The Review of Higher Education
Winter 2002, Volume 25, No. 2, pp. 125–140
Copyright © 2002 Association for the Study of Higher Education
All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162-5748)

Preservation or Transformation: Where's the Real Educational Discourse on Diversity?

Mitchell J. Chang

Recent challenges to affirmative action practices in higher education have pressed college and university presidents to clarify and sometimes to legally defend the educational value of diversity. On the public front, they have made themselves available to the media (Lee Bollinger interviewed in Weiss, 2001) and written articles for periodicals and alumni magazines (Rudenstine, 1996). Even former presidents have joined in this effort by empirically documenting the value of affirmative action (Bowen & Bok, 1998). Some of the most prestigious and selective institutions in the nation have also issued collective statements. For example, the Association of American Universities (AAU) purchased advertising space in the *New York Times* to issue a statement that emphasized the significance of racial diversity to the very concept of higher education. They cautioned that without diversity the quality and texture of education would be significantly diminished (AAU, 1997). Likewise, over fifty other higher education organizations endorsed a one-page statement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* ("On the impor-

---

Mitchell J. Chang is Assistant Professor of Higher Education and Organizational Change at UCLA. He holds a National Academy of Education/Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship to research the educational efficacy of diversity-related initiatives on college campuses. Address queries to him at Higher Education and Organizational Change, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, 3123 Moore Hall, Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521; telephone: (310) 825-0504; fax: (310) 206-6293; e-mail: mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu.

tance," 1998), stressing the importance of diversity and the necessity of implementing practices to achieve it.

Such public discourse aimed at preserving the consideration of race in higher education has indeed helped to both articulate the educational significance of attaining a racially diverse student body and focus more attention on the issue. Because these recent efforts are likely to be responses to attacks on race-conscious admissions practices, they have ostensibly focused on a narrow aspect of a broader diversity agenda as practiced on college campuses. Often missing from this limited public discourse are substantive discussions about how best to maximize the widespread benefits associated with diversity. Here, over 25 years of scholarship and initiatives on college campuses have much to say about what actually works. Without a more sophisticated and complex understanding about how diversity-related efforts work most effectively on college campuses and what they aim to achieve, educators may inadvertently undermine the educational impact of diversity by underestimating the level of institutional change and commitment necessary to realize the widespread benefits associated with diversity.

In this article, I analyze how overlooking critical areas of diversity-related campus initiatives may in the end preserve the very system that diversity advocates seek to transform. I first describe the discourse aimed at preserving race-conscious admissions practices. I then identify and separately analyze four areas that tend to be absent in this discourse. When these missing areas are taken together and seriously considered, I argue, they reflect a discourse about diversity that aims to transform institutions rather than to preserve existing practices. The differences between these two discourses are educationally meaningful because a discourse of transformation, unlike a discourse of preservation, creates even greater possibility for student learning and for meaningful and sustained democratic change.

DISCOURSE OF PRESERVATION

The general discourse regularly employed to defend university and college affirmative action practices, particularly regarding admissions, rests heavily on the 1978 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke.* This case was filed by a White student who was denied admission to medical school at the University of California, Davis. He charged that the university's admission program violated the California Constitution, Title VI, and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Supreme Court splintered over this case, and there were no clear grounds on which a majority of the justices agreed in reaching their respective decisions. In one of the majority (5–4) decisions, the Court affirmed the California Supreme Court's finding that the university's special admissions system was invalid. In another majority decision, also split

5–4, the Court reversed the California Supreme Court's order that prohibited the university from ever considering race in making admissions decisions. In both decisions, Justice Lewis Powell supplied the pivotal vote.

Although Powell was writing solely for himself and not the majority on either of the above two rulings, his opinion on *Bakke* is now regularly cited to defend race-conscious admissions programs. Powell recognized the medical school's interest in providing the educational benefits of a diverse student body as a permissible basis for considering race in admitting students. Explaining this decision, Powell stated that the First Amendment allows a university the freedom to make its own decisions about education, including the selection of its student body. He argued that diversity in the student body broadens the students' range of viewpoints and subsequently allows a university to provide for students an atmosphere that is "conducive to speculation, experiment and creation—so essential to the quality of higher education" (*Regents,* U.S. 312; 98 S. Ct., 2760). This type of atmosphere, he believed, enhances the institution's training and better equips its graduates. Because such goals are essential to the nation's future and are protected under the First Amendment, Powell concluded that race-conscious admissions practices when narrowly tailored serve a compelling educational interest. The four other Justices who supported the use of race, also upheld UC Davis's special admissions system.

In more recent suits by White applicants to dismantle race-conscious admissions programs, the *Bakke* ruling, particularly Powell's opinion about the compelling interest of diversity, has received mixed if not conflicting interpretations. An analysis of these rulings is beyond the scope of this paper, yet the general outcomes of key cases are essential to this article. Two courts affirmed the consideration of race in the admissions process: Michigan's Eastern District U.S. Court in *Gratz v. Bollinger and the University of Michigan* (2000), and the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Smith v. University of Washington* (2000). In contrast, three others prohibited the use of race: the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Hopwood v. State of Texas* (1996), the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Georgia's decision in *Johnson v. Board of Regents of University System of Georgia* (2000), and most recently, the U.S. District Court's ruling on the Eastern District of Michigan's decision in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2001).

Most legal scholars believe that the U.S. Supreme Court will eventually hear a case, possibly one of the two filed against the University of Michigan, concerning the circumstances and conditions under which race can constitutionally be taken into account as a factor in college admissions. If the highest court in the nation rules on such a case, it will have implications for every public and private university in the country that receives federal money. Given the legal immediacy and urgency—plus the fact that nearly all selective institutions seek to preserve the consideration of race in admissions—

it is perhaps a sound strategy for educational leaders to embrace a discourse of diversity that is largely shaped by the courts and that narrowly targets legal deliberations. In advancing this defense, it has also been helpful to have a body of scholarship that has recently emerged to support the diversity imperative and rationale (Astin, 1993; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Chang, 1999a; Gurin, 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

While the general public discourse aimed at preserving the consideration of race in admissions may well prove to be a sound legal defense and perhaps even a persuasive public one, it often fails to acknowledge more fully the breadth and depth of diversity as practiced on college campuses. Although a narrow perspective about campus diversity may not be a legal limitation—and legal scholars should be the judge of any legal shortcomings—it is certainly an educational one. Failing to recognize the scope of diversity can potentially blunt the types of substantive changes sought by diversity advocates that lead to the very educational benefits articulated in Justice Powell's opinion.

BROADENING THE DIVERSITY DISCOURSE

As noted above, the discourse of preservation aimed at affirming the use of race tends to: (a) overlook the full historical development of diversity-related efforts on college campuses, (b) focus primarily on admissions as the main goal, (c) ignore transformative aims, and (d) underestimate the impact of diversity on student learning. I address each area and make a case for the critical role each plays in advancing diversity efforts on university and college campuses.

Before proceeding, it is also important to note that, because legal deliberations over the use of race serve as the backdrop, the following discussion draws mostly from literature related to racial and ethnic diversity within the context of higher education. This approach, however, is not intended to minimize other important areas of diversity. Certainly, a wide range of issues and interests in multiple facets of society pertaining to gender, class, sexual orientation, and disabilities are critical parts of diversity-related efforts on colleges and universities.

The Importance of Historical Accounts

It is important to recognize that the "diversity movement" in higher education is not simply a colorful and innocuous idea or trend. Rather, many advocates of diversity-related efforts and initiatives hold that diversity is, at its core, an ideological justification for changing existing arrangements of privilege and power (Chan, 1989; Omatsu, 1994). Hirabayashi (1997) maintains that this movement seeks to "make education more equitable, diverse, and inclusive" and to "offer students and practitioners a set of alternative,

oppositional perspectives and resources" (pp. 25, 26). Because many diversity advocates seek to fundamentally rethink and change existing ideals and practices in higher education, a set of campus initiatives and policies became closely linked with its agenda.

Over the course of three and a half decades, the concept of diversity and its agenda grew to encompass a broad set of dimensions, issues, and initiatives on college campuses (Hurtado et al., 1999; Smith et al., 1997). The earliest initiatives to increase minority access on predominantly White campuses and later to enhance gender equity were prompted both by desegregation mandates and by social justice concerns grounded in democratic principles of equal opportunity and equality (Tierney, 1997; Trent, 1991b). Although the issue of equitable access for underrepresented students of color remains of paramount interest, since the mid-1980s, concerns about their persistence and academic success have become another important thrust of diversity efforts in higher education (Allen, 1992; Gándara, 1986; Rendon & Hope, 1996). Additionally, addressing ongoing incidents of racial and ethnic hostility directed toward students of color (Altbach & Lomotey, 1991; Colón, 1991; Hurtado, 1992) and the evolution of what Lawrence Levine (1996) termed "a more eclectic, open, culturally diverse, and relevant curriculum" (p. 171) have also become important concerns of a rapidly expanding diversity agenda (Bataille, Carranza, & Lisa, 1996; La Belle & Ward, 1996). These trends centered not only on race and ethnicity but also encompassed other high-stakes categories (i.e., gender, class, sexual orientation, and disabilities).

The broad set of institutional activities and purposes indicates how the diversity agenda now seems to touch every aspect of academic and civic life, making it difficult to pinpoint only one specific definition or goal associated with diversity. This unique quality is both a strength and a weakness. On the one hand, the breadth and depth of the diversity agenda suggest that it is leaving an indelible mark on higher education and is having widespread educational impact. On the other hand, the same qualities can also lead casual observers to agree with Judge B. Avant Edenfield's opinion that diversity is too "amorphous," "malleable," and "temporally unlimited" to function as an effective educational agenda (qtd. in *Johnson v. Board of Regents,* 2000).

Whatever the case, even this oversimplified historical account makes several crucial points about campus diversity clear. First, the concept of diversity has evolved until it now encompasses a wide range of issues related to democratizing nearly every aspect of higher education. Second, the diversity agenda is closely linked to a set of broad and varied campus activities and initiatives. Third, diversity-related efforts are not limited to improving only the proportional representation of underrepresented minority students.

Conversely, the discourse of preservation focuses almost exclusively on only those interests and initiatives associated with admitting underrepresented students of color. Referring to diversity in such simplistic terms ignores the many other areas of campus life affected by the diversity agenda. This point is particularly important because widespread educational benefits associated with diversity tend to emerge from a well-coordinated set of diversity-related efforts that effect change in multiple levels of the campus environment. Such change includes but is not limited to enrollment. This effect will be discussed in greater detail in the next section. Not surprisingly, few studies, as the nation's courts have already discovered, show that simply admitting a racially diverse group of students without complementing this practice with other diversity-related activities necessarily fosters educational benefits.

The Importance of Thinking Beyond Admissions

According to Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1999): "Campuses can no longer speak about changes in the number of diverse students without recognizing how this change affects the psychological climate or opportunities for interaction across different groups on campus—and ultimately changes in educational outcomes for students" (p. iv). They reached this conclusion after a methodical and comprehensive synthesis of the literature, linking established frameworks on race relations with emerging research about college students and campuses. From this analysis, they concluded that the goal of improving the climate for racial and cultural diversity requires a comprehensive approach and a long-term perspective. This approach must take into account the following dimensions of a college campus: *historical* (i.e., the institutional legacy of inclusion or exclusion), *structural* (i.e., the representation of students, faculty, administration, staff, etc.), *psychological* (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, views, etc.), and *behavioral* (i.e., students' involvement, curricular change, cross-racial contact, multicultural programming, etc.).

Because these four dimensions are strongly connected with each other, efforts to improve the enrollment of underrepresented students or the structural dimension, for example, may have negative effects on the psychological aspects of the climate if the campus fails to simultaneously address those socio-psychological issues. What usually happens is that, as the enrollment of underrepresented students increases, students perceive and at times experience greater racial tension and hostility. This occurs largely because faculty have not been trained to effectively educate a more diverse student population and the students themselves are not prepared to engage successfully in diverse communities. In contrast, Hurtado and her colleagues found, institutions that simultaneously addressed all four dimensions of diversity were more likely to improve their campus climate and maximize

the widespread educational benefits associated with student learning than those which treated diversity-related efforts in a piecemeal fashion.

Smith et al. (1997) reached a similar conclusion in their comprehensive review of the research literature. Although they identified a slightly different set of dimensions than Hurtado et al., they also underscored the necessity of a comprehensive, sustained, and coordinated plan to realize the potential educational benefits associated with diversity. Smith et al. emphasized simultaneously engaging three dimensions: (a) the inclusion and success of previously underrepresented groups, (b) the prevention of an overall "chilly" campus environment, and (c) the inclusion of diverse traditions in the curriculum, pedagogy, and scholarly inquiry. Because each dimension reinforces the other, they argued, a comprehensive set of diversity-related initiatives is necessary to maximize educational benefits.

The ways in which diversity works best are remarkably close to what we already know about student development. That is, the impact that college attendance has on students' development is largely determined by their level of engagement or involvement (Astin, 1984; Pace, 1987) and the overall impact is strongest when campuses deliberately fashion a set of mutually supportive and reinforcing experiences (Terenzini, Pascarella, & Blimling, 1996). This well-confirmed and widely accepted insight in higher education, however, seems to be lost in the discourse of preservation. This discourse seemingly implies that one particular dimension of diversity—increasing the proportional representation of underrepresented students of color—can singlehandedly produce widespread educational benefits for all students. Yet current research consistently shows that enrolling underrepresented students of color will succeed in limited ways and, at worst, exacerbate intergroup tension and conflict if those institutions are not prepared to educate them successfully or have not identified and removed hostile conditions that impede education (Altbach, 1991; Colón, 1991; Farrell & Jones, 1988; Hurtado, 1992; Levin & McDevitt, 1993).

From an educational standpoint, when campuses equate diversity only with changing institutional patterns of representation, they fail to maximize the benefits associated with diversity because widespread educational benefits are much more likely to emerge out of the context of institutional commitment to all facets of diversity. Moreover, campuses that pursue only one dimension of diversity limit their opportunity for making actual fundamental improvements in traditional practices and approaches. Such improvements are what Smith et al. (1997) called "institutional transformation." According to them, this dimension of diversity does not necessarily involve specific activities but complements the efforts of the other dimensions by raising issues about deeply entrenched arrangements that obstruct the democratization of institutions. Others have also emphasized the importance

of institutional transformation as a goal for diversity-related efforts, as the next section discusses.

The Importance of Recognizing Transformative Aims

Historically, postsecondary institutions did not willingly embrace, let alone collectively defend, diversity-related efforts. It took heavy-handed intervention by the federal government to open wider the doors of higher education to students of color. This change and subsequent institutional alterations now considered under the rubric of diversity varied in the ease with which different campuses implemented them; but it is fair to say that much ongoing administrative resistance (Altbach, 1991; Olivas, 1993; Trent, 1991a) and prolonged acrimonious debate (Levine, 1996) characterized the typical campus dealing with diversity issues. Institutional conflicts typically occurred because, as Hurtado (1996) observed, "These [diversity] issues often required fundamental changes in premises and practices at many levels" (p. 27), which, according to Chan (1989), threatened the very structure of power both within and outside the university.

Because the diversity agenda and its related efforts seek to effect change at almost all levels of higher education, it has been described as a "transformative enterprise" (Nakanishi & Leong, 1978; Wei, 1993). In this view, diversity initiatives are not simply innocuous extensions of preexisting institutional interests but are instead efforts that challenge and seek to transform traditional institutional practices and arrangements toward making education more equitable, diverse, and inclusive, as well as more open to alternative perspectives (Hirabayashi, 1997). Perhaps because the transformative aims associated with diversity tend to challenge existing arrangements, colleges and universities have not done all that they must do to maximize the educational benefits associated with diversity (Allen, 1992; Chang, 1999b). Hurtado (1996) held that "both resistance and change are inevitable parts of the major transformation that is under way in the mission of postsecondary institutions—a mission that includes diversity as a key component" (p. 29). Therefore, she maintained, some tension and conflict are likely at the level of deep institutional change in the history of individual campus diversity efforts. In an educational setting, however, tension and conflict are not necessarily problematic for learning (Gurin, 1999), unless they prevent campuses from successfully implementing a multifaceted approach to diversity.

Given that the transformative aims often clash with deep-seated institutional assumptions and values, the educational benefits associated with diversity emerge, more often than not, out of institutional transformation and not out of preexisting ways of operating and behaving. In other words, educational benefits for students emanate from changes that challenge prevailing educational sensibilities and that enhance educational participation.

Accordingly, retired Harvard professor Charles Willie pointed out in an interview that the educational significance of diversity is best observed when viewed as "the foundation for institutional change and self-correction" (qtd. in Buchbinder, 1998) and not as an uncritical manifestation of preexisting institutional values and ideals. As such, diversity calls into question not only how learning is viewed and what is valued, but also how learning should be assessed. In the next section, I will discuss further how the diversity agenda seeks to transform higher education's understanding of and impact on learning.

The Importance of a Broader View of Learning

With few exceptions, critics of diversity seem to concede that certain types of learning associated with diversity efforts (i.e., increased cultural awareness, reduced racial prejudice, greater tolerance for difference, etc.) may well take place. Instead, they are more likely to reject diversity-related efforts based on what they believe students ought to learn and who is qualified to learn. Regarding what students ought to learn, widely cited criticisms of calls to diversify college curricula include Allan Bloom's (1987) *The Closing of the American Mind* and Dinesh D'Souza's (1991) *Illiberal Education.* These and other commentaries triggered a well-publicized national debate over what knowledge is deemed legitimate, valuable, and worthy of respect. Olneck (2000) maintained that the curricular changes sought by diversity advocates and multiculturalists can be broadly viewed as an attempt to weaken "Euro-American-centric claims of universal representation" and the "hierarchical boundaries between particular knowledges" (pp. 323–324). At stake, according to Olneck, is the power to construct reality by imposing the legitimate vision of the social world and its divisions.

Regarding who is qualified to learn, critics of diversity often charge that aggressively enrolling more underrepresented students necessarily increases the numbers of "unqualified" students and subsequently, "dumbs down" the curriculum by simultaneously increasing the numbers of "remedial-education" courses (Clegg, 2000; Greve, 1999). Thus, in the minds of critics, privileges associated with "higher" learning on "elite" campuses should be guarded on two fronts. First, the privilege to enroll should be reserved only for those students who can demonstrate through standardized measures that they possess the particular potential to learn. Second, those "elite" institutions should not compromise their privileged status or quality of education by downgrading their curriculum with remedial education, even though pressures to do so stem from inequities in schooling. The logical extension of this reasoning is that those institutions with the least resources—primarily community colleges—should bear the burden of educating those students who need the most educational assistance.

Programmatic efficacy aside, the narrow views held by critics of diversity about what students should learn and who is qualified to learn raise the specter of whether the purpose of educating students is even really the primary point of contention. Critics appear much more concerned about maintaining and securing the privileges traditionally associated with learning than about whether diversity initiatives actually foster students' capacity to learn. Olneck (2000) contended that, paradoxically, "the value of knowledge is imparted by designating it as essential for all and by restricting access to its most privileged forms to those most qualified" (p. 322). While nearly all educators subscribe to the importance of maintaining high standards and quality education, the privileging of learning through curricula, instruction, evaluation, and the systematic sorting of students invariably constrains more than it advances opportunities to learn.

A more authentic discourse of diversity is sensitive to those issues and their negative consequences, and challenges the efficacy of privileging learning by raising some fundamental questions about learning itself. These questions include:

- Who deserves an opportunity to learn?
- How is the potential for learning evaluated?
- What is learned?
- Who oversees learning?
- What conditions advance learning for all students?

Raising these questions is not simply a rhetorical exercise but is linked to a broader diversity agenda that targets institutional changes at multiple levels. For example, the question, "Who deserves an opportunity to learn?" fundamentally targets concerns about educational access, which are linked to the diversity agenda through such initiatives as the aggressive recruitment of underrepresented students, race-sensitive admissions policies, transition/retention programs, minority-targeted scholarships, etc. Similarly, concerns about privileging a narrow body of knowledge ("What is learned?") are linked to efforts that infuse the history, literature, perspectives, contributions, etc., of previously invisible citizens into the general curricula to account for the heterogeneity and complexity of American society. Such campus initiatives might include institutionalizing a multicultural/diversity undergraduate course requirement, providing meaningful support for ethnic studies units, offering faculty release time to develop new courses, or hiring more tenure-track faculty who have expertise in those areas of study.

Because campus diversity calls fundamental assumptions about learning into question, conventional methods and measures of evaluation may not adequately capture the educational impact of related initiatives. Popular assessments that rely heavily on standardized tests of aptitude, post-college earnings, or occupational prestige, for example, may underestimate the educational significance of campus diversity because those measures do not

necessarily tap into other types of student learning linked to institutional transformation.

A more authentic discourse of diversity would begin with a broader view of learning and would recognize efforts that seek either to employ alternative modes of assessment or to broaden the range of valid educational outcomes. For example, diversity advocates have already called for increased utilization of multiple methods to carefully document whether diversity-related efforts are improving such educational outcomes as civic involvement, access to knowledge, cross-cultural tolerance, economic opportunities, encounters with difference, the ability to work effectively in diverse environments, citizenship, educational participation for all students, and other interests that a democratic society aspires to achieve. Indeed, in a recent review of research, Milem and Hakuta (2000) showed that diversity-related efforts not only effect change in multiple levels of the campus environment but also advance a broad spectrum of learning outcomes, some of which are often overlooked when assessing educational value.

Thus, although the diversity agenda typically seeks to transform structural arrangements and representation, its transformative aims are perhaps most recognizable in advancing student learning in distinctive ways. Carol Schneider and Debra Humphreys, writing for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), stated:

> [The] linkage between diversity and democratic society challenges higher education to think more deeply about what individuals learn from their experience of campus ethos—and how that learning in turn constrains or enriches the quality and vitality of American communities. (qtd. in Appel et al., 1996, p. vi)

The four areas identified in this article, which better capture the transformative aims of diversity, are a place to begin constructing a more authentic and comprehensive discourse. Such a discourse defies allegations that the diversity agenda simply seeks "diversity for diversity's sake" or is merely ideologically or politically driven. A transformative discourse makes it clear that the diversity agenda is inextricably linked to the advancement of student learning and the democratization of institutions. In this way, these missing areas of the preservation discourse are very much in line with Justice Powell's claims about the educational benefits of diversity.

Conclusion

While the shortcomings of the discourse aimed at preserving race-conscious admissions practices may not have immediate legal implications, they certainly have educational ones. The current discourse, heavily driven by court rulings, overlooks the importance of accounting for the evolution of

diversity, thinking beyond admissions, recognizing transformative aims, and viewing learning more broadly. These areas of campus diversity are critical for maximizing the benefits associated with diversity, assessing accurately its value, and sustaining meaningful and lasting democratic changes in higher education.

With the immediate attention on legal deliberations over the use of race in college admissions, it is perhaps a sound strategy for educators who occupy the highest positions of leadership and who must publicly, and in some cases legally, defend those practices to adopt a discourse of diversity that is largely shaped by the courts and which narrowly targets legal deliberations. However, if those educators' perspective of campus diversity is limited only to a discourse of preservation, it may have negative consequences for those who could benefit most from students. Although benefits may well start with increasing the enrollment of underrepresented students of color because students are sources of institutional change (Dey & Hurtado, 1994), it surely cannot stop there.

Therefore, as some college presidents defend the educational benefits associated with racial diversity, they may not be fully aware of the level of institutional commitment and transformation necessary to realize those benefits. Some may even resist those changes. If educators, particularly those in positions of leadership, fail to develop a fuller understanding and appreciation of campus diversity, their short-sightedness may both arrest educational potential and preserve the broader set of arrangements and institutional practices that diversity advocates seek to transform.

Given the current attention on affirmative action and the widespread interest among educators in protecting it, the higher education community has a fortuitous window of opportunity to advance a more authentic and comprehensive discourse of diversity. Although I mainly focused my discussion on race and ethnicity, such a discourse must also address critical issues concerning gender, sexuality, class, and disabilities. If advocates seize this opportunity to advance a discourse that has, as a core interest, the democratic transformation of higher education, they can make clearer to institutional leaders how best to conceptualize campus diversity and to maximize the educational benefits associated with it.

As matters now stand, however, some campuses still have serious trouble with this approach, as evidenced by the recent photograph controversy at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Unable to find an available photograph depicting the undergraduate population as diverse, the admissions office doctored the cover photograph of its admissions packet to include a Black student, thus attempting to promote the campus as a diverse institution (Yachnin, 2000). Good intentions notwithstanding, such naive and unethical practices to promote diversity clearly miss the mark, if in fact

they do not totally misrepresent, the core interests of a more authentic diversity agenda.

Besides clarifying how best to conceptualize and maximize the benefits of diversity, a discourse that aims to transform higher education will also assist institutions in pursuing diversity even under the worst-case scenario. Should the U.S. Supreme Court prohibit factoring in race when making admissions decisions, a discourse of transformation would make clear that colleges and universities still have at their disposal a sophisticated array of diversity initiatives to advance student learning and broaden educational impact. This insight has not escaped nonselective and open-enrollment institutions nor those currently prohibited from considering race. To the extent that diversity advocates can effectively advance a discourse of transformation, the fate of whether diversity will have long-term and lasting value in higher education will not be in the hands of the courts but may well rest on individual colleges and universities.

REFERENCES

Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 62,* 26–44.

Altbach, P. G. (1991). The racial dilemma in American higher education. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 3–17). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Altbach, P. G., & Lomotey, K. (Eds.). (1991). *The racial crisis in American higher education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Appel, M., Cartwright, D., Smith, D. G., & Wolf, L. E. (1996). *The impact of diversity on students: A preliminary review of the research literature.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Association of American Universities (1997, April 24). On the importance of diversity in university admissions. *New York Times,* p. 27.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297–308.

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change, 23,* 44–49.

Bataille, G. M., Carranza, M. A., & Lisa, L. (1996). *Ethnic studies in the United States: A guide to research.* New York: Garland.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Buchbinder, J. (1998). Moving ahead with purpose. *Harvard Education Bulletin, 42*(2), 14–16.

Chan, S. (1989). On the ethnic studies requirement. *Amerasia Journal, 15*(1), 267–280.

Chang, M. J. (1999a). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 377–395.

Chang, M. J. (1999b). Expansion and its discontents: The formation of Asian American studies programs in the 1990s. *Journal of Asian American Studies, 2*(2), 181–206.

Clegg, R. (2000, July 14). Why I'm sick of the praise for diversity on campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. B8.

Colón, A. (1991). Race relations on campus: An administrative perspective. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 69–88). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education.* New York: Free Press.

Dey, E. L., & Hurtado, S. (1994). College students in changing contexts. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *Higher education in American society* (pp. 249–267). Amherst, MA: Prometheus Books.

Farrell, W. C., & Jones, C. K. (1988). Recent racial incidents in higher education: A preliminary perspective. *Urban Review, 20,* 211–233.

Gándara, P. (1986). Chicanos in higher education: The politics of self-interest. *American Journal of Education, 95*(1), 256–272.

Gratz v. Bollinger and the University of Michigan (2000), 22 F. Supp.2d 811 (E.D. Mich. 2000).

Greve, M. S. (1999, March 19). The demise of race-based admissions policies. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. B6–B7.

Grutter v. Bollinger (2001), No. 97–CV–75928–DT, WL 293196 (E.D. Mich., 2001).

Gurin, P. (1999). *Expert report of Patricia Gurin, in the compelling need for diversity in higher education. Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al., No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.) Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al., No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich.).* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Hirabayashi, L. R. (1997). Asian American Studies and institutional politics. In T. K. Nakayama & C. F. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Asian Pacific Americans and the U.S. Southwest* (pp. 23–38). Tempe: Arizona State University.

Hopwood v. State of Texas (1996), 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 1996), *cert. denied,* 518 U.S. 1033, 116 S. Ct. 2581, 135 L. Ed. 2d 1095 (1996).

Hurtado, S. (1992). Campus racial climates: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education, 63,* 539–569.

Hurtado, S. (1996). How diversity affects teaching and learning: A climate of inclusion has a positive effect on learning outcomes. *Educational Record, 77*(4), 27–29.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education institutions.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 26. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Johnson v. Board of Regents of University System of Georgia (2000), 106 F. Supp. 2d 1362, 1375 (S.D. Ga. 2000).

La Belle, T. J., & Ward, C. R. (1996). *Ethnic studies and multiculturalism.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Levin, J., & McDevitt, J. (1993). *Hate crimes: The rising tide of bigotry and bloodshed.* New York: Plenum.
Levine, L. W. (1996). *The opening of the American mind.* Boston: Beacon Press.
Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. J. Wilds (Ed.), *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report* (pp. 39–67). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
Nakanishi, D. T., & Leong, R. (1978). Toward the second decade: A national survey of Asian American Studies programs. *Amerasia Journal, 5*(1), 1–19.
Olivas, M. (1993). The attack on affirmative action: Lives in parallel universes. *Change, 25*(2), 16–20.
Olneck, M. (2000). Can multicultural education change what counts as cultural capital? *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 317–348.
Omatsu, G. (1994). The "four prisons" and the movements of liberation: Asian American activism from the 1960s to the 1990s. In K. A.-S. Juan (Ed.), *The state of Asian America: Activism and resistance in the 1990s* (pp. 19–69). Boston: South End Press.
On the importance of diversity in higher education. (1998, February 13). *Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A48.
Pace, C. R. (1987). *Good things go together.* Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA.
Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978) 438 U.S. 265, 98 S. Ct. 2733, 57 L. Ed. 2d 750.
Rendon, L. I., & Hope, R. (1996). *Educating a new majority.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Rudenstine, N. L. (1996, March/April). The uses of diversity. *Harvard Magazine,* 48–62.
Smith, D. G., Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M. A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Leeshawn, C. M., Merchant, P. A., Beliak, H. D., & Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
Smith v. University of Washington (2000), 233 F.3d 1188 (9th Cir. 2000).
Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 149–163.
Tierney, W. G. (1997). The parameters of affirmative action: Equity and excellence in the academy. *Review of Educational Research, 67*(2), 165–196.
Trent, W. T. (1991a). Focus on equity: Race and gender differences in degree attainment—1975–76, 1980–81. In W. R. Allen, E. G. Epps, & N. Z. Haniff (Eds.), *College in black and white* (pp. 41–59). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Trent, W. T. (1991b). Student affirmative action in higher education: Addressing underrepresentation. In P. B. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 107–132). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Wei, W. (1993). *The Asian American movement.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Weiss, K. R. (2001, February 4). Lee Bollinger: University of Michigan president fights for affirmative action cause. *Los Angeles Times,* pp. M3.

Yachnin, J. (2000, September 21). U. of Wisconsin apologizes for doctoring photo to portray campus as diverse. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* http://chronicle.com/daily/2000/2009/2000092103n.htm.