View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University

Fayetteville State University
DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University

Government and History Faculty Working Papers | College of Arts and Sciences

June 1992

Institutional Inertia to Achieving Diversity: Transforming Resistance into Celebration

Nancy P. Greenman

Ellen B. Kimmel

Hellen M. Bannan

Blanche Radford-Curry
Fayetteville State University, bcurry@uncfsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/govt_hist_wp

Recommended Citation

Greenman, Nancy P ; Kimmel, Ellen B.; Bannan, Hellen M.; and Radford-Curry, Blanche, "Institutional Inertia to Achieving Diversity: Transforming Resistance into Celebration" (1992). *Government and History Faculty Working Papers.* Paper 2.
http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/govt_hist_wp/2

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences at DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Government and History Faculty Working Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University. For more information, please contact xpeng@uncfsu.edu.

Institutional Inertia to Achieving Diversity: Transforming Resistance into Celebration

By **Nancy P. Greenman, Ellen B. Kimmel, Helen M. Bannan, and Blanche Radford-Curry**

Nancy P. Greenman and Ellen B. Kimmel are professors in the Department of Psychological and Social Foundations, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa; Helen M. Bannan is a professor in the College of Education, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton; and Blanche Radford-Curry is a professor in the Department of Education, Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, Florida. *This paper evolved from a presentation by the authors at the 1990 meetings of the American Educational Studies Association in Orlando, Florida.*

> The task is not only to analyze the structural conditions by which inequity is reproduced in society but to search out every possible site in which the struggle for progressive transformation can take place.
> --Frederick Erickson (1987, p. 352)

Introduction

Since the early nineteen-sixties, educational reformers and political activists have pressed to open educational opportunities to previously denied groups, including, but not limited to, girls and women, Blacks/African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, physically challenged,

and newly immigrated groups. Despite legislation, government- and privately-funded change efforts, inservice education, curricular integration projects, and restructuring attempts, educational institutions remain remarkably the same. The fabric of this institutional inertia, we contend, is the inextricable linkage between individuals as culturally constructed beings and the institutions they collectively create and perpetuate. The focus of this paper, then, is articulation of multi-level, interdisciplinary perspectives on the problem of resistance to diversity as it is manifested in some institutions of higher education. We explore the nature of the mutually reinforcing dynamic between individuals and institutions in perpetuating existing structures. Finally, in response to Erickson's (1987) exhortation, we offer a pathway for transforming resistance into celebration of diversity by identifying some sites where change can occur.

Perspectives on the Problem

Where do we look to address institutional inertia? How do we pin down the inanimate structures? We think of institutions as concrete, even if they are neither literally nor figuratively so, but rather made of less substantial stuff. We track institutions through the expectations for behavior and the organized patterns of behavior of individuals. After all, institutions do not behave, the people who create and inhabit them do.

Structural Barriers To Diversity

Institutions are created within the boundaries of socially constructed realities and are woven with the fabric of these realities. What people consider the logical way to do things, or the most valued or efficient way to solve problems, or what is considered common sense, is so **within** this reality or from the perspective of the cultural world view. As Harkins (1976) succinctly put it, "Humans are the product of culture; culture is the product of humans" (p. 213). This world view is so pervasive and so elusive and so intertwined with every aspect of a culture that talking about it is extremely difficult. In fact, the need to do so is not perceived, as the assumption prevails that everyone who is not "mad or bad" accepts the same reality or truth (Watzlawick, 1976). Assumptions may be as basic as the value of the formalization of language (Menyuk and Menyuk, 1988) or the value of research (Suina, 1992). We are not simply speaking of ethnic, "racial," and gender difference here, but rather all aspects of cultural diversity. Sir Alfred North Whitehead described a "...general form of a form of thought; and, like the air we breathe, such a form is so translucent, and so pervading, and so seemingly necessary, that only by extreme effort can we become aware of it," (Whitehead in Michael S. Gregory, 1980, p. 300). This description aptly defines the concept of world view. Elusive though the world view may be, it is incumbent upon us to identify the prevailing assumptions in order to question, expand, or modify them

to encourage new forms of thinking, inquiring, and behaving. It is these assumptions that shape meaning, prescribe and reinforce behavior, and allow people to accept patterns and structures as appropriate and inevitable--even when they conflict with rhetoric for change. Thus, institutions appear to be unyielding behemoths.

The prevailing American world view is supported by particular "scientific" principles. Part of the Western societal world view, influenced by Greek philosophy and concretized in the nineteenth century, is that reality be validated by science. Thus, the Cartesian-Newtonian paradigm--belief in a fixed universe, stasis, equilibrium, matter as the essence of the universe, duality, reductionism, segmentation, deductive logic, linearity, and two-valued causality--provides the parameters for this world view.

This translates into the way the school year and school day are divided, the reduction ofknowledge into facts, facts into subjects, subjects into courses, courses into units, units into lessons, and lessons into objectives (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990). It saturates every aspect of both the overt and hidden curricula, from preschool through higher education--even the very form of school buildings. It allows and encourages us to view differences as negative and separate--not part of the reality.

While we readily acknowledge manifestations of the industrial model of standardization in public schooling, we are less apt to recognize the same rigid foundations at the university level. The conscious transformation, in the late nineteenth century, of American universities to the hierarchical German model, and the similarity of the structures inherent in such a model and in the uniform corporate model which evolved contemporaneously is not as readily discussed. Worse, we have not exposed such structures for their irrelevancy to a viable learning/research institution that would seek to reflect and embody the realities of diverse groups.

In an effort to reveal the operation of some structural barriers to cultural diversity, open-ended "ethnographic" interviews were conducted with 15 faculty of several southern universities (Greenman, 1990-91). Analysis of the data revealed the following:

1. Reward structures often do not reflect public rhetoric of diversity. Faculty reported that those who collaborate outside of their narrowly defined specialty often are "given a nod for the effort," but told that it does not really count toward tenure and promotion. For example, a marketing professor reported that her African-American-related research brought compliments from her colleagues, but she was told that, if she wanted tenure, she had better focus on her "area." Another professor reported that he was told that if he wanted tenure, he had to be the single author of his manuscripts.

2. Faculty who engage in long-term qualitative studies reported feeling very vulnerable; they observed that existing structures informed by cultural assump-

tions about "truth," "science," and "research," support brief statistical studies. As one professor stated, "I was hired partially because I do qualitative research, but I have been reprimanded for not having 'concrete data' and for not producing a quantity of publications." Another professor stated, "I have been told that I am not doing any research, when I've just completed and read the galleys for a book on a nine-year study."

3. Faculty reported feeling the need for "qualitative research groups" for "mutual support and help in negotiating an unfriendly system" and "to establish credibility in a positivistic research structure." One professor stated, "Empiricism is so narrowly defined. What is empirical research, anyway? If it is experiential, and involves the senses, then how can the participant-observation of qualitative research not be included?" Many reported discomfort with the fact that quantitative and qualitative research are viewed as polar opposites (see Howe and Eisenhart, 1990; Smith, 1983). They noted that, apparently, methodology becomes an end in itself--rather than an emergent, in Thelma McCormack's (1989) words, "constructed knowing wherein the two voices--emic and etic/subjective and objective are integrated...[where]...Authors may be passionate about formal knowledge and analytic about one's personal life" (p. 23).

4. Faculty, especially those from colleges of education, reported an apparent lack of congruence between the intended student outcome and the instructional design and evaluation used. In the words of one professor, "We profess the need for experiential learning, critical thinking, portfolio evaluation, sensitivity to diversity, and emergent teaching, but classrooms abound in didactic lecture and multiple choice exams; when we venture forth to practice what we preach, we are often punished for it."

5. Faculty reported that the faculty evaluation procedure structures do not allow for creativity or diversity of style. One professor in a college of education explained, "Students who are naive of the subject matter are the source of evaluations of the professors' pedagogical knowledge base--which is the subject matter expertise. If the professor models good teaching congruent with a new knowledge base, like emergent teaching, she--or he--is evaluated by students who use their own experience, or old knowledge base, for a criterion. It's like, if I were a biology professor, and taught the students all about cells, and then they evaluated me on whether or not I was being the best cell I possibly could."

6. Faculty reported that systems for accounting of human resources, FTE's, create structural barriers to effective use of expertise and resources in support of inter- or transdisciplinary efforts. Faculty who reported that they do interdisciplinary teaching and other projects reported that they do so "in spite of" the existing structures. "We can usually find ways around the structures, but it would really be nice if we didn't have to expend our energy in that way, and could instead just focus on the collaboration."

7. Faculty gave accounts of administration "shaping program through

implicit, often inappropriate criteria." One professor who was brought in on funded research "to develop an innovative emergent curriculum" recounted that she was "instructed to package the curriculum," told that it "could only be used on the graduate level because the undergraduates needed prescribed, not evolving, pedagogy and information." She related the following: "The physical space in which collaboration was fostered for all staff and faculty levels was dismantled for segregated office space because the interaction was interpreted as 'too much socializing.' They probably thought they were doing us a favor--giving us private offices, even after we explained our intent--but it effectively dampered the collaborative effort."

8. Faculty reported that "racism and cultural diversity are addressed as isolated personal problems, rather than structural ones." One professor in particular reported continually raising the issues of structural barriers to diversity, but was always told to see her supervisor about her "personal problems." As one professor indicated, "The conventional wisdom underlying the system involves assumptions that are part of the cultural hegemony of established classes in society."

9. Faculty reported that complex issues, such as affirmative action, "are reduced to simplistic problem-solving continua."

10. Faculty reported that, as one professor stated, "Although official rhetoric is supportive, cultural diversity and multicultural education are criticized as the antithesis of democracy and the issues are trivialized by invocations of 'politically correct' agendas." Several professors described misinformed public outcry against multicultural education and cultural pluralism citing "compromise of quality" and "dissolution of truth" as "inevitable consequences of multiculturalism."

Obviously, diversity is broadly defined within these themes. They describe faculty's assessment of barriers to **any** form of diversity, the structures that encourage and support uniformity and sameness of being, thinking and doing throughout the university.

A look at professor-student interactions in university classrooms and the way classes are structured provides more insight into the way individual behaviors reinforce the "cultural hegemony" in resistance to diversity.

Invisibility and Silence in the Classroom

Though discourse about contemporary education acknowledges diversity and multiculturalism, the roar of the mainstream is still the voice heard in classrooms--in curricula, text, expectations, and behavior. Culturally different groups are far less audible and visible. As Thorne (1989) described:

> Invisibility and silence are characteristic experiences of subordinated groups, especially in settings created and controlled by those with structural power. Of course, all groups have lively,

> talking occasions. But in dominant settings, like universities, where white, class-privileged men and their subcultures prevail, those not of the entitled categories may experience a particular kind of silence, infused with feelings of not being quite at home, of anxiety, of self doubt. (p. 313)

A history of curricula of exclusion has contributed greatly to this invisibility and silence. The fact that "...women of all social classes, ethnicities, and sexualities, and minority, working class, and gay men are to a great extent absent from traditional bodies of knowledge" (Thorne, 1989, p. 311) does not support multivocality. Thorne suggested that the existence of distortions and gaps in what we teach raises two questions: (1) What are the effects on those people whose lives and histories have been, and may still be, distorted or enveloped in silence?; and (2) What are the effects of the invisibility and silence of non-dominant groups on the privileged, the Euro-American, the heterosexual, the class-privileged, the men and boys whose experiences have been inflated as universal knowledge?

In response to Thorne's first question, the following anecdotes from Moses' (1989) research may provide some illumination on the classroom experiences of women of color. The data were collected from African American women at various colleges and universities. Their statements represent typical realities of the intersection of race and gender in student-faculty relations. Six themes appear most evident in these students' perceptions: (1) professors' limited expectations, due to race/gender; (2) professors' exclusion of gender/race issues from the curriculum; (3) stereotyping; (4) the implicit assumption that each student speaks for all African Americans and/or women; (5) the double estrangement from being both African American and female; and (6) failure to differentiate among Blacks. The silence and invisibility echo in these students' words:

> * My professor in biology did not know how to treat me. He seemed surprised when I told him I wanted to be a doctor.
>
> * My teachers, all but one, don't know how to treat me. They are always slightly surprised when I ask a probing or thoughtful question.
>
> * I have this older Black male professor who does not want to listen to me when I raise gender issues in class. It really upsets me because the majority of students in the class are female.
>
> * I was surprised to find that this professor who was really in tune to most issues...became hostile when I told her that her generalizations about Blacks were not true.
>
> * On the days I know they are going to talk about Black issues, I don't go because I know she is going to call on, me and it makes me uncomfortable.
>
> * It really upsets me that many times I know the answer, but my teacher will call on me to answer only questions about Black

issues or Black women's issues, but not general issues.

* As an older graduate student and frequently the only minority student, I sometimes feel that my comments and opinions are held up as though I speak for the entire Black race. Such sweeping generalizations are neither fair to me personally nor to Blacks in general.

* Sometimes I used to think that I was imagining this treatment of isolation. Then I would talk to other Black women about it, and they would talk about it too. It was not just me, but I thought it was, at least for the first year.

* I experience isolation because I am estranged from both Black and White students. White students ignore me because all they see is my blackness. They do not care to know me as a person, as a woman. From other Blacks I am isolated because I am West Indian. I am culturally different (pp. 3-4).

These perceptions are corroborated by the research literature. Joseph Katz (1985), in his discussion about White faculty and the effects of racism, delineated the following array of interactive behaviors and situations reported by African American students about their white faculty: (1) A professor's tone of voice or facial expressions display disbelief or surprise when the African American students respond correctly or otherwise show good performance; (2) Professors offer little guidance and/or criticism of African American students' work; and (3) Professors often make stereotypical comments about African American people without being aware of the impact these comments may have on African American students--particularly when they imply that African American people are less competent than White people.

Six African-American graduate and undergraduate students at a southern university were interviewed to corroborate the experiences so explicitly evident in the literature (Greenman, 1990-91). In addition to overwhelmingly supporting the issues already presented here, these students gave vivid descriptions of total invisibility by recounting ways in which they were completely ignored. Two examples demonstrate:

* I remember many classes where the professor pretended we were not even there. In this one class we all sat together--maybe to remind ourselves that we existed--and the professor never even looked in our direction. We used to joke about it all the time.

* One professor always had time for questions, but raised Black hands were ignored, and when only Black hands were left in the air, there was no more time for questions.

Jacqueline Fleming (1984) found that African American students get the least and White students get the most of their teachers' attention; that is, faculty spend

less time answering questions of African American students. There is mounting evidence that being ignored in the classroom is the major problem African American students experience at predominantly White colleges. They are virtually invisible.

These same observations are supported by evidence from research about the effects on women of masculine generics such as "he," "his," and "man," as in "every student should pick up his assignment" and "the evolution of man." A number of studies (e.g., Bodine, 1975; Kidd, 1971; Miller & Swift, 1976; Moulton, Robi & Elias, 1980) have demonstrated that women "blank out," are unable to form imagery of the given subject, and, in the extreme, feel schizophrenic when masculine generics are used. Other sources of gender bias reportedly include the following:

> 1. When professors are male, college men engage in more student/faculty interactions than do college women.
> 2. Professors note and gesture more in response to men's questions over those of women.
> 3. Male students present themselves more positively during interactions than do women students.
> 4. Professors are more rewarding when they address men as opposed to women (Allen and Niss, 1990, p. 608).

Such factors certainly support Thorne's suggestion that men (both White and African American) derive an inflated sense of presence and self-importance that accompanies privilege.

The concerns raised here about the intersection of race and gender in the ways faculty teach are also manifested in curricular issues. Curricula do not reflect current research and scholarship on issues about women and people culturally different from the mainstream, nor do they prepare students to successfully participate in a culturally pluralistic/multicultural society (McCarthy, 1990; Wilkerson, 1985-86). Evidence abounds supporting claims that omission of the African American experience from the curriculum incites underlying tensions; African Americans are deprived of acknowledgement and other students are deprived of learning about African Americans (e.g., McCarthy, 1990; Hollins and Spencer, 1990; Crichlow et al., 1990). The fundamental nature of existing curricula must be changed in order to address this problem. To compound these slights, Women's Studies and Black Studies programs typically continue to be administered by White women and African American men, not African American women (Moses, 1989). Hence, the concerns of African American women usually are not heard or, at best, their needs are presumed by others to be known.

Such presumptions further perpetuate negative cultural stereotypes about African American women. Too often the view that African American women are independent, emotionally strong, and capable of taking care of themselves masks the fact that, like White women, African American women have difficulty

asserting themselves in traditionally male-defined settings. Such stereotypes impact the efforts of non-dominant groups to overcome many of the biased student-faculty relations described above. Also, such stereotypes lead to misinterpretations of behavior. For example, Moses (1989) cited evidence that an African American woman's silence may be interpreted as a challenge or as disrespect, while an African American woman's "toughness" sometimes masks uncertainty and vulnerability. This raises the issue of differential interpretation of the same behavior and language exhibited by members of different groups. What is assertive for a man--viewed a strength--is labeled as aggressive in a woman, Black or White, and is deplored.

As to Thorne's second question, What are the effects on the privileged, the mainstream, below are but a few answers:

* Inbreeding of perception;
* Narrow sense of reality;
* Inaccurate science--Data on the few are not generalizable;
* Impoverished culture--Crackers, no cheese.

Most insidious is that members of the mainstream rarely have critical awareness of themselves in a cultural context; they are unaware of their unearned privilege and assume their norms and values are inviolate truth.

Mapping the Mainstream

"Mainstream" is a word inviting those intrigued by metaphor to play; even the authors of the dictionary could not resist, beginning their definition with the words, "the prevailing current." Analyzing the contents and contours of the mainstream as it flows through our educational institutions, is a task with geographical as well as historical aspects. Here, we offer a verbal map: an acronym that spells out clearly the properties of privilege that keep the mainstream flowing, and, by inference, reveals the many dimensions of difference that this mainstream engulfs and ignores--complex, intersecting levels of experience swirling with vitality at the edges of the current of conformity.

The structure of American education and the curricula that inhabit that structure implicitly spell "mainstream" as MY FATHER'S WASP (Bannan, 1991) as depicted in Figure 1. We are not talking here about a formally developed structure and curriculum designed for the purpose of teaching this acronym, but rather the values and orientation that permeate traditional American curricula.

These words represent the dominant, privileged position in several critical categories of difference operating in our culture: gender, age, class, appearance, health, region, handedness, sexuality, race, language, ethnicity, and religion. All of these systems are socially constructed, that is, they are cultural products, ideologically-inspired elaborations of biological, regional or economic differences, drawing hierarchies where reality displays diversity, delineating a di-

chotomy where life presents a continuum. Theorists of diversity (e.g., Hurtado, 1989; King, 1988; Lorde, 1984; and Minnich, 1990) unanimously insist that these various categories of difference are not additive, but interactive, creating complex hybrid forms of discrimination. As historian Gerda Lerner (1990) recently has reminded us, we need to understand that the apparent multiplicity of designations of deviance actually masks a single system of oppression using the old "divide and conquer" technique to reinforce the hierarchy and maintain the power of the dominant. Understanding this helps us to be successful in refusing to allow that ploy to work.

Figure 1

M	male
Y	young
F	financially secure
A	attractive
T	thin and tall
H	healthy
E	Eastern-Establishment
R	right-handed
'S	straight
W	white
A	Anglo
S	Saxon
P	Protestant

Those of us who spell ourselves differently are forced to stretch ourselves to understand this perspective that permeates everything we learn formally. While this adds a burden of otherness to our experience, it also can stimulate growth, if, somewhere in our education, we are given opportunities to develop a sense of the value of our own distinctive voice. Those people who fit the mainstream are privileged, in that they are rarely challenged by a sense of alienation. As Doris Davenport (1989-90) noted, people who are "identifiably 'white'....ostensibly--'free' of specific identifiers" seem to have "no need to identify themselves" (p. 82). However, that privilege has a cost: unconscious narrowness and arrogance inappropriate and limiting in a complex multicultural world.

In this map of the mainstream, all of us can see ourselves, at least potentially at some point in our lives, as both privileged and deviant. This seems to alleviate some of the guilt-induced denial that discussion of privilege often provokes. As Peggy McIntosh (1988) clearly demonstrated, it seems to be much easier to see

someone else's assumed advantage than to admit to one that, unconsciously accepted, benefits us directly. Seeing that right-handed privilege is real somehow makes it easier to admit that white skin privilege exists as well.

The arbitrary nature of these systems of discrimination becomes clearer as we notice that certain dimensions of difference are heavily weighted with meaning in our culture, while others are not as fully elaborated or fraught with consequences in terms of power. Helen Bannan and her students struggled together with the question of whether including dimensions of difference less obviously oppressive, such as region, appearance, and handedness, would trivialize the overwhelming impact of the major systems of oppression built upon the differences of gender, race, class, and sexuality. They decided that formulating the acronym to highlight the major systems of differentiation (as the first letter of each word in the acronym) would underline their importance without imposing a hierarchy of oppression, which was agreed to be counterproductive to our understanding of the interconnectedness of all these factors. The differences based on group identifications (gender, race, class, ethnicity, religion) are more powerful in producing curricular exclusion as well as personal incidents of discrimination. The individually-based differences of appearance create self-fulfilling prophecies of stereotypical expectations, so they impact on educational experience in a more directly personal way. All contribute, however, to a vision of the mainstream as a rapidly flowing confluence of conformity.

The particular river on which we are focusing in this paper, the American educational and curricular mainstream, has been carving its channel for a long time. Formal schooling in our earliest history was an experience entirely limited to those who spelled their identity in letters matching the first and last words of the acronym: Male, Young, White Anglo Saxon Protestant, plus Financially Secure, creating the very beginnings of the Eastern Establishment. When, in the 19th century, the system stretched to educate others--women, African Americans, Native Americans, immigrants, etc.--they were approached very pointedly as outsiders to be converted; the curriculum expressed a kind of Nativist democratic faith, and the teachers, often very consciously, acted as its missionaries. Some of the best of the teachers, individually, attempted to validate the worth of their students by conjuring a vision of a melting pot that took the best characteristics of its diverse contents, and blended them in a new American alloy. The image of the melting pot was popularized in the late nineteenth century, though the idea had its roots in the work of Crevecoeur in the Revolutionary period (Crevecoeur, 1782; Kraut, 1982; Prucha, 1973; Weiss, 1982).

The emphasis was always on conformity to the standard set by the beliefs of those who could unequivocally state, "MY FATHER'S WASP," however. The same textbooks and courses shaped students in schools and colleges coast to coast; for example, in the late nineteenth century Indian Commissioner Thomas J. Morgan introduced into BIA schools a standardized curriculum that was modeled

after that used in Ohio. Indian schools also emphasized industrial education, training students for manual and domestic labor, actualizing racist beliefs about Indian employment potential by providing only that sort of training (Prucha, 1976). African Americans experienced similar tracking, though the influence of W. E. B. Du Bois led to some emphasis on academic excellence for the "talented tenth" (Altschuler, 1982). Congruently, this same era also witnessed the birth of many strongly academic women's colleges, and of home economics as a discipline that aimed to improve the status and scientific credibility of the sphere to which most women were relegated, regardless of their education (Solomon, 1985). These efforts to adapt the curriculum to recognize differences were clearly motivated by the perspective of the dominant group, which kept the waters of the MY FATHER'S WASP mainstream free from any "polluting" influences of others, except for the few token individuals allowed to tread water as best they could if they would move along with the current.

By the nineteen twenties, some thinkers, writers, and teachers, prominent among them Horace Kallen, whose identity was spelled with different letters, developed the idea of cultural pluralism, substituting the romantic image of a symphony, or the mundane one of salad bowl, for the industrialized vision of pouring molten steel (Kallen, 1924; Gordon, 1964). In both symphony and salad, each constituent part retains its characteristics, while contributing to the tone or flavor of the whole. These ideas had some impact on schools dominated by the different; for instance, Indian schools began in the nineteen thirties to include teaching some traditional arts. By and large, however, "on flowed the river," the MY FATHER'S WASP mainstream.

The very velocity and strength of this flow enables it to carry much solid material: what might appear to be simply the flotsam and jetsam of individual idiosyncratic differences, when viewed from a broader perspective, can be seen to constitute the topsoil of many different traditions, enough "sediment," as it were, to construct new continents of understanding. As we moved to the later decades of the twentieth century, many groups of the different began redefining their differences in positive terms and insisting that the standard curriculum teach all students, not just their own children. A vision of a multicultural world, and the values of diversity appeared to be emerging, but these visions and values have yet to become reality.

Solutions

The Individual's Power to Transform

Prejudice and discrimination are not innate, rather they are learned--passed down as part of a cultural legacy:

You've go to be taught to hate and fear,
You've got to be taught from year to year,
It's got to be drummed in your little ear--
You've got to be carefully taught!
You've got to be taught to be afraid
Of people whose eyes are oddly made,
And people whose skin is a different shade--
You've got to be carefully taught.
You've got to be taught before it's too late,
Before you are six or seven or eight,
To hate all the people your relatives hate--
You've got to be carefully taught!
You've got to be carefully taught!
(Rogers and Hammerstein, 1949, pp. 136-137)

Although we are "carefully taught" the implicit and explicit cultural world view, we, as individuals, can transform our cultural legacy. The following report by an African American student of one professor's influence on her success is illustrative:

> As a graduate student, I was basically ignored. The only exception to this was one tenured professor, a Black man, who consistently encouraged me even though I was not in his program. I took only one course from him but he...encouraged my scholarship. He also published and gave me credit for two case studies I had completed for his class. He was one of the main reasons I stayed on. (in Moses, 1989, 3-4)

While most psychologists who have dealt with explanations of change have acknowledged the dangers of reductionism to the individual, they also have asserted the importance of such an analysis as part of multi-level theory building about change. Kurt Lewin introduced to psychology the force field model of change in which the status quo is not the static situation it appears, but rather a place held firm by dynamic forces that are equal in power as they clash against each other. He called the forces pushing the individual toward change the "driving forces" and those against, the "restraining forces" and argued that the most effective way to institute change was to melt the resistance rather than add to the driving forces. He was convinced that planned change was difficult but possible.

Chris Argyris (1982) and Donald Schön (1978) were less sanguine about that possibility. They outlined a cycle of events wherein new concepts and values were incorporated only to the degree that they perpetuated the system of ideas and values extant. Only a nuclear blast could dislodge the existing set of beliefs and values that underlie human behavior. Thus, psychologists have contended that while the nature of things is to change, the more they change the more they stay the same. Or, as various therapists have asserted, only when staying the same is far more

painful than adopting alternative behaviors, will clients stop resisting what's good for them.

Against such gloomy explanations of resistance to change--in this case the opening of education to "outsiders" as named by Bannan--two lines of recent research in social psychology offer hope that an in-group **can** change its attitudes toward an out-group and that this change can be expedited. As such, they illuminate personal pathways to overcoming institutional inertia and, in turn, suggest ways institutions can assist individuals within to facilitate greater openness to diversity.

The first research (Linville, Salovey, and Fischer, 1989) was a series of four studies, wherein traditional approaches to analyzing stereotyping were challenged and which demonstrated that people do not think about broad social categories in terms of a unitary stereotype, that is, a list of prototypical traits. Three experiments showed that greater familiarity of individuals with a category (or group) leads to greater perceived differentiation and variability. (It is interesting to note here that differentiation among out-group members is valued and contributes to dispelling stereotypes, while rigid or limited differentiation between the in-group and an out-group actually contributes to the creation of stereotypes.) We learn to see our differences. This greater familiarity operates even when the characterization is about an out-group--that is, it is not out-group status per se that leads to stereotyping, but familiarity or lack thereof that contributes more to stereotyping.

Specifically, in their experiments, groups of old versus young, Irish versus American, and male versus female evaluated themselves and each other. While older and younger and Irish and American groups stereotyped each other--that is failed to differentiate--males versus females did not. All three pairs constituted in and out groups, but only the first two were relatively unfamiliar with each other, lending support to the notion that familiarity is a key in the dissipation of stereotyping and contradiction of traditional notions of out-group homogeneity based on social group membership.

In their fourth study, Linville *et al.* (1989) varied familiarity directly by measuring students in a class over the semester, asking them to evaluate class members on various traits. As their familiarity with each other increased over the term, the differentiation and variability of their perceptions increased as predicted. (Although they became **less** favorable over time--to know them is not necessarily to love them...) This contradicts the assertion that greater familiarity with one's in-group accounts for greater in-group favoritism.

Linville *et al.* (1989) concluded by offering a model for the way our concepts about a category, here a social group, are encoded or stored. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to elaborate the model, in which learning and memory play a central role, and its testing via a computer simulation, but suffice it to say that the investigators did just that and felt that the results provide a cognitive basis for the differential familiarity hypothesis. However, their results also showed a concave impact of familiarity that indicates that, "...although greater familiarity with a

category provides the **opportunity** for the perceiver to form a more differentiated or variable representation of a category, it does not ensure that one will do so" (p. 175). There are caveats, of course. Familiarity is only one process, and there are undoubtedly other motivational and cognitive processes that play a role in social categorization. Their model implies that in-group/out-group differences will be greater when perceivers are more familiar with their in-group, as in the case of young versus old or American versus Irish groups. Other lines of research note that familiarity or exposure add an evaluative component so that this "piece" can be combined into increasingly comprehensive models to account for prejudice from a cognitive perspective.

To summarize, Linville *et al.*'s (1989) approach to stereotyping can be viewed in terms of the statistical properties of beliefs about members of social categories. For example, measures of central tendency detect systematic bias and become measures of prejudice. The differentiation measures indicate the likelihood that a perceiver will distinguish among group members on a trait and thus detect overgeneralizations about group members. Variability may reflect another type of stereotyping, or show the tendency to see group members as lying at two extremes. Using all three measures thus permits us to tap different aspects of prejudice and stereotyping and gives a "richer impression of the 'pictures in our heads'" (p. 187). Further, this reasoning and method suggest that the success of intergroup contact should be evaluated in terms of both fostering more favorable **and** more differentiated perceptions.

If understanding how we become able to deal with differences is our goal, the work of social psychologists using models of information processing may provide a key. Lack of differentiated thinking about a group permits more extreme evaluations of individual group members, stronger inferences from one member to the group, and out-group discrimination. Thus, promoting differential thinking about group members may be a useful strategy for altering stereotypes. Feminists, for example, come in all packages: Black, White, old, young, short, tall, male, female, etc. As an individual encounters more and more feminists--has greater familiarity--it is less likely that they can be stereotyped or lumped into one likeness except where they indeed are alike: all hold the belief that women and men are of equal value.

The second line of research to be described here is that of Patricia Devine (1989). Many classical and contemporary theorists have suggested that prejudice is an inevitable consequence of categorization (stereotyping), thus positing the "inevitability of prejudice;" so long as stereotypes exist, prejudice will follow. Stereotypes are automatically applied to members of stereotyped groups, and knowledge of the stereotype is equated with prejudice toward that group. This perspective has serious import since no one is without a social heritage that transmits attitudes and stereotypes about one's own and other groups. Devine and others argue instead that stereotypes and beliefs are distinct cognitive structures.

She reports three studies that challenge the "inevitability of prejudice" framework, studies that distinguish stereotypes from beliefs and the automatic or involuntary from the controlled or voluntary processes of cognition. As in the previous research, Devine draws on information processing work. Automatic processes involve the spontaneous activation of some well learned associations in memory, but have been shown to be replaceable by conscious intentions to evoke a different or new response under certain experimental conditions. The inhibition of automatic associations, however, requires both enough time and cognitive capacity.

There is strong evidence in children that stereotypes are well established in memory before the children develop the cognitive ability to question their validity or acceptability (e.g., Allport, 1954; Katz, 1976). This means that stereotypes are older and more accessible than personal beliefs. Devine's (1989) model assumes that high- and low-prejudiced persons are equally knowledgeable of cultural stereotypes, but differ in their beliefs about them. Low-prejudiced people have consciously **decided** a stereotype is inappropriate and thus experience a conflict between the automatic, culturally transmitted stereotype and their personal opinion of it. Such overt nonprejudiced responses require intentional inhibition of the automatic stereotype and intentional activation of nonprejudicial responses. However, if an individual is unaware that the stereotype is being activated, that activated stereotype may result in unintentional coloring of their beliefs and behavior. The implication of this automatic stereotype activation is serious, particularly when the stereotype is negative.

In the first study, Devine (1989) demonstrated that, indeed, high- and low-prejudiced individuals are equally knowledgeable of cultural stereotypes, a previously undocumented finding. Study two examined automatic stereotyping priming effects for high- and low-prejudiced individuals. Research participants evaluated ambiguously hostile behaviors after arousal of the stereotype of Blacks (as hostile). Briefly, participants were exposed at below the recognition level either to a list of 80 racial (Black) prime words such as Black, aggressive, basketball, poor, etc., to 20 neutral words or a list of 20 prime versus 80 neutral words, thus activating to a greater or lessor degree the racial stereotype. This occurred while they engaged in a vigilance task as a distractor. Following this, they read the classic "Donald" paragraph, a 12-sentence passage that portrays Donald, whose race is unspecified, as engaging in a series of empirically established hostile behaviors.

As expected, the level of activation of automatic stereotypes impacted high- and low-prejudiced participants equally. The 80-prime word list led to greater evaluations of hostility of Donald's behavior than the 20-prime word list for high- and low-prejudiced individuals alike. Here, the ability to consciously monitor stereotype activation was precluded. Thus, when stereotypes are automatically engendered, they may have effects that are inaccessible to the individual.

Study 3, the good news, demonstrated that, in contrast, when the conflict

between a nonprejudiced personal belief and a stereotype is made salient, low-prejudiced persons are motivated to reaffirm their nonprejudiced self-concepts. They denounce the stereotype and express their contrasting belief. In this study, students anonymously listed their thoughts about Blacks as a racial group. The high-prejudiced group listed many negative traits and were less likely to describe beliefs, while the low-prejudiced students listed few traits, but many beliefs, such as, "It's unfair to judge people by their color, they should be seen as individuals." What is significant here is that even though their identity was unknown, low-prejudiced individuals thought carefully about their responses to ensure that they did not contain stereotypes or prejudice, despite the fact that the stereotype was aroused by the task of writing about Blacks as a race. They censored the stereotypes so activated in favor of beliefs they had about these stereotypes. Moreover, they were reluctant to ascribe traits, positive or negative, to a group that would imply that all members of that group were alike in some way other than the color of their skin. They differentiated among the out-group members *á la* Linville *et al.* (1989).

Some have argued that automatic responses are independent of conscious beliefs--that in fact all White Americans are prejudiced toward African Americans, and nonprejudiced behaviors are just forms of impression management (cover ups for socially undesirable attitudes). Such an argument denies the possibility for change in beliefs, despite changes in words or rhetoric. Devine's (1989) model of the power of controlled processes to inhibit the automatic, in contrast, shows this power to be the key to escape prejudice. We are all victims of being limited capacity processors. We cannot attend to all aspects of a situation. When the controlled processes are precluded or interfered with, automatic processing occurs, and early learned stereotypes are activated and impact our behavior. But prejudiced responses are like bad habits--they can be broken. To do this, to resist resistance to equalitarian attitudes, the individual must: 1) decide to stop the old belief (behavior), 2) remember this resolution, and 3) try repeatedly and decide repeatedly to eliminate the habit and replace it with a rival, new belief in diversity as desirable.

More specifically, individual faculty and administrators can challenge their narrow spelling of MY FATHER'S WASP and behave in classrooms and on campus in ways that mentor and empower their constituents rather than diminish them.

Structural Sites for Transforming Institutions

As educators in an educational system that has been guided by psychology, we are reasonably comfortable personalizing issues. Thus, individual commitment to the elimination of prejudice and discrimination appears credible. Where, however, is the link between individual behavior and structural issues?

We scholars in the foundations of education are usually aware of the structure

of education and schooling in philosophical and socio-cultural contexts; we know that education is a socio-cultural institution; it consists of a life-long process of organized patterns of behavior that constitute learning. Education is culturally defined--institutionalized differently in different cultures. In Western society it traditionally takes the form of schooling in places called schools, though we recently have reaffirmed the importance of learning that happens beyond the school walls. We teach the ramifications of the contexts of learning to our students. Are we aware of the metaphors we choose for our perceptions of and interactions with reality? Are we aware of the overshadowing influence of MY FATHER'S WASP? We, the authors, contend that developing awareness of one's cultural world view provides structural access points to open educational institutions to diverse groups.

The automatic stereotype discussed earlier in this paper does not just address the obvious differences such as the skin color and other physical characteristics we often erroneously equate with culture, rather it addresses the subtle differences that challenge taken-for-granted aspects of culture. "Any individual's cognitive structure is a working model of the cultural system of which she or he is a part," (Spindler, 1976, p. 81). Not only must individuals examine themselves critically in their cultural contexts, but they must also examine the institutions they created and perpetuate. Aspects of structure that inhibit change and are incongruent with the rhetoric supporting diversity continually must be identified and addressed rather than seen as the only right and logical way to proceed. Examples of the need for doing this abound in the fragmented manner in which public schools are restructured and in the rhetoric of restructuring. Examples also are evident in the often weak efforts of institutions of higher learning to incorporate diversity.

The reductionist, segmented, dualistic nature of the prevailing world view seems to dictate that we perceive and define the problems in dealing with differences as isolated from other aspects of the system. Thus, changes become partial modifications rather than whole structural change. This is what Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch (1974) term first-order change, wherein a group or system articulates a problem from within the parameters of its basic assumptions, thereby projecting solutions from that same frame of reference. The derived solution, as a linear extension of the stated problem, inadvertently perpetuates the problem, so the more things change, the more they stay the same. This type of change is, then, internally derived; it occurs within invariant groups or systems. The criteria against which the participants in the system, and the very system itself, are evaluated are inconsistent with the nature of the desired changes.

Thus, we profess the desire for change and innovation, but often we are not willing to challenge the personal and structural barriers. As John Kenneth Galbraith said, "Faced with having to change our views or prove that there is no need to do so, most of us get busy on the proof," (in Ferguson, 1980, p. 197). Moses (1990) suggested that nothing short of a total rethinking or transformation of the

campus might accomplish professed goals of transforming curricula to be more inclusive of White women and people of color.

Clearly, viable structural, educational, institutional, and sociocultural innovations necessitate Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch's (1974) second-order change. Rather than a linear projection, this level of change embodies a discontinuity or transformation, providing a way out of the previously delineated system. It is a change of change that requires a reframing of the problem. The solutions thus generated are not necessarily logical from the parameters of the existing system or within the old perception of the problem. Groups or systems involved in second-order change are necessarily dynamic rather than self perpetuating.

Until we develop a conceptualization of the future as we would have it, and use this conceptualization to guide education and society in the present, no educational reform or societal change in pursuit of democracy of any significance is really possible (Shive, 1980). As delineated for individual volition in combating prejudice earlier in this paper, it appears that we must recognize where we are, state the assumptions, challenge them, and transform them. Fritz's (1984) concept of maintaining "structural tension" provides viable guidelines: 1) envision, 2) choose to achieve that vision--make a commitment, 3) be critically aware of where we are, and 4) continually reassess the current reality and refine the vision, constantly maintaining that structural tension between the two. The current procedure is to either let go of the vision or let go of the commitment to achieve it. At present, "progress" toward the vision unfortunately is evaluated against the criteria of the old system, thus sustaining institutional inertia. What is needed is evaluation against criteria congruent with the vision.

If the American world view must be scientifically validated, there are now principles based on scientific research that support an emerging paradigm or shift in that elusive "form of a form of thought." Quantum mechanics, the theory of chaos, new brain research, and biological, chemical, and environmental research all suggest that the essential principles of the universe and human beings include process, complexity, integration, interconnection, and unbroken wholeness. This emerging paradigm, then, supports the notion that complexity and diversity are as valid as sameness and simplicity. It also holds that all of the disparate elements are interconnected, that we can reframe the problem of conceptualizing, defining, and actualizing institutional change so that it can be approached as an unbroken whole.

Such an emerging paradigm allows the process to be just that--a process. Thus, education and society become engaged in an unending process of transformation--they become self renewing entities, embodying the scientific principle of a universe in process. The expanded criteria for success are an integral part of the transformative process.

The resources and expertise for achieving such change are readily available on university campuses. Many faculty and staff independently implement such change on a small scale. They are committed to a vision of diversity. We must

recognize this individual human action as a first step toward transforming institutions. It is incumbent upon those who share their vision similarly to take action, and upon all of us to work toward changing the structures rather than working around them.

Summary

Frederick Erickson (1987) defined the task as analysis and searching out of all possible sites in which transformation can occur. We have here recognized and articulated those often taken-for-granted or overlooked spaces within and surrounding individuals and institutions where prejudice and discrimination lurk, and have looked at perpetuation of that discrimination through the dynamic between individuals and institutions. We have offered examples of the ways in which prejudice, discrimination, and constricted world views manifest themselves and impact individuals in educational institutions. Finally, we have offered sites where individuals can challenge and transform themselves and their institutions. It is our hope that individual commitment to individual and institutional change will follow. We can transform resistance into celebration of diversity.

References

Allen, B. A., & Niss, J. F. (1990). A chill and the college classroom? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(8), 607-609.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Altschuler, G. C. (1982). *Race, ethnicity, and class in American social thought, 1865-1919*. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.

Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning and action: Individual and organizational*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bannan, H. M. (1991). My Father's WASP: Spelling the dimensions of difference. Unpublished manuscript.

Bennett, K., & LeCompte, M. (1990). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. New York: Longman.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company.

Bodine, A. (1975). Anthrocentrism in prescriptive grammar: Singular "they," sex-indefinite "he" and "he or she." *Language in Society*, 4, 129-146.

Crevecoeur, H. St. J. (1976). Letters from an American farmer. In Rischin, M. (editor), *Immigration and the American tradition*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Crichlow, W., Goodwin, S., Shakes, G., & Swartz, E. (1990). Multicultural ways of knowing: Implications for practice. *Journal of Education*, 172(2), 101-117.

Crowell, S. (1989). A new way of thinking: The challenge of the future. *Educational Leadership*, 47(1), 60-63.

Davenport, D. (1989-90). Pedagogy of ethnic literature: The agony and the ecstasy.

MELUS, 16(2), 51-62.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice! Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5-18.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 4.

Ferguson, M. (1980). *The Aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in the 1980's*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher.

Fleming, J. (1984). *Blacks in college: A comparative study of students, success, in Black and in White institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fritz, R. (1984). *The path of least resistance*. Salem, MA: DMA.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenman, N. P. (1990-91). Interviews with faculty and students of some southern universities. Unpublished study.

Gregory, M. S. (1980). The science-humanities program (NEXA) at San Francisco State University: The "two cultures" reconsidered. *Leonardo*, 13, 295-302.

Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Harkins, A. M. (1976). Controls, paradigms, and designs: Critical elements in the understanding of cultural dynamics. In J. I. Roberts, & S. K. Akinsanya (editors), *Educational patterns and cultural configurations* (pp. 212-221). New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Heshusius, L. (1989). The Newtonian mechanistic paradigm, special education, and contours of alternatives: An overview. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22(7), 403-415.

Hollins, E. R., & Spencer, K. (1990). Restructuring schools for cultural inclusion: Changing the schooling process for African American youngsters. *Journal of Education*, 172(2), 89-100.

Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher*, 19(4), 2-9.

Hurtado, A. (1989). Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of White women and women of color. *Signs*, 14(4), 833-855.

Kallen, H. M. (1924). *Culture and democracy in the United States*. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Katz, J. (1983). White faculty struggling with the effects of racism. In J. H. Cones III, J. S. Noonan, and D. J. Janka (editors), *Teaching minority students* (pp. 29-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, New Developments in Teaching and Learning Series, Vol. 16.

Katz, P. A. (1976). The acquisition of racial attitudes in children. In P. A. Katz (editor) *Towards the elimination of racism* (p. 125-154). New York: Pergamon Press.

Kidd, V. (1971). A study of the images produced through the use of the male pronoun as the generic. *Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication*, 1, 25-30.

King, D. K. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs*, 14(1), 42-72.

Kraut, A. M. (1982). *The huddled masses: The immigrant in American society, 1880-1921*. New York: Harlan Davidson.

Lerner, G. (1990). Reconceptualizing differences among women. *Journal of Women's History*, 1(3), 106-122.

Linville, P. W., Salovey, P., & Fischer, G. W. (1989). Perceived distributions of the

characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2), 165-188.

Lorde, A. (1984). Age, race, class and sex: Women redefining difference. In A. Lorde (editor), *Sister outsider* (pp. 114-123). Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

McCarthy, C. (1990). Multicultural education minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform. *Journal of Education*, 172(2), 118-128.

McCormack, T. (1989). Feminism and the new crisis in methodology. In W. Tomm (editor), *The effects of feminist approaches on research methodologies* (pp. 12-30). Calgary, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. *Working Paper*, No. 189, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Menyuk, P., & Menyuk, D. (1988). Communicative competence: A historical and cultural perspective. In J. S. Wurzel (editor), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 151-161). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Miller, C., & Swift, K. (1976). *Words and women: New language in new times*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Minnich, E. K. (1990). *Transforming knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Moses, Y. T. (1989). *Black women in academe. Issues and strategies*. Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Moses, Y. T. (1990). The challenge of diversity: Anthropological perspectives on university culture. *Education and Urban Society*, 22(4), 402-412.

Moulton, J., Robinson, G., & Elias, C. (1978). Sex bias in language use: "Neutral" pronouns that aren't. *American Psychologist*, 34, 1032-1036.

Prucha, F. P. (editor). (1973). *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian," 1880-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Prucha, F. P. (1976). *American Indian policy in crisis: Christian reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rogers, R., & Hammerstein, O. II (1949). *South Pacific*. New York: Random House.

Shive, R. J. (1980). The future: Implications for the learner. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240-117).

Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative versus qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. *Educational Researcher*, 12(3), 6-13.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Spencer, N. J. (1978). Can "she" and "he" coexist? *American Psychologist*, 34, 782-783.

Spindler, G. (1976). From omnibus to linkages: Cultural transmission models. In J. I. Roberts & S. K. Akinsanga, (editors), *In educational patterns and cultural configurations* (pp. 177-183). New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Suina, J. H. (1992, January). Pueblo secrecy result of intinsions. *New Mexico Magazine*, 70(1), 60-63.

Thorne, B. (1989). Rethinking the ways we teach. In C. S. Pearson, J. G. Touchton, & D. L. Shavlik (editors), *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 311-325). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Watzlawick, P. (1976). *How real is real?* New York: Vintage Books.

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.