I have been thinking and writing about race since I was in graduate school. My first three books were about race. But at the end of the 1997 edition of *Prejudice and racism*, I reached the conclusion that diversity was what I need to write about and understand. It was the new challenge. The next to last section of the 635-page book was titled—Diversity is a strength in the species and in society. The last section was “toward a more perfect union.” I closed with this challenge

> “Two paths stand before us. One, motivated by the best sense of liberty, equality and fraternity, moves us forward in the experiment in creating a more perfect union. A second, fueled by fear, self-interest, ignorance, and mistrust, turns us backward, and diverts us from the struggle toward tolerance and perfection. Our diversity comes from different origins, experiences, and goals. Our best possible selves, as a nation and a people, will be determined by the path we choose.” (Jones, 1997, p. 537)

I believe a diversity perspective, of necessity, represents the path best taken. But it is fraught with complications and difficulties.

Since I wrote this, I have thought a great deal about how to understand the ways in which race has been reflected in or subsumed by the idea of diversity. At the simplest level of analysis, diversity forces an expansion of the way we view prejudice, discrimination, marginalization and at the extreme, oppression. When I wrote about race, I had no qualms whatsoever about casting a moral judgment—racism is wrong and obstructing, disrupting and overcoming it was right by any moral metric. It was easy to identify the perpetrators, the mechanisms that sustained racism,
prejudice, and all forms of bias, and to provide abundant examples of how racism subverted the basic principles upon which the nation was founded and our humanity rests.

Further, just as we cannot undo the internet and its effect on our lives and the world we live in, we cannot retreat from the advancing diversification and our awareness of it. People adapt to it in different ways, but it is the new normal. What we do about it, and how successfully we do it will determine its effect on our future.

By 2014, I had organized my thinking about diversity and offered them in the *Psychology of Diversity* book. My talk today addresses some of the main ideas from this work.

I organize my talk around four main ideas.

- One, the meaning of diversity is both contested and conceived in multiple ways. The result is that diversity approaches necessarily involve political calculations and processes.

- Two, differences are fundamental to any understanding of diversity, and inconsistent, and multiple ideas about whether, how and which differences matter, creates complexity that challenges diversity-based strategies.

- Third, only way to approach diversity in a meaningful way requires a framework that jettison’s the zero-sum approaches based in an either/or analysis for a multidimensional model grounded in a Both/And approach.

- Fourth, I will reflect on aspects of diversity at UD.

I will discuss each of these points, highlight some of the challenges they present, and suggest how a both/and analytic can provide a meaningful path forward.
Duality of Diversity Definitions

My main point here is that racism and nativism comprise the historical legacy of racial inequality. Racism was the focus over centuries and anti-racism was the vehicle for change. The Civil Rights movement stood for this historical effort and in the late 60’s, Black consciousness, Black pride and black identity emerged to take control of who black people were and why and how they were resilient and proud. And this movement further illuminated to obstructing nature of white supremacy and its moral bankruptcy. Moreover, intentionality was no longer necessary to define a perpetrator of racism—implicit bias had not been coined yet nor microaggressions, but that was where this was headed. This anti-racism lens is reflected in Justice Brennan’s summary for the Court:

“A race-conscious remedy…is necessary to achieve…a fully-integrated society, one in which color of a person’s skin will not determine the opportunities available to him or her. If ways are not found to remedy underrepresentation in the professions, the country can never achieve a society that is not race-conscious…In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way…In order to treat persons equally, we must treat them differently.”

Brennan’s challenge was specific to taking race into account in university admissions to create a society in which race did not matter. This anti-racism perspective is embedded in, but not always acknowledged by current diversity beliefs.

An update of this view was provided by Justice O’Connor in the Grutter case when she specifically argued that DIVERSITY was a compelling interest. Her view went beyond race and lead to the general idea that institutions, people and societies benefitted from inclusion of diversity.

“universities, …represent the training ground for a large number of the Nation’s leaders, … the path to leadership must be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity. Thus, the (UMich) Law School has a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body. —Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003
Whereas Brennan argued that taking race into account was necessary to ameliorate the effects of historic racism, O’Connor argued that society had a compelling interest in diversity. Thus, depending on your viewpoint, “race” and “diversity” are now conflated. The amelioration of past discrimination is subsumed under a diversity label that heralds the benefits of diversity to everyone—business, military, universities and the nation as a whole.

Colleagues at Princeton have labeled these two approaches Moral and Instrumental, respectively. The former emphasizes the obligation to take actions that compensate for the historical disadvantages caused by blatant discrimination—see Georgetown University for example. The latter emphasizes the benefit to everyone. My colleagues find that White students overwhelmingly prefer the instrumental version of diversity, and Black and Brown students prefer the moral version. Moreover, 75% of diversity statements of universities can be classified as instrumental. Surprisingly, but importantly, they find that Black are less likely to graduate and more likely to perform poorly in schools that take an instrumental approach to diversity.

This a major distinction between these two meanings of diversity not only diverge form each other, they diverge in who endorses them and their consequences.

Finally, a conservative voice makes these two approaches explicit in his definition of diversity. Writing in the conservative New Boston Post, Peter Wood characterized diversity this way:

On one hand, it calls for Americans to see ourselves as one large multicultural community that happily celebrates its numerous parts. On the other hand, it fosters group grievances and bitter resentments. Diversity is both kumbaya and Black Lives Matter. Peter Wood New Boston Post—October 30, 2015

I believe it is the duality of diversity beliefs that foster confusion and conflict about diversity. Our diversity effort strives simultaneously to mount anti-bias programs, while espousing the
generalized benefits of inclusion. Groups who are concerned with biases they must overcome, feel unfulfilled, and at times disrespected when they are lumped with other groups with very different histories. The inclusive idea that everyone is better for it does not work in a world that is seen as a zero-sum contest for resources, prestige and opportunity. And some groups still experience obstacles to attaining them. And, we must consider history in this calculus. We cannot undo the past, but we cannot ignore either. It has become part of the diversity debate.

A further by-product of these distinctions is that to the extent that the moral approach is visible, Whites specifically feel that diversity not only does NOT include them but is actively seeking to constrain their opportunities. A colleague, Vickie Plaut at UC Berkeley published an interesting paper titled “What about me?” Plaut and her colleagues conducted five experiments looking at how Whites responded to various diversity related ideas and concepts. She found that Whites, but not racial minorities, made implicit associations between multiculturalism and exclusion, were less likely to link multiculturalism with the self, and, the greater their need to belong, the less interested they were in working for organizations that espoused a multicultural, as opposed to a colorblind, approach to diversity. On the other hand, these effects were attenuated when diversity was defined to include Whites. Finally, the more Whites paired multicultural concepts with the self, or felt included in organizational diversity, the more they endorsed diversity ideas.

The moral or anti-racism aspect of diversity is reluctant to include whites in its purview. If whites see that stance as what diversity is, then they feel excluded and actively or passively oppose or fail to support diversity efforts. So inclusion as a concept is both a goal of diversity and a challenge it faces.
The Challenge of Differences in Diversity

“Our similarities are different” -- Yogi Berra

Diversity IS difference and is manifest in myriad ways. Each single human being is unique, so the maximum diversity is 7,635,563,900 people as of 9:30 last night! We often reduce this number to four! And sometimes, considering URM, only 1! Diversity has expanded in recent years, but rather than clarifying it adds greater layers of complication. The more diverse we are at any level, the greater the gains from simulation, learning and experience, but the greater risk of colliding differences and ensuing conflict. Managing this cascading set of difference to the benefit of everyone is extremely challenging.

A Taxonomy of Diversity

One of my favorite forays into this complexity is the work of, Scott Page whose book, The Difference, makes a case for how and why diversity produces better outcomes than skill and knowledge in certain complex task situations. His taxonomy of differences highlights this complexity.

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

- **Perspectives**—ways of representing understanding the world around us.
- **Heuristics**-thinking tools or strategies for solving personal problems or achieving desired goals.
- **Interpretations**- creating categories into which we place and give meaning to things, events experiences.
- **Predictions**- inferences we make about what goes with or causes what.
Identity diversity represents differences among people based on sex, gender orientation, religion, race, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, immigrant status, and so on that are reflected in their affinity for and identification with those social categories.

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

Preference diversity reflects differences in taste and values, including

- **fundamental preferences**—the outcomes we value or prefer
- **instrumental preferences**—the means by which we pursue preferred outcomes

For the most part we focus on demographic diversity because it is easier to count. But as they say, everything that matters can’t be counted and everything that can be counted doesn’t matter! Identity diversity is often dismissed with the label “identity politics.” In fact, identity is a major source of variation as Page implies and is a major source of diversity within diversity groups. Considering cognitive and preference diversity, we multiply the sources of difference exponentially. We cannot possibly respond to this many degree of freedom in an institutional framework. So, we truncate to make it manageable. Consider, for example, International students. They may come from China, Southeast Asia, Japan, Middle East, Caribbean, South America and Africa, not to mention Europe. Considering this diversity of background, what does the international category mean?

Of note in a political calculus is Preference. We may agree on the ends but disagree on how to achieve them—DuBois and Booker T, Malcom and Martin. To
some extent diversity on college campuses is replete with preference diversity, in addition to all the other sources.

Diversity is not one thing it is many things. Its varied nature is one of its challenges; diversity introduces a higher level of complexity to various contexts and also increases the chances for conflicting views. However, the varied nature of diversity is also a principle source of its benefit; from complexity comes better problem solving, greater understanding and better citizens.

**Identity and collective consciousness**

Identity is the collective representation and reflection of the self.” The diversity issue is intimately bound up with identity—a collective consciousness in an individualist world. Some people talk about “Identity politics” like it is a blight on civilization and a perversion of democracy. I believe all politics are identity politics—some identities are more important than others. Identity is a basis for difference that challenges the ideas of colorblindness, individualism, and meritocracy. Once we acknowledge the legitimacy of identity, then the contest becomes over not **whether** identities matter but **whose** identities matter. Rather than abandon the significance and meaning of identity, we need to embrace it as a natural fact of social living, and a critical lever in a democratic process, and an avenue to power that we seek to share.

Finally, I want to emphasize that differences abound even in the familiar categories of identity and demographic diversity. Members of identifiable social groups vary widely. Moreover, individuals belong to multiple social groups. Mixed race, Pacific Islanders, Hawaiians and Alaskan natives are lumped under Other in UD statistics. This is obviously for
convenience and because in many cases the numbers are so small. A multidimensional approach to difference may be hard, but it may need to be path forward. But consider all the other difference that matter but are not counted. I believe firmly numbers and their usefulness in understanding, planning and problem solving. But some things, like experience have meaning and relevance outside the numbers. It is challenging to bring this to bear in our diversity agenda.

{microaggression and other qualitative research}

**Diversity is not Binary**

*The opposite of a great truth is also true -- Niels Bohr.*

Diversity is complex. Not a profound statement, but what does it imply or demand as a response? As I discussed earlier, the moral basis of diversity rests in part on historical discrimination and specifically Blacks and American Indians. DuBois drew a line that proclaimed color was the problem of the 20th century. Eldridge Cleaver, on behalf of the Black Panthers, asserted that one was either part of the problem or part of the solution. The binary framework of either/or, zero-sum thinking is an unacceptable basis for tackling the challenges of a diversity agenda.

I do not like simplistic slogans or metaphors for what diversity means or requires, but I do believe a both/and logic is necessary to pursue diversity objectives. Two or more things even those in opposition can both be good and true! Let me provide a case study of how this might work.

In 1978, I convened a group of psychologists under the aegis of both the APA and the National Institutes of Mental Health, to find ways APA could be organizationally receptive to diversity. We developed several proposals including establishing an office, a Board and a Division of ethnic minority affairs. The Board proposal was the most consequential because that
gave ethnic minorities a seat at the governance table. However, we hit an impasse regarding the composition of the Board that obstructed bringing the proposal forward. The Hispanic representatives argued that the Board membership should Black, Hispanic, American Indian and Asian. Blacks, however, argued that they had been challenging APA along these lines for over a decade, and had already done the most to open APA. They argued for a 5-2-2-2 representation. I created a negotiating team from each group, and they hammered out a compromise-4-3-2-2. This Orwellian solution I put in the both/and framework. Blacks got their recognition, Hispanics got a nod for their increasing significance, and Asian and American Indians accepted their secondary status. To reach both/and solutions, trade-offs are necessary. To be meaningful inclusive and pursue equity across boundaries of difference in a diverse world there must be negotiation, communication, and learning—from and with each other. Anthropologist Margaret Mead once likened people living in a post A-bomb world as pioneers. I believe we are living in a post-diversity explosion world and we are all learning how to do that.

**Thoughts on Diversity at UD**

The University of Delaware’s educational mission is to prepare students to live in an increasingly interconnected and diverse world. To do so, we are committed to fostering a robust educational environment that supports critical thinking, free inquiry, and an understanding of diverse views and values. We see diversity as a core value and guiding principle for our educational mission and thus must work to make diversity an integral part of everyday life on campus. To this end, we take diversity to mean both the recognition and appreciation of the different backgrounds, values, and ideas of those who comprise our campus, as well as a commitment to ensuring that all people on our campus are treated according to principles of fairness, civility, dignity, and equity. We are committed to building an educational community that understands people from different backgrounds and economic circumstances, with different needs, and from diverse personal and philosophical beliefs. We want to make all people who are part of the University feel welcome and valued in campus life.

**UD Diversity Statement**

This is an excellent statement of what diversity means at UD. Bu of course the devil is in the details.
One recurring problem is the differing meanings we have of what diversity means. The Center for the Study of Diversity (CSD) conducted a survey of undergrads in 2012 that asked them to define diversity and to describe diversity at UD. By far most students expressed a positive view of what diversity is, but several had the view expressed by the second comment. Students were extremely mixed in their views about where UD is in its pursuit. Efforts to pursue a diversity agenda come against the definitions of the concept, and ideas about what diversity does or should look like.

We have set aggressive goals for diversifying students, faculty and staff. One of the challenges of reaching these goals is the zero-sum belief that gains in one area must be accompanied by losses in another. To a significant extent, that is true. I analyzed enrollment data for UD undergrads at the Newark campus for the twenty-year period 1997-2018. I used 1997 as a baseline and computed changes in enrollment and percent of the total student population in five-year intervals for each racial/ethnic group.

Here's what I found:

- Overall enrollment increased by 3,432 students, an increase of 24%.
- Enrollment of Underrepresented Minorities (URM) increased from 1,276 (9%) to 2,472 (14.1%), an increase of 1,196; a 94% increase.
- White students increased from 12,346 (87.9%) to 12,823 (73%), an increase of 477; but a 14.3% decrease in total enrollment.
- Nearly 35% of the increased enrollment was accounted for by URM students.
However, Black student numbers decreased by 25. In 1997 they were 5.6% of enrollment, in 2018 they were 4.4%!

While Blacks and Whites were a lower percentage of the student body in 2018 than in 1997, Hispanics increased by over 7%, Asian Americans by almost 3%, and Others by over 6%.

There are several different stories to be drawn from these data which raise some challenging questions.

1. It looks indeed that the increase in underrepresented minority students means that the number of White students must be proportionately reduced. In fact, this is what happened.

2. URM or diversity or any composite representation of different groups masks the dynamics for each group. If we only looked at the aggregate URM numbers, we may applaud the growth. But it is remarkable that over this twenty-year period, UD has no appreciably larger number of African American Students than we did 20 years ago. I know for a fact that efforts have been made to recruit more African American students and the last two classes reflect significant success. Maybe we are on the right path, but maybe an even more aggressive strategy is needed.

One approach we have taken at the CSD is based on the idea of Diversity Competence—the ability and motivation to live meaningful and constructively in a diverse world. The concept consists of six dimensions—Diversity self-awareness, Perspective-taking, Cultural literacy, Personal and social responsibility, Global understanding and diversity knowledge application.
These principles have been adopted as criteria for certifying courses as meeting the multicultural course requirement.

We developed a 22-item psychological scale to assess diversity competence. Research shows that endorsing the diversity competency principles is associated with a frame of mind and supporting values and motivations that, I believe, are necessary for competent engagement in a diverse world. Diversity competent people are open to learning about and with others, recognizing their own preferences, tendencies and biases and talking them into account in their expectations and relationships. I further believe that institutions can be diversity competent as well, or not.

Self-examination, learning and consistent recognition of how institutional leadership is part of the diversity equation and the mutuality of what it takes to create an effectively diverse community are hallmarks of a diversity competent institution.

Rapid technological change and its consequent impact on social life and relations, greater shifts in populations across national borders and cultures, and greater opportunities to engage more with members of diverse groups both physically and virtually has dramatically transformed the social world. The amount and nature of human interaction today is fundamentally different from personal and intergroup exchange only two decades ago. Consequently, while basic psychological principles of intergroup relations
remain valid and relevant, it is also important for theory to encompass a world in rapid change and expanding social complexity. Yes, diversity is the new normal, but it is not yet normalized—still a work in progress.

**Full Participation—A diversity goal**

“…an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to thrive, realize their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others” (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh & Bush, 2011,