need to be tailored to the needs of European Americans and persons of color. This article offers a conceptual framework for future research and interventions.

Keywords

Diversity; higher education; resistance; affirmative action; training

Diversity in higher education, including colleges and universities, has many potential benefits. These include the enhancement of cognitive skills, cultural awareness, interest in social issues, a pluralistic orientation, and an overall heightened concern for the public good (Hurtado, 2005). Ethnocultural diversification is an essential mechanism for helping educational institutions in realizing goals that are frequently espoused in their mission statements. These benefits accrue to all, including European Americans.

However, the effects of diversification of organizations are varied. A review of the empirical literature suggests in some instances that group processes are disrupted by organizational diversification when ingroup and outgroup social categorization occurs, but in other

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gordon C. Nagayama Hall, Department of Psychology, 1227 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403. gnhall@uoregon.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: The following manuscript is the final accepted manuscript. It has not been subjected to the final copyediting, fact-checking, and proofreading required for formal publication. It is not the definitive, publisher-authenticated version. The American Psychological Association and its Council of Editors disclaim any responsibility or liabilities for errors or omissions of this manuscript version, any version derived from this manuscript by NIH, or other third parties. The published version is available at www.apa.org/pubs/journals/cdp

instances organizational diversification creates differences in knowledge, expertise, and perspectives that enhance work quality, creativity, and innovation (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Attitudes towards diversification are similarly varied. In this article we discuss: (a) different types of attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification that are analogous to attitudes toward paying taxes; (b) how dissent and resistance to ethnocultural diversification is influenced by these attitudes; and (c) possible methods of addressing resistance and motivating action. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U, 2007) defines diversity as individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations) that can be engaged in the service of learning. Our definition of ethnocultural diversity involves people of color and their cultures. We focus on people of color because of rapid demographic shifts, as well as the benefits to all of ethnocultural diversification (Hurtado, 2001, 2005) juxtaposed with the resistance of some to ethnoculturally diversifying higher education that has persisted throughout U.S. history. Moreover, people of color are visibly dissimilar to European Americans and visible dissimilarity has been demonstrated to be more strongly associated with a lack of organizational involvement than other forms of diversity (e.g., value dissimilarities; Hobman et al., 2004). Although there are many forms of diversity, we focus on ethnocultural diversity because there are many unresolved issues in this area, such as whether ethnocultural diversity is more influential than other forms of diversity (e.g., socioeconomic status). Moreover, it is important to focus on ethnocultural diversity because the unwarranted assumption that issues in this area have been resolved may shift attention away from ethnocultural diversity. For example, although overt racism is relatively uncommon, ethnically-based microaggressions are relatively common, as discussed below (D. Sue et al., 2007). Nevertheless, many of the issues raised here are applicable to other forms of diversity, such as social class, physical ability, and gender.

Ethnocultural diversification involves making higher education more inclusive of people of color and their cultures. The AAC&U (2007) defines inclusion as the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity – in people, in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, ethnocultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect – in ways that increase one's awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions. Ethnocultural diversification of higher education involves not only demographic diversity but ethnocultural diversity in all areas of institutional life, including research, curriculum, and campus climate. It is also important to note that ethnocultural diversification is a means to the end of academic excellence and not necessarily an end unto itself.

Attitudes Toward Ethnocultural Diversification of Higher Education

A useful metaphor for understanding attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification in higher education may be found in people's attitudes toward paying taxes. One group is opposed to paying taxes and believes that individuals should fend for themselves. This group pays taxes only when required to do so. This may be a relatively small group, included among the 26% in a recent poll who believed that Bush era tax cuts should continue for all (CBS News poll, 2010). We characterize this group as *dissenters*. A second, relatively large, group values the benefits taxes provide but would not voluntarily pay taxes if they were not required to do so, or at least would pay less on a voluntary vs. mandatory basis. This group may be represented among the 53% who believed that the Bush era tax cuts should continue only for households earning less than \$250,000 (CBS News poll, 2010). We characterize this group as *passive supporters*. A third relatively small group values the benefits of taxes and might pay taxes,

or at least contribute to causes or organizations committed to the public good, such as charities, whether required to or not. This group may be represented among the 14% who believe that the Bush era tax cuts should expire for all (CBS News poll, 2010). We characterize this group as *active supporters*. Table 1 describes the characteristics of these three groups. Students, faculty, and administrators can be members of any of these groups, as can persons of any ethnic background, including people of color.

Similar to those who are opposed to paying taxes, Dissenters in higher education resist efforts to engineer ethnocultural diversification. They may believe that initiatives to diversify a campus violate doctrines of fairness and academic freedom. For example, European Americans who believe that hiring decisions should be made exclusively on qualifications and ability, and that advantaging persons from minority groups is unfair, oppose ethnocultural diversification via affirmative action (Aberson, 2007). Dissenters also may believe that a high quality institution will naturally attract diverse students, faculty, administrators, and employees without special efforts toward ethnocultural diversification. In fact, special efforts may be viewed as the heavy-handed actions of a governance structure that are costly and ineffective. Such opposition may reflect individualist attitudes, in which each person is responsible for their own welfare. Individualists regard civic or community responsibilities as less important than taking care of themselves (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Individualists may expect others to take care of themselves, as well. Beliefs in the value of meritocracy may dictate that individuals should succeed on their own merits and that no individual or group should receive an unfair advantage via assistance. Indeed, individualist attitudes have been found to be associated with opposition to affirmative action and perceptions of African Americans as personally responsible (e.g., having less ability, having less motivation) for being less successful than European Americans (Federico & Sidanius, 2002). Analogously, paying taxes to assist others may be considered an abrogation of individual responsibility. Such individualist attitudes reached a zenith in the anti-tax movements of the 1980s and, more recently, in the “tea party” movement.

Individualists tend to believe that individuals succeed on their own merits. The standards of success in most higher education institutions benefit and have been established by European Americans, many of whom are invested in preserving their group’s dominance (Federico & Sidanius, 2002). Diversity, by definition, is a departure from the norm and may disadvantage qualified individuals who differ from those in power who are committed to the status quo. Those in power tend not to consider perspectives other than their own, which inherently disadvantages those with diverse perspectives (Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006). Such power over other groups can be addicting and similar to those with addictions, the needs of those who might interfere with the addictive process are denied and ignored by the addict (Dobbins & Skillings, 2000). Although European Americans are commonly the group in power, it is possible that any group in power could become invested in their group’s dominance.

Consistent with this individualistic approach to merit, many who resist ethnocultural diversification consider themselves “color blind” and purport to view individuals on their own merits independent of their race or ethnicity. To categorize a person in terms of their racial or ethnic characteristics might be considered tantamount to stereotyping (S. Sue et al., 2009). However, a “color blind” perspective may still impose the majority group’s standards and fail to appreciate the merits of ethnocultural diversity. D. Sue and colleagues (2007) have characterized “color blindness” as a microaggression because it denies the racial and experiential reality of people of color. Microaggressions are “brief, and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that

communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color” (D. Sue et al., 2007, p. 271).

Although those who believe in “color blindness” and that race plays a minor role in life success may deny that they are racists, such seemingly egalitarian attitudes may negatively impact people of color. Although a democratic ideal of ignoring differences is in many ways laudable, group differences do exist and matter. Relevant experimental research suggests that when individuals attempt to suppress stereotypes of persons of color that such stereotypes become hyperaccessible (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2007). Thus, those who attempt colorblindness via suppression of stereotypes may actually become more vulnerable to stereotyping than if they accepted and valued group differences. Ignoring race- and ethnic-based disparities will not make them disappear. Moreover, race, ethnicity, and culture are important components of identity for many persons of color, which are discounted in colorblindness (D. Sue et al., 2007).

In the relative absence of ethnocultural diversity, its opponents may contend that other forms of equally important diversity already exist, such as intellectual or religious diversity. In instances where a small amount of ethnocultural diversity does exist, opponents of special efforts to diversify may tout the existing diversity as evidence that “business as usual” is effective. Such opposition to ethnocultural diversification might be considered a reflection of politically conservative beliefs, but politically liberal persons who believe in egalitarianism have also been found to oppose efforts toward ethnocultural diversification (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000). Moreover, senior faculty have been found to hold less positive attitudes toward diversity than more junior faculty and are also less likely to address issues of diversity in their teaching (Maruyama & Moreno, 2000; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). Dissenters may also be more common among faculty members in the natural sciences than in the social sciences or humanities because human ethnocultural diversity is less likely to be a content area in the sciences than in the other fields. Ethnocultural diversity in the natural sciences is often not addressed unless it becomes an environmental issue, such as students of color feeling excluded from student work groups or when departments are pressed to account for the lack of women in both faculty and student ranks. Nevertheless, there may be dissenters in any natural science, social science, or humanities discipline. Returning to the tax analogy, those who oppose taxes may be from all socioeconomic backgrounds and are not restricted to the upper and middle classes.

Similar to those who value the benefits that taxes bring, Passive Supporters in higher education may philosophically understand the benefits of diversity. They may be open to special efforts toward ethnocultural diversification as a means of creating equal opportunities and egalitarianism. However, ethnocultural diversification of higher education may be viewed by Passive Supporters as just one priority among many. They may be willing to support ethnocultural diversification efforts that are relatively low cost (e.g., give a talk to high school students of color who are visiting campus) but may be less willing to support efforts that are relatively high cost (e.g., actively recruiting faculty of color, ethnoculturally diversifying the curriculum, participating in professional development to challenge their attitudes about diversity). They also may find it difficult to engage in complicated discussions about diversity, much less defend it against detractors. In short, their support of ethnocultural diversification may weaken when they find themselves outside their comfort zone.

Another characteristic of Passive Supporters may be apathy. Although they do not actively resist ethnocultural diversification, they comply with it only because they perceive that they are required to do so or that it is politically correct. They may be unclear about the definition of diversity and believe that diversification benefits others but not themselves. They may

also fail to understand the intellectual and ethnocultural benefits that ethnocultural diversity accrue to all (Hurtado, 2001) and they may even be influenced by stereotypes about people of color (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). The primary beneficiaries of ethnocultural diversification may be perceived by some Passive Supporters to be people of color without recognizing that benefits of diversification are shared by the entire community and are tied to overall institutional excellence.

Active Supporters believe in and actively support efforts to ethnoculturally diversify all aspects of higher education. Ethnocultural diversification is a top priority and this group believes that it should be so for all in the campus community. Efforts to recruit ethnoculturally diverse individuals to a campus, which may be perceived as too much by Dissenters or as adequate by Passive Supporters, may be perceived as too little by Active Supporters. They are not satisfied with demographic diversity and may regard initiatives to recruit diverse individuals as token unless there is a corresponding effort to change the curriculum, climate, and how the “business” or daily operations of higher education is conducted.

Although Dissenters, Passive Supporters, and Active Supporters are described categorically, it is likely that the boundaries between groups are permeable and that attitudes toward ethnocultural diversity fall along a continuum. Moreover, most campuses include persons with a range of attitudes toward diversity. Each group may also influence the other. Dissenters’ criticisms of ethnocultural diversification may assist Active Supporters in developing a stronger rationale for their positions and more persuasive arguments to present to Passive Supporters. For example, when Dissenters decry the costs of ethnocultural diversification, Active Supporters can point to the benefits for all of ethnocultural diversification, which have been empirically demonstrated (Hurtado, 2001). Conversely, the rationale and arguments for resistance could be strengthened by Active Supporters’ criticisms of opposition to ethnocultural diversification. Passive Supporters may attract Dissenters or Active Supporters who become weary in their stands on diversity. For example, Dissenters or Active Supporters may shun the publicity associated with their views and be persuaded by Passive Supporters to take a break from the limelight and pursue other interests.

Based on the characterizations of the three groups, we can assume that many persons of color are Active Supporters of ethnocultural diversification. Empirical research suggests that persons of color, women, and junior faculty are more likely to be activists with respect to diversity than those in other groups (Hurtado, 2001; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). However, it is not necessarily the case that persons of color are not Passive Supporters or Dissenters. An individual’s racial or ethnic identity might influence their relative support of ethnocultural diversification (Sellers et al., 1998). Persons of color for whom ethnicity or race is a central part of their identity are more likely to be Active Supporters. Those who perceive persons of color as oppressed or who believe that persons of color should control their own destiny are also more likely to be Active Supporters. In contrast, persons of color who consider the similarities between persons of color and others as important, and value assimilation or acculturation as a means to success, may be more likely to be Dissenters or Passive Supporters. Dissenters of color are often championed by European American Dissenters as representing the opinions of people of color, although Dissenters may be in the minority in many communities of color.

Contextual issues may also influence support and activism. Some supporters of ethnocultural diversification may be less active in contexts perceived to be demographically diverse. In such contexts, bystander effects may occur, in which the responsibility to assist a

person in need is someone else's. The bystander effect is particularly likely to occur if the person in need is perceived as being a member of an outgroup (Levine & Crowther, 2008).

Resistance to Ethnocultural Diversification of Higher Education

Similar to the necessity of laws to get people to pay taxes, institutional mandates for ethnocultural diversification may be necessary. When individual and institutional attitudes toward diversity are congruent, resistance to ethnocultural diversification is likely to be low or nonexistent (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). Resistance develops when attitudes are not congruent. Persons having each of the three types of attitudes discussed above may engage in forms of resistance to ethnocultural diversification.

Active Resistance

Active resistance may be most characteristic of Dissenters who are philosophically opposed to special diversity efforts. Although overt racism and discrimination are examples of active resistance, they are relatively uncommon (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). Less overtly racist resistance might include interfering with ethnocultural diversification via lawsuits that claim reverse racism in affirmative action or leaving a setting. Active resistance in an organization in which ethnocultural diversification efforts are taking place might include somewhat subtle efforts to dismantle these efforts via socially isolating individuals that represent ethnocultural diversity. For example, arranging for a senior faculty member of color mentor a junior faculty member of color may appear to be ethnoculturally responsive, but it also may isolate both faculty members from other social networks in an academic department (Thomas & Plaut, 2008).

As discussed above, persons who actively resist ethnocultural diversification are not necessarily conservative or racist. Moreover, persons who are actively supportive of ethnocultural diversification may also engage in active resistance. For example, they may reject a campus diversity plan if they believe its reach to be too limited (e.g., demographic diversification without intellectual diversification) or they may refuse to become involved in diversity efforts (e.g., teaching a diversity course, chairing a diversity committee) because they believe that they have already paid their dues and it is not their responsibility to educate others. Active supporters may actively resist working with those less committed to ethnocultural diversification because work groups having common goals are more efficient than those in which goals are not shared (Pieterse, van Knippenberg, & van Ginkel, 2011).

Active resistance by definition does not occur among Passive Supporters, who are characterized by inaction. Active resistance may also come from those who have engaged in ethnocultural diversification efforts that they perceive as having failed. This attitude is similar to that of those who believe that they already have paid their dues. For example, if an academic department has unsuccessfully attempted to recruit faculty of color, some may give up trying, believing that additional efforts are a waste of time. However, as with other academic endeavors, such as getting work published or landing grants, a more productive approach might be to analyze the reasons for failure and attempt to address them.

Another form of active resistance is more subtle and analogous to seeking tax shelters. Some who are opposed to ethnocultural diversification efforts may seek contexts in which they are sheltered from such efforts. For example, a person may take a job in a geographic area that is not ethnoculturally diverse or at particular institutions that are not diverse. Within an ethnoculturally diverse context, a person may seek shelters from ethnocultural diversification, such as an exclusive faculty club or another nondiverse organization. The risk of such approaches is isolation from the benefits of an ethnoculturally diverse society.

Passive Resistance

Passive resistance occurs primarily through inaction with regard to ethnocultural diversification. It could occur in any of the three groups, but is most likely among Passive Supporters. Passive resistance may involve silence regarding discriminatory behaviors or avoiding issues and people associated with ethnocultural diversity (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). Although Passive Supporters are unlikely to actively create barriers to ethnocultural diversification, they also may not perceive existing barriers. They may believe in a “free market” approach to diversity, which suggests that diversity will naturally occur as the nation diversifies demographically. Passive non-discrimination organizational policies may be perceived as sufficient to create an environment that will create diversity (Thomas & Plaut, 2008). Passive Supporters would not necessarily oppose ethnocultural diversification efforts as many Dissenters would, but they also may not see such efforts as an urgent need. They may even point to the election of Barack Obama as evidence that special ethnocultural diversification efforts are not necessary or even that racism has ended. Such passive resistance, if widespread, can be as effective in undermining ethnocultural diversification as active resistance.

The potential problems of the “free market” approach to ethnocultural diversification are illustrated in the history of South Africa. Although the majority of the population has been Black, the White minority remained in power until relatively recently. Ethnocultural diversification involves not only demographic changes, but shifts in attitudes and power. Those who tout Obama’s election as the end of racism and of the need for ethnocultural diversification have overlooked exit polls, which indicate that 55% of Whites voted for John McCain (CNN, 2008). Obama won the election on the strength of non-White voters and White voters under the age of 30. Had only Whites voted in the election, Obama might not be president.

Others who are supportive of diversity efforts may feel paralyzed by the complexity of diversity issues. Analogous to those who view the tax code as too complex and turn to someone else for help (e.g., an accountant), some may turn to others for help on diversity issues. For example, they may hire an external consultant with expertise in the areas of multicultural organizational development or facilitating diversity dialogues. Or, they may look internally for institutional expertise on diversity, such as an affirmative action office or an office of institutional diversity. Although this approach can be productive, it could also shift responsibility for diversity efforts to others. If there is a person or persons having expertise on diversity, the burden of responsibility may shift to the “expert.” For example, if a diversity course exists in an academic department other faculty in the department may not view the integration of diversity into other courses as necessary. Another pitfall of shifting responsibility to others is that others could be blamed for an ineffective ethnocultural diversification effort. That is, if a department or campus unit hires a diversity specialist and a diversity-related incident still arises, the specialist may be blamed for not having “fixed” the diversity problems for which they were hired.

Another somewhat less passive approach to ethnocultural diversification is a desire for simplification. Taxes are often viewed as unnecessarily complicated, weighty, and confusing. Analogous to those who advocate a simple flat tax (“one simple form”) for everyone, there are those who may seek cultural competence without expending much effort. For example, such individuals may believe that they have achieved cultural competence if they have visited another country as a tourist, read a single book, or attended a single workshop. Following such an experience, they may believe that they do not need to take any further action. However, cultural competence is not an end state, but is something that constantly develops and is multidimensional (D. Sue, 2001).

When diversity initiatives are in place, another form of passive resistance is minimal compliance. For example, if a progress report is required, the illusion of progress could be created (e.g., “although the person we hired did not represent diversity, the pool of applicants that we recruited from was diverse”) without actual commitment. Those who take this approach may perceive that an institution will have difficulty in legally mandating ethnocultural diversification and feel that their inaction will have no actual consequences. Minimal compliance is analogous to those who file extensions on tax returns to comply with the law and pay taxes only when absolutely necessary.

Passive forms of resistance may be easier to address and change than active forms. Those who engage in passive resistance to ethnocultural diversification may constitute a larger group than those who engage in active resistance and may be more amenable to becoming actively supportive of ethnocultural diversification because their resistance is less calcified. Perhaps a realistic goal for active resisters is not to convert them to active supporters, but to get them to become less active in their resistance. Put another way, more efforts could be made to explain how their diversity/tax dollars are being put to good use that, in the end, benefits them. Fines or other forms of punishment that are levied against those who fail to pay taxes are not applicable here because resisting ethnocultural diversification is not illegal.

In summary, active resistance to ethnocultural diversification is most characteristic of Dissenters. Passive Supporters are by definition not active and Active Supporters typically do not engage in active resistance to ethnocultural diversification. Passive resistance to ethnocultural diversification can occur in any of the groups but is most characteristic of Passive Supporters.

Motivating Action and Enacting Solutions

How can active and passive resistance to ethnocultural diversification be effectively addressed within each of the attitudes toward diversity? In this section we address potential solutions for each of the three attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification. These solutions are listed in Table 2. There are more solutions for Passive Supporters than for the other groups, as this group may be the most amenable to change. We begin with an overview of methods of attitude change that will be addressed with respect toward each of the three attitudes.

Relevant to this discussion is the social psychological literature on attitude change. The most influential model of attitude change in this literature is the dual process model (Crano & Prislin, 2006; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). The first process is known as a central process in which persuasive messages are carefully analyzed and effective when a receiver is properly motivated and the message is logical and data-based. When a receiver is unmotivated, a second process occurs in which peripheral cues (e.g., perceived credibility of the source) or heuristics (e.g., affective reaction) interfere with the impact of the message. Thus, individuals must be properly motivated and receive a logical, data-based message for attitude change to occur.

Another social psychological literature relevant to this discussion is that on intergroup contact, which has been the most influential model of reducing prejudice. Such approaches seek to reduce group boundaries and intergroup antipathy (Dixon, Tropp, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2010; Zárate, 2009). Intergroup contact tends to reduce negative reactions to members of the other group, such as anxiety, and increase positive reactions to the other group, such as empathy (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Intergroup contact may cause some persons, particularly those in majority groups, to become more open to ethnocultural diversification. Intergroup contact also tends to cause minority group members to have more favorable attitudes toward majority group members. However, intergroup contact has been

found to prompt minority group members to underestimate the injustices experienced by their group and to become less motivated to support needed action to challenge social inequality (Dixon et al., 2010).

The differential advantages of intergroup contact for advantaged and disadvantaged persons suggest the need for group-specific interventions. One group-specific method is to enhance the group identity of minority groups. A strong group identity increases distinctiveness and thereby reduces competition and prejudice among groups. In a series of studies, Latino/a Americans who perceived themselves as having a distinct identity were less prejudiced than those who perceived themselves as similar to others (Zárate, 2009). Across studies, racial/ethnic identity is also associated with better psychological functioning among persons of color (Hall, 2010; Zárate, 2009). Thus, intergroup contact may be most useful in gaining support for ethnocultural diversification among European Americans whereas strengthening racial/ethnic identity may be most useful among persons of color.

Dissenters

Dissenters who actively resist ethnocultural diversification may be the most difficult group to change. Some advocates of ethnocultural diversification may contend that efforts directed toward this group are a waste of time and resources. Nevertheless, vocal dissenters can derail ethnocultural diversification efforts. Thus, a goal with this group might be to reduce their level of resistance.

The attitudes of hardcore Dissenters may be recalcitrant because they are aware that ethnocultural diversification threatens their group's social dominance (Federico & Sidanius, 2002). Such persons may be unmotivated to change and unpersuaded even by logical, data-based messages. For example, arguments that the rapidly changing racial/ethnic demographics of the U.S. make social change inevitable could increase resistance, as evidenced in Arizona where both the Latino/a population and anti-immigrant sentiments are increasing (Tavernise, 2011). Intergroup contact may backfire for majority group Dissenters insofar as perceived similarities with a minority group may be interpreted as an economic threat (Zárate, Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004). For Dissenters of color, race and ethnicity may not be a central component of their identity and they may be relatively immune to appeals based on racial/ethnic identity or solidarity.

Instead of attempting to change the attitudes of actively resistant Dissenters, mandatory approaches to ethnocultural diversification may be needed. Mandatory diversity plans implemented by administrators in the private sector have been found to be more effective in achieving demographic diversity than non-mandatory programs to produce attitude change, such as social networking and feedback to reduce bias (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). However, recent legal challenges to affirmative action may make mandatory ethnocultural diversification difficult to enact on a large scale (Crosby, Iyer, & Sincharoen, 2006). Unlike the general consensus that the U.S. government and the taxes that support it are necessary, there is not a general consensus that ethnocultural diversity is necessary, or at least that it should be mandatory.

The U.S. government does have the power to mandate some forms of diversification. For example, since 1993 the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Revitalization Act has required that members of ethnic minority groups be included in NIH-funded clinical trials in an effort to increase the external validity of health research (Hohmann & Parron, 1996). Researchers who would not otherwise consider diversity issues must now consider strategies to recruit and retain diverse research participants. Although the NIH mandate has not necessarily achieved its desired effects with respect to creating research sample diversity (Mak, Law, Alvidrez, & Perez-Stable, 2007), a positive side effect might be at least some erosion of

active resistance to ethnocultural diversification. Similarly, NIH and National Science Foundation (NSF) programs to increase the diversity of the research workforce by targeting funding for predoctoral and postdoctoral scientists from underrepresented groups also may both ethnoculturally diversify higher education institutions and erode active resistance to diversification. Many of those whose research is funded by NIH and NSF are researchers in the natural sciences, some of whom may be Dissenters. In order to successfully compete for these funds, researchers need to be able to attract and retain diverse students in their laboratories. When faced with the prospect of supplemental research and laboratory funding, many Dissenters may become open to ethnocultural diversification because they concede that it has instrumental value.

While some Dissenters who participate in mandatory diversification efforts may continue to dissent and resist, other Dissenters, particularly passive resisters, may experience the benefits of intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Such benefits of ethnocultural diversification juxtaposed with attitudinal resistance may create cognitive dissonance and the necessary motivation to process attitude change messages. Cognitive dissonance theories suggest that people seek to reduce dissonance when they perceive inconsistencies between their attitudes and behavior (Festinger, 1957). One potentially persuasive message for Dissenters having egalitarian values, who oppose ethnocultural diversification efforts but experience the dissonance of a positive experience with mandatory ethnocultural diversification, would be to present data on the lack of diversity in higher education institutions (including one's own) in which proactive ethnocultural diversification efforts do not occur. Becoming less resistant to or even supportive of ethnocultural diversification would reduce dissonance insofar as ethnocultural diversification is consistent with a value of egalitarianism. Indeed, there is evidence that opposition to affirmative action among those who favor equity is mitigated when discrimination against women and minorities becomes salient (Son Hing, Bobocel, & Zanna, 2002). Of course, an alternative method of reducing dissonance for a Dissenter would be to cognitively disengage from mandatory ethnocultural diversification or to construe any positive effects as transitory.

As discussed above, a goal with Dissenters who are active resisters is for them to become less active in resisting ethnocultural diversification rather than attempting to win their support. Dissenters who have calcified attitudes are difficult to change. Nevertheless, positive experiences with ethnocultural diversification may move some Dissenters toward supporting it.

Passive Supporters

Mandatory approaches such as those described above may also benefit Passive Supporters. However, voluntary approaches to ethnocultural diversification have been found to create a more positive work climate in organizations compared to mandatory approaches (Niemann & Dovidio, 2005). Whereas mandatory approaches may be more necessary with Dissenters who have limited motivation for change, voluntary approaches might have more utility with Passive Supporters. To the extent that Passive Supporters constitute the largest of the three groups, interventions targeted toward getting Passive Supporters to become more active in their support of ethnocultural diversification could have a broad institutional impact.

In keeping with the dual process model of attitude change, Passive Supporters will need to be motivated to become active in ethnocultural diversification efforts. One source of motivation for Passive Supporters is to become active is a diversity-related crisis. Such crises might involve classroom conflicts over race or ethnicity or protests about mistreatment of students of color. However, crises are unpredictable and may occur following damage that is difficult to repair (e.g., strained faculty-student relations).

Crises are motivating because they make ethnocultural diversification issues salient and create a sense of urgency. Another method of accomplishing saliency and urgency is a compelling presentation regarding ethnocultural diversity. In a recent study, a 20-minute video on the differential treatment of African American vs. European American men in various social contexts (apartment rental, retail store) or a neutral video were presented to European American college students (Soble, Spanierman, & Liao, 2011). Relative to the neutral video, the former video resulted in lower colorblindness, increased empathy for non-Whites, and an increased sense of guilt regarding racism. Although the durability of these effects or behavior change was not examined, these findings suggest that even brief persuasive messages can induce attitude change with respect to ethnocultural diversity.

Motivational interviewing, a dissonance-based intervention, has been used to motivate both attitude and behavior change among persons with problems resistant to change, such as addictions (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). The goal of motivational interviewing is to help a person consider their own goals and to help identify discrepancies between actual goals and behaviors. Although motivational interviewing has not been evaluated with respect to attitudes toward ethnocultural diversity, its effectiveness has been demonstrated in treating substance abuse and in promoting health behaviors (Martins & McNeil, 2009). This approach is more effective among those who are contemplating change, similar to Passive Supporters, than those who are resistant to change, similar to Dissenters.

A higher education example of such a discrepancy between goals and behaviors can be found in a study of 1500 faculty at Research I universities in which most valued diversity but most did not incorporate diversity into their teaching (Maruyama & Moreno, 2000). Presenting the contrast between egalitarian values and a non-diverse campus might motivate Passive Supporters to consider becoming Active Supporters. A demonstration that ethnocultural diversification of higher education is not the default might also be convincing. For example, documenting the lack of actual or projected demographic change in a university over a series of decades relative to community or national demographic change during the same time period might be motivating to some. In contexts in which administrators, or the majority, or both are Dissenters, a useful contrast might be made between the institution and other leading institutions that are more diverse, such as the University of California, Stanford University, or the University of Michigan. Liberal arts colleges may not necessarily look to these Research I institutions as role models. Nevertheless, some of the leading liberal arts institutions, including Wellesley College, Swarthmore College, and Pomona College, are also among the most ethnically diverse. The case could be made that these institutions have become intellectual leaders because of the benefits that diversity has brought them. For example, the intellectual and cultural benefits of diversity for all were demonstrated at the University of Michigan (Hurtado, 2001). Most persons in academia aspire toward intellectual excellence and might be persuaded that ethnocultural diversification could make their institution better.

An alternative motivational approach to emphasizing the benefits of ethnocultural diversity would be to emphasize the costs of a lack of diversity. These include: (a) cognitive costs, such as a reliance on stereotypes; (b) affective costs, such as guilt, fear, or discomfort associated with persons of color; and (c) behavioral costs, such as social awkwardness due to limited association with people of color or self-censoring in multicultural contexts (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Another cost would be the risk of becoming less competitive in a rapidly changing global economy. For example, an inability to effectively work with persons from ethnoculturally diverse backgrounds has the potential to disadvantage a person both personally and professionally.

Once adequate motivation for change is established, the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 2001) suggests that creating specific plans of action will increase the likelihood of Passive Supporters becoming active. Those who are able to specify how, when and where they would engage in a behavior have been found to be more likely to engage in the behavior than those who do not make such plans (Sheeran & Orbell, 2000). Passive Supporters may value ethnocultural diversity at some level but are inactive because of a lack of knowledge, opportunity, or fear born out of inexperience.

A first step in a plan of action regarding ethnocultural diversification is self-examination (Roisircar, Dobbins, & Malloy, 2010). Self-examination may include a consideration of the impact of racism on oneself and others (D. Sue et al., 2007). Because efforts to be color blind may inadvertently result in stereotyping (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2007), an awareness of ethnocultural differences is important. Persons who are “color blind” tend to view the campus climate for college students of color as better than the way the climate is perceived by most students of color themselves (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008). However, an exclusive focus on differences may also increase prejudice, so a balance between differences and common ground might be useful (Paluck, 2006). Such issues of balance between similarities and differences are important when a training group is heterogeneous with respect to ethnicity, gender, class, or other variables. Other components of the first step include increasing one’s ability to identify microaggressions in general and in oneself, understanding the impact of microaggressions on people of color, and accepting responsibility to take corrective actions to overcome racial biases (D. Sue et al., 2007).

Attitudinal changes in the first step do not necessarily lead to behavior. Thus, in keeping with the intergroup contact literature, a second step in a plan of action would be to become involved with ethnoculturally diverse groups. Such involvement might include intergroup dialogue, organizations that focus on ethnocultural diversity (e.g., multicultural student or faculty organizations), diversity committees responsible for recommending or implementing change, diversity training programs, or multicultural symposia (Rogers & Molina, 2006). For European Americans, the purpose of such involvement would be to reduce group boundaries and increase intergroup empathy (Dixon et al., 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). The purpose of involvement in organizations that focus on ethnocultural diversity for persons of color would be to establish or strengthen their racial, ethnic, and ethnocultural identity (Zárate, 2009).

The presumably positive experiences in step two would lead to a third step of becoming actively involved in ethnocultural diversification efforts. Such efforts might improve the campus diversity climate. For example, Grinnell College has attempted to create a welcoming environment in the sciences for women students and students of color by creating a pre-orientation week and by restructuring introductory courses to be more accessible, including the blending of lecture and lab work, personal contact with professors, and demonstrating to students how their knowledge can be used to help their communities (Lee, 2009). For those who have the resources to make a greater commitment, recruiting and retaining ethnically diverse students, and hiring and retaining ethnically diverse faculty would be components of the third step. Such actions are likely to have a lasting impact, as diverse faculty and students often attract other diverse faculty and students (Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention, and Training in Psychology, 1997; Ridley, Mendoza, & Kanitz, 1994). Psychology training programs recognized as exemplary for their efforts in recruiting and retaining students of color are characterized by interdependent environments, where cooperation and teamwork are emphasized (Rogers & Molina, 2006). The creation and facilitation of interdependent environments will enhance ethnocultural diversification of higher education settings because such environments may be perceived as supportive by diverse students, faculty, and administrators. Nevertheless, interdependent

environments are at odds with the independent culture of higher education, which underscores the monumental task of ethnocultural diversification.

Active Supporters

Many Active Supporters have adequate motivation to change and are already actively involved in ethnocultural diversification efforts. Active Supporters are most likely to be the impetus for campus change with respect to ethnocultural diversification because they have the motivation, knowledge, and experience that they can share with others. However, some Active Supporters may actively or passively resist ethnocultural diversification efforts because they are skeptical of their likelihood of effectiveness. In other words, there is not a sense of efficacy. Recent research indicates that perceived efficacy is associated with engaging in anti-discrimination actions (i.e., distributing anti-discrimination flyers on campus; Stewart, Latu, Branscombe, & Denney, 2010). Actively or passively resistant Active Supporters might become motivated to participate in ethnocultural diversification efforts that are campus-wide (e.g., a diversity initiative for the whole institution), as opposed to those that are local or isolated, because such broad efforts may be perceived as likely to succeed.

The ethnocultural diversification solutions proposed for Dissenters and Passive Supporters primarily involve demographic diversification. Recruiting and retaining ethnoculturally diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrators certainly may contribute to the diversity of a campus and are tangible, proximal goals for Dissenters and Passive Supporters. However, some Active Supporters may view demographic diversification as a first step, and may be skeptical of demographic diversification that is not accompanied by ethnocultural diversification of research, curricula, and institutional climate (Ridley et al., 1994). Resistant Active Supporters may be mobilized if they perceive an institutional commitment to ethnocultural diversification that is comprehensive rather than superficial. Again, perceived efficacy may motivate resisters to become active (Stewart et al., 2010).

Conclusion

Tax paying is a partial but useful metaphor for attitudes toward diversification, be it ethnocultural or other forms of diversity. The success of ethnocultural diversification in higher education may depend on attitudes toward diversity. We characterize groups based on their attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification as Dissenters, Passive Supporters, and Active Supporters. Mandatory approaches to decrease the resistance of Dissenters to ethnocultural diversification may be necessary, whereas compelling voluntary approaches may be useful for Passive Supporters. Solutions need to be tailored to the needs of European Americans and persons of color. Although these types of attitudes toward ethnocultural diversification have yet to be empirically evaluated, they offer a conceptual framework for future research and interventions.

Acknowledgments

Work on this article was supported by the Asian American Center on Disparities Research (National Institute of Mental Health grant: 1P50MH073511-01A2).

References

- Aberson CL. Diversity, merit, fairness, and discrimination beliefs as predictors of support for affirmative-action policy actions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2007; 37:2451–2474.
- Ajzen I. Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2001; 52:27–58.

- American Association of Colleges & Universities. Making excellence inclusive. 2007. Retrieved July 2010 from www.aacu.org/inclusive_excellence/index.cfm
- CBS News poll. CBS News poll: Most oppose GOP tax Plan. 2010. Retrieved 2/3/11 from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20024494-503544.html
- CNN. Exit polls. 2008. Retrieved 4/24/09 from <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#USP00p1>
- Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention, and Training in Psychology. Visions & transformations: The final report. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 1997.
- Crano WD, Prislin R. Attitudes and persuasion. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2006; 57:345–374.
- Crosby FJ, Iyer A, Sincharoen S. Understanding affirmative action. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2006; 57:585–611.
- Dixon J, Tropp LR, Durrheim K, Tredoux C. "Let them eat harmony": Prejudice -reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2010; 19:76–80.
- Dobbins JE, Skillings JH. Racism as a clinical syndrome. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 2000; 70:14–27. [PubMed: 10702846]
- Dovidio JF, Gaertner SL. Aversive racism and selective decisions: 1989–1999. *Psychological Science*. 2000; 11:315–319. [PubMed: 11273391]
- Federico CM, Sidanius J. Racism, ideology, and affirmative action revisited: The antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002; 82:488–502. [PubMed: 11999919]
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson; 1957.
- Galinsky AD, Magee JC, Inesi ME, Gruenfeld DH. Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science*. 2006; 17:1068–1074. [PubMed: 17201789]
- Galinsky AD, Moskowitz GB. Further ironies of suppression: Stereotype and counterstereotype accessibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2007; 43:833–841.
- Hall, GCN. Multicultural psychology. 2. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall; 2010.
- Hobman EV, Bordia P, Gallois C. Perceived dissimilarity and work group involvement: The moderating effects of group openness to diversity. *Group and Organization Management*. 2004; 29:560–587.
- Hohmann AA, Parron DL. How the new NIH guidelines on inclusion of women and minorities apply: Efficacy trials, effectiveness trials, and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1996; 64:851–855. [PubMed: 8916610]
- Hurtado, S. Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In: Orfield, G., editor. *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group; 2001. p. 187–203.
- Hurtado S. The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2005; 61:595–610.
- Kalev A, Dobbin F, Kelly E. Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*. 2006; 71:589–617.
- Lee, S. Diversity in science. 2009. Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed website: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/08/26/grinnell>
- Levine M, Crowther S. The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2008; 6:1429–1439. [PubMed: 19025293]
- Mak WWS, Law RW, Alvidrez J, Perez-Stable EJ. Gender and ethnic diversity in NIMH-funded clinical trials: Review of a decade of published research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*. 2007; 34:497–503.
- Martins RK, McNeil DW. Review of motivational interviewing in promoting health behaviors. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2009; 29:283–293. [PubMed: 19328605]
- Maruyama, G.; Moreno, J. University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. In: Maruyama, G.; Moreno, JF.; Gudeman, RH.; Marin, P., editors. *Does diversity*

make a difference?: Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors; 2000. p. 8-35.

- Mayhew MJ, Grunwald HE. Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 2006; 77:148–168.
- Miller, WR.; Rollnick, S. Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change. 2. New York: Guilford; 2002.
- Niemann YF, Dovidio JF. Affirmative action and job satisfaction: Understanding underlying processes. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2005; 61:507–523.
- Oyserman D, Coon HM, Kemmelmeier M. Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2002; 128:3–72. [PubMed: 11843547]
- Paluck EL. Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2006; 62:439–451.
- Pettigrew TF, Tropp LR. How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 38:922–934.
- Petty, RE.; Cacioppo, JT. Central and peripheral routes to attitude change. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1986. Communication and persuasion.
- Pieterse AN, van Knippenberg D, van Ginkel WP. Diversity in goal orientation, team reflexivity, and team performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 2011; 114:153–164.
- Ridley CR, Mendoza DW, Kanitz BE. Multicultural training: Reexamination, operationalization, and integration. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 1994; 22:227–289.
- Rogers MR, Molina LE. Exemplary efforts in psychology to recruit and retain graduate students of color. *American Psychologist*. 2006; 61:143–156. [PubMed: 16478358]
- Roysircar, G.; Dobbins, JE.; Malloy, KA. Diversity competence in training and clinical practice. Competency-based education for professional psychology. In: Kenkel, MB.; Peterson, RL., editors. Competency-based education for professional psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2010. p. 179-197.
- Sellers RM, Smith MA, Shelton JN, Rowley SAJ, Chavous TM. Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 1998; 2:18–39. [PubMed: 15647149]
- Sheeran P, Orbell S. Using implementation intentions to increase attendance for cervical cancer screening. *Health Psychology*. 2000; 19:283–289. [PubMed: 10868773]
- Soble JR, Spanierman LB, Liao H. Effects of a brief video intervention on White university students' racial attitudes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2011; 58:151–157. [PubMed: 21142353]
- Son Hing LS, Bobocel DR, Zanna MP. Meritocracy and opposition to affirmative action: Making concessions in the face of discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002; 83:493–509. [PubMed: 12219850]
- Spanierman LB, Heppner MJ. Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites Scale (PCRW): Construction and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2004; 51:249–262.
- Stewart TL, Latu IM, Branscombe NR, Denney HT. Yes we can! Prejudice reduction through seeing (inequality) and believing (in social change). *Psychological Science*. 2010; 21:1557–1562. [PubMed: 20889931]
- Sue DW. Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 2001; 29:790–821.
- Sue DW, Capodilupo CM, Torino GC, Bucceri JM, Holder AMB, Nadal KL, Esquilin M. Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*. 2007; 62:271–286. [PubMed: 17516773]
- Sue DW, Lin AI, Torino GC, Rivera DP, Capodilupo CM. Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2009; 15:183–190. [PubMed: 19364205]
- Sue S, Zane N, Hall GCN, Berger LK. The case for cultural competency in psychotherapeutic interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2009; 60:525–548.

- Thomas, KM.; Plaut, VC. The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. In: Thomas, KM., editor. Diversity resistance in organizations. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2008. p. 1-22.
- van Knippenberg D, Schippers MC. Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2007; 58:515–541.
- Worthington RL, Navarro RL, Loewy M, Hart J. Color -blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 2008; 1:8–19.
- Zárate, MA. Racism in the 21st century. In: Nelson, TD., editor. *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination*. New York: Psychology Press; 2009. p. 387-406.
- Zárate MA, Garcia B, Garza AA, Hitlan R. Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as predictors of attitudes towards Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2004; 40:99–105.

Table 1

Attitudes Toward Cultural Diversification

Group	Size	Resistance to Diversity	Amenability to Change
Dissenters	Small	Active	Low
Passive Supporters	Large	Passive	Low to Medium
Active Supporters	Small	Low or Active	Low, but can lead change

Table 2

Solutions by Attitudes Toward Cultural Diversification

Group	Mandatory/voluntary solutions	Solutions
Dissenters	Mandatory	Dissonance induction, intergroup contact
Passive Supporters	Mandatory or Voluntary	Compelling incident or presentation, motivational interviewing, emphasis on the costs of a lack of diversity, plan of action
Active Supporters	Voluntary	Enhance sense of efficacy