What Makes Higher Education's Diversity Advantageous? Reflections from Literature Review

*1Easaw Alemayehu Assefa

*1Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Educational Planning and Management, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Abstract
Diversity refers to persons with a variety of viewpoints, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political beliefs, professional backgrounds, heritage, and life experiences. There are several empirical research on higher education diversity, however there is little on literature review. The goal of this brief literature review was, therefore, to figure out what makes higher education's diversity advantageous in the global higher education system. A contextual discourse analysis was used to materialize the study. To this effect, a review and reflection were used to discuss the global current state of higher education diversity and its problems, the benefits of teaching and using diversity in higher education, as well as the barriers to doing so. It also posed two questions as a topic (i.e., is it necessary for higher education to value diversity? What role does higher education play in promoting diversity?). Finally, the findings of the evaluated studies demonstrated that, while there are basic challenges with higher education diversity, the diversity that exists at universities is highly beneficial, since knowledge development and transfer are at the core of the institution`s heterogeneity. This article makes a call for the global higher education to do more, or at the very least be more proactive, in diversifying its staff and student body, as well as establishing an atmosphere that encourages such diversity by considering the advantages mentioned. A complete empirical study focused on diversity management in a specific higher education institution is also recommended.

Keywords: Advantages, Diversity, Higher Education

1. Introduction
1.1. Background Information
In higher education, diversity is a term used to describe a variety of phenomena related to differences across and within higher education institutions (Kivinen and Rinne, 1996) [28]. Meek *et al*. cite Trow (1995) [48] for a very useful broad concept of diversity (2000). He defines higher education's diversity as distinct forms of postsecondary education and institutions within a state or nation having different missions to educate and train for different lives and careers, different teaching styles, different organizational and funding structures, and different laws and government relationships (Meek *et al*., 2000) [34]. This definition will be used for this reflection, which is concerned with variations amongst institutions within the global higher education system.
Diversity in Higher Education Institutions is unavoidable since each organization in any system, public or private, has its unique history, geographical location, instructors, and students. As Meek and Wood (1998) [35] put it, there is significant difference in how organizations have formally created and rebuilt themselves when seen through the international perspective. Diversity among instructors, staff, and students is valued because diverse people are seen as helping different groups and giving varied perspectives on institutional performance and quality. 2009 (Robinson-Neal) [41].
The four categories of diversity that regularly occur at higher educational institutions across the world include diversity representation, climate and intergroup interactions, curriculum and scholarship, and variance in institutional

principles and structures (Kezar, & Eckel, 2008; Owen, 2009) [27, 39]. Proportional, relational, curricular, and structural diversity are four major categories that can impact administrators, instructors, and students throughout the world, as well as an institution's structure, mission, pedagogy, culture, content, and policy. Multiculturalism is another name for diversity, described as developing a state of being in which a person feels comfortable and interacts effectively with persons from any culture, in any situation, since she or he has received the necessary information to do so (Ashikali, & Groeneveld, 2015) [14]. Due to the unique nature of educational institutions, where the consumers-students-are proportionally much more within the organization's control and influence, higher education diversity is created differently than in a business context (Stewart & Carpenter-Hubin, 2000) [44].

Diversity in higher educations also needs to recognize the need of taking into account and appreciating students' diverse identities, as well as ensuring that educational approaches recognize and validate these identities. This can be accomplished by developing learning strategies that take into account group diversity as well as the importance of group diversity in the learning environment (Talbot 2003) [47]. Faculty members must be aware of and understand their own positions in relation to their students, as well as endeavor to identify the beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions they employ to respond to diversity (Krishnamurthi, 2003) [30].
The social justice reason, the educational benefits rationale, and the corporate rationale are three main categories of challenge and opportunity diversity agendas, according to

*Corresponding Author: Easaw Alemayehu Assefa

< 1 >

Williams (2013) [52]. The social justice justification refers to the need for higher education institutions to reflect changing demographic trends and address both historical and contemporary identity-based societal injustices (Jackson *et al*. 2003) [26]. The educational benefits justification is based on research findings that show the value of attracting and maintaining students from different backgrounds to educational and human development missions. The commercial reason alludes to the necessity for institutions to become more inclusive in order to compete in the market for outstanding students, teachers, and staff, as well as to prepare students for a globalized economy and varied workforce (Williams 2013) [52].

Furthermore, the staff and teachers, as well as the students, will be diverse. As a result, diversity may be claimed to have a greater effect and, as a result, more relevance in this particular setting, leading to the conclusion that diversity management research in education is extremely relevant and important. In truth, multiculturalism aims to promote the value of diversity by acknowledging and supporting other people's contributions and perspectives. Multiculturalism is more than just variety. Aguirre and Martinez (2006) [1] add to the explanation by emphasizing the commitment to recruit, maintain, reward, and promote a diverse mix of productive, motivated, and devoted employees. Furthermore, both diversity and multiculturalism have gained in prominence in higher education, and many academics use the terms interchangeably to highlight multiculturalism's value of different populations and contributions (Oritiz, 2013; Ross, 2014) [37, 43]. The author focusses on the notion of variety because this isn't research concerning greater multiculturalism. However, it is crucial to understand that the notion of multiculturalism, as well as the objective of a multicultural society, gives diversity efforts a boost and sets the stage for what the author refers to as the diversity imperative (Miller *et al*., 2008).

According to Ortiz (2013) [37], the diversity initiative is described as attempts by schools and organizations to move away from the rhetoric of inclusion and toward the practice of equality. According to Owen (2009) [39], higher education diversity has two distinct meanings. Furthermore, while diversity of difference interprets diversity as simply the presence and value of differences, diversity for equity implies a more social justice-oriented concern for making universities more inclusive and equitable-or being concerned with "the difference that differences create" (Swain, 2013) [45]. While both of these depictions are correct in the current scenario, data suggests that the current diversity climate is substantially larger. When we examine how many higher education institutions throughout the world have made diversity part of their mission statement, the term "initiative" seems inadequate. Though the author's focus will be on higher education, the phrase "diversity imperative" is used to refer to the presence of all diversity initiatives and great concepts (Talbot 2003) [47].

Despite the vast amount of varied empirical research on the topic of higher education diversity available all around the world, a literature review report's scope is severely constrained. As a result, the scarcity of literature review publications on higher education diversity prompted this perspective. This reflection examines a wide range of diversity-related literature in order to gain a better understanding of diversity and its advantages on higher education institutions. As a result, this short piece fills a vacuum in the literature by providing a high-level overview of diversity concerns and advantages at universities throughout the world. This brief reflection paper from the literature review also shows how diversity has been a major driving force in the global higher education.

1.2. Methods and Procedures

The author's goal is to determine the benefits of implementing a diversity a in the global colleges and universities, as well as to summarize the accumulated state of knowledge of interest and to emphasize critical questions that empirical research has left unsolved. Therefore, this reflection used contextual discourse analysis as a method, which is concerned with the long-term investigation of underlying causes and effects of situations, in this instance higher education diversity advantages. According to Locke (2004) [31], contextual discourse analysis aims to investigate how discursive practices, events, and texts emerge from and are ideologically shaped by power relations and struggles, as well as the often-impervious relationships of causality and determination between discursive practices, events, and texts and wider social and cultural structures, relations, and processes.

Discourse analysis focuses the investigation of authentic documents found in significant social institutions such as universities and offices of departments of education. The analyst's first primary goal, according to Rogers *et al*. (2005) [42], is to determine the relationship between specific texts, interactions, and social practices; the second goal is to interpret the configuration of discourse practices; and the third goal is to use the description and interpretation to explain why and how social practices are constituted, changed, and transformed in the ways they are. The aims, possibilities, and criteria of critical discourse analysis are to keep track of theory development, analytical approaches, and empirical research procedures (Van Dijk, 2006) [51].

Methodologically, by applying the mentioned discourse analysis technique, the writer of this article entitled: "What makes higher education's diversity advantageous" has used a literature review reflection, which is under the category of qualitative inquiry method. Consequently, a number of related higher education diversity documents were collected and right after making a deep reading of them, an analysis of the global current state of higher education diversity and its problems, the benefits of teaching and using diversity in higher education, as well as the barriers to doing so. It also posed two questions as a topic (i.e., is it necessary for higher education to value diversity? What role does higher education play in promoting diversity? Was professionally and objectively done. For making a comprehensive higher education's diversity advantages reflection, 41 (forty-one) published articles, was used. I approached my review of the scholarly literature following four steps. First, the authors read five foundational monographs to help guide both my theoretical understanding and search procedure. Second, I searched ten research databases extensively. There were 80 sources found throughout my search. Third, each of the 80 sources was assessed for relevance to the study question (What Makes Higher Education's Diversity Advantageous?). With the exception of forty-one manuscripts, nearly all of the texts were declared unrelated to the research issue. An ancestry technique was used in the fourth and final step to find additional sources cited in both the foundational texts and those located through database searches.

1.3.   Purpose of the Paper

The goal of this article was to discover what makes diversity advantageous in the global higher education system.

< 2 >

Specifically, the article aims to look into the advantages of teaching and incorporating diversity into higher education, as well as the challenges that come with it. It also explained why higher education places a great priority on diversity. It has also considered how higher education may help to promote diversity.

2. Some Theoretical Basis for Diversity

There is no commonly accepted definition of diversity, despite the efforts of various authors. People's differences and similarities are referred to as diversity. Employees differ depending on social identifying variables such as age, gender, color, and ethnicity, as well as values, views, and cultural origins, despite the fact that a company claims to be essentially homogenous (Weber *et al.*, 2018) [54]. According to Williams and O'Reilly, diversity is defined as "any attribute that individuals use to tell themselves that another person is different" (1998). Diversity, on the other hand, was described by Jackson *et al.* (2003) [26] as differences in personal qualities among individual members of a workgroup.

Individual differences, such as age, gender, ethnicity, and so on, are classified as diversity. To explain the heterogeneity in diversity research, underlying concepts such as social identity (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) [46], similarity-attraction (Byrne, 1971) [18], and self-categorization (Turner *et al.*, 1987) [50] have been employed. These concepts have been separated using individual perspectives on social and personal identity. Individual social identity is influenced by membership in a group, whereas personal identity is more or less unaffected. According to the self-categorization hypothesis, an individual joins a group based on social comparisons such as position, money, and education in order to differentiate themselves from their in-groups and others into several relevant groupings (Turner *et al.*, 1987) [50].

According to social identity theory, people's perspectives arrange themselves into social groups based on characteristics such as age, race, and gender (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) [46]. Individuals are more likely to be drawn to those who share their qualities and viewpoints, whereas those with different attitudes, ideas, and experiences present a challenge (Byrne, 1971) [18]. Together, these ideas form the conceptual framework for relational demography theory (Tsu *et al.*, 1992) [49], which contends that demographic characteristics within work units have a significant impact on an individual's behavior and attitudes. Finally, these concepts address the disadvantages of workplace diversity, such as race, gender, age, and nationality. These theories contend that a homogenous group of people is more productive and has less conflict than a diverse group of people due to the attraction to in-group members who have similar characteristics. These assumptions suggest that diversity has a detrimental impact on organizational performance and firm effectiveness. Diversity, according to some optimistic experts, may help organizations in the long term. The positive stance was backed up by information decision-making, upper echelon theory, and the integration learning perspective (Ely and Thomas, 2001) [21]. According to these views, group members' differences lead to the sharing of information, ideas, skills, and perspectives, promoting creativity and problem-solving abilities, and so improving group performance, firm effectiveness, and organizational performance. The upper echelon hypothesis, which says that senior management team diversity improves organizational performance by bringing together people with different backgrounds, experiences, and values, has reaffirmed the same idea (Knight *et al.*, 1999) [29].

3. The Advantages of Teaching Diversity in Higher Education

Diversity is said to affect access and justice, teaching approaches and student learning, research aims, quality, management, social relevance, financing, and other elements of higher education. (Meek & Wood., 1998) [35]. As a result, the usefulness of diversity research cannot be overlooked. Diversity as curriculum is a component of the diversity imperative dedicated to weaving diversity into the university's mission and teaching. This branch emphasizes diversity orthodoxy, or correct ways of thinking about and valuing all aspects of diversity, as well as offering other points of view (Ortiz, 2013) [37]. To accomplish this purpose, diversity curricular requirements, mandated trainings for students, professors, and staff, and first-year experience programs are all employed.

According to diversity as curriculum, much more than simply achieving adequate representation among staff and students, but a more comprehensive understanding of diversity and the impetus for meaningful actions; actions that go beyond surface solutions that do not disrupt the underlying assumptions and perceptions that define the status quo (Brown 2004) [16]. Many people believe that rather than being left to chance, diversity should be actively desired, implemented, and studied, nurtured, and maintained throughout and after implementation (Brown 2004) [16]. Furthermore, diversity is a process that starts with the initial inclusion of individuals from other groups, but it also requires institutions that support and encourage their retention by creating a sense of belonging, as well as techniques that teach a society to embrace and cherish variety.

Diversity as a curriculum helps students to not only learn about different points of view and defy stereotypes, but also actively change culture and socially engineer a specific vision for a better society. Because universities are responsible with producing the intelligentsia and future leaders of society, their product informs every area and has an influence on every social stratum. Diversity as a curriculum, according to Krishnamurthi (2003) [30], may take three forms: additive, integrative, and transformational. This shows that additive curriculum includes certain multicultural possibilities, integrative curriculum includes multiculturalism as a set portion of requirements, and transformational curriculum includes diversity as the fundamental educational concept.

Diversity as curriculum, in whatever shape it takes, attempts to give a complete, accurate, and intellectually honest picture of reality, as well as to prepare students to flourish in a multicultural society and meet a range of learning needs. Ross (2014) [43] presents evidence that when students connect with one another through programmatic and curricular initiatives, positive cognitive and democratic outcomes are obtained. Enrolling in diversity-focused classes can reduce levels of intolerance and bias for all of these reasons, according to the study.

Because students rarely interact with people who are significantly different from them on campus, actions to facilitate diverse student contact and encourage democratic citizenship skills are framed as elements of a social justice education, which 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. As a result, diversity as curriculum is a pedagogical strategy for fostering connections between variety and a "always incomplete, always in-progress

< 3 >

process of working toward democracy" that evolves as more diverse perspectives are absorbed (Ross *et al*., 2014) [43].

The postmodernist approach fuels a lot of the friction around diversity as a curricular goal. Classicist defenders of Western civilization fight these changes, claiming that important epistemological traditions and discursive frameworks should be preserved. The issue over diversity as a curriculum sometimes serves as a proxy for the larger debate over whether higher education should be instructional and truth-seeking or formative and justice-seeking. The perception of a postmodern assault on traditional Western thought has prompted an epistemological and ontological dispute between ideologies that are vastly different. Furthermore, Mac Donald (2018) [33] is a vocal opponent of diversity as curriculum (and diversity programs in general), describing it as a poisonous concept created of identity politics and political academia that undermines humanistic ideals, feeds prejudice, and widens cultural gaps. As a result, diversity as a curriculum, in this perspective, distinguishes people based on their skin color, gender, and sexual orientation, and then paints the current status quo as inherently oppressive (Mac Donald 2018) [33]. Besides that, the diversity bureaucracy condemns meritocratic standards as discriminatory, imposes both formal and informal quotas, and teaches students to see themselves as perpetual victims, resulting in a nation of narrowed minds primed for grievance because when students are taught that circumferential bias poses an existential threat, they conflate nonconforming ideas with hate speech.

3.1. Individual Advantages of Diversity

Most higher education research has traditionally focused on how individual students learn and evolve throughout the course of their academic careers. Much of this research has recently focused on how campus racial dynamics effect student outcomes. There is the greatest empirical evidence supporting arguments for continuing to utilize affirmative action in college admissions in the realm of how individuals benefit from diversity (Robinson-Neal, 2009) [41].

Individual benefits refer to how having a diverse campus helps individual students' educational experiences and outcomes. Individual benefits of variation tend to boost student growth and development in the cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal domains, according to research (Ross, 2014) [43]. This educational benefit is universal in that it helps all students, not only minority students who may have had an unfair advantage in the admissions process.

Indeed, contacts with persons of other races benefit the majority of students who have had little direct contact with minorities in the past. The universality of this benefit distinguishes the diversity argument from the remedying discrimination explanation, in which minority students were given special consideration to pay for historical racial injustices (Krishnamurthi, 2003) [30].

Prior to actually delving into the studies that demonstrates how diversity helps individuals, it's critical to define diversity. In the context of this discussion of individual benefits, there are two types of variation. The first is structural diversity, defined as the numerical and proportionate representation of students from diverse racial and ethnic groups in the student population. A second type of diversity is defined by the experiences that students have with difference (Aguirre, & Martinez, 2006) [1]. Students' contacts with a variety of ideas and information, as well as their connections with a variety of people, all fall under the heading of diverse interactions. The above distinctions are not mutually exclusive. As a result of

their contacts with a range of people, students are routinely exposed to a diversity of information and opinions. When additional forms of diversity are present, their effect is increased. Structure variation, according to Ortiz, is required for diverse interactions to occur. Various people's presence and efforts have allowed various thoughts and information to reach the academy. Interacting with other people is also impossible if they are not mirrored in the environment (Ortiz, 2013) [37].

3.2. Group of Students Advantages from Diversity

Understanding what outcomes are might help you figure out what the consequences of diversity are for you. Ashikali and Groeneveld (2015) [14] suggest a method for summing up diversity-related outcomes that she finds beneficial. According to Ashikali and Groeneveld, diversity on campus has three primary types of results. Learning outcomes refer to active development processes in which students participate while in college, student involvement and motivation, intellectual and academic skill learning and refinement, and the value that students place on these skills after graduation. Democratization outcomes relate to the techniques through which higher education prepares students to be engaged citizens in an increasingly diverse and complex society.

Citizenship engagement is defined as students' desire to influence society and the political system, as well as their involvement in community and volunteer activities. Racial/cultural engagement refers to a student's level of cultural awareness and appreciation, as well as their readiness to engage in activities that foster racial understanding. Compatibility of differences refers to students' understanding of shared values across racial/ethnic groups, the idea that group conflict may be useful when used responsibly, and the fact that differences do not have to be a negative component in society (Kezar, & Eckel, 2008) [27]. The ability of students to live and function well in a diverse society is Gurin's final category of outcomes. This refers to the degree to which college has prepared students to be successful in their lives after graduation, as well as the degree to which the college experience has succeeded in overcoming a societal divide. To Gurin's (1999) [23] categories of outcomes, two more types of outcomes are helpful. The first demonstrates how students feel diversity has enriched their college experiences. Process results are what they're called. This section contains information such as student satisfaction surveys, impressions of the campus environment, and so on.

3.3. Diversity's Advantages for Institutions

According to a study, more diversity within an institution or organization can improve the institution or organization. The institutional benefits of diversity refer to the ways in which diversity increases the performance of an organization or institution. Unfortunately, little empirical study has been done on how campus diversity affects schools and colleges. However, there is an increasing body of evidence that shows how diversity affects colleges and universities (Ottaviano 2005) [38]. Furthermore, research from the business sector suggests that diversity promotes organizational effectiveness in a variety of ways.

It's no surprise that the private sector has been at the forefront of these investigations. Organizations realize that in order to stay competitive both worldwide and locally, they must discover ways to overcome hurdles and seize opportunities presented by growing racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity. The findings of research on the impact of growing

< 4 >

globalization on enterprises' human resource demands are discussed in this section. After that, there is a discussion of research on the impact of diversity in organizational situations.

As a good instance, the RAND Corporation research (Bikson and Law, 1994) [15] gives crucial information on the human resource demands that arise when the global economy expands rapidly. For this study, representatives from sixteen multinational corporations and sixteen higher education institutions were interviewed in cities across four geographic areas (Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Houston/Dallas). These cities were chosen based on evidence that they were aware of and actively responding to a more global economic environment, and hence are likely to be at the forefront of addressing globalization issues. The study focused on four major topics: how these corporations and colleges perceived globalization; the human resource needs that these perspectives of globalization presented; what colleges and corporations do (or can do) to prepare workers to meet these human resource needs; and what is still required to produce a workforce that is competitive in a global economy.

The commercial and academic groups were mainly in agreement when it came to their thoughts on globalization. To begin, they believe that economic activity has changed from a local to a global or international level. Furthermore, every economic activity must be highly adaptive to local conditions in order to be effective. These changes have required swift, flexible responses to opportunities and challenges, as well as organizational changes. Finally, in order for all of this to happen, employees must be adequately prepared to deal with these challenges and the expectations they engender (Bikson and Law, 1994) [15]. In a study of the impact of cultural diversity in business settings, Brown (2004) [16] discovered that effectively managing diversity achieves three types of organizational goals.

Among these are moral, ethical, and social responsibility objectives, as well as company legal obligations and financial performance goals. Brown (2004) [16] presented study data suggesting a relationship between an individual's emotional and achievement outcomes, as well as features of diversity (gender, ethnicity, and age). Some of the specific objectives stated include levels of job involvement, employee turnover, promotability assessments, and degrees of value congruence. Brown (2004) [16] claims that efficiently managing diversity leads to lower attrition rates, higher use of flextime work scheduling, and improved work team productivity. Diverse organizations should have a cost advantage (Brown, 2004) [16].

4. Is It Necessary for Higher Education to Value Diversity?

In addition to the force of rights language and our historical tendency toward equality, there must be additional variables that contribute to this occurrence's power. In recent decades, the issue of diversity has risen from obscurity to become a major concern among institutions. Similarly, a number of laws and activities aimed at increasing the number of people who represent various groups and creating the atmosphere to sustain this diverse population have supported this shift (Epple 2008) [22]. Similarly, changing demographics among students, a global economy, a more diverse workforce, and the need for an inclusive education environment are all often cited reasons for colleges' desire to include diversity into their mission (Krishnamurthi 2003) [30].

Studies have discovered other motivations for promoting

diversity in higher education. Including a diverse set of data broadens perspectives or draws attention to those that have been overlooked previously. This is because variety may help students develop their own identity, creativity, self-awareness, empathy, and ethical abilities. Students will be more conscious of racism, sexism, oppression, and privilege as a result of stressing disparities. Furthermore, being exposed to a diversity of settings on campus can help kids prepare for success in a diverse world.

Understanding how others think, feel, and experience the world can help with personal development and intellectual maturity. On the other hand, identifying and challenging institutions of power and privilege is vital to combat systematic injustice. These are just a handful of many reasons (Harvey 2011; Clarke 2012; Swain 2013; et al) [24, 19, 45] but the great majority of them fall into one of two categories: economic or social. Various perspectives present variety as a direct factor for economic growth, creativity, and innovation; as a multiplier of worker potential and solidarity; as a need for participation in a global economy; and even as a boost to productivity and average pay on the economic side (Clarke 2012; Ottaviano 2005) [19, 38]. Here on sociopolitical perspective, justifications tend to emphasize diversity as a corrective mechanism for historical injustice, a means of preserving our laws and principles, a democratizing force, a multiplier of national potential and solidarity, and the only way to truly ensure fair opportunity. (Eppel 2008; Ross 2014) [22, 43].

The Department of Education's mission is to advance student performance and global competitiveness via educational quality and fair access, with the objective of preparing all of the nation's students to be great global citizens and compete in a global setting (DoE 2016). To that aim, the Department of Education encourages colleges to design diverse and inviting campuses that not only attract and admit students from varied backgrounds, but also support and retain them after they arrive. This group believes that enacting broad anti-discrimination or intercultural tolerance legislation is insufficient to address pre-existing disparities (DoE 2016).

In order to accomplish long-term change, the diversity imperative demands active measures. Because educational accomplishment and economic results are inextricably linked in culture, higher educational institutions have become an important part of this effort. These debates focus on one aspect of diversity: affirmative action, which is concerned with minorities' recruitment, retention, and economic success. Numerous different motivating factors address problems such as rising demographic heterogeneity in 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 rising demographic heterogeneity in the population and the pressure that globalization places on universities to prepare students to engage and compete in an increasingly interconnected and dynamic world (Swain 2013) [45]. This is the cultural part of the diversity imperative, which is more concerned with the formative aspects of diversity immersion and the shaping of heterogeneous individuals rather than whoever gets in and thrives.

5. What Role Does Higher Education Play in Promoting Diversity?

The short answer is a lot, with for several reasons. While no two universities have the same diversity policy, there are certain common threads that serve to understand the situation.

< 5 >

For start, Ofori (2000) [36] separates the utilization of diversity in higher education under 4 groups: impartiality, commonality, variety, and submariner similarity. Diverse similarity attempts to treat cultural differences and similarities equally and in appropriate measure, to better reflect the. 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. Higher education institutions can employ any of these paradigms, alone or in combination, to transform how they think about diversity and, as a result, how they act.

Based on their university experiences, many scholars published a thorough list of what they perceive to be evidence-based best practices in the field of diversity. They recommend that higher education institutions adopt a mix of the five approaches outlined below to promote the diversity mandate. To begin, they should establish an institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion by incorporating diversity into their core purpose, developing strategic plans to set targets and ensure correct budg *et al* location, and developing data gathering and monitoring capabilities. Second, to encourage inclusion, diversity should be included into all parts of the institution, including the student body, faculty, curriculum, and pedagogy, to ensure that students see themselves reflected in contemporary circumstances. Thirdly, a priority should be focused on creating relationships with potential students, supporting pipelines in the local community from kindergarten to grade 12, and offering continuing and targeted help throughout each important stage test preparation, admissions application, and financial aid. Fourth, to encourage success and retention, support services such as smart course selection to reduce remedial requirements, individualized mentoring and tutoring, and first-year experience programs should be made available after enrollment. Fifth, and most notably, academic institutions should create an inclusive climate through cultural competency programs, campus climate assessments, mandatory diversity training and coursework, cultural and emotional support systems, student participation in climate and diversity decisions, and additional financial support for the most underprivileged.

It is widely believed that diversifying a higher education system is a significant approach for addressing student expectations. A more varied system is seen to be better equipped to give access to higher education to people from various educational backgrounds and intellectual ability (Ortiz, 2013) [37]. The concept is that in a diversified system in which the performance of higher education institutions varies, each student is given the opportunity to work and compete with students from similar backgrounds. Every student has the choice of identifying an educational setting in which he or she has a realistic chance of success (Eppel, 2008.) [22]

According to the research evaluated, diversity in higher education also increases social mobility. A varied system promotes both upward and dignified downward mobility by offering several entry points into higher education and different types of transfer. A diversified system allows for the correction of choice flaws, increases chances of success, corrects poor motivation, and broadens educational horizons. Diversity is often considered as desirable since it can adapt to labor market demands. The thesis here is that a rising range of labor-market specialties is essential in modern society to allow for future economic and social growth (Ottaviano 2005) [38].

6. Challenges for Diversity in Higher Education

It's also clear that the vast majority of universities and colleges have chosen the goal of having a more diversified campus community. According to the executive summary of the Virginia Tech Faculty Climate Report, "diversity must become a more compelling component of our vision of a great university" (Hutchinson & Hyer, 2000) [25]. This statement encapsulates not just the institution's commitment to a more varied population, but also a new definition of quality that incorporates diversity. Universities have also begun many diversity-related programs and other intercultural studies in order to achieve this goal.

On the other hand, the job of overcoming a history of exclusion is massive. According to Lowe (1999) [32], college and university presidents' commitment is crucial in moving diversity beyond rhetoric to the promise it holds, without which the issue of diversity would become a cyclical philosophical debate. While there is no denying the importance of campus leadership, it is equally vital to recognize that most of the country's most prestigious universities have a long history and culture of exclusion. It is a sort of exclusion based on race, but in certain situations also on gender and disability. To put it another way, prejudice based on distinctions such not being European-American, manly, or 'normal.' History, on the other hand, is irreversible. It has an impact on the here and now.

As a consequence, as stated in the Campus climate report: student perceptions, some Black students felt their recruitment had nothing to do with real interest in them and their studies. The purpose of the recruitment was to have a diverse group of students (Hutchinson & Hyer, 2000) [25]. This viewpoint is not novel; it supports Dilg's (2000) [20] contention that students of color in predominantly white institutions are caught between the effects of broadening the demographic basis of such institutions and the realities of day-to-day experiences in such institutions.

Whenever it came to the history of higher education in America, Brubacher (1977) [17] hit the nail on the head when he said that it was initially meant for the upper classes. In this comment, he clearly captures a historical perspective, which still influences current society judgment on who deserves a higher degree to some extent. He cited a 1948 New York Times story on a Fordham University president's concern about rising university enrollments. Paying a large number of substandard students into the currency of higher education will simply debase it, conjuring a kind of intellectual Gresham's Law,' as the president described it. The preceding explanation reflects the mental roadblocks that higher education institutions face while implementing a diversity policy. Aside from natural resistance to change, colleges must deal with the worries of the 'old white boys' club' (Platt, 1993) [40], who make up the majority of academics and, more importantly, may regard diversity as a direct threat to their dominance.

7. Concluding Remark

The central objective of this literature review was to determine through empirical materials gathered from various peer reviewed published sources to assess the advantages of diversity in the global higher education environment. The findings provide valuable insights towards what makes higher education's diversity advantageous. For instance, it is commonly suggested that increasing the variety of a higher education system is an important method for meeting the demands of students. A more diverse system is seen to be

< 6 >

better able to provide access to higher education to individuals with diverse educational backgrounds and intellectual abilities. The idea is that under a diverse system in which higher education institutions performance differs, each student is given the opportunity to work and compete with students from comparable backgrounds. Every student has the option to identify an educational setting in which his or her prospects of success are reasonable. From the reviewed papers, it can also be concluded that at higher education diversity also promotes social mobility. A diverse system encourages both upward and honorable downward mobility by providing many options of entrance into higher education and multiple kinds of transfer. A diverse system enables for the repair of decision faults; it gives more possibilities for success; it corrects low motivation; and it broadens educational horizons. Diversity is also seen as advantageous since it able to suit the demands of the labor market. The argument here is that in modern society, an expanding diversity of labor-market specializations is required to allow for future economic and social progress. In line with this, a homogenous higher education system is regarded to be less capable of responding to the labor market's various requirements than a heterogeneous one.

Despite the abundance of various empirical studies available throughout the world, the breadth of a literature review report is severely limited. As a result, this reflection was inspired by a lack of literature review articles in the topic of higher education diversity. In order to get a better knowledge of diversity and its influence on higher education institutions, this study reviews a wide range of diversity-related literature. Therefore, this mini work fills a gap in the literature by giving a glance understanding of diversity issues and benefits at universities throughout the world. According to the outcomes of this study, diversity and its management are very complicated challenges. They are, however, far more advantageous in the higher educational setting, where knowledge creation and transmission are at the center of the institution, and where a diversity of ideas and opinions is seen to have a substantial influence.

Although the findings of this literature review report can provide various insights, the fact that it was based on the general higher education diversity which indicates the limitation in the specificity of its findings in the single higher education`s diversity issue. Given the growing number of higher educational institutions in particular with their possible diversity concern, more specific research is needed to examine how the diversity issue may impact teaching and learning process at a country level. More on this, only the advantage of incorporating diversity in higher education were exposed in this little reflection. Future reflections on the effects, obstacles, and possibilities of diversity and diversity management in higher education, in accordance with single country higher educational policy, tactics, would be valuable.

This paper makes a call for the global higher education to do more, or at the very least be more proactive, in diversifying its staff and student body, as well as establishing an atmosphere that encourages such diversity by considering the advantages mentioned.

References

1. Aguirre A, Martinez RO. Diversity Leadership in Higher Education. ASHE Higher Education Report. ASHE Higher Education Report. 2006; 32(3):1-113.
2. Alemayehu E, Shibeshi A. Distributed Educational Leadership in the Private Schools of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Perceptions, Practices, Challenges and Opportunities. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 2021; 25:1-21.
3. Alemayehu E. The Relationship between Servant Leadership and Staff Satisfaction in Ethiopian Higher Education: The Case of Kotebe Metropolitan University. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 2021; 25:1-13.
4. Alemayehu E. Practices, Obstacles and Benefits of Instructional Leadership at Private Schools of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 2021; 25:1-18.
5. Alemayehu E. Gender and Leadership in Ethiopian Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities: The Case of Addis Ababa University. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 2021; 25:1-22.
6. Alemayehu E. Gender in Educational Leadership Position in Addis Ababa City's Private Schools: Inclusiveness, Perceptions and Challenges. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. 2021; 25(7):1-10.
7. Alemayehu E. "Leadership Development at Government Schools: Practices and Challenges: The Case of Hamele 1967 School, Addis Ababa." *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research*. 2021; 4(6):45-72.
8. Alemayehu E. Does continuous professional development (CPD) improve teachers' performance? Evidences from public schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Research & Reviews: Journal of Educational Studies*. 2021; 2(1):1-31.
9. Alemayehu E. Expansion of Higher Education in Ethiopia: Challenges and Opportunities: The case of Kotebe Metropolitan University and Saint Mary University. *International Journal of Research in Engineering & Management*. 2021; 4(4):157-179.
10. Alemayehu E. An Analysis of the Current Mother Tongue Instructional Language Policy in Ethiopia. *Global Scientific Journal.* 2021; 9(6):521-547.
11. Alemayehu E. Ethiopia's Mother Tongue Instructional Language Policy: a Methodological Discourse. *International Journal of Research in Academic World*. 2022; 1(8):20-27.
12. Alemayehu E. "Instructional Supervision in the Private Schools of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Awareness and Practices" *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research*. 2022; 5(4):30-73.
13. Assefa EA. Does diversity in higher education matters most? Evidences from document analysis. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal.* 2022; 26(S2):1-12.
14. Ashikali T, Groeneveld S. Diversity management for all? An empirical analysis of diversity management outcomes across groups. Personnel Review. 2015; 44(5):757-780
15. Bikson TK, Law SA. Global Preparedness and Human Resources: College and Corporate Perspectives. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1994.
16. Brown LI. "Diversity: The Challenge for Higher Education." Race, Ethnicity, and Education. 2004; 7(1):21-34, DOI: 10.1080/1361332042000187289.
17. Brubacher JS. On the philosophy of higher education (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass), 1977.
18. Byrne D. The Attraction Paradigm, Academic, New York, 1971.
19. Clarke CG, Antonio AL. "Rethinking Research on the Impact of Racial Diversity in Higher Education." The Review of Higher Education. 2012; 36(1):25-50, DOI: doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2012.0060.

< 7 >

20. Dilg M. Response to Rosa Hernández Sheet's review of race and culture Educational Researcher. 2000; 29(9):24-26. Available online at: www.aera.net/pubs/er/arts/29-09/dilg01.htm.

21. Ely RJ, Thomas DA. "Cultural diversity at work: the effects of diversity perspectives on workgroup processes and outcomes", Administrative Science Quarterly, 2001; 46(2):229-273.

22. Epple D, Romano R, Sieg H. Diversity and affirmative action in higher education. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*. 2008; 10(4)475-501.

23. Gurin P. Expert Report of Patricia Gurin, in The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education.Gratz *et al*. v. Bollinger, *et al*., No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.) Grutter *et al*. v. Bollinger, *et al*., No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1999.

24. Harvey WB. "Higher Education and Diversity: Ethical and Practical Responsibility in the Academy." Study of Race and Ethnicity. Ohio State University: Kirwan Institute, 2011.

25. Hutchinson SR, Hyer P. The campus climate for diversity: student perceptions (Blacks-burg, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), 2000.

26. Jackson SE, Joshi A, Erhardt NL. "Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications", Journal of Management, 2003; 29(6):801-830.

27. Kezar A, Eckel P. Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. International Journal of Leadership in Education. 2008; 11(4):379-405.

28. Kivinen O, Rinne R. "The Problem of Diversification in Higher Education: Countertendencies Between Divergence and Convergence in the Finnish Higher Education System Since the 1950s", The Mockers and the Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Covergence and Diversity in Higher Education VL, Meek L, Goedegebuure O, Kivinen, Rinne R (eds.), Oxford, Permagon, 1996.

29. Knight D, Pearce CL, Smith KG, Flood P. "Top management team diversity, group process, and strategic consensus", *Strategic Management Journal*. 1999; 20(5):445-465.

30. Krishnamurthi M. "Assessing Multicultural Initiatives in Higher Education Institutions." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2003; 28(3):263-277, DOI: 10.1080/0260293032000059621.

31. Locke T. Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Cromwell Press, 2004.

32. Lowe E. Promise and dilemma: perspectives on racial diversity and higher education (Prince-ton, NJ, Princeton University Press), 1999.

33. Mac Donald H. The Diversity Delusion. New York: St. Martin's Press. 2018; 220:237-40.

34. Meek VL, Huisman J *et al*. "Understanding Diversity and Differentiation in Higher Education: An Overview", Higher Education Policy. 2000; 13(1):1-6.

35. Meek LV, Wood FQ. Managing Higher Education Diversity in a Climate of Public Sector Reform, Evaluations and Investigations Programme. Higher Education Division, 1998.

36. Ofori-Dankwa J, Lane RW. "Four Approaches to Cultural Diversity: Implications for Teaching at Institutions of Higher Education." Teaching in Higher Education. 2000; 5(4):493-499, DOI: 10.1080/713699171.

37. Ortiz MA. Assessing Diversity: A Cost Benefit Analysis of Culture Centers and Targeted Students' Success. Wright State University: Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 2013; 11(8):15-19.

38. Ottaviano GIP, Peri G. "The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities." Journal of Economic Geography. 2005; 6(1):9-44, DOI: doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbi002.

39. Owen DS. "Privileged Social Identities and Diversity Leadership in Higher Education." The Review of Higher Education. 2009; 32(2):185-207, DOI: doi.org/10.1353/rhe.0.0048.

40. Platt M. Beyond the canon, with great difficulty, Social Justice. 1993; 20(1-2):72-81.

41. Robinson-Neal A. Exploring Diversity in Higher Education Management: History, Trends, and Implications for Community Colleges. 2009, from http://iejll.synergiesprairies.ca/iejll/index.php/iejll/article/viewFile/690/350

42. Rogers R, Malamcharuvil-Berkes E, Mosley M, Hui D, O' Garro Joseph G. Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature. Washington. Sage Publications, 2005.

43. Ross SN. "Diversity and Intergroup Contact in Higher Education: Exploring Possibilities for Democratization through Social Justice Education." Teaching in Higher Education. 2014; 19(8):870-881, DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2014.934354.

44. Stewart AC, Carpenter-Hubin J. The Balanced Scorecard: Beyond Reports and Rankings. Planning for Higher Education. 2000; (29)2:37-42.

45. Swain SG. Diversity Education Goals in Higher Education: A Policy Discourse Analysis. University of Maine: Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2013.

46. Tajfel H, Turner JC. "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict", in Austin WG, Worchel S (Eds), The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations, Brooks-Cole, Monterey, CA, 1979, 33-47.

47. Talbot DM. "Multiculturalism." Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2003, 423-446.

48. Trow M, Diversity in Higher Education in the United States of America, "CVCP Seminar on Diversity in Higher Education", London, as cited in Meek VL *et al*., 1995, 2000.

49. Tsu AS, Egan TD, Iii CAO. "Being different: relational demography and organizational attachment", Administrative Science Quarterly. 1992; 37(4):549-579.

50. Turner JC, Hogg MA, Oakes PJ, Reicher SD, Wetherell MS. Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1987.

51. Van Dijk TA. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. Amsterdam. University of Amsterdam, 2006.

52. Williams DA. Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education. Sterling: Stylus Publishing, 2013.

53. Williams KY, O'Reilly CA. "Demography and diversity in organizations: a review of 40 years of research", Research in Organizational Behavior. 1998; 20:77-140.

54. Weber TJ, Sadri G, Gentry WA, "Examining diversity beliefs and leader performance across cultures", Cross Cultural and Strategic Management. 2018; 25(3):382-400.

< 8 >