

Reducing Student Prejudice in Diversity-Infused Core Psychology Classes

Heather D. Hussey, Bethany K. B. Fleck, and Rebecca M. Warner

University of New Hampshire

The current quasi-experimental study compared two sections of a course, one that included diversity content and one that did not. The authors obtained pretest and posttest data on students' attitudes toward a number of different minority groups and on their levels of course content knowledge. The authors also examined two questions: first, whether exposure to diversity would reduce prejudice, and second, whether inclusion of diversity content would reduce the amount of core course content learned by students. At posttest, significant differences were found in terms of positive attitude change; infusing diversity into course content did not affect content knowledge.

Keywords: attitude change, curriculum, diversity, inclusion, prejudice

The need for a diversified education increases with our growing multicultural society (Fluck, Clouse & Shoostari 2007). Morey (2000, 25) writes, "Students can no longer afford to be ignorant of other cultures, societies, and political systems." It is expected that by 2015, 1 to 2 million individuals, including many minority group members, will seek some sort of higher education (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2002). Although structural diversity has been shown to positively affect students and the classroom (Kowalski 2000; Maruyama & Moreno 2000) by confronting stereotypes (Goldstein 1995), challenging prejudices (Ford, Grossman & Jordan 1997), increasing complex thinking in students (Antonio et al. 2004), and better preparing students to thrive in a diverse world (Craig 2000; Igwebuike 2006; Kowalski 2000), other research suggests that mere contact is not enough (Chan 2006; Gurin et al. 2003; Marshall 2002). Furthermore, at academic institutions with limited minority populations, the task of preparing students to thrive in a global society is placed on classroom education about diverse individuals with whom they may work, socialize, live, date, etc. (Laird, Engberg & Hurtado 2005; Marshall 2002).

Past research suggests education and interaction are the most common ways to prepare students for these tasks.

Many individuals believe prejudice is due to ignorance and in turn are open to learning about diverse others (Esses & Hodson 2006). However, most individuals will not seek out this knowledge and contact on their own. Fiske's (1998) review of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination suggests that people prefer and seek out information consistent with their preconceived notions about outgroups. A growing body of research suggests that classroom education about minority groups is effective in reducing stereotyping as well as explicit and implicit prejudice and discrimination (Fiske 1998; Harris 2003; Kernahan & Davis 2007; Pettijohn & Walzer 2008; Rudman, Ashmore & Gary 2001). However, certain individuals are more open to this type of education than others (Laird et al. 2005; Whitt et al. 2001). Those holding positive and even ambivalent attitudes toward minorities are more likely to seek out and process information about diverse others (Fiske 1998), making them likely candidates for enrolling in diversity related courses. Conversely, highly prejudiced individuals are more likely to blame society for prejudice and are less supportive of educational attempts to decrease bias (Esses & Hodson 2006), making them the least likely to enroll in a diversity course. Less direct methods of reducing prejudice may be needed for these individuals, such as positive intergroup contact (Esses & Hodson 2006).

This paper describes how students' levels of prejudice were reduced through course materials and methods involving diversity, and adapted to prepare students for a global society. Although this paper is limited to a specific course (i.e.,

Correspondence should be addressed to Heather D. Hussey, Department of Psychology, University of New Hampshire, 10 Library Way, Durham, NH 03824, USA. E-mail: hfauteux@unh.edu

social psychology), many of the elements of this course (e.g., type of readings, guest speakers, and projects) are adaptable to courses in other disciplines.

Defining Diversity

The first task is defining what diversity means (Chang 2001) and how to incorporate diversity in an educational setting (Chan 2006). For the purposes of this study, diversity refers to variance, variety, and a range in characteristics including race, social class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, weight, political affiliation, religion, as well as many other historically underrepresented groups in a particular group, population, or setting (Banks 2002). The ways in which teachers educate students about these diverse groups can be placed “along a continuum from not at all inclusive to completely inclusive of diversity” (Laird et al. 2005, 451). There are diversity-focused courses in which the entire course is devoted to diversity topics such as the psychology of prejudice (Pettijohn & Walzer 2008). There are also varying levels of diversity-infused courses in which diversity issues are not the main focus of the course but are integrated through multiple perspectives of historically underrepresented groups (Banks 2002; Enns 1994; Goldstein 1995). The current study examined a diversity-infused course using “course content and pedagogy that are more inclusive of traditionally marginalized groups” (Goldstein 1995, 228). In addition, the methods and materials used in the diversity-infused course were based on those in Banks’ (2002) transformative and social action approaches discussed below.

Levels of Inclusion

Contributions approach. Although there are a number of theories about how best to include diversity into course curriculum, there appears to be a general consensus that inclusion of multicultural education happens in gradual stages (Kitano 1997; Morey, 2000). Banks (2002) proposed that there are multiple levels in which a teacher may deliver a multicultural education. The first level is the contributions approach, which can be considered somewhat of a first step to multicultural education. One example of contributions is covering holidays celebrated by different cultures and social groups. For example, instructors might include National Coming Out Day when discussing holidays. Little preparation is involved, and there is little to no change in the overall curriculum of the course.

Additive approach. Banks’ (2002) next level of inclusion, the additive approach, requires more preparation and work than the contributions level, but the overall course structure and most of the curriculum remains unchanged. Instructors add an activity, unit, or module devoted to a diversity related topic or issue. For example, Livingston (2000) taught students about ableism by having students examine accessibility for disabled individuals in campus buildings and writ-

ing a reflection paper on their experiences. Excerpts from students’ papers suggest that this activity may increase awareness of ableism in society and understanding of obstacles disabled individuals face. Kossak & Johnson’s (2001) study of graduate students in social work suggests that active learning techniques that confront stereotypes about social groups aid in decreasing students’ likelihood to stereotype. Ford & colleagues (1997) developed a teaching unit devoted to unintentional racism for an introductory psychology course. This unit consisted of three 50-minute class periods aimed at increasing students’ education about racism and appreciation of diversity. Ford & colleagues (1997) found the unit was effective in reducing negative attitudes toward Blacks, but not in increasing positive attitudes. Lack of improvement in attitudes could be due to how the material was covered.

Mahoney & Schamber (2004) examined units aimed at increasing multicultural sensitivity in two courses. Each group examined readings and held discussions related to issues of diversity during a 3-week unit. Group I focused on comprehension and application of the material; Group II was asked in addition to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate diversity materials. The authors found the simpler coverage of diversity in Group I was effective in increasing awareness only; students did not report any attitude change toward minority groups or diversity issues. The authors suggested the methods employed in Group I only served to reinforce ethnocentric views. The in-depth coverage in Group II produced a greater increase in multicultural sensitivity.

Transformation approach. The third level of Banks’ (2002) course curriculum reform is the transformation approach, similar to Kitano’s (1997) transformed level of multicultural change. This level differs vastly from the first two in terms of classroom components, with instructors reworking the entire curriculum to offer each course topic through multiple, non-dominant perspectives. Teaching methods and materials foster understanding and tolerance of other cultures as well as critical evaluation of monocultural perspectives. Students are encouraged to think for themselves and to reach their own conclusions. In this level of curriculum change, teachers and students learn from each other.

Sheldon (1999) examines diversity issues in each course topic as a secondary agenda as a means of raising awareness and decreasing biases through critical analyses of assumptions and self-reflection. For example, Sheldon (1999) had students apply their knowledge of persuasion through writing proposals arguing why public displays of affection should be allowed on campus. Following this, she informed the students that their arguments were for the gay and lesbian community and not the heterosexual community. She notes that, “students unknowingly reveal their assumptions,” which they normally would not profess to prior (210). The main concept was persuasion; however, students also learned about their own biases, and classroom discussion was used to reflect on these revelations.

Banks (2002) suggests using critical thinking questions to aid students in viewing the course topic from a different perspective. For example, in teaching students about “The Westward Movement,” he asked students what they thought the movement meant, who was moving, to what region, and why. The purpose of such questions was to enable students to see that the “Westward Movement is a Eurocentric term because the Lakota Sioux were already living in the West and consequently were not moving” (31). Once students realize the course topic is from a dominant perspective, Banks (2002) suggests having students describe the topic through the non-dominant perspective as well as renaming the topic to be more inclusive.

Social action approach. Banks’ (2002) fourth level of inclusion is the social action approach. This level expands on the transformation approach by offering opportunities for action along with multicultural knowledge. In this approach, instructors provide opportunities to participate in cultural awareness events and assign projects that require social action. Many students are interested in learning about and befriending individuals different from them, but they avoid these interactions due to expected discomfort, false beliefs, and fear of stigmatization by association (Mohr & Sedlacek 2000; Swim, Ferguson & Hyers 1999). However, positive structured contact with diverse individuals has been shown to decrease prejudice and stereotypes (Berryman-Fink 2006; Chang 2001; Meaney et al. 2008) and to increase awareness, positive attitudes, and compassion toward minority groups (Meaney et al. 2008). However, such conditions do not happen often in natural settings (Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux 2005), are not guaranteed to lead to generalized positive attitudes toward members outside of the contact group (Hewstone & Greenland 2000), and can lead to increased hostility if group inequalities are made salient (Hewstone & Greenland 2000). Nevertheless, educators need to foster positive group contact if they are to promote further contact and reduce prejudices, false beliefs, and contact anxiety (Hewstone and Greenland 2000).

For example, Paoletti, Segal & Totino (2007) describe a humanities course in which mostly affluent White students volunteered at a Boys and Girls Club with mostly lower-class Black and Latino high school students. Learning outcomes were assessed through minute papers, journals, and portfolios. Although these qualitative methods gave students a greater opportunity to express understanding, the authors note the difficulty in assessing positive change in multicultural learning due to the students’ different starting and ending levels of diversity-related knowledge. Nevertheless, there were notable differences in student writing. Students were more comfortable and likely to write about their initial racial and class stereotypes in their assessments, which could be a result of positive interaction with these groups (Berryman-Fink, 2006).

Goals of Current Study

The current study had two main objectives. First, we were interested in whether infusing diversity into a social psychology course would result in positive attitude change toward different minority groups. Second, we were interested in whether incorporating diversity into the course curriculum would have any effect on students’ content knowledge of social psychology. Students from two separate social psychology classes completed pre- and posttest measures examining social psychological knowledge, racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ageism, and socially desirable responding. The first social psychological course (control group) used “traditional” methods and materials where diversity was not purposefully included, whereas the second course (treatment group) was modeled after Banks’ (2002) transformed and social action approaches to multicultural education. We hypothesized that a diversity-infused course curriculum would result in positive attitude change toward minorities without a cost to students’ content knowledge.

METHODS

Participants

The sample consisted of 86 undergraduates from two separate social psychology courses located at a New England University. Due to unmatched data from pre- and posttests as well as incomplete surveys, data from only 63 participants were analyzed. The control sample consisted of 27 students and the treatment sample consists of 36 students. Students were placed into these groups based on their own enrollment and were not informed of the study until the end of the semester. Demographic information is presented in Table 1. Significant differences in gender ($t(61) = -2.925, p = .005$) and race ($t(61) = 2.001, p = .050$) existed between the two classes, with the control class having a higher number of male students and greater racial diversity.

Materials

Students in each class completed pre- and posttest surveys, including questions about demographics, their knowledge about social psychology, as well as their attitudes regarding five different social statuses (i.e., race, sex, class, sexual orientation, and age). Socially desirable responding was also measured due to the obvious nature of the outcome measures to which many students may falsely report positive attitudes. Except for content knowledge, all outcome measures were rated on 4-point scales that ranged from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree), with greater total scores indicating higher levels of that variable. All outcome measures had good internal consistency with Cronbach alphas ranging from .71 to .94.

TABLE 1
Participant Demographics

	Control Condition (n = 27)	Treatment Condition (n = 36)
Average Age	20 (SD = 1.27)	20 (SD = 1.06)
Year in College		
2	12	18
3	9	10
4	6	8
Gender Identity		
Female	16	32
Male*	10	4
Unidentified	1	0
Sexuality		
Heterosexual	25	33
Bisexual	2	2
Homosexual	0	1
Racial Identity		
Caucasian*	19	32
Other	7	3
African American	1	1
Class		
Upper Middle	15	21
Working	5	8
Lower Middle	4	6
Upper	3	1

*Indicates a significant difference, $p < .05$.

Content knowledge. Because of differences in assignments and grading between the control and treatment class, the Intuitions about Social Psychology scale was used to measure students' content knowledge. Fein, Bonner & Reiss (2005) devised the Intuitions about Social Psychology scale as a means of previewing the issues in a social psychology course as well as a way of assessing knowledge of the class content. The shorter 20-item version of this scale used had questions such as, "People are more likely to behave consistently with their own standards if they are in front of a mirror" and, "People usually work harder when working together on a task with others than they do when working alone." In addition, many of these questions contain terms and concepts (e.g., attribution theory, prejudice, and persuasion) deemed to be important knowledge in social psychology (Boneau 1990). Items were answered on a true/false basis and scored by number correct.

Racism. Altemeyer (1996) originally devised the Manitoba Prejudice scale to measure one's racial prejudice in a Canadian sample. However, due to our sampling within the United States, we used the 20-item version from Laythe, Finkel & Kirkpatrick (2001) that was altered to better fit an American population. An item from this scale designed to measure racial prejudice is, "As a group Hispanics and Blacks are naturally lazy, promiscuous, and irresponsible." A reverse-scored item includes, "In general, Blacks have gotten less than they deserve from our social and anti-poverty programs."

Sexism. Swim & colleagues (1995) devised the Modern Sexism Scale as a means of measuring individuals' denial that discrimination against women still exists, opposition to women's demands for equal treatment, and resentment toward programs and policies aimed at helping women. Examples of the 8-item scale include, "Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States" and, "It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America" (reverse scored).

Classism. The Modified Economic Beliefs Scale (MEBS) was devised by Aosved & Long (2006) to measure individuals' prejudice toward the economically disadvantaged. Examples from this 15-item scale are, "Homeless people should get their acts together and become more productive members of society" and, "If given the chance, a poor person would be able to keep a job" (reverse scored).

Heterosexism. The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays (ATLG) scale devised by Herek (1988) was designed to separately measure individuals' prejudices toward lesbians and gay men. The ATLG consists of two 10-item subscales, one concerned with lesbians (ATL) and the other with gay males (ATG). An example item from the lesbian subscale is, "Lesbians just can't fit into our society," and an example from the gay male subscale is, "Male homosexuality is a perversion".

Ageism. Fraboni, Saltstone & Hughes (1990) developed the Fraboni Scale of Ageism (FSA) to measure individuals' ageist language, avoidance of older people, as well as other acts of discrimination against older people. Examples from this 29-item scale include, "Most old people can be irritating because they tell the same stories over and over again" and, "Old people deserve the same rights and freedoms as do other members of our society" (reverse scored).

Social desirability. Because individuals tend to answer dishonestly when asked questions that may reflect poorly on them (e.g., prejudicial attitudes), a measure devised by Reynolds (1982) to measure individuals' socially desirable responding was used. This 13-item scale includes questions such as, "It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged" and, "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake."

Procedure

Following Institutional Review Board approval, data collection occurred during the first and last week of classes. Students were informed prior to testing that this study examined individuals' attitudes toward diverse others and that participation would earn extra credit points toward their final grade in the course. The instructors were not present during data collection so that students could feel more comfortable about

TABLE 2
Teaching Methods and Materials Related to Diversity Inclusion

<i>Curriculum Component</i>	<i>Treatment Class</i>	<i>Control Class</i>
Text Book	Myers (2007) <i>Exploring Social Psychology</i> was used due to greater diversity coverage (as advertised by its publishing company).	Aronson's (2004) <i>The Social Animal</i> .
Additional Readings	Eleven peer reviewed journal articles examined a specific social psychological concept (e.g., locus of control) through the perspective of a minority group (e.g., those with disabilities).	Zimbardo's (2007) <i>The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil</i> .
Writing Assignments	Students explored how diversity affects their lives and those around them by journaling about three separate observed interactions between groups in regards to what happened, the characteristics of the ingroup and outgroup member(s) involved, how the people involved were affected by the incident, how the student was personally affected, and how the incident relates to concepts covered in class	Students wrote two papers; a reaction paper connecting the concepts of the class to the material covered in the additional reading and a social psychological critique of a film. Additional writing assignments included reflections on individuals' behavior during Halloween and reactions to class content as certain website materials.
Outside of Class Assignments	Students were required to attend at least three events dealing with diversity topics, many of which were hosted by the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs. Students wrote a reaction paper detailing their experience and personal reactions for each event as a way of reflecting on what they had learned by attending the event and interacting with diverse individuals. Attendance at more than three events resulted in extra credit.	Attending events outside of class was not required. Students were encouraged to attend a list of talks related to psychology (e.g., memory) and write a critique of the event for extra credit.
Course Content, In Class Activities & Discussions	Content, activities, and in class discussion were based around the main concept(s) covered in class and incorporated diverse perspectives.	Content, activities, and in class discussions were based around the concepts covered in the readings.
Guest Speakers	Guest speakers from diverse backgrounds came to class on multiple occasions to lead classes on oppression, privilege, and GLBT dating and attraction.	There were no guest speakers.
Assessment Methods	Students were assessed through five multiple choice quizzes, six papers, a capstone project, and participation.	Students were assessed through three tests (multiple choice, short answer, and essay questions), two main papers, and short reflection papers.
Capstone Assignment	In groups, students completed a poster presentation dealing with at least one concept from class presented through a multicultural perspective. For example, a poster aimed at educating others about attraction may creatively present theories of liking found in the GLBT literature.	There was no final project in this course.

informed consent, anonymity of responses, and to limit expectancy effects at posttest. Anonymous code numbers kept participants' personal information confidential and were used to match pre- and posttest scores.

Curriculum in the diversity-enhanced condition. The treatment condition consisted of one section of social psychology taught by a fourth-year female graduate student in social psychology. In this condition, substantial diversity material was infused into the course materials and teaching methods. See Table 2 for the ways in which diversity was included into the curriculum for this section of social psychology.

Curriculum in the control condition. The control condition consisted of another section of social psychology taught by a fifth year female graduate student in social psychology. This instructor did not intentionally incorporate diversity into the course. Covering some diversity issues

in any social psychology course is inevitable due to the nature of topics generally covered (e.g., prejudice) however, only diversity issues and concepts covered in the texts were examined. See Table 2 for further description of teaching methods and materials for this section.

RESULTS

Pretest differences between groups. Few differences were found between the two courses during the first assessment. Apart from significant gender and race differences in class composition reported earlier, there were no significant differences between the two classes on any other pretest scores.

Demographic and attitude differences for all participants. There were no significant differences at pretest in levels of prejudice based on participant groups

TABLE 3
Group Mean Differences in Prejudice Measures at Pre
and Posttest

Measure	Pretest		Posttest	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Control				
Racism	33.70	6.08	32.81	8.68
Sexism	15.44	3.26	15.22	4.26
Classism	28.48	6.19	29.00	6.93
Heterosexism	28.41	9.11	27.33	7.56
Ageism	53.59	9.71	53.59	10.75
Treatment				
Racism	36.61	9.01	31.94*	7.63
Sexism	15.58	4.00	14.81	4.15
Classism	30.47	6.86	28.58*	6.70
Heterosexism	34.08	12.74	30.28	10.31
Ageism	54.19	11.87	51.36	12.20

*Indicates significant reduction in treatment class compared to control class at posttest, $p < .05$.

(i.e., race, sex, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or age) at pretest. Significant differences in gender existed at the end of the semester on two outcome measures. More specifically, males scored significantly higher than females on sexism ($t(60) = 3.040$, $p = .004$) and classism ($t(60) = 1.998$, $p = .050$).

Attitude change pre- to posttest. Analyses were run to examine whether a course curriculum infused with diversity influenced student attitudes toward minority groups. Controlling for pretest scores on social desirability and the five measures of prejudice (i.e., racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and ageism), results showed significant reductions in prejudice levels for two out of the five minority groups examined. The diversity-infused class showed significantly greater reductions in racism ($F(1, 63) = 8.758$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .137$) and classism ($F(1, 63) = 5.200$, $p = .026$, $\eta_p^2 = .086$) in comparison to the control class. See Table 3 for group mean differences in prejudice measures between pretest and posttest.

Content knowledge. Students' attainment of social psychological knowledge was examined through comparison of scores on the Intuitions about Social Psychology measure. At posttest, both classes showed nonsignificant increases in number correct; there was no significant difference between the two courses ($F(1,63) = 2.429$, $p = .125$), suggesting that infusing core curriculum with diversity does not come at a cost to content knowledge.

DISCUSSION

The results suggest that infusing diversity into classroom teaching methods and materials has a positive influence on

student attitudes toward minorities without a cost to content knowledge. Significant reductions were found in racism and classism in students attending the diversity-infused social psychology class. Mean differences in outcome measures showed nonsignificant trends suggesting possible reductions of sexism, heterosexism, and ageism in the diversity course, which is not surprising given that these prejudices are related (Aosved & Long 2006). Furthermore, these findings support past research in suggesting that education about diverse individuals coupled with positive contact situations are effective in decreasing prejudice (Fiske 1998; Hewstone & Greenland 2000; Rudman et al. 2001).

These results should be interpreted with caution. Differences between the control class and treatment class could be influenced by several factors. Although both sections were taught by female graduate students within the same teaching and social psychology program, there were differences in instructional delivery. This is especially due to the fact that the instructor of the diversity-infused course has spent years researching prejudice, attended diversity trainings, and belongs to diversity-related committees. This is a confound, but also an example of the differences often found between instructors who teach a diversified education and those who do not (Mayhew & Grunwald 2006; Simoni et al. 1999; Wasonga & Pivral 2004).

It is also important to note that the two classes did not significantly differ in amount of content knowledge attained; both classes showed a similar increase in content knowledge over the course of the semester. This is contrary to beliefs that inclusion of diversity limits core content covered (Aveling 2002). However, the two courses differed in types of assignments as well as methods and materials used, which made the comparison of content knowledge between the courses somewhat difficult. This is another confound that exemplifies differences between traditional and transformed courses (Kitano 1997). Past research suggests comparing written assignments in assessing attainment of knowledge and awareness, but note the difficulties in using such methods (Paoletti et al. 2007). Students in both courses wrote reflection papers on observed interpersonal interactions, read an assigned textbook, and had additional readings. The difference that existed was the focus on diversity within each aspect of those assignments. In addition, students in the treatment condition were exposed to more diversity through certain assignments as well as guest speakers. Future research would benefit by using more controlled procedures as well as additional measures of knowledge and prejudice reduction.

Demographic variables must also be considered when interpreting these findings as well as the size of the sample. Past research has shown that men tend to score higher than women on prejudice measures such as sexism, racism, heterosexism, ageism, and classism (Aosved & Long 2006; Morrison & O'Conner 1999; Swim et al. 1995); however, men only scored significantly higher on sexism and classism at posttest in the current study, which could be due to the small number of

male participants. Nevertheless, these trends in higher prejudice scores for males could have contributed to the lack of significant prejudice reductions in the control class. The current study was also limited with the higher enrollment of females in each class, which could have also contributed to reductions in prejudice levels found. Whitt & colleagues' (2001) work suggests that females are more open to diversity education. In addition, the majority of students in both classes were 20 years old, White, female, heterosexual, and upper middle class. Although a transformative curriculum is meant to teach to and about *all* students (Banks 2002), the current study is unable to measure this goal. Future studies would benefit by controlling for variables such as gender, as well as replicating the findings with a more diverse classroom composition.

Mayhew, Grunwald & Dey's (2005) study of students' perceptions about their institution's achievement of a positive climate for diversity points to a diversified curriculum as the number one indicator of success. These authors suggest that faculty commitment to diversity through the use of diversity-related materials, activities, etc. can greatly affect students, especially students of color. Academic institutions that lack diversity courses and/or courses with diversity content contribute to the "chilly climate" reported by many minority students (Gurin Matlock, Wade-Golden & Gurin 2004). Attitude change, learning outcomes, as well as feelings of inclusivity are in need of further investigation for minority students enrolled in diversity-infused courses.

The methods and materials used in this study are potentially applicable to other courses and disciplines. For example, economic teachers can assign additional articles examining trade, economic stabilization, and scarcity within different countries (Fluck et al. 2007). History teachers can examine the development of American society through the roles and perspectives of Black women (Banks 2002). Social issues can be brought into statistics courses by examining statistical differences between social groups in terms of hate crime victimization. Students in natural resources could examine conditions of water pollution in lower- versus upper-class communities and then work in groups to improve poor conditions. Diverse guest speakers are another way to incorporate diversity into any classroom.

Although there are a number of studies examining attitude change toward minorities as a result of attending a diversity-focused course (e.g., women's studies), the literature examining diversity-infused core courses (e.g., social psychology) is still growing (Kiselica & Maben 1999). The present findings suggest that curriculum infused with diversity content can reduce prejudice. In addition, there is a much smaller possibility of self-selection bias in diversity infused courses. For example, it is more likely that students who are tolerant and comfortable with sexuality would take a course focused on sexual orientation (Stevenson 1988). Infusing courses with diversity material can reduce prejudice while still communicating basic content knowledge. These findings suggest

that students in diversity-infused courses also learn about the "other," which has a positive influence on their attitudes toward these diverse individuals with whom they may work, socialize, and live (Marshall 2002).

REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B. 1996. *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Antonio, A. L., M. J. Chang, K. Hakuta, D. A. Kenny, S. Levin, & J. F. Milem. 2004. Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science* 15(8): 507–510.
- Aosved, A. C., & P. J. Long. 2006. Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles* 55: 481–492.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college. <http://www.greatereexpectations.org> (accessed May 27, 2008).
- Aveling, N. 2002. Student teachers' resistance to exploring racism: Reflections on "doing" border pedagogy. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* 30(2): 119–130.
- Banks, J. A. 2002. *An introduction to multicultural education* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berryman-Fink, C. 2006. Reducing prejudice on campus: The role of intergroup contact in diversity education. *Collage Student Journal* 40(3): 511–516.
- Boneau, C. A. 1990. Psychological literacy: A first approximation. *American Psychologist* 45(7): 891–900.
- Chan, E. 2006. Teacher experiences of culture in the curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 38(2): 161–176.
- Chang, J. M. 2001. The positive educational effects of racial diversity on campus. In *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of Affirmative Action*, ed. G. Orfield, 2–13. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Craig, K. M. 2000. Teaching students about hate and changing awareness. *Teaching of Psychology* 26(1): 44–45.
- Dixon, J., K. Durrheim, & C. Tredoux. 2005. Beyond optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist* 60(7): 697–711.
- Enns, C. Z. 1994. On teaching about the cultural relativism of psychological constructs. *Teaching of Psychology* 21(4): 205–211.
- Esses, V. M., & G. Hodson. 2006. The role of lay perceptions of ethnic prejudice in the maintenance and perpetuation of ethnic bias. *Journal of Social Issues* 62(3): 453–468.
- Fein, S., B. L. Bonner, & B. Reiss. 2005. *Instructor's resource manual: Social psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Fiske, S. T. 1998. Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In *The handbook of social psychology: Vol 2* (4th ed.), ed. D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey, 357–411. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fluck, U., S. F. Clouse, & N. H. Shooshtari. 2007. Reducing ethnocentrism in international business students with an online multicultural supplement. *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 18(2/3): 133–151.
- Ford, T. E., R. W. Grossman, & E. A. Jordan. 1997. Teaching about unintentional racism in introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology* 24(3): 186–188.
- Fraboni, M., R. Saltstone, & S. Hughes. 1990. The Fraboni Scale of Ageism (FSA): An attempt at a more precise measure of ageism. *Canadian Journal on Aging* 9(1): 56–66.
- Goldstein, S. B. 1995. Cross-cultural psychology as a curriculum transformation resource. *Teaching of Psychology* 22(4): 228–232.
- Gurin, P. Y., E. L. Dey, G. Gurin, & S. Hurtado. 2003. How does racial/ethnic diversity promote education? *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 27(1): 20–29.

- Gurin, P., J. Matlock, K. Wade-Golden, & G. Gurin. 2004. Racial climate on campus: What do student perceptions mean? *The Climate for Diversity on Campus* 12(1): 5–11.
- Harris, T. M. 2003. Impacting student perceptions of and attitudes toward race in the interracial communication course. *Communication Education* 52(3/4): 311–317.
- Herek, G. 1988. Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research* 25: 451–477.
- Hewstone, M., & K. Greenland. 2000. Intergroup conflict. *International Journal of Psychology* 35(2): 136–144.
- Igwebuike, J. G. 2006. Legal and policy implications for faculty diversification in higher education. *The Negro Educational Review* 57(3/4): 189–201.
- Kernahan, C., & T. Davis. 2007. Changing perspective: How learning about racism influences student awareness and emotion. *Teaching of Psychology* 34(1): 49–52.
- Kiselica, M. S., & P. Maben. 1999. Do multicultural education and diversity appreciation training reduce prejudice among counseling trainees? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 21(3): 240–255.
- Kitano, M. K. 1997. What a course will look like after multicultural change. In *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*, ed. A. I. Morey & M. Kitano, 18–34. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kossak, S. N., & M. M. Johnson. 2001. The effects of a sensitization technique on stereotyping behavior. *Social Work Education* 20(2): 199–207.
- Kowalski, R. M. 2000. Including gender, race, and ethnicity in psychology content courses. *Teaching of Psychology* 27(1): 18–24.
- Laird, T. F. N., M. E. Engberg, & S. Hurtado. 2005. Modeling accentuation effects: Enrolling in a diversity course and the importance of social engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education* 76(4): 448–476.
- Laythe, B., D. Finkel, & L. A. Kirkpatrick. 2001. Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40: 1–10.
- Livingston, K. 2000. When architecture disables: Teaching undergraduates to perceive ableism in the built environment. *Teaching Sociology* 28(3): 182–191.
- Mahoney, S. L., & J. F. Schamber. 2004. Exploring the application of a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity to a general education curriculum on diversity. *The Journal of General Education* 53(3–4): 311–334.
- Marshall, P. L. 2002. Racial identity and challenges of educating White youths for cultural diversity. *Multicultural Perspective* 4(3): 9–14.
- Maruyama, G., & J. Moreno. 2000. University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. *Does diversity matter? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms*, 9–33. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors.
- Mayhew, M. J., & H. Grunwald. E. 2006. Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education* 77(1): 148–168.
- Mayhew, M. J., H. E. Grunwald, & E. L. Dey. 2005. Curriculum matters: Creating a positive climate for diversity from the student perspective. *Research in Higher Education* 46(4): 389–412.
- Meaney, K. S., H. R. Bohler, K. Kopf, L. Hernandez, & L. S. Scott. 2008. Service-learning and pre-service educators' cultural competence for teaching: An exploratory study. *Journal of Experiential Education* 31(2): 189–208.
- Mohr, J. J., & W. E. Sedlacek. 2000. Perceived barriers to friendship with lesbians and gay men among university students. *Journal of College Student Development* 41(1): 70–80.
- Morey, A. I. 2000. Changing higher education curricula for a global and multicultural world. *Higher Education in Europe* 25(1): 25–39.
- Morrison, T. G., & W. E. O'Connor. 1999. Psychometric properties of a scale measuring negative attitudes toward overweight individuals. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 139(4): 436–445.
- Paoletti, J. B., E. Segal, & C. Totino. 2007. Acts of diversity: Assessing the impact of service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 111: 47–54.
- Pettijohn, T. F., & A. S. Walzer. 2008. Reducing racism, sexism, and homophobia in college students by completing a psychology of prejudice course. *College Student Journal* 42(2): 459–468.
- Reynolds, W. M. 1982. Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 38(1): 119–125.
- Rudman, L. A., R. D. Ashmore, & M. L. Gary. 2001. "Unlearning" automatic biases: The malleability of implicit prejudice and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81(5): 856–868.
- Sheldon, J. P. 1999. A secondary agenda in classroom activities: Having students confront their biases and assumptions. *Teaching of Psychology* 26(3): 209–211.
- Simoni, J. M., K. Sexton-Radek, K. Yescavage, H. Richard, & A. Lundquist. 1999. Teaching diversity: Experiences and recommendations of American Psychological Association Division 2 members. *Teaching of Psychology* 26(2): 89–95.
- Stevenson, M. R. 1988. Promoting tolerance for homosexuality: An evaluation of intervention strategies. *Journal of Sex Research* 25(4): 500–511.
- Swim, J. K., K. J. Aikin, W. S. Hall, & B. A. Hunter. 1995. Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(2): 199–214.
- Swim, J. K., M. J. Ferguson, & L. L. Hyers. 1999. Avoiding stigma by association: Subtle prejudice against lesbians in the form of social distancing. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 21(1): 61–68.
- Wasonga, T. A., & J. A. Pivreal. 2004. Diversity and the modeling of multicultural principles of education in a teacher education program. *Multicultural Perspectives* 6(3): 42–47.
- Whitt, E. J., M. I. Edison, E. T. Pascarella, P. T. Terenzini, & A. Nora. 2001. Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education* 72(2): 172–204.

Copyright of College Teaching is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.