

**THE INSTITUTE
FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**SEVENTH ANNUAL
JACQUELINE P. DANZBERGER
MEMORIAL LECTURE**

**FEATURING
CLAUDE STEELE, PH.D.
DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR ACVANCED STUDY
IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES;
LUCY STERN PROFESSOR IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, STANFORD
UNIVERSITY**

APRIL 16, 2007

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

*Transcript by:
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

ELIZABETH L. HALE: Good afternoon and welcome to the Seventh Annual Jacqueline P. Danzberger Memorial Lecture. We would like to have this be a conversation and we understand that some of you like the option of being able to sort of come and go and we promise not to feel badly if you are coming and going, but we'd like you to sort of move forward so that as you hear what Professor Steele has to say and you get ready to ask a question, we could really get into a discussion.

My name is Betty Hale and I'm president of the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, D.C. and we are the co-sponsor of this event with the National School Boards Association. We are honored to be able to do this and we do this lecture in honor of a colleague, Jackie Danzberger. And 25 – I think it was 25 years ago, maybe not quite 25 years ago, 23, Jackie Danzberger worked with a couple of people and they developed something called an indicator of school board effectiveness and I want you to keep these ideas in mind as you listen to what the professor has to say about stereotypes and about, more importantly about the institutional leadership that is going to be required.

Now, before I tell you those things that Jackie and her colleagues found across the country – you know, I think if you live in Washington, D.C. you have a tendency to sort of think that everybody in the country reads The Washington Post, The New York Times, and listens to public radio. So I love it when I go across the country and I get to read USA Today. Well, imagine this, USA Today has the following: negativity at school – now, I want to just tell you this that I once said to the national – the group that does the NAPE test – if you could figure out how to show America how its students are doing as clearly as USA today can tell you anything they want you to know, we will be in much better shape.

Here's what they're telling us today: negativity at school – and this is from a huge climate survey – the percentage of teachers who say they often hear these types of remarks from students, 40 percent of the teachers polled said they hear students making sexist remarks; 33 percent said they hear students making homophobic remarks; 12 percent said they hear students making racist remarks and three percent said that they hear students making negative religious remarks.

We are here today because you represent the institutional leadership that is required to do what I think the professor said in an interview which is to say to open the schoolhouse doors to all of our students, keeping in mind that effective school board members basically provide the leadership for public education and advocate for the educational needs and interests of all students.

Now, I'm not going to take time to go through all 15; I am going to say to you that the one indicator that every school board in America that was involved in this work said that they themselves felt that they were least effective at was oversight of education policy.

We are delighted to have you here today. I think that the very fact that you're here gives me great faith in what the future holds. I am delighted to be here. We, again, are delighted to be the co-sponsor and Anne Bryant, your leader, is going to introduce our speaker. Thanks, Anne.

ANNE L. BRYANT: Thank you, Betty. And in case you're wondering what the Institute for Educational Leadership is all about, Betty and her colleagues have been providing guidance to school districts, to policymakers for many years, but Betty's leadership of this organization has truly been exemplary and so, let's give a round of applause for Betty Hale. (Applause.)

Okay, I've got an admission, Claude. I did not know Claude Steele well before Betty Hale called me up and proposed him for the Jacqueline Danzberger Lecture. I'd heard his name, but I faked my first reaction of,

oh, terrific! (Laughter.) Then after I hung up the phone, I Googled you and, wow, what I learned about this individual is really mind-blowing. You're famous. You're smart. You're very well known by all the people that matter, so it put me in my place. (Laughter.) So it is indeed a pleasure to introduce Dr., Professor, author Claude Steele to this audience of school board members, district administrators, and state association leaders.

Claude Steele is the Lucie Stern Professor of Psychology at Stanford University where he has taught since 1991. Previously, he served on the faculties of the University of Michigan, University of Washington, University of Utah. Professor Steele's research interests are how people cope with self image threats, how group stereotypes can influence intellectual performance and addictive behaviors.

Professor Steele has served as president of the Society of Personality and Social Psychology, the president of the Western Psychological Association, and was a member of the board of directors of the American Psychological Society. He is the recipient of numerous awards which I won't go into, but you can read about in your program.

Okay, so that's the very recognized part of Claude Steele, but let me share why I think we will learn a lot from him today. His research has real impact on the culture and climate within schools that school board members actually have a responsibility for. I'll remind you of the key work of school boards: that eight-part framework of governance – I love it when I see heads nodding – which starts with vision, but along about step number five is boards are responsible to make sure that the climate in the schools are great places for students to come to learn and teachers and administrators to love coming to teach. And that work has really guided NSBA and, I hope, state associations across the country.

This year, we just announced and we – it's a parallel study to last year – two surveys on climate. And actually I thought Betty might be referring to that, but USA Today did another poll. But last year, we unleashed and published a survey of 32,000 students called Where We Learn. And then two weeks ago, we published a survey of 4800 teachers and 267 administrators in urban districts asking them the same parallel questions about climate. We labeled it, Where We Teach. And so, Claude, I have those for you today and I'd like to give them to you.

What Claude has spent his life work doing is on the one hand simple, and yet very complex. Students are greatly affected by the stereotypes that are prevalent in race and gender. Whether it's taking a state reading or math exam or selecting a course in college or creating their own set of expectations about how far they will go in their careers, race and gender matter. So I am really looking forward to hearing from Claude Steele today because his work kind of gets at the roots of learning, not the test scores, not just the curriculum, but how kids and teachers and administrators feel and live with inside the school doors, which we as school board members are responsible for.

So, Professor Claude Steele, and now friend Claude Steele, take it away.

CLAUDE STEELE: Now can you hear me? There we go. Now you can hear me. Okay, great; I'm free; I can move around. Thank you very much for that warm introduction, Anne. It's a real pleasure for me to get to talk to you. Just as a word of orientation, I'm a social psychologist – that's a person who studies how society affects the psychology of the individual – and I've always been interested in applying that perspective to educational issues. And so that's how I get into this situation.

I've never had any real influence within a school system, so – (chuckles) – it's great to be able to talk to you and I hope that we will break out into discussion. I know we will at some point, but I guess I should just invite you if you have a question and I'm going along and it seems like I'm going along 90 miles an hour, don't

hesitate to raise your hand; I'm very flexible about that and I can orient what I've got to say more to what you're thinking that way.

My research has been variously sort of labeled in the psychology literature as stereotype threat, in the popular literature to some degree stereotype threat, social identity threat, but I always race to point out that it's been concerned with two real, very related problems. The first is the underperformance in school and on tests of groups whose intellectual abilities are negatively stereotyped. That's been the touchstone problem that has oriented our research and as we go through this, the years of this research, we often go back to that problem and that directs what we do in our research, the issues we try to take on.

The other problem is very related to that; it might rough – for lack of a better term, it might be called the diversity problem or the diversity phenomenon. It's one thing to numerically integrate a school or a classroom or a workplace; it's another thing to make that school, classroom, or workplace a place where everybody can flourish. And what are the barriers to making that a place where everybody feels comfortable, where relationships are sort of positive and facilitate learning as opposed to possibly interfering with learning.

So those are the two problems: performance and this larger task – I think of it as a basic American challenge. I always say that I think we in this society don't give ourselves enough credit for having integration as a real goal of society, as a real ambition and expectation of how our society should function. I think this is one of the achievements of the Civil Rights era is that expectation. So these problems are related to it.

I hope I'll impress on you a couple of things. One is the importance of the social context on learning, that learning is not something that happens in a vacuum or can happen under any circumstances. And if there's one theme I want to stress – and so I'll just say it now in case I forget to later – belonging is necessary for learning. I want to – that is an overarching theme. People have to have a sense of belonging in a setting in order to learn. And in ways that will not surprise you, our identities – our race, our gender, our age, and the like – can interfere with a sense of belonging and thereby interfere with a sense with learning, in that order. So I hope all that will become vividly clear as I go along.

The second thing is that I hope you'll get a deeper understanding of the importance of our social identities, that these are not fictions, that it won't quite do to say I see everybody the same way, even though that comes, I think, often from very good intentions, very noble intentions. But I think it can miss the realities that go with the identities that we have in these everyday classroom situations. And so I hope that across the talk, you'll get a concrete idea of what I mean by that, of how that can happen, how significant a social identity is.

Okay. Those are the orientations. The last thing I'd say is that first, bear with me; there's going to be – I'll give you our analysis that's emerged in our research over the years. So the first part is going to be trying to explain it and to show you how we dug into these issues and came up with a certain format. That's the first part of the talk. But keep in mind I am going to remedy; I'm going to solutions, suggestions for solutions.

This research now is about almost 20 years old and probably for the last six or seven years, I've been primarily focused on solutions, so a lot of the first part is older work and a lot of the latter part is newer work in that sense. And I shouldn't present myself as anything but now a citizen in the world of people that do this research. This kind of research is being done in many places, in many countries of the world.

So okay, well, I'd like to begin it with just a simple definition of social identity just so you have some sense of what I mean by that. It's the part of our personal identity, the sense of who you are, that comes from group memberships and the social categories to which we belong and I really put that up there so you can see

that every human being has a ton of social identities. Everybody does in the sense that I'm defining them: our age, our sex, our race, our religion, profession, ethnicity. I could make the argument that no two people on the earth have exactly the same combination of social identities and that that may be in part where we get our individuality – not totally, but in part where our individuality emerges is from having some kind of combination of social identities that we have.

The other point is that the significance that a social identity has – this is getting some of this 75 cent psychology language out of the way – (chuckles) – early in the talk. I promise it won't get any worse than this. I hate this term contingencies of social identities; I wish there was something clearer and simple. But the thing that makes an identity significant to us, that affects how we function, is the things in life that we have to contend with because we have a given identity. That's what makes identity real.

If I can go through my life and not have to contend with anything based on my, I don't know, my professional identity, then that identity doesn't become very important to me. But in fact, I have to contend with all kinds of things – some positive, some not so positive – based on that identity and my whole life is organized around that identity from the beginning of the day to the end of the day. So that identity is hugely important to me; it's important to me as other identities that, you know, like for example, race or age or sex or something like that.

The point is that they aren't things that people can just pick up and put down, decide to emphasize or not decide to emphasize. Identities are real things because the ones that are important to us are usually tied to real contingencies. Sometimes I try to use a dramatic example to make this clear and one that I've been fascinated with in recent years is the story of Anatole Broyard who was The New York Times book reviewer for a number of years. And I read his reviews, was much impressed by them, wrote some essays on illness. If I'd have thought anything about his identities, what identities, I would have thought because he used certain kind of terms that I associated with a certain New York psychoanalytic school, I would have thought he was Jewish. Anatole Broyard: maybe French, something like that, you know, if I had any image of him. Well, when he died in 1994, he revealed to his adult children for the first time that he was black and that, you know, he'd been passing essentially for all of his adult life.

Well, then the story begins to be emerged. Henry Louis Gates first revealed this in a New Yorker piece, but then Philip Roth read that piece and it became the central character in the novel, "The Human Stain," which became a movie, "The Human Stain." So that's – the central figure Coleman Silk in that book is modeled after Anatole Broyard.

He grew up black in the Bronx; his family migrated from New Orleans, sort of a high yellow family, as they might be referred to at the time. His father was a carpenter and passed during the day in order to get work because blacks couldn't get union membership and couldn't work as carpenters at the time. So to do that, he would pass during the day, but then he came back home at night and by all accounts lived comfortably black, so to speak.

And so did Anatole, or Buddy as he was called in those days. But one thing about him is he was a tremendous student and midway through city college, I mean, he'd mastered just about the entire Western canon of literature and he had these huge ambitions to be a writer. He was married to an African-American woman. They had a child – lived, as I say, black, as a black person. Goes into the Army at the end of World War II, something happens in there and he makes a decision that if they don't ask, I'm not going to tell. And he comes out of the Army white, divorces the wife, separates from the family, the parents, the sisters, the child, everything that would be involved in that and that is so dramatically depicted in the movie and the book, especially. I recommend the book, especially, "The Human Stain."

Moves to New York, becomes a raconteur, an essayist, buys a book store, does all kinds sort of fascinating things, gets a huge book contract to write his autobiography, which, as you can imagine, never actually got written. (Chuckles.) And time goes by, gets this job as the daily book reviewer for The New York Times. Eventually moves out to the suburbs of Connecticut and finishes out his life there.

Well, if you ask yourself what would his life had been like if he'd come out of the Army and stayed black versus what his life was like coming out of the Army with the white identity, then you get a perfect example of what I mean by contingencies. That's what I mean by contingencies: real things – limitations, in this case – that he would have had to contend with because he's black. That's what makes being black significant.

He would never have gotten the loan to buy that bookstore. He would never have been able to live in the West Village; he would have had to live Uptown or in Bed-Stuy, where he came from because the city was sternly segregated in those days. He would have met a completely different friendship network. A completely different set of opportunities would have been distributed his way and not his way. He would never have gotten the job writing for The New York Times. If he was going to be a writer at all, he would have had to have been a writer that wrote about the Negro experience. So those are the things that are the contingencies. That's what I mean that makes an identity significant.

If those things go away, then the significance of that identity goes away. You take him, you put him in Lagos, Nigeria, nobody's concerned about being black over there; everybody's black. They are concerned about your religion; they're concerned about rural/urban differences. There are certain identities that are profoundly significant there. His having been an American immigrant, that would have been profound. But being black probably wouldn't be.

And I want to argue that without that, his black identity that he forged in the United States would be, over time, kind of, you know, atavistic, something that he remembers, he keeps track of baseball scores and so on, but it wouldn't have been a very significant orientation in his life. That's – I'm pushing the argument that far. I'm going to push it that far.

I also want to stress that among the contingencies that a person – that make an identity significant to us is a sense of being threatened on the basis of having that identity in some way, threatened in the sense of being obstructed in some course of life that I want to take because I have this identity, or maybe even being in physical danger. I've got a quote that stresses that: People often see themselves in terms of whichever one of their allegiances, that is identities, is under attack. Whether he accepts or conceals it, proclaims it discreetly or flaunts it, it is with that allegiance that the person concerned identifies.

So I want to argue that's almost a kind of power that we have over each other is to threaten each other on the basis of a given social identity. And just think about it: age, race, sex, profession, region of the country, ethnicity, language, dialect, I mean, on and on the list goes. And if you're in a situation, a setting, where you feel people could devalue you based on one of those identities, that makes that identity come on full force and take over, in a psychologist's terms, your psychological functioning. You start to see the world through the lens of that identity; you start to connect to other people who have got that identity. It starts to be something that you use to organize yourself and to set how you orient toward life. It becomes very significant.

And we're very alert as human beings to any subtle cues to being threatened on the basis of identity, as you will see in this talk that I'm about to – some of the research I'm about to give. I'm going to skip through some things just for the sake of speed.

I just want to summarize this with a couple of statements. Social identities originate with, and are sustained by, the contingencies that go with particular situations, the things that go with them in a given situation. And the second thing is the most psychologically impactful contingencies are those that in some way threaten us. And we feel threatened on the basis, as I increasingly do, of age, for example. (Chuckles.) You know, people just regard you differently; they have different expectations; they see you through stereotypes. All kinds of things happen when you get older and it's a big part of getting older is contending with those perceptions and how people – what their expectations are.

Or I could tell the story from the standpoint of being young. When you're young people see you in certain ways, through the lens of certain kind of stereotypes and they make certain kinds of judgments and it could be, depending on the context, a real disadvantage. But it'll make – and if you're in a situation like that where you feel threatened on the basis of that identity, that identity becomes big time for you, becomes real center stage.

Okay, let me show you some research and this will, I hope, begin to reveal some of the educational, schooling implications of these ideas. I'm done with theory now and we can move on to some concrete demonstrations and examples. One area that really started this line of thinking and line of research is this phenomenon of stereotype threat. And by stereotype threat all I mean is when you're in a situation or you're doing something for which a negative stereotype about one of those identities that you've got is relevant; you could be all alone, but you could recognize that a stereotype about that identity that you have is relevant to what you're doing.

And as soon as that happens, you know that you are at risk of being judged in terms of that stereotype or treated in terms of that stereotype. And that's all I mean by stereotype threat, just recognizing that people think of people like me in this situation a certain way and therefore in this situation I could be seen that way or be treated that way. And actually, I'm a lot younger inside than people think on the outside – (laughter) – it's not fair. Well, that's what I mean by stereotype threat.

And our reasoning was could this form of threat be a factor in the underperformance in school of groups whose intellectual abilities are negatively stereotyped? That's the connection that got us launched. We started with women in math, that group in that context, negatively stereotyped in this society as I'll talk about in a minute. That's not true in all societies, but it is true in this society.

So our reasoning was very simple. We did a very simple experiment. We brought women and men who were very strong math students at the University of Michigan into the lab one at a time. We selected them for being very good math students and very committed to math, and equally so the men and the women. One at a time and we gave them a really difficult math test, a half-hour section of the graduate (record ?) exams you take if you're a math major, not the general quantitative section of the GRE, but the math major. I couldn't begin to read these items let alone answer these items.

So this is a really hard math test but these are really good math students. We give them a half an hour all alone. Our prediction is – our theory is that for women, this will be a fundamentally different situation than it will be for me, fundamentally – it looks fair. It looks perfectly fair. But as soon as the woman experiences frustration in that test – frustration, frustration, frustration, I'll say that a ton of times – as soon as she experiences frustration, as a member of this society, she knows at some level, often semi-consciously, that the stereotype about women's math ability is relevant here. It's relevant.

Maybe, maybe what they say – I don't even think this is consciously articulated – but maybe what they say about women is true. Maybe I'm – I've always been good at this. It's been important to me, but maybe at this test, I'm meeting my Waterloo, I'm meeting the limits of my abilities based on the kind of person I am, based on being a woman, based on this category and here this reputation is. So all right, so, she doesn't believe it and she comes out of that test completely not believing the stereotype is true, but during that test she spent a hell of a lot of time worrying about it. And our prediction is her performance will go down in that situation.

Men in the same situation, they take the test and they, too, could worry about whether they're any good at math. They'll have the same frustration, but it won't signal that there is a category-based, a group-based, an identity-based limitation as is signaled in the case of the woman. They won't have that extra thing to worry about. And over the years of doing this research, I think people would rather take personal blame in most of these situations than believe that something about their group is – how their group is understood is the problem. That's very, very upsetting to people. And that's the upset that women have to deal with in that situation.

Okay, here's what happened. Men and women equally skilled in math – and you can see on this difficult test, they have just as much math ability – I can explain how we figured all that out later on, but take my word for it – they have equal, maybe higher math ability than the men in this situation. And yet on this difficult test at the frontier of their ability, they under-perform in relation to men. Well – and this is what I'm sure you see in a classroom a lot.

Yeah?

Q: Were they set up for – (off mike) – in that they thought they were not as good?

MR. STEELE: No, we didn't say anything to them. They just came in and took a test. No set up.

Yeah?

Q: When was this – what year?

MR. STEELE: You can get this – this has been shown consistently in six countries of the world over the last 15 years.

Q: It's the last couple of years that there seems to be a shift – (off mike).

MR. STEELE: No evidence of it in these kind of experiments.

Yeah?

Q: You're saying you didn't predispose them, saying, oh, lady, this is really going to be hard – (off mike) – maybe society in general says – (off mike).

MR. STEELE: That's it. In this society in general. I can tell you, just to jump ahead in my story a little bit, if you go to Poland and you do these tests where women are equally distributed in quantitatively-based fields – like the sciences, mathematicians, the engineers are half women – you don't get these effects. Some Asian countries, same thing. But in Britain, France, Italy, United States, there is this stereotype.

And I also know that that's what the women are thinking about in that experiment. Again, if I had time to really show you the nuts and bolts of the experiments, we have clever ways of measuring what's on the top of

your brain, but you're not quite able to say it because you can – you know, like a Rorschach test, you know, kind of a Rorschach principle where you project. Well, if you use that kind of an instrument here, what women are thinking about is this image of, this stereotype about women having limited ability.

Okay, yes?

Q: (Off mike.)

MR. STEELE: Oh, okay, thank you. Good advice, to repeat the questions from now on out. But to prove our point, these are not enough data. To prove our point, what we have to do is have them take the same test, but this time in a situation where this stereotype about women isn't relevant to the test, isn't relevant to interpreting their experience on the test. Within a few minutes, you'll see me do that in a variety of ways, but the very first way we did it in this experiment – this is the very first experiment we ever did – we did the following way:

Just as they sat down to take the test, the men and the women one at a time in this laboratory room, this very difficult test, just as they sat down to take that test. We told them, look you may have heard that women don't do as well on difficult math tests, but that's not true for this particular test; for this particular test, women always do as well as men, no effect whatsoever; this test cannot discriminate between men and women; no use repeating that, right? And now, what that says is that they're again in the middle of that experiment and the frustration starts to happen, the test is difficult, but they now are assured this is not showing about them as a woman. It could be showing something about their own personal, you know, Betty Jones' math ability. But it's not showing anything about being a woman. All right.

And if it didn't work, you know, I wouldn't be here, so – (laughter). It works. (Laughter.) You can see that there are all kinds of interesting things in what I just sprang up there, but the main thing to focus on is what happens to the women under that instruction. Their math performance goes up dramatically on this difficult test and matches that of the men. You might notice that the men's comes down a little bit.

I'll just give you a hint – we can talk about that later, but a hint of what that's about. If you were on the upside of somebody else's negative stereotype, then the frustration you have trying to perform in that area doesn't mean you don't belong in the area. It's just irrelevant – the frustration isn't as upsetting. You can be favored by a positive – as an African American male playing basketball, I was terrible at it. I endured all kinds of frustration but it only later in life occurred to me that maybe I don't belong here – (laughter) – because my group is positively stereotyped there and if screw up, me and the rest of the world thinks, well, that's not a big deal. But if you're a white guy and you screw up in that situation, it could be interpreted by you and the rest of the world as maybe you don't belong there; maybe you should get another thing going in life, you know? Tennis, swimming. I actually was a swimmer; that was my sport.

Okay, so I have here what Larry Summers actually said – (laughter) – as you know, in that conference – and the thing to focus on here is that sentence in italics. The second is – he's talking about why women are not in the sciences and quantitatively-based fields like at Harvard or in higher education and he says, well, he thinks maybe they just – the first one is he thinks well, maybe, they just don't want to work that hard. The second one is what I would call a differential ability of aptitude at the high end. That's what got Larry Summers in big trouble and eventually cost him the presidency of Harvard University. It wasn't solely responsible for his decline, but it started a kind of downfall, you know, that other things then came into play and a year later, after making this, he was out the door and now Harvard has a new president.

You can see – the question, too, investigators ask is, well, I read about that stereotype threat stuff, what does a statement like that do to women who are, for example, going around the halls of his own university trying to become chemists and physicists and mathematicians and engineers? What does it do to them? So they did a simple experiment kind of mapped on ours to basically ask the question, does mentioning that math is genetically-based, is a genetically influenced capacity, does talking about that, what effect would that have on women's math performance?

Here's a very simple experiment they did. They had them take one math test and then after they took that little simple math test, they had them read an article and in one condition they got the same experimental treatment that I just described to you – you might have heard that this test – you might have heard that women don't do as well on math tests as men, but on this particular test, there's no gender difference. So that first thing there is that no gender difference instruction.

The second one is you don't say anything, the standard stereotype threat effect and you see what happens. Again, stereotype threat lowers performance. The third condition is the critical one. That's what happens if you just have women read an article about genes being very important in math ability before they take a math test, a difficult math test. You haven't said anything about, you know, the math test being difficult. You haven't said anything – all you've done is mention the idea that this is an ability rooted in genetics, in genes. Then you produce that kind of an effect on their performance.

That the stereotype, after all, is – this is one of the things about stereotypes. They're essentialistic. They're saying that people in this group have some essential characteristic, something inherently true about them, that leads to this outcome. So when that stereotype is raised, that's the allegation, that's the threat in the air that you are at risk of confirming something inherent about your group. And so when you start talking about abilities like these being genetically based or limited in some way, you increase the impact of that stereotype on that person's head.

I just want to raise this now because when we get into the remedy section, you can begin to see some of the things that we, in schooling, do that reinforced that idea that abilities do have a significant genetic component to them, if not a direct component, then certainly a limitation. And there is probably no area where Americans believe that ability is more genetically rooted than in math. Very different than in Poland; very different than in China. They don't believe that math is so substantially rooted in individual differences in genetic capacity like we do. But we do. We have this kind of take. And, in part, some of the effects we see these differences, these group achievement gaps, are rooted in that cultural lore.

Okay, race. This is a study done at the University of Oklahoma. I'll just put everything up very quickly so you can see what happens. These are people taking an IQ test and they're taking the gold standard of IQ tests, which is the Raven's Progressive Matrices. It's the gold standard because it's a non-verbal IQ test. There's a big design – a square and it's a design with lines or circles or some kind of design and then there are five little designs and you have to pick the one that continues the big design. Which of these five is the same design as that top design? You don't have to say a word. All you have to do is be able to make the right answer. They start out very easy and they get really difficult. And the beauty of this experiment is that you can tell people who are taking this test that it's either an IQ test, like people interpret it to be, or you can tell them it's a puzzle.

If you tell them it's a puzzle, for the black students taking this test, this same test is now irrelevant to that nasty stereotype out there about African Americans' intellectual ability. This is not an ability test' this is a puzzle. So you can see the differences in performance that happened when the test is presented one way or the other. Black students and white students at Oklahoma: the blue bars are the black students; the purple bars are

the white students. When the test is given with its standard instructions or if it's explicitly stated that it's an IQ test, you see that the black students dramatically under-perform in relation to the white students, about a standard deviation which is about the size of the difference in IQ between these two sectors of the population. You tell them that this same test is a puzzle, there's nothing to do with it: boom. Blacks' scores go up.

Okay. At this point, you have to know that these experiments are replicated time and time again; there are hundreds of them by this point. That's – for the first five or six years, we hardly said anything about this research just to make sure everybody else could get these effects and it turns out you can get these effects extremely easily with a procedure like that. Okay.

This then – you know, you can do this with regard to sports, black athletes, white athletes, they're brought in, elite athletes at the University of Arizona, big athletic program, they're brought into the lab one at a time, asked to do 10 holes of golf in a little experimental golf room. And to put the white athletes under stereotype threat, you say just before they do this task, this is a test of natural athletic ability – (laughter). Everybody knows the stereotype – (laughter) – and under the weight of that stereotype, because these kids are invested in this, they dramatically under-perform in relation to the black athletes on this test. You turn the tables by giving them exactly the same test, but this time you say, this is a test of sports strategic intelligence. Stereotypes are – now, the black athletes are under stereotype threat.

Math – what about Asian women? They have two opposing stereotypes that are relevant: the ethnic stereotype that Asians are good at math and the gender stereotype that women are bad at it. Well, whichever you activate before they take the test is what happens on the test. If you remind them of their gender, they under-perform; if you remind them of their ethnicity, they beat the boys in that kind of an experiment.

So I could go over this forever, but I want to give you, you know, a strong impression about testing and performance and how much it is tied to the contingencies that are bearing on people's identities. In particular, what we've got demonstration of are these stereotypes. And in a second I'll show you what makes stereotypes relevant.

I want to just show you one experiment which deals with the experience of perhaps being a teacher. What does a white teacher facing minority students?

Yeah?

Q: (Off mike.)

MR. STEELE: Yeah, now the research literature begins these effects in the third grade and goes all the way through like professional school. Oh yes, the question is what is the age of these students and the women in math studies have been done as early as the third grade and they go all the way through professional school – grad school and professional school.

Yes?

Q: Is it a conscious thing that students – (off mike) – admit that's what –

MR. STEELE: Yeah, question is: Is this a conscious thing? Do they admit that? No. No. You go in and, interestingly, in a stereotype threat condition where you know they underperformed; you interview them; they are very calm and relaxed and they say, I beat this test because I – the subjective experience of it is that

they kind of know this test is important and they buckle down and try real hard. But buckling down and trying really, really hard on a test like this undermines performance.

There's one thing here that I've got to stress. All of the studies that I've described to you are studies that use people who are very committed to performing well in the domain. So they're – you might say, well, geez, can't you just buckle down and overpower these stereotypes? Can't you just burst through them? That's what I'd do. This is a strong message in the African American community, even after the Imus thing. I must have heard this a thousand times. These stereotypes motivate me and they do motivate people. But when you're talking about – when you've got somebody performing at the limit of their skills, at the frontier of their skills, and they're trying that hard, first it's difficult to sustain that kind of effort out there. It's difficult, for example, a woman in a graduate level math class – statistics or biology – just to continue to persist in that area knowing or feeling that you have to work twice as hard. It's hard to do that; it's hard to sustain it.

And the other thing is when you're under timed performances like that, that kind of an effort actually interferes. It's like too much effort. You need to relax more and be more engaged with the material in a responsive way. So it's really important to stress here that these underperformances are not happening because of people trying not hard enough; they're happening because of people trying too hard.

It made me immediately aware that when you think about something as a racial achievement gap in the schools, there's two groups that we're talking about. One is the classic group that isn't identified with school, don't care about school, has maybe had enough stereotype threat by the time, let's say, the fifth grade. They're sitting there, waiting to get out of there. That's an under-motivated, dis-identified group. That group, from research we've done, does not show stereotype threat effects. (Audio break, tape change.)

I'm going to skip this. I just wanted to show that, for example, teachers, on the other side of this equation, can feel tremendous stereotype threat in interacting with black students, and the stereotype through what they feel is not about their ability but about their racism or possible racism, that it can make it very difficult to have conversations and to say certain things to students in this kind of context because there is this stereotype out there that well maybe I'm insensitive in some way, insensitive to my privilege, I don't know much about the background, I could do a Don Imus here or something and I'd be in big – so there, take my word for it, that experiment shows that.

But let me move ahead to the basic question of what makes this stereotype threat a big deal in school? We first thought it must be some internalized low self-esteem on the part of the participants in this research, but you can see from what I've just said, that's not true. It's happening in the biggest way for the students with the most confidence and the most commitment to performing well. So it isn't logical to push that sort of cultural idea that it's all about confidence and self-esteem because the confidence and self-esteem is leading these people into, basically, a very high-pressured situation that somebody with less self-esteem would never have gotten into in the first place. They wouldn't go there. They would have dropped out of the math major, they never would have majored in math if they didn't have a great deal of confidence and competence and high expectations and everything for doing that.

But for those that get there and are now trying to function at the frontier of your skills, which is always where you're functioning, if you're moving up and getting better and better in a domain. That's where you, if your group is negatively stereotyped, you've got this identity pressure to deal with. And our question, then, is, well, how can we start to reduce this? Where is it coming from? The answer: it's coming from cues in the environment that can make this pressure stronger or weaker. That's the basic idea that I'm going to try to convince you of. Cues that signal threatening contingencies foster a vigilance and hamper a sense of belonging in the setting. And that, in turn, impairs learning and performance in the setting.

As soon as I walk into a setting and I have some sense that under some, I'm walking into a Silicon Valley startup firm, I'm my age and the CEO is 26 – (laughter) – everybody in there is younger than he is, they're listening to music I've never heard of, they all have bicycles hanging down from their work cubicles, they're living in some world I don't even know much about, but I'm trying to get a job there? Well in every interaction I have in that situation, will they take me seriously as a software writer? Will they believe my work? What kind of expectations do they have? Every interaction is shrouded with this possibility that they're responding to my identity in some way. So I'm multi-tasking, and if I'm multi-tasking, I can't learn that well. That's the point.

There are also – here's where the good news starts to come – cues that signal non-threatening contingencies and foster belonging in the setting, and thus, learning can happen. I'm going to tell a hopeful story here in a minute. I'm going to start out with the notion that, well, I'm going to start out with the notion that I think diverse classrooms have an inherent amount of identity threat in them. That's the bad news, but the good news is, I'm going to say, I think there are ways to solve this.

Here's just a bunch of cues, I just list them. Sandra Day O'Connor said the happiest day she ever had in the Supreme Court was the day that Ruth Bader Ginsburg got there. (Laughter.) Only woman in the Supreme Court – Jesus, that's rough. Everything she does is looked at through that, so another woman gets there, it diffuses the – so numbers is a tremendously powerful cue. Segregation in networks, personal and professional, you walk into a situation and it seems to be strongly segregated along some line, that becomes a cue that that identity is really going to be important. When I was a kid, I think the first time I ever was aware of being a black was when I was in the second or third grade, and I realized, I was told, we kids going to school learned that we couldn't go in the summer to the city park swimming pool two blocks over because it was a white pool. We could only go on Wednesday afternoons. And I can remember saying, Jesus, what the Hell is that about? (Laughter.)

You know, you don't ever get a really good answer. (Laughter.) You know, but all of a sudden, you know something about you is important. And you try to figure that you, and you're hung on this problem, and that's a cue, makes identity significant. A stereotype threat of the sorts I've just described is another cue. Well, I could go on. One that may be, a certain one that may be a particularly important are low priority on identity integration in a setting. This is something that I think can happen when you have a diverse setting and people put apparently very little priority on valuing that diversity. Then that can be a signal that uh-oh, so the identities that have negative stereotypes about them, that can be a very threatening situation. There has to be explicitly, call it window dressing, call it whatever you want, there has to be some affirmation of that being an important thing in order for people who would otherwise be problematizing that situation to begin to feel comfortable. Those are all these kind of cues that could happen.

Here's a simple one, just to give you some story of the impact. This is actually the Stanford mathematics department, a map, that red office, let's say that's a woman graduate student's office, and let's say those are the two bathrooms that are right near the office. That's a pretty neutral set of cues that you have to go into, if you're a woman, into the woman's bathroom, if you're a man, into the men's – that is a cue that is a contingency of your identity. You've got to do the right thing. If you do the wrong thing, it's going to be a real embarrassing day for you, so we all do it, but it's so, we're so used to it, nobody ever thinks about this.

But suppose you were in a situation like this, which is the way the math department actually looks. Hmm. Yeah. How would you feel if you're that woman in that, that graduate student in that office? You'd feel, you know, again, you don't know what does this mean. You don't really know. Like me, what is this swimming thing, restriction? I don't really actually know, but why are there only men's bathrooms around

here? Why in the pictures on the wall, there's only men? What does that say about – and now I'm taking the test and I experience frustration. Maybe I just don't – I don't belong in this situation.

So here's a study we did, which really gets at this. We had – these are our women who are math, science or engineering majors at Stanford. These are very talented women. And we have them interviewing for a summer institute on math and science, and they show up to the laboratory in preparation for their, as they're waiting for their interview, we hooked them up to physiological recording equipment on the premise that later on, they're going to be in another experiment with huge guises in order to make these things plausible and feel like they're falling. This is the art of being a researcher. You have to make a seamless part of reality.

So we have them all hooked up now, take my word for it, and then, just before, so we're recording their physiological reactions, and we also have them fill out a few questionnaires at the end of, just before they go into this interview that they're going to have, and lo and behold, while they're hooked up, we say, you might want to look at a few, a video showing what last year's institute looked like. Okay? So on that side, you're left side, that's the ratio, the photographs are one woman to every man. The unbalanced side are three men to every one woman. And I put these pictures up because you can see, when you look at them like this, it's hardly noticeable. It's not noticeable, really, in a big way.

But here's what happens with regards to their results. Memory – I like this one. Recognition, because our notion, if you'll remember that thing, is that if you see a cue that signals that you might be under threat because of an identity, you're going to get vigilant, and our idea here is if you get vigilant, you're going to remember things better, so the women who have watched – the women who watched the unbalanced video, three men to every women, that's all they did, that's all that happened in there, but you can see, they remembered details of that video better than any other group, indicating pretty clearly that they're vigilant in that situation, they're paying attention. What's going on here?

Cues just about the experimental room: same thing. They have a better memory of that. Cardiovascular activity, dramatically different for the women. Almost every measure we take – vascular reactivity, which is related to hypertension, much greater. Same things happen with regard to race, huge differences of physiological. Brain activation happens in the anxiety sectors of the brain as a whole area of research which looks at the physiology and the brain reactivity to be under a stereotype threat kind of situation. Sense of belonging, those women have a much lower sense of belonging in that situation. I could talk about performance, for example, if you give a difficult math test to women, very difficult math test, and you start adding men to the room, performance goes down. I don't like that because you can imagine the implications for integrated classrooms. But I just, at this point, want to finish that as my last comment about diagnosis. Now let's get on to remedy.

The bad news is that identity threat is intrinsic to most diverse settings, the default state of affairs unless something is done to reduce it. I think this is a reality of American life and probably life in many places in the world that we seem reluctant to think about. We tend to think of it being a matter of being a good person and our will and commitment to being a good person as being the only necessary in order to make a diverse situation function effectively, and I want to argue through this whole line of argument that I'm making that it's more than that, it's more than that, that it has to be informed, that this is as difficult as rocket science in some ways, integrating populations like we're trying to do in these situations.

Good news: Some level of salience of identity safety cues in a setting can foster trust even when other cues in the setting might suggest otherwise. This is the start – the good news. The goal is that identity safety is something that I think we have to make in American schooling as a primary, as something we have to do first before we can expect equal learning by all groups to happen in a situation. When enough cues, implicit or

explicit, signal that identity-based threats are not normative in the setting, or that genuine acceptance in the setting is possible, a sense of identity safety results, performance and trust are then less tied to group identity. That's the danger of something like a Don Imus remark. It is incredibly subjugating. It makes some portions of the population feel identity-threatened all the time. And that puts them under tremendous functional disadvantage in a society. So names do hurt. There seems to be in the air these kind of threats, but they can be very powerful.

And, well, strategies for going at them. I have some strategies for the settings first and then some strategies that individuals can follow. I'll talk first, just for the sake of getting this discussion going, about what settings can do. I think leadership is a lot more important than people think, and this is where perhaps these remarks come to direct relevance to your interests. As I was saying, when leaders value diversity, then it becomes the norm for how the whole organization and the whole school function; it becomes normative when a leader stands behind that. When a leader acts as if that's of peripheral importance, then these kind of concerns all have peripheral importance, and all the way down the line, everybody thinks that it's normative to kind of put them in the back, on the back burner and not really deal with them effectively.

The other thing is the – one thing I think I've learned more than anything else going through this research for all these years is that the way we Americans think about ability is extremely injurious to huge portions of our population; that we think academic ability is genetically limited. We really do. I don't care how much nice stuff we put on, we act like – you go to a typical high school math class or a junior high school math class or science class, and the ideology – I'm going to call it that – the ideology behind instruction is often that people, some people have more ability in this area than other people. And we track kids accordingly. We structure a school world whereby we have institutionalized the ideology that ability is a limiting thing.

So now you come into that situation and you're a member of a group whose abilities are negatively stereotyped. How can you not feel constantly under some kind of threat, constantly vulnerable to some sense of being, of confirmed those stereotypes and those doubts? How persistent can you really be? How – you go home, your parents say, try twice as hard. You can do that for awhile and everybody does, but can you really sustain that over a long period of time in order to perform really equally and effectively with some kid who is, by that same stereotype, favored? I can play this out in the other domain.

Let's take basketball. That's the domain where Africans have the stereotype advantage. Track and field, they have the stereotype advantage in that kind of – can you imagine being a white kid actually persisting, what it must take, to persist to where you'd get to be an Olympic 100 meter dash sprinter? I mean, you'd have to live a – your whole life would be a gauntlet of negative expectations about you. You would be at every step along the way not encouraged, tolerated sometimes, people being nice to you, but they wouldn't really maybe give you the best scholarship to college, you wouldn't get the benefit of the doubt almost anywhere along the way, so how many people are going to actually push through that and survive there?

Well, just when you think about how these stereotypes and the pressures tied to them, how they play themselves out over the course of development over a person's life as a person develops in a domain, you can begin to see, I'm looking at these experiments, just a cross-sectional. This is just one day, but they come out of that experiment and they have to go back to a life that is, where that's a factor all the time. So I've sometimes say, I'm surprised that the achievement gaps aren't bigger than they actually are. Yeah.

Q & A Section:

Q: Women math teachers – how do the girls do?

DR. STEELE: Girls do better if girls are together.

MS. HALE: Question?

DR. STEELE: Oh, the question is, with women math teachers, do girls do better? Yeah. That's the question. That isn't as big a factor, it seems, in these kinds of experiments, this kind of research, as the composition, the number of other women in the class. The actual sex of the teacher is a minor factor, little bit, but not a major factor, whereas the number is a bigger factor. I wish it weren't, but it does seem to be a bigger factor. Yeah.

Q: Are we somehow telling groups that this is your target, and they somehow tend to not disappoint us by hitting the target, whether it be lower or higher? I know, I'm a mountain bike rider. On occasion, they tell me when I see a rock, don't look at the rock because you will hit what you look at. You have to look at – are we setting predisposed view by saying, you're going to do lousy at this test, so they say, okay, subconsciously, I will do lousy not to disappoint you?

DR. STEELE: Yeah, well, that would be a kind of self-fulfilling pro – oh, yes, the question is, do we, are these stereotypes kind of targeting people and saying to them, we don't expect you to do well at this test, and so then the person kind of gives up and follows, self-fulfills? Some portion of these, or effects like these, not these particular effects, but effects like these is due to self-fulfillment. That happens, where a person gets tired of dealing with the other pressure, but it's very important to keep in mind that most people try really hard to beat the stereotype first. They really try to beat the thing first, and it's the persistence and the, under the, in the domain where that stereotype is hard, that becomes fatiguing and difficult, rather than a person self fulfilling. Then they may begin to sort of give up and look like they're self fulfilling. That's how I would describe it.

Q: Is there a certain level of understanding or of knowledge where they are able to overcome that stereotype. If you can see where they were tested throughout their high school years – (inaudible) – college, graduate – (inaudible)?

DR. STEELE: I wish I could say that, but almost the opposite is true.

MS. HALE: What was the question?

DR. STEELE: The question is, is there some point of achievement where these effects start to wear out, so to speak, and maybe at the college or the graduate school level, people are better able to handle stereotype threat because they have gotten enough skills with which to not fall to its pressures, and I do think, I'm going to give you some other examples here in a minute, I do think there are skills that, if we could teach them, would enable something like that to happen, but I think without those skills, almost the opposite is true because the farther you go in a domain, the more you're, what typically happens is you see fewer and fewer people like you in that domain, the sense of threat, the cues become more menacing and it gets to be more of a burden in your life, and so lots of women go to college wanting to be scientists and all kinds of things, but by the – usually within 18 months, they have left quantitatively-based fields, and unlike men, who leave quantitatively-based fields because their grades are low, women leave, whether or not they leave is completely unrelated to grades. Computer science has almost no women, and the best predictor of how you do in computer science is your verbal SAT score, and women have better verbal SAT scores than men. So the culture of a context starts to have these belongingness effects on people.

Yes?

Q: How did you get around genetics? Because, I mean, I'll probably never be a famous basketball player just because of my genetic makeup.

DR. STEELE: How do I get around genetics is the question. Well, that's almost the topic for another lecture. (Laughter.) But let me say, as a psychologist, the best evidence that people have with regard to genetics contributing to gross behaviors like IQ test performance or something of that sort is extremely questionable research. It's based on either adoption studies or twin studies, and let me just give you one simple problem with all that research that you can take away from this lecture. The idea is that, well, we had these two identical twins and we put them in separate environments, and yet their IQs are relatively correlated with each other, they're kind of similar, so that must mean that there's some genetic determination of IQ because of that.

Well, most adoption agencies put people in, try to put separated twins in very similar environments, so there is nowhere in this research where there is any really substantial – where environment is, has been given any real substantial variation. All this methodology comes from the genetics of agriculture, like corn. What's the role of genes in determining the height of corn? Genes versus the environment, where you can imagine that if the environment is perfect, then all the differences between the corn stalks is due to genes. But if the environments are dramatically different, none of the variation is due to genes. One is a very cold, terrible environment; the other is very facilitating and so on.

So I really want to make a point that with regard to abilities like school abilities, these are the things we're concerned with. Let's forget basketball for a minute. Let's forget that for a minute. Let's talk about math performance. Throughout Asia, people do not think of math performance as something that reflects, in any significant way, genetic differences between people. And certainly K through 12, they have better math performance than our society does.

We way, way, way, way overuse this, almost to the point where I don't think – it has such – the difference between the degree to which we use it and the scientific basis for it is so dramatic that I would have to put it in the category of ideology, although I know it is something that is a part of all of our assumptive worlds because we're a part of this society and we just learn that that's the natural way to think about it. Somebody's talking about their kid or their cousin and say, well he must have the right genes for that because man, he's good at that, and he seemed to be good at that right away. And genes just, it's just a part of our common sense. It just seems so reasonable.

But what gene determines math? What gene? What set of genes determines math? What set of genes determine that this guy's going to be a CEO and this guy's going to be a criminal? What set of genes? Would maybe the same genes, if they had any effect on behavior, be as equal factor in both of those things?

So when you take this down and you get away from people who really hold that as a strong set of beliefs, the genetic notion, I think, does not hold that much water, and I think it is a devastating, if there is a single thing in all of American schooling that I could wave a wand and get rid of, it would be that assumption. If you work hard, you can get good at math. Anybody. Anybody in this room can get good at math if they – it takes immersion time, long immersion time. It takes good teaching. It takes the kind of scaffolding that the development of any kind of skill builds. That's what we're about, is scaffolding the development of abilities, and we're not in any significant way hampered by genetic limitations. So I want to stress that.

If that gets out of the ideology, then all the stereotype threat – and it's more than ideology because we live in a world where all of this is institutionalized in a tracking system, for example. If we treated lower tracks as something that you could get out of, as opposed to something that sealed you in, thinking of it as sealing you

in, that's the genetic story. But if you're in a lower track because you didn't have the background and the immersion time to really be up to Calculus Two level, but we're going to take you there, we're going to take you there real fast, and we're going to work and demand a lot out of you, then the tracking system becomes a godsend.

But when it's seen as something that you're going to get this criteria and you're going to get this track and you're not going to get anything, this is going to be the kind of curriculum you get pegged to your ability forever, then you're sealed in there, and it's justified. It's justified by cooking up or fanning up the notion of genetics and that genetics are so important, that they really demand this kind of organization of the school system. It's just American ideology. It's not really science.

Yeah – woops. Did it come back, but then I knocked it out again? Okay.

Challenge and support. How does a white professor give critical feedback to a black student? I'll spare you the experiment, but it's a powerful – there is a powerful way to do that, which is to simply say, look, I looked at your work, and we use very high standards. Challenge them: We use very, very high standards. I looked at your work; I think you can meet those standards. If you put it to them that way, it's like water on parched land. You're dealing with a different human being. I mean, these are some of the most dramatic experimental findings we've ever had – that form of feedback. Challenge and affirmation of their ability to meet the challenge – challenge and affirmation of their ability to meet the challenge.

A tracking system is exactly the opposite, and it's organized. Oops, things went to hell while I turned away here. (Laughter.) Ah. One of the things that a – I'm going to go skip to this last one because a student of mine published a paper this summer in science, which we're very proud of because science is a really tough journal for a social scientist to publish in – you don't get many of these – and the study he did was so miraculous that I want to tell you about it and then tell you why I think it worked.

The study was simple: seventh and eighth graders in New Haven, Connecticut, and black kids and white kids all in the same classroom. There is a traditional achievement gap: black kids performing worse than the white kids. But about two weeks into the course they hand out an exercise which tells the students to write down what their most important values about being people are. They just write down the most important values they think. Now, these are seventh and eighth grade kids. That's all they do. They put it into an envelope, they turn it back in, and in study after study – they had to replicate this thing so many times in order for it to be published – the black kids' performance who did that, their performance goes up to match that of the white kids. It totally eliminated the achievement gap in those classes.

Why would something like that happen? Well, first, there's an amazing story about how people regarded this. People thought it was ridiculous; this would never work; this is such a huge problem; I've spent my life working on this problem; there's no way some simple intervention like this is going to work.

Two things I'd say about this. One is I think very good teachers do what that little exercise had them do. They really do connect with a person and find what the person thinks is valuable about them and is interested in. That's what a really good teacher does is they come to the kid and find the kid. They don't say, I'm just going to be fair here; I'm colorblind here, and, you know, if you meet my standard, damn it, you'll be accepted. Well, you know, to a person under all that kind of suspicion, how could they believe that? That is just going to be completely demotivating.

So this little exercise does that, and it also tells you what the threat is that they're under every day in that classroom, that they're under this suspicion – like imagine you're a kid in your family and you think that your

parents like your older sister better than you. (Laughter.) Everything that happens is read through that lens, you know, to evaluate that possibility. Well, that's what having a problematized identity in a classroom like this is like, and what this little thing does is to kind of cure that, or to reduce the impact of that on their experience in the classroom, and then once you belong in a classroom, once you really belong – look at all the movies out there, the whole genre of, you know, teacher goes into horrible ghetto school and turns it around. There must be a dozen of these movies out here; every major actress has done one. What do they do? They always do that; they always connect to who these kids really are. And that's what race, social class, gender, these identities can make it hard to do.

Maybe I better stop at this point. Thank you. (Chuckles.) (Applause.)

MS. HALE: Last Friday I put the finishing touches on a proposal to the Coca Cola Foundation, and because I am a person of a certain age, I remembered when Coca Cola had the ad that was the song, they wanted to teach the world to sing in perfect harmony. And basically this was a proposal where what we want to do is to work in high schools to figure out how we can address and meet the needs of today's young people across cultural, socioeconomic and linguistic differences, and I have to say that I really regret that I had not heard Professor Steele's comments because I believe that I would have written a much stronger proposal. I think every person trying to educate America's diverse student population today should hear this.

Professor Steele, I am in your debt. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

(END)