

DOES DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION MATTERS MOST? EVIDENCES FROM DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Easaw Alemayehu Assefa, Addis Ababa University

ABSTRACT

Acceptance and respect are important to the notion of diversity. It entails accepting the fact that everyone of us is unique and appreciating our differences. Race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, age, physical ability, religious views, political opinions, and other ideologies can all be considered. The abundance of literature on diversity is found globally, but a document analysis paper is very limited. Therefore, the goal of this mini document analysis was to assess the importance of incorporating diversity in the global higher education system. To this effect, after providing a brief background on the current higher education diversity status with its problems, the benefit of teaching and using diversity in higher education, the widespread support for the diversity requirement in higher education, what higher education's doing in the name of diversity, and why are they doing it was discussed using document review and analysis. Finally, the findings from the reviewed documents indicated that diversity and its management are extremely difficult challenges to handle. They are, however, far more relevant in the educational setting, where knowledge development and transmission are at the center of the institution. It is also recommended that an in-depth feasibility research that focuses on the diversity management in higher educational institution is the need of the day.

Keywords: Benefit, Diversity, Higher Education, Multiculturalism.

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

Since each organization in any system, public or private, has its own history, geographical location, professors, and students, variety in Higher Education Institutions is inescapable. When seen through the 'international lens, there is evident variance in how organizations have formally constituted and restructured themselves, as Meek and Wood (1998) characterize it. Because different people are regarded as supporting different groups and providing different views to institutional performance and quality, diversity among teachers, staff, and students is appreciated. (Robinson–Neal, 2009).

Diversity representation, climate and intergroup interactions, curriculum and scholarship, and variety in institutional ideals and structures are the four types of diversity that frequently arise at higher educational institutions around the globe (Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Owen, 2009). Along with, proportional, relational, curricular, and structural diversity are four broad categories that can affect administrators, teachers, and students, as well as an institution's structure, mission, pedagogy, culture, content, and policy worldwide. Furthermore, multiculturalism, defined as "creating a state of being in which a person feels comfortable and interacts well with individuals from any culture, in any environment, since she or he has learned the requisite knowledge to do

so," is another term for diversity (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015).

Due to the particular character of educational institutions, where the consumers – students – are under comparatively much greater control and influence of the organization, diversity in higher education is developed differently than in a corporate setting (Stewart & Carpenter-Hubin, 2000). Furthermore, there will be variety among the staff and instructors, as well as among the students. As a result, diversity may be argued to have a bigger influence and, as a result, more relevance in this specific environment, leading to the conclusion that diversity management research in education is very relevant and essential.

In fact, multiculturalism attempts to promote the value of variety by recognizing and celebrating the contributions and viewpoints of other peoples. Besides, diversity is an important component of multiculturalism, but multiculturalism goes much farther. As an additional justification, Aguirre & Martinez (2006) underlines the commitment to attract, retain, reward, and advance a diversified mix of productive, motivated, and dedicated people. As well as, both diversity and multiculturalism have grown in importance in higher education, and many academics use the terms interchangeably to describe multiculturalism's value of various populations and contributions (Ortiz, 2013; Ross, 2014). Because this isn't a study about larger multiculturalism, the author concentrates on the concept of diversity. However, it is critical to recognize that the concept of multiculturalism, as well as the goal of a multicultural society, lends weight to diversity initiatives and sets the stage for what the author refer to as the diversity imperative.

The current understanding suggests that, the diversity initiative, according to Ortiz (2013) is defined as efforts of schools and institutions to transition from the language of inclusion to the practice of equality. Owen (2009) elaborates on this concept by claiming that diversity in higher education has two distinct meanings. What is more, the diversity of difference interprets diversity simply as the presence and value of differences, but diversity for equity suggests a more social justice-oriented concern for making universities more inclusive and equitable – or being concerned with "*the difference that differences create*" (Swain, 2013). While both of these portrayals are accurate in the current situation, the evidence shows that the contemporary diversity climate is significantly greater. When we consider how many higher educational institutions in the world have made diversity a part of their mission statement, the word 'initiative' seems insufficient. Though the focus here will be on higher education, the author uses the term diversity imperative to refer to the existence of all diversity programs and grand ideas (Talbot, 2003). This mini document analysis better reflects how diversity has become a fundamental driving factor of the global higher education, embedded into its core fabric.

Diversity as a Concept

Although several authors have defined variety, there is no universally recognized definition. The term diversity refers to people's distinctions and similarities. Despite the fact that a business professes to be largely homogeneous, personnel differ based on social identification factors such as age, gender, color, and ethnicity, as well as values, beliefs, and cultural origins (Weber et al., 2018). Diversity is defined as any traits that individuals employ to inform themselves that another person is different, according to Williams & O'Reilly (1998). In contrast, Jackson et al. (2003) defined diversity as variances in personal characteristics among individual members of a workgroup.

Diversity has been defined as an infinite number of characteristics, such as age, gender, ethnicity, and so on, that distinguish individuals. Underlying ideas such as social identity Tajfel & Turner (1979), similarity-attraction Byrne (1971) and self-categorization Turner et al. (1987) have been used to explain the heterogeneity in diversity research. Individual perspectives on social and personal identity have been used to separate these ideas. Individual social identity is influenced by group membership, whereas personal identity is more or less independent of group participation. The self-categorization hypothesis states that an individual joins a group based on social comparisons such as position, money, and education to distinguish themselves from their in-groups and others into various relevant groupings (Turner et al., 1987). Individuals' views organize themselves into social groups based on particular traits (e.g., age, race, and gender), according to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Individuals are more likely to be drawn to others who have similar characteristics and views, whereas those with distinct attitudes, beliefs, and experiences pose a challenge (Byrne, 1971).

These ideas, taken together, provide the conceptual framework for relational demography theory Tsui et al. (1992), which posits that demographic characteristics within work units have a significant impact on an individual's behavior and attitudes. Finally, these ideas address the negative aspects of diversity in the workplace, such as race, gender, age, and nationality. These ideas, on the other hand, claim that a homogeneous group of individuals is more productive and has less conflict than a heterogeneous group of people because of the attraction to in-group members who have similar features. As a result of these hypotheses, it appears that diversity is negatively related to organizational performance and company effectiveness. Optimistic experts have claimed that variety may benefit organizations in the long run. Information decision-making, upper echelon theory and the integration learning perspective all supported the positive position (Ely & Thomas, 2001).

Dissimilarity among group members, according to these theories, leads to the distribution of information, ideas, skills, and perspectives, enhancing creativity and problem-solving abilities, and so boosting group performance, firm effectiveness, and organizational performance. The upper echelon hypothesis, which claims that senior management team diversity has a favorable influence on organizational outcomes owing to various experience, backgrounds, and value systems, has reiterated the same principle (Knight et al., 1999).

The Advantages of Teaching Diversity in Higher Education

There are assertions that diversity has an impact on access and fairness, teaching techniques and student learning, research goals, quality, management, social significance, funding, and other aspects of higher education. (Meek & Wood, 1998). As a result, the importance of a Diversity research cannot be neglected or undervalued.

The component of the diversity imperative devoted to weaving diversity into the university's purpose and teaching is known as diversity as curriculum. This branch promotes diversity orthodoxy, or right methods of thinking about and appreciating all elements of diversity, in addition to presenting varied views (Ortiz, 2013). In addition to, diversity curriculum requirements, required trainings for students, professors, and staff, and first-year experience programs are all used to achieve this goal.

Much more than simply achieving adequate representation among staff and the student body, but a more encompassing conceptualization of diversity and the impetus for meaningful

actions; ones that move beyond surface solutions that do not disturb the underlying assumptions and perceptions that define the status quo, according to diversity as curriculum (Brown, 2004).

Many think that diversity must be deliberately pursued, put in place, and regularly studied, nourished, and supported throughout and after implementation, rather than being left to chance (Brown, 2004). Furthermore, diversity is a process that begins with the initial inclusion of people from other groups, but it also necessitates institutions that support and encourage their retention by providing a sense of belonging, as well as strategies that teach a society to accept and value diversity.

Diversity as a curriculum not only allows students to learn about many viewpoints and defy conventional conventions, but it also allows them to reform culture and socially engineer a specific vision for a better society. Universities' output informs every field and impacts every social stratum since they are entrusted with developing the intelligentsia and future leaders of society. According to Krishnamurthi (2003), diversity as a curriculum can take three forms: additive, integrative, and transformative. This demonstrates that, additive places some multicultural options in the curriculum, integrative makes multiculturalism a fixed subsection of curricular requirements, and transformative places multiculturalism as the central curricular tenet.

Diversity as curriculum, in whatever form, aims to present a full, accurate, and intellectually honest vision of reality, as well as to equip students to thrive in a multicultural society and to better satisfy a variety of learning requirements. Ross (2014) offers a body of data demonstrating that when interactions among different students are promoted through programmatic and curricular interventions, favorable cognitive and democratic results are achieved. For all these reasons, according to the findings, enrolling in diversity-focused courses can lower levels of intolerance and bias.

Because students rarely interact with those who are significantly different from themselves on campus, actions to facilitate diverse student contact and encourage democratic citizenship skills are framed as aspects of a social justice education – one that includes teaching and learning processes aimed at assisting students in critical reflection on dehumanizing sociopolitical conditions and actions they can take to change those conditions. Thus, diversity as curriculum is a pedagogical method to facilitating linkages between diversity and a always unfinished, always in-progress process of working toward democratization that continues to change as more varied viewpoints are incorporated (Ross et al., 2014).

Much of the tension around the diversity as curriculum objective is fueled by the postmodernist viewpoint. Classicist defenders of Western civilization struggle against these shifts, believing that significant epistemic traditions and discursive frameworks should be preserved. In this context, the dispute over diversity as a curriculum frequently acts as a proxy for the greater debate over whether higher education should be instructional and truth-seeking or formative and justice-seeking. The impression of a postmodern assault on conventional Western thought has sparked an epistemological and ontological debate between significantly different ideologies. What is more, Mac Donald (2018) is one of the most outspoken critics of diversity as curriculum (and diversity programs in general), seeing it as a poisonous ideology born of identity politics and political academia that undermines humanistic principles, feeds intolerance, and deepens cultural divides.

In turn, this suggests that, according to this viewpoint, diversity as a curriculum identifies persons according on their skin color, gender, and sexual preference, and then portrays the

current status quo as fundamentally oppressive (Mac Donald, 2018).

Furthermore, the diversity bureaucracy condemns meritocratic standards as discriminatory, imposes quotas both formal and informal, and teaches students to see themselves as perpetual victims creating a nation of narrowed minds, primed for grievance because when students are taught to believe that they are at existential risk from circumambient bias, they conflate nonconforming ideas with hate speech.

Personal Advantages of Diversity

Traditionally, most of higher education research has focused on how individual students develop and evolve over their time in school. In recent years, much of this study has concentrated on how racial dynamics on campus affect student results. In the domain of how individuals gain from diversity, there is the most plentiful scientific data supporting arguments for the ongoing use of affirmative action in college admissions (Robinson-Neal, 2009). Individual advantages relate to the ways in which the presence of diversity on campus improves individual students' educational experiences and outcomes. Individual advantages of variety, according to study, appear to improve student growth and development in the cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal domains (Ross, 2014). This educational benefit is universal in that it benefits all students, not only minority students who may have gotten a "head start" in the admissions process. Indeed, majority students who have had little direct contact with minorities in the past have the most to gain from interactions with people of different races. The universality of this advantage contrasts the diversity argument from the remedying discrimination justification, in which minorities pupils were given particular priority to compensate for previous racial injustices (Krishnamurthi, 2003).

Before going into the research that shows how diversity benefits individuals, it's crucial to first clarify what diversity means. There are two forms of variety in the context of this discussion of individual advantages. The first is structural diversity, which is defined as the numerical and proportionate representation of students from various racial/ethnic groups in the student body. The encounters that pupils experience with difference define a second sort of variety (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006). Students are impacted by their encounters with varied ideas and information, as well as their relationships with diverse persons, which fall under the category of diverse interactions. These kinds of differences aren't mutually exclusive. Students are regularly exposed to a variety of information and ideas as a result of their interactions with a variety of individuals. The influence of each form of variety is amplified when the others are present. According to Ortiz, structural variety is a prerequisite for different interactions to occur. The presence and efforts of varied people have allowed diverse ideas and information to reach the academy. Similarly, interacting with various individuals is impossible if they are not reflected in the surroundings (Ortiz, 2013).

Advantages of Diversity for Group of Students

Understanding what is meant by outcomes is useful in determining what the outcomes of variety are for individuals. Ashikali & Groeneveld (2015) proposes a way for summarizing diversity-related outcomes that she finds useful. Ashikali & Groeneveld outlines three basic sorts of outcomes impacted by diversity on campus. Learning outcomes relate to active development

processes in which students get involved while in college, student engagement and motivation, intellectual and academic skill learning and refining, and the value that students place on these abilities after they leave college. The methods in which higher education prepares students to become active citizens in a society that is growing increasingly varied and complicated are referred to as democracy outcomes. Students' interest and desire in influencing society and the political system, as well as their participation in community and voluntary work, are referred to as citizenship engagement.

Students' degrees of cultural knowledge and appreciation, as well as their willingness to participate in activities that promote racial understanding, are referred to as racial/cultural engagement. Students' awareness of similar values across racial/ethnic groups, that group conflict can be productive when utilized responsibly, and that differences do not have to be a destructive factor in society is referred to as compatibility of differences (Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

Gurin's last category of outcomes is concerned with students' abilities to live and function effectively in a varied society. This specifically relates to the amount to which college has prepared students to be successful in their lives after graduation, as well as the extent to which the college experience has succeeded in breaking a pattern of societal division. It is useful to add two additional sorts of outcomes to Gurin's (1999) categories of outcomes. The first shows students' perceptions on how diversity has enhanced their college experiences. These are referred to as process results. This area includes results such as student satisfaction surveys, views of campus atmosphere, and so on. The material gains that student receive as a consequence of their enrollment at various institutions are reflected in a final kind of outcome.

Institutional Advantages of Diversity

Greater diversity inside an institution or organization may also help the institution or organization, according to study. The institutional advantages of diversity relate to the ways in which diversity improves an organization's or institution's effectiveness. Regrettably, there hasn't been much actual research on how campus diversity affects schools and universities. However, there is a growing corpus of data that demonstrates how diversity influences colleges and universities. Furthermore, private-sector research shows that diversity improves organizational efficiency in a number of ways. It's no coincidence that the private sector has taken the lead in researching these issues.

Businesses recognize that in order to remain competitive both globally and domestically, they must find solutions to solve the obstacles and capitalize on the possibilities that greater racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity presents. This section opens with a discussion of the conclusions of research on the influence of rising globalization on firms' human resource demands. Following that, a discussion of studies on the influence of diversity in organizational contexts is presented.

RAND Corporation research (Bikson & Law, 1994) gives crucial information on the human resource demands that arise as a result of the global economy's fast development. This research interviewed officials from sixteen multinational firms and sixteen higher education institutions from cities across four geographic regions (Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Houston/Dallas areas). These locations were chosen based on evidence that they "*appeared to be aware of and actively responding to a more global economic environment, and hence are likely to be on the leading-edge addressing globalism concerns.*" The study looked at four main topics:

how these corporations and colleges viewed globalism; the human resource needs that these views of globalism presented; what colleges and corporations do (or can do) to prepare workers to meet these human resource needs; and what still needs to be done to produce a workforce that is competitive in a global economy.

In terms of their perspectives on globalization, the business and academic groups were mostly in agreement. To begin with, they feel that economic activity has shifted from a local to a international or global level. Furthermore, for any economic activity to be effective, it must be very adaptable to local conditions. These developments have necessitated quick, adaptable reactions to opportunities and difficulties, necessitating organizational adjustments. Finally, in order for all of this to happen, staff must be properly trained to face these obstacles and the expectations they create (Bikson & Law, 1994).

Brown (2004) indicated that managing diversity well achieves three types of organizational goals in an assessment of the influence of cultural diversity in corporate settings.

Objectives relating to moral, ethical, and social responsibility, as well as legal requirements of companies and economic performance goals, are among them. Brown (2004) provided study findings demonstrating a link between an individual's emotional and achievement results and diversity aspects (gender, ethnicity, and age). Job participation levels, staff turnover, promotability evaluations, and degrees of value congruence are some of the specific outcomes mentioned. According to Brown (2004), effectively managing diversity results in decreased attrition rates, increased usage of flextime work scheduling, and increased work team efficiency. Organizations that effectively leverage their diversity should have a cost advantage (Brown, 2004).

Barriers of Diversity in Higher Education

It is true that the objective of having a more diverse campus community has been adopted by the majority of universities and colleges. Diversity must become a more compelling component of our vision of a great institution, according to the executive summary of the Virginia Tech Faculty Climate Report (Hutchinson & Hyer, 2000). This statement embodies not just that institution's commitment to a more diverse community, but also the new visioning of quality that includes diversity. Similarly, universities have started different diversity-related programs and other intercultural studies in an attempt to realize this objective.

The task of overcoming a history of exclusion, on the other hand, is enormous. Thus, according to Lowe (1999) the dedication of college and university presidents is critical in advancing diversity beyond rhetoric to the promise that it contains, without which the topic of diversity would remain a repetitive and cyclical intellectual argument.

While there is no doubting the importance of campus leadership support, it is also critical to acknowledge that the origins of most big prominent institutions of higher learning are firmly rooted in a lengthy history and culture of exclusion. It is a form of exclusion based primarily on race, but also on gender and disability in some cases. In other words, discrimination based on differences, such as not being European-American, masculine, or 'normal.' History, on the other hand, does not go away. It has an effect on the present.

As a result, it's not surprising that some Black students believe their recruiting had little to do with a genuine interest in them and their education, as stated in the 'Campus atmosphere report: student perspectives.' The goal of the recruiting was to have a representative number of

students from minority groups (Hutchinson & Hyer, 2000). This perspective is not new; it backs up Dilg (2000) claim that students of color at primarily white institutions are trapped between the consequences of broadening the demographic base in institutions, and the realities of day-to-day experiences in such institutions.

When analyzing the history of higher education in America, Brubacher (1982) got to the core of the problem when he argued that higher education was originally intended for the upper classes. He definitely catches a historical viewpoint in this remark, which still shapes the current societal opinion of who merits a higher degree to some extent. He quoted a 1948 New York Times article on a Fordham University president's reservation about increased university enrollments. Paying enormous numbers of mediocre students into the currency of higher education could only lead to its debasement, therefore evoking a type of intellectual Gresham's Law,' as the president put it .

The above discussion captures the mental barriers that higher education institutions encounter in moving forward with a diversity strategy. In addition to natural opposition to change, universities must contend with the concerns of the 'old white boys' club' (Platt, 1993), who make up the majority of the faculty and, more crucially, may see diversity as a direct challenge to their positions of power.

Why is there so Widespread Support for the Diversity Requirement in Higher Education?

There must be other factors that make this occurrence so powerful, in addition to the force of rights rhetoric and our historical trend toward equality. The topic of diversity has risen from obscurity to become a fundamental concern of colleges in recent decades. Similarly, a variety of policies and initiatives particularly geared at raising the numbers of individuals who represent varied groups, and improving the climate that would support this diverse population have aided this transformation (Epple, 2008). Likewise, students' shifting demographics, a worldwide economy, a more varied workforce, and the need for an inclusive education environment are all often mentioned reasons for universities' desire to include diversity into their purpose (Krishnamurthi, 2003).

Other reasons for encouraging diversity in higher education have been highlighted by researchers. Incorporating a wide range of information helps widen viewpoints or highlight those that have previously been neglected. This is due to the fact that diversity may aid in the construction of a student's own identity as well as their creativity, self-awareness, empathy, and ethical aptitude. For this reason, by emphasizing differences, students can have a better awareness of racism, sexism, oppression, and privilege. Moreover, students can be better prepared to succeed in a varied world if they are exposed to a variety of situations on campus.

Individual growth and intellectual maturity can be aided by understanding how others think, feel, and experience the world. On the other hand, in order to counteract systemic injustice, it is necessary to identify and challenge structures of power and privilege. These are only a few from a long list (Harvey, 2011; Clarke, 2012; Swain et al., 2013) but the vast majority of arguments fall into one of two categories: economic or sociopolitical. Once more, diverse views portray diversity as a direct factor for economic growth, creativity, and innovation; a multiplier of worker potential and solidarity; a need for participation in a worldwide economy; and even a boost to productivity and average pay on the economic side (Clark, 2012; Ottaviano, 2006). On the sociopolitical side, arguments tend to stress variety as a corrective mechanism for

historic injustice; a means of upholding our laws and beliefs; a democratizing force; a multiplier of national potential and solidarity; and the only method to fully guarantee equitable opportunity. (Ross, 2014; Epple, 2008).

The education's mission is to promote student performance and global competitiveness by supporting educational excellence and providing equitable access," *with the objective of preparing all of the nation's students to be excellent global citizens and to compete in a global environment*". To achieve this, the Department of Education encourages colleges to develop diverse and inviting campuses that not only attract and admit students from varied backgrounds, but also support and retain them after they arrive. This believes that enacting broad anti-discrimination or intercultural tolerance legislation alone will not enough to address pre-existing imbalances.

The diversity imperative necessitates active strategies in order to achieve long-term change. Higher educational institutions have become a critical component of this drive since educational achievement and economic results are intricately connected in culture. These sorts of arguments deal with one side of the equation: the affirmative action component of diversity, which is concerned with minorities' recruitment, retention, and economic success (Ofori-Dankwa & Lane, 2000).

Other motivations address issues such as the increasing demographic heterogeneity of the population and the pressure that globalization places on universities to prepare students to engage and compete in an increasingly interconnected and dynamic world, as well as the increasing demographic heterogeneity of the population and the pressure that globalization places on higher education to prepare students to engage and compete in an increasingly interconnected and dynamic world (Swain, 2013). This is the cultural side of the diversity imperative, which is more concerned with the formative aspects of diversity immersion and the molding of multicultural citizens than with who gets in and succeeds.

What is Higher Education's doing in the Name of Diversity, and Why are they doing it?

The basic answer is that there is a lot, and for a variety of reasons. While no two higher educational institutions operate in the same way when it comes to diversity policies, there are certain common threads that help to clarify the issue. To begin, Ofori (2000) divides how higher education's use diversity in principle into four categories: neutrality, similarity, diversity, and diver similarity. Similarity emphasizes how cultures are similar rather than how they differ, which tends to overstate common ground; diversity reverses this by emphasizing difference over similarity, which can obscure common ground; and diver similarity attempts to treat cultural differences and similarities equally and in appropriate measure, to better reflect the .Higher educational institutions can use any of these paradigms, alone or in combination, to change the way they think about diversity and, as a result, change their behaviors. Various researchers issued a detailed list of what they believe to be evidence-based best practices in the area of diversity, based on university experiences.

To promote the diversity mandate, they propose that higher educational institutions use a combination of the five measures listed below. To begin, they should make an institutional commitment to fostering diversity and inclusion by incorporating diversity into their core mission, adopting strategic plans to identify objectives and assure proper budget allocation, and building data collection and tracking capabilities. Second, diversity should be incorporated into

all aspects of the institution, including the student body, faculty, curriculum, and pedagogy, to promote inclusivity by ensuring that students see themselves mirrored in their surroundings. Third, a focus on outreach and recruitment should be placed on developing relationships with prospective students, supporting from kindergarten up to grade 12 pipelines in the local community, and providing ongoing and targeted assistance during each critical step test preparation, admissions application, and financial aid should be prioritized. Fourth, following enrollment, support services such as smart course placement to decrease remedial requirements, personalized mentorship and coaching, and first-year experience programs should be provided to promote success and retention. Fifth, and most importantly, universities should create an inclusive climate, which can include cultural competency programs, campus climate assessments, mandatory diversity training and coursework, cultural and emotional support systems, student participation in climate and diversity decisions, and extra financial assistance for the most disadvantaged.

CONCLUSION

Although there is a wealth of diverse literature available worldwide, the scope of a document analysis report is severely constrained. As a result, the lack of diversity literature review publications prompted this research. This study examines a wide range of diversity-related articles in order to have a better understanding of diversity and its impact on higher education institutions. This paper addresses a research vacuum by describing a comprehensive grasp of diversity concerns and advantages at universities.

The findings of this study imply that diversity and its management are issues of high complexity. At the same time, they are of much greater relevance in the educational context, where knowledge generation and transmission are at the heart of the institution, and where variety of ideas and viewpoints is considered to have a significant impact. The majority think that all children should have equal access to education, but there is disagreement over how this ideal should be implemented in practice.

There is a profound schism over curriculum control and the university's mission. One side is attempting to raise a generation of enlightened adults who have a deeper understanding of physical reality and metaphysical truth, while the other feels that in order to improve society, they should be forming a community of global citizens and social justice activists. The debate will undoubtedly rage on for some time, but it is apparent that higher educational institutions are fortunate in that they have mostly retained their autonomy. This gives individuals the freedom to pursue their goals as they see proper. A high level of institutional discretion is nevertheless required and prudent in order to maintain value pluralism and authentic diversity. It is also recommended that an in-depth feasibility research that focuses on the diversity management in higher educational institution is the need of the day.

REFERENCES

- Aguirre Jr, A., & Martinez, R.O. (2006). Diversity leadership in higher education. Ashe higher education report. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 32(3), 1-113.
- Ashikali, T., & Groeneveld, S. (2015). Diversity management for all? An empirical analysis of diversity management outcomes across groups. *Personnel Review*.
- Bikson, T.K., & Law, S.A. (1994). Global preparedness and human resources: college and corporate perspectives.

- Brown, L.I. (2004). Diversity: The challenge for higher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 7(1), 21-34.
- Brubacher, J.S. (1982). On the philosophy of higher education. Revised edition. The Jossey-Bass series in higher education. Jossey-Bass Inc., 433 California Street, San Francisco, CA 94104.
- Byrne, D.E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. Academic press.
- Clarke, C.G., & Antonio, A.L. (2012). Rethinking research on the impact of racial diversity in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 25-50.
- Dilg, M. (2000). Response to Rosa Hernandez Sheet's review of race and culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(9), 24-25.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D.A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: the effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Epple, D., Romano, R., & Sieg, H. (2008). Diversity and affirmative action in higher education. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 10(4), 475-501.
- Gurin, P. (1999). Expert Report of Patricia Gurin. *University of Michigan*.
- Harvey, W.B. (2011). Higher education and diversity: ethical and practical responsibility in the academy. *Study of race and ethnicity. Ohio state university: kirwan institute*.
- Hutchinson, S.R. & Hyer, P. (2000). The campus climate for diversity: student perceptions. (*Blacksburg, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*).
- Jackson, S.E., Joshi, A., & Erhardt, N.L. (2003). Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of management*, 29(6), 801-830.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 379-405.
- Knight, D., Pearce, C.L., Smith, K.G., Olian, J.D., Sims, H.P., Smith, K.A., & Flood, P. (1999). Top management team diversity, group process, and strategic consensus. *Strategic management journal*, 20(5), 445-465.
- Krishnamurthi, M. (2003). Assessing multicultural initiatives in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(3), 263-277.
- Lowe, E.Y. (Ed.). (1999). Promise and dilemma: Perspectives on racial diversity and higher education. (Vol. 32). Princeton University Press.
- Mac Donald, H. (2018). The Diversity Delusion. *New York: St. Martin's Press*, 1-3.
- Meek, V.L., & Wood, F. (1998). Managing higher education diversity in a climate of public sector reform. Evaluations and Investigations Program, Higher Education Division.
- Ofori-Dankwa, J., & Lane, R.W. (2000). Four approaches to cultural diversity: Implications for teaching at institutions of higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(4), 493-499.
- Ortiz, M.A. (2013). Assessing Diversity: A Cost Benefit Analysis of Culture Centers and Targeted Students' Success. *Wright State University*.
- Ottaviano, G.I., & Peri, G. (2006). The economic value of cultural diversity: evidence from US cities. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(1), 9-44.
- Owen, D.S. (2009). Privileged social identities and diversity leadership in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 32(2), 185-207.
- Platt, A. M. (1993). Beyond the canon, with great difficulty. *Social Justice*, 20(1/2 (51-52), 72-81.
- Robinson-Neal, A. (2009). Exploring diversity in higher education management: History, trends, and implications for community colleges. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 13(4), n4.
- Ross, S.N. (2014). Diversity and intergroup contact in higher education: Exploring possibilities for democratization through social justice education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(8), 870-881.
- Stewart, A.C., & Hubin, C.J. (2000). Beyond Report and Ranking. *Planning in Higher Education*, Winter, 2001.
- Swain, S.G. (2013). Diversity education goals in higher education: A policy discourse analysis. *The University of Maine*.
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C., Austin, W.G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organizational identity: A reader*, 56(65), 9780203505984-16.
- Talbot, D.M. (2003). Multiculturalism. *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, 4, 423-446.
- Tsui, A.S., Egan, T.D., & O'Reilly III, C.A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., & Wetherell, M.S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. *basil Blackwell*.

- Weber, T.J., Sadri, G., & Gentry, W.A. (2018). Examining diversity beliefs and leader performance across cultures. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*.
- Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly III, C.A. (1998). Demography and Diversity in Organisations: A review of 40 years of research in BM Staw and LL Cummings (eds) *Research in Organisational Behaviour*. *Jai Pres, Connecticut*.

Received: 19-Mar-2022, Manuscript No. AELJ-22-11551; **Editor assigned:** 21-Mar-2022, PreQC No. AELJ-22-11551(PQ); **Reviewed:** 04-Apr-2022, QC No. AELJ-22-11551; **Revised:** 07-Apr-2022, Manuscript No. AELJ-22-11551(R); **Published:** 14-Apr-2022