Part One

Framing Diversity
Chapter 1
Psychology of Diversity
Challenges and Benefits

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

Thomas Jefferson
Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776

Major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. High-ranking retired officers and civilian military leaders assert that a highly qualified, racially diverse officer corps is essential to national security. Moreover, because universities, and in particular, law schools, represent the training ground for a large number of the Nation’s leaders, . . . the path to leadership must be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity. Thus, the Law School has a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body.

Justice Sandra Day O’Connor
Introduction

This book is about diversity. Diversity refers to those things that make us different from one another. Race, ethnicity, and gender are the most common differences that are mentioned in diversity conversations. But diversity is much more than demographic differences. We are different by virtue of our country of origin, our culture, sexual orientation, age, values, political affiliation, socioeconomic status, and able-bodiedness. Our psychological tendencies, abilities, or preferences also mark diversity.

There are more than 7 billion people on the planet and each person is uniquely different from every other. Diversity is a global reality. Diversity becomes significant in Germany and the Netherlands when increasing numbers of immigrants arrive from Turkey, Africa, and South America. African, West Indian, and South and East Asian immigrants diversify the United Kingdom and Canada. Sub-Saharan Africans immigrate to South Africa and challenge locals for jobs and opportunities. Ethnic differences in the Pacific Islands, Eastern Europe, Canada, and many countries of Africa highlight both differences and similarities. To this we add the pressures created by trying to meld the diverse countries of Europe into a common union, the European Union (EU). Differences in politics, economic policy, cultural traditions, and religious beliefs challenge the fabric of a common identity. All of these diversity trends reflect global dynamics of difference. A recent Google search of the term yielded 229,000,000 hits, evidence of its relevance to our everyday experiences. So how can we possibly address diversity of this magnitude?

Our approach is to narrow it down. Although our goal is to help people understand diversity and people's responses in the broadest global context, much of this book is a case study of diversity issues in the United States. In this book, diversity is examined primarily with respect to racial and ethnic differences, although we also cover differences in gender, religion, ability, and sexual orientation. Diversity, and how people respond to it, depends on the history, economics, and politics of a society and the psychology of its members. For this reason, we focus primarily on diversity in the United States. However, we also refer to diversity in other nations and cultures and how responses to diversity may be similar or different.

As the book's subtitle implies, prejudice and racism play an important role in the context of diversity; they are a challenge to achieving its positive potential effects. One of the challenges of diversity in everyday life is to understand and reduce the biases that hinder the creation of diversity in groups, institutions, organizations, and societies. But equally challenging is to find the proper balance of approaches to diversity that simultaneously strengthen the fabric of our institutions and society and enrich our individual lives, while preserving the cherished values of equality of opportunity and social justice for all.

Diversity is based in difference, but a variety of similarities intersect these differences. Tsui and colleagues, for example, propose that both demographic differences and similarities between co-workers and supervisors affect task performance and behavior in organizational settings, but in somewhat different ways (Tsui, Porter, & Egan, 2002). They call this idea relational demography. Objective similarities—actual similarity in a given context—are important, but subjective similarities, the extent to
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which people perceive how similar they are to others, and how people weigh them against differences often matter even more. In general, perceiving greater similarity among workers in an organization is related to better performance and commitment to the organization. But perceiving greater similarity does not mean that people do not recognize or respect differences, as well.

What differences and similarities mean in a given relationship will depend on the norms and expectations in that context. A Black and a White female nurse may work together better and show greater support for the organization because of their normative similarities—both are women in a field in which women are the norm—than might a White male and a White female nurse, who are demographically similar by race but normatively dissimilar in the nursing context. In this case, gender similarity is more important than racial similarity. The simple fact of difference then does not create problems. Differences relative to what, when, and where play an important role in determining what the effects are. Diversity offers many ways for us to see similarities with others; it’s not just about differences.

The two quotes at the beginning of this chapter, one from the Declaration of Independence and the other from Justice O’Connor, illustrate a major challenge we face as a democracy. These statements, made at widely varying times, demonstrate that the United States has a fundamental commitment to equal opportunity and equal rights, and a compelling interest in diversity. As enunciated by Justice O’Connor, compelling interest provides the legal basis for determining when and how taking race into account may be used to further diversity objectives in higher education. This commitment to diversity raises three fundamental questions that are the subject of this book: How can we create equality in a society that is so diverse? What are the impediments or barriers to realizing this goal? What are the benefits when we achieve it?

The biggest barriers to equality, given the diversity of our society, have historically been prejudice and racism, because they are premised on the belief that people are not equal. Prejudice and racism shape how we think about diversity and difference. When the institutions of society, such as law and education, reinforce these beliefs, the result is a self-perpetuating social hierarchy in which some groups have more, privileges and wealth for example, and other groups have less. One national ideal is to treat everyone equally, and yet everyone is not equal, because we are a diverse society. There are real and imagined differences among us. The challenge is to treat people fairly, recognizing that we are not all equally qualified for the same job, and respect the differences among us. Diversity has come to be valued in global and local businesses, in educational institutions, and in the military. Justice O’Connor’s statement recognizes this and argues that we have a compelling interest to engage every citizen in the social, educational, and economic institutions that provide direct paths to leadership. Do you agree? America has always been diverse, but over time we have become diverse in different ways. Despite our increasing diversity and the recognition by many that dealing effectively with diversity is essential to our security and economic well-being, engaging diversity remains controversial and raises challenging problems.

Sturm and colleagues refer to successfully achieving diversity in colleges and universities as full participation: “an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to
thrive, realize their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others” (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, & Bush, 2011, p. 3). Diversity is not a static, or a fixed number. We think of diversity as a catalyst for full participation in our communities, institutions, society and in our lives.

This book’s main purpose is to help readers understand the psychology of diversity by reviewing what we know about human behavior and how it shapes our experiences with diversity in a variety of settings and contexts. This book highlights some psychological reactions to diversity and the emotions, perceptions, and behaviors they activate. It also presents evidence that guides us toward promising pathways for reducing some of the adverse impacts that may accompany increased diversity, as well as demonstrates some of the important benefits that diversity can produce.

The Goals of this Book

We have three main goals for this book. First we want to demonstrate the depth and breadth of diversity in the United States. Our perspective is that diversity has always been a feature of American society (see Chapter 3). This diversity has dramatically increased along race and ethnic dimensions since the 1960s. If the expanding diversity is properly understood and well managed, it will strengthen our security, economic prosperity, and innovation.

A second goal of this book is to describe how diversity is reflected in people, groups, institutions, and cultures, and how and why we react to these forms of diversity in the ways that we do. Prejudice and discrimination result not only from the actions of bigots, but also from the unexamined actions and attitudes of those of us who consider ourselves “unprejudiced.” We show that prejudice is “normal” in that it is rooted in basic human cognitive, neurological, and emotional processes. As a consequence, we must overcome powerful and ordinary predispositions in order to reduce prejudices. We present research-based strategies for overcoming some of these prejudices and thus create a more favorable environment for diversity to flourish. In this way, we hope to empower students to actualize their goals regarding equity and democracy.

Third, and finally, our goal is to present some of the problems, challenges, and differing perspectives on diversity, and we provide some historical and cultural perspectives about diversity in the United States. This book may lead you to ask more questions than we have raised here and perhaps it will help you understand and become aware of diversity’s challenges. It may also encourage thinking about solutions to some of the challenges we raise. We hope this will help you better live in increasingly diverse settings, institutions, and societies. We want your understanding of diversity to be based on research findings that explain how diversity affects human behavior, and we also want you to appreciate the challenges that these findings present.

What is Diversity About?

Fundamentally, diversity is about differences between and within individuals, institutions, and societies. However, talking about diversity simply as difference is not what we mean in this book; we consider the kinds of social differences that society identifies
as important for determining the experiences and futures of individuals and groups. There are many ways in which a person or group is related to diversity. This book will invite you to learn more about what is meant by diversity, our psychological responses to it, what we know about human behavior and diversity, and how it impacts us as people and as a nation. Although diversity often offers opportunities for positive benefits, it is not just any differences that are beneficial. We do not want more felons or bullies among us. But other things equal, we do believe that diversity of perspectives, experiences, talents, and backgrounds can enrich most contexts, institutions, and relationships.

However, as we will show in later chapters, there seems to be a general human tendency to avoid differences or react negatively to them. Moreover, when we focus on differences, we often fail to appreciate the similarities among us. These biases occur at all social levels: (a) individual attitudes and behavior, (b) institutional policies and programs, and (c) cultural beliefs and practices that often lead to biases in relationships and in institutions. Two of the major challenges of diversity in everyday life are to understand and reduce the many biases that hinder the creation and support of effective diversity in groups, institutions, organizations, and societies and then to maximize the benefits of diversity and to minimize the difficulties and adverse effects growing diversity can produce.

This book focuses on the psychology of diversity—basic psychological processes that are triggered when we encounter people who are different from us in significant and salient ways, or experience being treated differently by others because of our social status. It further explores the dynamics of mental representation and social interaction across individuals, institutions, and cultures, and how differential bases of power, privilege, and status affect these interactions. Finally, it identifies the effects of diverse contexts on the thoughts, actions, and feelings of people in them.

We begin with four real stories, based on student-to-student interviews done in a course on racism and prejudice, about experiences of prejudice. These stories come from student-led interviews about diversity and help to illustrate what we mean by diversity’s challenges at these three levels.

**Fahad H.** is an exchange student from Pakistan who has lived in the United States for less than a year and is getting his Masters Degree at an Ivy-league university. He has strongly defined typical Middle Eastern facial features and a golden hue to his skin. His hair is dark. He also has a slight Pakistani or Indian accent. His western dress, charming manner, excellent spoken and written English, and handsome features also define him. Fahad describes his experiences on his campus and those when not on the campus as being very different:

> When I am not at the university I feel more conscious of my accent. I’m sometimes asked where I am from, but not in a kind or curious way, but with suspicion. I’m watched on the train. I’ve been stopped by transit cops asking where I am going and where I came from. This has never happened to me in Pakistan, my home. I know people treat me differently because of 9/11.

Fahad has a number of Pakistani friends, some of whom wear traditional dress, are Muslim, or have English-speaking characteristics similar to his, who have had similar experiences. Fahad is aware of the well-documented strong negative bias against
Middle-Eastern and Muslim persons since 2001. Fahad and his friends are experiencing bias at the individual level.

Susanna G. is a college student who has worked for 5 years as an administrative assistant in a graphic design and marketing firm in New York City. She was born in the United States and her parents were born in the Dominican Republic. She came across an article in The New York Times about bias against and exclusion of Blacks and other minorities in her industry. Susanna brought the article to a class on racism and prejudice to discuss it with her professor. She stated,

She asked, “Is this an example of institutional bias based on race in the workplace?”

Tameeka A. is a senior at a private university where she is a marketing major. She has always worked in fashion sales, and over the summer between her junior and senior year she applied for and was hired as a salesperson for a large national clothing chain that caters to preppy fashion for “all American” young men and women. She arrived on her first day dressed to impress. Her hair was neatly braided cornrows, she wore large gold hoop earrings, and a colorful skirt and blouse with coordinating African print. Tameeka was called into her manager’s office and told she could not wear cornrows or large hoop earrings on the sales floor because they did not represent the image the store wanted to promote. She was also told to “tone down her clothing” because ethnic clothing was not allowed on sales personnel. Tameeka was also told that if she didn’t want to change her style she would only be able to work in the stockroom. Is it fair to Tameeka that conforming to the company standards prohibits her personal expression in how she dresses? Does the manager not have the right to dictate appropriate dress code for the company? Is Tameeka experiencing a form of cultural bias?

Robert S., when he is asked, describes himself as White. His mother is Italian and his father is Irish, but he says, “I’m White,” when asked his racial and ethnic identity. Robert has no ethnicity that he acknowledges day to day—it is only part of his background, called up when asked, but he does not see it as self-defining. When interviewed he cannot describe any ways in which he has experienced individual, institutional, or cultural biases. Robert says in this interview, “I don’t see color, we live in a society where everyone has equal rights and a chance to prove himself.” Is Robert unbiased? What is his place in the social diversity of America?

These brief descriptions illustrate how people perceive or experience bias on an individual, institutional, and cultural level. They also illustrate that some majority group members may not experience such biases, based on their racial status. But we also go beyond this three-prong framework to propose that not all challenges to diversity are because of biased perceptions, intentions, or beliefs. There are two basic ideas that reflect this viewpoint. First, at times it is not the right and wrong of a situation that we must consider but rather the difference between two positions or among
several that may be reasonable, appropriate and worthwhile and therefore difficult to resolve. Second, the more diverse perspectives and points of view there are, the more difficult it is to formulate policies and programs, articulate values, and accept principles that are equitable for all.

A Taxonomy of Diversity

The psychology of diversity considers different meanings and aspects that diversity can assume. Often diversity is used only to refer to ethnic and racial differences and it is also often confused with affirmative action. Scott Page (2007) provides a useful taxonomy for distinguishing among different types of diversity. He proposes four main diversity categories: cognitive, identity, demographic, and preference.

**Cognitive diversity** reflects differences in patterns of thinking, analysis, perception, and point of view, including:

- Perspectives: ways of representing and understanding the world around us.
- Heuristics: thinking tools or strategies for solving personal problems or achieving desired goals.
- Interpretations: creating categories into which we place and give meaning to things, events, experiences.
- Predictions: inferences we make about what goes with or causes what.

**Identity diversity** represents differences among people based on sex, gender orientation, religion, race, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, immigrant status, and so on that are reflected in their affinity for and identification with those social categories.

**Demographic diversity** occurs when differences among people are based on social categories or social roles without regard to their psychological salience for the person. These differences usually consist of the same categories as identity diversity.

**Preference diversity** reflects differences in taste and values, including:

- **Fundamental preferences**: the outcomes we value or prefer.
- **Instrumental preferences**: the means by which we pursue preferred outcomes.

We are used to thinking about identity and demographic diversity. Complications arise when we introduce cognitive or psychological diversity and preferences or values. Even when people agree about valued outcomes like fundamental preferences, they may disagree about the best way to achieve them—instrumental preferences.

Another useful taxonomy is provided by Milem (2003). He proposes three interrelated ways to view diversity: **structural diversity** (numerical and proportional representation), **diversity-related initiatives** (cultural awareness workshops, ethnic studies courses, etc.), and **diversity interactions** (exchanges between and among people who are different). Structural diversity does not guarantee either of the other two forms. And you cannot have the last two if structural diversity does not exist, thus all three are interconnected. Research supports the positive benefits of both diversity initiatives and diverse interactions (Chang, 1999; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004).
Diversity is not one thing, it is many things. Its varied nature is one of its challenges; diversity introduces a higher level of complexity to various contexts than does homogeneity. However, the varied nature of diversity is also a principal source of its benefit; from complexity comes better problem solving, greater understanding, and better citizens.

**When Diversity Does Not Add Up To Equality**

Political and economic power is unevenly distributed in society but social hierarchy is normal (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Groups vary in their ability to make decisions that affect the well-being of others. In this case, the group may have considerable influence that can disadvantage less-powerful groups, and advantage their own group. In the United States, men, particularly White men, have historically had greater educational and professional opportunities than have women. On average men get paid more and have more prestigious jobs. Is the reason for this simply because they are better at these jobs? Or is it because they have had more advantages? Or is there something about our cultural values and beliefs that assign greater prestige to things men do? It is hard sometimes to distinguish the influences of privileged opportunity, societal practices and cultural beliefs, and merit-based accomplishment.

We believe in merit, equality of opportunity, and fairness. But accomplishing all of these is challenged by historical patterns of advantage and disadvantage, and by ongoing biases. Many of these biases occur without awareness or intention.

Take a moment and think about the social groups with which you identify and their relative position in the U.S. social hierarchy. Do you belong to or identify with groups that have traditionally been disadvantaged? Groups that have been advantaged? Do you believe that one may be advantaged by virtue of not being disadvantaged? In those instances, disadvantage is hidden. People’s understanding of advantage and disadvantage is often limited to what is salient. So calling attention to yourself or your group may be a way to transform disadvantage into advantage.

This book addresses many questions you have probably thought about as you have encountered diversity such as the following.

- When people disagree about the value of increasing diversity, what do they disagree about?
- Does diversity mean the same thing to members of underrepresented groups and majority groups? What are some differences in how it might be understood?
- How can we really be fair to everyone when our society is so diverse?
- Do racism and prejudice remain factors in race relations in the United States? Or, are we now a post-racial society?
- What kinds of diversity strengthen an organization, institution, or society? If so how does it?
- Are there right ways and wrong ways to manage diversity? How do we balance an emphasis on what we have in common with what makes us different?
- Where does individual bias come from? What role does culture play?
• Do some groups have more power than others? Are historical disadvantages or advantages for some groups perpetuated in today’s society? If so, does it continue? Can anything be done about this?
• Is it fair to consider race/ethnicity or gender in college admissions? Is it fair not to?
• What role do Whites play in our analysis and understanding of diversity? Is it really true that diversity benefits all? In what ways?

You may have a number of other questions about diversity and more may come to mind as you read this book. Try to remember them—write them down in fact—so that when you finish reading this book, you can determine if your questions have been answered or if you need to look elsewhere for additional resources to answer them.

**Perspectives on Diversity**

Diversity is a topic of enormous scope and complexity. We cannot cover all of these aspects of diversity in this book. Instead we focus on core psychological processes and institutional practices that inhibit or facilitate effective diversity in schools, organizations, and society at large. Our goal is to present a coherent story about diversity and how people react to it for better or for worse.

**Behavioral Science and Diversity**

Although we draw on work from a range of disciplines, we approach diversity primarily from the perspective of psychology, hence *The Psychology of Diversity*. We emphasize the central role of individual perceptions of, and reactions to, diversity. We consider research from the micro-level of neuroscience, which studies the structure and function of the brain and their relation to behavior, to the macro-levels of social and political psychology, which examine how our identification with various groups influence how we respond to others. The scope of our perspective is broad. We also consider institutional and cultural influences on diversity. Nevertheless, consistent with our psychological perspective, we discuss how historical events, institutions such as the legal system, and culture affect responses to diversity by shaping the way people think, feel, and act.

We illustrate the roles of history and politics largely through examples of events and policies that have shaped U.S. society. As such, the concept of race and issues about race relations occupy central places in this book. Race relations have been the defining form of intergroup relations in the United States politically and socially since the arrival of people from Europe and Africa. Most of the psychological research on intergroup relations has been about race, because of the primacy of Black–White relations during the Civil Rights Movement in the United States and because of our history of enslavement based on skin color. The Black–White divide, known for decades as “the color line,” was identified by W. E. B. DuBois (1903) as the problem of the twentieth century. This divide is the primary lens through which we see race.
Race is very real as a practical point of departure for social identity, social classification, and meaning making.

In a discussion about diversity, race can play a central role in highlighting the meaning of diversity, but it is not the only aspect of diversity we consider. We emphasize throughout the book that diversity is, well, diverse; understanding one form of diversity does not automatically mean we understand other forms. Therefore, we consider diversity of many types both internationally as well as nationally. Nevertheless, race in the United States represents a consistent thread across the chapters in this book that allows us to draw on a large body of work to develop a more comprehensive narrative of how history, politics, economics, and human psychology operate, often in concert, to shape diversity and reactions to it.

Returning from time to time to issues of race allows us to illustrate how culture and history influence the ways people think about diversity. It informs us about misconceptions and why they develop. For example, many people still think that race is a biological concept that represents differences among people. But research has clearly shown that a biological basis for race is an inadequate explanation of the wide range of human variation. Asian and European gene variations are very similar to each other, and all the genetic variations found in Asians and Europeans are also found among Africans. The amount of variation found within any race group, Asians for example, will be greater than the variation between any two groups, Asians and Europeans for example. The human genome is 99.9% the same for all human beings (for more information, see National Institutes of Health Human Genome Project http://www.genome.gov/). We are, in fact, more biologically alike than we are different.

Even though race means little in a biological sense, in a social sense race matters a lot. As historian Robin Kelley explained in the 2011 PBS documentary, *Race – The Power of Illusion*, race is not about how you look, but “how people assign meaning to how you look” (http://www.pbs.org/race/000_About/002_04-background-02-05.htm). As we saw in our four student profiles, the significance of race lies in its social meaning. Societies construct significance for any concept or thing by imbuing it with beliefs and assumptions and by applying actions and organizational structures to it. Racism is the most pernicious outcome among the beliefs about race. In a racialized society, where life outcomes are determined in part by racial classification, racial inequality is embedded in and a product of social institutions (Jones, 1997; Smedley & Smedley, 2012).

In our discussions of race, we do not imbue the term or the groups Black or White with biological significance (see Helms, Jernigan, & Mascher, 2005). However, we recognize that race groups such as Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, and so forth are socially meaningful when they result in differences in treatment and different social outcomes within a diverse society.

We adopt the general framework of diversity science in our analysis of the psychology of diversity (see Plaut, 2010). According to Plaut, a diversity science should (a) avoid employing and perpetuating an abstract conception of race; (b) locate the sources of inequality not only in individual minds but also in the practices, policies, and institutions that they create; (c) unearth cultural ideologies that help perpetuate systems of inequality; (d) interrogate the mask of privilege that Whiteness carries; (e) investigate the perspectives of both minority and majority groups in dynamic interac-
Diversity within Diversity

All members of diverse groups are not alike, far from it. Diversity is not sufficiently captured by looking at racial, ethnic, or cultural groups as a whole. Not only is there diversity within groups but, at the individual level, a person belongs to multiple diversity groups. Think about yourself. You have a gender, cultural background, sexual orientation, age, way of thinking, and so forth. You belong to multiple groups that, taken together, represent diversity in U.S. society. Of course there are even more groups that you may belong to, such as student, so this concept of diversity gets rather complicated. The fact that each of us belongs to multiple diversity groups complicates any consideration of diversity but must be incorporated into our understanding of it. There is, therefore, diversity “within” and “between” people or groups. We are a diverse society and within the customary demographic markers, there are even more layers of diversity.

Here are some examples. Asians from Korea are different from those from Japan who are different from those from China, and a multitude of diversity exists within each of these Asian groups. South East Asians from India are different from persons from Malaysia, Vietnam, Cambodia, and so on. Whether they are first- or second-generation immigrants to the United States also matters. The so-called “model minority,” Asian or Asian American, covers a broad spectrum of socioeconomic statuses, languages, cultures, and immigrant statuses (Sue, Sue, Sue, & Takeuchi, 1995). Hispanics are considered an ethnic group as well as a race category in the U.S. Census, but they may be Black or White or Asian, come from Mexico, Central or Latin America, Spain, Puerto Rico, or Cuba. They may live in the southwest, on the west coast, the east coast or the southeast, each with different challenges and presenting a different cultural context. Like members of all other groups, they vary by sexual orientation.

While we frequently discuss Black–White relations in this book, it is also important to keep in mind the diversity within these groups. Blacks are young and old, rich and poor, immigrant and native born. They may live in Black urban environments or Black suburban enclaves or integrated suburban settings. Robinson (2011) describes this diversity as comprising at least four groups: (a) mainstream, the middle-class majority with a full ownership stake in American society; (b) emergent, persons of mixed-race heritage and communities of recent Black immigrants; (c) transcendent, a small elite group with massive wealth, power and influence; and (d) abandoned, a minority with defeatist dreams and pessimistic hope. According to Robinson, these “four Black Americas are increasingly distinct, separated by demography, geography and psychology . . . leading separate lives” (Robinson, 2011, p. 5). Touré (2011) goes further to describe 40 million ways to be Black based on the uniqueness of each and every Black person.

Whites too are rich and poor, urban and suburban, well educated and not, gay and straight, and members of many different ethnic groups, such as Italian, Polish, or
German. American Indians are from different nations, live in different parts of the United States, and have different traditions and needs. They too vary in socioeconomic status, acculturation, and sexual orientation.

Finally, a large and growing number of people consider themselves to be of mixed race, a group also richly diverse as described for the other groups we mention. By 2050, one in five Americans will describe themselves as multiracial (Lee & Bean, 2012). And we add one further wrinkle: diversity exists not only between and within groups—reflecting ways in which they are different from one another, but also within each individual—reflecting the diversity of experience, identity, and consciousness of each person. So when we talk about diversity, it is not one thing but many. The challenges our society faces in making a harmonious mixture are enormous. This book cannot “solve” these challenging diversity perspectives and issues. We can, however, share psychological research findings that shed light on the challenges and provide some answers to some of our questions about diversity.

But we do not want to leave you with the impression that diversity is only about problems and difficulties. Diversity among us in a variety of settings creates opportunities and better outcomes. So the challenges are not only to lessen the adverse impacts and meet the problems that diversity presents, but to capitalize on the opportunities that multiple perspectives, different experiences and talents, understandings, and even hunches or intuitions can offer.

The Diversity Divide: Benefits versus Challenges

Although we argue that diversity is a reality and an important social value, we also are well aware that everyone does not share the belief that diversity is necessarily good (Crisp & Turner, 2011). The value of diversity is contested in this society; some think it is merely a code for promoting special interests, while others think it is important to promote fairness and level the playing field for different groups. Further, whether you endorse diversity as a valuable goal or oppose it as an infringement of individual rights depends on what it means to you. Some people embrace and promote diversity as valuable and necessary, while others think it is divisive and a threat to core American traditions and values. This makes promoting diversity a challenge. Let’s consider some of the reasons that are associated with the benefits viewpoint first.

What Are the Benefits of Diversity?

Among the reasons offered for the value of diversity are that it (a) facilitates adaptability, flexibility, and creativity in thinking and acting; (b) produces better citizenship in a more diverse world; (c) fosters human capital, which are the resources that people bring to enterprises, by engaging participation of marginalized groups; and (d) is morally correct and consistent with the core U.S. values of equity and fairness. A brief summary of the reasoning for each of these benefit perspectives follows.

Adaptability, flexibility, and creativity  
Flexibility is the trait that allows a person to perceive others in non-stereotypical ways, to view situations in novel ways, and to
offer creative solutions to complex problems. This trait, as does adaptability and creativity, often follows exposure to diversity (Page, 2007). For example, in one study racially diverse and non-diverse (all-White) mock juries were exposed to pre-trial questions about racism. The diverse jury exchanged a wider range of information, were more lenient to both Black and White defendants, cited more case facts, made fewer errors of fact, and were more amenable to discussing racism than when they were all-White juries (Sommers, 2006).

Another study examined the effects of both diversity of opinions and racial diversity in small group discussions (Antonio, Chang, Hakuta, Kenny, Levin, & Milem, 2004). Members of groups that included minorities, whether based on race or divergent opinions, saw the minority person as contributing novel ideas to the discussions of a social issue, such as the death penalty or child labor practices in developing countries. Furthermore, diverse groups showed greater integrative complexity as evidenced by more differentiation and integration of multiple perspectives. Even younger children show benefits of diverse perspectives. When taught to classify information along multiple dimensions, 5- to 10-year-old children created counter-stereotypical combinations of social roles. They created combinations such as a female manual worker and a male secretary and were much less likely to make gender-stereotyped judgments and responses (Bigler & Liben, 1992).

Better citizenship The United States is increasingly diverse, not only in its population but in every aspect of social, organizational, and institutional functioning. Good citizenship in a diverse world requires that one understands and respects differences. Being afraid of differences or seeing them as threatening is counterproductive. Those optimistic about diversity believe that diversity experiences and training prepare a person for living and functioning in a diverse world.

Research supports this claim. Gurin et al. (2004) developed an Intergroup Dialogues Course, designed for first-semester college students from diverse backgrounds to bring diversity and democracy into alignment using a curriculum consisting of readings, lectures, papers, and intergroup dialogues. The Intergroup Dialogues Course is based on five principles: (a) presence of diverse others in this course based on pairing people of color and White people; women and men; African Americans and Jews; gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals; and Whites and Hispanics; (b) discontinuity from pre-college experiences; (c) equality among peers; (d) discussion guided by civil discourse rules; and (e) normalization, and negotiation of conflict.

Students who participated in the Intergroup Dialogues Course, compared with those who did not participate, were more likely to believe that differences are not divisive, that conflict is not necessarily bad, and that learning about other groups is desirable and worthwhile (Gurin et al., 2004). After participating in the Intergroup Dialogues Course, students were more likely to be interested in politics and to participate in campus civic and political activities. They also indicate that they are more likely to be active in the community and to promote racial and ethnic understanding once they graduated.

Full use of human capital Systematic exclusion of segments of society from its most important institutions, such as education, military service, professions, and so forth,
takes a toll on everyone. The Tuskegee Airmen story illustrates this point very well. The Airmen, a special all-Black cadre of fighter pilots, integrated a racially segregated Army Air Corps during World War II (see the Hollywood movie *Red Tails* for a dramatization of their story). At first they were marginalized and limited to simple non-combat and low-risk assignments. Eventually, they were sent out on very dangerous missions, in somewhat faulty planes, to protect White pilots from harm. While doing this they proved that they were excellent and brave pilots. As their feats continued, and with expanding duties and assignments, the Tuskegee Airmen became one of the best squadrons in the Air Corps.

A similar situation occurred when the U.S. military adopted the “Don’t ask don’t tell” policy toward gay and lesbian service members in the 1980s. This compromise policy allowed gay and lesbian military personnel to serve, as long as they did not live openly as non-heterosexuals. In effect, the policy required members of a minority group to hide a part of their identity. Its repeal made it possible for gay men and lesbians to serve with integrity and human dignity and some were observed to be among the bravest and best. And it was not until 1994 that women were permitted to occupy combat positions, such as serving on warships, in the military.

A society is better and stronger when it promotes and encourages broad participation from all citizens. It costs more to incarcerate a person for a year than to send him or her to college for that same year (Resnick, 2011). In 2011, for example, the cost for a student attending Princeton University in New Jersey was $37,000; the expense associated with a prisoner in a New Jersey state prison was $44,000. Certainly most incarcerated criminals deserve and need to be in prison. However, for many prison inmates, it would have been much better to find opportunities for them early in life to participate as citizens and become engaged in society.

*It is morally correct and consistent with the value of equality*  Equality of opportunity is a core value of the United States. As we will see in Chapter 3, throughout U.S. history, equality has been a core value but not a reality. A guiding diversity principle is desirable because it sets our sites on equality. According to this view, inequality is not a natural consequence of human variations in abilities, character, and culture. Rather, the characteristics that make a strong person and a strong society are found in all groups. When we narrowly identify the attributes that are considered as criteria for opportunity, the diversity among us is shortchanged. Even if the criterion is relevant and important, such as SAT scores or grades, potential diversity of access and participation is limited.

A current university president who is from a diversity group that is often marginalized, was a poor test-taker, and was denied access to educational opportunities for many years, even though he obviously had the ability to succeed. Diversity as a social goal requires looking for ways to increase participation and outcomes for people and groups who have been excluded or marginalized. We don’t know what we may be missing by overlooking these groups. Including diversity as a guiding social principle is morally correct and reflects the highest value for which we stand as a nation.

Institutions of higher learning are increasingly including diversity as an educational and institutional goal. For example, in 2011, the 165-year old City College of New York renewed a long-standing commitment to diversity by establishing a Council on
Inclusion and Excellence. This linked the College’s mission of excellence with one of inclusion. The Council’s mission includes “[enhancing the College’s] ability to fully incorporate the full diversity of backgrounds, traditions and experiences of faculty, staff, and students in realizing the goal of an inclusive community that values excellence in scholarship, creative arts, teaching and learning, and student development.” The Council also makes recommendations that promote an understanding of how inclusion and participation of the diverse groups within the College community fosters excellence. It further works to encourage a culturally rich and cohesive environment that nourishes student retention and academic success (Report of the President’s Council on Inclusion and Excellence, September 2012, City College of New York; http://www.ccny.cuny.edu/inclusion/mission.cfm).

What Are the Challenges of Diversity?

Among the reasons offered that bolster the opinion that diversity is undesirable are that it (a) excludes non-minority groups, typically but not always Whites; (b) defines which differences matter on the basis of convenience or ideology; (c) violates the principle of reward based on merit; and (d) highlights differences, fostering stereotyping and driving people farther apart. A brief summary of the reasoning for each follows.

*The practice of diversity can be exclusionary*  
Is diversity a characteristic of our nation that is both expanding and beneficial, or is it a specification of which groups should be given preferential treatment? People who do not belong to a “diversity group” often feel like diversity is “not about them.” If you are White, male, able-bodied, young, heterosexual, and middle class, you are in the default non-diverse group. Diversity then refers to other people and excludes you. From this viewpoint diversity goals are at best irrelevant, or at worst threatening (Norton & Sommers, 2011; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011).

Diversity goals may seem suspect even to those they seem to benefit, particularly Black persons. When diversity becomes a central goal, the discourse of social justice and civil rights diverges from a focus on race. In the name of diversity, it seems that a focus on specific groups is blurred, so Blacks may feel as threatened as Whites. Thus, one may be suspicious about diversity because of what it excludes—it’s not about me, it fails to include me—or how it dilutes historical and ongoing efforts on behalf of certain groups. Diversity then can be both exclusionary because it is too narrowly defined or too inclusive because it is too broadly defined. Either way, individuals may have good reasons to feel that diversity does not apply to them or their group.

*Which differences matter?*  
People are different from each other in myriad ways. Deciding which differences to privilege is not easy. The question becomes, What kinds of diversity matter? A former nominee of President Richard Nixon to the U.S. Supreme Court, G. Harrold Carswell, was rejected for, among other reasons, being a mediocre jurist. Senator Roman Hruska (R. Nebraska) came to his defense: “Even if he were mediocre, there are a lot of mediocre judges and people and lawyers. They are entitled to a little representation, aren’t they, and a little chance?” (Time Magazine, 1970).
Obviously, mediocrity is not a diversity value, but what kinds of diversity should be valued? Furthermore, is it necessary to set specific diversity goals? If we don’t have specific goals and instead simply say we respect differences and want more of them, when can we say we have reached our goal? Which person best represents diversity: a transgendered individual or a lesbian? Do Asians add to diversity? If so, in what settings? What about older adults or persons with physical or mental challenges? In some cases we may want to recruit more members of certain groups to diversify a setting. In other situations, it may be enough to simply treat all groups respectfully and allow them to be welcomed and successful.

Diversity of perspective or point of view, values, beliefs, and so on can also be aspects of diversity to consider. For example, college campuses are considered to be bastions of liberal thought and politics. Some argue that diversity could or should include more conservative perspectives. The same might be said of conservative institutions of higher learning.

**Diversity undermines meritocracy**  

*Meritocracy* is a core belief about how benefits should be earned and bestowed. In theory, merit is objectively determined on an individual basis. If you work harder, if you are smarter, you should get more or have more. Higher SAT scores combined with a high grade point average should give a person an advantage over a person who does not have these credentials. What does social group or race have to do with it? The answer is, a lot. Context matters.

Many people have argued that modern-day baseball records set during the so-called steroid era should be set aside because these players had an unfair advantage. Others argue that every era was different and aspects of the earlier records can be called into question as well. Racial segregation in baseball meant that some of the best players who were Black could not compete during the time many old-time players, like Babe Ruth, set their records. We cannot really answer the fairness question from this perspective, but it raises an important point: Fairness is not easily calculated and differences among us may contribute to that calculation in a favorable or unfavorable way. The context by which we judge fairness is very important.

**Focusing on differences may promote conflict**  

Does highlighting differences lead to stereotyping and ultimately drive people farther apart? Research has shown, for example, that emphasizing a *multicultural perspective*, in which people focus on others’ different racial, ethnic, and cultural heritages, leads people to stereotype others more (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). Conversely, adopting a *colorblind perspective*, in which group differences are ignored, is associated with greater prejudicial behavior. Moreover, the colorblind approach is considered a requirement for achieving true meritocracy.

Although the term is generally applied to race issues, it is a more general ideology that minimizes any group differences in favor of individual assessments. For example, working together in diverse groups for a period of time can reduce the effects of surface-level factors like race, and strengthen deep-level factors like attitudes which can produce more group cohesion (Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002).

Essentially, these divergent beliefs about diversity challenge our ability to allow diversity to flourish. They are flip sides of the same issue, making diversity very complex.
and not amenable to simple solutions. Those holding beliefs in the colorblind approach may be indifferent or apathetic about diversity initiatives; and in some instances, actively oppose them. Those holding a multicultural perspective usually support initiating of diversity activities, but may fail to see some possible unintended but adverse consequences of them such as those mentioned above.

Organization of this Book

As we have seen, diversity is challenging to understand and analyze. Our approach is based primarily on the research literature in social psychology, which has largely focused on prejudice exhibited by Whites because of the history of racial discrimination in the United States and the general presence of Whites in positions of power and authority. We recognize that members of other groups can also be prejudiced and we believe that a full understanding of the psychology of diversity should examine prejudices of diverse groups, not just Whites. Also studied, but not nearly as much, has been how people respond when they are the targets of prejudice and discrimination. This research increased significantly after 1990 (Swim & Stangor, 1998). However, diversity research really began around the beginning of this century (Plaut, 2010).

Diversity research, from a scientific perspective as discussed in Chapter 2, incorporates research on race and ethnicity but goes beyond it. Plaut (2010) offers a framework for diversity research: It should avoid abstract conceptions of race; locate the sources of inequality not only in persons, but also in the practices and policies of institutions; and unearth cultural ideologies that help perpetuate systems of inequality. With respect to the race and ethnicity diversity, it should examine the mask of privilege that Whiteness carries, and investigate the perspectives of both minority and majority groups in dynamic interaction. It should also document the experiences of groups beyond the much-studied and analyzed Black–White binary.

We know much less about how people experience diversity than we do about the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination. Therefore, although we take a research-based approach, at times we must accept that we do not have the research to support certain ideas, ideals, or practices. At these junctures, we ask you to think for yourself, search for research or perhaps do research, discuss issues, and to come up with your own opinions. We hope you will use these as opportunities to think deeply about the questions, answers, and complexities of the diversity debate.

This book is organized into four parts. Part One provides an orientation and presents the background to diversity and the approach that we take in our analysis and discussion. Parts Two and Three focus on the different ways in which bias can be expressed on an individual, institutional, and cultural level. Part Two emphasizes how individual psychological processes—how we think, feel, fear, need, and desire—shape our responses to difference and diversity. Part Three discusses how organizational, institutional, and cultural forces influence the ways groups are positioned in society and how power determines the degree to which societies and people benefit from diversity. Part Four presents an appraisal of the future of diversity, based on existing literature, and offers some key principles that can guide us into that future. Each chapter concludes with a series of questions that ask readers to reflect upon the
implications of the material in the chapter and apply new insights to relevant personal situations, events, and social issues.

Part One, Framing Diversity (Chapters 1–3), consists of three chapters and builds on the ideas we have presented in this introductory chapter. This section provides a context for understanding diversity and describes our approach to discussing challenges to it. Chapter 2, Central Concepts in the Psychology of Diversity, introduces key concepts and terms that recur throughout the book and that are central to our analysis. Chapter 3, Historical Perspectives on Diversity in the United States, focuses on the historical evolution of diversity in the U.S. population. Understanding how we respond to diversity today requires knowing how we got to where we are historically, politically, and socially. We explore themes such as the historical reasons for our diversity and how it has been managed, and how this past history of diversity affects us now.

Part Two, Psychological Processes (Chapters 4–9), consists of five chapters that explain how individual and group processes present challenges to diversity and its benefits. These biases are related to personality, basic psychological processes, and even brain structure and function. We also consider the consequences of individual and group biases for people who are often its targets. These chapters raise and discuss a number of questions. Are there biological and neurological reasons that a person expresses prejudice? Do biological responses explain why some people are racist? How do in-groups and out-groups form? How have they been studied? How do they affect their members and others?

Chapter 4, Personality and Individual Differences, identifies the types of people who actively resist diversity. However, personality is only one of many processes that determine people’s reactions to diversity, and the current challenges to diversity go far beyond a limited number of “bad apples” with prejudiced personalities. Chapter 5, Social Cognition and Categorization, reviews how the average person thinks about people and social contexts, this is, social cognition. The mental shortcuts that people use to navigate a complex and diverse world can often lead to bias against people who are unfamiliar to us or different in the way they look, speak, or act. Nevertheless, this chapter also shows that diversity does not have to be divisive. For example, a single personalized interaction with a member of a different group can dramatically change how a person thinks about that group as a whole.

Chapter 6, Social Identity, Roles, and Relations, describes how people, through normal and seemingly rational processes, can devalue members of other groups and resist diversity. For instance, social discrimination in the past can lead to justifications for different treatment of diverse group in the present and future. However, it is possible for people to value, rather than devalue, diversity. When we work cooperatively with others who offer different types of knowledge or perspective, we appreciate the ways that diversity benefits us all. Diversity doesn’t have to produce divides; it can be seen as an important social resource, one that should be embraced rather than avoided.

Chapter 7, Is Bias in the Brain?, addresses the question of whether we are biologically programmed to be biased. It discusses how different areas of the brain are activated spontaneously when we encounter a person from a different group and how that can automatically arouse bias. But this chapter also shows that we can short-circuit these biases. Although the structures and activities of the brain are often
recruited in our social biases, biology is not destiny. What we choose to think about and experience determines how the brain responds to diversity.

Chapter 8, Coping and Adapting to Stigma and Difference, shifts the focus to how people respond to bias in the short and long term. Perceiving persistent racial discrimination directed at one’s group generally has negative psychological consequences. But a substantial body of research shows both the negative effects of perceiving or expecting biased treatment or judgment and ways in which one may counter these negative influences. For example, adopting a strong racial or ethnic identification can protect a person from the adverse effects of perceived discrimination. In general, the negative psychological consequences of belonging to a stigmatized minority group and perceiving that you have been treated unfairly are balanced by psychological adaptations that preserve well-being and self-esteem.

Chapter 9, Intergroup Interaction, shows that diversity is relational; it is about intergroup relations, not just about the separate biases that people hold toward each other or about the ways people cope with being the target of these biases. Intergroup interactions are more fragile than exchanges between members of the same group, and people in intergroup interactions often misunderstand each other despite positive intentions. However, when intergroup contact occurs under appropriately structured circumstances, such as those involving cooperation and the exchange of personal information, it can substantially improve intergroup attitudes and become uniquely rewarding.

Part Three, Culture, Power, and Institutions (Chapters 10–12), extends the analysis of intergroup relations and diversity by asking a number of questions. How do we consider the broader influence of culture and institutions on bias? How do we make judgments of fairness, merit, and deservingness when people are different, and power resides within some groups more than others? Diversity is not just about how a person thinks or feels about another person in a different group, it is also about where groups are situated in society and how institutions reflect this hierarchy.

We address the issue of cultural diversity in Chapter 10. This chapter describes how differences between people pose challenges to ideas about equality, fairness, merit, and value. This chapter focuses on ways in which our differing cultural backgrounds, perspectives, traditions, and predispositions vary as a function of where and how we grew up. Do these differences pose challenges for recognizing diversity? Does it create challenges for fairness? How can we avoid biases against some cultural groups while favoring others? This chapter also summarizes the research that illustrates some obstacles to diversity, and different ways in which we believe it can be successfully achieved.

Chapter 11, Social Roles and Power in a Diverse Society, explores the ways different groups strive to maintain advantage or seek recognition and influence in society. Power and privilege are central characteristics of any social order. The challenge for societies concerned with fairness is to balance the motivations for groups to maintain or enhance their social power while accommodating, indeed welcoming, diversity and the social change and advantages that may accompany it. In this chapter we explore how power is acquired and maintained and its relationship to social roles. The effects of power are pervasive. Therefore, a critical step in addressing bias in power dynamics
is developing an awareness of the problem and ways in which diverse groups can negotiate power and privilege in the context of fairness.

Chapter 12, The Challenge of Diversity for Institutions, further examines how biases against diversity can be embedded in the policies that institutions and organizations adopt. Institutional bias can be intentional or unintentional, subtle or easy to detect, and it may have negative or positive outcomes. Detecting bias in institutions is a complex task, and it is often difficult to prove. This chapter reviews evidence of adverse outcomes for members of minority groups in the economic system, educational sphere, and justice system and gives a few brief examples from other areas in U.S. society. In the final analysis, addressing institutional biases requires consideration of the broad cultural context in which it occurs.

The final chapter, The Psychology of Diversity: Principles and Prospects, summarizes what we have learned and what it means. It organizes the challenges we face in addressing diversity and points toward promising pathways to surmount obstacles and forge new opportunities. The goal of these analyses is to create a vision of a richly diverse society and a way to secure it that makes the diversity among us a cause of celebration and the achievement of a richer, better society for all.

In summary, in this book, we consider the psychology of diversity as it reflects our past, functions in our current everyday experiences, and forecasts our futures, personally and collectively. We are a nation that values both diversity—this is the “land of opportunity”—and equality; we believe, as Thomas Jefferson said, that all people “are created equal.” Yet, we often respond to diversity, politically and individually, with racism and discrimination. Much of the research on diversity has focused on understanding these obstacles, and this book reflects much of that emphasis. However, the psychology of diversity also teaches us how to move beyond prejudice and racism, and achieve the benefits of interactions across the boundaries of diversity, transacting social hierarchies to create greater degrees of fairness and opportunity. This book reflects our belief that fear of difference can be tempered by excitement about new opportunities to learn and experience others. That “tolerance” of diversity can grow into appreciation of diversity, respect for difference, and a willingness to engage others across traditional group-based fault lines. We believe that to the degree we do that, we become more knowledgeable, creative, prosperous, moral, and socially responsible. Diversity is not about “them” or “others” but includes us all.

Summary

Diversity is a global and U.S. reality. There are more than 7 billion people on the planet and each person is uniquely different from every other. Our approach is to narrow it down. Although our goal is to help people understand diversity and people’s responses in the broadest global context, much of this book is a case study of diversity issues in the United States.

The psychology of diversity—the basic psychological processes that are triggered when we encounter people who are different from us in significant and salient ways, or experience being treated differently by others because of our social status—is examined primarily with respect to racial and ethnic differences, although we also
cover differences in gender, religion, ability, and sexual orientation. Diversity, and how people respond to it, depends on the history, economics, and politics of a society and the psychology of its members. For this reason, we focus primarily on diversity in the United States.

Prejudice and racism play important roles in the context of diversity and are a challenge to achieving its potential positive effects. It is a challenge to find the proper balance of approaches to diversity that simultaneously strengthen the fabric of our institutions and society and enrich our individual lives, while preserving the cherished values of equality of opportunity, individual liberty, and social justice for all. The United States has a fundamental commitment to equal opportunity and equal rights, and a compelling interest in diversity.

This commitment to diversity raises three fundamental questions that are the subject of this book: How can we create equality in a society that is so diverse? What are the impediments or barriers to realizing this goal? What are the benefits when we achieve it?

This book’s main purpose is to help readers understand the psychology of diversity by reviewing what we know about human behavior and how it shapes our experiences with diversity in a variety of settings and contexts. This book highlights some psychological reactions to diversity and the emotions, perceptions, and behaviors they activate. It also presents evidence that guides us toward promising pathways for reducing some of the adverse impacts that may accompany increased diversity, as well as demonstrating some of the important benefits that diversity can produce.

Diversity is a topic of enormous scope and complexity. The psychology of diversity approach focuses on core psychological processes and institutional practices that inhibit or facilitate effective diversity in schools, organizations, and society at large. We emphasize the central role of individual perceptions of, and reactions to, diversity. We consider research from the micro-level of neuroscience to the macro-levels of social and political psychology, and institutional and cultural influences on diversity.

This book reflects our belief that fear of difference can be tempered by excitement about new opportunities to learn and experience others. That tolerance of diversity can grow into appreciation of diversity, respect for difference, and a willingness to engage others across traditional group-based fault lines. The psychology of diversity helps identify the means by which these important goals can be reached.

Questions for Thinking and Knowing

1. Draw a diagram, for your own use, that identifies ways in which you belong to diverse social categories. Some sources you might consider include family characteristics; race, ethnicity, and cultural background; and qualities that are unique to you as an individual but which you share with groups with which you identify. What sources of diversity included in your diagram were not included in the chapter? Does this help you define diversity?
2. Why is diversity challenging? How can we define and understand it so that it is less challenging?
3. Make a list of all the ways you can see that diversity is important and valuable today in your community, school, or work setting?

4. Which of the chapters outlined most appeal to you and which do you think will be the most challenging for you to understand? Think about why this might be the case.

5. List the five questions that you most want answered by this book. Save this list and review it at the end of the semester. Write us to let us know how well your initial questions were answered.
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