6. Diversity on the blackboard: the nexus between teaching, diversity, and awareness

Marte C. W. Solheim and Sigrun M. Moss

INTRODUCTION

The concepts of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging are being spoken about and raised in businesses and among the public, as well as in research and higher education institutions. Due to mobility and globalisation, diversity has increased in many areas of the world (Özden et al., 2011). This has rendered it necessary to introduce concepts such as 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007) to capture the complexities and positionalities of people. With this increased diversity come intercultural meetings and relations, their associated advantages, and potential communication-related challenges (Elphinstone, 2018). In addition to this greater diversity, indications point to greater awareness on issues of diversity among groups, such as students. Movements like 'Me Too' and 'Black Lives Matter' have led to extensive discussions, and practices have been called out. Several policy responses at various levels of society aim to strengthen diversity, equity, and inclusion. One example is the Paris Declaration of EU Member States, promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance, and non-discrimination through education (see Claeys-Kulik et al., 2019). The need for equality is also emphasised in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, the clearest for gender being number 5, which calls for achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls.[1] This is a complex picture, however, as we have simultaneously observed hate crimes, discrimination, and racist discourses on the rise over the last years in many countries, particularly in the West (e.g., Virdee & McGeever, 2018). Concomitantly, in an article on shifting diversity discourses (Moss & Solheim, 2022), we argued that discourses on diversity within segments, especially in the Western world, appeared to be shifting from multiculturalism towards a narrower focus on monoculturalism, nationalism, and prejudice. For example, several scholars writing on Brexit have

claimed that statements related to minority groups previously considered to be socially unacceptable were once again becoming mainstream (see, e.g., Favell, 2020). In the present chapter, we emphasise that while complex processes promote tolerance, diversity, inclusion, and associated values, processes are also ongoing to delegitimise this in certain societal segments (see, e.g., Augoustinos & Every, 2007). The discursive battle among competing views on diversity, combined with increased diversity in society, is a focal reason for students and staff in higher education to engage in discussions and practices of diversity and inclusion.

Much could be said about these issues and processes, and many before us have written more extensively on the pedagogies of diversity and education (e.g., Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013; Northedge, 2003; Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021; Tienda, 2013), as well as on the structural diversity policies in place at universities (e.g., Iverson, 2007; 2012). We have two aims with our chapter. First, we, as higher education teachers, need to become better at handling issues of diversity in our educational practices and preparing students to better understand and handle these issues. Second, we should create more awareness of different points of view among both staff and students. Since universities should focus on creating safe, accommodating, and respectful places also in practice, discussions on how we handle diversity and differences in practice at our own institutions and in our courses are therefore key. In our endeavour to contribute to unpacking the nexus between teaching, diversity, and awareness, we here in this chapter focus on key aspects pertaining to diversity awareness, cultural sensitivity, and diverse knowledge. Through discussions and readings, we chose four key aspects that we wish to present here (though there are of course many more we could have explored further). First, we explore diversity teaching. Second, we look at 'onsite' diversity. This refers to what Denson and Bowman (2013) call *structural diversity*, i.e., student body composition. We also acknowledge and include staff and faculty in this 'onsite' diversity. Third, we pay attention to processes of 'us and them', and the intergroup relations that diversity often implies. Fourth, we look at the need for diverse knowledge. In a decolonialist approach, one needs to consider who the students are hearing from, who has conducted the research they read, and who is included as knowledge producers. Combined, these four speak to the nexus between teaching, diversity, and awareness. Before discussing these four key aspects, however, we present our chosen theoretical positioning: cultural psychology, which offers an approach for seeing the mutual influence between people and culture.

CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY AND INTENTIONAL WORLDS

Shweder (1991) explained cultural psychology as the study of intentional worlds, which to him is a way of looking at how members of a group order their lives. Communal participation creates this common intentional world, and the people of the community order their lives based on such worlds (see also Cresswell, 2009). Shweder (1991, p. 76) further describes cultural psychology as 'the study of personal functioning in particular intentional worlds. It is the study of the interpersonal maintenance of any intentional world.' The key is thereby that nothing simply is as it is; the focus pertaining to these intentional worlds is that human views of reality are always the product of how the topic or issue at hand has been presented, represented, and contextualised, and what reactions are seen as fitting. Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013, p. 34) simplified and unpacked Shweder's intentional worlds, stipulating the following four main points: '(1) intentional worlds are filled with cultural patterns inherited from prior generations, (2) the worlds are subjectively experienced as reality, (3) intentional worlds direct and shape human experience, and (4) individuals actively facilitate, repress, and transform the cultural stuff that makes up the intentional world'. This shows how the nexus between teaching, diversity, and awareness could benefit from awareness of frameworks such as Shweder's intentional worlds.

To exemplify, Shweder (1991, p. 75) talked about weeds: 'Because a weed is a weed is a weed, but only in some intentional world, there is no impersonal, neutral, "objective," "scientific," independent-of-human-response, botanical, genetic, or "natural kind" definition of plants that we can specify in the abstract or in general which ones count as weeds.' In one setting, a particular flower is an unwanted weed. For example, one of us was working at a tourist office in the north of Norway as a student. One day, a flabbergasted Asian tourist came into the office asking what the Norwegian economy was really like. She had driven the length of the country, and every ditch was handled by a gardener, she said, who had planted the most beautiful flowers. Were we really hiring gardeners to take care of the outback in this country? The flower in question was *chamaenerion angustifolium*, known as rosebay willowherb in the UK and Ireland (fireweed in US English; *geitrams* in Norwegian). The flower is tall and purple, and in Norway it is seen as a weed. The tourist saw it as beautiful and purposely planted. What plants are categorised as weeds, and whether the plant is attractive and wanted or a nuisance, depends on time and place, and the intentional world one belongs to and whether that world has constructed the plant as a weed. Shweder (1991) also called for discussions on how the intentionality of the world strengthens or goes against the intentionality of the

person. This could further relate to agency, as it explores how groups choose or make their own intentional world, or otherwise 'end up living in an intentional world created or selected by others' (Shweder, 1991, p. 103). This agency issue is focal in looking at diversity discourses and intentional worlds.

In terms of culture, a binary categorisation has been between a static reading of culture on the one hand and a more dynamic reading on the other hand. Elphinstone (2018) contrasts the essentialist cultural frame (e.g., Hofstede, 1980) against a view of culture as being socially constructed (e.g., Garneau & Pepin, 2015). The essentialist cultural frame holds that people can be categorised into groups based on their cultural background. Långstedt (2018, p. 293) argued that the 'essentialist cross-cultural management paradigm legitimises a discourse that undermines the agency of people with different cultural backgrounds'. In such an essentialist frame, the culture becomes singular and does not allow for extensive pluralism and intra-group variation. This thus may become a relatively simplistic reading of culture. We base our own take on culture on Elphinstone's constructivist take on culture, about which she noted that 'I favour a constructivist cultural perspective, recognising that not all members of a cultural group will behave in similar ways or hold the same values, and that identity refers to what *we do*, not simply who *we are*' (p. 50, drawing on Hassim & Sedick, 2016). Thus, this differs from the essentialist view focusing on what a person 'has' or 'belongs to', rather than what is 'done' (see discussion in Långstedt, 2018). Moreover, Hong and Mallorie (2004) argued that an individual could hold more than one cultural meaning system, overlapping with social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and its work on multiple and dynamic identities. Simply put, we all belong to many different groups. The groups we see ourselves as belonging to are our ingroups. Outgroups are relevant groups we do not see ourselves as belonging to. The theory postulates that we tend to favour our own groups, as we need to draw positive self-esteem from our group memberships. The constructivist view of culture is in line with Shweder's intentional worlds. Shweder (2000) emphasised that if one had the 'right' perspective on issues of culture, negative intergroup issues could be reduced, as views of self and others would be influenced by how one saw culture. For example, in a study by Adams et al. (2008), teaching students about racism based on an understanding of intentional worlds resulted in more perceptions among the students that racism was based on systemic issues, compared with those who received a rather more 'mainstream' psychological portrayal of racism (i.e., more static and essentialist).

In the following section, we return to our four key aspects regarding the nexus between teaching, diversity, and awareness. First, we explore diversity teaching. Second, we look at structural diversity, i.e., student body composition as well as that of the faculty. Third, we pay particular attention to processes of 'us and them'. Fourth, we look at the need for diverse knowledge.

DIVERSITY TEACHING

In an increasingly globalised world, students need to learn cultural competence (e.g., Cranney & Dalton, 2012; Velayo, 2012), as do educators (Keith, 2012). Higher education institutions have been urged to 'develop students' intercultural sensitivity and competence to prepare them as professionals and as citizens for the requirements of a globalising world' (Van Melle, 2020, p. 8). As graduates enter an increasingly diverse working life, they need skills in both diversity awareness and cultural sensitivity; however, 'intercultural sensitivity and competence development do not occur automatically. Learning interventions are required for the development in this' (Van Melle, 2020, p. 8).

Many higher education institutions have targeted inclusiveness as a strategic value, which impacts their learning and teaching, research, and institutional cultures (though there is extensive variation in the conceptualisation of inclusive pedagogics, as discussed by Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021). Claeys-Kulik et al. (2019) highlight the role of education in facilitating health, civic, and cultural participation. They investigated 159 higher education institutions across 36 European systems and noted the growth of diverse learning environments better preparing students for a diverse research environment and society. On another note, allowing academic knowledge to feed into students' lived experiences and frames of reference would make it 'more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and this facilitates the intuitive learning experience' (Jabbar & Hardaker, 2013, p. 274) (see also Krashnoff, 2016, for a systematic overview of culturally responsive teaching containing a guide to evidence-based practices enabling to teach all students equitably).

Many diversity-related activities are available. Elphinstone (2018) mentions two simulation activities: the BaFá BaFá (Shirts, 1977) and the culture-general assimilator (Brislin, 1986). The former is an approach where students are divided into two groups representing two distinct cultures with different sets of values and behaviours. The students then have to visit and observe one another, trying to learn and grasp the norms and procedures of the other culture. After this, they participate in a session where they talk about stereotypes, misconceptions, conclusions, and attitudes, as well as the need for being open and cooperative in interacting with others (see Dunn et al., 2011).[2] As for the culture-general assimilator, it provides 100 incidents with a short storyline that include a cultural misunderstanding. Students are then presented with different alternatives as to why this cultural miscommunication occurred, and rate how well those explain the situation. They are then given feedback on their choice and learn why a certain explanation may best fit the story. Both these approaches have been found to offer students much-needed cultural preparation (Elphinstone, 2018). It should however be emphasised that particularly

the BaFá BaFá has been criticised for a more essentialist approach to culture, where the approach 'overgeneralise[s] cultural diversity into only two discrete categories' (Kim & Ofori-Dankwa, 1995, p. 482).

A pertinent issue to be aware of and address is unconscious bias ('habits of the mind'), and create awareness in terms of how we, by examining our own beliefs, become conscious of self, and evaluate processes used and how they affect our perceptions and decision-making. Numerous neurological tests and exercises, such as the 'Implicit Association Test' (IAT), could help students – the future leaders and managers – to identify unconscious biases, reflect on these, and through this attempt to reduce their influence. It is also important to move beyond these awareness-raising tests towards actively reflecting on our own practices, and on how all of us and our practices are influenced by our biases. Learning cultural competence entails learning how to respectfully respond to and meet people of all backgrounds and walks of life in ways ensuring dignity (Elphinstone, 2018; Lum, 2011). To do so, institutionally structured courses, teaching, and initiatives are important, but cultural competence goes beyond that. In a question-and-answer session with Professor of Psychology and Education, Derald Sue, Sue emphasised: 'First, formal training through workshops and academic work is required. However, that is not enough. Cultural competence is more than cognitive and intellectual understanding…. Cultural competence must be obtained through experiential reality' (Tracey, 2006, p. 49). Several scholars similarly emphasise that gaining cultural competence is likely to be a never-ending process (Garneau & Pepin, 2015).

An important point to include comes from research by Miller et al. (2019), where they look at the emotional labour (drawing on Hochschild) involved in teaching, and how this is often gendered and racialised. They explore how this is experienced by participants teaching diversity courses. Some of the participants in the study talked about the disproportionate amount of emotional labour they spent in caring for students who shared underrepresented identities, often because they knew there were not others present or willing to do this work. Others spoke about their decisions not to perform emotional labour because they believed they were ill-suited, for whatever reason, to do so; these participants were often white and/or male and less often sought out by students to perform such work. Here Miller and colleagues emphasise that such cross-category mentoring (across culture, gender, race) is important for higher education institutions in constructing a diverse atmosphere (e.g. Reddick, 2012). Miller and colleagues say: 'People who have historically been privileged in higher education spaces must do more and better work, which includes lifting the sole burden of emotional labor off those who "are good at it"' (p. 499).

LEARNING FROM 'ONSITE' DIVERSITY

Denson and Bowman (2013) defined structural diversity as student body composition, including students' cultural backgrounds, class backgrounds, gendered experiences, and all features which make them both similar and different. As a starting point for the point on learning from 'onsite' diversity, we draw on Omland and Andenæs (2018), who wrote about young unaccompanied asylum seekers. They emphasised that, while this was an at-risk-group, 'research focusing on the characteristics that define them as such, and thus differentiate them from other young persons, may inadvertently hinder an understanding of these boys as similar to other young people' (p. 79). The balance between the specific and general, or the different and similar, is a focal starting point, as differentiating too much can lead to exotification and reify differences rather than similarities.

Diverse universities can contribute to preparing students for diversity. Research, particularly from the US, but also from Australia and elsewhere, has demonstrated the benefits of culturally and racially diverse school environments. Denson and Bowman (2013, p. 556) pointed out that such universities could create 'richly varied educational experiences that help students learn and prepare them for participation in an increasingly diverse world' (see also Bowen & Bok, 1998; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005). In a study by Wells et al. (2008), students at a diverse high school reported that the key outcome for them was that they became more at ease with diverse people, as well as more accepting of them. This, again, could better prepare them, not only for the diverse workforce they will meet, but also for interactions in the society at large. In a study at the University of Michigan, Laird (2005) found that students who had more extensive experiences with diversity, both in terms of courses and positive contact with fellow students of different backgrounds, scored higher on social agency, critical thinking, and academic self-confidence. Jayakumar (2008) explored the relationship between white students' exposure to racial diversity in college and their post-college 'cross-cultural workforce competencies', concluding that 'postsecondary institutions may provide lasting benefits to white students by promoting a positive racial climate for a racially diverse student body' (p. 615). The above examples are mainly based on racial or ethnic diversity. Bice-Wigington and Morgan (2018, p. 393) emphasise that one needs 'to move beyond a historic understanding of diversity and difference' to awareness that better captures the contexts and breadth of diversity. In their article they focus on place diversity, discussing rural areas compared to central areas, thus reminding us of the broad and varied potentials for engaging with and learning from 'onsite' diversity.

Making the most of cultural diversity on university campuses with, for example, exchange students or international students also leaves much to be desired, in our experience. According to Wright and Lander (2003, p. 250), 'universities are deluding themselves if they believe that the presence of international students on campus contributes to the internationalisation of higher education'. Research in different areas of the world has found that the interaction between national students and international students has often been very limited (e.g., Smart et al., 2000; Volet & Ang, 1998). In an international class one of the authors of this chapter taught, this was very much the case: the international students would stick together, as would the Norwegian students. This became apparent within the classroom, as students would choose to sit in the same spot class after class, and together with the same people, and opt to work together on assignments.

In one of the courses taught, precisely on diversity and social identity theory, the author brought up these observations, leading to a discussion in the classroom on how we have been used to dividing ourselves into groups, and how that could influence our approach to tasks and group dynamics, as well as the end results. These examples allude to the importance of having teachers at higher education institutions who actively seek to address and discuss issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI, or DEIB: 'diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging'), in close collaboration with students. This can hold important implications for awareness among students both within the classroom and, importantly, after graduation.

Faculty composition is also important when discussing 'onsite' diversity. Research has investigated racial diversity in higher education institutions and equitable student access in the US. When it comes to undergraduate students of colour in the US, the percentage has risen from about 30 per cent in 1996 to 45 per cent in 2016 (Espinosa et al., 2019). This number is expected to increase in the years to come (Frey, 2018). But despite concrete efforts and an 'increase in students of colour, a concomitant rise in faculty diversity is not evident, and most faculties remain predominately white. White professors comprise 76% of US college and university faculty while Black, Latinx, and Native American professors account for approximately 11% of full-time faculty members combined' (Grier & Poole, 2020a, p. 1190).

Hence, while numerous higher education institutions have taken concrete action to make it easier for people from 'traditionally less-represented backgrounds to find their place in higher education' (see Claeys-Kulik et al., 2019, p. 9), several recent examples act as counter-narratives, such as underlying racially discriminatory practices of faculty hiring (e.g., Muñoz et al., 2017, p. 1). Responding to why higher education institutions have lacked diversity among faculty members, Marybeth Gasman, Director of Penn GSE's Center for Minority Serving Institutions, points to such racially discriminatory prac-

tices. She received much attention after she wrote an essay in *The Washington Post* in 2016, noting: 'The reason [higher education institutions] don't have more faculty of colour among college faculty is that we don't want them. We simply don't want them.'[3] Gasman has provided workshops tied to diversifying faculties across the US, and in her *Washington Post* essay, she further explained how to create a more diverse pipeline of successful candidates and pointed out the benefits of a diverse faculty. Gasman (2016) wrote that having a diverse faculty 'in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion – adds greatly to the experiences of the students in the classroom (…) It also challenges them to move away from a "white-centered" approach to one that is inclusive of many different voices and perspectives.' Recent examples highlight that diversity is on the rise among college presidents following the focus on institutional racism and societal inequality.[4] In the wake of the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery and too many others, numerous corporations have responded by issuing public statements in support of Black Lives Matters, turning Juneteenth (commemorating the end of slaverly) into a company holiday, and so on (Grier & Poole, 2020b). Grier and Poole (2020b, p. 378) argue that 'While these actions are surely steps in the right direction, they only scratch the surface of the long-standing problems of racism and inequality that have historically plagued our society.'

US AND THEM

Diversity is related to existing and potential categorisations of 'us' and 'them'. Howarth and Andreouli (2016) empirically illustrated how diversity was experienced, drawing on qualitative data from schools across England. They noted that communities were not based on either diversity or commonality, instead the focus was on commonalities *through* diversity:

> … a forged perspective through the recognition of different views. This is not a question of diversity as a threat to community, but a matter of diversity as a means to build community. Solidarity can be built on the basis of recognition of diversity, not its denial. (Howarth & Andreouli, 2016, p. 330)

There were examples of approaches based on demonstrating and teaching the pupils about difference, and to respect and value those differences. An example included a cultural day where people would wear 'their own clothes' from their 'homelands'. The pupils however did not enjoy this activity. Howarth and Andreouli (2016, p. 334) explain that

> … such activities can be seen to establish or reify difference and position pupils in two clear camps: English and outsider; us and them. This limits the expression of more hybrid and contextualised identities despite the fact that some feel both

English and Asian, narrows the representation of 'Englishness' and so may support subtle forms of othering and discrimination. Hence there can be a real danger to 'celebrating difference' in the school practices for managing diversity; in trying to promote respect for difference, they end up reifying difference and so maintaining intergroup boundaries.

This speaks to the point Omland and Andenæs (2018) raised regarding young unaccompanied asylum seekers, who quickly become seen as 'more different' than they are, with people ignoring that one of their main purposes is that of being youth like other youth. It also speaks to the observations by Clarke and Newman (2019) on allowing for complex identities, rather than singular, simplistic identities, more akin to essentialist readings of culture. In research, including in psychology, individuals have often been defined by singular characteristics rather than there being room for plural and complex categorisations (see Billig, 1996). According to Clarke and Newman (2019, p. 69), these result in 'categorical distinctions between segments of the population (…) and treat both the locations and the dispositions as singular'. Through such simplistic handling of people's positions on different phenomena, one risks ignoring both variation and heterogeneity (Buhagiar & Sammut, 2020; see also discussion in Moss & Solheim, 2022).

Concomitantly with this, and in light of a more globalised society, Hong and Mallorie (2004) called for an understanding of the existence of multiple cultural systems, something they argued was seldom considered. For the purposes of this chapter, it is thus pivotal to keep in mind that our social identities are dynamic and can change (Levine et al., 2005), and that they depend on the setting and situation one is in. For example, in the classroom, one is seen as a student, while other characteristics such as ethnicity, age, and gender might also add into the perception. A person may hold other identities simultaneously, as a parent, a sibling, a football coach, and so on. In other words, people hold multiple identities, and the intentional world framework could assist us in grasping the superdiversity of many societies today. This also ties into intersectionality perspectives, which emphasises that 'subjectivity is constituted by multiple, interrelated dimensions of experience' (Kurtiş & Adams, 2016).

An approach to diversity which takes on such complexities in a different way than the 'cultural day' example above, can be found in Liu (2020). He addressed cultural diversity in music programmes in the classroom, highlighting that allowing students to share music with which they engaged outside the classroom was a great starting point: 'Inviting students to bring in music that matters to them helps them develop their own voices and to recognise and respect different voices, through which we acknowledge the complexity and multiplicity of how diversity plays out in human experiences' (p. 97). Liu's example illustrates the facilitation of student engagement based on honouring

students' personal tastes and preferences. Thus, there is room to draw on different cultural heritages if wanted, to draw on the music of the majority culture or music from other places. A broader and more constructivist stance on culture is hence allowed, rather than a more essentialist version where one may feel reduced to what one is born as. Liu (2020) channelled first-hand experience as a public-school music teacher struggling 'over the selection of music materials that are relevant and meaningful to my students', asking:

> How do I create a space that acknowledges the diverse cultures of my students but also leaves room for exploration? As a person of Chinese descent, I am well aware that one's musical identity does not necessarily align with the appeared racial/ethnic identity, not to mention the fluidity and variety of one's musical interest. Surely my intention here is not to discourage music teachers to stop incorporating diversity in the curriculum altogether but to acknowledge the complexity and multiplicity of how diversity plays out in human experiences. (Liu, 2020, pp. 97–98)

THE NEED FOR DIVERSE KNOWLEDGE

In most, if not all, academic disciplines today, theories and concepts are mainly grounded in and developed from a European-American perspective (e.g., for psychology, see Sue, 2001; van de Vijver, 2013). The knowledge to which we expose our students via theories, examples, and findings is thus narrow. Tracing who we are hearing from in academia shows a clear overemphasis on Europe and America. This is reflected in students' reading lists, potentially influencing what is seen as 'true' and what variety of knowledge and findings the students can access (see for example Adetula et al., 2022). Knowledge is thereby produced and reproduced within specific intentional worlds. This is also an issue within the European-American context itself, as some people are given more representation than others. A related example from business schools is the substantial lack of diversity in published case studies, often employed in teaching at such institutions to showcase real or imagined business-related scenarios. Of the approximately 19,000 cases available on Harvard Business Publishing (HBP) – which, according to the Berkeley Haas Center for Equity, Gender, and Leadership (2020), comprise 80 per cent of the cases used in business schools globally – only 1 per cent include a Black executive as a protagonist or central decision-making figure (see also Ethier, 2017).

This could lead to the maintenance and reinforcement of the status quo of executives as white and male (Berkeley Haas Center for Equity, Gender, and Leadership, 2020). In a similar vein, Morris (2017) described a gathering of the White House Council of Economic Advisors, where more than 150 deans and leaders of business schools met to discuss a report prescribing 'best practices'. The premise was to prepare students to enter the 21st-century workforce, and

the 'best practices' report addressed specific case studies in its recommendations, urging writers to make

> case studies more representative and [ensure] that they reflect modern workplaces. For example, showing diversity in leaders solving a wide range of problems is important to illustrate the wide range of diversity in the business community. This includes showing women and minorities in more significant line management roles and/or as the main protagonist in the case. (Morris, 2017, p. 499)

Referring to Symons (2016), Morris (2017) reported that most published cases featured white male protagonists, and that female and minority protagonists were underrepresented (only one out of the 21 award-winning cases from 2015 to 2016 featured a female protagonist). Because of this awareness, and considering too few cases comprising protagonists representing minorities, strategic actions have been taken. One example of this is the MBA Student Association that acted through the 'Juneteenth Case Pledge'[5] reaching out to commit faculty members to writing a case featuring a Black protagonist.[6] This received great attention and efforts were put in to write cases, and Jan Hammond (Senior Associate Dean for Culture and Community at Harvard Business School), stated that 'Our students are right that protagonist diversity matters. By studying cases with a wide diversity of protagonists, students learn that talent and leadership come from all background and identities' and 'If students don't understand that they'll worsen inequities, miss out on opportunities for themselves, and miss chances to create opportunities for others.'[7]

Another aspect is who is positioned and legitimised as producers of knowledge. In his chapter 'A reflection on the politics of knowledge production at South African universities: When black identity meets legacies of institutional racism', Maseko (2020) explored who got to engage in knowledge production. He discusses who the 'typical' knowledge producers have been, also in South Africa, looking at the impact of the longstanding reduction of Africans to research subjects rather than as legitimate knowledge producers. A possible means to avoid such a narrow approach to knowledge is to engage in thinking 'otherwise' (Escobar, 2007) or 'turning the lens' (Adams & Salter, 2007). This would entail:

> … using the epistemic perspective and knowledge formations of racially subordinated communities as a privileged standpoint from which to generate critical consciousness about hegemonic accounts of reality in general. This process of critical consciousness entails both recognition of the White-washed roots of mainstream constructions of reality and a search for alternative constructions that better reflect and promote the aspirations of broader humanity. (Adams et al., 2018, p. 341)

This resonates with Shweder's call for a focus on the risk that people would end up 'living in an intentional world created or selected by others' (Shweder, 1991, p. 103). Hence, the issue of agency is crucial in examining diversity discourses and intentional worlds, and educators and students should continually be asking which knowledge 'counts' and which is potentially discounted by our approaches? What literature is included into the reading lists? Whom are the students hearing from? What intentional worlds are included and excluded? Such reflexivity and critical discussions can also serve to empower the students to evaluate their own positionality.

FOSTERING A DIVERSE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT WITH MEANINGFUL INTERACTIONS

Alongside previous research highlighting diversity as much more attainable than inclusion (Shore et al., 2018), one knows that higher education institutions have a long way to go to ensure the representation of minorities among both students and faculty. Therefore, one needs to work towards inclusive environments where people feel they can be fully themselves (if they want to), and where it is safe to critically explore, discuss, and contribute. Putnam (2007) emphasised the need to create room for people from various backgrounds to meet, interact, and learn from another:

> We need more opportunities for meaningful interaction across ethnic lines where Americans (new and old) work, learn, recreate and live. Community centres, athletic fields, and schools were among the most efficacious instruments for incorporating new immigrants a century ago, and we need to reinvest in such places and activities once again, enabling us all to become comfortable with diversity. (Putnam, 2007, p. 164)

Such notions signify becoming comfortable with diversity and bridging various group divides. Creating a higher-education culture where students feel they belong and can contribute facilitates the sharing of knowledge and open-minded discussions, where people can interact meaningfully across groups. This would depend on a structure and system emphasising these issues towards forming inclusive learning environments.

One of the authors of this chapter has been involved in many diversity, equity, and inclusion projects. What most often becomes apparent is that managers tend to lack the language needed to address matters of diversity and inclusion. At the same time, it is crucial to ensure that our education systems can facilitate interaction across groups, while delving into differences and learning more about intercultural sensitivity.

In a time marked by globalisation and increased migration, the incoming workforce must acquire the cultural competence and ability to work with

people from various backgrounds and birthplaces. Moreover, as identified by the World Economic Forum,[8] important future skills include complex problem-solving, creativity, and innovation, all of which diversity has been proven to foster (see, e.g., Solheim et al., 2020, on experience diversity and the novelty content of innovation; and Solheim & Fitjar, 2018, on foreign-born workers, international networks, and innovation).

Future research should delve into issues of diversity in higher education institutions within various contexts, as much of the literature addressed has been focused on narratives from the West. Looking at issues of diversity and teaching elsewhere, using Shweder's intentional worlds, could contribute to wider, contextualised discussions of diversity, awareness, and teaching. The COVID-19 pandemic has further spurred discussion on inequality and precarious situations; as students attend class remotely, the different living situations affecting their well-being and productivity come to the fore, alongside related issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Simultaneously, the pandemic forced us to advance technological solutions, making the world even smaller, and potentially enabling more people to take more active part in these various discussions and students to hear from more diverse voices.

NOTES

1.   See https://sdgs.un.org/goals.
2.   For the training material, see www.simulationtrainingsystems.com.
3.   https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/09/26/an-ivy
   -league-professor-on-why-colleges-dont-hire-more-faculty-of-color-we-dont
   -want-them/.
4.   https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/02/14/colleges-have-hired-more
   -minority-presidents-amid-racial-reckoning.
5.   https://www.hbs.edu/news/articles/Pages/juneteenth-case-pledge.aspx.
6.   https://www.hbs.edu/news/articles/Pages/case-protagonists.aspx.
7.   https://www.hbs.edu/news/articles/Pages/case-protagonists.aspx.
8.   https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/10/top-10-work-skills-of-tomorrow
   -how-long-it-takes-to-learn-them/.

REFERENCES

Adams, G., & Salter, P.S. (2007). Health psychology in African settings: A cultural-psychological analysis. *Journal of Health Psychology, 12*(3), 539–551.

Adams, G., Edkins, V., Lacka, D., Pickett, K.M., & Cheryan, S. (2008). Teaching about racism: Pernicious implications of the standard portrayal. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 349–361.

Adams, G., Salter, P.S., Kurtiş, T., Naemi, P., & Estrada-Villalta, S. (2018). Subordinated knowledge as a tool for creative maladjustment and resistance to racial oppression. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(2), 337–354.

Adetula, A., Forscher, P. S., Basnight-Brown, D., Azouaghe, S., & IJzerman, H. (2022). Psychology should generalize from—not just to—Africa. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *1*(7), 370–371.

Augoustinos, M., & Every, D. (2007). Contemporary racist discourse: Taboos against racism and racist accusations. In *Language, discourse and social psychology* (pp. 233–254). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berkeley Haas Center for Equity, Gender and Leadership. (2020). *The state of diversity, equity & inclusion in business school case studies*. https://www.haas.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/EGAL-_Case-Compendium_-Analysis_Final.pdf.

Bice-Wigington, T., & Morgan, K. (2018). Teaching note: Diversity and difference through a rural lens. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *54*(2), 392–396.

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (2nd edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Brislin, R. W. (1986). A culture general assimilator: Preparation for various types of sojourns. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *10*(2), 215–234.

Buhagiar, L. J., & Sammut, G. (2020). 'Social re-presentation for …': An action-oriented formula for intergroup relations research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 352.

Claeys-Kulik, A.-L., Jørgensen, T. E. & Stöber, H. (2019). Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in European Higher Education Institutions. Results from the INVITED project, retrieved from https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/web_diversity%20equity%20and%20inclusion%20in%20european%20higher%20education%20institutions.pdf.

Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (2019). What's the subject? Brexit and politics as articulation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(1), 67–77.

Cranney, J., & Dalton, H. (2012). Optimising adaptive student behaviours. In J.E. Groccia, M.A.T. Alsudairi, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective* (pp. 60–76). New York, NY: Sage.

Cresswell, J. (2009). Towards a post-critical praxis: Intentional states and recommendations for change in acculturation psychology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *33*(2), 162–172.

Denson, N., & Bowman, N. (2013). University diversity and preparation for a global society: the role of diversity in shaping intergroup attitudes and civic outcomes, *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(4), 555–570.

Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2009). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American Educational Research Journal*, *46*(2), 322–353.

Dunn, T. P., Meine, M. F., & Dunn, S. L. (2011). The Bafá Bafá simulation revisited: A new way to address diversity issues in public administration initiatives that involve citizen engagement. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations*, *10*(6), 221–229.

Elphinstone, L. (2018). Cultural competence for teachers and students. In K. Keith (Ed.), *Culture across the curriculum. A psychology teacher's handbook* (pp. 46–67). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Escobar, A. (2007). Worlds and knowledges otherwise: The Latin American modernity/coloniality research program. *Cultural Studies*, *21*(2–3), 179–210.

Espinosa, L. L., Turk, J. M., Taylor, M., & Chessman, H. M. (2019). *Race and ethnicity in higher education: A status report*. Washington, DC: Higher Education Policy for Minorities in the United States.

Ethier, M. (2017, April 27). HBS case studies need diversity – Now. Poets & Quants. Retrieved from https://poetsandquants.com/business-school-news/hbs-prof-case-studies-need-diversity-now/?pq-category=business-school-news&pq_category=business-school-news.

Favell, A. (2020). Crossing the race line: 'No Polish, No Blacks, No Dogs' in Brexit Britain? Or, the Great British Brexit Swindle. In F. Duina, & F. Merand (Eds.), *Europe's Malaise* (Research in Political Sociology, Vol. 27) (pp. 1–41). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Frey, W. (2018). *Diversity explosion: How new racial demographics are remaking America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Garneau, A. B., & Pepin, J. (2015). Cultural competence: A constructivist definition. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 26,* 9–15.

Gasman, M. (2016, September 26). An Ivy League professor on why colleges don't hire more faculty of color: 'We don't want them'. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/09/26/an-ivy-league-professor-on-whycolleges-dont-hire-more-faculty-of-color-we-dont-want-them/.

Grier, S. A., & Poole, S. M. (2020a). Reproducing inequality: The role of race in the business school faculty search. *Journal of Marketing Management, 36,* 1190–1222.

Grier, S.A., & Poole, S. M. (2020b). Will social marketing fight for black lives? An open letter to the field. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 26*(4), 378–387.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72,* 330–366.

Hassim, J., & Sedick, S. (2016). Developing cultural competencies in collectivist contexts. In K. Lowell (Ed.), *Cultural competence: Elements, developments and emerging trends* (pp. 21–48). Hauppage, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. New York, NY: Sage.

Hong, Y., & Mallorie, L. M. (2004). A dynamic constructivist approach to culture: Lessons learned from personality psychology. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *38*(1), 59–67.

Howarth, C., & Andreouli, E. (2016). Nobody wants to be an outsider: From diversity management to diversity engagement. *Political Psychology, 37*(3), 327–340.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 595–610.

Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(5), 586–611.

Iverson, S. V. (2012). Constructing outsiders: The discursive framing of access in university diversity policies. *The Review of Higher Education*, *35*(2), 149–177.

Jabbar, A., & Hardaker, G. (2013). The role of culturally responsive teaching for supporting ethnic diversity in British University Business Schools. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18*(3), 272–284.

Jayakumar, U. (2008). Can higher education meet the needs of an increasingly diverse and global society? Campus diversity and cross-cultural workforce competencies. *Harvard Educational Review 78*(4), 615–651.

Keith, K. D. (2012). Culture and teaching. Lessons from psychology. In J.E. Groccia, M.A.T. Alsudairi, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective* (pp. 156–170). New York, NY: Sage.

Kim, P. S., & Ofori-Dankwa, J. (1995). Utilising cultural theory as a basis for cross-cultural training: an alternative approach. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *18*(4), 478–500.

King, M. L., Jr. (1968). The role of the behavioral scientist in the Civil Rights movement. *Journal of Social Issues*, *24*(1), 1–12.

Krashnoff, B. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching: A guide to evidence-based practices for teaching all students equitably.* Region X Equity Assistance Center Education Northwest, culturally-responsive-teaching.pdf (educationnorthwest.org).

Kurtiş, T., & Adams, G. (2016). Decolonial intersectionality: Implications for theory, research, and pedagogy. In K.A. Case (Ed.) *Intersectional pedagogy: Complicating identity and social justice* (pp. 46–60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Laird, T. F. N. (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), 365–387.

Långstedt, J. (2018). Culture, an excuse? – A critical analysis of essentialist assumptions in cross-cultural management research and practice. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *18*(3), 293–308.

Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4), 443–453.

Liu, C. -W. (2020). Exploring diverse voices in the classroom. *General Music Today* *33*(2), 97–99.

Lum, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Culturally competent practice: A framework for understanding diverse group and justice issues* (4th edn.). Pacific Grove, CA: Thomson Brooks/ Cole.

Maseko, S. (2020). A reflection on the politics of knowledge production at South African universities: When black identity meets legacies of institutional racism. In Y. Acar, S.M. Moss, & O.M. Ulug (Eds.), *Researching peace, conflict, and power in the field* (pp. 301–319). Cham: Springer.

Miller, R. A., Howell, C. D., & Struve, L. (2019). 'Constantly, excessively, and all the time': The emotional labor of teaching diversity courses. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *31*(3), 491–502.

Morris, R. J. (2017). Underrepresented minority protagonists: An impactful opportunity. *The CASE Journal*, *13*(5), 589–591.

Moss, S. M., & Solheim, M. C. W. (2022). Shifting diversity discourses and new feeling rules? The case of Brexit. *Human Arenas*, *5*, 488–508.

Muñoz, S. M., Basile, V., Gonzalez, J., Birmingham, D., Aragon, A., Jennings, L., & Gloeckner, G. (2017). (Counter)narratives and complexities: Critical perspectives from a university cluster hire focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis, 6*(2), 1–21.

Northedge, A. (2003). Rethinking teaching in the context of diversity. *Teaching in higher education*, *8*(1), 17–32.

Omland, G. B., & Andenæs, A. (2018). Negotiating developmental projects: Unaccompanied Afghan refugee boys in Norway. *Childhood*, *25*(1), 78–92.

Özden, Ç., Parsons, C.R., Schiff, M., & Walmsley, T. L. (2011). Where on earth is everybody? The evolution of global bilateral migration 1960–2000. *The World Bank Economic Review 25*(1), 12–56.

Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum. Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*(1), 137–174.

Reddick, R. J. (2012). Male faculty mentors in Black and White. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 1*(1), 36–53.

Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). Intentional worlds and global citizenship. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 3(*1), 34–52.

Shirts, R. G. (1977). *BaFá BaFá – A cross-cultural simulation.* Simile II.

Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N, & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review, 28*(2), 176–189.

Shweder, R. A. (1991). Thinking through cultures: Expeditions in cultural psychology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shweder, R. A. (2000). Moral maps, 'first world' conceits, and the new evangelists. In L.E. Harrison, & S.P. Huntington (Eds.), *Culture matters: How values shape human progress* (pp. 158–176). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Smart, D., Volet, S., & Ang, G. (2000). *Fostering social cohesion in universities: Bridging the cultural divide.* Canberra: Australian Education International.

Solheim, M. C. W., & Fitjar, R. D. (2018). Foreign workers are associated with innovation, but why? International networks as a mechanism. *International Regional Science Review, 41*(3), 311–334.

Solheim, M. C. W., Boschma, R., & Herstad, S. J. (2020). Collected worker experiences and the novelty content of innovation. *Research Policy, 49*(1), 103856.

Stentiford, L., & Koutsouris, G. (2021). What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education? A systematic scoping review. *Studies in Higher Education, 46*(11), 2245–2261.

Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counselling Psychologist, 29*(6), 790–821.

Symons, L. (2016, March 9). Only 11% of top business school case studies have a female protagonist. *Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2016/03/only-11-of-top-business-school-case-studies-have-a-female-protagonist?.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Pacific Grove, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Tienda, M. (2013). Diversity ≠ inclusion: Promoting integration in higher education. *Educational Researcher, 42*(9), 467–475.

Tracey, M. D. (2006, February). Q&A with Derald Sue: Gaining cultural competence. *Monitor on Psychology, 37*(29), 49.

Van de Vijver, F. J. (2013). Contributions of internationalisation to psychology: Toward a global and inclusive discipline. *American Psychologist, 68*(8), 761–770.

Van Melle, J. (2020). *Developing students' intercultural sensitivity: A technical action research study at an international business school in the Netherlands* (Also known as the 'Shoe Sole Project') [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Liverpool].

Velayo, R. S. (2012). Internationalising the curriculum. In J.E. Groccia, M.A.T. Alsudairi, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective* (pp. 268–278). New York, NY: Sage.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–1054.

Virdee, S., & McGeever, B. (2018). Racism, crisis, Brexit. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 41*, 1802–1819.

Volet, S., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. *Higher Education Research and Development 17,* 5–23.

Wells, A. S., Duran, J., & White, T. (2008). Refusing to leave desegregation behind: From graduates of racially diverse schools to the Supreme Court. *Teachers College Record, 110*(12), 2532–2570.

Wright, S., & Lander, D. (2003). Collaborative group interactions of students from two ethnic backgrounds. *Higher Education Research & Development, 22*(3), 237–251.