

1-1-2013

The “Little White Lie:” An Exercise to Explore the Relevance of Diversity Curriculum

Kristine F. Hoover

Assistant Professor, Department of Organizational Leadership, Gonzaga University, hoover@gonzaga.edu

Lazarina Topuzova

Assistant Professor, Department of Organizational Leadership, Gonzaga University, topuzova@gonzaga.edu

Heather M. L.

Graduate, Department of Communication and Leadership (Class of 2013), Gonzaga University, hmlwallace@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>

Recommended Citation

Hoover, Kristine F.; Topuzova, Lazarina; and M. L., Heather (2013) "The “Little White Lie:” An Exercise to Explore the Relevance of Diversity Curriculum," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 2 : No. 1 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol2/iss1/12>

This Praxis is brought to you for free and open access by ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact epublications@regis.edu.

The “Little White Lie”: An Exercise to Explore the Relevance of Diversity Curriculum

Kristine F. Hoover
Assistant Professor, Department of Organizational Leadership
Gonzaga University
(hoover@gonzaga.edu)

Lazarina N. Topuzova
Assistant Professor, Department of Organizational Leadership
Gonzaga University
(topuzova@gonzaga.edu)

Heather M. L. Wallace
Graduate, Department of Communication and Leadership (Class of 2013)
Gonzaga University
(hmlwallace@aol.com)

Abstract

Compared to the previous decade, fewer incoming college students see racism as a major problem in America (Sax et al. 2001). While there are many complex variables that contribute to persistent racism, we argue that forms of both overt and covert racism are in part perpetuated by our language. This paper offers a concrete example of how educators in business schools in Jesuit institutions of higher education can infuse justice/social responsibility into our curricula (Spitzer 2010). The classroom activity, as described, is designed for a traditional face-to-face undergraduate classroom. Grounded in the principles of Ignatian pedagogy, this exercise provides a practical tool to contextualize the power of language of today’s Millennial college student, surfacing the connotations of power and privilege, while supporting student experience, reflection, and action.

Introduction

“Open, unbiased individuals who further the causes of inclusivity and justice are not born, they are made through talk.”¹

To pretend that we have overcome the issues of racism and that the lived experience of all Americans is equitable is more than “a little white lie.” In recent years fewer incoming college students see racism as a major problem in America² and yet in our society today there remains a great deal of evidence of inequality both in our own domestic backyard and in our global community. According to recent job pattern statistics, whites compose 66% of total employment and minorities 34%, with executive / senior level officials and managers positions held by whites 88% of the time, while in contrast minorities hold 54% of laborer positions.³ Concerns regarding global inequality by the World Bank stretch far beyond and yet are still inclusive

of matters of race and nationality.⁴ Multiple analyses global income (in-)equality⁵ highlight perceptions of fairness and distributive justice as an ethical issue and also as a matter of global peace where low income may be a catalyst for unrest.

Among academics there is agreement that business education needs to adapt to better prepare students for the challenges of the contemporary world. Jesuit business education today is called to address the Jesuit mission through four themes infused in the curriculum: faith/spirituality; service; justice/social responsibility; and business/professional ethics.⁶ Some of those challenges include globalization, a changing workforce, both in terms of generational differences and attitudes towards work, ethically challenged workplaces, and a civic sector that has

“subtly, almost implicitly become devalued and lost respect”.⁷

The journey of business students in a Jesuit institution of higher learning must include an examination of “truth” in language and relationships. Being men and women in service for others requires students of the Jesuit tradition to understand how our dominant culture, including the English language, impacts or contributes to systems of social injustice. Freire stated “knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other”.⁸ Those concepts and the call of Ignatius to first understand the self and then engage with the other in the spirit of solidarity and service are very familiar to educators in Jesuit institutions.⁹

In this paper we illustrate the contemporary utility of an exercise in a traditional face-to-face undergraduate introduction to management class. We begin by outlining several key distinguishing characteristics of Millennial learners, discussing briefly language as a powerful mechanism for producing and reproducing power and the implications for social justice. This is followed by a description of the class activity and how it illustrates the principles of Ignatian pedagogy. We then conclude with why it is important for business educators today to explore this relationship between language and power with our students in our quest for excellence and distinction in Jesuit business curricula.

Millennials, Race and Social Justice – Today’s Students

Traditional undergraduate students in today’s classroom belong to what is frequently referred to as Generation Y or the Millennial generation. The concept of a “generation” in this sense is based on the “historical location” (i.e. common context, opportunities, and experiences) of people born generally within a given range of years, although exact dates may not be agreed upon. People who belong to the Millennial generation were born approximately between 1982 and 2003, and will largely make up the majority of the traditional college student body until at least 2024. Common

characteristics attributed to this group of people collectively are their propensity for digital media, confidence, optimism, conservatism, conservation, and collaboration.¹⁰

As a group, Millennial students are more racially and ethnically diverse than previous generations. The percentage of people who identify themselves as Hispanic, Black, Asian, or other has reached 41% in this generation relative to 23% in the Baby Boomer generation. Correspondingly, people who identify themselves as whites make up 59%, 66%, and 77% of the population in the Millennial, Generation X, and Baby Boomers generations.¹¹ In the collegiate setting, enrollment of minority students in terms of race is also increasing both in objective numbers as well as percentages of the student population. While 37% of the Millennial generation has no plans or does not know if they will graduate from college, the majority are either graduates of higher education, are currently in higher education, or plan to earn a college degree at some point in their lives. Of Millennials who do not plan to graduate from college, 29% are White, 29% are Black, and 44% are Hispanic.¹² Yet, increased formative experiences of interaction between races may not be the case. Based on data from the Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative and Urban Research, “children of all groups are being raised in environments where their own groups’ size is inflated, and where they are under-exposed to children of other racial and ethnic backgrounds”¹³ and racial and ethnic minority “children have lower exposure to white children in their neighborhoods now than was true ten years ago.”¹⁴

Regardless of formative interracial experiences, digital media has provided this generation exposure to highly visible racial unrest, including the Croatian ethnic cleansing of the 1990s, Rodney King trials in 1992, the Rwandan Genocide of 1994, the trial of OJ Simpson in 1995, 2001 September 11 Attacks, 2005 Ohio race riots following Neo-Nazi protests, 2005 and 2007 French Civil Unrest, 2007 Legal Arizona Workers Act (LAWA), 2008 election of the first American President who is Black, 2011 Arab Spring, and the 2012 Sikh Temple bombing – all events providing context for meaning-making and race. Race for this generation has expanded beyond a black-white issue, to include people from all

nationalities.¹⁵ Based on factors including the increased segregation in education and neighborhoods, as well as the increased exposure to racially charged events through digital media, there are conflicting ideas about the Millennial attitudes towards diversity and social justice.

In 1968, a teacher in Iowa created the now famous “blue-eyed, brown-eyed” experience with her third grade class.¹⁶ The experience was particularly relevant given the contextual reality of the shooting of Martin Luther King, Jr. The students who participated in these original experiences are now over 45 years old, and certainly not from the Millennial generation. Because Millennials have grown up with the rhetoric of “celebrating diversity,” international festivals and multicultural dinners, Broido advocates for college experiences that among other initiatives, “move beyond food, festivals, fashion, and fun” to deal with issues of power, privilege, and oppression.¹⁷ The exercise described in this paper provides a relatively simple, yet effective opportunity for students to consider issues of social justice in their own present day language.

The exercise described here was inspired by the essay *Racism in the English Language* by Robert Moore. In this essay, Moore provides “A Short Play on ‘Black’ and ‘White’ words.”¹⁸ In a brief paragraph, he uses the following words or phrases with their meaning in parenthesis: blackly (angrily), blacken (defame), black eye (a mark of shame), black words (hostile), denigrate (to cast aspersions; to darken), black hearted (malevolent), black outlook (pessimistic, dismal), blackguard (scoundrel), black mark (detrimental fact), black brow (scowl at), black cat, black deed, black sheep (one who causes shame or embarrassment because of deviation from the accepted standards), blackballed (ostracized), blacklist (list of undesirables), blackmail (to force or coerce into a particular action), blackjack (to compel by threat), whitewash (cover lip or gloss over vices or crimes), black lie (harmful, inexcusable), white (purity and innocence), black and white (entirely bad or entirely good), white man (marked by upright firmness), black clay, pot calling the kettle black, niggardly (grudging, scanty), white of you (honest, decent). These examples of “black” and “white” words and phrases are poignant, but just as the “blue-eyed, brown-eyed” documentary

provides a snapshot of a specific place and time, many of the specific examples provided by Moore may also be dated or uncommon and thus less effective to the Millennial generation. Reflecting on the unique characteristics of Millennial students, Berzsenyi suggests the possibility for a “truly transformational pedagogy: empowering students to be reflective, critical, and ethical community activists and advocates for social justice.”¹⁹ Of note, she suggests that based on Millennials’ propensity for digital media, there may be a call for educators to “disrupt students’ absorption in emotionally vacant, dehumanized violent narrative, permeating their mass media culture, and invite them to creatively re-vision their “real” worlds.”²⁰

Language, Culture, and Race - Significant Discourse

For us as educators it is important to critically examine language and its use in the classroom, because it is one way that power imbalances are constructed and perpetuated. Since the early 20th century philosophers and linguists have been discussing language and its importance in constructing our reality. Ludwig Wittgenstein made the bold statement that the limits of language are the limits of our worlds.²¹ Sociolinguists further elaborated this idea to uncover the mechanisms through which language produces and perpetuates knowledge and power. As inheritors of this academic tradition, today we can draw on propositions that metaphor is pervasive in our thoughts and actions,²² the notion of the symbolic power of language,²³ or “ideology-in-language” and “language of social semiotic.”²⁴

Language is not simply talking about things and ideas; it is talking about the meaning and value of those things and ideas. We give meaning to words through discourse and shared sense-making.²⁵ As a parent rolls a round object across the floor and says “ball” a child learns that the particular *thing* means *ball*. When the child attempts to put the ball in her mouth she is told, “no we don’t eat the ball, we roll the ball.” The child begins to learn function and purpose of the thing called *ball*. She also begins to learn concepts like *good* and *bad*, *right* and *wrong*. If the child then sees her four-legged family friend roll on the carpet next to her, she

may pat Fido and call him *ball*. “No, that is dog, this is ball. The ball is a toy,” she may be coached. And now the child has begun to learn the essence of the thing called *ball* and what a ball is not.

Language and this process of making meaning are continuous. As we interact communicatively we discern meaning for more complex things and ideas. We also begin to classify things into categories and assign value labels to them. If we look at a man on a street corner with a sign that says, “homeless, anything helps,” and call him “a homeless person” we may mean that he is a person without a permanent residence. More likely though, we may also be ascribing a label with social significance. Homeless may then be associated with being poor, drunk, dirty, lazy, and mentally ill.

In this way, language is also a process by which culture is transmitted. By labeling the man on the street corner as a “homeless” man and applying the labels of lazy, dirty, drunk and so forth, we assign value, not just difference. From there, how we as a larger group think about, talk about and act toward homeless people is meaningfully defined by the cultural construct created through language. “Culture thus encompasses all aspects of our behavior that have evolved as social conventions and are transmitted through learning from generation to generation.”²⁶ Language is not neutral, it constructs and perpetuates the culture within which it operates.

Hill maintains that racism is present and very much alive in the 21st century White American culture, and that language is an important instrument that perpetuates racism.²⁷ While today instances of overt racism may not be as prevalent, covert and subtle acts are common and either unacknowledged or denied.²⁸ Social linguists and anthropologists identify those subtle acts as racialized discourses and have identified several types. Studies have focused on every-day use, authoritative texts, the public space, including “accents,”²⁹ news, the press, and mass media and the world of politics.³⁰

When we use the word “race” to what are we referring? Race is in fact a social construction³¹. As a social construction it is formed and perpetuated through language. Race and other categories of

difference have been lumped into the politically sensitive pot of “diversity.” Rather than representing a myriad and continuum of difference, the term has collapsed into an overly simplified representation of “otherness.” Dick and Wirtz further warn “such terms as “ethnicity,” “diversity,” and “multiculturalism” may function as polite ways of avoiding the charged politics of ‘race.’”³² The question then becomes relevant: Can we eliminate racism from our language by ignoring race? Today it is not uncommon to advocate for “colorblindness” as a response to racism.³³ Apfelbaum, Norton, and Sommers argue that “shutting our eyes to the complexities of race does not make them disappear, but it does make it harder to see that colorblindness often creates more problems than it solves.”³⁴ Failing to see or ignoring color does not serve to equal the playing field, but rather serves to dismiss the social consequences of race as no longer relevant. It also further collapses all difference into the normalized category of “whiteness.” Rather than ignoring the physical characteristics of “race,” it is imperative to discuss and deconstruct the social implications of the hierarchy of value that is created by the system of meaning that we call “race.”³⁵

In relation to race our culture, as manifested in our language, still perpetuates separation and isolation. As an example, many terms that describe the process of social exclusion utilize the term “black:” blackball, blacklist, blackmail, or black sheep. The phrase black sheep is generally defined as: an outcast, trouble-maker, nonconformist, disgrace. The term originated with ancient sheep herders who culled the black sheep from the herd. White fleece is more highly desirable because black fleece cannot be dyed. Black sheep were seen as contaminants to the herd. This concept, which originally meant keeping the end product of the herd, the shorn fleece, as marketable as possible, eventually took on meaning as a social construct. In areas such as South Africa and pre-civil rights America it was illegal for “whites” to marry or have children with “blacks.” The mixing of blood lines was seen as depleting the purity of the white race. Indeed it is still socially uncomfortable in many areas for people to see mixed-race couples and families.

It is not simply that “white” words refer to different things than “black” things, but that the

concepts referenced are predicated on racist beliefs about the value of white culture as superior to black culture. Being white is identified as the natural and normal standard, rather than a social creation with incredibly powerful socio-political implications. As Lipsitz poignantly states “as the unmarked category against which difference is constructed, whiteness never has to speak its name, never has to acknowledge its role as an organizing principle in social and cultural relations.”³⁶

Because of its power to construct our reality, establish meaning and how we reach consensus about that meaning, language is a mechanism through which (power) structures are reproduced and perpetuated. It is therefore imperative for an educator to be able to enter into a conversation about how language use perpetuates stereotypes. Critical linguist Roger Fowler discussed the different functions of language and implicit ideology in language use, and offered a perspective on what are the applications of critical linguistics. He points out that “by giving more power to the reader, it promotes the confidence that is needed for the production of readers (and interlocutors) who are not only communicatively competent, but also critically aware of the discursive formations and contradictions of texts, and able to enter into dialogue with their sources. This dialogue might be internal, for a reader, in which case s/he will learn something about society and its values by becoming aware of alternative beliefs.”³⁷

Educators can also draw on the principles of Ignatian pedagogy to guide students in navigating the tension in pursuing both the internal dialogue and understanding of self (reflection), and engaging the other (action in service) as compassionate leaders.

Context, Experience, Reflection, Action – The Class Exercise

In this section we describe an activity that one of the authors used in an undergraduate introduction to management class. The purpose of the exercise is to guide students to explore for themselves their own language and to consider the potential nuances of words, relative to race. It can be used in many educational settings where self-awareness and multiculturalism are topics, including courses in management, organization behavior, human

resources, communication, leadership, or international business. This exercise has the potential to engage both the cognitive and affective elements of the learning process, and relates to all of the Ignatian pedagogical elements of context, experience, reflection, and action.

The exercise requires each student to have pencil and paper, or other means to document and submit their results. It is appropriate for any class size. There are no reading materials required prior to the exercise, however, it is strongly suggested that students follow up with relevant readings and reflective writings covering topics such as privilege, social justice, or equal employment law.

The exercise involves several steps that are described below and align with context, experience, reflection, and action elements of Jesuit pedagogy.³⁸ The first step of the exercise can be completed in class to provide context, requiring approximately 15 minutes. Alternatively, this initial step can also be assigned as homework to prepare for an upcoming class on diversity. The additional steps of the exercise involve data analysis that occurs out of class, writing assignments and lecture to debrief and move students towards action.

Context – Step 1: Brainstorming

Students are instructed that they are going to participate in a brainstorming session that will last ten minutes and that they will need a pen and paper to record their ideas. The classroom is divided in half, such as the north and south or left and right sides of the room, with approximately equal numbers of students on each side of the room. During those ten minutes, students are to silently list as many words or phrases that they are familiar with in common language and contain the word black (for the students on one side of the room) and white (for the students on the other side of the room). Every student should number from 1 to 10 down the left side of his/her paper with the goal of listing at least ten words or phrases in the column on their paper (one half of the students focusing on “black” and the other half focus on “white”). As the instructor, continue to remind them as needed that this is a silent exercise and encourage them to reach the goal of ten or more words or phrases. Announce time

such as the halfway point and when there are only two minutes remaining. When the ten minutes have elapsed, congratulate the students on whatever number of words or phrases they were able to list.

Alternatively, this activity can be done as a homework assignment using the same directions. The advantages of assigning this step of the exercise as homework are to 1) save on class time and 2) allow students to use additional resources, such as internet searches, dictionaries, etc. However, it should be emphasized that the words or phrases identified should be ones that the *students are familiar with in their own common language*. The purpose of the exercise is to consider the presence of nuanced words, not for students to compete for the longest list of words or phrases possible. All other steps of the exercise that involve debriefing should be done in class as instructor presence is key to support constructive dialogue.

Experience - Step 2: Questioning, Hypothesizing, and Affective Reaction

Using the list of words or phrases each student has created, ask the students to make three narrow columns on the right side of their paper with the list. Each column should be delineated by making lines from the top of the page to the bottom of the page. Label the first column “Positive,” the middle column “Neutral,” and the last column “Negative.” Then, for each word or phrase on their individual list, each student should indicate if the word or phrase has a positive, neutral, or negative connotation by placing a check mark in the corresponding column. Ask the students to write down the sums for the total number of words or phrases they listed and the total number of words or phrases for each of the column headings, positive, neutral, and negative (4 calculations total).

This is an opportunity to begin to surface cognitive perceptions and affective reactions. Ask students for any initial findings. Thank them for their participation and let them know that you will

be tabulating the aggregate data and will report back the results at the next class meeting.

Reflection - Step 3: Making Meaning

In this step, students are encouraged to achieve personal insights regarding their own language and deepen their understanding of the implications for themselves and others. To facilitate the process of meaning making of the experience, the instructor organizes and prepares the data. Tabulate descriptive statistics for each of the two samples (i.e. words or phrases including the word black and words or phrases including the word white), including:

- Average number of total words or phrases (including duplicates) per person (cumulative number of words or phrases listed / total number of participants), and
- Average number of unique words or phrases (with no duplicates) per person (total number of unique words or phrases / total number of participants).

List the unique words or phrases for each sample by highest to lowest frequency, keeping the associated data for frequency and connotations. Complete calculations, including:

- percentage of positive, neutral, and negative connotations for the each of the highest frequency words for each sample,
- the number of unique words that had more than 90% neutral or positive connotations for each sample, and
- the number of unique words that had more than 90% neutral or negative connotations for each sample.

A blank table and a completed table as an example are shown below (Figures 1 and 2). These tables can be inserted into PowerPoint or shared as transparencies with the class to facilitate dialogue. Before beginning class conversation, if the class has not already developed patterns to create a safe space, spend time discussing the concepts such as group norms, productive discomfort, or how to dialogue.³⁹

Your Black/White words & phrases...

n= _____ Total students	Words with “Black” n= _____ students	Words with “White” n= _____ students
Avg # of total words	_____ per person	_____ per person
Avg # of unique words	_____ per person	_____ per person
Avg % (+) words	_____ % by group	_____ % by group
Avg % (neutral) words	_____ % by group	_____ % by group
Avg % (-) words	_____ % by group	_____ % by group
Most frequently listed words (listed in decreasing frequency):		
(% +, neutral, -)		

Figure 1: Blank Table

EXAMPLE: Student Black/White words & phrases...

n=30 Total students	Words with “Black” n=14 students	Words with “White” n=16 students
Avg # of total words	6.5 per person	7.5 per person
Avg # of unique words	3.5 per person	6.4 per person
Avg % (+) words	17.6% by group	31.6% by group
Avg % (neutral) words	33.0% by group	45.9% by group
Avg % (-) words	49.5% by group	22.4% by group
Most frequently listed words (listed in decreasing frequency):		
	Black eye (100% negative)	White Christmas (100% positive/neutral)
	Blackout (87.5% negative)	Snow White (100% positive/neutral)
	Black board (100% neutral)	Whiteout (87.5% positive/neutral)

Figure 2: Completed Table

Display the results of the exercise in class and ask the students to respond to the following questions:

- How common are these terms? With what frequency do you use or hear these words or phrases in your context (weekly, daily, other)?
- What patterns do you see in the data?
- Is this a relevant topic to discuss with today’s college students? Why or why not?
- What are the implications for business, as business professionals, as consumers, as members of community?
- How does this exercise relate to our class content?
- What does this mean to you? Are there any connections with the concept of Magis, Men and Women for others, or other foundational Jesuit values?
- What are possible actions that can be taken, given this information?

The role of the instructor here is to not only ask questions, but also to encourage critical thinking, guide a productive dialogue, accompany the students in their learning, and ultimately contribute to the formation of the student.⁴⁰

Action - Step 4: Writing Assignments

Action can demonstrate growth based upon experience and reflection. The Ignatian pedagogical paradigm does not expect that action will occur immediately; indeed, Fr. Kolvenbach reminds us that the learning process is one of formation where “We aim to form leaders in service, in imitation of Christ Jesus, men and women of competence, conscience and compassionate commitment.”⁴¹ Action, therefore, should be understood in the context of formation and internal human growth, that founded in experience and informed by reflection, is manifested externally. The idea of formation of character, implies a life-long process that does neither begin nor end in the classroom, a process where the learner continually grows, moving through experience, reflection, action, and evaluation.

Part A of the writing assignment is to be completed outside of class and provides students with the opportunity to make the “truth” themselves, individually (or interiorized choices,⁴²

first step of action). Part B of the assignment is an informal in-class extemporaneous writing in response to prompts. Through the writing assignment, students have an opportunity to demonstrate growth in their understanding, or demonstrate externally the consistency with this newfound conviction.

Critical to Jesuit education is developing the skill of discernment, the activity of writing in conjunction with activity. Criteria of good discernment include: 1) self-direction by the student to be a part of defining goals, activities, and outcomes, and assessment process, 2) focus on the process over the outcome, 3) reflection as a primary goal of the project, and 4) faculty guidance to encourage growth in thinking and the formation of discernment as habit.⁴³ Berzsenyi has provided powerful ideas to encourage guided reflection on social justice issues. Adapted from her suggestions in a creative writing class, she identified the following prompts:

Part A: Research and Becoming Informed

- What do you know about your topic?
- What are the sources of information you have on this topic so far, if any?
- If any sources used, how credible are they for this topic?
- How do you feel about your topic—sad, hopeless, excited, challenged, other?
- What biases do you have on this topic—preconceived attitudes that lead you to see the topic as proper, against the grain, traditional, natural or unnatural, “the way things are”, popular, vile, perverse, or the like?
- What are the values of right and wrong, good and bad, or should be and should not be that you have on this topic?
- What do you need to learn to have a fuller understanding of the topic?
- Where will you go to find more information on your topic? Sources?

Part B: Critical Thinking Informal Response Writing Prompts

- What information, images, or stories surprised you in your research about your topic?
- Did this data change in any way or degree how you feel or thought about the topic? Explain how or why not?

- What information, images, or stories reinforced your feelings and attitudes about the topic?
- What questions remain for you about and for those involved in the social issue concerning you?
- Whom do you blame or see responsible for this social situation and why?
- In an ideal world, describe how would the people, environment, animals, laws and policies, values and norms, etc. appear and interact so that this social problem no longer existed?
- What basic factors have to change to enable this vision of our world?
- Do you have any ideas of how to solve the problem?
- Can you participate in the solution process?
- Would you be willing to participate in the solution process?⁴⁴

Conclusion

Without doubt there are many complex variables at the root of persistent social exclusion and racism. In this paper we argue that these inequities are in part perpetuated by our language. If, as members of Jesuit institutions of higher education, we are called to address the Jesuit mission and infuse justice/social responsibility into our curricula,⁴⁵ we must find new ways to better prepare students for the challenges of the contemporary world. We must explore the potential of exercises that may create productive discomfort in order to make meaning in a globalizing world with all the ethical challenges it presents to its increasingly diverse workforce. It is by the very nature of being at a Jesuit institution that members of the community, students, staff, and faculty, can strive for the *magis* (excellence), *cura personalis* (care of the whole person), service with others, and finding God in all things.⁴⁶

In this paper we presented our experience using an exercise in a traditional face to face undergraduate classroom. In our view, the exercise provides a practical tool to contextualize the power of language of today’s Millennial college student, surfacing the connotations of power and privilege. The exercise is grounded in the principles of Ignatian pedagogy, supporting

student experience, reflection, and action. It is our intention that the impact will support each of us as Jesuit educators in our quest for excellence and distinction in Jesuit business curricula. *HJE*

Notes

¹ Andrea Voyer, “Disciplined to Diversity: Learning the Language of Multiculturalism,” *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 3, no. 11 (2011): 1889.

² Linda J. Sax, Jennifer A. Lindholm, Alexander W. Astin, William S. Korn, and Kathryn M. Mahoney. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2001*, Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 2001.

³ U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. “2010 Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry,” accessed September 28, 2012, http://www1.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo1/2010/index.cfm#select_label.

⁴ Branko Milanovic, “Global Income Inequality: What It Is and Why It Matters?” *DESA Working Paper No 26*. 2006, accessed September 28, 2012, http://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2006/wp26_2006.pdf.

⁵ International Monetary Fund, “World Economic Outlook Database,” accessed September 28, 2012, <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/01/weodata/index.aspx>; World Bank, “World databank,” accessed September 28, 2012, <http://databank.worldbank.org/ddp/home.do?Step=12&cid=4&CNO=2>.

⁶ Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., “The Distinctiveness of Jesuit Schools,” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 1, (2010): 1.

⁷ Chris Lowney, “The Competitive Advantage of Jesuit Business Schools,” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 1, (2010): 37.

⁸ Paolo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 72.

⁹ Timothy J. Kloppenborg, Edward P. Hahnenberg, and Leslie Ann Prosak-Beres, “Helping Our Students Better Understand Themselves and Serve Others,” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 3, (2012): 1-12; Spitzer, “The Distinctiveness of Jesuit Schools.”

¹⁰ Sharn Donnison, “Unpacking the Millennials: A Cautionary Tale for Teacher Education,” *Australian Journal for Teacher Education* 32, no. 3 (2007): 1-13.

¹¹ Pew Research Center, “Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next,” accessed September 28, 2012, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/02/24/interactive-graphic-demographic-portrait-of-four-generations/>.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ John R. Logan, Deirdre Oakley, Polly Smith, Jacob Stowell, and Brian Stults, *Separating the Children* (Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, State University of New York at Albany, 2001), 1.

¹⁴ Ibid., 4.

¹⁵ Neil Howe and William Strauss, *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000).

¹⁶ PBS, “A Class Divided,” January 2003, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/divided/>.

¹⁷ E.M. Broido, “Understanding Diversity in Millennial Students,” *New Directions for Student Services* 10, (2004): 73-85.

¹⁸ Robert B. Moore, *Race, Class, and Gender: An Integrated Study*, 4th ed., ed. Paula S. Rothenberg (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

¹⁹ Christyne Berzsenyi, “Inviting the ‘Millennials’ to be Voices for Social Justice in Their Creative Writings,” *The CEA Forum* 40, no. 2 (2011): 1.

²⁰ Ibid., 2.

²¹ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922).

²² See George Lakoff, “The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

²³ See Pierre Bourdieu, “Social Space and Symbolic Power,” *Sociological Theory* 7, no.1 (1989): 14-25.

²⁴ Roger Fowler, “On Critical Linguistics,” in *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (London: Routledge, 1996), 4.

²⁵ Teun A. van Dijk, “Discourse and the Denial of Racism,” *Discourse & Society* 3, no. 1 (1992): 87-118.

²⁶ Guy Deutscher, *Through the Language Glass: How Worlds Colour Your World* (London: Random House, 2010), 9.

²⁷ Jane Hill, *The Everyday Language of White Racism*, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008).

²⁸ van Dijk, “Discourse and the Denial of Racism.”

²⁹ Hill, *The Everyday Language of White Racism*.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Brenda Allen, *Difference Matters: Communicating Social Identity* (Longrove, IL: Waveland Press, 2010); George Lipsitz, *The*

Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).

³² Hillary P. Dick and Kristina Wirtz, “Racializing Discourses,” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21 (2011): E4.

³³ Carmen Nobel, “The Case Against Racial Colorblindness,” *Working Knowledge, Harvard Business Review*, accessed September 26, 2012, <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/6919.html>.

³⁴ Evan P. Apfelbaum, Michael I. Norton, and Samuel R. Sommers, “Racial Colorblindness: Emergence, Practice and Implications,” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21 (2012): 208.

³⁵ American Anthropological Association, “Statement on ‘Race,’” accessed September 29, 2012, <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm>.

³⁶ Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, 1.

³⁷ Fowler, “On Critical Linguistics,” 7

³⁸ Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., “The Characteristics of Jesuit Education,” accessed September 28, 2012, http://www.seattleu.edu/uploadedFiles/Core/Archive/Jesuit_Education/CharacteristicsJesuitEducation.pdf.

³⁹ See Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).

⁴⁰ Kloppenborg, Hahnenberg, Prosak-Beres, “Helping Our Students Better Understand”; Michael McMahon, “The Jesuit Model of Education,” accessed September 28, 2012, http://www.edocere.org/articles/jesuit_model_education.htm.

⁴¹ Kolvenbach, “The Characteristics of Jesuit Education” ¶110.

⁴² See *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach*, accessed September 28, 2012, http://www.seattleu.edu/uploadedFiles/Core/Archive/Jesuit_Education/Ignatian%20Pedagogy.pdf.

⁴³ Abigail Gosselin, “Cultivating Discernment,” *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* 1, no. 1 (2012): 16-30, <http://www.jesuihighereducation.org/index.php/jhe/article/view/7>.

⁴⁴ Berzsenyi, “Inviting the ‘Millennials.’”

⁴⁵ Spitzer, “The Distinctiveness of Jesuit Schools.”

⁴⁶ Kolvenbach, “The Characteristics of Jesuit Education.”

Bibliography

Allen, Brenda. *Difference Matters: Communicating Social Identity*. Longrove, IL: Waveland Press, 2010

- American Anthropological Association. “Statement on ‘Race.’” Accessed September 29, 2012. <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm>.
- Apfelbaum, Evan P., Michael I. Norton, and Samuel R. Sommers. “Racial Colorblindness: Emergence, Practice and Implications.” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21 (2012): 205-209.
- Berzsenyi, Christyne. “Inviting the ‘Millennials’ to be Voices for Social Justice in Their Creative Writings.” *The CEA Forum* 40, no. 2 (2011): 1-23.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “Social Space and Symbolic Power.” *Sociological Theory* 7, no.1 (1989): 14-25.
- Broido, E. M. “Understanding Diversity in Millennial Students.” *New Directions for Student Services* 106 (2004): 73-85.
- Deutscher, Guy. *Through the Language Glass: How Worlds Colour Your World*, London: Random House, 2010.
- Dick, Hillary P. and Kristina Wirtz. “Racializing Discourses.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21 (2011): E2-E10.
- Donnison, Sharn. “Unpacking the Millennials: A Cautionary Tale for Teacher Education.” *Australian Journal for Teacher Education* 32, no. 3 (2007): 1-13.
- Fowler, Roger. “On Critical Linguistics.” In *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, 3-14. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Gosselin, Abigail. “Cultivating Discernment.” *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* 1 no. 1 (2012): 16-30. <http://www.jesuithighereducation.org/index.php/jhe/article/view/7>.
- Hill, Jane. *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Howe, Neil and William Strauss. *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.
- “Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach.” Accessed September 28, 2012. http://www.seattleu.edu/uploadedFiles/Core/Archive/Jesuit_Education/Ignatian%20Pedagogy.pdf.
- International Monetary Fund 2012. “World Economic Outlook Database.” Accessed September 28, 2012. <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/01/weodata/index.aspx>.
- Kloppenborg, Timothy J., Edward P. Hahnenberg and Leslie Ann Prosak-Beres. “Helping Our Students Better Understand Themselves and Serve Others.” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 3 (2012): 1 – 12
- Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans, S.J. “The Characteristics of Jesuit Education.” Accessed September 28, 2012. http://www.seattleu.edu/uploadedFiles/Core/Archive/Jesuit_Education/CharacteristicsJesuitEducation.pdf.
- Lakoff, George. “The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor.” In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 202-251. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Lipsitz, George. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Logan, John R., Deirdre Oakley, Polly Smith, Jacob Stowell and Brian Stults. *Separating the Children*. Albany: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, State University of New York at Albany, 2001. Accessed September 28, 2012. <http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/Under18Pop/U18Report/MumfordReport.pdf>.
- Lowney, Chris. “The Competitive Advantage of Jesuit Business Schools.” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 1 (2010): 37-50.
- McMahon, Michael. “The Jesuit Model of Education.” Accessed September 28, 2012. http://www.edocere.org/articles/jesuit_model_education.htm.
- Milanovic, Branko. “Global Income Inequality: What It Is and Why It Matters?” *DESA Working Paper No 26*. Accessed September 28, 2012. http://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2006/wp26_2006.pdf.
- Moore, Robert B. *Race, Class, and Gender: An Integrated Study*, 4th ed. Edited by Paula S. Rothenberg. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Nobel, Carmen. 2012. “The Case Against Racial Colorblindness.” *Working Knowledge, Harvard Business Review*. Accessed September 26, 2012. <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/6919.html>
- Palmer, Parker. *The Courage to Teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- PBS. “A Class Divided.” January 2003. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/divided/>.
- Pew Research Center. “Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next.” Accessed September 28, 2012. <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/02/24/interactive-graphic-demographic-portrait-of-four-generations/>.
- Sax, Linda J., Jennifer A. Lindholm, Alexander W. Astin, William S. Korn, and Kathryn M. Mahoney. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2001*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 2001.

- Spitzer, Robert J., S. J. “The Distinctiveness of Jesuit Schools.” *Journal of Jesuit Business Education* 1 (2010): 1 – 16.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. “2010 Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry.” Accessed September 28, 2012.
http://www1.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment/jobpat-eeo1/2010/index.cfm#select_label.
- van Dijk, Teun A. “Discourse and the Denial of Racism.” *Discourse & Society* 3, no. 1 (1992): 87-118.
- Voyer, A. “Disciplined to Diversity: Learning the Language of Multiculturalism,” *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 34, no. 11 (2011): 1874-1893. doi:10.1080/01419870.2011.552620.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922.
- World Bank. “World dataBank.” Accessed September 28, 2012.
<http://databank.worldbank.org/ddp/home.do?Step=12&id=4&CNO=2>