Running Head: DIVERSITY INCLUSIVITY

Understanding the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses

Thomas F. Nelson Laird

Indiana University

Author note: Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Assistant Professor, Indiana University. Please direct correspondence to the author at 1900 East Tenth Street, Eigenmann Hall Suite 419, Bloomington, IN 47406-7512, or tflaird@indiana.edu.

Abstract

Most studies of curricular diversity have focused on the effects of student participation in diversity courses on student outcomes. Though the results have been positive, these studies have used limited measures of curricular diversity and there is a great need for a complimentary body of research demonstrating what faculty and what types of courses are more likely to include diversity. This study relies on 12 diversity inclusivity items derived from a comprehensive model of how diversity is included into a course to investigate how much diversity is being included in collegiate courses and what predicts diversity inclusivity, as measured by two scales: diversity grounding and inclusive learning. The results, based on 8,720 responses from faculty participating in the 2007 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, suggest that most faculty are including diversity in their courses in some way, but that women and faculty of color tend to include diversity to a greater extent than their colleagues. Also, courses taught in the arts and humanities and education are, on average, among the most inclusive.

Understanding the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses

Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) assert that "research on *whether* and *how* diversity might affect education is of crucial legal and practical importance" (p. 332, italics in original). In partial fulfillment of that call, a growing body of empirical research spanning course-level, institutional, and national data sets attests to the positive effects of curricular experiences with diversity on student cognitive and affective outcomes (Astin, 1993; Chang, 2002; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Nelson Laird, 2005; Nelson Laird, Hurtado, & Engberg, 2005; Smith & Associates, 1997). Though the results of these studies support the overall assertion that so called "diversity" courses encourage important skills, abilities, and attitudes, the work in this area leaves two issues unaddressed. First, the variety of ways curricular diversity is measured actually belies a common understanding of the many ways diversity is included into courses. Second, outside of a couple of studies examining the amount students interact across difference in faculty members' courses (e.g., Kuh, Nelson Laird, & Umbach, 2004), almost no research has investigated which faculty and which courses are more likely to be inclusive of diversity. So, while more work is needed to answer Gurin et al.'s (2002) call, the same urgency exists for scholarship examining whether and how factors, such as faculty characteristics and disciplinary context, shape diversity experiences, particularly curricular experiences with diversity.

Model of Course Inclusivity

In the empirical research that examines course or course-taking effects, what counts as curricular exposure to diversity varies. In some studies, a course that meets the general education diversity requirement is such a course (Chang, 2002). In other studies, effects are examined for courses taught in particular departments, such as women's or ethnic studies (Astin, 1993), or

courses using a particular instructional method, such as intergroup dialogue (Hurtado, 2001; Zúñiga, Nagda, Sevig, Thompson, & Dey, 1995). Together, these studies amount to a shotgun approach to assessing the effects of curricular exposure to diversity. With such an approach, there are likely many courses that deal with diversity that do not get counted. For example, many courses that deal with diversity do not satisfy a general education requirement, fall under women's or ethnic studies, or use an intergroup dialogue approach. Further, though some studies go beyond simple dichotomies and compute a count of courses taken (e.g., Nelson Laird, 2005), qualitative distinctions in the ways courses include diversity are also generally not measured.

To better understand the overall picture of what constitutes curricular experiences with diversity, I developed a model of diversity inclusivity rooted in a course planning model (Stark & Lattuca, 1997) and drawing on models from areas such as multicultural education (e.g., Banks, 2003; Sleeter & Grant, 2003) and feminist theory/pedagogy (e.g., Maher & Tetrault, 1994; McIntosh, 1983). The model identifies nine elements of a course (purpose/goals, content, theoretical foundations, learners, instructor(s), pedagogy, classroom environment, evaluation, and adjustment), as well as a diversity inclusivity continuum for each element (for a complete description of the model and its development see Nelson Laird, 2003). The content of a course, for example, can range from monocultural to multicultural and the evaluation methods in a course can range from "standardized" to methods sensitive to the diverse learning needs of the students. The model offers advantages over past methods for examining diversity in the curriculum. First, it moves researchers and practitioners away from trying to make simple determinations about what is and what is not a diversity course. Instead it offers multiple avenues for determining the diversity inclusivity of any course. Further, it undermines the use of common

assumptions, like "all women's studies courses are diversity courses" and "there is no way a physics course can be a diversity course."

<div align="center">Operationalizing Diversity Inclusivity</div>

In addition, the model described above can be used to develop methods for assessing the diversity inclusivity of courses. The current study relies on 12 survey items that address ways faculty include diversity into the 9 elements of their courses (see Table 1). A faculty member receiving these items would be asked to identify how much the things covered in each item happened in a particular course she/he taught. Faculty respond to each item on a 4-point scale ranging from "Very little" to "Very much."

As constructed, each item was intended to capture the diversity inclusivity spectrum associated with each course element. For example, as noted before, the content of a course can range from monocultural—focusing exclusively on content from a single culture—to multicultural—focusing on content from multiple cultures. The content item listed in Table 1 (item c) was worded to reflect the upper end of the spectrum. Therefore, faculty who did this "very little" in their course were assumed to have courses more toward the monocultural end of the content spectrum and those that indicated they did this "Very much" were assumed to have courses that have multicultural content.

As faculty do not always consider each element of a course distinctly in their planning processes (Stark & Lattuca, 1997), it was assumed that there would be patterns of response that would allow the 12 items in Table 1 to be collapsed. However, no *a priori* underlying structure was assumed.

Purpose

Though considerable work has been done to *describe* how diversity (or multiculturalism) can work its way into courses (e.g., Banks, 2003; Kitano, 1997; Nelson Laird, 2003; Schoem, Frankel, Zúñiga, & Lewis, 1993; Sleeter & Grant, 2003; Warren, 1998), little empirical work has been done to examine the extent to which diversity has worked it way into the curriculum[1]. The first purpose of this study was to fill that gap through an examination of how much faculty report including diversity into the different elements of their courses.

The second purpose of this study was to determine the factor structure of the 12 diversity inclusivity items. This part of the study was aimed at understanding the underlying patterns of faculty members' responses to the items and to determine if internally consistent scales could be derived from the 12 items. Such scales mark a first step toward developing assessment tools appropriate for researchers and those involved in college teaching to use in investigating and developing diversity inclusivity in college courses.

Finally, though evidence suggests that diversity courses are important experiences for students in terms of their learning and development (Chang, 2002; Gurin et al., 2002; Nelson Laird, 2005; Nelson Laird et al., 2005), there is surprisingly little evidence about the indicators that predict the amount a course is inclusive of diversity. Are women more likely to include diversity in their courses than men? What about tenure status, racial/ethnic group, or length of time teaching? Are upper division courses more inclusive of diversity than lower division courses? This study sought to fill this void by determining the degree faculty and course characteristics predict the diversity inclusivity scales derived in the second part of the study.

Methods

Data

The data for this study come from the 2007 administration of the Faculty Survey of

Student Engagement (FSSE), an annual survey of faculty designed to compliment the National

Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). FSSE items ask faculty members about their

expectations for students, their observations of student behaviors, how they spend their time on

professional activities (e.g., teaching, advising, and research), and how they structure classroom

activities and course assignments to encourage certain student behaviors and outcomes. FSSE

offers participating institutions two survey options (for more information about the survey

options visit www.fsse.iub.edu). Because this study focuses on aspects of particular courses, the

data come from the 100 U.S. baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities that administered

the course-based survey option, which asked faculty to pick a particular course taught during the

2006-07 academic year and respond to the bulk of the questionnaire regarding that course.

Response rates at the 100 institutions ranged from 22% to 92%, with an average response rate of

48%.

Sample

The sample for this study was narrowed by two factors: citizenship status and course

level. Preliminary analysis suggested that within racial categories, the effect of foreign status

likely varied. Rather than unpacking this interaction—a task beyond the scope of this study and

complicated by low numbers of respondents in certain race-by-citizenship categories—I chose to

narrow the sample to U.S. citizens. Also, the FSSE questionnaire asks faculty to identify whether

the course they teach is a lower-division (mostly first-year students and sophomores) or upper-

division (mostly juniors or seniors) course. Faculty who identified their course as an "Other"

type of course, a graduate course or an undergraduate course that does not fit the upper-lower dichotomy, were not included in the sample[2].

After narrowing and deletion for missing data, the sample for this study contained 8,720 faculty members. Almost half (47%) of the respondents were female and four-fifths (80%) were White (3% Asian, 3% African American, 3% Hispanic, 3% other racial/ethnic minorities including American Indian and multiracial faculty, and 8% indicated a preference not to respond to the race/ethnicity item). Slightly less than 7 of 10 respondents (68%) had a doctorate, 82% worked fulltime, and 44% were tenured. The median number of prior years of teaching was 14 and the median course load was 5 for the 2006-07 academic year.

The courses faculty responded about were mostly upper division (60%), had between 21 and 50 students (51%, with 34% smaller courses and 15% larger courses), and did not fulfill a department or college-wide diversity requirement (88%). Also, the courses faculty responded about came from a variety of disciplinary areas: 27% arts and humanities, 6% biological science, 8% business, 8% education, 3% engineering, 11% physical science, 8% professional, 15% social science, and 13% other fields (e.g., agriculture, communications, and computer science).

Measures and Analyses

The 12 diversity inclusivity items (see Table 1) were used for descriptive and factor analyses. These items were contained among a set of questions added to the end of the 2007 FSSE instrument for research and development purposes. Simple frequencies were examined to understand the distributions of faculty responses to the items. To understand the structure underlying these 12 items, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted using Principle Axis Factoring with a Varimax rotation.

The dependent measures for the regression analyses were the scales created based on the factor analysis. To understand what predicts diversity inclusivity in college courses, each dependent measure was regressed on faculty characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, years of teaching experience, employment status, tenure status, course load, and perception of curriculum-wide diversity inclusivity) and course characteristics (disciplinary area, level, size, and diversity requirement status). See Appendix A for descriptions of each independent variable. Each dependent measure was standardized prior to running the analyses. Consequently, the unstandardized coefficients for dichotomously measured independent variables are equivalent to standardized mean differences with pooled standard deviations (i.e. effect sizes). Standardized coefficients yield effect sizes for the continuously measured indicators (years of teaching experience, course load, and curriculum-wide diversity inclusivity).

Limitations

This study has two primary limitations. First, institutions choose to use the FSSE and determine which faculty members are invited to participate. Consequently, self-selection limits the claims that can be made about the representativeness of the sample. However, based on several institutional characteristics (Carnegie type, control, region, and location), participating institutions represent a wide variety of U.S. colleges and universities. Though there were a disproportionate number of some types of institutions (e.g., public master's institutions), the overrepresented types of colleges and universities tend to enroll a larger number of undergraduates and employ a larger number of faculty. In addition, the faculty members who participated mirror the national population of faculty at baccalaureate-granting institutions along several characteristics (e.g., gender and disciplinary area).

Second, the courses at participating institutions were not sampled. Rather, faculty members chose the courses about which they responded. This approach, while it produced a wide variety of course types, makes it impossible to determine whether the courses in the study are representative of all courses at participating institutions, which may further limit the study's generalizability beyond the institutions and courses covered by the faculty in the sample.

Results

The results of this study suggest that diversity is being included in a wide array of courses across college curricula. Further, the items used to tap diversity inclusivity form two reliable scales that appear to focus on the diverse grounding of a course and how inclusive learning strategies are used. When regressed on faculty and courses characteristics, several key predictors of both scales were found, including gender, race/ethnicity, and disciplinary area.

Amount of Diversity Inclusivity

Table 2 presents the distribution of faculty responses to each of the 12 diversity inclusivity items. Somewhat strikingly, there are two distinct patters of response that split the items into two groups of six. For items a through f, the distributions are relatively flat (a perfectly flat distribution would have 25% of faculty responding in each category). For items g through l, the distributions are skewed, with a large majority of faculty responding "Quite a bit" and "Very much."

On the first six items, those that focus on the purpose/goals, content, theoretical foundations, and instructor(s) of a course, between 40% and 59% of faculty indicated that each item was done a lot ("Quite a bit" or "Very much") in their courses. Slightly under half of the faculty indicated that working with people of different cultures, emphasizing contributions from people from different cultures, and addressing one's own biases about course-related issues

during class (items b, c, and f) were done quite a bit or more. However, over half said

understanding how to connect learning to societal problems, covering course topics from

multiple theoretical positions, and exploring one's own cultural biases (items a, d, and g) were

done a lot.

For the last six items, those that cover the learners, pedagogy, the classroom

environment, evaluation, and adjustment, at least 73% of the faculty indicated that each of the

items was done a lot in their courses. Fully 96% of the respondents indicated that they work a lot

on creating a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning. For those who have pushed for

learner-centered teaching (e.g., Barr & Tagg, 1995), faculty members' responses to these items

should be encouraging.

Across the 12 items, the distributions of faculty responses suggest that most faculty

members are including diversity into their courses in some ways, at least a little. The

distributions suggest a majority—sometimes a large majority—of faculty try to be inclusive

about their students (learners), their pedagogy, the classroom environment, evaluation, and

adjustment. Fewer faculty indicated being inclusive in the purpose and goals, content, theoretical

foundations, and in examining themselves, though still close to 50%. These two distinct patterns

of distributions were not anticipated and, interestingly, the two groups of items noticeable in

Table 2 appear again in the factor analysis discussed below.

Diversity Inclusivity Scales

Table 3 presents the results of the exploratory factor analysis (Principle Axis Factoring

with a Varimax rotation; KMO = 0.89 and Bartlett's Test was significant, $p < 0.001$), which

yielded two factors separating the items into groups of six, the same groups observable in Table

2. The factor loadings in Table 3 are from the rotated factor matrix. In the initial extraction, Factor 1 explained 42% of the variance and Factor 2 explained an additional 14%.

After rotation, the items most closely associated with Factor 1 (factor loadings > 0.40), were used to create a scale I have called, diverse grounding. For each respondent, I used the mean of the six items as a scale score. The scale's reliability was good (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$) and, as expected given the item distributions, the scale's mean was very close to the mid-point of the scale range (mean = 2.52, sd = 0.77). The items most closely associated with Factor 2 were similarly used to create a scale I have called, inclusive learning. This scale was equally reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$) but with a mean over 3 (mean = 3.27, sd = 0.59).

Given the original response options for each item, a scale score of 3 indicates that faculty averaged a score of "Quite a bit" for the items that made up the scale. Nearly one-third (32%) of the faculty respondents averaged above 3 on the diverse grounding items, and fully 72% averaged above 3 on the inclusive learning items. These percentages are substantially higher than the 12% of the respondents that indicated that their courses met a diversity requirement.

Predictors of Diversity Inclusivity

The analyses run to determine the faculty and course characteristics that predict diversity inclusivity captured a significant amount of variance in the two dependent measures. The independent variables explained 29% of the variance in diverse grounding and 16% of the variance in inclusive learning. The bulk of the difference in explained variance is attributable to the relative predictive power of disciplinary area in the models. For diverse grounding, the entry of the disciplinary area variables explained 17% more variance than faculty characteristics alone, which explained about 8% of the variance. For inclusive learning, faculty characteristics alone

explained 11% of the variance and disciplinary area only captured an additional 4% of the variability.

Table 4 contains the regression coefficients for both models. The sizeable predictors are generally significant in both models, though the relative size is often different between models. For example, women score higher than men on both dependent measures, but they score eighteen one-hundredths of a standard deviation higher on diverse grounding and two-fifths of a standard deviation (0.40) higher on inclusive learning. In addition, faculty of color in all groups score higher than their white colleagues on both measures. Even faculty who preferred not to respond to the race question averaged higher scores on both measures than faculty who identified as white ($B = 0.11$, $p < 0.01$, for diverse grounding and $B = 0.06$, $p > 0.05$, for inclusive learning).

For the other faculty characteristics, the coefficients were generally quite small. Differences based on highest degree earned, years teaching, employment status, tenure status, and course load were all trivial in size and only rarely detectably different than zero. However, a faculty member's perception of the inclusivity of the undergraduate curriculum at her or his institution was a modest positive predictor of both dependent measures ($\beta = 0.13$, $p < 0.001$, for diverse grounding and $\beta = 0.12$, $p < 0.001$, for inclusive learning).

Disciplinary differences were apparent in both models, but the pattern of differences varied. On average, after controlling for the other variables in the model, faculty members in arts and humanities, education, professional fields, and social sciences scored nearly a standard deviation or more above their colleagues in the physical sciences on diverse grounding. Faculty in engineering scored almost identically to their physical science colleagues ($B = 0.02$, $p > 0.05$). Faculty in 'other' fields (e.g., agriculture or computer science) scored over a tenth of a standard deviation higher ($B = 0.14$, $p < 0.001$), faculty in biological science scored nearly a third of a

standard deviation higher (B = 0.29, p < 0.001) and faculty in business scored over half a standard deviation higher (B = 0.57, p < 0.001) on average.

For inclusive learning, the differences were generally smaller. After controlling for the other measures in the model, biological science, engineering, and physical science faculty scored nearly identically. The remaining fields scored anywhere from one-fifth of a standard deviation (social science) to three-fifths of a standard deviation (education) higher than faculty in physical science.

The differences between upper and lower division courses were modest for diverse grounding (B = 0.14, p < 0.001) and trivial for inclusive learning (B = 0.03, p > 0.05). Course size mattered only for inclusive learning—scale scores for faculty teaching small courses averaged two-fifth of a standard deviation higher than large courses (B = 0.41, p < 0.001) and medium sized courses fell in between (B = 0.27, p < 0.001). Finally, and not surprisingly, the difference between courses that met a diversity requirement and those that did not was relatively large for diverse grounding (B = 0.55, p < 0.001) and modest in size for inclusive learning (B = 0.21, p < 0.001).

Discussion and Implications

Much of the dialogue about including diversity into the curriculum has focused on the inclusion of course content that is from or about non-Western, non-Classic, or non-privileged peoples and perspectives (Nelson Laird, 2003). Interestingly, a clear majority (60%) of the faculty respondents in this study suggested that their course content emphasized contributions from multiple cultures "Very little" or "Some." Depending on one's perspective, this could be alarmingly high or low. In my own judgment, it is a reasonable percentage. There are many courses where infusing diverse content, even if possible, is seen as difficult, not necessary, or, for

some, undesirable. Think here of many introductory courses, courses from the sciences, or courses about design or research methods. One has to be creative and often buck the norms within one's field to find ways to bring diversity into the content of such courses.

As the results of this study suggest, however, in focusing on content, one risks overlooking other important ways diversity is worked into collegiate courses. In addition, too much focus on content may unintentionally exclude faculty who feel diverse content is for someone else to deal with. It might also lead researchers to underestimate the effects of curricular experiences with diversity. In my own efforts to understand what constituted a diversity course, I quickly realized, based on the work of many others (e.g., Banks, 1999; Kitano, 1997; Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Warren, 1998), that diversity could be included into each aspect of a course and, consequently, nearly every course was—or could become—a diversity course to some degree (Nelson Laird, 2003).

A simple finding of the current study is that diversity is being included in many courses across undergraduate curricula through the eight elements of a course other than content. For example, over half of the faculty respondents in this study indicated that students in their courses gained a lot in terms of understanding how to connect their learning to societal problems or issues and that their courses drew a lot on multiple theoretical perspectives. Over four-fifths of the respondents indicated that they did a lot to create a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning and tried a lot to empower students through class participation. Such high levels of inclusivity were not expected.

In fact, it seems faculty are near a broad consensus on the importance and need to include diversity in the ways captured by the inclusive learning items—almost three-fourths of faculty respondents averaged "Quite a bit" or above on that scale. With such apparent buy-in, one can

question whether educators should reorient conversations about including diversity into courses by focusing first on the things connected to inclusive learning. One potential strategy for faculty development in this area would be to start conversations with faculty members where there is most agreement: fostering a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning. Then move progressively toward areas where fewer faculty members include diversity: from varying teaching methods to using multiple theoretical perspectives to including diverse content. If done well, such a conversation would highlight good practice, encourage faculty to recognize what they do already, highlight areas where faculty can push themselves to improve, and leave open the possibility that certain areas of one's course do not need to include diversity.

For diagnostic purposes, it would be simple to develop a tool for faculty members to estimate the diversity inclusivity of any of their own courses from the items in this study. Such a tool could inform the type of conversation outlined above and could be used by individual faculty members examining their own courses or in multiple types of faculty development settings (e.g., workshops or one-on-one consultations).

As they are currently, the 12 diversity inclusivity items combine to form two reliable scales. To build from the work in this study, researchers should consider expanding beyond the 12-items as well as trying to develop measures for students that would give a similarly comprehensive view of the inclusivity of the courses students take. For both the student and faculty measures, it will be important to investigate the validity of the resulting scales.

The two scales created from the 12 diversity inclusivity items in this study were useful for two reasons. First, the item groupings themselves highlighted which aspects of a course seem to move toward diversity inclusivity together. The diverse grounding items illustrate that when faculty have more inclusive content, they are also likely to be inclusive in terms of their course

goals, the theoretical underpinnings of the course, and their level of examining their own biases and limitations. For inclusive learning, as faculty are more inclusive in terms of their classroom atmosphere, they are also likely attempting to be inclusive in terms of understanding their students, using teaching methods that allow for different types of learning, using multiple types of evaluation, making adjustments based on student needs, and empowering students in class. Though not developed with this in mind, the group of inclusive learning items highlights how pedagogies from diversity and multicultural perspectives (e.g., Freiere, 1970, 1998; Giroux, 1997; Maher & Tetrault, 1994)—those that informed the development of the diversity inclusivity model—share a great deal with those informed by a student development approach (e.g., Baxter Magolda, 1999). Although some work has been done to illustrate how adopting a multicultural perspective may require a certain level of development (King & Shuford, 1996), more work is needed to illustrate how diversity informed pedagogies align with those based on developmental models and perspectives.

The two scales also proved useful in that they allowed for a succinct examination of what predicts diversity inclusivity. Not surprisingly, because the findings mirror previous results from FSSE (Kuh et al., 2004), women and faculty of color reported higher levels of diverse grounding as well as inclusive learning in their courses to a greater extent than their male and white colleagues, respectively, even after controlling for other variables in the model. Though whites and males may be less likely to include diversity into their courses in these ways due to socialization and cultural norms, there is nothing inherent in their gender or race/ethnicity that prevents including diversity into their courses. In fact, if evidence continues to suggest that including diversity into courses has important educational benefits for students (Chang, 2002;

Gurin et al., 2002; Nelson Laird, 2005), ways need to be used to challenge or undo that socialization and establish different prevailing cultural norms.

Other faculty characteristics had trivial effects on both measures of diversity inclusivity, with the exception of faculty perceptions of how much the undergraduate curriculum at their institution included diversity. Two possible explanations exist for the latter. It may be that the more diverse the curriculum on campus, the more faculty feel pressure to include diversity into their own courses. Alternatively, the more faculty members include diversity in their own courses, the more they are likely to see the overall curriculum as inclusive. Sorting out the direction of this effect may prove extremely difficult, but is nonetheless worth further study.

The most influential course characteristic in both models was disciplinary area. While the results suggest that some disciplines are more likely to use inclusive learning, the differences were not as large as with diverse grounding, which is much more prevalent in arts and humanities, education, professional fields, and social science. Though there is room to argue that diverse grounding is not necessarily anathema to the other disciplinary areas, it may be more practical and productive in those fields to reshape the conversation about diversity in the curriculum by focusing first on inclusive learning, as suggested earlier.

Relatively large differences in inclusive learning were observed between courses of different sizes (course size did not seem to impact diverse grounding)—in general, the larger the course, the less it focused on inclusive learning. Though this result certainly adds to the concern over large courses (McKeachie, 1980; Kokkelenberg, Dillon, & Christy, 2008), some suggest that such results are not preordained and that faculty can take steps in their larger courses to be learner-centered and promote active participation and engagement among their students (see Stanley & Porter, 2002).

Finally, the results suggest that courses that fulfill a diversity requirement include diversity to a greater extent than courses that do not fulfill such requirements. The effect on diverse grounding was sizeable and the effect on inclusive learning was modest, but what was surprising about these effects was that they were not larger, further suggesting that diversity inclusiveness is happening in many courses that do not meet such a requirement. This highlights the need for researchers to be careful when examining the effects of curricular diversity on students. For example, studies that examine the effects of diversity requirements (e.g., Chang, 2002) may only be conservative estimates of the effects of curricular exposure to diversity since many non-required courses likely include diversity as much as or more than those requirements. One approach to demonstrating this underestimation would be to compare the effect of diversity requirements against courses that average above a 3 on both the diverse grounding and inclusive learning scales.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

As a largely exploratory study, the investigation reported here highlights that diversity is being included in many, many courses. Courses in women's and ethnic studies, education, social work, and other fields often considered to be the locations of most diversity courses are clearly not the only places one can find diversity inclusivity. Courses inclusive of diversity also do not all meet diversity requirements and, further, an individual course may be inclusive in some aspects and lack inclusivity in others. This study also shows that many, many faculty are bring diversity into their courses through an inclusive learning approach, which combines knowing student needs, creating a classroom environment conducive to learning, and varying teaching and evaluation methods to reach different types of students.

These findings highlight the need for researchers and practitioners to find more nuanced ways to discuss what it means for a course to be a "diversity" course. The 12 items used in this study to create the dependent measures are a first step toward tapping a nuanced understanding of how faculty include diversity into their courses. Certainly more items and alternate approaches are worth exploring. Further, a similarly nuanced approach is needed to understand student participation in curricular experiences with diversity and developing a set of items students can respond to should be a priority for researchers in this area as well as comparing the effects of the resulting measures of curricular exposure to diversity to those used in the past.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (2003). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*(6), 12-25.

Biglan, A. (1973) The characteristics of subject matter in different scientific areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*, 195–203.

Chang, M. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The Journal of General Education, 51*(1), 21-42.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330-365.

Humphreys, D. (2000). National survey finds diversity requirements common around the country. *Diversity Digest, 5*(1), 1-2.

Hurtado, S. (2001). Research and evaluation on intergroup dialogue. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace* (pp. 22–36). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 26, No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

King, P. M., and Shuford, B. C. (1996). A multicultural view is a more cognitively complex view. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(2), 153–164.

Kitano, M. K. (1997). What a course will look like after multicultural change. In A. I. Morey & M. K. Kitano (Eds.), Multicu*ltural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kokkelenberg, E. C., Dillon, M., & Christy, S. M. (2008). The effects of class size on student grades at a public university. *Economics of Education Review, 27*, 221-233.

Kuh, G. D., Nelson Laird, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty activities and student behavior: Realizing the promise of Greater Expectations. *Liberal Education, 90*(4), 24-31.

Maher, F. A. & Tetrault, M. K. T. (1994). *The feminist classroom*. New York: Basic Books.

McIntosh, P. (1983). *Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective*. Working Paper #124. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McKeachie, W. J. (1980). Class size, large classes, and multiple sections. *Academe, 66*(Feb.), 24-27.

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2003). *Exploring what makes a course a "diversity" course: Delineating the elements of a course and how they are inclusive of diversity*. Unpublished manuscript.

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on

    academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking.

    Research in Higher Education, 46, 365-388.

Nelson Laird, T. F., Engberg, M. E., & Hurtado, S. (2005). Modeling accentuation effects:

    Enrolling in a diversity course and the importance of social action engagement. *Journal*

    of Higher Education, 76, 448-476.

Nelson Laird, T. F. & Niskodé, A. S. (2008, March). *How gender and race moderate the effect of*

    peer interactions across difference on student and faculty perceptions of the campus

    environment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational

    Research Association, New York, NY.

Schoem, D., Frankel, L., Zúñiga, X., & Lewis, E. (1993). The meaning of multicultural teaching:

    An introduction. In D. Schoem, L. Frankel, X. Zúñiga, & E. Lewis (Eds.), *Multicultural*

    teaching in the university. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five*

    approaches to race, class, and gender (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, D. G., and Associates (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students*

    benefit. Washington, DC: Association of American College and Universities.

Stanley, C. A. & Porter, M. E. (2002). *Engaging large classes: Strategies and techniques for*

    college faculty. Boston: Anker Publishing.

Stark, J. S. & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action*.

    Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Warren, K. J. (1998). Rewriting the future: The feminist challenge to the malestream curriculum.

    In G. E. Cohee, E. Daumer, T. D. Kemp, P. M. Krebs, S. Lafky, & S. Runzo (Eds.), *The*

feminist teacher anthology: Pedagogies and classroom strategies. New York: Teachers

College Press.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., Sevig, D., Thompson, M., & Dey, E. (1995, November). *Speaking the

unspeakable: Student learning outcomes in intergroup dialogues on a college campus*.

Paper presented at a meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Footnotes

[1] A notable exception is the work of Humphreys (2000) examining how many institutions have adopted diversity requirements. However, by focusing on diversity requirements, she too took a narrow view of how diversity could be included into the curriculum.

[2] Because FSSE is designed to compliment the NSSE, the lower and upper division dichotomy is used to parallel the dichotomous nature of the NSSE sample, which only contains first-year students and seniors.

Appendix

Independent Variables

Name	Description
Faculty Characteristics	
Female	0 = Male; 1 = Female
Race/ethnicity[a]	White/European American[b], Asian/Asian American, Black/African American, Hispanic American, Other, Multiple ethnic identifications, Preferred not to respond
Doctorate earned	0 = no doctorate; 1 = doctorate earned
Years teaching (in decades)	Continuous variable
Fulltime	0 = Part-time; 1 = Full-time
Tenured	0 = Not tenured; 1 = Tenured
Course load	Continuous variable
Perceived institutional curricular diversity	1 = Not at all inclusive to 7 = Totally inclusive
Course Characteristics	
Disciplinary area[a]	Arts and humanities, Biological science, Business, Education, Engineering, Physical science[b], Professional, Social science, Other fields
Upper division course	0 = Lower division, 1 = Upper division
Course size[a]	20 students or less, 21 to 50 students, More than 50 students[b]
Diversity requirement	0 = Not required; 1 = Department or college requirement

[a] Dichotomous indicator created for each group (0 = not in group, 1 = in group)
[b] Reference group

Table 1
Diversity Inclusivity Items

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

[a] Faculty members were asked how much each item happened in their course sections. Response options were 1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, and 4 = Very much
[b] Course elements from Nelson Laird's (2003) model.

Table 2
Distribution of Faculty Responses to the Diversity Inclusivity Items (N = 8,720)

Item[a]		Very little	Some	Quite a bit	Very much
a	Students gain an understanding of how to connect their learning to societal problems or issues	12%	29%	31%	28%
b	Students develop skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds	23%	36%	24%	18%
c	The course content emphasizes contributions to the field by people from multiple cultures	30%	30%	21%	19%
d	The course covers topics from multiple theoretical perspectives	15%	27%	32%	27%
e	You explore your own cultural and intellectual limitations as part of class preparation	19%	28%	27%	27%
f	You address your potential biases about course-related issues during class	20%	38%	26%	17%
g	You try to learn about student characteristics in order to improve class instruction	5%	22%	35%	38%
h	You vary your teaching methods to encourage the active participation of all students	2%	21%	37%	40%
i	You work on creating a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to student learning	<1%	4%	29%	67%
j	You try to empower students through their class participation	1%	11%	30%	57%
k	You evaluate student learning using multiple techniques	4%	19%	34%	44%
l	You adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, or assignments) based on student learning needs	4%	21%	32%	43%

[a] Faculty members were asked how much each item happened in their course sections.

Table 3
Factor Structure of the Diversity Inclusivity Items (N = 8,720)

Factor Groupings and Items[a]	Factor 1	Factor 2
Diverse Grounding (α = 0.84, mean = 2.52, sd = 0.77)		
a Students gain an understanding of how to connect their learning to societal problems or issues	0.68	0.16
b Students develop skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds	0.72	0.24
c The course content emphasizes contributions to the field by people from multiple cultures	0.74	0.16
d The course covers topics from multiple theoretical perspectives	0.58	0.17
e You explore your own cultural and intellectual limitations as part of class preparation	0.67	0.33
f You address your potential biases about course-related issues during class	0.52	0.21
Inclusive Learning (α = 0.84, mean = 3.27, sd = 0.59)		
g You try to learn about student characteristics in order to improve class instruction	0.36	0.55
h You vary your teaching methods to encourage the active participation of all students	0.21	0.72
i You work on creating a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to student learning	0.14	0.68
j You try to empower students through their class participation	0.23	0.72
k You evaluate student learning using multiple techniques	0.22	0.62
l You adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, or assignments) based on student learning needs	0.17	0.62

Note: The analysis used Principle Axis Factoring with a Varimax rotation. Factor loadings are from the rotated factor matrix. Factor 1 explained 42% of the variance and Factor 2 explained an additional 14%. For each respondent, the mean of the group of items most aligned (loading > 0.40) with a factor was used as a scale score. Scale reliabilities, means, and standard deviations are given in parentheses.
[a] Faculty members were asked how much each item happened in their course sections. Response options were 1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, and 4 = Very much

Table 4
Diversity Inclusivity Regression Results (N = 8,720)

	Diversity Grounding[a]			Inclusive Learning[a]		
	B	SE of B	β	B	SE of B	β
Constant	-1.56	0.06	***	-1.21	0.06	***
Female	0.18	0.02	0.09***	0.40	0.02	0.20***
Race/ethnicity						
White/European American	*reference group*			*reference group*		
Asian American	0.09	0.06	0.01	0.30	0.06	0.05***
Black/African American	0.34	0.05	0.06***	0.31	0.05	0.06***
Hispanic American	0.31	0.05	0.06***	0.26	0.05	0.05***
Other race/ethnicity	0.25	0.05	0.04***	0.20	0.06	0.03***
Preferred not to respond	0.11	0.03	0.03**	0.06	0.04	0.02
Doctorate earned	0.04	0.02	0.02	-0.07	0.02	-0.03**
Years teaching (in decades)	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.05***
Fulltime	-0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.03	0.01
Tenured	-0.05	0.02	-0.02*	-0.06	0.03	-0.03*
Course load	0.01	0.00	0.03**	0.02	0.00	0.05***
Curricular diversity	0.09	0.01	0.13***	0.08	0.01	0.12***
Disciplinary area						
Arts and humanities	1.09	0.03	0.49***	0.41	0.04	0.18***
Biological science	0.29	0.05	0.07***	-0.01	0.05	0.00
Business	0.57	0.04	0.16***	0.29	0.05	0.08***
Education	1.17	0.04	0.31***	0.63	0.05	0.17***
Engineering	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.00
Physical science	*reference group*			*reference group*		
Professional	0.98	0.04	0.27***	0.24	0.05	0.07***
Social science	1.16	0.04	0.42***	0.18	0.04	0.06***
Other fields	0.14	0.04	0.25***	0.34	0.04	0.12***
Upper division course	0.14	0.02	0.07***	0.03	0.02	0.01
Course size						
20 students or less	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.41	0.03	0.19***
21 to 50 students	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.27	0.03	0.13***
More than 50 students	*reference group*			*reference group*		
Diversity requirement	0.55	0.03	0.18***	0.21	0.03	0.07***
Multiple R	0.53			0.40		
R-squared	0.29			0.16		
Standard Error	0.85			0.92		
F	144.87***			56.11***		

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

[a] Dependent variable standardized prior to entry into the model.