



PROJECT MUSE®

Establishing Differences Between Diversity Requirements and
Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Mark E. Engberg

The Journal of General Education, Volume 60, Number 2, 2011, pp. 117-137
(Article)

Published by Penn State University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jge.2011.0012>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/455854>

Establishing Differences Between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity

Thomas F. Nelson Laird and
Mark E. Engberg

Over the last thirty years, higher education has witnessed dramatic reform to the general education curriculum, most notably through the incorporation of multiculturalism into specific core requirements. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2000), for instance, found that 63 percent of the institutions that responded to its millennial survey either had a diversity requirement or were in the process of developing one. Fostered in part by rapid demographic shifts in American society (U.S. Census, 2009), diversity requirements are predicated on providing students structured opportunities to think more critically about difference in U.S. society while improving their ability to appreciate cultural pluralism and analyze social inequalities (Banks, 2006; Bell & Griffin, 2007). While there is considerable variation in the curricular and pedagogical models employed across the broad spectrum of colleges and universities (Humphreys, 2000), embedding diversity within the core curriculum indicates that knowledge about diversity is an essential component of a college education.

Despite the rise in diversity course requirements (Humphreys, 2000), research examining the efficacy of diversity in the undergraduate curriculum is still in an incipient stage and in need of closer scrutiny (Chang, 2000). For instance, students' exposure to diversity occurs in a variety of curricular contexts—in the

general education core, in specific departmental and interdisciplinary domains such as women's or ethnic studies, or through the use of student-centered pedagogical strategies such as intergroup dialogue (Engberg, 2004; Nelson Laird, 2011). Further, many multicultural educators espouse that in order to optimize diversity-based learning, faculty members need to employ active learning strategies and create inclusive and supportive classroom environments that validate diverse cultures and address student needs (Bennett, 2007; Brown, 2004; Gay, 2000; Marin, 2000). The extant literature, however, has only paid minimal attention to these contextual and pedagogical aspects of multicultural courses, with the majority of studies focusing on either nominal classifications (e.g., diversity course requirement) or content-based derivatives (e.g., number of ethnic or women's studies courses), leaving our understanding of how diversity is infused into the undergraduate curriculum and the effects of that infusion incomplete.

Building off the gaps in the extant literature, the purpose of this study is to investigate differences between courses that vary in terms of their diversity emphases. Relying on data from faculty at a national sample of colleges and universities, we investigate differences between courses that meet institutional or departmental diversity requirements and those that are not required. The latter group is divided based on two empirically vetted scales that examine the extent to which a course is both grounded in diversity and inclusive of diversity in terms of pedagogical practice (Nelson Laird, 2011). Thus, this study illuminates whether and how diversity requirements differ from two types of nonrequired courses—those that are highly inclusive and less inclusive of diversity—across a variety of good teaching practices and faculty and course characteristics.

In addition to expanding the empirical literature on diversity courses, this study provides researchers, administrators, and practitioners with an empirically vetted means to assess how diversity is included in curricula and to determine who is teaching courses inclusive of diversity, in what contexts, and with what good teaching practices. Given the increased pressures toward accountability and the distinctively dynamic environment of higher education, examining the effectiveness of the undergraduate curriculum has become an institutional necessity. This study provides a means to regularly and systematically assess the efficacy of an institution's multicultural learning commitment while providing faculty and administrators a more nuanced and theoretically derived understanding of where and how diversity is making its way into the undergraduate curriculum.

Literature Review

The field of multicultural education incorporates a wide range of established practices and models for transforming courses and curricula from monocultural to multicultural (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). In examining the higher education

curriculum, theorists have suggested a broad taxonomy in which diversity courses appear as required or nonrequired features of the undergraduate curriculum or as the singular focus of departments, such as women's and ethnic studies (Gaff, 1991; Humphreys, 1997; Nelson Laird, 2010). In the review that follows, we first examine how diversity courses have been studied in relation to student outcomes, followed by a more specific focus on the types of pedagogical practices that are generally associated with diversity courses.

Studying the Effects of Diversity Courses

The extant literature specifically exploring the efficacy of diversity course requirements is limited in terms of the number of available studies and the overall generalizability of the results, with many studies situated within single institutions and no common or agreed upon definition of what constitutes a diversity requirement (Bidell, Lee, Bouchie, Ward, & Brass, 1994; Brehm, 1998; Chang, 2002; Hasslen, 1993; Hathaway, 1999; Henderson-King & Kaleta, 2000; Palmer, 2000). While these studies utilized a variety of methodological approaches (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods), the results were mixed, with some studies showing substantial gains in student outcomes related to the reduction of racial bias (e.g., Chang) and others showing mixed or nonsignificant changes in students' feelings about different racial groups (e.g., Henderson-King & Kaleta, 2000).

In addition to studies examining diversity course requirements, a number of researchers have examined the efficacy of more general types of nonrequired diversity courses, with specific attention to outcomes such as attitudes regarding affirmative action (Inkelas, 1998; Smith, 1993), tolerance (Taylor, 1994), awareness of racial inequality (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Lopez, 1993), social agency (Nelson Laird, 2005; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005), and the reduction of stereotypes and racial bias (Kahn, 1999; Marin, 2000). Similarly, a number of researchers have examined the influence of ethnic studies (Astin, 1993; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 1994; Vogelgesang, 2001) and women's studies (Astin, 1993; Hurtado, 2001; Palmer, 2000; Stake & Hoffman, 2001) courses on the importance students place on promoting racial understanding as well as their awareness and appreciation of different racial groups. While the major findings from these studies suggest that diversity courses have a positive impact on students' attitudes toward diversity (see Engberg, 2004, for a more substantial review), most of these studies examine the cumulative effects of enrolling in a specific category of diversity courses (women's studies, ethnic studies, etc.), with little attention to what specifically makes such course offerings effective in improving students' understandings and skills.

Pedagogical Practices Underlying Diversity Courses

Numerous educators have written about the skills and disposition necessary for teachers to be effective in multicultural classrooms. Bennett (2007) and Gay (2000), for instance, have suggested that for multicultural educators to be effective, they must be able to build classroom milieus that address students' needs, validate different cultural backgrounds, and provide equitable access to different educational opportunities. Consistent with these strategies, scholars suggest that multicultural educators must possess a deeply reflective stance toward understanding how their own particular biases shape their experiences toward interacting and communicating with diverse others (Banks, 2004; Marín & Marín, 1991). Other researchers have built upon the earlier work of Allport (1954) in designing multicultural opportunities that engage diverse others in cooperative learning experiences that facilitate intergroup dialogue and cross-cultural interactions (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2007).

Researchers examining the pedagogical practices that often underlie diversity courses have consistently noted the importance of cross-cultural interactions in promoting a range of multicultural outcomes (Chang, Denson, Saenz, & Misa, 2006; Hurtado, Dey, Gurin, & Gurin, 2003). While many of these studies concentrate on the overall frequency of interactions, researchers have also noted that the quality of interactional diversity is an essential component of diversity education in fostering social agency (Nelson Laird, 2005; Nelson Laird et al., 2005). Other researchers have suggested that the extent to which active learning is incorporated into a diversity course is linked to both cognitive development and moral reasoning (Hurtado, Mayhew, & Engberg, 2003). Researchers have also shown that diversity courses that promote reciprocal intergroup learning among students and allow for opportunities in which students explore their own and others' social identity groups are more successful in building pluralistic skills and dispositions (Engberg, 2007; Engberg & Hurtado, 2011). Finally, research has often highlighted the importance of specific course-based activities, such as reflection, journaling, and other experiential activities, in promoting a host of multicultural outcomes (Mayhew & DeLuca Fernández, 2007).

Despite these advances, few studies have comprehensively examined pedagogical practices across a range of diversity-based courses to understand how such practices differ according to course designation (i.e., required or nonrequired) and overall level of diversity inclusivity. Further, we only have a partial picture of who uses pedagogical practices commonly associated with diversity coursework. For example, a few scholars have examined predictors of faculty including diversity content or readings (Hurtado, 2001; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006), feminist or minority perspectives (Milem, 2001), emphasis on diversity

experiences (Kuh, Nelson Laird, & Umbach, 2004; Umbach, 2006), and student encounters with difference (Reason, Cox, Lutovsky Quayle, & Terenzini, 2010). The findings suggest that women, faculty of color, more recently hired instructors, faculty at lower ranks, full-time faculty, faculty in soft fields, faculty with more liberal political orientations, and those with positive beliefs about diversity use such practices more than others.

Conceptual Framework

Given the breadth of curricular options that exist on college campuses that emphasize multiculturalism, Nelson Laird (2010, 2011) developed a model of diversity inclusivity based on a course-planning model (Lattuca & Stark, 2009) and models from multicultural and diversity education (Banks, 2006, 2010; Sleeter & Grant, 2009) and feminist theory and pedagogy (Maher & Tetrault, 2001; McIntosh, 1983). The diversity inclusivity model contains nine elements important to diversity courses (purpose/goals, content, foundations/perspectives, learners, instructors, pedagogy, classroom environment, evaluation, and adjustment) and defines how each element can be inclusive of diversity along a continuum ranging from not at all inclusive to highly inclusive. For instance, the content of the course can range from monocultural to multicultural, providing a means to assess whether the course focuses on a single culture or multiple cultural groups. Similarly, the evaluation methods employed with a course can rely on more standardized modes of assessment or incorporate methods that are more sensitive to the diverse learning needs of the students enrolled in the course (see Nelson Laird, 2010, for a lengthier discussion of the diversity inclusivity model).

The diversity inclusivity model offers several advantages over past methods for examining diversity in the curriculum. First, it moves researchers and practitioners away from trying to make simple determinations about what is and what is not a diversity course. Instead, it offers multiple avenues for determining the diversity inclusivity of any course. Second, the model provides a more comprehensive understanding of where diversity is actually occurring across the entire undergraduate curriculum, which allows previously ignored courses (e.g., science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses) to emerge as potential avenues in which students are actively exposed to multicultural practices.

In order to operationalize the various dimensions of the diversity inclusivity model, Nelson Laird (2011) developed a number of survey items to assess how diversity is emphasized across each of the nine course planning elements (see Table 1). Faculty were then surveyed across a wide spectrum of U.S. baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities, and their responses were examined through exploratory factor analytic procedures. The results of this

initial study indicated two broad-based diversity inclusivity scales that measure the extent to which a particular course is grounded in diversity (e.g., inclusive content, goals, and foundations/perspectives) and the extent to which a particular course is inclusive of different learning styles, pedagogical practices, and evaluation techniques. Taken together, these scales provide a convenient and effective means to assess the level of diversity inclusivity in an individual course and across the undergraduate curriculum as well as an important avenue to segment courses based on their overall diversity emphases.

TABLE 1 Diversity inclusivity items

Scale/Item ^a	Corresponding Course Element ^b
<i>Diverse Grounding</i>	
Students gain an understanding of how to connect their learning to societal problems or issues.	Purpose/goals
Students develop skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds.	Purpose/goals
The course content emphasizes contributions to the field by people from multiple cultures.	Content
The course covers topics from multiple theoretical perspectives.	Foundations/perspectives
You explore your own cultural and intellectual limitations as part of class preparation.	Instructor(s)
You address your potential biases about course-related issues during class.	Instructor(s)
<i>Inclusive Learning</i>	
You try to learn about student characteristics in order to improve class instruction.	Learners
You work on creating a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to student learning.	Pedagogy
You vary your teaching methods to encourage the active participation of all students.	Classroom environment
You try to empower students through their class participation.	Pedagogy
You evaluate student learning using multiple techniques.	Assessment/evaluation
You adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, or assignments) based on student learning needs.	Adjustment

^aFaculty members were asked how much each item happened in their course sections. Response options were 1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, and 4 = Very much.

^bFrom Nelson Laird's (2010) model.

Research Questions

Because past studies often utilize an approach that simply identifies a curricular offering as a “diversity course” with little attention to the underlying content or pedagogy, this study seeks to illustrate how such an approach can be problematic. We start with one such dichotomy, whether a course is a diversity requirement or not, and then divide the nonrequirement group in two using Nelson Laird’s (2011) more nuanced understanding of how diversity is included in courses. Our research questions follow from the separation of the courses into three groups. Specifically, we are interested in answering the following questions:

1. How do the characteristics of the faculty and courses taught vary by diversity course type (diversity requirement, highly inclusive nonrequirement, and less inclusive nonrequirement)?
2. How do teaching practices vary by diversity course type?

We hypothesized that diversity requirements and highly inclusive nonrequirements would be similar along faculty and course characteristics but differ from less inclusive courses. We also thought that it was likely that the highly inclusive nonrequirements would employ at least as much emphasis on effective teaching practices as the diversity requirements, possibly more.

Methods

Data

The data for this study come from the 2007 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), an annual survey of undergraduate teaching faculty at many U.S. institutions. FSSE offers participating institutions two survey options (for more information about the survey options, visit <http://www.fsse.iub.edu>), both designed to complement an institution’s participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Whereas students completing NSSE indicate their level of participation in educational practices, faculty members completing FSSE report their expectations for students, their observation of student experiences, the ways they structure their classes, their perceptions of the campus environment, and how they spend their time professionally. Though oriented differently, faculty respond to many survey items about the same activities students are asked about on NSSE. Since the current study focuses on aspects of particular courses, the data come from the one hundred U.S. baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities that administered the FSSE course-based survey option, which asked faculty to pick a particular course taught during the 2006–7 academic year and respond to the bulk of the questionnaire regarding

that course. Response rates at the one hundred institutions varied from 22 to 92 percent, with the average response rate equal to 48 percent.

Sample

After exclusion for data missing from the variables in our study, our sample contained 8,115 faculty members. About 45 percent of the respondents were female, and over three-fourths (76%) were white, with 5 percent Asian, 4 percent African American, 4 percent Hispanic, 1 percent American Indian, 1 percent multiracial, and 1 percent other racial/ethnic minorities, and 8 percent indicated a preference not to respond to the race/ethnicity item. Slightly over seven of ten (72%) respondents had a doctorate. Over a tenth (12%) were part-time lecturers or instructors, the vast majority of the part-timers in the sample. Another 12 percent were full-time lecturers or instructors, 27 percent were assistant professors, 24 percent were associate professors, and 25 percent were full professors. The average course load for the 2006–7 academic year was five courses among these faculty members.

Since each faculty respondent based her or his responses on a single course taught during the 2006–7 academic year, there is a one-to-one correspondence between faculty members and courses in the data. The courses faculty responded about were mostly upper division (56%), had between twenty-one and fifty students (54%, with 26% smaller courses and 17% larger courses), and did not fulfill a diversity requirement (87%). Half (50%) of the courses met some form of general education requirement. The courses represented a wide range of fields. In this study, as with other studies examining teaching differences with FSSE data (e.g., Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, & Schwarz, 2008), we used Biglan's (1973) classification of fields along three dichotomies: hard–soft, pure–applied, and life–nonlife. Courses from the hard/pure/life fields (e.g., biology) made up 8 percent of the sample, with 13 percent from hard/pure/nonlife fields (e.g., physics), 2 percent from hard/applied/life fields (e.g., agriculture), 4 percent from hard/applied/nonlife fields (e.g., engineering), 13 percent from soft/pure/life fields (e.g., psychology), 30 percent from soft/pure/nonlife fields (e.g., history), 13 percent from soft/applied/life fields (e.g., education), and 17 percent from soft/applied/nonlife fields (e.g., business administration). See Nelson Laird et al. (2008) for a breakdown of specific fields by category.

Measures and Analyses

The key independent variable in our analyses divided the faculty respondents into three groups. Those faculty members who indicated that the course they responded about met a department or college-wide diversity requirement were in one group ($n = 1,099$). We then divided the faculty teaching nondiversity requirements into two groups based on their scores on a second-order diversity

inclusivity scale comprising the two scales developed previously (Nelson Laird, 2011). We selected a cut point of 3.5 (out of 4), which was sufficiently high to indicate considerable inclusion of diversity while keeping the high-diversity inclusivity group (those scoring 3.5 or above) nearly the same size ($n = 1,098$) as the diversity requirement group. While our choice of a cut point was somewhat arbitrary, our selection kept diversity inclusivity high but created a group that should be at least as prevalent on campuses as the diversity requirement group. Those scoring below the cut point made up the third group ($n = 5,918$).

Our analyses were informed by our two research questions. To answer the first, cross-tabulations with chi-square tests were used to identify differences in faculty characteristics (i.e., gender, race, highest degree earned, rank and employment status, and course load) and course characteristics (i.e., course level, course size, status as a general education requirement, and disciplinary area) across the three groups. See Table 2 for a description of the faculty and course characteristic measures.

TABLE 2 Faculty and course characteristic measures

Measure	Description
<i>Faculty Characteristics</i>	
Female	0 = Male; 1 = Female
Race/ethnicity	1 = American Indian or other Native American; 2 = Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander; 3 = Black or African American; 4 = White (non-Hispanic); 5 = Hispanic; 6 = Multiracial; 7 = Other; 8 = Preferred not to respond
Non-U.S. citizen	0 = U.S. citizen; 1 = non-U.S. citizen
Doctorate earned	0 = No doctorate; 1 = Doctorate earned
Rank and employment status	1 = Part-time lecturer/instructor; 2 = Full-time lecturer/instructor; 3 = Assistant professor; 4 = Associate professor; 5 = Full professor
Course load	Integer values from 1 to 18
<i>Course Characteristics</i>	
Course level	1 = Lower division; 2 = Upper division; 3 = Other
Course size	1 = 20 students or less; 2 = 21 to 50 students; 3 = More than 50 students
General education requirement	0 = Not required; 1 = General education requirement
Disciplinary area ^a	1 = Hard/pure/life; 2 = Hard/pure/nonlife; 3 = Hard/applied/life; 4 = Hard/applied/nonlife; 5 = Soft/pure/life; 6 = Soft/pure/nonlife; 7 = Soft/applied/life; 8 = Soft/applied/nonlife

^aUsed Biglan's (1973) categories as in Nelson Laird et al. (2008).

To answer our second question, we used analyses of variance procedures to determine mean differences on nine factorially derived scales that indicate the teaching practices and emphases used in the courses about which faculty responded: the diverse grounding of a course, the emphasis on inclusive learning, the amount of student interactions across difference, the emphasis on deep approaches to learning, the focus on active classroom practices, the amount of student–faculty contact, the emphasis on intellectual skills, the emphasis on practical skills, and the emphasis on personal and social responsibility (see Table 3 for scale descriptions and reliabilities; for additional information on each scale, see Nelson Laird, 2011; Nelson Laird et al., 2008; Nelson Laird, Niskodé-Dossett, & Kuh, 2009). We created scale scores by averaging a faculty member’s responses on the scale’s component items. For all scales, except the measure of active classroom practice (range = 1 to 8), the scales ranged from 1 to 4.

Limitations

This study has two primary limitations. First, institutions chose to administer FSSE and determined which faculty members were invited to participate. Consequently, self-selection limits the claims that can be made about the representativeness of the sample. Still, the participating institutions and faculty members mirror the U.S. baccalaureate-granting institution and faculty populations on important characteristics (FSSE, 2007). Second, the courses at participating institutions were not sampled. Rather, faculty members chose the courses about which they responded. This approach, while it produced a wide variety of course types, makes it impossible to determine whether the courses in the

TABLE 3 Effective teaching scales

Scale	Description	Reference
Diverse grounding	6-item scale ($\alpha = 0.84$)	Nelson Laird, 2011
Inclusive learning	6-item scale ($\alpha = 0.83$)	Nelson Laird, 2011
Diverse interactions	2-item scale ($\alpha = 0.87$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009
Deep approaches to learning	12-item scale ($\alpha = 0.84$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2008
Active classroom practice	5-item scale ($\alpha = 0.71$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009
Student–faculty contact	3-item scale ($\alpha = 0.77$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009
Intellectual skills	4-item scale ($\alpha = 0.60$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009
Practical skills	4-item scale ($\alpha = 0.63$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009
Individual and social responsibility	4-item scale ($\alpha = 0.81$)	Nelson Laird et al., 2009

study are representative of all courses at participating institutions. Though this likely limits the study's generalizability, there is a lot to be learned from the 8,115 faculty members and courses represented in this study.

Results

The results of this study suggest that the three groups of faculty/courses are different from one another in terms of faculty and course characteristics and teaching emphases and practices. Tables 4 and 5 present the distributions of faculty members by faculty and course characteristics. Table 6 contains the means and standard deviations for the effective teaching scales by course type along with an indication of whether the differences were significant.

TABLE 4 Percentage of faculty with certain characteristics within course types

Variable	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement	Diversity Requirement	Less Inclusive Nonrequirement	Pearson χ^2
Female	61%	47%	41%	143.6***
Race/ethnicity				376.0***
American Indian/ Native American	1%	1%	1%	
Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander	4%	14%	4%	
Black or African American	5%	7%	3%	
White (non-Hispanic)	73%	59%	80%	
Hispanic	5%	7%	3%	
Multiracial	2%	2%	1%	
Other	2%	3%	1%	
Preferred not to respond	9%	8%	8%	
Non-U.S. citizen	7%	17%	6%	156.1***
Doctorate earned	68%	64%	73%	55.9***
Rank and employment status				90.1***
Part-time lecturer/instructor	13%	18%	10%	

(continued)

TABLE 4 (*continued*) Percentage of faculty with certain characteristics within course types

Variable	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement	Diversity Requirement	Less Inclusive Nonrequirement	Pearson χ^2
Full-time lecturer/instructor	13%	14%	12%	
Assistant professor	31%	26%	26%	
Associate professor	22%	22%	24%	
Full professor	21%	20%	27%	

NOTE: Course load results were not significant (Pearson $\chi^2 = 50.7, p > .05$).

 $p < .001$

TABLE 5 Percentage of courses with certain course characteristics within course types

Variable	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement	Diversity Requirement	Less Inclusive Nonrequirement	Pearson χ^2
Course level				44.9***
Lower division	30%	40%	39%	
Upper division	63%	54%	56%	
Other	7%	6%	5%	
Course size				50.4***
20 students or less	31%	23%	27%	
21 to 50 students	58%	58%	55%	
More than 50 students	11%	19%	19%	
General education requirement	48%	75%	45%	324.9***
Disciplinary area				466.5***
Hard/pure/life	3%	4%	10%	
Hard/pure/ nonlife	2%	10%	16%	
Hard/applied/life	1%	1%	2%	
Hard/applied/ nonlife	1%	3%	5%	
Soft/pure/life	16%	14%	12%	

Variable	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement	Diversity Requirement	Less Inclusive Nonrequirement	Pearson χ^2
Soft/pure/nonlife	39%	37%	27%	
Soft/applied/life	22%	17%	11%	
Soft/applied/ nonlife	16%	13%	17%	

*** $p < .001$

TABLE 6 Mean scores on effective teaching scales by course designation

Scale	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement		Diversity Requirement		Less Inclusive Nonrequirement		Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Diverse grounding	3.54	0.30	2.99	0.70	2.23	0.61	***
Inclusive learning	3.85	0.20	3.44	0.54	3.10	0.58	***
Diverse interactions	2.94	0.88	2.58	1.00	2.10	0.84	***
Deep approaches to learning	3.50	0.35	3.15	0.53	2.83	0.55	***
Active classroom practice	3.27	1.15	2.96	1.25	2.42	1.09	***
Student– faculty contact	3.40	0.95	2.92	0.89	2.82	0.85	***
Intellectual skills	3.48	0.44	3.25	0.56	2.91	0.58	***
Practical skills	3.07	0.61	2.81	0.73	2.57	0.68	***
Individual and social respon- sibility	3.03	0.64	2.73	0.81	1.99	0.73	***

*** $p < .001$

Faculty and Course Characteristics

As seen in Table 4, with the exception of course load, all of the chi-square tests were significant ($p < .001$). A greater proportion of women (61%) responded about teaching a highly inclusive nondiversity requirement, while the proportion was more similar for women who taught diversity requirements (47%) and less inclusive nondiversity requirements (41%).

Greater proportions of faculty of color taught diversity requirements rather than the other two types of courses (e.g., 7% of Hispanic faculty taught diversity requirements, compared with 5% who taught highly inclusive nonrequirements and 3% who taught less inclusive nonrequirements). The percentage of faculty responding about a diversity requirement (64%) or a highly inclusive nonrequirement (68%) that had a doctorate was less than the percentage among faculty teaching less inclusive nonrequirements (74%).

The pattern by rank was more complicated. A greater proportion of lecturers and instructors responded about teaching a diversity requirement, though the difference was more pronounced for part-timers (18% of those teaching a diversity requirement versus 10% of those teaching less inclusive nonrequirements) than full-timers (14% of those teaching a diversity requirement versus 12% of those teaching less inclusive nonrequirements). The proportion of assistant professors was greatest among the highly inclusive nonrequirements (31% versus 26% diversity requirements and 26% less inclusive nonrequirements), while the proportion of associate and full professors was greatest among the less inclusive nonrequirements.

The differences in course characteristics among the three types of courses were also pronounced (see Table 5). Relative to the other two groups, highly inclusive nonrequirements included a greater percentage of smaller (31%) and upper-division courses (63%). As expected, diversity requirements were more likely to meet a general education requirement (75%) compared with the other two groups (less than 50%). Courses in hard fields were more likely to be less inclusive nonrequirements, and those in soft fields were more likely to be diversity requirements or highly inclusive nonrequirements.

Differences in Effective Teaching by Course Type

Table 6 contains the means and standard deviations for the nine dependent measures by group. The results indicate that on every teaching measure highly inclusive nonrequirements had higher means than diversity requirements and that less inclusive nonrequirements averaged the lowest scores. In all cases, the analyses of variance indicated that the differences were significant ($p < .001$).

TABLE 7 Effect size estimates for mean differences between course types using diversity requirements as the reference group

Scale	Highly Inclusive Nonrequirement	Less Inclusive Nonrequirement
Diverse grounding	0.72	−1.00
Inclusive learning	0.67	−0.58
Diverse interactions	0.39	−0.53
Deep approaches to learning	0.61	−0.55
Active classroom practice	0.26	−0.47
Student–faculty contact	0.54	−0.11
Intellectual skills	0.38	−0.57
Practical skills	0.37	−0.35
Individual and social responsibility	0.36	−0.89

NOTE: Effect sizes calculated by predicting standardizations of the effective teaching scales with dichotomous indicators of course type in regression models.

Using the diversity requirement group as the reference group, estimates of effect size (i.e., standardized mean differences with pooled standard deviations) ranged in magnitude from a modest tenth of a standard deviation (0.11) to a full standard deviation (1.00), with the average effect size near a half a standard deviation (0.52).

As seen in Table 7, the largest differences were found on the diversity inclusivity measures, with highly inclusive nonrequirements averaging scores around seven-tenths of a standard deviation (effects sizes of 0.67 and 0.72) above diversity requirements and less inclusive nonrequirements scoring as much as a full standard deviation below diversity requirements (effect sizes of −1.00 and −0.58). The weakest difference for highly inclusive nonrequirements was found on the active classroom practice measure (0.26), whereas the weakest difference for less inclusive nonrequirements was found on the student–faculty contact measure (−0.11).

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that past methods used to measure students’ exposure to curricular diversity (e.g., examining courses that meet a campus diversity requirement) may overlook an important set of curricular experiences that are highly inclusive of diversity. By using an alternate method—measuring

the diversity inclusivity of each course—we identified a group of highly inclusive, nonrequired diversity courses equal in size to a group of courses that met department or college-wide diversity requirements. The highly inclusive group of diversity courses (and corresponding faculty members) was associated with significantly higher scores than the required diversity group in terms of diverse grounding and emphasis on inclusive learning, suggesting that on many campuses there may be a sizable group of courses more inclusive of diversity than the courses that meet the institutions' diversity requirements. Further, this group of courses/faculty scored significantly higher on seven other measures of good teaching practices, an indication that these courses may be particularly powerful learning environments.

It is worth noting that the courses that met a diversity requirement scored significantly above the less inclusive nonrequirement group on all our measures of good teaching practices, which resonates with past studies that have found positive educational effects for diversity requirements (e.g., Chang, 2000, 2002). However, our findings suggest that those effects are likely only conservative estimates of how much the inclusion of diversity into the curriculum influences students. By comparing diversity requirements (or some other incomplete set of diversity courses) with all other courses, researchers have likely been including significant curricular experiences with diversity in their comparison groups. Consequently, their estimates are likely low, particularly if the goal is to accurately assess the effects of curricular experiences with diversity.

If our findings are any indication, the effects of the highly inclusive nonrequirements may actually be greater than those of the diversity requirements. Thus, it is time for the development of more sophisticated measures of students' curricular exposure to diversity. Such measures, perhaps similar to the measures of diversity inclusivity used in this study, should allow researchers to better estimate the effects of curricular exposure to diversity, a key component of how diversity influences college and university students (Gurin et al., 2002).

Some of the differences in these courses may have to do with who is teaching them and the characteristics of the courses. We found that women were disproportionately teaching highly inclusive nonrequirements and that faculty of color and foreign faculty were disproportionately teaching diversity requirements. Those with a doctorate were overrepresented in the less inclusive nonrequirements, as were full professors. Assistant professors were overrepresented in the highly inclusive nonrequirements, and instructors and lecturers were disproportionately among those teaching diversity requirements. Together, these findings suggest that teaching about diversity is disproportionately the purview of groups traditionally marginalized in higher education and those with less power and prestige. As other studies (e.g., Kuh et al., 2004) have shown, these

groups tend to use more effective practices, which partially explains our findings regarding effective teaching practices.

However, beyond the past studies (Kuh et al., 2004; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Reason et al., 2010; Umbach, 2006), which do not differentiate between course types, our results suggest that the characteristics of those teaching required diversity courses are different from the characteristics of those who teach highly inclusive nonrequirements. While uncovering these differences is a useful first step, explaining why these patterns exist is important follow-up work. Why, for instance, are women and assistant professors more likely to teach highly inclusive nonrequirements and faculty of color (particularly Asian American faculty) and part-time faculty more likely to teach diversity requirements?

Among the findings regarding course characteristics, it was not surprising that a disproportionate number of highly inclusive nonrequirements were smaller and upper-division courses, that diversity requirements were far more likely to meet a general education requirement, or that hard fields were disproportionately represented among less inclusive nonrequirements. These findings do, however, raise questions for institutional planning. Is this the desired allocation, or should a greater proportion of highly inclusive courses be lower division or from the hard fields?

Implications

For institutions, our results suggest that academic leaders should consider examining how diversity requirements are defined and the process for determining what courses meet the requirement. Should it be the case that a sizable number of courses on campus are more inclusive of diversity than those meeting the diversity requirement?

Further, our findings suggest that there may be important differences in the faculty and course characteristics observed between diversity requirements and highly inclusive nonrequirements. Who should be teaching diversity courses and requirements? This question deserves discussion at the department, college, and university levels. The differences in faculty and course characteristics found in this study likely represent a less-than-desirable distribution in need of adjustment. As pointed out previously (Nelson Laird, 2011), an expanded sense of how diversity is included in courses may be essential to bring different disciplinary areas and different types of faculty to the table to discuss course improvement related to diversity.

With mounting evidence of the educational effectiveness of diversity coursework (e.g., Chang, 2002; Gurin et al., 2002) and some sense from this study that prior estimates of the effects of curricular diversity may be conservative,

institutions and individual faculty should place greater emphasis on making their undergraduate curriculum more inclusive of diversity. This will necessarily involve discussion of general education requirements, disciplinary differences, course sizes, and distinctions between lower- and upper-division coursework, as well as effective teaching practices and who is more likely to use them. While these discussions may not be comfortable, one lesson from Nelson Laird's (2010, 2011) work is that focusing on elements of courses other than content (e.g., classroom atmosphere) could prevent many faculty from opting out of the dialogue altogether.

One place to start the dialogue is through research and assessment of the diversity inclusivity of courses. To better understand and capture this, researchers and campus leaders need to take a step forward in their approaches. Researchers need to move away from dichotomies to better capture the effects of diversity inclusion in the curriculum. Educators on campuses need to reconsider how courses become diversity requirements and how to better assess these and other diversity initiatives. As the results of this study suggest, past approaches are limited in their usefulness. It is time for a more nuanced way of thinking about and documenting diversity inclusivity. The model and corresponding scales used in this study proved to be a valuable step forward in this direction. Additional derivatives of the model, such as rubrics and interview protocols, would be easy to create and could also assist faculty, institutions, and researchers in better understanding curricular diversity and its effects, as well as how to improve their course offerings.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2000). *AAC&U survey on diversity requirements: Overview of survey data*. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from <http://www.aacu.org/divsurvey/irvineoverview.cfm>.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.; pp. 3–29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Banks, J. A. (2010). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (7th ed.; pp. 233–56). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). Designing social justice education courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.; pp. 67–87). New York: Routledge.

- Bennett, C. I. (2007). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Bidell, T. R., Lee, E. M., Bouchie, N., Ward, C., & Brass, D. (1994). *Developing conceptions of racism among young white adults in the context of cultural diversity coursework*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC ED377270.)
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different scientific areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195–203.
- Brehm, C. J. (1998). *Stereotypes, tolerance, and the classroom*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston. (ERIC ED426927.)
- Brown, E. L. (2004). What precipitates change in cultural diversity awareness during a multicultural course: The message or the method? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 325.
- Chang, M. (2000, Winter). Measuring the impact of a diversity requirement on students' level of racial prejudice. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved March 30, 2000, from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Woo/research2.html>.
- Chang, M. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *JGE: The Journal of General Education*, 51(1), 21–42.
- Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Saenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 430–55.
- Engberg, M. E. (2004). Improving intergroup relations in higher education: A critical examination of the influence of educational interventions on racial bias. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(4), 473–524.
- Engberg, M. E. (2007). Educating the workforce for the twenty-first century: A cross-disciplinary analysis of the impact of the undergraduate experience on students' development of a pluralistic orientation. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(3), 283–317.
- Engberg, M. E., & Hurtado, S. (2011). Developing pluralistic skills and dispositions in college: Examining racial/ethnic group differences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 82(4), 416–43.
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *FSSE 2007 overview*. Bloomington, Ind.: Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Gaff, J. G. (1991). *New life for the college curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330–65.
- Hasslen, R. C. (1993). The effects of teaching strategies in multicultural education on monocultural college students' perceptions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(01), 56A. (UMI No. 9413010.)
- Hathaway, R. S., III. (1999). *College student definitions of key concepts and thinking in a multicultural education course* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan.
- Henderson-King, D., & Kaleta, A. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(2), 42–64.
- Humphreys, D. (1997). *General education and American commitments: A national report on diversity courses and requirements*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Humphreys, D. (2000). National survey finds diversity requirements common around the country. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from www.diversityweb.org/Digest/foo/survey.html.

- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187–203). Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Hurtado, S., Dey, E. L., Gurin, P., & Gurin, G. (2003). College environments, diversity, and student learning. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 18, pp. 145–90). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hurtado, S., Mayhew, M. J., & Engberg, M. E. (2003, November). *How diversity courses affect the development of moral reasoning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, Oreg.
- Inkelas, K. K. (1998, November). *Increasing visibility: The racial attitudes of Asian Pacific American students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Miami.
- Kahn, S.R. (1999). Teaching an undergraduate course on the psychology of racism. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(1), 28–33.
- Kuh, G. D., Nelson Laird, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty activities and student behavior: Realizing the promise of greater expectations. *Liberal Education*, 90(4), 24–31.
- Lattuca, L. R., & Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lopez, G. E. (1993). *The effect of group contact and curriculum on white, Asian American, and African American students' attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Maher, F. A., & Tetrault, M. K. T. (2001). *The feminist classroom* (2nd ed.). Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Marín, G., & Marín, B. V. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Marin, P. (2000, May). The educational possibility of multi-racial/multi-ethnic college classrooms. In *Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms* (pp. 61–83). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors.
- Mayhew, M. J., & DeLuca Fernández, S. L. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(1), 55–80.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Grunwald, H. E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 148–68.
- McIntosh, P. (1983). *Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective*. (Working Paper #124). Wellesley: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.
- Milem, J. F. (1994). College, students, and racial understanding. *Thought and Action*, 9(2), 51–92.
- Milem, J. F. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affect student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 233–49). Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(4), 365–87.
- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2010). *Conceptualizing diversity inclusivity for college courses*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2011). Measuring the diversity inclusivity of college courses. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(6), 572–88.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Engberg, M. E., & Hurtado, S. (2005). Modeling accentuation effects: Enrolling in a diversity course and the importance of social action engagement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 448–76.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Niskodé-Dossett, A. S., & Kuh, G. D. (2009). What general education courses contribute to essential learning outcomes. *JGE: The Journal of General Education*, 58(2), 65–84.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., Kuh, G. D., & Schwarz, M. J. (2008). The effects of discipline on deep approaches to student learning and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 469–94.
- Palmer, B. (2000). *The impact of diversity courses: Research from the Pennsylvania State University*. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Woolresearch.html>.
- Reason, R. D., Cox, B. E., Lutovsky Quayle, B. R., & Terenzini, P. T. (2010). Faculty and institutional factors that promote student encounters with difference in first-year courses. *Review of Higher Education*, 33(3), 391–414.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Smith, K. M. (1993, May). *The impact of college on white students' racial attitudes*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360923.)
- Stake, J. E., & Hoffman, F. L. (2001). Changes in student social attitudes, activism, and personal confidence in higher education: The role of women's studies [Electronic version]. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 411–36.
- Taylor, S. H. (1994). Enhancing tolerance: The confluence of moral development with the college experience. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(01), 114A. (UMI No. 9513291.)
- U.S. Census. (2009). *Projections of the total resident population by five-year age groups, race, and Hispanic origin with special age categories: Middle series, 2075 to 2100*. Retrieved July, 22, 2009, from the U.S. Census Web site, <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/nation/summary/np-t4-h.pdf>.
- Vogelgesang, L. J. (2001, November). *The impact of college on the development of civic values: How do race and gender matter?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 451791.)
- Umbach, P. D. (2006). The unique contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 317–45.
- Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., Chesler, M., & Cytron-Walker, A. (2007). *Intergroup dialogue in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 32, No. 4.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.