DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 675   HE 027 517

AUTHOR   Tierney, William G.
TITLE   Multiculturalism in Higher Education: An
                Organizational Framework for Analysis.
INSTITUTION   National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning,
                and Assessment, University Park, PA.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
                Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   Feb 94
CONTRACT   R117G10037
NOTE   36p.
PUB TYPE   Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.)
                (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Change Strategies; *Colleges; *Cultural Pluralism;
                *Higher Education; Institutional Environment;
                Institutional Role; Multicultural Education;
                Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; *Self
                Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS   Foucault (Michel); Giroux (Henry); Hooks (Bell);
                *Postmodernism

ABSTRACT
        This article suggests that a critical postmodern
organizational perspective offers significant ways to assess an
institution of higher education's effectiveness. The first part of
the article outlines what is meant by "critical postmodernism" and
then delineates a definition of multiculturalism in higher education
based on the work of Henry Giroux, Michel Foucault, and bell hooks.
Critical postmodernists see the individual as object and subject in
history and locate action in a socio-historical realm that gets acted
out on a cultural terrain that is contested, redefined, and resisted.
Critical postmodernists believe that conflict is natural and to be
fostered in the struggle for empowerment. This section also offers a
definition of multiculturalism whereby it relates to the construction
of ideas pertaining to issues such as race, class, gender, and sexual
orientation. The second part develops a five-point organizational
framework that an institution's participants may employ in assessing
multiculturalism: (1) leadership, (2) structure, (3) decision-making,
(4) finance, and (5) socialization. The framework is intended to
provide a comprehensive way for an organization's participants to
think about, and then analyze and change an institution's efforts
toward increased multiculturalism. Contains 23 references. (JB)

ED 371 675

Multiculturalism in Higher Education:

An Organizational Framework for Analysis

William G. Tierney
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
403 South Allen Street, Suite 104
University Park, PA 16801-5252
(814) 865-6347

February 1994

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

In this article the author suggests that a critical postmodern organizational perspective offers significant ways to assess an institution's multicultural effectiveness. In the first part of the article the author outlines what is meant by "critical postmodernism" and then delineates a definition of multiculturalism in higher education based on the work of Giroux, Foucault, and hooks. In the article's second part the author develops a five-point organizational framework that an institution's participants may employ in assessing multiculturalism. The framework's points pertain to leadership, structure, decision-making, finance, and socialization. In doing so, the text offers a comprehensive way for an organization's participants to think about, and then analyze and change, an institution's efforts for multiculturalism.

During the last decade perhaps no topic has generated as much heated debate on college campuses as have discussions surrounding what is loosely called "multiculturalism." Arguments have occurred in virtually all areas of the academic enterprise. Some argue that the core requirement–the "Canon"–is Eurocentric, while others suggest that the race or gender of an author should be irrelevant when teaching the classics. The under representation of women faculty and faculty of color is of concern to some, and to others the issue is trivial (Hamermesh, 1992; Chronicle of Higher Education, 1992). A Board of Trustees' investment in businesses that operate in South Africa was a rejection of multiculturalism to some critics, while to others the action was based on sound business principles. The inclusion of a sexual orientation clause in an institution's statement of non-discrimination is seen by some as an affirmation of multiculturalism, and by others, it is a slap in the face to Christianity. That Black and Hispanic students are far less likely than white students to complete a degree is testimony to multiculturalists that postsecondary institutions are alien territory for individuals other than Anglos, while to others student retention has more to do with an individual's background than institutional racism (Green, 1989, p. 3).

I could continue and list additional areas of contention, but my simple point is that regardless of one's position on multiculturalism, it has become a major topic of discussion. The topic may be framed by four observations. First, definitions of multiculturalism vary according to different interpretations. Is an institution multicultural if it excludes consideration of lesbian and gay issues from its curricula? Is gender a multicultural issue? When individuals argue about multiculturalism they generally do so without using similar

1

definitions and unproblematically accept the term. Second, although I obviously have overdrawn both sides of the multicultural debate for reasons of clarity, in general, proponents and opponents talk past one another. Indeed, there are not two sides to the debate, but many. As the examples above highlight, multiculturalism is an issue for those who voice a concern about multiculturalism and it is another topic altogether for those who believe that issues of race, gender, sexual orientation and the like are not appropriate variables for making decisions. Third, most often when we have discussed multiculturalism we have not thought of it from an organizational perspective, but rather from the vantage point of a specific issue--the curriculum, hiring policies, investment practices, and the like. And fourth, the assessment of multiculturalism in higher education often relies on simple minded facts and figures based in a modernist world. An institution has increased its faculty of color by X percent, we often hear, therefore the institution may be evaluated positively for its efforts toward building a multicultural campus.

I have two goals for this article that address these observations. First, I suggest that a critical postmodernist organizational perspective offers powerful ways to assess an institution's multicultural effectiveness. Second, I develop an organizational framework which an institution's participants may employ as a way to think about, and change, policies and practices that relate to multiculturalism.

In what follows I call upon critical postmodernism as a theoretical framework for defining multiculturalism. In doing so, I have found the work of Henry Giroux (1990, 1992), Michel Foucault (1980), and bell hooks (1989, 1990) to be helpful. Instead of offering yet another critique of functionalism or positivism and merely offering the

fundamentals of critical postmodernism, I hope to highlight here how we might employ

these notions as a way to promote equity in educational assessment. Thus, I first briefly

sketch what I mean by critical postmodernism, then I define multiculturalism from this

perspective; in the article's second part I offer the scaffolding for how an organization's

participants might use this framework in analyzing multiculturalism in their organization.

Critical Postmodernism and Multiculturalism

Defining Critical Postmodernism

Because critical postmodernism itself is a relatively new idea and a contested term, a

brief definition is helpful. The idea is a blend of critical theory and postmodernism. On

the one hand, critical theory rejects the positivist ideal that knowledge is verifiable, logical,

and scientific, and instead asserts that all knowledge is socially and historically determined

and a consequence of power. The struggle is to understand the larger structural

relationships of society in order to change society. On the other hand, postmodernism

rejects the idea that absolutes exist. Any claim to metanarratives based on reason are

discarded in favor of multivocality. Postmodernism does not so much search to change

society, but rather understand one's position in it.

Critical postmodernists, notes William Tierney, see the individual "as both object

and subject in history, and locate action within a socio-historical realm that gets acted out

on a cultural terrain that is contested, redefined, and resisted. People are neither passive

objects incapable of resistance, nor are they unconstrained individuals able to determine

their own histories" (Tierney, p. 28, 1993). Critical postmodernism, then, takes into

account the larger structural aspects that exist in society and the more microscopic

contested manifestations of that structure that occur on a daily level. In essence, the theory blends the praxis-oriented nature of critical theory with postmodernism's concern for understanding difference. Rather than assume that consensus ought to be a goal, critical postmodernists believe that conflict is natural and to be fostered in the struggle for empowerment. The unity of the individual, group, or organization is fractured and we strive to understand the multiplicity of relations that exist in society. Culture, rather than a homogeneous entity, becomes a site of production and contestation not only over the goals of an organization, but also over the processes taken to achieve those goals.

Defining Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is a term that far too often is unproblematically accepted as if consensus exists about its meaning. Whether one supports multiculturalism (Gollnick, 1992) or has reservations (Ravitch, 1990), authors generally subscribe to the notion that the definition of "culture" is in terms of ethnicity, and "multicultural" implies peoples of color. Further, when we speak of multiculturalism most often we discuss curriculum and teaching that takes place within a classroom (Grant, 1992). In a helpful article on multiculturalism, for example, Christine Sleeter discusses five general approaches to multicultural education. Each approach locates multiculturalism in the classroom (Sleeter, 1989, p. 55).

My concern with definitions of multiculturalism in this fashion is that they locate culture in terms of color and deflate the idea of how power and knowledge function to create socially created categories. Black people and Red people, for example, presumably have culture, while White people do not; our discussions about multiculturalism revolve around whether those of us who are culturally "different" should have a place in the

4

curriculum. In this light, no one questions if White people have a place in the curriculum, because their inclusion is taken for granted. Multiculturalism becomes a term that exists in relation to dominant norms. As Henry Giroux notes, the discussion about multiculturalism functions as a "pedagogy of normative pluralism" (1988, p. 95). The unstated assumption is that we are all more or less alike, we have similar interests and needs, and consensus is achievable.

The view I will advance is that culture is constituted through knowledge and power relations that exist in reference to dominant norms. As Chandra Mohanty states, "...The academy and the classroom are not mere sites of instruction. They are also political and cultural sites that represent accommodations and contestation over knowledge by differently empowered social constituencies" (1990, p. 183). "Culture," then, is not something one group has and another does not; rather, culture is an area for struggle over meaning. Individuals and groups produce culture within a social and historical context. Struggle over the multiple meanings of culture occurs not merely in a classroom but in all areas of the academy. The challenge for participants is to understand which meanings are dominant, how they came into being, and whose interests are served by such definitions and interpretations.

Dominant norms relate not only to issues of race, but as I will argue, other concerns as well. To isolate race in a definition of multiculturalism essentializes individuals and groups as if someone who is Black is a unified identity rather than a multiplicity of selves. As Michelle Wallace observes:

> It is not often recognized that bodies and psyches of color have trajectories
> in excess of their socially and/or culturally constructed identities. What is

5

needed to achieve effective social change is some intervention in the present deployment of these bodies and psyches, an intervention that demands a sophisticated level of theorization of racial and social identity" (1991, p. 7).

Accordingly, we need to move the idea of multiculturalism away from a discussion of those presumably who have race (people of color) and those who are raceless (Anglos) to a discussion of the multiple identities that exist in the late 20th century. We also must move beyond the classroom and into the academy so that we come to terms with not merely teacher–student interactions and styles, but the structural aspects within which teaching and learning are embedded so that we are able to understand how knowledge and power function and change in academic cultures. As we do so, we consider the relation of the academy to the state and to other organizations.

Insofar as multiculturalism is the heart of this text, it behooves me to develop a definition rather than simply criticize previous attempts. In keeping with the article's intent, I offer a definition of multiculturalism from the perspective of a postsecondary organization:

Participants in a multicultural organization employ the concept of culture as a framework. In doing so, the organization embraces diversity in all of its practices and policies. Multiculturalism relates to the construction of ideas pertaining to issues such as race, class, gender, and sexual orientation.

Rather than implicitly suggest that the definition should be passively accepted by the reader--or by an organization's participants--I delineate how I interpret the definition so that the reader may reject, modify or accept the words. My point here is that in a postmodern organizational world authors as well as policy makers have an obligation to

6

offer insight into the structure of our thinking and to realize that one static overarching definition cannot exist. The constant deconstruction/ reconstruction that I am suggesting is necessary often paralyzes postmodern action in the organizational world, for if we are not to agree on base understandings then how are we able to act?[1]

Such a comment assumes consensus over definitions, which as I will discuss, is impossible in a multicultural world. The very act of naming topics, defining problems, developing solutions, will always be seen as contested terrain in a postmodern world. At the same time, postmodernism has more to offer us with regard to organizational assessment than merely the often playful and ironic interplay of words and ideas to which some postmodernists subscribe. I am suggesting that we utilize the sense of deconstruction/ reconstruction not as a point for paralysis but as an opportunity for action. Accordingly, I break apart the definition and consider what my words suggest.

"Participants in a multicultural organization ..."

"Participants" suggests at least two comments. All individuals are included in the make up of the organization, and they are active in the construction of the organization. That is, I neither used the language of hierarchy--"administrative leaders," for example--nor did I employ a noun such as "individuals" or "people." "Participants" act. They create. They disagree. If we maintain the term "participants," then we must consider the actions/

---

[1] I am thinking, for example, of recent works on postmodernism and organizations by Burrell (1988), Cooper and Burrell (1988), and Gergan (1992). However insightful these works are with regard to postmodern analysis, the reader is consistently left with the idea that radical organizational change is impossible and any attempt is naive.

7

reactions not merely of the president or faculty, but also, for example, of the students and staff.

By using the words "in" and "organization" I have framed the discussion. I am not writing of academe as a conglomeration of disciplinary affiliations or of an institution as an entity without borders. Presumably an organization that has individuals who act "in" it, also has individuals who are outside of it. Immediately, then, we must raise questions about membership. Who gets in? How does one become a participant? Concomitantly, who is denied entrance and based on what criteria?

"... employ the concept of culture as a framework."

"Employ" suggests work and action whereas "concept" is ideational. I have used them together to suggest that an organization's participants act out ideas. Ideas have consequences and they occur in the organization. The ideas form a cognitive "framework" that I have called "culture."

"Culture" is one of the more over utilized and misunderstood terms to have gained currency in social science research during the last decades. As I employ the term here I am specifically painting a design of culture that is symbolic in nature and understood through a host of communicative artifacts that exist within social and historical contexts. We understand culture in an organization through the analysis of symbolic codes that are acted out on grand and small scales on a daily basis. A president's speech to the Faculty Senate at the start of a school year, for example, is potentially an important cultural event not merely because it is a tradition or ceremony, but also because of the context in which it exists, who the individual speaks to, and about what he or she speaks. We analyze this

8

example not only for what is done, but also for what is not done. By speaking to the Faculty Senate who does the President exclude? By focusing on one topic, what does the individual overlook? Why has an organization given symbolic power to one individual and not others? And further, we do not only analyze grand events, but we also investigate the minute, microscopic aspects of the organization that take place on a daily basis.

By writing of culture in this manner I move it away from a functional analysis where we assume culture is a conglomeration of static artifacts and that an organization's culture is mutually shared and understood. Instead I highlight interpretation where conflict and difference replace consensus and harmony. In doing so, norms such as "whiteness" are decentered, and assimilationist strategies are displaced. The idea of cultural equilibrium is rejected in favor of a more dynamic, processual analysis of culture.

The analysis of culture enables us to forcefully consider multiculturalism in ways that other organizational frameworks do not. Total Quality Management (TQM), for example, is the latest organizational fad in higher education (Sherr and Teeter, 1991; Seymour, 1993). TQM's centerpiece is to focus on the "consumer" or "customer" and provide quality. Examples that are given usually have to do with streamlining processes such as registration or applications for financial aid. Who can argue with the desire to cut down on paperwork? The assumption that an organization ought to strive for quality, however, conveniently overlooks any specific concerns for multiculturalism. Indeed, TQM is a framework that ostensibly espouses organizational neutrality in the drive for "quality." In the 1980s we heard similar discussions surrounding the use of the terms "effectiveness" and "efficiency."

9

The problem with a concern for "quality" or "effectiveness" and other such buzzwords is something of a conundrum. It is difficult to develop an argument against "quality." Who is against "excellence," "efficiency," or other such concepts? Why should we not try to be more receptive to the "consumer's" needs? Surely the vast majority of individuals hope to produce quality work. However, by assuming that words such as "excellence" or "customer" are mutually understood we fall into the modernist trap that consensus can or does exist in an organization. The problem is that concerns for excellence and the like that are unproblematically accepted inevitably mask the interests of those in power. Without an explicit awareness that we exist in a cultural web, to use Clifford Geertz's oft used phrase, we construct a framework that is monocultural.

I am suggesting the opposite. By suggesting that we center the discussion of higher education within a cultural framework we specifically locate cultural practices in the organization and focus on how the symbolic codes at work privilege some and silence others. Indeed, one of the goals of the framework is not to reach a problematic consensus such as is hoped for with words such as "quality;" rather, the employment of a cultural framework seeks to enable voice and accentuate difference.

"The organization embraces diversity ..."

I have offered three words that might be considered a grammatical error and logical impossibility. An "organization" is a collection of individuals and in fact, an idea. "Diversity" is a concept. "Embrace" is a physical action. Consequently, as an idea, an organization can not "embrace" anything, and an individual or group can not "embrace" a

concept such as diversity. But words create portraits and I struggle here to create in the reader's mind the portrait of group action toward an ideal.

I develop more problems for myself by using the quasi sexual imagery of an "embrace." Some will say that "accepts" might be more appropriate, for "accept" is not sexually charged. However, I have chosen "embrace" in the sense that Ghandi and Martin Luther King spoke of agape. Agape is Greek for love. It is love not of a sexual nature, but of a spiritual one. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote:

> Agape is disinterested love. It is a love in which the individual seeks not his own good, but the good of his neighbor. ... Agape is love seeking to preserve and create community. It is insistence on community even when one seeks to break it. It is a willingness to sacrifice in the interest of mutuality and a willingness to go to any length to restore community (1958, p. 87).

The assumption of agape, then, is that when an individual is in pain I can not be happy; that our joy exists in mutuality rather than exclusivity.

Thus, I offer a portrait of an organization where individuals work to ensure that everyone's voice is heard and developed. The focus on diversity highlights how the organization accentuates multiculturalism rather than monoculturalism. The use of the word "diversity" by itself would be inappropriate because it is not defined, but I will do so in the next sentence. For now, the intent is to highlight the centrality placed on difference.

... in all of its policies and practices."

The operative word in this section is "all." Often, we cordon off cultural actions and of consequence, multiculturalism, as if they exist in certain arenas and not in others.

11

14

As central organizing concepts I am arguing that in every action and policy one needs to consider the cultural ramifications and multicultural implications.

There are two ways to consider "all" policies and practices. On the one hand, the event itself needs to be analyzed. On the other hand, the choice of the event needs to be brought into question. The development of an institution's budget, for example, can be analyzed to see how resources are spent that focus on multiculturalism. At the same time, one may analyze how the process of the development of the budget includes diverse opinions or excludes others.

"Multiculturalism relates to the construction of ideas ..."

As with the definition of culture, the suggestion offered here is that multiculturalism is not simply a set of acts. Instead, it is an ideology that is constructed within the organization. A commitment to this form of multiculturalism, states Peter McLaren, "is understood as busy - it's not seamless, smooth or always in a relative state of political equilibrium. Resistance multiculturalism doesn't see diversity itself as a goal but rather argues that diversity must be affirmed within a politics of cultural criticism and a commitment to social justice" (Estrada & McLaren, 1993, p. 31). Ideas are thus developed by the organization's participants as opposed to the often unstated assumption that some acts are ideologically neutral and develop without social and cultural contexts.

"... pertaining to issues such as race, class, gender and sexual orientation."

I finally tie multiculturalism to specific practices, but as is obvious, I do so in a halting manner by the use of "such as." The strength and weakness of this statement revolves around the use of the seemingly innocuous words "such as." The strength of the

section is that by using "such as" I highlight that issues like "gender or sexual orientation" are constructed categories. Issues are tied to ideologies and what becomes an issue at the end of the 20th century may not have been an issue at the beginning of the century. Sexual orientation is one such category where the scant literature prior to 1970 always defined the issue in terms of deviancy, whereas today growing numbers of individuals see gay, lesbian and bisexual identity in terms of the expansion and inclusion of culture and the struggle for basic human rights. Thus, the section is open-ended enough to enable the inclusion of other issues as they arise.

The weakness of the section, however, is Foucauldian in nature in so far as I am unable to explain how issues enter (or leave) public discourse. If the phrase were without the preceding sentences it would be clearly insufficient because it enables an organization's participants to consciously or otherwise overlook issues. Multiculturalism defined, for example, only in terms of race, excludes a definition of cultural difference between men and women. The cultural capital that the upper classes bring to an institution would also be seen as "normal" so that individuals from the working class would always be seen as deficient. However, given that the definition of multiculturalism hinges on the social and historical relationship of (a) culture to the organization, and (b) the organization to society, one is unable to overlook at the end of the 20th century issues "such as" gender or sexual orientation. At the same time, one of the maddening aspects of incorporating Foucault's work into an organizational analysis is that we must reject neatly defined concepts of how issues come to be important at specific points in time.

How does the definition help our understanding of multiculturalism and the four problems outlined at the start of the article? I reiterate that the definition is cast with the idea of deconstruction/ reconstruction as an ongoing activity. Participants use the definition as a point of departure to consider whether they are working towards multiculturalism. With regard to the four observations outlined at the start of the article, most obviously, the definition offers a written text for an organization's participants to debate. By placing action in a wide organizational context we are better able to frame multiculturalism in an overarching category rather than as a segmented topic of temporary interest. The definition also situates multiculturalism within the parameters of the organization rather than as a singular issue for classroom teaching. What the definition does not do is develop a sketch about how to assess whether a college or university is enacting the definition. I turn to this task.

Assessing Multiculturalism

Prior to developing a scaffolding for an assessment of multiculturalism based on the definition developed in the previous section, I call attention to four caveats:

1. For multiculturalism to be successful in an institution the organization's participants must embrace all of the points.

2. Assessment is an activity defined and conducted by the community instead of a handful of administrators; consensus is not a goal.

3. The points that follow have ties to modernist analyses; we should not fool ourselves into thinking that everything within a postmodern organization is

14

different. Goals, objectives and analysis remain important, but the definitions and processes that we use will differ from modernist assumptions.

4. Assessment is an on-going activity that reflects the importance of process and the assumption that an organization's culture is dynamic and conflictual rather than static and consensual.

In what follows I offer five points for organizational assessment of multiculturalism that is based in critical postmodernism and utilizes the definition developed in section one.

Intellectual leadership. Of the five points, intellectual leadership is the least well-defined and perhaps the most important. Leadership is not something that fits neatly into a checklist to decide whether an individual exhibits leadership. However, an individual or group of individuals who are able to evoke values consistent with the multicultural definition offered above provide a critical service to their organization. In essence, how does a leader enact and foment organizational agape?

Intellectual leadership does not necessarily need to come from the institution's president, and in this day and age, most college participants believe that it cannot come from the president. By and large, in many people's eyes the college presidency has been reduced to an individual who manages a bureaucracy and seeks funding. We need to remember, however, that as with all organizational participants, college presidents exist within cultures; what we expect of them reflects the culture as much as it does an individual's personality. We think of our presidents as bureaucrats or fund raisers because we have defined them in that manner. In a socially constructed world there is nothing that says an individual or institutional role must act in a particular way.

15

I mention college presidents because by the power of their office they hold a specific voice in the organization that an untenured assistant professor, for example, does not automatically have. We should expect that individuals who reside in organizational roles that have voice to use that voice in the advancement of multiculturalism.

Intellectual leadership is not simply a passing reference to the importance of diversity or a speech on Martin Luther King Day. Instead, a leader provides direction by words, thought, and actions. An individual such as a college president or dean who shows up at a lecture series on Gay and Lesbian Scholarship exhibits support for multiculturalism simply by attending such an event. A Chair of the Faculty Senate who sits in on a Women's Studies course because he wants to become conversant in the area provides another example of intellectual leadership. Indeed, in an intellectual organization such as a college or university where we are supposedly devoted to the life of the mind, a leader sends explicit symbolic messages if he or she attends a multicultural event to honestly learn about a specific area of scholarship.

Conversely, we often find that multicultural activities, lecture series, curricular workshops and the like are the responsibility of students, student affairs offices, and a handful of faculty. When we segregate activities in such fashion the organization's culture sends strong signals that some activities are important and others are not. How should one interpret that a college president is in attendance at every football game–home or away–but sends regrets to the Black Student Alliance that he will be unavailable to attend any activity during the campus's Black History Week? One need not be a semiotician to

decode such communicative acts. I am suggesting that a multicultural organization must have individuals who exhibit intellectual leadership.

I also do not intend to place the responsibility for intellectual leadership merely in the hands of individuals in administratively high places. Rather, I am arguing that those individuals must exhibit such leadership. On other levels, however, all individuals in the organization are capable of intellectual leadership. A faculty member in a southwestern university who actively tries to learn about Navajo history and culture, incorporates what she learns into her curriculum and pedagogy highlights to her peers and to her students that she values diversity. A faculty member who makes what he thinks are innocent jokes during Rape Awareness Week sends one message, and a Resident Assistant who organizes "Straight Talks" to deal with homophobia for his dorm sends another message. Intellectual leadership is ill-defined, but it is also essential in an organization that values diversity, and it is possible at all levels of the organization.

Structure. An organization that values diversity will have a variety of structural aspects. In a large institution an individual who reports to the president or provost will have as his or her sole responsibility the coordination and implementation of multicultural activities. In a small institution the president or provost will have on his or her staff a similar individual. The importance of such an individual is simple and straight forward. Any observer of organizational decision making knows that important decisions often get made in small groups that report to the president or provost. If multiculturalism is a key concern, then it needs a vocal advocate.

17

Some will argue that multiculturalism should be the responsibility of everyone and consequently it should not be cordoned off in this manner. Although I surely agree that everyone should embrace diversity, far too often, issues pertaining to diversity are shunted aside because they do not have someone as a full time advocate. Others will suggest that such an individual should report to a Vice President or Dean of Student Affairs. Such a suggestion is lamentable. Diversity is not an issue that pertains only to students. The concerns of faculty, administrators, staff, and workers also need to be taken into account; accordingly, the individual must report to either the president or provost. A reporting responsibility such as this also sends a signal to the community about the importance placed on the topic.

The organization should also encourage the formation of structured multicultural groups that report to the president and provide information, advice, and feedback in a timely manner. Intellectual leaders will welcome groups such as these even though at times their formation will create disagreement, conflict and problems for the administration insofar as such groups will undoubtedly at times interpret the organizational world in ways different from a central administrator. Indeed, the norm in academe is to discourage the formation of such groups and to distance the administration from such activities. I am suggesting the opposite. Encourage the creation, for example, of a Commission for Women or a Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies. Further, the individual who works on a permanent basis should create forums where diverse groups are able to network and create areas of common concern. Again, the normal reaction is to try to create divisions so that

groups are separate; in a postmodern organization that encourages diversity the organization's participants will foster on-going dialogue and debate.

Since the curriculum is presumably the core of a postsecondary institution's purpose, there should also be within the structure a permanent body that looks not merely at curricular change, but specifically considers ways to diversify the curriculum. By "curriculum" I do not only mean what is taught, but also how material is taught. Individuals need to consider new ways to approach new learners. More often than not, such attempts at new curricula or new ways of teaching are temporary or at the behest of a particular individual. I am suggesting that a specific body be created that is on-going and offers systematic analysis about how to diversify what we teach and how we teach.

Finally, organizational roles need to be populated by a wide fabric of individuals. We often point to the lack of faculty of color, or the under representations of women in tenure track roles. We also need to consider why more under represented groups are not in visible positions of authority throughout the organization. What does it say to the organization's participants when after five "national searches" a president has hired only white men for senior administrative positions? In a multicultural organization the argument that one should hire "only the best" is a canard that should be rejected. Such arguments once again force us to deal with the issue of excellence as if one may have one or the other—excellence or diversity. Obviously multicultural organizations demand excellence. But one needs to assess why one institution is incapable of hiring individuals from under represented groups and another institution is successful. Rather than accept deterministic answers—we live in an isolated area, for example—the organization's

19

participants accept the world as socially constructed and try to create change. An organization that demands diversity and excellence will reflect diversity in its hiring practices, and of consequence, who populates the organization at all levels.

Strategic planning and goals. One problem with comments about diversity is that they are often vague, general, and timeless. An institution "strives for a world without racism," or "desires equity" or "supports diversity in its hiring practices." We would not allow such vague language when an institution tries to raise money in a capital campaign. Any administration that simply said it "hopes to raise money," or "desires increased income" would run into serious criticism from its Board of Trustees. The organization's participants should be similarly critical of undefined goals with regard to multiculturalism.

Every multicultural group in the organization should be encouraged to submit written annual reports to the president and board that will be widely disseminated. These reports should outline problems, current projects and future goals. Similarly, every academic unit should have within its overall plan a comment about what it has accomplished over the past year with regard to diversity and what it will attempt in the future. Once again, such comments should not be empty platitudes, but rather, delineate specific goals and time frames for achieving diversity.

If an institution, for example, has only five percent of its faculty who are people of color, then it should project how and when it will achieve a higher proportion. Comments such as "The college intends to increase its minority hires," should be replaced with ideas such as, "within three years we will increase junior and senior level minority

20

hires. To achieve this goal we will recruit in areas that we have never attempted before and we will devise a hiring plan that is tied to diversity."

As with the structural comment about the need to hire an upper level administrator to be in charge of multicultural affairs, the point here is that without specific goals, ideas related to multiculturalism are often left by the wayside. A racial problem occurs on campus. The president convenes an "Ad Hoc Committee" to investigate the problem and make suggestions. The group meets and issues a report. Nothing occurs. In effect, the institution's response was to write a report. Once again, we would not allow that to happen in other decision making areas of the university and we should not let it happen with issues pertaining to diversity. Clearly stated goals set within a specific time frame that are widely disseminated enable the academic community to have bench marks upon which they can judge if they are achieving multicultural excellence. Finally, a group should be charged with the responsibility for assessing diversity across all areas and issues on a yearly basis.

Budgeting and finance. Colleges and universities have faced hard times in the 1990s. It is commonplace to hear of budget cutbacks, retrenchment, and hiring freezes. The administration often exhorts the populace to "share the burden." Unfortunately, unless budgeting is undertaken as a philosophical task, issues related to multiculturalism often are harmed. It stands to reason that the newest additions in an institution's budget often relate to multiculturalism. Twenty years ago few institutions had a Women Studies Center and ten years ago even fewer organizations had any programming for lesbian and gay issues. Specialized recruitment efforts aimed at the American Indian population is a

21

24

recent phenomenon and a concern for the disabled has become a topic within the last decade. Consequently, these programs are often the least well established in a budget's line items. To cut a new program as much as one that has been in place for a century is placing the new program at risk; further, if the institution values as a basic ideal the new program then it will place it as a budget priority rather than as an expendable item.

Similarly, new programs such as a Chicano Studies Center often exist on temporary funds out of one or another special budgets. Such funding depends on the good will of the sponsoring administrator and the availability of funds. Once again, when budget cutbacks occur the first kind of money to dry up is temporary funding and special budgets. Similarly, foundations often provide money for diversity related projects. The Ford Foundation, for example, has a long history of funding a variety of efforts aimed at increasing the pool of minority scholars. Foundation money, however, has a finite time frame and all too often when the funding ends, so does the project, however successful it may have been because the institution does not have a budget line for the project.

Each example highlights the often tenuous fiscal position that diversity-related projects operate within at a college or university. The examples also underscore my earlier point that any assessment effort must gauge the success of each of the areas I am outlining. An institution may have intellectual leadership as well as concrete plans to increase faculty of color, but if at the same time the budgeting practices do not reflect an overt concern for multiculturalism then the institution falls short of achieving diversity.

The logical next step in a strategic plan after it has been developed is to match the strategic goals with solid funding. We ought to appreciate the dilemmas that

22

administrators face. The vast majority of institutional funding is set in the sense that an English department, for example, gets so much funding per year; unless one plans dramatic cutbacks where departments or colleges are cut, at least 75 percent of the budget is redundant from previous years. However, there are rewards and incentives that might be developed. One incentive, for example, is funding from a President's "diversity program" for a department that is able to attract a minority scholar. Another incentive is the creation of new positions that are specifically targeted toward under represented groups. Yet another incentive is to enable faculty free time to revise their courses.

In sum, if an institution honors diversity when it needs to cut back the organization will not cut all programs equally because some are newer and cutbacks will cripple them. Rather than place multicultural efforts in a budgetary limbo from year to year they will be placed within an institution's regular operating budget. When a grant is written the objective will not be merely to gain temporary funding; at the time of the proposal submission, the institution will project how it will fund the project once the funding has ended. All of these examples highlight how a budget may be used as a philosophy that states institutional priorities and honors diversity.

Socialization. If an organization is a culture, then there are over riding norms and values. These values are constructed over time and reside in the ideology and ethos of the institution. The culture mirrors the values of the constituents. Thus, for organizations that have been shaped for a century by primarily white men, we should assume that the culture all to often unproblematically reflects a reality constructed by such individuals. What happens when new members join the organization? How do the values and ways of

23

doing things, for example, differ when a substantial number of women are present in the institution? Such questions hinge on an institution's approach to the socialization and training of new and old members.

Too often we work from a deficit model when individuals from under represented groups enter the institution. The assumption is that they do not understand how the institution functions and they must be helped to fit into the system. However well intentioned such help may be, what we overlook with such an approach is that rather than simply trying to change individuals, we also ought to work on re-norming the institution. From this perspective, although all new individuals will need help in acclimating themselves to a new culture, we also must work at re-socializing individuals already within the institution as well as changing the culture of the organization.

Socialization involves a variety of practices aimed at orienting individuals to a culture. In academe, such practices are especially important as we try to create a more diverse climate. As with the structural suggestions outlined, an institution that is concerned about multiculturalism will develop specific approaches from the moment someone is hired. On-going orientation and mentoring programs are examples of the kind of activities that should occur for all new faculty, but especially for individuals from under represented groups.

At the same time, we need to develop a systematic approach for individuals to understand people different from themselves. An institution that is a stone's throw from a Native American reservation, for example, ought to have developed a program for all of its participants to understand the culture and history of the specific tribe. I raise this point

because far too often individuals will never have the opportunity to understand difference unless the organization specifically creates those opportunities. There are many faculty, in fact, who are "a stone's throw" from an American Indian reservation and have never set foot there. If we are to create an institution that is multicultural, then it can not simply be those who are "different" who adapt. To understand and enact multiculturalism is the responsibility of everyone. Accordingly, training sessions on a wide variety of topics need to be developed and presented. In particular, curricular and pedagogic workshops that consider ways to enhance diversity in the classroom are critical.

Socialization is also an activity that demands intellectual leadership, for obviously, everyone in the organization should be assumed to be a multicultural learner. Rather than assume that only students, or only student affairs personnel, etc. should be involved in training sessions, a multicultural organization is one where we realize that the way to understand difference is by being involved in difference. In this light it is insufficient that some campuses have created a "diversity requirement" where students must take a course or two, and yet faculty have no concomitant commitment. Senior administrators and faculty who partake in training sessions and workshops set examples and standards. Conversely, once again when we hear that senior administrators will be exempt from an affirmative action workshop on the grounds that they are too busy, we receive a negative example.

Taken together, these five points form the scaffolding for what we might look for in assessing the multicultural climate of a college or university. Obviously, the framework is not a simple checklist of do's and don'ts; nor should it be since it works from the definition advanced in part one. Assessment is always a philosophical exercise, and this is

25

particularly so with regard to multicultural assessment. Instead of questionnaires that provide rank orders of specific items I am suggesting that a framework such as the one I have offered enables individuals to first decide how well the institution is achieving multiculturalism, and then to plan what to do. Are there intellectual leaders who provide examples? In what way does the structure enhance multiculturalism? Does the organization's strategic plans and budget provide clear directions, goals, and financing with regard to diversity? Are socialization activities sporadic or on-going? Who is being socialized? These are the kinds of questions that naturally fall out from the framework.

Conclusion

I have attempted two tasks that are theoretical and practical in nature. I have tried to reorient our thinking about multiculturalism away from a segmented view and toward a comprehensive organizational analysis. In doing so, I have relied on what I have called critical postmodernism to inform how we might think about multiculturalism. One of the problems I have found with critical theory and postmodernism is that individuals often have an idea about how to "think" about these theories, but they are lost with regard to how to "act." Although one can not provide a cookbook for action, it is a shortcoming for those of us who subscribe to such theories that we have not done a better job at enabling individuals and groups to act within their own organizations, for especially with critical theory, one key assumption is that people should be empowered to enact change.

Accordingly, I have laid out a schema upon which an organization's participants might assess institutional action with regard to multiculturalism. The schema follows the definition of multiculturalism developed, but also has antecedents in organizational theory.

26

29

As an organizational analysis, the framework does not look only at the curriculum, for example, but takes into account all aspects of organizational action. To be sure, a curriculum will be investigated both structurally and strategically to determine if it embraces diversity, but the framework advanced here also will suggest ways to consider who teaches those courses, who takes them, and how the rest of the community receives them and evaluates them.

As I noted in part one, a community's definition of multiculturalism is bound to change and is always open to debate and reinterpretation. However, an organization's participants have an obligation to define what they mean by multiculturalism so that they can then consider how they might act in terms of strategy, budgeting, and the like. I have offered one definition and a framework for action and assessment that hopefully enables us to move one step closer to equity in academe.

Bibliography

Burrell, Gibson. (1988). "Modernism, postmodernism and organizational analysis."
Organization Studies, 9(2), 221-235.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1987). "Characteristics of full-time college professors."
Chronicle of Higher Education, 39(1), p. 28.

Cooper, Robert and Gibson Burrell. (1988). "Modernism, postmodernism and
organizational analysis: An introduction." Organization Studies, 9(1), 91-112.

Estrada, Kelly and Peter McLaren. (1993). "A dialogue on multiculturalism and
democratic culture." Educational Researcher, April, 27-33.

Foucault, Michel. (1980). Power/knowledge. New York: Pantheon.

Gergen, Kenneth. (1992). "Organization theory in a postmodern era." In Michael Reed &
Michael Hughes, Rethinking organization (pp. 207-226). London: Sage.

Giroux, Henry. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Giroux, Henry. (1990). "The politics of postmodernism." Journal of Urban and Cultural
Studies, 1(1), 5-38.

Giroux, Henry. (1992). Border Crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education.
New York: Routledge.

Gollnick, Donna. (1992). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher
education. In Carl Grant, Research and multicultural education (pp. 218-239). New
York: Falmer Press.

Grant, Carl. (1992). Research and multicultural education. New York: Falmer Press.

28

Green, Madeleine. (1989). <u>Minorities on Campus</u>. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hamermesh, D. (1992). "Diversity within adversity." <u>Academe,</u> 78(2), 7-14.

hooks, bell. (1989). <u>Talking back</u>. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, bell. (1990). <u>Yearning</u>. Boston: South End Press.

King, Martin Luther. (1958). <u>Stride toward freedom</u>. New York: Harper and Row.

Mohanty, Chandra. (1989-1990). "On race and voice: Challenges for liberal education in the 1990s." <u>Cultural Critique,</u> 14, 179-208.

Ravitch, Diane. (1990). "Multiculturalism." <u>The American Scholar,</u> 59(3), 337-354.

Seymour, Daniel. (1993). "Quality on campus." <u>Change,</u> 25(3), 14-27.

Sherr, Lawrence & Deborah Teeter. (1991). <u>Total quality management in higher education,</u> 71. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sleeter, Christine. (1989). "Multicultural education as a form of resistance to oppression." <u>Journal of Education,</u> 171(3), 51-71.

Tierney, William. (1993). <u>Building communities of difference: Higher education in the 21st century</u>. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Wallace, Michelle. (1991). "Multiculturalism and oppositionality." <u>Afterimage,</u> 19(3), 6-9.

29

TABLE 2

COVARIATE-ADJUSTED MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR END-OF-FRESHMAN YEAR READING
COMPREHENSION, MATHEMATICS, CRITICAL THINKING, AND COMPOSITE ACHIEVEMENT

GROUP	Reading Comprehension	Mathematics	Critical Thinking	Composite Achievement[a]
Attended A Two-Year Institution				
Mean	59.80	56.25	59.85	-.37
SD	5.75	3.87	6.05	.77
Attended a Four-Year Institution				
Mean	60.25	55.64	60.02	-.39
SD	5.44	3.67	5.72	.73

[a]Z-scores (mean = 0, standard deviation = 1 for the entire sample of 2685 students) were used to form Composite Achievement from the combination of Reading Comprehension, Mathematics, and Critical Thinking.

34

TABLE 3

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONAL EFFECTS

	Reading Comprehension		Mathematics		Critical Thinking		Composite Achievement	
	Two-Year	Four-Year	Two-Year	Four-Year	Two-Year	Four-Year	Two-Year	Four-Year
Gender (Female = 1; Male = 0)	-.151[a]	1.276[a]			-.736[d]	.596[a]	-.146[a]	.536[a]
Ethnicity (Non-White = 1; White = 0)	1.534[b]	-.339[b]	.548[c]	-.547[c]			.317[b]	-.608[b]

Note: Regression coefficients with the same superscript are significantly different in magnitude at $p < .05$ with the inluence of all other covariates in the model controlled statistically.