

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat: A Phenomenological Case Study of Students'
Construction of Race and its Influence on Beliefs, Behavior, and Actions

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Anthony J. Bettendorf

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Advisor

April 2016

Table of Contents

List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
Chapter One: Campus Racial Climate: Fostering Diversity and Social Justice in Higher Education	1
Introduction.....	1
Language and Framework.....	4
Terms Associated with Campus Racial Climate.....	5
Terms Associated with Student Engagement of Diversity	13
Theoretical Framework.....	15
Conceptual Framework.....	17
Chapter Two: Campus Racial Climate	23
Differential Perceptions by Race	23
Reports of Racial Bias and Racism.....	33
Diversity and Social Justice Initiatives	42
Diversity Courses.....	43
Intergroup Dialogues	52
Diversity Experiences and Outcomes	62
Limitations in the Conversation on Campus Racial Climate.....	70
Research Questions.....	73
Chapter Three: Methodology	75
Background and Research Questions.....	75
Research Paradigm.....	77
Qualitative Approach.....	77
Phenomenology.....	79
Bounding the Study.....	81
Setting	81
Participants.....	81
Social Justice Leadership Retreat	84
Process	86
Compensation	87
Role of the Researcher	88
Data Collection and Analysis.....	90
Establishing Trustworthiness	96
Chapter Four: Results	100
Participation	100
Making Meaning of Race, Racism, and Campus Racial Climate.....	102
Students' Beliefs About Their Capacity for Leadership and Democratic Action	118
Behavior related to Social Justice Action	130

Chapter Five: Discussion, Implications, Limitations, and Conclusions	137
Discussion	137
Implications for Research	147
Implications for Theory	150
Implications for Practice	154
Limitations	160
Conclusions.....	162
References	163
Appendix A: Past Retreat Descriptive Data	176
Appendix B: Retreat Philosophy	177
Appendix C: Retreat Activities	180
Appendix D: IRB Forms	189
Tables	
Table 1: Model of Intercultural Maturity	19
Table 2: Participants	101
Table 3: Student Descriptions of How they Make Meaning of Race	104

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin my acknowledgements by thanking my advisor, Dr. Rebecca Ropers-Huilman. You have challenged me throughout this process, and have provided support as I have worked on more drafts than I care to remember. I have appreciated your patience and encouragement as I have worked through a variety of life events that have slowed my progress. You have been there constantly helping me to move forward, and I will be forever grateful for your help in making this happen.

I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Darwin Hendel, who was my first advisor when I originally enrolled in the EdD program, and has graciously been with me throughout my graduate school journey. Thank you to Dr. Karen Miksch and Dr. Jarrett Gupton for providing some good insight and resources during my first defense.

I also want to thank my family and friends. My immediate family including my mom, dad, and sister have been a constant source of support and encouragement throughout the last decade as I have been working on coursework and completing my study and writing. They have checked in and provided me motivation to move forward. My friends have also played a valuable role in helping me complete this dissertation. My friends Shannon and Joel have always checked in with me and tried to encourage me to keep getting things done. I would like to give my friends Joel and Skip a special thank you as they have both allowed me to stay with them during my research trips up to Minnesota. My friend, Dr. Amelious Whyte has also been right in my corner cheering me forward and sharing parts of the journey as we were both working on writing. I have appreciated your help and encouragement through this process as well.

I would also like to thank a few members of my original cohort. Kevin, Grant, and I were like the Three Musketeers going through classes together, and spending about six months studying together for our written exams. I will always have fond memories of our Sunday sessions in the McGrath Library in St. Paul going through notes and flashcards to make sure we had all our info together. I could not have made it through the class portion without their encouragement and friendship. A special shout out to my stats group Kevin and Nikki! I could not have survived stats class without the two of you. I will forever remember our many hours in the Wilkins Hall computer lab after grabbing Q'doba for dinner☺

I would also like to thank Susan Stubblefield and Laurie McLaughlin who were the Assistant Director and Director of Housing & Residential Life when I worked at the University of Minnesota. Both were supportive of me doing my doctoral work, while working full time for their department. I will always appreciate the time and encouragement that they both gave me during the time that I worked at the University of

Minnesota. Both have continued to encourage me when I left the institution, and through the years, this encouragement has been valuable to me.

I would also like to thank some folks I work with here at Iowa. First, I would like to thank our Director of Residence Education Kate Fitzgerald. She was supportive of my PhD pursuits from the time I interviewed to come and work here. She proctored my final written exam question; she has continually kept on me about my progress, and has been a constant source of support. I am appreciative of her and her partner Kelley opening their house for me to come and hang out with their dogs and do some writing. I have had many a good writing moment there, and have enjoyed the company of Cheyenne, and now Marley and Sophie☺ I would also like to thank my current supervisor Greg for checking in with me and providing support as I have moved forward in this process. My colleagues over the years including Lindsay, Amy, Moni, Becky, and Amy have also been constant supporters and cheerleaders for me to finish this dissertation.

I would like to thank Von Stange, the Assistant Vice President and Senior Director of University Housing & Dining at the University of Iowa for his encouragement as I have gone through this process. He also graciously read through and helped me with my writing in Chapters 1 and 2.

I also need to thank my Iowa City friends who have been cheering me on the last 6 years. Jerry Howe, Mo Howe, and the Reverend Dr. John Harper have been supportive, have encouraged me, and have been patient with me throughout this journey.

I would be remiss if I did not thank my editor, K. Kris Hurst for her help in getting this paper into shape.

I would also like to thank all of the students, faculty, and staff who have helped me and continue to help me in my journey of understanding race. The participants and facilitators of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat provided me with many learning moments during my time working as a co-coordinator. These lessons remain with me today. I humbly dedicate my research to all past and future participants.

Lastly, to all of my family and friends I would like to say thank you. This has been a long journey for me. It has meant long hours of work, sometimes missing events, or not being able to devote all the time I wanted to certain things to keep this process moving. You all have been patient with me, and have shown me kindness and encouragement. I would not be where I am today without all of you. I will be eternally grateful for your belief in me.

Abstract

This study examines students' participation in an intensive intercultural experience, the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. The study utilizes the Intercultural Maturity Model, leadership and democracy outcomes as a framework for the research. Specifically, the study investigates how this experience impacts the ways students make meaning of racial issues, the students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, and behavior as it relates to social justice action. Results suggest that students attending this experience developed more complex cognitive skills, cultivated belief and motivation in their ability to take action, and engaged in social justice action as a result of attending the retreat.

Chapter 1: Campus Racial Climate: Fostering Diversity and Social Justice in Higher Education

About fifteen years ago, I moved from my small town to go to school at the University of Minnesota. Upon arrival, I met Bittoo, Marcia, Tehout, and Cornelious, my first friends of color. As I came to know each of these friends, I came to a powerful and life changing discovery. Much of what I had learned about people of color was inaccurate. The stereotypes, biases and misinformation I had learned growing up and from society had taught me that people of color had experiences similar to mine growing up, going to college, and interacting with others and institutions within society. I had no conception of the privilege I had as it related to race. I quickly learned that my friends of color had different experiences interacting with others, society, and institutions because of their race. It was during this point in my life that I began to be interested in campus racial climates and the experiences of people of color.

Over the last three decades, higher education has undergone monumental change as a direct result of the diversification of the demographics of students who attend. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), between 1976 and 2012, the percentage of students of color attending institutions of higher education rose from 15% to 32% of the total student population. Specifically, the percentage of Asian Pacific Islanders attending college increased from 2% to 6%, Hispanics from 4% to 15%, and African Americans from 10% to 15%.

In addition to demographic shifts, new laws, policies, and court decisions have influenced and increased the racial diversity of our student populations, and created greater access for racially diverse student populations (Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado & Cade,

2001; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003). Court cases including *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003), and *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) and state laws banning affirmative action, continue to influence the racial make-up of institutions of higher education (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2005; Olivas, 2005). Recently, the Supreme Court agreed to rule on yet another case involving race-conscious admissions, *Fisher v. University of Texas Austin* (2012), which could further influence the racial composition of higher education. Both demographic shifts and these court cases have important implications for higher education and, more specifically, for the campus racial climate that students encounter within institutions of higher education.

Increased racial diversity on campus helps institutions create rich educational environments in which students learn, develop, and engage with diverse perspectives, activities which are critical in the cognitive and psychosocial development of students (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Students' holistic development is critical to their ability to integrate new skills, knowledge, and awareness of diverse perspectives in interculturally competent and mature ways (King & Baxter Magolda). In turn, intercultural competencies are critical to the development of civically active members of an increasingly global society (Bowman, 2010b; Engberg, 2007; Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Though the campus racial climate can create positive benefits, it can also present experiences and create barriers that negatively affect students.

Many students face barriers to their attainment of the benefits of diverse educational environments. These barriers include racism, racial and ethnic discrimination, and racial microaggressions (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Boyson &

Vogel, 2009; Franklin, Smith, & Hung, 2014; Gonzalez, 2002; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Nelson Laird, 2005; Smith, 2009; Smith, Allen, & Danley 2007; Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007a; Sue, et al, 2007b; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). Based on campus case studies, the Prejudice Institute (2004) estimates that 25% to 30% of minority students experience acts of hostility. Research indicates that the manifestation of racism, racial/ethnic discrimination, and microaggressions have changed in the last twenty years (Cabrera, 2012; Cabrera, 2014; Franklin, Smith, & Hung 2014; Smith, 2009; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Sue et al., 2007a; Sue et al., 2007b). Students of color today experience increasingly subtle acts of hostility (Cabrera, 2012; Cabrera, 2014; Franklin, Smith, & Hung 2014; Smith, 2009; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Sue et al., 2007a; Sue et al., 2007b; Yosso et al., 2009). Studies indicate that African American students experience proportionately more racism and hostility on campus than Asian, Latino/a, or Native American students (Ancis et al., 2000; Mack, Tucker, & Cha, 2000; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Smith, 2009). White students may not be the targets of the hostility, but they are also affected. The hostile campus racial climate impacts their cognitive and psychosocial development processes and hinders the skills, knowledge, and awareness that will prepare them for a global society (Gurin, 1999; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005).

Evidence suggests that as the racial diversity of the campus increases at predominantly White institutions, the campus racial climate becomes more hostile for students of color (Engberg, 2007; Hurtado, 1992; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Smith, 2009; Smith, Allen, Danley, 2007; Solórzano, Villalpando, & Oseguera, 2005; Yosso, Smith, Ceja & Solórzano, 2009). The hostility of the racial climate materially affects students of

color, affecting their persistence, graduation, development, and success (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Smith, 2009; Solórzano et al., 2005; Yosso et al., 2009).

Higher education must address the increasing hostility of campus racial climates to allow all students to benefit from rich and diverse learning environments that will prepare them for future participation in a global society. Institutional understanding of racial climate dynamics allows institutions to develop and enhance diversity and social justice initiatives that foster an environment of success for all students.

One initiative utilized by a public Midwest institution to address campus racial climate is the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. The Social Justice Leadership Retreat is a three-day cultural immersion experience. The retreat introduces the concepts of social justice, challenges students based on the concepts, and attempts to inspire the participants to become change agents and take action creating a socially just campus. I co-founded and worked with the retreat during a period of my career in higher education. I decided that I wanted to do my research on this experience. I will discuss the Social Justice Leadership Retreat in more detail in Chapter 3. Before discussing the literature on campus racial climates and social justice initiatives, I begin by defining language and providing the framework, which guided my research.

Language and Framework

The terms and phrases related to racial matters are part of the social construct within the United States, and constitute a social reality for White people and people of color who live within this construct. As Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2010) wrote, “Whereas for most Whites racism is prejudice, for most people of color racism is systemic or

institutionalized” (p. 8). Given the different ways people can understand terms related to race and racism, it is critical to be explicit about the constructs, meanings and definitions of the language surrounding racial matters. Next, I will explicitly discuss each construct’s meanings and definitions to clarify how I am using these terms in this dissertation, and the lens through which I view the conversation on campus racial climates.

Terms associated with campus racial climates. The first important term I discuss is the concept of *race*. Within the literature there is little disagreement that race is a socially constructed category. Adams, Bell, and Griffin (2007) define race as

A social construct that artificially divides people into distinct groups based on characteristics such as physical appearance (particularly skin color), ancestral heritage, cultural affiliation or history, ethnic classification, and/or the social, economic and political needs of a society at a given time (p. 108).

Adams et al. (2007) further note that researchers agree that there is no scientific evidence, biological or genetic, for racial categories. Placing this in the context of the United States, White European settlers created the first racial categories through force, and colonized land that belonged to the indigenous and First Nation people (Takaki, 1993). The European colonies viewed it as their responsibility to colonize and reform the “savage people” of America (Takaki). This reform included teaching indigenous and First Nation people European ways and forcing them to obey European laws. In this way, White colonizers created a two-tiered social structure around race that ensured that power was established and maintained for White Europeans.

Apart from the acceptance of race as a social construction, the literature is sharply divided. Bonilla-Silva (2010) describes three perspectives on how social scientists construct race in the literature. The first argues that since race is socially constructed it should not be a category of analysis, and researchers who utilize race contribute to the creation of a false reality. The second as defined by Bonilla-Silva, "...gives lip service to the social constructionist view--usually a line in the beginning...then proceed[s] to discuss "racial" differences in academic achievement" (p. 8). Social scientists in this category consider indicators such as crime and SAT scores as racial, and do not account for the impact social dynamics can have on these indicators. The last, advocated by Bonilla-Silva, argues that while race is socially constructed, it has become a social reality and, therefore, affects individuals' lived experiences. Informed by this literature, I choose to define race as a social construct that influences how individuals make meaning of their situations and experiences.

In order to understand how a social construct impacts the ways in which individuals make meaning of their situations and experiences, we must examine the term *racial structure*. Racial structure refers to the "social construct that some people have greater inherent worth than others – white people being superior to people of color – and laws, customs, and culture were built up to reinforce this thesis" (Kendall, 2006, p. 43). Race and racial categories within the United States have changed throughout the history of the country (Adams et al., 2007; Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Takaki, 1993; US Census Bureau 2012). In his book, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, Ronald Takaki (1993) traces the development of the racial structure created in the U. S. He describes how the category "White" within the racialized social system was created and

evolved over time. For example, many people of Irish, Italian, Jewish, Greek, and Eastern European descent were considered “nonwhite” at one time in U. S. history. As Bonilla-Silva explained, “When race emerged in human history, it formed a social structure (a racialized social system) that awarded systemic privileges to Europeans (the people who became “White”) over non-Europeans (the peoples who became “non-White”). In the documentary “Race: The Power of an Illusion, The Stories We Tell” (California Newsreel, 2003), the filmmakers describe the great scientific effort in America during the 1800s and early 1900s to create the illusion of biological racial differences in order to justify the treatment of those not White. The systemic privileges include institutional structures, laws, policies, or practices that benefited the people categorized as “White” to the detriment of people not so categorized (Bonilla-Silva). These systemic privileges form the basis for what we know today as white privilege.

White privilege is defined as “The concrete benefits of access to resources and social rewards and the power to shape the norms and values of society that whites receive, tacitly, or explicitly, by virtue of their position in a racist society” (McIntosh, 1989). Frances Kendall (2006) notes, “white privilege is hard to see for those of us who were born with access to power and resources. It is very visible for those to whom privilege was not granted” (p. 22). The benefits of White privilege are often not conscious or noticed by White individuals, who do not feel particularly powerful or that they have privileges others do not have. Many people who have privileges based on race, gender, or another dominant identity simply do not recognize those privileges McIntosh suggests that the inability to perceive white privileges are “Conditions of daily exposure which [we

take] for granted” (p. 10). A review of the literature highlights numerous examples of White privilege. One example comes from Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007), whose research describes an experience of Black students.

The participants describe a residence hall area where White students play Frisbee, football, and hang out in general until 1 a.m. typically. On this evening, a Black student and nine of his Black friends are in the same place, and participating in the same activities as the White students. The university police pull up in a squad car and tell the students they are not allowed to be there. Soon four squad cars and two bike units arrive as the Black students in a calm demeanor try to explain students (White) do this all the time there. The students are not causing problems and merely attempting to engage in activities other students engage in there, yet are made to leave. (p. 565-566)

Another critical element in keeping the notions of race and a racial structure in place is *institutional racism*. I add the institutional here to emphasize the systemic nature of racism, but throughout the rest of the text, it will appear as racism. Racism as defined is:

A system of advantage based on race and supported by institutional structures, policies, and practices that create and sustain advantages for the dominant White group while systematically subordinating members of targeted racial groups. This relative advantage for Whites and subordination for people of color is supported by the actions of individuals, cultural norms, and values and the institutional structures and practices of society (Adams, Bell, & Griffin et al., 2007, p. 108).

The definition illustrates that race and the racial structure have been created within the U.S. to maintain an advantage for those people who are defined as “White”. Within the definition lie two key components, prejudice and power. Prejudice is commonly defined as a negative or unfavorable feeling toward a particular group. Power refers to the ability to institutionalize advantages for a group.

It is important to note that in the United States, while any racial group might view itself as superior, only the white group has the power to institutionalize that belief into laws, policies, practices, and culture to subordinate other groups based on that institutionally held power (Kendall, 2006, p. 21-22).

In defining racism, it is also important to identify the transformation that racism has undergone within recent U.S. history. The word racism often evokes images of overt racial hatred that is publicly displayed (Cabrera, 2012; Cabrera, 2014; Smith, 2009; Sue et al., 2007a; Sue et al., 2007b; Yosso et al., 2009). However, researchers are discovering that today racism is often more subtle, covert, and hidden in everyday interactions (Cabrera, 2012; Cabrera, 2014; Smith, 2009; Sue et al., 2007a; Sue et al., 2007b; Swim et al., 2003; Yosso et al., 2009). These more innocuous and insidious forms of racism have been termed *racial microaggressions*.

Microaggressions are “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory or negative racial slights and insults that potentially have harmful or unpleasant psychological impact on the target person or group” (Sue et al., 2007b, p. 72). Often these insults and slights are subtle and seemingly harmless, and can be

unrecognized, overlooked, or difficult to understand or decipher (Solorzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2007b; Sue et al., 2007a; Yosso, et al., 2009;). Deciphering the messages that may or may not be present can be debilitating for the target of a microaggression (Smith, 2009).

Sue et al. (2007b) identify three types of microaggressions: (1) microassaults, or purposeful derogatory verbal and nonverbal attacks; (2) microinsults, or subtle, insensitive communication that targets racial heritage or identity; and (3) microinvalidations or communications that downplay, exclude, or dismiss the realities, experiences, and histories of people of color (p. 274). Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) offer an example of a microassault from the literature. The authors tell the story of an experience of one of their research subjects. The Black student was followed, watched, and detained by a police officer because he “fit the description” of a perpetrator who had committed a crime across town. The constant nature of these occurrences causes mental, emotional, and physical strain in people of color, and can be termed “*racial battle fatigue*” (Smith, 2004).

Racial battle fatigue is defined as “emotional, physiological, psychological, behavioral strain exacted on racially marginalized and stigmatized groups and the amount of energy loss dedicated to coping with racism” (Smith, 2009, p. 301). The concept of racial battle fatigue brings together studies of racism and stress with combat stress syndrome. Smith compares historically White campuses to battle zones for Black students. Due to the subtle nature of the microaggressions students of color face, it is difficult to discern the motivation of those expressing the negative interactions. Further, he explains:

In this social milieu, when institutional and individual racist practices are present, Black students must constantly dedicate time and energy to determine if there was a stressor, whether that stressor was motivated by a racist (or gender/racist) purpose and how or if they should respond (p. 302).

Feagin, Vera, and Imani (1996) provide the following example from an interview with a student of color about their experiences understanding White student comments, “It might have happened, but I just blow stuff off. I just go about my business and do what I need to do so I can get out.... [When you’re blowing stuff off, what makes you do that?] Because if I do anything, then I’ll be the bad person. As long as they don’t touch me, it’s alright.” (p. 68). The student in the example clearly struggles with trying to understand the comments of White students, and experiences frustration and stress because the student of color did not feel able to respond.

The last element supporting the racial structure that is important to understand is *bias*. Bias based on racial categories, or “racial bias,” generally refers to an unreasoned judgment related to a racial group (Dovidio et al., 2004; Engberg, 2007; Kendall, 2006). Specifically, the concept of racial bias is more effectively understood and defined through the concept of *intergroup bias* (Dovidio et al., 2004; Engberg, 2007). Intergroup bias refers to the ways in which individuals tend to understand and favor the groups in which they identify as a member, as opposed to the groups for which they are not members (Engberg).

Intergroup bias presents itself in a variety of forms including behaviors, beliefs, emotions, and attitudes about or toward other groups (Dovidio et. al, 2004). Further, Dovidio and his colleagues outline four components of intergroup bias, which include

prejudice, stereotypes, negative affect, and discrimination. Each of these components provides a foundational understanding of campus racial climate.

Prejudice defined is a negative attitude, though there is some debate in scholarly literature about the nuances and characteristics that must be present in defining prejudice. Some researchers argue that prejudice is a negative attitude based on unreasoned judgment directed toward an individual or group because the individual is a member of that group (Allport, 1954). I consider a broader perspective to be more viable, defining prejudice as a positive or negative opinion, attitude, feeling, or belief that stems from an individual's understanding of the group/individual that is the target of the prejudice (Dovidio et al., 2004). For example, a person may have a prejudice about someone who is Black, which may be positive or negative.

Stereotypes used to categorize others represent an individual's understanding about the members of a specific social group (Dovidio et al., 2004; Engberg, 2007). Stereotyping is a cognitive process that assists people in making meaning of complex environments, but it often results in overgeneralizations and can be inaccurate, whether they are positive or negative (Dovidio et al., 2004): For example, a positive stereotype people may have about Black males is that they are good athletes, while a negative one that they are criminals. Stereotypes involve cognition to categorize a black male as athletic or a criminal; while prejudice is an affective reaction. I may see a black male and may feel uncomfortable, or may experience a positive or negative feeling about that black male, not specifically connected to cognitive thought processes. *Affective reactions* consist primarily of emotional responses to an individual based on one or more of the individual's social identities (Dovidio et al.; Engberg). The emotional reactions people

experience range from a strong negative or positive affect to more subtle emotions like discomfort or anxiety (Dovidio et al.).

The final component of intergroup bias, *discrimination*, involves unequal treatment toward members of a specific racial group (Adams et al., 2007; Dovidio et al., 2004; Engberg, 2007; Kendal, 2006). Usually the treatment manifests in a form of unjustified and negative behavior (Dovidio et al.). The behavior could be conscious or unconscious and intentional or subtle (Dovidio et al.; Engberg). Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) provide a powerful example of discrimination that involved police and one of their research subjects.

The authors tell the story of a Black student who was taking a physics course and went to the physics computer lab to utilize a program there. A police officer arrived and requested ID because of a report of a suspicious looking person in the building. Once the student showed student ID, the officer asked for a second piece of identification. The student was specifically targeted because he was Black.

Having defined terminology that is important to understanding campus climate, the next section focuses on terminology that relates to student engagement of diversity.

Terms associated with student engagement of diversity. Research indicates that student engagement with diversity comes in a variety of forms. Engagement with diversity includes curricular and co-curricular experiences, which encompass diversity courses as well as workshops. Students also interact with diverse peers informally through friendships groups, and formally in curricular and co-curricular activities.

Student engagement with diversity promotes two types of student outcomes (Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002).

The first is *learning outcomes*. The literature demonstrates that engagement in a diverse environment fosters more active participation in learning processes, and more complex thinking about issues. Nicholas Bowman did a meta-analysis of the literature on diversity experiences and cognitive development that demonstrated college diversity experiences have positive effects on cognitive development (Bowman, 2010a). Specifically, Bowman (2010a) found that diversity experiences with interpersonal interactions with racial diversity show the strongest relations to cognitive development. Cognitive development is measured through student engagement and motivation, maturation of academic and intellectual skills, and the importance of being able to apply these skills after school (Gurin, 1999). Further, research indicates that those interventions that include learning about other groups where intergroup contact occurs have the greatest effects (Denson, 2009). These learning processes promote learning outcomes for students attending college, and diverse environments further enrich the ability of students to achieve these outcomes.

The second type of outcomes is *democracy outcomes*. Simply defined, democracy outcomes refer to preparing students to be active citizens in a society that is becoming more global (Bowman, 2010b; Engberg, 2007; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). Gurin (1999) posits three measures that promote democracy outcomes: citizenship engagement, racial/cultural engagement, and compatibility of differences. *Citizenship engagement* refers to the motivation for students to become

involved in society, politics, and community service activities after college.

Racial/cultural engagement refers to students' awareness of culture, knowledge of culture, and motivation for further racial understanding. *Compatibility of differences* refers to awareness and belief in common values across racial and ethnic groups that group conflict can be beneficial if managed constructively, and that differences are not necessarily divisive to society. In his meta-analysis, Bowman (2010b) discovered a significant relationship between diversity experiences and their relation to civic engagement. The meta-analysis describes civic engagement to encompass each of the democracy outcomes. Specifically Bowman (2010b) found that 96 percent of the effect sizes in his meta-analysis were positive in relation to diversity experiences relationship to the three democratic outcomes. Additionally, interpersonal interactions with racial diversity proved more effective at promoting democratic outcomes than curricular and co-curricular diversity experiences (Bowman).

Theoretical framework. In this dissertation, I utilize a framework developed by Hurtado and colleagues originally in 1998 and 1999, subsequently updated by Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano in 2012 to including the definition of campus racial climate. Their framework includes the institution's history (legacies of inclusion/exclusion of racial groups), organizational/structural (structures and processes), compositional diversity (numerical representation of racial groups), the psychological climate (attitudes and perceptions), and the behavioral dimension (interactions of people across differences). The authors further note that two forces, internal and external, shape campus racial climate. External forces include government policies, programs, and sociohistorical forces. As stated in the introduction, external forces have undergone

changes that have affected campus racial climates. Internal forces include legacies of inclusion/exclusion of racial groups, actual numbers of students of color attending colleges, perceptions and attitudes, and behavioral or intergroup relations. I will briefly explain each component.

Some institutions of higher education have admitted and graduated students of color from their inception; however, the vast majority of predominantly White institutions have historically limited or excluded students of color. Research has shown the legacies of predominantly White institutions can impact current practices and influence campus racial climate (Hurtado, 1992). In order to overcome their historical legacies, campuses must create a supportive environment. A supportive environment includes establishing programs to accommodate students of color, creating institutional philosophies on the institutional responsibility to educate students of color, demonstrating commitment to Affirmative Action, offering minority specific programs, and paying attention to the psychological climate and group relations (Hurtado et al., 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012).

Compositional diversity of an institution refers to the actual numbers of different racial groups on campus (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012). Many predominantly White institutions focus most of their attention on increasing numbers of various racial groups on their campuses. Research has found that higher proportions of White students negatively affect opportunities for cross-racial interactions and learning experiences (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012). Additionally the lack of diversity can lead to tokenism of racial groups resulting in students viewed as symbols and not individuals. Increasing the numbers of students of color on campus is therefore

important, and sends the message that ensuring that all students' benefit from diverse interactions is a high priority for the institution.

The psychological climate includes views of group relations, institutional responses to diversity, perceptions of discrimination and racial conflict, and attitudes held about different racial groups (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012). The research shows that racially diverse administration, faculty, and students view the climate differently. Students of color are more likely to recognize different forms of prejudice and discrimination where White students are less likely to notice these differences (Cabrera & Nora, 1994, 1996). These perceptual differences are a product of the campus environment that can materially impact future interactions and outcomes for students.

The behavioral dimension consists of reports of social interactions, interactions between individuals from different racial backgrounds, and the nature of relationships on campus (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012). Behavioral and intergroup relations have become increasingly important with reports of increasing hostility and racially motivated incidents (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Farrel & Jones, 1988; Hurtado, 1992; Solórzano et al., 2005). Research demonstrates that students' involvement in campus life impacts successful educational experiences including cognitive outcomes (Astin, 1993; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005) and retention (Astin, 1993). This includes involvement in clubs, organizations, and campus programs.

Conceptual framework. The conceptual framework guiding my research is a model of intercultural maturity developed by King and Baxter Magolda in 2005. I refer to this concept throughout my dissertation, and feel it is important to define intercultural

maturity as I use it in this dissertation. I define intercultural maturity as a framework that integrates three important domains of development, which include cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. Specifically, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) define intercultural maturity as

Multi-dimensional and consisting of a range of attributes, including understanding (the cognitive dimension), sensitivity to others (the interpersonal dimension), and a sense of oneself that enables one to listen to and learn from others (the intrapersonal dimension). (p. 574).

Unless otherwise noted this is what is meant by the term intercultural maturity.

The cognitive dimension of development examines the way people think about and understand diversity. King and Baxter Magolda (2005) included a variety of cognitive development theories when developing this dimension. Table 1 lists the different theories that contributed to the development of this model. As Table 1 demonstrates, knowledge evolves from something explicitly right and wrong, which is constructed by others, to something that shifts and is internally constructed by the individual through experience, evidence, and others. As noted earlier, cognitive development is an important aspect of learning and democracy outcomes, and plays an important role in the behavioral and psychological tenants of campus racial climate (Bowman, 2010a; 2010b; Gurin, 1999, Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2012).

Table 1 Model of Intercultural Maturity			
Domain of Development and Related Theories	Initial Level of Development	Intermediate Level of Development	Mature Level of Development
Cognitive (Baxter Magolda, 1992, 2001; Belenky et al., 1986; M. Bennett, 1993; Fischer, 1980; Kegan, 1994; King & Kitchener, 1994, 2004; Perry, 1968)	Assumes knowledge is certain and categorizes knowledge claims as right or wrong; is naïve about different cultural practices and values; resists challenges to one's own beliefs and views differing cultural perspectives as wrong	Evolving awareness and acceptance of uncertainty and multiple perspectives; ability to shift from accepting authority's knowledge claims to personal processes for adopting knowledge claims	Ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors into an alternative cultural worldview and to use multiple cultural frames
Intrapersonal (Cass, 1984; Chickering & Reiser, 1993; Cross, 1991; D'Augelli, 1994; Helms, 1995; Josselson, 1987, 1996; Kegan, 1994; Marcia, 1980; Parks, 2000; Phinney, 1990; Torres, 2003)	Lack of awareness of one's own values and intersection of social (racial, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation) identity; lack of understanding of other cultures; externally defined identity yields externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices; difference is viewed as a threat to identity	Evolving sense of identity as distinct from external others' perceptions; tension between external and internal definitions prompts self-exploration of values, racial identity, beliefs; immersion in own culture; recognizes legitimacy of other cultures	Capacity to create an internal self that openly engages challenges to one's views and beliefs and that considers social identities (race, class, gender, etc.) in a global and national context; integrates aspects of self into one's identity
Interpersonal (M. Bennett, 1993; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Kegan, 1994; Kohlberg, 1984; Noddings, 1984)	Dependent relations with similar others is a primary source of identity and social affirmation; perspectives of different others are viewed as wrong; awareness of how social systems affect group norms and intergroup differences is lacking; view social problems egocentrically, no recognition of society as an organized entity	Willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; relies on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist (but are not coordinated); self is often overshadowed by need for others' approval. Begins to explore how social systems affect group norms and intergroup relations	Capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences; understanding of ways individual and community practices affect social systems; willing to work for the right others

The intrapersonal dimension of development examines how individuals understand themselves or their own identity. Included in intrapersonal development are the ways in which people use their values and beliefs to understand their race, ethnicity, class, sexual

orientation, and religious affiliation (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). There is a wealth of information on identity development that helps frame the trajectory of individuals within this domain. Table 1 outlines the different theories utilized in row two.

Developmentally, individuals begin in a realm where there is an absence of understanding their values and identities, which are largely defined externally.

Development progresses to a point where individuals are able to internally define and integrate their many identities in a greater context (nationally and globally). As diverse populations of students arrive in higher education the intrapersonal domain of development plays an important role in students being able to achieve learning and democracy outcomes. Additionally, the campus racial climate, and especially the behavior and psychological dimensions, are influenced by an individual's intrapersonal development.

The interpersonal dimension analyzes,

...the ability to interact effectively and interdependently with diverse others. In particular, this draws on the mature capacity to construct and engage in relationships with other's perspectives and experiences, but that are also true to one's own beliefs and values (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005).

Individuals in the early phase of the development of the interpersonal dimension rely on others to define identity and social realities. Gradually individuals work toward interdependent relationships in which they are able to appreciate differences and understand the ways in which systems impact individuals and society, and work to advocate for others on social issues. The literature on campus racial climates and diversity and social justice initiatives emphasizes the importance of development within

this dimension as well as development in the behavioral and psychological dimensions outlined by Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999 and Hurtado et al., 2012.

Examination of the framework provided by King and Baxter Magolda (2005) reveals similarities in the stages of development as well as differences. In Table 1, each of the rows examines a different dimension of cognitive development, which includes differences between those dimensions. Looking at the columns however reveals similarities in each of the dimensions of development from initial to mature. In the early stages of development, learners tend to construct meaning from external entities. Cognitive dissonance is the vehicle that causes individuals to move to different stages of development. Gradually, learners come to understand that knowledge is not certain, and begin to develop their own their ability to construct meaning internally. Eventually, at the more complex stages learners develop self-authorship in each of the areas of cognitive development.

I found the model of intercultural maturity to be a useful lens to view how students construct and make meaning of race and campus racial climates (cognitive dimension). Additionally, the model also helps make meaning of students' beliefs, behavior, and action in regards to social justice (interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions). I found the model to be especially helpful looking at changes to these dimensions over a period of time. The model of intercultural maturity connects directly to the research questions I will be examining in this dissertation and will discuss further at the end of Chapter 2 and in Chapter 3.

In chapter two, I will discuss the literature on campus racial climate and social justice and diversity initiatives. Chapter two closes with the question I developed for this

dissertation. In chapter three, I will provide the methodology I utilized in exploring the research questions for my dissertation. I will then discuss the results of my research in chapter 4. In chapter five, I will provide the discussion about the results from my research. Additionally, I will provide implications for theory, research, and practice that will provide the insight I gained through this research for future research on this topic. Lastly, I will provide my conclusions.

Chapter 2: Campus Racial Climate and Diversity and Social Justice Initiatives

The literature on campus racial climates suggests that students of color and White students perceive and experience campus racial climate in different ways. Specifically, students of color encounter racial bias and racism more than their White peers (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2003). As a result, students of color often view their campus racial climates as more hostile than their White peers. White students encounter little discrimination based on their race and often fail to recognize campus racial climate tensions (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005). My review of the literature begins by examination of nineteen studies that focus on campus racial climate. The first group of studies focuses on differential perceptions of the campus racial climate by race, while the second group of research concentrates on the bias and racism experienced by students of color.

Section two of the literature shifts attention to the diversity and social justice initiatives employed by institutions of higher education. Specifically this section addresses three bodies of research. The first cluster of research examines diversity courses. The second group explores research on intergroup dialogue. The last examines diversity experiences and their outcomes.

Differential Perceptions by Race

To investigate differential race perceptions, I selected nine studies that explore the ways in which students who identify with different racial categories perceive their campus climates. Each of these articles concludes that students of color experience a hostile campus racial climate, while White students do not. Three of the often-cited

studies examine the perceptions of campus climate (Allen, 1985; McClelland & Auster, 1990; Smith, 1981). I specifically discuss the McClelland and Auster (1990) study. This study assisted me in understanding early perceptions of campus racial climate, by providing a foundation from which I made comparisons to recent work. The next seven studies offered me greater understanding about particular populations of students. These seven more recent works use more thorough research designs and complex methodologies to consider specifics about each racial group compared to the earlier research. The distinctions among racial groups are instrumental in allowing me to accurately define the issues students from different racial groups face, and effectively examine the problem of hostile campus racial climates. The last study published most recently reinforces findings from previous studies.

The earliest studies of student perceptions about campus racial climate (Allen, 1985; McClelland & Auster, 1990; Smith, 1981) focused on Black and White students, while not examining other racial identities such as Asians, Latinos, or Native Americans. These studies investigated a single institution with small sample sizes and were mostly quantitative in nature. I begin with specifically examining the McClelland and Auster Study.

McClelland and Auster's (1990) investigation of campus racial climate at a White liberal arts college used a mixed methods approach to examine interaction and contact between White and Black students as a means of understanding the campus racial climate. The study collected throughout a three-year period from faculty and student-led discussion groups focused on racial issues. The results indicated that on the predominantly White campus, Blacks were more likely to interact with Whites than

White students were with Blacks. The researchers found that in everyday interactions, Black and White students seem to interact with few conflicts; but when they more closely examined those interactions, they found that Black students did perceive the campus racial climate as more hostile than their White peers. The hostility was subtle, and not the overt type of racism that was the form of racism recognized at the time of the study. The qualitative elements of McClelland and Auster provide further insight into relationships within the data of the quantitative findings. Their results found, “dissatisfied Blacks are not an alienated minority; many Blacks who have been ‘successful’ by traditional standards such as grades, campus involvement... continue to see racism as a key but neglected problem” (p. 633). White students spoke of individuals rising or falling on their own merits. The White students also showed little support for affirmative action or busing to diversify schools. The researchers found no instances where results garnered from the two methods differed, thus bolstering their confidence in the results.

Hurtado’s (1992) landmark study improved on the previous research in three critical areas. First, Hurtado’s study utilized longitudinal data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The longitudinal nature of this study allowed for greater understanding over students’ time in college as opposed to the single snapshot seen from most other studies at the time. Secondly, CIRP data included over 190,000 students across the country. The large number of students and regional diversity in the survey allowed greater generalization of the study results. Finally, Hurtado expanded the students studied from only Black and White, to include Chicano students.

Mack, Tucker, Archuieta, DeGroot, Hernandez, and Cha (1997) further expanded on Hurtado's (1992) research, albeit on a much smaller scale. They conducted a study that examined interethnic relations of five small private institutions in California, and included Asian students.

Among the earlier studies, consensus formed around the perceptions of students of color and White students. Most of the studies indicated that students of color perceived and experienced more hostility than White students. Hurtado (1992) discovered in her study that one in four students viewed their campuses as having considerable racial tensions, with only 12 percent believing that discrimination was not a problem. Mack et al. (1997) found that Asian and Latino students' opinions of the racial climate fell between the negative views of African Americans and the positive views of White students. These studies found that campus racial climate was hostile for students of color; however, since African Americans, Asians, and Latinos were generally treated as uniform groups, it is difficult today to understand if there are differences in the experiences within different racial groups or the magnitude or character of those differences.

The last 15 years saw more methodologically complex studies published. In an attempt to address limitations of the Mack et al. study, Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr (2000) utilized different methodological and analytical approaches to analyze perceptions of campus racial climate for African American, Latino, Asian, and White students. In their research, Ancis and colleagues compared each racial group to the others, which was unique to previous studies. For example, every category of students of color experienced stereotyping and prejudice from White students, but Latino students experienced the least

among them. Analyzing data in this manner not only allows researchers to determine how each of these groups perceives the campus racial climate, but also allows for a nuanced understanding of the way African Americans perceive the climate compared to Latino, Asian, and White students. Analyzing data in this manner allows for greater understanding of the unique experience of each racial group.

Ancis et al. (2000) included 578 undergraduate students at a large mid-Atlantic university in their research: of those, 136 self-reported as African American, 130 as Asian American, 77 as Latino/as, and 235 as White. The researchers used the Cultural Attitudes and Climate Questionnaire, developed by Helm, Sedlacek, and Prieto (1998), which examines eleven factors: racial tension, cross cultural comfort, diversity awareness, racial pressures, residence hall tension, fair treatment, faculty racism, respect for other cultures, lack of support, comfort with own culture, overall satisfaction. Researchers mailed the questionnaire to 964 undergraduate students, and the return rate was 60 percent.

The outcomes of the study were significant, and provide insight into differences in experience among racial groups, the magnitude of difference, and between group differences. When compared to the other races in the study, African American students had experiences that are more negative. Specifically, “African American students experienced greater racial-ethnic hostility; greater pressure to conform to stereotypes; less equitable treatment by faculty, staff, and teaching assistants; and more faculty racism than did other groups” (Ancis et al., 2000, p. 183), which was consistent with prior research. In addition, when considering all the racial and ethnic groups, findings indicated that compared with African American and Asian students, Latinos experienced

less racism, and were more comfortable with their campus racial climates. Additionally, Latino students reported greater comfort with their own cultural backgrounds, which seemed to reduce stress. As with other studies, White students reported the least amount of racial tension or discrimination, as well as a lack of recognition of interracial tensions.

Suarez-Balcazar, Orellana-Damacela, Portillo, Rowan, and Andrews-Guillen (2003) utilized a unique mixed methods approach to examine the perceptions and experiences of campus racial climate, and focus on situations in which students experience differences. This study collected in two phases. The first phase consisted of interviews in which 30 students of color (including African American, Asian, and Hispanic) explained experiences of differential treatment. The researchers converted the experiences into vignettes for the questionnaire portion. Phase two included distributing the questionnaire to 322 African American, Asian, Latino, and White. The participants rated each of the vignettes using a five-point scale to measure their perceptions of the situations presented.

The findings supported previous research and further illuminated understanding of student perceptions of campus racial climate. Consistent with prior studies, the researchers found that African Americans experienced the highest amount of differential treatment, which included direct forms of racism and stereotyping. Asians and Hispanics experienced the next highest amounts of differential treatment. The results presented a nuanced view of the locations on campus where students experienced differential treatment. African Americans specifically noticed differential treatment from peers and faculty in the classroom (Suarez-Balcazar et al.). Hurtado and Ponjuan (2005) conducted one of the first studies focusing specifically on Latino students. The study examined

Latino student experiences and perceptions of campus racial climate. The research is important not only for extending understanding of Latino students, but also because it was longitudinal and regionally diverse, including nine different institutions.

Hurtado and Ponjuan's findings indicated that students who spoke Spanish in their homes were more likely to perceive the campus racial climate as hostile (Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005). Students reporting positive interaction and co-curricular experiences with diverse peers found the campus racial climate to be less hostile. The study also found that support programs, peers and familial support were important factors for Latino students' sense of belonging and ultimately success.

Rankin and Reason (2005) conducted a study that departed from the trend of the early 2000s by grouping student of color together instead of separating them by specific identity. The researchers in this study chose to group students this way due to the smaller number of respondents and the different experiences of people between and within particular racial and ethnic groups. The researchers included ten institutions from across the United States.

Rankin and Reason found that in general, students of color felt the campus racial climate was racist and hostile, while White students in the study viewed the campus climate as nonracist and respectful. More than in previous studies, Rankin and Reason found that White students reinforce White privilege on their campuses through their lack of support and active resistance to policies intended to improve campus racial climate. White students also viewed the administration as addressing racism more favorably than did student of color, and, unlike their peers, believed that the curriculum represented the contributions of underrepresented groups. The authors termed this type of White

privilege as epistemic privilege: White students were not aware of how they were benefiting from White privilege or the barriers that were in place for students of color (Rankin & Reason). The authors also point to low rates of harassment for White students and White students' ability to ignore harassment and see the climate as friendly.

Prompted by continuing reports of tension surrounding campus racial climate, Harper and Hurtado (2007) conducted a qualitative study of the perceptions of campus racial climate in order to understand how climates have evolved since Hurtado's landmark study in 1992. The researchers began with a literature review, examining journal articles focused on students' perceptions of campus racial climate completed since Hurtado's 1992 study, and found seventy-one percent were quantitative. The authors excluded "climate studies regarding racial/ethnic minority faculty and other underrepresented populations, conceptual works, literature reviews, unpublished conference papers, dissertations and theses, legal proceedings, reports, and books" (p. 9). Of the qualitative studies, only one qualitative study done between 1992 and 2007 was multi-institutional during this period.

Harper and Hurtado's (2007) qualitative study utilized focus groups to investigate perceptions of campus racial climate. They included Asian Americans, Blacks, Latinos, Native Americans, and Whites, from five predominantly White institutions from three regions, making it the most inclusive explored in this body of research. Each of the focus groups was racially homogeneous in nature, because it allowed students from each racial group to feel more comfortable in sharing their experience. This comprehensive study allowed more generalization to its multi-campus nature.

Harper and Hurtado's 2007 research yielded nine themes from the focus groups:

1. *Cross-race consensus regarding institutional negligence.* Students in each of the focus groups expressed frustration over their universities' espousal of diversity, and the lack of evidence that they were putting this pledge into action.
2. *Race as a four-letter word and an avoidable topic.* Focus groups noted that race was not overtly discussed on campus, and was often avoided in classrooms and structured venues on campus.
3. *Self-reports of racial segregation.* Participants in the focus groups said there were segregated spaces on campus; they themselves had few friends from different racial backgrounds; and discerned a lack of engagement with minorities on the part of White students.
4. *Gaps in social satisfaction by race.* Black students on every campus were most dissatisfied with the social environment on campus. Latinos, Native Americans, and Asians expectations for social support were more modest.
5. *Reputational legacies for racism.* Black students in each focus group described the reputations of racism, the negative ways their institution was viewed within the Black community, and histories of exclusion before ever arriving on campus.
6. *White student overestimation of minority student satisfaction.* White participants reported thinking that minority students were satisfied with their campus experiences, and were largely unaware of the dissatisfaction of their minority peers.
7. *The pervasiveness of whiteness in space, curricula, and activities.* Students of color found it difficult to identify shared cultural spaces on campus, and identified almost all spaces, activities, and curricula on campus as being White.

8. *The consciousness-powerlessness paradox among racial/ethnic minority staff.*

Students of color recognized disadvantages and dissatisfaction, but expressed a general sense of powerlessness in broaching these topics for fear of being seen as troublemakers who always bring up race.

9. *Unexplored qualitative realities of race in institutional assessment.* All focus groups reported that this study was the first time an institutional effort had been made to inquire about and discuss these topics.

These findings describe a pattern of isolation, alienation, and stereotyping for students of color that is consonant with previous literature.

Terrell Strayhorn (2013) recently published a study that examined race and gender in students' perceptions of campus racial climate and their desire to leave college. The study included 391 students at a single PWI in the southeast U.S. The study utilized the College Student Success Questionnaire to survey the students.

The results of this research support the other earlier studies' assertions that Black and White students have different perceptions of campus racial climate. The study found that Black students perceived the campus climate as cold and uncaring at greater levels than their White peers (Strayhorn, 2013). Additionally, a larger proportion of Black students expected to encounter racism at the university when compared to White students. These two factors played a significant role in Black students' decisions to leave their institution. The study demonstrates that students of color continue to view the campus climate as hostile, and the hostile environment has consequences for retention in higher education.

Bias and Racism Experienced by Students of Color

As noted earlier, the nature of racial bias and racism in United States society has changed from overt to covert. Ten research efforts demonstrate the changing nature of racial bias and racism. The first two frequently cited quantitative studies on racism occurred before 2000. The next seven studies in this section demonstrate a shift toward qualitative approaches and utilization of critical race theory to understand student experiences of racial bias and racism. The last study is a quantitative piece that supports the work of the qualitative research.

Earlier research on racial bias and racism tended to be quantitative in nature. Examination of these two studies will allow comparison and contrast. The first was a multi-institutional study with 1,271 students from three regions of the U.S. (Mack, Tucker, & Cha, 2000). The study utilized survey data from a private, a mid-size public, and a large public institution. The other quantitative study was a single institution study with a sample size of 145 students (McCormack, 1998). In McCormack's longitudinal study, the researchers examined information from three different years over an eight-year period. The longitudinal data allow for review and evaluation over a period of time as opposed to a single period of study, although the single institution nature of the study makes the results harder to generalize.

Both of these studies looked at Black, Latino, Asian, and White students and found that African American and Latino students experienced more discrimination (McCormack, 1998) or hate incidents than other groups (Mack, Tucker, & Cha, 2000). Mack and colleagues found that the rates of hate incidents for African Americans and Latinos in both studies were double the rate for White and Asian students. McCormack's

findings were similar for African American and Latino students, though the longitudinal data trended toward increases in hate crimes experienced by Asian students. Both studies also found that White students experienced little or no discrimination or hate incidents based on their race.

Beginning in 2000, the literature examining racial bias and racism began to encompass the changing nature of racial bias and racism, which had become subtle instead of overt. Research began to concentrate on a new concept called microaggressions, particularly specific racial/ethnic groups' experiences with microaggressions. At the same time, research methodologies shifted to the use of qualitative methods and critical race theory to understand the experiences of students of color. Four of the six studies in this group specifically identified three types of microaggressions, effects, and responses for African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. Two articles add to the understanding of microaggressions, by using different utilize methodologies. The last article applies knowledge gained through qualitative research and creates a quantitative study that helps to support the earlier qualitative work.

Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso (2000) conducted the earliest of seven studies identifying microaggressions. This qualitative study included students at three predominantly White research 1 institutions. The researchers did not include the institutional, making it difficult to assess whether the sample was regional or multi-regional. Instead of using a random sampling method, Solórzano and colleagues used a purposive sampling technique with predetermined criteria to identify African American students who would be able to contribute to the study. The researchers conducted ten

focus groups with thirty-four African American students, utilizing a grounded theory model to analyze the data. Unfortunately, the study does not provide specific criteria used in selecting the students, which would have allowed for greater understanding and comparisons to other research conducted.

Consistent with the earlier quantitative studies, the researchers found that microaggressions contributed to the negative racial campus climate. Students described feeling isolated and alienated, and experienced self-doubt (Solórzano et al., 2000). The students reported micro-aggressions that cases affected their ability to perform academically and caused them to drop classes, change majors or leave the institution.

Swim et al. (2003) utilized a mixed methods approach understand the nuanced experiences of racism that African American students encounter, using diaries that participants filled out each day. A total of 51 African American students participated in the study. Swim et al. coined the term “everyday racism” to describe “mundane hassles that could be forgotten by the day’s end” (p. 40), and related everyday racism to the racial microaggressions as described by Solórzano et al. (2000). The approach lends itself to deeper understanding of student experiences, while also allowing for measurement of the frequencies of everyday racism that participants experienced.

Swim et al. unearthed useful information about the patterns and frequencies of everyday racism that expands on the research on microaggressions. The findings showed that racism is common and patterned for African American students (Swim et al., 2003). While prior research described racism as occurring occasionally, sometimes, or frequently, the students’ diaries allowed them to pinpoint a more exact frequency, as well as to specify the types of racism or patterns that occurred. Thus, data from the journals

allowed the researchers to better describe and understand the frequency of the subtle and difficult to discern experiences with racism that may not be evident with other methods of research. The results indicated,

for college students, the frequency of racism can be more concretely described as occurring about once every other week in the form of incidents that are probably or definitely prejudiced and once a week if more ambiguous incidents are counted (Swim et al., 2003, 59).

The research indicated the most common type of microaggression occurrence was staring, and the most common reaction was anger (Swim et al.).

Focusing in more closely to African American men, Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) explored microaggressions, and introduced the concept of racial battle fatigue as an effect of constant microaggressions. Although using focus groups is common to other qualitative measures (Solorzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2007a; Yosso et al., 2009), Smith and colleagues focused on African American men. A total of 36 students participated, and the study included six schools spanning the East Coast, Midwest, and West Coast.

This study brought out two important themes about the types of microaggressions black males' encounter, such as anti-black male stereotypes and hyper-surveillance (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). In other words, black males were seen as out of place on campuses and often stereotypically "fitting the description" of non-legitimate members of the campus community.

The participants described microaggressions occurring in every facet of their lives at the university, including in the classroom and in social settings. The study found that law enforcement was commonly involved in these incidents (Smith, Allen & Danley,

2007). Smith et al.'s study was the only one of any of the studies in this section to mention of the role of law enforcement in micro-aggression, likely a product of stereotypes and hyper-surveillance. Students described feeling angry, disgusted, anxious, and unaccepted on campus, feelings that Smith et al. describe as "racial battle fatigue".

Smith et al. blended two schools of theory to construct the meaning of racial battle fatigue. Racial battle fatigue is a result of the ongoing nature of the microaggressions, constant questioning of acts, strong emotions, and the feeling of not belonging to campus (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). The concept is important to the body of knowledge about black students, but other studies apply the concept to other racial groups.

Kenneth Gonzalez (2002) utilized a unique qualitative approach to understand the campus racial climate and experiences of microaggressions of Chicano students. Gonzalez used ongoing interviews and observations of two male Chicano students at a predominantly White institution over a two-year period. The study

The results of Gonzalez's study reinforce other research on racial bias and racism, while providing important understanding of the Chicano experience. Gonzalez (2002) found a campus racial climate saturated with the dominant White culture, and other cultures received no welcome or value. Further, Gonzalez found that the Chicano students in his study experienced microaggressions in social, physical, and epistemological realms. Further, Gonzalez found the Chicano students to be experiencing what he termed cultural starvation on the predominantly White campus. Chicano students were deprived of their culture socially, in their physical space (residence halls, campus buildings, structures, etc.), and within epistemological realms.

The presence of Chicano students was not valued or seen as important, and as a result, Chicano students felt as though they did not belong at the predominantly White institution. Gonzalez commented that the study showed a lack of support on campus in the form of Chicano culture, courses, faculty, and family. The major limitation of this study is that it included only two students; however, the next study expands and confirms the findings of Gonzalez.

Yosso, Smith, Ceja, and Solórzano (2009) used critical race theory and focus groups to explore the campus racial climate and microaggressions experienced by 37 Latino students at four institutions in different regions of the United States. The study used purposeful sampling, with predetermined criteria to select the ability of selected participants to contribute to the study.

The research examined the types, effects, and responses of Latino students, and provided detail about the Latino student experience with campus racial climate and microaggressions. The results identify three types of microaggressions prevalent for Latino students: intrapersonal racism, racial jokes, and institutional racism (Yosso et al., 2009). Of particular note, the study demonstrates how White students and institutions utilize the microaggressions to isolate, demean, and make Latino students feel as though they do not belong on campus.

White students used both verbal and nonverbal microaggressions in classes to reinforce intellectual superiority and dominant culture, thereby causing Latinos to doubt their own intelligence (Yosso et al., 2009). The findings also indicated all of the participants had experienced racial jokes targeting Latino students. The authors noted racial jokes about Latino students were an easy way for White students to gain

acceptance, and Latinos who accepted the jokes gained admittance into the mainly White friend groups. Those Latino students who did not accept the jokes experienced exclusion from mainly White friend groups. The researchers discovered to be culturally starving or not representing Latino students' social, physical, and epistemological realms, thus supporting the findings of Gonzalez (2002).

The effects of the racial microaggressions on Latino students mirror those of the previous studies on Black students. These findings show that microaggressions produce stress, rejection, and anxiety for students (Yosso et al., 2009). Latino students reported astonishment by the "silencing, dismissive and verbally assaultive behaviors for professors, graduate teaching assistants, and peers" (Yosso et al., p. 674, 2009). The authors note that the cumulative effects of these experiences on Latino students lead to racial battle fatigue and a need exists for further research on the impact of racial battle fatigue on Latino student health.

An important theme in these studies is that Latinos respond to microaggressions by creating counter-space. Latino students look for ways to build community amongst themselves, noted in Gonzalez's (2002) work as being a critical support for Latino students. The presence of a Latino community allows students to vent frustrations, cultivate friendships, and create a supportive environment with people who share their cultural experiences and histories. These communities are sometimes referred to as counter-spaces. The findings show that White students do not understand the need for counter-spaces and tend to view them as self-segregation (Yosso et al., 2009). As one participant noted, "They think we're trying to exclude them" (Yosso et al., 2009, 677). Strikingly participants noted, "they would rather forgo relationships with White students

– even those with whom they would have liked to have had relationships in order to protect themselves from the inevitable disregard” (Yosso et al., 2009, 678). White students’ misunderstanding of cultural counter-space and their resultant mistrust of Latino students creates an additional barrier to students gaining the full benefits of a diverse environment.

Sue et al. (2007a) specifically focused on examining microaggressions with relation to Asian students. As with previous studies discussed, the researchers utilized qualitative methods and focus groups, which included ten Asian American students. The results demonstrated similarities to the experiences of Black and Latino, while. The key finding of the study identified eight major microaggression themes for Asian American students. The microaggression themes include: (a) alien in own land, (b) ascription of intelligence, (c) exoticization of Asian women, (d) invalidation of interethnic differences, (e) denial of racial identity, (f) pathologizing of cultural values/communication styles, (g) second class citizenship, and (h) invisibility (Sue et al., 2007a). Participants also reported spending time determining if a microaggression occurred and whether they should respond, mirroring experiences of Latino and Black students examined previously.

Museus and Park (2015) also examined the experience of Asian American students in their study. The study examines Asian American students because the researchers discovered when analyzing peer reviewed journals that less than 1% of published articles gave attention to Asian American students (Museus & Park, 2015). As with the previous studies the researchers designed a qualitative study of racism in the lives of Asian American students.

The study included 46 students from institutions across the country and of varying sizes. The data for the study came from two larger qualitative studies of Asian American students. As noted, the researchers used three types of purposeful sampling including maximum variation, intensity, and snowball sampling (Meseus & Park, 2015). The researchers conducted face to face interviews, which lasted between 60 and 90 minutes (Meseus & Park, 2015).

The results indicated that Asian American students encounter the following nine forms of racism,

(a) racial harassment, (b) vicarious racism, (c) racial isolation, (d) pressure to racially segregate, (e) pressure to racially assimilate, (f) racial silencing, (g) the perpetual foreigner myth, (h) the model minority myth, and (i) the inferior minority myth (Meseus & Park, p. 551, 2015).

The findings contribute to understanding a racial group that few have studied. Additionally, the data demonstrate that Asian American students experience racism, which in some other studies is less clear, or appears diminished compared to other racial groups. The results also show that Asian students experience isolation on campus and pressure to segregate themselves as a result. The findings also illuminate differences between East Asian students and Southeast Asian students. The latter influenced by both the model and inferior minority stereotypes (Meseus & Park, P. 566). The research underscores the need for further research on this population of students. Additionally, the results support other studies indicating the bias and racism experienced by students of color.

Franklin, Smith, and Hung (2014) apply the concepts of racial battle fatigue and microaggressions to study the impact on Latina/o students. The majority of research on racial battle fatigue and microaggressions in the 2000s and into the 2010s is qualitative (Gonzalez, 2002; Smith et al., 2007; Solórzano et al., 2005; Sue et al., 2007b; Swim et al., 2003; Yosso et al., 2009). This study links racial battle fatigue and microaggressions quantitatively. The study utilizes the Racial Battle Fatigue Scale (RBFS). The RBFS measures racial microaggressions; psychological, physiological, and behavioral items. The questionnaire was distributed to Latino/a undergraduate and former undergraduate students from across the country. The final sample included 210 students.

The findings support the qualitative work done on this subject already noted in this review. Specifically, the results indicate racial microaggressions significantly influence psychological stress (Franklin et al., 2014). The research found that Latino/a student's experience "...frustration, being more aware of racism, irritability, mood changes, shock, disappointment, and agitation" (Franklin et al., 2014, 315). These results are similar to the qualitative studies. The quantitative nature of this study is important in providing insight into further refining future studies as well as providing empirical evidence that supports the qualitative work done on these topics.

Diversity and Social Justice Initiatives

Colleges and universities have employed a variety of initiatives to address the issues of racial bias and racism, create a campus racial climate that supports student success, and prepare students for a global society. These initiatives include diversity courses, racial awareness workshops, intergroup dialogues, living and learning environments, and shared residential living environments. Studies show that these

activities are connected with positive socio-cognitive development and commitment to racial engagement (Astin, 1993; Chang, 1999; Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin 2002; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The following sections explore the literature on diversity courses and intergroup dialogues to consider the efficacy of these methods in fostering diversity and social justice.

Diversity courses. Diversity courses are courses that relate to a particular social or cultural issue, or have curricula or content related to the diversity found in U.S. society, and fall under an institution's diversity general education requirement. Diversity courses traditionally encourage interaction with diverse peers, expose students to diverse perspectives, and promote democratic engagement (Castellanos & Cole, 2015; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005). The research asserts that these courses take place within a classroom setting in which students are able to interact frequently with each other and with diverse peers (Gurin, 1999, Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Research has found that the quality and quantity of interaction with diverse peers is important in stimulating active thinking, citizenship engagement, and importance of social action, all which relate to democratic outcomes (Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002). The diverse learning environment and student interactions within it affects the context in which students engage and, more importantly, prompts complex thinking (Gurin, 1999; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Complex thinking is critical for cognitive and individual development, both of which are linked to racial engagement and development. Further, these three areas of development are all important aspects of learning outcomes and democracy outcomes for students.

Eight studies in this literature review examined diversity courses (Castellanos & Cole, 2015; Chang, 2002; Cole, Case, Rios, & Curtin, 2011; Gurin 1999; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Lopez, 2004; Mayhew & Deluca Fernandez, 2007; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005). Each of these studies used a quantitative approach and focused on single institutions; however, one study analyzed national data in addition to the single institution explored (Gurin, 1999). Across these studies, findings indicate that diversity courses have positive effects on students of color and White students. Closer examination of each of the studies will reveal the specific effects on students.

Gurin (1999) undertook a broad examination of classroom diversity and informal interactions with diverse peers to understand how they affect learning and democracy outcomes. Gurin analyzed a subset of data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Study (CIRP), a national study including 9,316 students from 200 colleges and universities. The researcher compared CIRP data to the Michigan Student Survey (MSS), which included 1,321 students. Thus, this study is the largest review of diversity courses ever conducted. The data analyzed included White, African American, and Latino students.

Gurin's study showed that students who experienced higher levels of diversity in class and informal interactions with peers of different races, "showed the greatest engagement in active thinking processes, growth in intellectual engagement and motivation, and growth in intellectual and academic skills" (p. 45). Further, these students "showed the most engagement in various forms of citizenship, and the most engagement with people from different races/cultures" (p. 46). The data demonstrated

strong support for the impact of learning and democracy outcomes, and helped build a foundation for future research.

Chang (2002) conducted a unique study for its time, which empirically addressed the impact of a diversity course requirement on racial views and attitudes, a key measure of democracy outcomes. Chang's study encompassed a large public institution in the Northeast that had offered 25 courses as part of a diversity course requirement for the previous seven years. The study, randomly assigned thirteen courses to the pretreatment group, and the remaining twelve to the treatment group. A total of 173 undergraduate students participated in the study, including 33% students of color. Chang contacted instructors to invite their class to be a part of the study. Seven of the pretreatment group and eight of the treatment group agreed to participate.

Chang (2002) chose to employ a "between subjects" design utilizing independent samples of the population instead of a pre/posttest methodology. The researcher decided not to alert the participants they were a part of the study, so there would be no influence on student responses to the questions. The study utilized the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) to measure prejudice in each of these groups. The MRS provides distinction between older overt forms of racism and current subtle forms. However, the instrument is limited, as it only explores prejudice toward African Americans, and thus was not reflective of the other racial diversity on many college campuses.

The results of the study were important to future research on diversity course requirements and the impact of course requirements on democratic outcomes. Results indicated that students completing the diversity course requirement had more favorable judgments of African Americans (Chang, 2002). Additionally, students who had already

taken other diversity courses before the study had lower levels of prejudice at the beginning of the course than students who had not completed the requirement. Chang argues that taking a greater number of diversity courses may sustain lower levels of prejudice for those who have already taken courses as opposed to improving skills.

In another study, Gretchen Lopez (2004) examined curriculum, attitudes, and personal interactions of first-year college students as they entered the institution and at the end of their first year. The study included 480 White, 165 Asian, and 82 African American students. Latinos and Native Americans were not included as a demographic group, as there were insufficient numbers of Native American and Latino student respondents. Entrance and exit surveys gathered demographic and intergroup attitudes, comparing intergroup attitudes and experiences during the first year. Lopez compared Whites in diversity courses as well as Whites not enrolled in these courses.

The diversity courses had the most consistent and positive effect on the interracial contact White students had with minority groups, which in turn influenced the attitudes of White students. The decision to compare White students enrolled in diversity courses with those not enrolled was a key addition from previous research. White students enrolled in diversity courses with diverse peers had greater attitudinal effects than White students not enrolled in diversity courses. Specifically, contact with diverse peers was positive for White students' support of equality as measured through out-group contact with African American students. Additionally, Lopez found that diversity classes raised awareness of inequality for White students. Lopez's study measured democratic outcomes and citizen engagement of White students, a facet, which had not appeared in prior research of racial/cultural engagement and compatibility.

Gurin, Nagda, and Lopez (2004) examined the impact of an intergroup relations course on enrolled students. Unlike the Lopez (2004) study, this longitudinal study measured students at entrance and the end of the first term and during their senior year. Students in the study included a test group of students who elected to take the course, and a control group of students who did not participate in the course. The sample included 174 students with 87 in each group. The researchers controlled for gender, race, in/out state residence, and campus residency. The design allowed for greater understanding of attitude changes over time, while the methodology allowed for a baseline of the group studied as measured by the control group.

The findings indicated that personal development and the ability to function in a diverse society are dependent on positive interactions with diverse peers (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004), expanding previous literature that focused only on interactions (whether positive or negative). The researchers found that the course and corresponding development were more profound for White students than for students of color, which concurred with the Lopez (2004) study. Also of note, students of color perceived less division and showed more interest in learning about other groups than their own in environments where interactions with diverse peers were positive (Gurin, et al., 2004).

Nelson Laird, Engberg, and Hurtado (2005) examined enrollment in diversity courses and engagement. Utilizing the Study of Student Thinking & Interaction (Hurtado, 2003), they compared diversity courses to traditional courses. The sample included 367 students, 227 of whom enrolled in a diversity course and 140 who enrolled in a management course. As with the two previous studies (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Lopez, 2004) there were beginning and end assessments. Of the students

participating, 78% were first or second year students. This sampling strategy allowed the researchers to examine the effect of a diversity or regular course on students.

The results indicated, “previous enrollment in diversity courses and enrollment in one of the diversity courses in this study (compared to enrollment in a management course) are positive, significant determinants of the quality of students’ interaction with diverse peers” (Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005, p. 468). Consistent with Gurin, Nagda, and Lopez (2004) quality of interaction was critical. The study also demonstrated the universities’ positive commitments to social action on behalf of students in the diversity courses. Students demonstrated increased social action through enrollment in additional courses during which students engaged and had positive interactions with diverse peers (Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado). The findings further supported the measures of both learning and democracy outcomes, and the importance of courses in helping students benefit from diversity.

Cole, Case, Rios, and Curtin (2011) studied the impact of a required diversity course. Specifically, the researchers examined students’ understanding of racial inequality and their social development using race and perspective taking as moderators for course effectiveness. The study took place at the University of Michigan. One of the colleges at the University of Michigan has a “Race and Ethnicity” course as a degree requirement. The criteria for a course to meet this requirement includes,

...the inclusion of “substantial, but not necessarily exclusive” discussion of “(a) the meaning of race, ethnicity, and racism; (b) racial and ethnic intolerance and resulting inequality as it occurs in the United States or elsewhere; and (c)

comparisons of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, social class, or gender (Cole et al., 2011, p. 399).

The sample included first-year students enrolled in introduction to psychology and all courses meeting the requirement. Students completed two surveys, one in September, and one in December. The total sample included 173 students, which included 106 student in a diversity course and 67 in psychology.

The findings indicated students enrolled in diversity courses exhibited greater awareness of overt racism and the concept of White privilege (Cole et al., 2011). The findings in this study included many different diversity courses. The results support the notion that diversity courses in general, not just a single course or instructor produce positive results for students, which supports other studies in this section (Chang, 2002; Lopez, 2004; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005). Similar to the other studies the effects were greater for White students. The researchers also found that the diversity course and not exposure to diversity on campus caused the observed changes (Cole et al., 2011). Lastly, the findings indicated that absent mandating courses to explore connections of inequality that some students became more aware of connections between racism and other forms of inequality.

Castellanos and Cole (2015) undertook a study to examine diversity courses and the effect the courses have on civic engagement for White students and students of color over the course of four years. The study took place at American University of the West Coast (AUWC), which is a research university located in a metropolitan city. The data included students who completed the 2004 Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey and the 2008 AUWC Senior Survey. The total number of students

completing both was 404, and 72% identified as White and 28% identified as students of color (Castellanos & Cole, 2015).

The researchers "...utilize Bennett's (2001) genres of multicultural education to formulate a typology of diversity content clusters" (Castellanos & Cole, p. 795, 2015).

The framework allowed researchers to examine the differences in diversity course.

At the core of Bennett's research are four broad principles of multicultural education: cultural pluralism, social justice, affirmation of culture in teaching and learning process, and educational equity. These core principles underlie the genre clusters, which are utilized in the current study: (a) curriculum reform, (b) multicultural competence, (c) societal equity, and (d) equity pedagogy (Castellanos & Cole, p. 797, 2015).

The researchers found that similar to other studies diversity courses played a role in developing civic engagement in students. The findings also indicated that courses on multicultural competence had positive effects across all students (Castellanos & Cole, 2015). Unlike some of the other studies on diversity courses, the researchers discovered, "diversity courses are not created equal, in that diversity courses with distinct goals and objectives can have a differential effect on students' educational outcomes" (Castellanos & Cole, p. 805, 2015). Differing from other studies the researchers found that courses about societal issues affected students of color more so than their White peers. The framework used in this study shows promise for future research on diversity courses, but as the authors note, further research will increase understanding in this area.

In the realm of diversity coursework, Mayhew and DeLuca Fernandez (2007) examined pedagogical practices in courses with social justice components. They sought

to understand the impact of the pedagogical practices on student learning. The practices examined included “opportunities for reflection, perspective-taking, the application of knowledge, interactions with diverse peers, and collaborative work with peers, and discussions about diversity” (p. 74). These practices were closely linked with democratic outcomes mentioned several times throughout the literature.

Mayhew and DeLuca Fernandez studied one large institution located in the Midwest. The participants were undergraduate students, 60% of whom were female and 21% of who identified as students of color. The researchers examined five courses based upon three criteria: instructor willingness to participate, incorporation of social justice content, and the instructor’s pedagogical practices. Researchers specifically examined pedagogical learning practices related to how students make meaning of social justice issues. Students completed a survey at the end of the course about “student attitudes toward and perceptions of educational practices most conducive to facilitating the development of moral reasoning and social justice learning in a classroom context” (Mayhew & DeLuca Fernandez, 2007, p. 65).

Mayhew and DeLuca Fernandez’s findings provided important information about how the pedagogical approach used in diversity courses affect,

how students make meaning of social justice issues; how they construct their social identities in light of power, position, prejudices, and expressions of discrimination; and how they make sense of both as they consider their roles in a diverse democratic society (p. 74).

The authors argued in favor of a societal systematic approach, which they define as “course content dealing with systematic oppression, the societal structures and

inequalities that cause and sustain it, and how individuals perpetuate and/or discourage it” (p. 74). The societal systematic approach helped students achieve more democratic outcomes specifically in the areas of citizenship engagement and racial/cultural engagement. Three of the courses studied, an Intergroup Dialogue course, a service-oriented course called Project Community, and Introduction to Sociology, were intended to teach students skills to analyze structural sources of oppression and inequality and outline ways individuals could take action. Through these three courses, the researchers found students learned more social justice lessons than students who had been enrolled in courses with less sociologic approaches. The results also supported previous findings on the importance of positive interactions between diverse peers. Negative interactions were found to have a profound impact on outcomes achieved, and students experiencing negative interactions were less likely to achieve social justice learning outcomes. Data revealed that diverse peer interaction did not have as much impact as the context and pedagogy, which differs from most other studies reviewed. A realm in which diverse peer interaction is critical is in intergroup dialogues.

Intergroup dialogues. Intergroup dialogues bring together people of two or more social groups who have or could have a history of conflict. In these face-to-face meetings, which are typically peer-facilitated, students explore issues of social justice through a variety of activities in a safe environment (Nagda, et al, 1999). In the context of this dissertation, research on race-focused intergroup dialogues is considered.

Intergroup dialogues studied in this review brought students together through a facilitated experience taking weeks or months. The dialogues actively involved the participants in exploring their group identity and examined ways in which power,

privilege, and oppression structure these experiences (Belue Buckley & Quaye, 2014; Muller & Miles, 2016; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Zúñiga & Nagda 2003; Zúñiga, Nagda, Sevig, 2002). Throughout the experience students developed skills, explored ways to challenge inequity, and considered opportunities to promote social justice (Belue Buckley & Quaye, 2014; Muller & Miles, 2016; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Zúñiga & Nagda 2003; Zúñiga, Nagda, Sevig, 2002). The dialogues met the criteria outlined by Pettigrew (1998) to help mediate change and include, “learning about the out-group, changing behavior, generating affective ties, and in-group reappraisal” (p. 88). Of the literature reviewed on intergroup dialogues, I include here four articles that best describe the experiences and outcomes for the students involved.

One theme present in research on intergroup dialogues is that learning took place for both White students and students of color who participated (Belue Buckley & Quaye, 2014; Muller & Miles, 2016; Nagda, 2006; Nagda et al., 1999; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003). The finding is significant because previous research on the effects of diversity courses indicated that White students tended to benefit most from those experiences. Intergroup dialogues offer the unique opportunity for the voices of all involved to be heard in ways that courses cannot engage in dialogue due to the racial composition of the class, the formality of courses, and the tendency for some voices in courses to be silenced. Intergroup dialogues engage all of the participants from each of the racial groups represented in learning.

Another theme that emerged is the importance of quality facilitation, an important element for the success of all involved (Belue Buckley & Quaye, 2014; Muller & Miles, 2016; Nagda et al., 1999; Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). Facilitation of an intergroup

dialogue needs to be intentional and thoughtful, and facilitators must be prepared to adapt and adjust to meet the needs of their group (Muller & Miles, 2016; Nagda et al., 1999; Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). Belue Buckley and Quaye (2014) noted in their study the tension that facilitators face as they negotiate whether to step in or be a part of the background. Facilitators need training and preparation to set the agenda and adapt as the dialogue moves forward. Facilitating an intergroup dialogue includes,

conducting the experiential activities; debriefing the exercise and opening up for more dialogue; and closing the session. They ensure ground rules are being followed... They also model dialogic skills—active listening, asking questions, probing, sharing personal experiences, voicing emotions, expressing appreciation, voicing observations (Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002).

A pair of peers should facilitate an intergroup dialogue in order to create a sense of safety and nonjudgment. The identities of the co-facilitators should ideally represent the identities of the participants. Nagda, et al. (1999) described the key features of intergroup dialogues. Intergroup dialogues include a small group between 10 and 14 participants. The small group is important for participants to feel safe to engage in dialogue. Also important is balancing the group as best as possible among the identities represented.

The first piece of research included in this review was a formative evaluation on intergroup dialogues (Nagda et al, 1999). The evaluation used a variety of methods including focus groups, surveys, student interviews, and observations of the dialogues by the researchers. A total of 50 junior-class students participated in the evaluation including White, African American, Asian, Latino, and Native American students.

The formative evaluation discovered that students increased their commitment to cultural diversity and social justice through the learning experiences that occurred during the dialogues. The evaluation results outlined five learning experiences identified by 93% of the students, which included:

- Learning about experiences and perspectives of people from other social groups;
- Valuing new viewpoints;
- Understanding the impact of social group membership on their identity;
- Increased awareness of social inequalities;
- Learning about the difference between dialogue and debate.

(Nagda et. al., p. 443, 1999).

The next six articles enhance and add to the findings of the formative evaluation and further describe intergroup dialogues. There are a variety of similarities among the three quantitative articles reviewed here (Nagda, 2006; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003). All three are single institution investigations and included a pre- and post-survey model to understand the learning from the intergroup dialogues. Each of the three studies was racially diverse, including White, African American, Asian, Latino, and Native American students. Belue Buckley and Quaye (2014) examined intergroup dialogue through qualitative research at a single institution to determine how students and facilitators utilized intergroup dialogue to make meaning of social justice. Hopkins and Domingue (2015) utilize a qualitative approach to determine the skill sets undergraduate students learn in intergroup dialogue. The last article Muller and Miles (2016) examine

group climate and outcomes within intergroup dialogue. Each of these pieces of research support the findings of the formative evaluation.

In their study, Nagda and Zúñiga (2003) explored intergroup dialogues, specifically the processes and relations created during the dialogues. The study included 42 student participants who were part of a series of five dialogues for one credit. The research design measured eight outcomes over three domains: social awareness, dialogic communication, and building bridges. The results indicated,

the more the students valued the dialogic learning process the more likely they were to benefit from the overall intergroup dialogue goals: to provide conversational settings for students to raise racial awareness, talk about race and racism with people from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, and to strengthen desire for interracial bridging (Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003, p. 123).

Additionally, the dialogues increased awareness of racial identity for both White students and students of color.

Nagda, Kim, and Truelove (2004) reported a study of intergroup learning in a diversity and justice course. The course focused on utilizing different learning modalities to learn about differences. The study included 175 students in four cohorts of the course. The outcomes examined in this study included prejudice reduction and promotion of diversity.

The research found that use of a mix of learning modalities, which included lectures, readings, and intergroup dialogues, increased motivation for intergroup learning, reduced prejudice, and promoted diversity. The findings were consistent for both students of color and White students. Second, purposeful lectures and readings which

increased cultural knowledge, and dialogues which allowed for interaction, encouraged motivation for intergroup learning and students taking action (Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004). Both findings suggest different measures of learning outcomes and democracy outcomes, specifically student engagement, motivation, and racial/cultural engagement, which benefit students.

Nagda (2006) examined the communication processes of intergroup dialogues, defining four processes of communication. The communication processes are:

- a. Alliance building involves relating to and thinking about collaboration with others in taking actions toward social justice.
- b. Engaging self is the involvement of oneself as a participant in interactions with others.
- c. Critical self-reflection refers to the examination of one's ideas, experiences and perspectives as located in the context of inequality, privilege, and oppression.
- d. Appreciating difference is learning about others, hearing personal stories, and hearing about different points of view in face to face encounters.

(Nagda, p. 563).

The study consisted of 211 participants enrolled in a cultural diversity and justice course who completed a pre/posttest survey.

The results indicated that communication processes are sequential in bridging differences for participants (Nagda, 2006). Nagda explained, "communication processes can begin with appreciating difference (exposure to and learning about others), move to engaging self and critical self-reflection, and finally alliance building" (p. 565). Though

the communication processes are sequential, the analysis also demonstrated that the communication processes are interrelated in their collective impact on the process of building bridges. The study demonstrated the necessity of critical self-reflection and alliance building to the process of bridging differences. The critical self-reflection portion of the dialogues sets it apart from the harmonizing nature of other anti-bias work, while alliance building expands this and examines power relationships as it relates to race.

Belue Buckley and Quaye (2014) explore intergroup dialogue with regard to how students and facilitators make meaning about social justice. Unlike the previous three studies, this study utilized a qualitative approach. The study took place at a Mid-Atlantic public, research-intensive institution. The researchers examined one-credit intergroup dialogue courses for undergraduate students. Each of these courses had a central theme based on a specific identity. The study took place over 18 months. During this time 42 interviews were conducted with 28 participants, three dialogues were observed, and the researchers examined coursework from students willing to share.

The findings support information from the other studies of intergroup dialogue and present a few nuanced findings that add to the conversation on intergroup dialogues. As with the other studies, the researchers found that the intergroup dialogue assisted students in learning to listen to each other and to respect the diversity of experiences they heard. As with other studies, facilitators in this study were careful about the use of their voice in the classroom, and encouraged student voices to lead the discussion.

This study also made an addition to the research on intergroup dialogues. Unlike diversity courses, which can discuss macro and micro levels of social justice, the authors

found that the intergroup dialogue studied focused on micro issues of social justice. The micro issues of social justice. The micro issues, “involved building and examining relationships between people of different social identities” (Belue Buckley & Quaye, p. 15-16, 2014). Lastly, the study also found,

Dialogue seemed to invoke knowledge and action. It centered on students gaining knowledge rooted in individual experiences of diverse peers, and it involved action rooted in the practice of authentic listening and personal sharing in the midst of a group with diverse identities, experiences, and beliefs” (Belue Buckley & Quaye, p. 18, 2014).

The study shared several examples of students seeking knowledge on a micro level to understand different identities on a personal level.

Hopkins and Domingue (2015) examine the skill development students learn participating in intergroup dialogue. This study also utilized a qualitative approach. The study included students from seven public and two private schools. The schools ranged in size from large to small and included schools from across the U.S. Researchers analyzed data from 229 interviews with students completing an intergroup dialogue course.

Participants in this study described learning communication, cognitive, and affective skills that are interconnected (Hopkins & Domingue, 2015). Specifically the researchers noted six themes that emerged from the interviews. “Participants consistently emphasized learning the skills of active listening, suspending judgment, perspective taking, voicing, working with conflict constructively, and recognizing social identities and social oppression” (p. 394). These findings add support to earlier articles that

emphasized communication, self-reflection, bridging differences, and social awareness. Further the findings indicate these processes, “gradually encourage, support, and challenge participants to find a voice in the dialogue and to develop the capacity to listen and work with different perspectives and experiences constructively” (p. 400). The research also revealed that participants learned about their own identities, the identities of others, and how those identities are a part of systemic oppression. The researchers also suggest movement toward an intergroup dialogue curriculum and blends theory and practice.

The final article for intergroup dialogue (Muller & Miles, 2016) studies intergroup dialogue in a multicultural psychology class. Specifically the researchers explore group climate development and outcomes. Group climate is the emotional environment created during the intergroup dialogue (Muller & Miles, 2016). The outcomes studied included development of critical social consciousness and building relationships across groups (Muller & Miles, 2016). The study included 19 intergroup dialogues at a large public university in the Southeastern United States. The intergroup dialogues were required portion of a multicultural psychology course over three semesters; however, student participation in the research was optional. Students involved in the study did a pre and post dialogue survey. During the three semesters 161 students participated in the intergroup dialogues, and 87 completed both the pre and post dialogue surveys.

The results of the research largely support the findings already discussed in this section of the literature. The researchers found the group formed in the intergroup

dialogue held importance to the members because they developed a sense of closeness (Muller & Miles, 2016). Specifically the researchers note,

Attention to relationships and safety appear to allow group members to become invested in dialogue, resulting in the observed increases. Similarly, the development of safety and of strong interpersonal relationships seems to have allowed IGD participants to feel increasingly willing and able to discuss issues between themselves (Muller & Miles, p. 13, 2016)

Additionally the researchers observed changes in the pre and post dialogues.

Comparing the results demonstrated that students reported, “decreased “blindness” to racial privilege and institutional discrimination, and increased empathic perspective taking abilities” (Muller & Miles, P. 13). The results indicate that students experienced development of critical awareness skills with regard to inequity. Further, students gained skill in understanding the perspective of other identities different from their own. As the investigators note,

These findings indicate that increasing perceptions of individual group members’ perceptions of engagement in the group are related to greater increases in empathic perspective taking, and greater development of critical awareness of racial privilege and institutional discrimination post dialogue.

The researchers refer to this as a “partner effect”, and note that individuals in the intergroup dialogue can affect the outcomes of others (Muller & Miles, 2016). The study further supports the findings of intergroup dialogue and provides nuance to the significance of group members and their influence on each other.

Diversity experiences and outcomes. The final body of research in this dissertation examines conditions that influence diversity experiences and outcomes of the diversity experiences. Four of the articles reviewed in this section (Engberg 2007; Hurtado, 2005; Hurtado & Engberg, 2011; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007) employ the same data sample to analyze different aspects of diversity experiences and conditions that influence student outcomes. Another article (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005) examines the impact of diversity experiences on democracy outcomes. The next article (Cole & Zhou, 2013) examines diversity experiences relationship to civic mindedness with regard to students. Then Pascarella et. al. (2014) explores the effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills, which is an important component of student outcomes. The last piece of research is an evaluation of common diversity experiences as it relates to reducing racial bias (Engberg, 2004). The evaluation is important because racial bias reduction is a key component to realizing democracy outcomes.

The first four articles (Engberg 2007; Hurtado, 2005; Hurtado & Engberg, 2011; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007) utilize data from a national research project titled *Preparing Students for a Diverse Democracy*. The study included nine public institutions from across the U.S. selected on three criteria: commitment to diversity initiatives, recent success at increasing diversity in their enrollment, and commitment to public service (Hurtado, 2005). The sample included 4,697 students of which 69% were White and 31% were students of color. The size of the sample and geographic diversity allow for generalization of the results.

The study was longitudinal in nature, which allowed for greater understanding of the student experiences and changes during that period. Students completed a survey

upon matriculation in the fall of 2000 with a focus on pre-college experiences. The follow-up survey completed at the end of their second year examined the impact of their college experience.

Hurtado (2005) examined intergroup relations among students to assess exposure to diversity through classroom and informal interaction, and subsequent influences on cognitive outcomes, social cognitive outcomes, and democratic outcomes and development. The quality of student interactions with diverse peers is positively associated with the development of problem solving skills. Positive interactions were strongly associated with positive democracy outcomes for students. Data also indicated that students who had positive interactions viewed racial inequality as a problem at the end of the study. The longitudinal nature of the study also provided key information, indicating, “students who have an opportunity to take a diversified curriculum by the end of the second year of college tended to score higher on 19 of 25 outcomes in the study” (p. 603). Further, “Extracurricular diversity events and activities produced significant effects on 17 of 25 outcomes” (p. 605). The data support the critical finding that interactions affect outcomes for students as early as the second year of college.

Saenz, Ngai, and Hurtado (2007) specifically examined the conditions that influence intergroup relations to further the research in this area. Their findings indicated that students brought early experiences with intergroup relations with them to college. Students who grew up in diverse neighborhoods, schools, and with opportunities to interact with diverse peers had interactions that are more positive in college. Racially diverse institutional environments affected Whites more than students of color. Diverse institutional environments allowed White students increased opportunities for interaction

across race, which was critical for positive interactions to occur. Another key finding was that opportunities for intense dialogue were a significant predictor of positive interactions (Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado). Involvement in non-academic, less structured environments was also a significant predictor for 3 of 4 groups (Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado). This finding is important for institutions because creating opportunities for students that are formal and less formal may allow for increased boundary crossing and interactions between students (Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado). The results provide insight into opportunities that support many of the measures of learning and democracy outcomes.

Engberg (2007) utilized data from the Preparing Students for a Diverse Democracy study to understand how diversity experiences translate into learning outcomes. He developed a measure to examine skills that underlie a pluralistic orientation. Pluralistic orientation is defined as “the ability to see multiple perspectives; the ability to work cooperatively with diverse people; the ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues; openness to having one’s views challenged; and tolerance of others with different beliefs” (p. 285). The results build upon the findings of the previous studies. Engberg found that positive interactions with diverse peers exerted the most significant effect on pluralistic orientation in the second year of college. The findings also indicated, “students’ interactions across race, both positive and negative, were associated with the largest and most significant total effects on their second-year pluralistic orientation compared to the effects of participants in campus facilitated diversity experiences” (p. 307). Greater structural diversity led to greater engagement and positive interactions, which indirectly affected pluralistic orientation. The intentionality of interactions was a critical finding. “Merely leaving interactions across

race to chance, without providing students with skills to communicate effectively across difference can potentially diminish how secure students feel in their pluralistic abilities” (p. 309). Departing from other research, Engberg found “participation in co-curricular diversity activities showed few direct effects toward pluralistic orientation” (p. 308). Engberg did find a direct link between co-curricular diversity and higher levels of intergroup learning. The intergroup learning from the diversity co-curricular activities helps students to translate their experiences into gains in pluralistic orientations.

Zúñiga, Williams, and Berger (2005) examined diversity experiences and students’ motivation to take action on democratic outcomes. The focus of the study was interactions with diverse peers, diversity courses, and activities. The researchers proposed that, based on the earlier work of Gurin (2002), “involvement in campus diversity - diverse interactions, curricular diversity, co-curricular diversity-related programs - may motivate students to become more engaged in actualizing inclusive and non-discriminatory behaviors at the personal and social level” (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, p. 664). The conceptual framework for the study utilized Astin’s (1993) Input-Environment-Output model. The model utilizes demographic characteristics, college characteristics, and pretests as inputs, relevant parts of the college experience (diverse interactions, diversity related co-curricular activities, and general co-curricular activities) as the environment, which are hypothesized to impact the two outcomes of motivation for reducing one’s own prejudices and motivation to promote inclusion and social justice (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger).

The researchers administered a survey in the fall and spring to conduct their longitudinal research. The study included three residence halls at a single predominantly

white campus in the Northeast. A total of 597 undergraduate students participated, with 74% White and 26% students of color. The longitudinal approach was similar to other studies in the larger section of diversity and social justice initiatives. The four-page instrument developed from previous research focused on student participation in diversity experiences.

Data indicated that diversity courses and cross group peer interactions had strong influences on motivation to reduce one's own prejudice (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). Co-curricular activities (cultural activities, diversity awareness events, and cultural events) showed mixed effects on motivation and social justice actions (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger). Students involved in cultural activities, diversity awareness events, and cultural events demonstrated an increased motivation to reduce prejudice, but did not impact outward actions for the students (Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger). The findings indicate that curricular activities had a stronger impact on motivation to reduce prejudice and social justice actions, yet these activities can work in tandem with co-curricular activities to maximize achievement of democratic outcomes for students.

Hurtado and Engberg (2011) utilized data from the Preparing Students for a Diverse Democracy study for two purposes. The first was to test a theoretical model for the development of pluralistic orientations during the first two years of college. The second and more important contribution to the literature was to test a model for different racial groups in order to understand similarities and differences for each group. The results delivered an empirically proven measure to assess if colleges and universities are achieving their goals in preparing students for a global society. Additionally, the results indicated that students entered college with similar self-assessments of their pluralistic

abilities. However, data indicated, “Asian students demonstrate significantly lower appraisals of their pluralistic skills compared to other race groups” (p. 436). Consistent with other studies, the data indicated that positive informal interactions play an important role in pluralistic development, and negative interactions can hamper development of pluralistic orientations. The researchers discovered a few key differences. First, for White students increases in compositional diversity allowed for more interactions across race and those could have positive or negative consequences depending on the quality of the interaction. Second, the model presented may not be a good model for understanding Latino students’ development of pluralistic orientations due to the psychological mediators used in the model. The authors recommend further quantitative and qualitative research for further understanding of Latino students.

Cole and Zhou (2013) employed Banks’ Multicultural Education Framework to study the effects of student involvement in diversity experiences at college. The researchers applied the model to determine how diversity experiences contributed to civic mindedness. Banks model includes five dimensions. The dimensions include content integration, knowledge construction, equity pedagogy, prejudice reduction, and empowering school culture and social structure (Cole & Zhou). The researchers note that in order to influence students each of these dimensions needs to be integrated simultaneously (Cole & Zhou). The Multicultural Education Framework has been utilized extensively in K-12 education and the researchers applied the framework to a single institution.

Cole and Zhou’s study was a longitudinal study conducted at a single institution on the West Coast. The study brought together three data sources. The first data source

was The Freshmen Survey, which the Cooperative Institutional Research Program created. The second was University Senior Survey. The final piece of data included student transcripts, which allowed the researchers to know the courses taken by students during their time at the institution. The sample included 447 students, and 144 were ethnic minority.

The results of the study indicate that diversity experiences (multicultural courses, service learning, racial awareness workshops, student-faculty interactions, interracial interactions and campus racial harmony) significantly and positively promoted civic mindedness. The finding indicates that Banks' framework is a useful tool. The study provided support "...to Banks' claim that positive experiences in each dimension increase the power and influence in regard to every other dimension" (Cole & Zhou, p. 117, 2013) Further the findings indicated, "the positive effect of one diversity experience on students' development of civic mindedness is optimized when diversity experience in other dimensions are present and intentionally structured" (Cole & Zhou, p. 117, 2013). The research provides support to the other findings in this area of the literature, while utilizing a different conceptual framework.

Pascarella et. al. (2014) studied the effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking during students' four years in college. The study used data from the Wabash National Study (WNS) of Liberal Arts Education. The WNS was a longitudinal pretest-posttest study. The WNS included undergraduates attending 17 four-year colleges and universities including 11 liberal arts colleges, three research universities, and three regional institutions. The present study included 949 students who completed both assessments.

The data provided additional support that exposure to diversity experiences contributes to cognitive development and critical thinking, which are both important student outcomes. Additionally, “The cognitive effect of diversity experiences appears to be sustained during 4 years of college and may even increase in magnitude over time” (Pascarella et. al., p. 90, 2014). The study also found as with other studies that diversity experiences may benefit White students more than students of color. Unlike the other studies, a nuanced finding emerged in this study. The researchers found that students with lower ACT scores seemed to benefit more from engagement and interactional diversity than their higher scoring peers.

Engberg’s (2004) meta-analysis examined four methods used by educators and institutions to reduce racial bias. Three of these methods related to this literature review included multicultural courses, diversity workshops and trainings, and peer-based interventions. The research itself was groundbreaking as there have been studies on each of the methods examined, but no study to create a framework to examine the overall quality of the efforts.

Engberg (2004) found that the majority of multicultural efforts around the curriculum were effective. Analyzing survey-based research showed evidence that supported the effectiveness within the context of higher education curriculum for ethnic and women’s studies courses and the cumulative effect on reducing racial bias, but noted that the results for diversity courses were less clear. The quasi-experimental research in this arena was problematic due to selection bias. The cumulative effect was unclear across race, gender, discipline, and class level groups.

The findings in the examinations of diversity workshops and trainings indicate benefits, yet differential effects among groups. Engberg (2004) found “White students tend to be most affected by workshop participation” (p. 491). Other racial groups tended to have smaller or non-significant effects. The differential effects among groups were difficult to measure because researchers often aggregate minorities into one group.

When examining peer interventions Engberg (2004) found “evidence points in the positive direction for the effectiveness of peer interventions to reduce racial bias” (p. 497). The research cautions against drawing conclusions as intergroup dialogues make up the majority of peer interventions. Additionally, the studies on peer interventions are heavily female, which provides little insight into differential gender effects. An important note is Engberg’s finding of threats to internal and external validity in many of the studies examined on peer interventions.

The research on multicultural courses, diversity workshops and trainings, and peer-based interventions had positive effects on bias reduction. Due to the limitations of the different methodologies utilized in each of the studies examined, Engberg (2004) concluded that no definitive assertions could be made regarding the effectiveness of multicultural courses, diversity workshops and trainings, and peer-based interventions.

Limitations in the Conversation on Campus Racial Climate

The literature presented illuminates the status of the conversations on campus racial climate and initiatives institutions are undertaking to address these issues. My critical examination of the literature reveals limitations and highlights pieces of the conversation on campus racial climates requiring further research and discussion. The areas in need of further research and discussion include: the methods utilized to research

students, the impact of hate/bias incidents on the persistence and retention of students of color, the pervasiveness of hate/bias incidents, and research on diversity workshops, trainings, and immersion/retreat experiences. The area of diversity workshops, trainings, and immersion/retreat experiences is especially sparse. Further research on the ways these experiences impact the ways students make meaning of race and racism, the students' understanding of campus racial climate, the impact on democracy and learning outcomes for students, and how these experiences prepare students for a diverse society would greatly enrich the conversation on campus racial climates.

Two approaches are most common in the literature on campus racial climate and diversity and social justice initiatives. The first approach, seen largely in earlier studies, examines students of color as a singular group and compares their experiences to White students. These studies have made important contributions to the conversation. However, increasingly research indicates that different racial groups experience campus racial climate differently. Grouping all non-White students together in research reduces the ability to gain insight into the specific experiences of different racial groups. The second approach, which includes recent studies, examines a particular racial group or examines each racial group in comparison to White students. Understanding the specific experiences of each racial group is critical for institutions as they plan diversity and social justice initiatives and attempt to address the components of campus climate outlined by Hurtado and associates (1998, 1999) and Hurtado et al., (2012).

Many of the studies mention or specifically examine hate/bias incidents or campus microaggressions, there is little conversation specifically examining how these incidents affect the retention and persistence of students of color. The research indicates

that these incidents can affect the social, academic, and adjustment of students to college. The research is lacking regarding how these incidents may affect the persistence and retention of students of color in our institutions of higher education. It is crucial that institutions understand this information to retain their students and to help them be successful.

Another missing piece of this scholarly conversation involves understanding the pervasiveness of hate/bias incidents and campus microaggressions, and their effects due to underreporting by students. Hate/bias incidents and campus microaggressions reported make up only a portion of the incidents that occur on campus. As Downey and Stage (1999) explain, “According to the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, victim non-reporting ranged from 80% to 94% at four different institutions” (p. 5). Truly understanding the extent and effects of hate crimes is challenging when a majority of incidents are not reported, but in order for the campus climate to change and interventions to be effective, institutions need this information.

There has been little conversation on the ways in which diversity workshops, trainings, and immersion experiences impact the campus racial climate. The research on these areas is limited especially with regard to diversity trainings and workshops. The literature that does exist examines smaller trainings and workshops, but does not address longer weekend experiences that exist on some campuses. Generally, the research indicates these interventions have potential to reduce bias. The lack of research on these interventions does not allow for conclusive assertions about the impact. Engberg (2004) noted that few specifics are known due to internal and external threats to validity of the studies reviewed which could be influencing the true effects of these interventions. There

is a need for discourse to understand the positive and negative effects of these experiences on campus racial climates.

Information on how these experiences influences the ways in which students make meaning of race and racism would help in understanding how students view campus racial climate before attending and after they complete these experiences. Longitudinal data would provide an additional piece of the conversation that would help further understand these experiences. The literature examines some of these experiences, but does not consider how these experiences can influence student's months after attending these types of experiences.

The recent emergence of democracy and learning outcomes is also an area where further conversation regarding diversity trainings, workshops, and retreats is required. Research has not explored democracy and learning outcomes in relation to these student experiences. The trainings, workshops, and retreats may have immediate or long term effects on these outcomes and preparing students for a diverse society that remain unknown. Additionally, they may affect how participating students experience and shape their campus racial climate after such experiences. Further investigation into these types of initiatives would be valuable additions to the conversation on campus racial climate and democracy and learning outcomes.

Research Questions

An increasingly global society demands that higher education prepare students for an increasingly diverse society. Colleges and universities have pursued a variety of methods to prepare their students for the challenges they will face. Though the literature addresses initiatives like diversity courses, curriculum and intergroup dialogues, the

literature on social justice retreats is scarce. This dissertation intends to address the following questions.

- How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus?
- How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice?
- How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action?

My research explores these questions through a specific initiative; the Social Justice Leadership Retreat conducted annually at a large Midwest public institution.

Students attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat and participating in the research wrote a guided autobiography of how they make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate prior to attending the retreat. I did observations of the students at the retreat. Utilizing the information from the autobiographies and my observations, I developed interview questions. The interviews focus on how students conceptualize race, racism, campus racial climate, preparation for being a part of a diverse society, and any social justice actions or motivation for these actions that students have taken following the retreat. Following the individual interviews, I conducted a focus group to understand how students conceptualize race, racism, campus racial climate, preparation for being a part of a diverse society, and any social justice actions or motivation for these actions that students have taken following the retreat and individual interview. I outline these processes in the following methodology chapter.

Chapter 3: Methodology

My dissertation endeavored to understand a case study of a Social Justice Leadership Retreat (SJLR) that took place at a Midwestern college in the winter of 2013, and how it impacted students who attended the SJLR. Examination of this experience involved development of a means to study this phenomenon, and the students who attend. In this chapter, I provide background information on the Social Justice Leadership Retreat and outline the research questions I addressed in my study. Next, I provide the research paradigm that guided the research I undertook. I then bound the study and provide details about the students, institution, the retreat, and the process. Subsequently, I outline the means through which I collected and analyzed the data. Finally, I demonstrate the methods I utilized in establishing trustworthiness.

Background and Research Questions

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat was a weekend-long immersion experience for students. During the winter of 2013 retreat weekend, students learned about power, privilege, and oppression through a variety of activities. One of the more important experiences was students' construction of their life-maps. This experience facilitated students' discussion of their personal stories as they relate to power, privilege, and oppression. My research grew out of the work I completed when I helped develop the Social Justice Leadership Retreat, and co-led the retreats for five years during my studies at the University. During that time, I witnessed many learning moments and transformative experiences for students. I also started my PhD program around that time. Throughout my program, I looked for research on retreat type experiences like the Social

Justice Leadership Retreat to understand the experiences and learning that occurred for students engaged in these experiences.

As I looked for previous research, I discovered several things. First, only limited research had been completed on weekend long social justice immersion experiences. Second, there was a lack of research that explored the experience, learning, and development of students attending these experiences. Therefore, I wanted to look at how students made meaning of their experience at the retreat and how their experiences influenced them after the retreat was over. I have specific interest in race, campus racial climate, and students' capacity for leadership and democratic action. My interest in these topics goes back to the story I shared at the beginning of my dissertation, and making my first friends of color. Since those first meetings, I have been actively working to learn about the experiences of people of color and continue to unlearn the misinformation I taught to me by society about people of color. I also feel compelled to educate others and help them unlearn the same misinformation. The research questions I address in my study include:

- 1. How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus?*
- 2. How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice?*
- 3. How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action?*

In order to address these research questions, I needed to determine an appropriate research design. After examining many different possibilities, I chose to proceed with qualitative research and a research design of a phenomenological case study of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. In the next parts of this dissertation, I outline the research paradigm, discuss the boundaries of the study, describe my data collection and analysis, articulate my role as a researcher, and propose processes for establishing trustworthiness of the findings.

Research Paradigm

Qualitative Approach. The methodological approach utilized in the research is qualitative. Qualitative research is inquiry that helps to understand a social phenomenon in its natural setting (Creswell, 2003; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Vidich & Lyman, 1994). The research examines individuals interacting with their environments and how they construct meaning of that experience. Merriam notes that qualitative researchers “are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world” (p. 6). The following synthesizes some of the important characteristics of qualitative research from various researchers.

1. Qualitative research occurs in a natural setting where the human behaviors or events being studied occur (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Vidich & Lyman, 1994).
2. The focus of qualitative research is the participants’ perceptions of their own perceptions and experiences, and how they make meaning of these within

their lives (Creswell; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Vidich & Lyman, 1994).

3. Qualitative research employs an emergent strategy rather than testing existing theory. Meanings, concepts, and interpretations are negotiated with the participants involved in the study (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Vidich & Lyman, 1994).
4. The researcher is the primary instrument in collecting data and analyzing the data instead of another instrument (inventory, computer, or questionnaire) (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Vidich & Lyman, 1994).
5. Qualitative methods differ from quantitative designs in that theories and hypothesis are not established before engaging in the research. Rather they are constructed during the research process (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998).
6. Descriptive data (words, pictures, etc.) emerge from a qualitative study as opposed to numerical data (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998).
7. Qualitative research focuses on processes, and not necessarily on the outcome. Researchers are interested in understanding how things occur (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998).
8. Criteria for evaluating qualitative and quantitative data differ. The researcher in a qualitative study seeks trustworthiness and verification of their work rather than traditional validity and reliability as is used in quantitative analysis (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998).

My dissertation proposal and completion utilized a constructionist paradigm that guided the interpretations made regarding the meaning-making of the participants around race, racism, and campus racial climate. The assumption of the paradigm is that reality is not discovered, but that it is constructed and shaped by the individuals interacting with the world (Creswell, 2003; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). Broido and Manning (2002) outline four common themes that shape the constructionist paradigm,

1. The researcher-respondent relationship is subjective, interactive, and interdependent.
2. Reality is multiple, complex, and not easily quantifiable.
3. The values of the researcher, respondents, research site, and underlying theory cannot help but undergird all aspects of the research.
4. The research product (e.g., interpretations) is context specific (p. 436).

Phenomenology. My research design was developed as a phenomenological case study. Phenomenology began as a philosophical movement founded by Edmund Husserl (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Phenomenology examines the “essence” of the self’s experience as it relates to a phenomenon as described by the participants (Creswell, 2003; Gall, Gall, & Borg). Psychologists have since created a set of processes and procedures for planning and conducting phenomenological investigations, which include the following steps:

- *Identify a topic of personal and social significance.* The researcher should determine a subject that is compelling for them emotionally and on an intellectual level. This is important, as data will be collected as the researcher and participants experience with the phenomenon.

- *Select and engage appropriate participants.* In phenomenological research, the participants become a part of the research process. During the research, the researcher checks in with the participants who help process and make meaning of the data by adding or eliminating aspects of the data.
- *Interview each participant.* At least one longer interview is done with each participant in order to gain as much information about the phenomenon and their experience as possible. Interviews tend to be unstructured, so that the researcher is able to capture as much of the experience as possible.
- *Analyze interview data.* Data collected during interviews and observations are broken into themes, and the researcher attempts to make meaning of the themes that come through from participants. Participants are involved in this process through validating accounts, or providing clarification to the researcher on their experiences (Gall, Gall, & Borg).

The central phenomenon in my study was the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. To understand this phenomenon, I used a case study approach.

Case studies generally help produce detailed descriptions, develop possible explanations, or evaluate a phenomenon. Case studies allow the researcher to explore an event or program. A key aspect of a case is that it is bounded by time and activity (Creswell 2003; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003; Merriam, 1998). If there are no ends or boundaries on the activity or on the number of people interviewed, it is not a case (Merriam). Case studies also utilize multiple methods (Merriam). Further, Merriam outlines three features that help define a case study, which include:

- *Particularistic.* Cases focus on a specific phenomenon or event.

- *Descriptive.* Case studies provide thick and rich data as a result of the investigation.
- *Heuristic.* A case study can increase how the reader understands the phenomenon that is being studied in the case.

Bounding the Study

Setting. I conducted the study on the campus of a large public institution in the Midwest. The institution is located in one of the largest metropolitan cities in the Midwest. The metropolitan area in which this institution is located contains the majority of the states' population. The metropolitan area is the most racially diverse area within the state, a diversity that has been increasing over the last ten years. The institution enrolls approximately 50,000 students on the campus in which I conducted the study. The institution is located near the heart of the city, and that provides access to a wide array of ways for students to interact with different racial identities. The institution also espouses diversity within its mission statement, and across campus does a great deal of work to foster social justice, inclusion, and diversity in academics, student affairs, and programs on campus.

Participants. The participants of this study included students who applied and were accepted to attend the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. On the application, students are asked to identify any experiences they had had with social justice education and any stories about their identities they would like to share, what they hope to gain from the experience, and organizations they are involved with on campus. Students were not specifically asked about their social identities for several reasons. First, there was concern about how students might perceive many personal questions about their identity,

and whether that would dissuade them from wanting to participate. Second there was concern about the perception from applicants about what retreat organizers would do with that information: specifically would their participation affect their being accepted into the retreat. The organizers decided therefore to leave the questions open-ended and hope that students would share some stories or information about their identities, or that information gleaned from leadership and organizations with which students were involved as the facilitation team examined the applicants for individuals they knew. Students on each of the retreats I worked with represented themselves with a variety of different social identities.

The organizers used a variety of different recruitment efforts to encourage students to attend across campus. Past participants and facilitators nominated people formally, and those individuals received a personalized invitation to apply. Additionally, past participants and facilitators hung fliers in their offices and spread word of the retreat to students and colleagues with whom they worked. The sponsors of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat included the Vice President of Student Affairs, the Associate Vice President of Auxiliary Services, Housing and Residential Life, and several student services offices on campus. Advertisements were sent to each of these offices encouraging students to attend the retreat. The retreat organizers also put on several information sessions to talk about the retreat in locations around campus including the cultural centers, and Gay Lesbian Bisexual Transgender Programs Office. Throughout the years, the retreat also formed some good working relationships with some departments on campus, particularly the Family and Social Sciences program. The program had sent many of their undergraduate and graduate students to the retreat over

the years and did a lot of advertising for the program in the courses and through their list serves.

During the period of time I co-coordinated the retreat (2004-2009), I worked with the data gathered from student applications. The data from the retreats offered during this time are in Appendix A with the exception of the year in school for the January 2006 retreat, which I was not able to find in my records, and thus was unable to obtain.

Between 2004-2009, 443 students attended the retreat. Participation in the retreats ranged between 40 and 70 students. As documented in Appendix A, all of the retreats were predominantly female in attendance. Only 99 of the students who attended were male, while 344 who identified as female. There was an even mix of students at different points of their academic careers at each of the retreats. Overall, 105 first year students, 77 sophomores, 90 juniors, 78 seniors, and 24 graduate students attended the retreats between 2004-2009 (with the exception of Jan. 2006, which I was not able to find). A majority of students attending the retreats (372) had majors in the Liberal Arts, Social Sciences, Arts, Humanities, and/or Education. Fifty of the students majored in the physical sciences, and 24 were graduate students in various fields.

The details of the participants attending the particular retreat I studied (2013) were provided to me once the coordinators of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat had received participant applications. I used a purposeful sampling technique to select the participants for interviews and the focus group, based on criteria from their applications, autobiographies, and my observations while at the retreat. I intended to have equal numbers of students of color and White students as a part of the study: my dissertation topic was focused on race, so I wanted to have an even mix to allow me to gain insight

into the experiences of both White and non-White students. I utilized the information in their autobiographies to determine their race. The retreat application asks for information on gender, academic major, leadership involvement on campus, and academic year. I examined all of the data in the applications to provide as much of a balanced mixture of students in these areas as is possible with race being the criteria with the greatest emphasis. I detail the participant make-up of my study in Chapter 4.

Social Justice Leadership Retreat. The Social Justice Leadership Retreat studied for this dissertation is a three-day immersion experience for students that takes place at a camp in a rural part of the state approximately 90 minutes from campus. The Social Justice Leadership Retreat has its roots in the Colorado State University “Multicultural Leadership Retreat” and The University of Vermont’s, “The Next Step” program. The retreats in each of these locations as well as the current study began as a means to give students a forum to discuss issues of social justice on campuses where a need for students to be able to discuss these issues existed. The other co-founder of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat brought the knowledge of the CSU retreat with him as well as “The Next Step” retreat he helped to start at The University of Vermont. Together, we used the knowledge that he brought as well as my own, to develop the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. According to the materials from the retreat,

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat is designed to help educate students about the concepts of social justice and community leadership through exploration of their own stories, the stories of others, explore issues of oppression and privilege, develop contacts and support networks across campus, and develop skills to be an ally to many different groups.

Through exposure to theory and extensive experiential learning situations, students will:

- Gain new knowledge around social justice issues
- Sharpen their skills of self-awareness
- Learn how to integrate what they gain from the retreat into their lives and into the lives of others (Social Justice Leadership Retreat, Participant Packet).

As discussed earlier, it is important in a phenomenological case study to have an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon studied. Therefore, I included a program overview in Appendix B and a description of the activities in Appendix C.

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat draws upon a variety of sources in the development of the activities that occur throughout the weekend. Adams, Bell, and Griffin's book *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* (2007) provides much of the theoretical underpinnings of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. The framework for the Social Justice Leadership Retreat includes concepts like social justice, oppression, individual and group identities, definitions, and privilege, as drawn from Adams, Bell, and Griffin (2007). Additionally, concepts such as the social oppression matrix, systemic oppression, and social and cognitive identity theory also come largely from the work of those authors.

The facilitators for the Social Justice Leadership Retreat participate in a competitive selection process during which they express their expectations and responsibilities. Facilitators who cannot adhere to these expectations and responsibilities are not accepted. Facilitators for the retreat included a faculty or staff member paired with a student who had previously attended the retreat as a participant. Facilitators were

required to attend three meetings, during which the facilitation team got to know each other, walked through activities, and practiced their facilitation skills.

Process. The case I studied was bounded by guided reflection with participants before the retreat, observations of the retreat, an interview following their participation in the Social Justice Leadership Retreat, and a focus group three months after the retreat. Students develop, change and grow over time (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). As a result, it is effective to collect data from students at more than one point in time, a method often referred to as a longitudinal approach. Longitudinal research allows for systemic analysis of how students grow and develop by examining the data collected at different points in time. I planned to gain insight into how such experiences promote growth by studying the changes made by the students and how they believed the experiences influenced them.

I developed the questions for the guided autobiographies following examination of the literature on campus racial climate and social justice and diversity initiatives, and guided by the model of intercultural maturity developed by King and Baxter Magolda (2005). The guided autobiography questions are in Appendix D. Karyn McKinney (2005) inspired the idea of the autobiography portion of the study from reading the book *Being White: Stories of Race and Racism*. The questions asked in the autobiography section arose from my critically consideration of the literature, exercises I have done in trainings with students, and thinking about the intercultural maturity model. The goal of these questions was to help identify a baseline of how the students viewed their own racial identity and what they recalled of their first memories of race, before engaging and exploring these topics more in depth as a part of the retreat. Additionally, I explored how

they viewed racism and the campus racial climate on their campus. The responses from the autobiography provided initial insight into the developmental states of the students with regard to their intercultural maturity. The autobiography provided valuable information as I further developed the interview and focus group questions.

The individual interview questions based on an examination of the literature, and reflection on the intercultural maturity model are in Appendix D. The interview questions focused on gathering additional information from the students on how they make meaning of their race, racism, and the campus climate. Additionally, the questions began to probe further about leadership and democracy beliefs, and behaviors relating to social justice. I also began to examine how the students have taken action with regard to social justice prior to the retreat.

I conducted the focus group interview approximately three months (late April, 2013) following the retreat. Questions addressed to the focus group probed how students understood and made meaning of race, racism, campus racial climate, leadership and democracy beliefs during the three months after attending the retreat, and specifically if there had been any development in regards to their leadership and democracy beliefs, behaviors, or actions. Further, questions addressed to the focus group examined what specific actions students took in regards to social justice action and leadership on their campus. The focus group questions are in Appendix D.

Compensation. Throughout this process, I provided compensation for the students who participated in the study. Students participating in the interview received a \$25.00 gift card from the university bookstore. Students who participated in the focus groups received pizza and snacks during the participation.

Role of researcher. In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the primary data collector. Researchers possess personal values, assumptions, and biases. As the researcher, I needed to address my values, assumptions, and biases at the onset of the study. I am not sure that I believe that it is possible to be totally objective, and think that it is important to try to provide balance through focus on the perceptions and perspectives of those participating in the study. My biases, assumptions, and values shape my understanding and the views I bring to interpreting the data I collect from students. My experiences attending college and working in higher education have shaped my perceptions of campus racial climate and diversity and social justice initiatives. I have worked as a college administrator for ten years. I have worked at two Doctor Granting institutions in the Midwest. The first had an enrollment of approximately 70, 000 students, and approximately 50,000 on the campus in which I worked, and I served in the role of a Residence Hall Director. The second has approximately 30,000 students, and I serve in the role of Area Coordinator. Both roles have allowed me the opportunity to work closely with students in their experience outside of the classroom. During this time, I gained insight into the campus racial climate on both campuses. I would describe both campuses as actively working to improve the campus climate, but both needing to do some work to make it better. I have also had a high level of involvement in developing diversity and social justice initiatives to improve campus climate on both campuses. Developing programs and experiences to help students develop their knowledge, awareness, and skills for diversity and social justice is something for which I have great personal passion.

In particular, I helped to start the Social Justice Leadership Retreat on one of these campuses. As a co-founder, I helped to develop the curriculum and experiences for the students attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. I was intimately involved in marketing the retreat, selecting participants, selecting facilitators, co-facilitating the retreat and the follow up after the retreat. Even though I no longer work at the institution where the retreat occurred, I have strong ties to the ongoing retreat events. I would describe the retreat as a positive experience where students grew, learned, and developed with each other.

I believe that my detailed knowledge of the Social Justice Leadership Retreat provided context and understanding to the student experience at the retreat, allowing me to study that experience in depth. In each of my experiences, I was in the role of co-leader of the retreat and responsible for details and scheduling. During my dissertation research, I observed the entire process of the retreat, a qualitative difference in my level of participation that I believe allowed me to view the experience from a fresh perspective that I had not experienced before, and allowed me to focus on the participants. The observations allowed me to pay closer attention to the comments, interactions, and non-verbal communications that the participants demonstrated. Attention to those details was a surprising experience for me in that I recognize that I probably missed a lot in my earlier experiences by not being able to focus on how the students experienced the retreat.

It is also important to note and understand that my presence at the retreat could have a multitude of effects. My hope was to use my observer role to help to build some rapport with the participants I am studied. Greater rapport allowed for a deeper connection and level of comfort with me as the researcher, and more sharing about

experiences for the participants. I was aware that my presence could also have had some negative effects on the other participants at the retreat. They could be less willing to share information in front of me, and might worry about what I wrote down, or what I thought at particular times during the retreat. None of the participants explicitly demonstrated or shared negative impacts from my observing them during the interview or focus group interview.

Data Collection and Analysis

I collected data between December 2012 and May 2013. This included review of the autobiographies, my observations while at the retreat, an hour interview in the month following the retreat, and interviews with a focus group three months after the retreat. Additionally, I reviewed retreat materials, and I kept a notebook of my thoughts, impressions, and feelings during those experiences. I made entries after each of the activities of initial thoughts, impressions, and feelings, and included a deeper reflection at the end of each day. The brief entries enabled me to capture major thoughts and ideas, since there was not a lot of down time between activities.

Throughout each of these processes, I examined responses to questions and observations through the lens of my research questions. Each of the questions in the guided autobiography, individual interview questions, and focus group interview specifically related back to one of my research questions. Connecting the questions in this way allowed me to connect the questions to my data. Once I grouped the information by research question, I was able to sort and look for themes that emerged that provided answers to my research questions. I also looked through the responses to each of the research questions with regard to my conceptual framework, which provided

further insight into student development. I also looked at the responses through the lens of racial identity of the participants. I wanted to understand the experiences of both White students and students of color to understand how they were similar and how they differed. Lastly, I looked through the data for any other themes that emerged that did not relate directly to any of these areas. I will now outline each of these data collection points in more detail.

The first piece of data came from guided questions that students accepted to attend the retreat needed to reflect upon, and write responses to before they attended the retreat. A consent form attached to the questions is in Appendix D. The form let the students know about the study, and about the questions asked in the guided autobiography. Since the retreat focused on all areas of social justice, I informed the participants that race is only one of many topics discussed at the retreat, but would be the primary focus of my study. I felt this was important so as to not raise the issue too much with them prior to the retreat. I did not want to influence the topic of race becoming the focus of conversation, since that is not the total focus of the retreat. I used my prior retreat experience to watch for this during my observations, so that if appropriate, I could make a note.

The guided autobiography questions that students completed are included in Appendix D. Specifically, I asked students about how they make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate. I reviewed the data submitted by the students. As I read the responses, I looked for common themes and emerging topics. I organized these themes and topics into categories and codes that captured and described the data from the participants. Additionally, I examined the themes and topics that emerged through the

lens of intercultural maturity. Through the students' responses and my derived themes, I tried to gain a deeper understanding of the initial developmental level of the students prior to participating in the retreat experience. I gained information that was helpful in guiding my observations as well as further development of the interview and focus group questions.

After I collected the guided autobiographies, I attended and observed the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. I was forthright with the participants of the retreat that I was doing research on the Social Justice Leadership Retreat to further understand issues of campus racial climate, racism, how students made meaning of race, impact on leadership, and social justice related actions. I felt it was important to share this with the participants of the retreat; I felt not telling them would be distracting to the learning of the retreat, and potentially make participants feel less comfortable sharing information throughout the weekend.

As I observed the students who were participating in the study, I thought about the information I gained through their autobiography questions done prior to the retreat. Thinking about those questions helped me develop the questions I thought about while I observed the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. Broadly speaking, I watched for ways in which their beliefs about race were challenged, insights they made about their own racial identities, any new ways they were thinking about race, racism, or campus climate. During the ally and caucus portion of the retreat, I paid specific attention to the identity caucus groups they joined and their interest in taking action on these different topics when they returned to campus. I also created maps to help track observations during the activities as much as possible. The maps, questions, and notes were tools utilized during

the observations, and I left space to record my thoughts and reactions to the activities (Merriam, 1998).

Through my observations, I looked for further context into their written responses as well as for learning moments that occurred to them during the retreat. During the retreat, I kept field notes on the different behaviors and interactions that I observed. At the end of each day, I reflected on what I observed that day at the retreat. I developed an observation sheet to note contributions, and took notes on contributions that participants made during the activities. During the actual retreat, there was not a lot of free time, and not a lot of time between activities, and at the end of most days the participants were usually tired, so I chose not to ask them to do additional reflections during the retreat weekend.

After the retreat, I did a thorough review of my field notes and observations. I looked for themes and patterns that emerged from the observations in order to create categories to organize the observations. The literature and the intercultural maturity model helped to guide the organization of this data. I compared and contrasted these observations with the data that I gathered in the autobiography process. As I reviewed the data during the ongoing process, I was able to adjust my categories as necessary. The observations provided some context into the autobiography responses, and provided some insight into the ways students constructed meaning around race as well as their level of intercultural maturity along each of the dimensions. Utilizing the data from the autobiographies and observations, I worked on creating the interview questions that occurred a month after the retreat was completed.

The next piece of data collected was an interview with the participants. The interview was one-hour and was conducted face-to-face with the participants. I invited each student who completed the autobiography for a face-to-face interview. The interview questions developed as I reviewed the autobiographies and my retreat observations. The interview questions discussed democracy and leadership beliefs, and social justice oriented actions that the student had engaged with prior the retreat. I recorded the interviews, and transcribed the recordings verbatim. Additionally, I took notes during the interviews and typed those out as a supplement to the transcriptions. Upon completion of the transcription and notes, I asked participants to review the document, and provide any feedback on whether the document captures their experience, and to provide any additional or thoughts about their interview responses.

I analyzed the data from the interview, completing a thorough review looking for emergent patterns and themes (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998). Derived themes were then coded and organized into categories. The literature and the intercultural maturity model guided the organization and analysis of the interviews. I examined the data for any additional or new themes, and used the coding previously done to categorize the data. I then compared the categories with others that emerged during the previous portions of the research. Comparison further enhanced data collected up to that point in the research. Additionally, I gained further insight into the developmental level of the participants, and changes that occurred. I then compared the data and analyzed the findings. I used this information to enhance or adjust the questions that I developed for the focus groups.

Three months after the Social Justice Leadership Retreat, I conducted a face-to-face focus group with the students that I had previously interviewed on campus. The

focus group lasted approximately an hour and a half. During the focus group, I asked students some semi-structured, reflective questions. The focus group questions are in Appendix D. I adjusted the questions for the focus group based on analysis of the autobiographies, observations, and particularly the interviews I conducted, eventually asking eight questions (Merriam, 1998). Questions assessed the impact of the retreat on student development, democracy and leadership beliefs as well as social justice. I recorded the focus group and took notes; I transcribed each recording verbatim. After the transcriptions were completed, I gave students the transcription to ensure accuracy of their contributions, and to provide thoughts or feedback they had upon reviewing the transcriptions.

I selected using a focus group to gauge responses rather than additional individual interviews for several reasons. First, focus groups often generate interactions among the participants that encourage participants to share feelings, thoughts, or beliefs they might not share or think about on their own, and can be a valuable source of data (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). I believed the focus group had the potential to provide rich information that I would not be able to capture in a one on one interview. The interactions that the participants had with each other offered additional evidence of developmental changes in their intercultural maturity that would be more difficult to ascertain in an individual interview. Additionally, information about social justice beliefs, democracy and leadership outcomes, and action-oriented behavior may be shared more openly. The focus group provided an opportunity for me to gather information, and watch the students interact.

The research conducted for this study created a large amount of data. I utilized excel, note sheets, and post it notes to help me organize, categorize, and make meaning of the data. I looked at the data in a variety of ways. I examined it holistically to understand the impact of the Social Justice Leadership retreat on the research questions posed. Throughout my review of the data, I utilized the intercultural maturity model as a guide to understanding the development of the students. The model served as a helpful lens in understanding how the students are making meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate as it pertains to their development and interactions with the campus environment. Additionally, developmental movement because of the retreat may be an indicator of how the retreat can impact meaning making, but also students' social justice beliefs, democracy and leadership outcomes, and action-oriented behavior. I believe that utilization of the model as a lens helped me to understand the students' developmental level prior to and during the retreat, while providing the vehicle to ascertain if the students experienced development in any of the dimensions. Additionally, I reviewed the research by race to understand similarities and differences that may exist for White students and for students of color.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Qualitative research differs from quantitative research in that it utilizes different methods and criteria for establishing the trustworthiness of the data. Quantitative research focuses on internal and external validity and is a more rigid means of establishing authenticity of the data studied. Phenomenological research focuses on the participants' own interpretation of their experiences, and, as a researcher, I employed a variety of techniques to ensure the trustworthiness of the data that were gathered. I

utilized member-checking, triangulation of data, peer examination, reflections on researcher bias, observation, thick and rich description to establish trustworthiness.

Member checking, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), is “the most crucial technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314). Through the member checking process, the participants receive the data and become part of the research process. Participants confirm the information and data the researcher is gathering (Creswell, 2003). Furthermore, participants are also able to add to the credibility of the research by having a chance to react to the data and the final narrative and have that reaction incorporated into the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). I asked each of my participants to review the data from their interviews, the observations, and the focus groups I made from the Social Justice Leadership Retreat for accuracy. Throughout each of these review periods, I incorporated new information and data from the participants.

Triangulation of data assisted in checking for accuracy. Triangulation of the data means that I examined data collected from multiple sources. In this research, sources included autobiographical reflections, individual interviews, focus group discussions, and observations. Triangulation permits sorting the data in a way that allows common themes to emerge. There are four types of triangulation that were identified by Denzin (1978) which include cross-checking results across data sources, theories, methods, and among different investigators. I looked for emerging themes from the written autobiographies, interview, focus group, and the observations I took while on the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. Then, I crosschecked each of these different pieces of data additional themes and commonalities.

Another method of checking for trustworthiness included having my work reviewed by a peer examiner. A peer examiner is someone who is familiar with the phenomenon studied. The peer examiner plays many roles, which include support, challenging researchers' assumptions, encouraging methodological next steps, and asking difficult questions about methods and interpretations that made during the process of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell, 2003). I identified someone who had facilitated the Social Justice Leadership Retreat before and currently works within higher education to be a peer reviewer.

The next method is observation of the phenomenon. Observation of the phenomenon allows the researcher to build rapport with the participants of the study; rapport allows participants to feel more comfortable sharing information and providing feedback (Creswell & Miller 2000). Additionally, observations allow the researcher to compare data collected during interviews and their observations. I observed the Social Justice Leadership Retreat and gathered data about the experience as a whole, but paid particular attention to the participants I interviewed.

As outlined earlier, I self-disclosed to the participants important biases, beliefs, and assumptions that I brought to the study. As Creswell and Miller (2000) note,

It is particularly important for researchers to acknowledge and describe their entering beliefs and biases early in the research process to allow readers to understand their positions, and then to bracket or suspend those researcher biases as the study proceeds (p. 127).

I disclosed information about myself to participants in the interview process, focus groups, and during my observations at the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. I kept a

journal during my research, which helped me to be aware of possible perceptions and biases that came up during my research.

Chapter 4 Results

The longitudinal data collected for this phenomenological case study included four collection points. The first data set was a pre-retreat autobiography, which students completed a month prior to attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat (henceforth SJLR). The second included observations of the activities of the entire group during the SJLR. One month following the retreat, I conducted individual interviews with the students, using questions developed from the pre-retreat autobiography and observations at the retreat. Lastly, I conducted a focus group interview three months after the retreat. Data from the previous three collection points drove the development of the focus group interview questions.

The design of the study allowed me to examine students' thoughts and perceptions of race, racism, and campus racial climate over time. The pre-retreat autobiography provided an initial understanding of their views prior to attending the SJLR. The individual and focus group interviews offered the opportunity to study the ongoing development of these views. Further, the data showed how attending the SJLR influenced students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action as well as their behavior as it relates to social justice action. After discussing students' participation in the study, I describe my findings in four sections below, which correspond with the research questions in the study.

Participation

Twelve students completed the pre-retreat autobiographies and agreed to participate in the study, including observation at the retreat. Eight student participants identified themselves as White or Caucasian, one participant identified herself as Asian,

one “Black, specifically African from Libya”, one as Latina and White, and the last as Black and Latina. Eleven of the twelve participants identified as female and one as male.

Table 1 lists specific Information on each student.

Pseudonym*	Gender	Year in School	Racial Identity (self- identified)	Major
Brad	M	Sophomore	White	Sociology
Angie	F	Sophomore	Black African	Neuroscience
Mandy	F	First Year	White	Undecided
Carrie	F	Junior	White	Family Social Science
Vivian	F	First Year	White/Latina	Undecided (Business)
Susan	F	First Year	White	French & History
Mildred	F	Junior	Asian	Nutrition
Becky	F	First Year	White	Biomedical
Ellen	F	First Year	Black/Latina	Spanish Studies
Rose	F	Senior	White	Biology, Society and Environment
Sophia	F	Senior	White	Kinesiology
Joy	F	Senior	White	Social Justice, Global Studies, Family Social Science

*Each participant was issued a pseudonym to protect their anonymity

During the three to four weeks following the retreat, I conducted individual interviews with ten of the original twelve participants. Two of the participants left the study. One participant (Mildred) dropped out of the study citing lack of time, and the other (Angie) did not respond to my communications setting up her individual interview. Mildred and Angie identified as students of color.

I conducted focus group interviews three months after the retreat had taken place. Six out of the ten students who previously interviewed were present for the focus group interview: Brad, Mandy, Susan, Becky, Rose, and Sophia. These six students all identified themselves as White. Four students did not attend the focus group: Joy, Ellen, Carrie, and Vivian. Joy failed to respond to communications about the focus group interviews. Ellen and Carrie were unable to attend the time of the focus group interview.

Vivian had something come up at the last minute that prevented her from attending. I made multiple attempts to schedule an alternate time for a second focus group with Vivian, Ellen, and Carrie, but was unable to find a time when the students could attend a second focus group. I suspect that the proximity to the end of the semester made scheduling difficult for the students.

Making Meaning of Race, Racism, and Campus Racial Climate

The first research question focused on: How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus? The question was intended to discover if the SJLR affected the way the participants made meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate, and how if at all that changed over time. I made initial assessments of the way the students made meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate by analyzing the guided autobiographies, and then again following the retreat with the individual and focus group interviews. It is important to understand the cognitive changes students experienced for two reasons. First, cognitive development and thinking that is more complex indicate growth in intercultural maturity and demonstrate learning (Bowman, 2010; 2010a; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2012; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Growth in intercultural maturity and learning connect to learning outcomes for students (Bowman, 2010; 2010a; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2012; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Below I detail the themes that emerged around how the students made meaning of each of these areas.

Race. Race was a topic explored through a specific question in each portion of the research process. I asked the participants in both the guided autobiography and the

individual interview what it meant for them to be the race with which they identified. During the focus group interview, I asked the participants how their views of race, racism, and campus climate had changed since the retreat. Table 2 lists participant responses to these questions as a means of analysis, and a demonstration of development with regards to intercultural maturity that was observed in the participants who completed the study.

Table 3
Student Descriptions of How They Make Meaning of Race
 (Note: Only students completing both Guided Autobiography and Interview Included)

Name	Guided Autobiography	Individual Interview	Focus Group
Brad	Race is a socially constructed identity based on one's skin color. Race is also the result of a belief in perceived biological differences between people of different skin colors. I identify as white, or Caucasian.	You're white. You are privileged. Everything that you've accomplished or earned, or worked hard for is now going through a re-evaluation. Why did I get that? Who did not get it and why? I think from SJLR I learned to question. Even on the street...if I see someone who does not appear as the same race as me I say to myself, 'This is an interracial interaction. How am I going to act?' If a person of color is coming this way, and I am going the other, how am I going to act? I am very conscious of my actions because I know from some of my classes that people of color can also be conscious of the way they are perceived by other people. So, I personally don't ever want to be in a position where I put them in a position where they think I belittle them because as a white person. I have that privilege and power to just kind of throw history at them like white people are better, and I don't want to do that, and so, I am very cognizant. Do I smile? Do I not smile? Do I make eye contact? Do I not make eye contact? Do I move over? Do I move closer? Do I go slower, or do I pick up the speed? What do I do?	I didn't realize at the beginning of the semester how many conversations we were going to have about certain issues surrounding race, to be specific racism, and so really helping students understand where their privilege is coming from has been a really rewarding experience.
Mandy	Race means a biological background that gives one certain traits. These traits are unique to a race that is how they can be categorized. I think of myself as white.	I identify as a white Caucasian and I think that the retreat did not change the fact that I am White, but it did make me more aware of the fact, and that being White means things that I was unaware of before attending the retreat.	It has really raised my awareness. I have been paying attention to how well represented different races are in textbooks and advertisements, and thinking about what that means.
Carrie	I feel that race directly relates to	I recognize that that I have more privilege in our	

	<p>your ethnic background, but also is a matter of what you physically look like. I would consider myself white, although I wish I knew more about my family history and where they come from - however due to numerous adoptions and unknown parentage I do not know my family heritage or my ethnicity.</p>	<p>society. It frustrates me, but it also I've learned to not just focus on feeling guilty, but more so kind of helping other people who are in similar situations to myself. This includes white working to middle class that just become aware of their white privilege, and how it can work to our advantage and not so much for people of color.</p>	
Vivian	<p>Race is a group of people that are connected through history, traditions, family lines, culture and many other determining factors. Race is an identifier but not a definer (which our culture tends to make it). I identify myself as Latina, but I am also "white".</p>	<p>I feel like that can be a hard question because there are so many definitions of it and it is so personal and unique to each person. Personally, I identify myself as Latina and white, so Latina on my mom's side; German, Irish, and Swedish on my dad's side. It is something interesting because when someone asks what my ethnicity is automatically I say Latina. I don't say Latina and white and I think part of that for me is that white is normal that is the norm, and so Latina that is what I identify with cause that is something different and a culture that I gravitate toward more cause the culture of my German, Irish, and Swedish heritage is the American culture that everyone has, and the proven culture I grew up with is the one I gravitate toward.</p>	
Susan	<p>I guess race to me is a human-constructed concept around which many decisions are made. Sadly, race often contributes to the types of treatment various people receive, even though biologically we are the same. It is just a color of skin that seems to mean much more than it should.</p>	<p>It means privilege; it means I think having a much easier time in this country. I also think it means I don't have the experiences that minorities have had especially African Americans, Asian Americans, and I work at a school where I hear a lot of stories that don't apply to me at all because I don't have that life, so it is really interesting. White privilege is how I view that.</p>	<p>Awareness, I have noticed it more in my text books and videos we watch for class, I am very aware of when was this made, what was the predominant race used in this, and I try to pay more attention to advertisements, I see now and stuff like our student guides, I try to pay attention to that.</p>

Becky	Race to me means the nationality you personally identify with. Typically associated with the color of your skin, it truly goes past that, and represents your heritage. I identify racially as Caucasian, because my skin is white, and because that's how I was raised.	I think the first thing that pops into mind is white privilege, which I definitely recognize. I see that and it sucks that it is there, and the privilege part is not always bad for me, but it is not a good thing.	I think that since going there I was not super aware of the difference in the ratio and stuff and how some groups are a minority. After going to the retreat I think I have become more aware of the actual ratio. There are fewer minorities than I thought. I think my awareness has changed.
Ellen	I identify as Afro-Latina. My mother is of Latina descent and my father is African American. Race, while a social construct, is a marker by which other people perceive me and treat me based off of. It is also intertwined with my culture as Latina and thus a defining characteristic of who I am as an individual and community member.	Means that I have African ancestry, and I am connected to African history, but also share that same ancestry with Latina, and I also share the Mexican language and both are native to my family.	
Rose	Well we are the human race and we wouldn't be able to interbreed if we were different races. This thought process has of course been shaped by my university education. I identify as white but find there to be blurred lines between how people define race and ethnicity.	Before coming to college it did not really mean anything, I just did not really think of it. Now that I have learned of these concepts, I understand white privilege.	I guess before I was an advocate, well, I guess I still am, but I talked about it and was learning about it, but I have made more of a shift into being an activist more so, and as a CA trying to provide these spaces where we can talk about these issues and doing instead of talking one on one or reading about it. I've also tried to figure out what it means to be white more myself.
Sophia	I identify as a white female. Race to me is just another box on the survey.	I don't know it's not something I really thought about all that often before the retreat. I mean race is something that from your time as a small child you begin to notice it so it's definitely something I notice particularly when I am in environments with people who are a majority of people are not white or Caucasian. The ideas of shame, guilt, and privilege in conversations are something I had not thought about	The idea of patience and having a conversation vs. preaching what is right, and getting people to come to their own conclusions. It is important to realize that everybody has their own opinion and the retreat made me think about how I felt about issues of diversity and social justice. It made me realize how important it is to come to your own conclusions and so to help people figure that out and in particular with the

		before the retreat.	residents in my house.
Joy	Race is a concept that was created and does not have much scientific basis. It has been used as a tool to divide people, so I tend to not identify with a race or use racial categories to identify other people. And I go so far as not calling myself white or someone else black.	Well it means really that I am not participating in something that is very common in my culture. I base things on ethnicity and differences in different heritages and the Geographic's of where their family is from.	

The participants' understandings of race and racial constructs prior to attending the SJLR fell into three categories: race as a social construct, as a classification, and as a biological reality. Three White students and one student of color (Brad, Joy, Susan, and Ellen) interpreted race as a social construct. Brad shared a reflection of this view in his guided autobiography, stating, "Race is a socially constructed identity based on one's skin color. Race is also the result of a belief in perceived biological differences between people of different colors." The other three students espoused similar views to Brad, including Susan, who defined race as "a human constructed concept that allows for different treatment based on skin color even though biologically we are the same" and Joy: "Race is a concept that was created and does not have much scientific basis. It has been used as a tool to divide people". The responses of the students in this group demonstrated complexity in thinking about race that was not present in other groups.

The second group of students, which included six participants, three White (Carrie, Becky, Sophia) and three students of color (Mildred, Vivian, and Angie) viewed race as a classification. Angie shared an example of this view as follows, "Race is a classification used to distinguish people whose physical appearances, culture, language, etc., varies from one another." The other students in this group provided similar responses to Angie's, using phrases such as "checking a box", and "people connected by history, ethnicity, traditions, and culture". Unlike the first group these students did not make the distinction that race was a social construct. Instead the students viewed race as a classification that was based on what they and others saw and observed.

The last student, Mandy, viewed race in a biological sense and stated, "Race means a biological background that gives one certain traits. These traits are unique to a

race; that is how they can be categorized.” Mandy’s response was the only person in the study that initially stated that she believed race was a biological reality. As we shall see, however, as the study progressed they began to express subtle changes in their perspectives on race.

The data from the individual interviews presented three themes that demonstrated some changes in the ways students made meaning of race. The students were asked the same questions that were asked in their pre-retreat autobiographies which included, “How would you identify your racial identity? And, “What does it mean to you to be (racial identity self-ascribed by the participant)?” Three themes emerged from these questions.

The first theme explored White privilege: five of the White participants made meaning of their White identity through identification of white privilege. An example of this sentiment was expressed by Becky:

I think the first thing that pops into mind is white privilege, which I definitely recognize. I see that and it sucks that it is there, and the privilege part is not always bad for me, but it is not a good thing. I had not thought about it this way prior to attending the retreat.

Prior to attending the retreat, Becky did not make meaning of her White identity through White privilege. Becky came to understand White privilege at the retreat, and began to make meaning in that fashion following her learning at the retreat. Brad exemplified a deeper understanding of what White privilege means to him on a daily basis, and how he has had to reexamine things as a result of his increased understanding:

You’re white. You are privileged. Everything that you’ve accomplished or earned, or worked hard for is now going through a re-evaluation. Why did I get

that? Who did not get it and why? I think from SJLR I learned to question. Even on the street...if I see someone who does not appear as the same race as me I say to myself, 'This is an interracial interaction. How am I going to act?' If a person of color is coming this way, and I am going the other, how am I going to act? I am very conscious of my actions because I know from some of my classes that people of color can also be conscious of the way they are perceived by other people. So, I personally don't ever want to be in a position where I put them in a position where they think I belittle them because as a white person. I have that privilege and power to just kind of throw history at them like white people are better, and I don't want to do that, and so, I am very cognizant. Do I smile? Do I not smile? Do I make eye contact? Do I not make eye contact? Do I move over? Do I move closer? Do I go slower, or do I pick up the speed? What do I do?

It should be noted that in the pre-retreat autobiographies no students mentioned White privilege in their responses, but after the retreat, five of the White students (Carrie, Susan, Becky, Rose, and Sophia) made meaning of their White identity through the concept of white privilege. Constructing their White identity in this way demonstrates more certainty about their race, more awareness of their values, and some appreciation of differences. The participants had developed meaning making in this capacity from their experiences at the SJLR. Referring back to the intercultural maturity model framework, students were beginning to demonstrate complexity in their thinking that was not present in their autobiographies, which begins to demonstrate a level of greater intercultural maturity. The data revealed that the experience was not the same for the students of color Ellen and Vivian.

Ellen and Vivian provided a second theme, which centered on culture. Ellen and Vivian made meaning of their race through their cultural differences, and the experiences that connected to their identities. Vivian gave an example during her interview:

Personally, I identify myself as Latina and white...It is something interesting because when someone asks what my ethnicity is automatically I say Latina. I don't say Latina and white, and I think part of that for me is that white is normal; that is the norm, and so Latina that is what I identify with cause that is something different and a culture that I gravitate toward. I don't think anyone is just one thing, but it allows me to have different perspectives and see things from different ways because I have family from another country, and I can go visit and see how that is different and different is not wrong...I think sometimes we grow up thinking there is one way to do things. And part of my culture, and what I have grown up with, has really taught me that I think of how to see things differently, and be more open and accepting to different people, and to be curious and wanting to learn about other people's cultures.

Ellen shared the thoughts expressed by Vivian. In addition, Ellen stated that she often feels forced to identify with a particular race due to the way she looks. She noted her appearance showed no signs of her other racial identity unless she provided that information.

Joy suggested a third way in which students made meaning after their participation in the SJLR. Specifically, she resists racial identification for herself or others. In both her pre-retreat autobiography and in the individual interview, Joy expressed the following views on race:

Race is a concept that was created and does not have much scientific basis. It has been used as a tool to divide people, so I tend to not identify with a race or use racial categories to identify other people. And I go so far as not calling myself white or someone else black. I am not participating in something that is very common in my culture. I base things on ethnicity and differences in different heritages and the geographies of where their family is from.

Unlike any of the other students in the study, Joy actively chose to renounce racial identification systems.

Racism. I asked students in their pre-retreat autobiographies what racism means to them, and the participants' responses fell into two categories: those mentioning power, and those that did not. Most of the students did not mention power in their meanings. Angie provided an example of this perspective, "Racism is when a group of people or groups of people think that their race is inferior to others." At first, I wondered if the students meant superior, and reread to ensure their word was inferior. The students were specifically referencing people of color and how racism makes them feel. Angie went on to say, "People who are racist demean others' characters, culture, and lifestyle." By defining racism in this way, the students touched on prejudice and discrimination, but failed to make meaning of the power and privilege that define racism as outlined in Chapter 2.

Brad and Ellen differed from the majority of the students in the way they made meaning of racism. For example, Brad responded, "Racism reflects the hierarchy of power defined by white supremacy. In society those with privilege and power, namely

White people, are in the position that it benefits their best interest to act prejudicially towards those without privilege.” Ellen explained:

Racism is the institutionalized idea that whiteness is the status quo and superior. This idea permeates not only America's policies, but also the way by which individuals treat each other and perceive them based on the ideas input by white supremacy.

Brad and Ellen were able to articulate how power and privilege play a crucial role when discussing racism. The rest of the students in their pre-retreat autobiographies did not express the connection that these two students made. Evidence of a shift in the students’ thinking concerning racism is perceptible in the post-retreat interviews individual interviews.

During the individual interviews, I asked the students to tell about what they learned about racism growing up. The students reported that what they learned about racism was tied to the amount of exposure the students had to diversity. Becky expressed an example of this in her interview about a friend who identifies as a person of color:

I have a friend actually who is quite vocal about a lot of the issues surrounding [racism], and when you first start seeing, you are kind of like “I don’t even know what you are talking about Alex.” Now I’m reading more of the stuff that she is posting and I am like wow, that makes sense, and it sucks.

The White students reported that they became more aware of racism as they were exposed to a greater diversity of people, as older adolescents. The retreat played a role in exposing students to diversity and as a result impacting their awareness of racism. Mandy noted an example during her interview, “Just the fact that it was

not just black and white that there were all these other identities and a lot that are not represented [helped me learn].” Alternatively, students of color were aware of racism from much younger ages. Ellen described growing up in a mostly White town where there was much of what she termed “anti-blackness”. Vivian described her feelings of “always being on the outside in grade school”. Both Ellen and Vivian were aware of their racial differences early in their lives.

The focus group provided evidence that the White participants’ views of race and racism had changed. The pre-retreat autobiographies demonstrate these participants were not particularly aware of race and racism on campus. Brad is the exception to these five. He articulated the concepts, and was aware of race and racism on campus in his autobiography. Rose, Sophia, Becky, Susan, and Mandy each specified that the retreat had changed their views and made them more aware of race and racism on campus. The awareness of race and racism was best expressed by Susan:

I have noticed it more in my text books and videos we watch for class, I am very aware of when was this made, what was the predominant race used in this, and I try to pay more attention to advertisements, I see now and stuff like our student guides, I try to pay attention to that.

The other students discussed similar themes, noting, “How different racial identities are represented on campus (Mandy)” and “being aware of the actual size of different racial groups on campus for the first time (Becky)”. The revelations of these participants was directly tied to their experiences and learning at the retreat. The participants also pointed to being more observant in student spaces on campus and within their communities both on and off campus as a result of

having attended the retreat and being exposed to different identities in a space where conversations could happen safely.

Campus Racial Climate. The retreat participants' view of campus racial climate changed throughout the study, from uncertainty about the presence of a campus racial climate to an increased understanding and awareness of the campus racial climate. The change in views indicates cognitive and intrapersonal growth on the part of the participants. Additionally, the change shows that students are achieving learning and democracy outcomes. The students are developing cognitively, which is one of the learning outcomes. Lastly, the change demonstrates that students engaging with their awareness of other races and cultures, which is a key aspect of democracy outcomes.

In the pre-retreat autobiography most participants were unsure how to define campus racial climate. In particular, the White students discussed their perceptions of the campus as a diverse one. Susan reported, "I think that on campus there is definitely more diversity than I ever saw back in my hometown." Though the White students believed there was diversity, they also noted that the experience can be negative for students of color. The students of color differed from this view, and did not think the campus was diverse. Ellen provided an example:

The campus is misconstrued as "diverse", when really it just has a higher amount of minority concentration. As a result, people on campus use this "ratio" of minority to white individuals to explain away any possible social/race issues existing within campus.

Several of the White participants noted that students tended to hang out with their own racial groups. The participants were evenly split on whether or not they thought the

campus racial climate was becoming more of a problem, less of a problem, or not changing. Approximately a third thought it was more of a problem, a third that it was less of a problem, and a third felt they did not know or had not been on campus long enough to judge.

During the post-retreat interviews it became clear that participants had a better understanding of campus racial climate as a result of attending the SJLR and listening to others with different identities and participating in the activities at the retreat. Several themes emerged from their responses. Most prevalent was that the students now recognized that the campus is predominantly White. Though Brad noted there is a perception by White students that it is more diverse in his comments:

If you were to ask the students do you think this is a racially diverse campus, most of the White people would say yes. It's interesting to consider when you are a White person looking at mainly a sea of White people with a lot of other colors to that you call that diverse. If you were a person of color looking at a sea of White people you would not call that diverse. I have heard that argument from people of color that they do not feel it is racially diverse.

The other White participants echoed this theme. The students of color agreed that the campus did not feel that diverse. Discussing the perceptions of campus racial proportions led participants to discuss their observations of the diversity of groups of people on campus.

The second theme that emerged in the interviews was the students' perception of racial segregation on campus, a perception noted by each of the interview participants.

The participants reported the perception that certain majors on campus have different mixes of races, and that the segregation of races into different majors is perceptible in where people congregate on campus. Vivian expressed this during her interview:

I guess I was thinking more specifically of [the Business School]. That is what I mainly see because of my major. Outside of [this school], the institution as a whole has a diverse population, but for the most part it seems really segregated. Not segregated as in our history, but I think a lot of it is people gravitate toward people that are like them. I think that is because that is where it is comfortable. It is easy, and you don't have to think or worry about not understanding our backgrounds.

Ellen and Becky also indicated that the students in the business school tended to be mostly White, as were those in some of the sciences. Arts and humanities classes were perceived as having somewhat more diversity. According to Joy, Carrie, Becky and Sophia, the areas on campus where these majors are located tend to reflect these racial.

Lastly, the students indicated that there seemed to be a lack of space for discussions or conversations to happen on campus. Ellen made reference to this during her interview:

I would say that there is definitely an idea that we should all just get along. I feel like there is a lot of conformity and misperceptions going on about race. I feel that discussions about race and race relations are often reserved for conferences and discussions about race that are in the union, but not incorporated into classes as much as they should be.

According to participants, the lack of space for these conversations and discussions impacted the climate on campus negatively. Neither the classrooms nor spaces outside of classroom create a safe environment for students to have open and genuine conversations about race. The absence of a safe space made it more difficult for students to engage with each other racially. The White students especially did not feel comfortable approaching students of color for fear of making a mistake and offending someone.

In summary, the SJLR had important impacts on the ways in which students made meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate. The common theme that emerged from the data is that students' views about each of these areas became more complex, and the students exhibited a greater understanding of how they made meaning of these terms. Comparing the pre-retreat autobiography responses to student responses following their attendance of the SJLR shows evidence that the retreat created cognitive dissonance and opportunities to expand their knowledge in each of these areas. Cognitive growth and increased complexity in meaning making are important elements in intercultural maturity and in the development of leadership outcomes.

Students' Beliefs About Their Capacity for Leadership and Democratic Action

The second research question focused on: How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice? The concept of preparing students for their futures in society is connected directly to diversity outcomes. One of the major principles of democracy outcomes is preparing students to be a part of a society that is becoming increasingly global and diverse. As noted in the literature review, diverse interactions with peers can

influence beliefs, motivation, and actions for social justice. I tailored the individual interviews and focus group interviews to discuss student interactions with diverse peers at the SJLR, and inside and outside the classroom to identify which had more of an impact on the students' learning. In this section, I examine the SJLR and institutional diversity and the roles each play influencing the beliefs, motivation, and actions related to social justice. The themes that emerged from the interviews centered on an increased comfort in interacting and engaging with students from different identities as well as a motivation toward alliance and advocacy. I then examine the SJLR and its influence on students' motivation to gain knowledge, skills, and awareness around race.

In the individual interviews, I asked the students how the retreat and racial diversity on campus had prepared them for the future outside of the institution. The White students and students of color had different perceptions on how racial diversity prepared them to live and work with others who were racially different. Ellen and Vivian were uncertain that racial diversity had helped them be prepared to work and live with others, and both suggested that they had been learning to work and live with others their whole lives as people of color. Vivian captured this sentiment in her interview:

I guess it has kind of prepared me to live with others, and to deal with different situations. That is just more of the nature of living with new people, and not necessarily based in the diversity here. I have not really seen a lot of that in my hall specifically because I am in a Living and Learning Community. So I don't know how much of my growing from that aspect can be attributed to the institutions' diversity, but the nature of living with people who are not like you in every aspect that kind of just naturally happens I guess.

Ellen reported, “I have always been aware that there are different races; institutional diversity really only helped me learn about other cultures.” Both felt that they needed to adjust constantly to White people on a daily basis.

The White students indicated that racial diversity on campus and at the SJLR had helped to prepare them for living and working within a global society. Joy discussed this briefly during her interview noting, “Well it has made me a lot more comfortable with being around people that are different than myself.” Other students described it as follows; “it exposed me to identities that I had not interacted with before” (Susan), and “provided diverse voices that I will encounter working outside the university” (Brad). The ability of the White students to interact with identities and races that they have not before on campus was clearly important to those students.

I wanted to look deeper into the impact of racial diversity on campus, and followed up with questions concerning diversity inside and outside the classroom. Although all participants indicated that they were influenced by the racial diversity inside and outside the classroom, there were differences between the students of color and the White students who were interviewed. Vivian and Ellen noted the lack of racial diversity in their classes, stating that this impacted their ability to learn different perspectives, and influenced their motivation in the classroom. Vivian elaborated on this during her interview:

I feel like inside the classroom because there are so much a lot of the same backgrounds it’s kind of like ...group think where everyone has the same perspective, and to try to bring up a different point of view can be difficult

partially because what if someone does not agree with that? Or what if that is not what we are supposed to be talking about or whatever that might be?

Ellen expressed similar sentiments. She noted that classrooms were “incredibly segregated. For example my Afro History class predominantly black, but there are plenty of classes that are extremely white with one or two minorities”. The lack of race in the classroom did not contribute to a wealth of ideas shared. Both indicated the lack of diversity in the classroom negatively impacted their motivation.

White students Brad, Joy, Mandy, Becky, Rose, and Sophia tended to believe that there was diversity in the classroom and that it was beneficial. Becky captured this sentiment during her interview:

I think that it has been a positive experience and a benefit. It's nice to have a few friends who came from other countries. I have friends at smaller state schools and they are like what? You have all these friends of different races? That's cool and part of the reason that I came here.

The White students also commented that the diversity in the classroom enriched their learning particularly about race, as discussed by Mandy during her interview:

I definitely think it enriches my learning like I guess of race. It brings a different perspective to the same subject. Like a lot of Americans were taught the same way and have the same view of something. If you take someone from a different culture or different race you are taking their view and learning process and adding it into yours, so like something...I have a linguistics class and there are three White people, and the rest are all different races, so that class is probably the most discussion that I have during any class time, and it is the most interesting.

The White students indicated that exposure to diversity was important. Contact with diversity provided many of the White participant's new experiences with racial identities previously unknown as well as interactions and discussions. The interviews indicated that more of these conversations and experiences tended to happen outside of the classroom where the perception was that it was more diverse. Rose provided several examples of conversations that she had with students in her residence hall in her role as a Community Advisor. She discussed mediating a roommate issue that involved different races, and an educational conversation she had with students about the use of the N word. Becky discussed educational conversations that she had with students from other countries over dinner. These interview responses reported that White students found the perceived diversity as mostly positive, motivating them to learn more about race.

The White participants indicated that the SJLR assisted with engagement and learning the stories of their diverse peers as well as understanding the role of allyship. The students experienced diversity on campus inside and outside the classroom, however the environment on campus did not always provide the opportunity to learn the stories of those with different identities, or engage in conversation in a safe space. Brad explained the sense of learning stories during his interview:

I know that for people who are not white it can be difficult to talk about their experiences because it is something that people of color have had to deal with for their whole life. I'm someone who is like, "Tell me all about it. I want to know your story, so that your story can be my story, and I can grapple with my own privilege, and understand how racism exists in your life and how you are oppressed. Your story can become my motivation for advocacy on your behalf

because at the end of the day that is what social justice is all about.” I think the retreat demonstrated that in the sense where there were some voices that were not heard as often as I would have liked, but I just need to approach the conversation regarding race.

Sophia and Susan discussed allyship from two different perspectives. Susan discussed her discovery of what an ally is during her interview:

I think that the biggest factor from the retreat is how to be an ally. I have never really thought about allies and I have always taken the “I have a friend who is this” so I am going to help them. This takes a step further and helps you stand with them not for them, and I never thought about it that way.

Sophia focused more on the community of allies formed at the SJLR indicating:

...getting motivated and having that knowledge in my immediate vicinity as well as people who are also passionate about these issues, and are ...allies for dealing in these things. If I need to talk about an issue with somebody I have four other people in the building who went on the retreat who I can talk to about these issues.

Understanding what an ally is, and knowing that they had formed a community of allies was an important point noted by the participants. The participants did not discuss gaining this understanding in the classroom, or on campus outside of the classroom on campus. All of the participants reported that they had a greater sense of comfort when working with people of different races than they did prior to the retreat. The participants specifically noted an increased ability to engage in conversations about race. The conversations are not something that participants reported happening in the classroom or

on campus for lack of a safe environment to engage in those conversations. Elements of the retreat that influenced the sense of comfort included listening to others stories and learning to be an ally.

The literature has shown that experiences in classroom, extracurricular, and retreat environments contribute positively to democracy outcomes including citizenship engagement, racial/cultural engagement, and compatibility of differences (Bowman, 2010b; Engberg, 2007; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). These environments can impact the motivation of students to gain knowledge, skills, and awareness around race. An environment that is open to dialogue and sharing is important to the learning that can occur. In this section, I discuss how the retreat facilitated the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and awareness around social justice; the environment created at the retreat; and how students' belief in action was influenced by the retreat.

During the individual interviews, students were asked how the retreat had increased their motivation to increase their knowledge, skills, and awareness around race. Except for one student, participants in the study reported that the retreat had increased their motivation to expand their knowledge, skills, and awareness of race. The students explained that they were motivated by exposure to the life experiences of others that was shared during retreat activities; many made particular note to the Wall of Oppression activity (Activities and explanations can be found in Appendix C). The exposure to these life experiences motivated them to seek further knowledge at the retreat as well as after they had returned to campus. Brad shared an example of his experience at the retreat during his interview:

The other activity was the Wall of Oppression. There were some racial groups that were included on the boxes, and I think hearing all of the stereotypes and labels and all the terms that are used to describe people it's helpful to know if I have heard them. Where have I heard them? Do I use them? What are the proper terms? What is true and what is false? I think what stood out the most in that activity was when the Native American group was there...there was not anyone who identified as Native American, so no one brought a personal story to that group. For me that is a sign that this racial group either goes unnoticed, or I might need to learn a little more about this racial group. I would be really hard pressed to find people who identify with that racial group to talk to about their experiences. When racial groups were underrepresented, or when I heard terms I needed to evaluate, that was when I needed to give more thought to race.

Other participants also noted that learning about life experiences and identities they were not familiar with on the retreat motivated them increase knowledge, skills, and awareness. For example Joy noted:

It just brought the topics to the front of my mind and re-centered it and kind of triggered all these emotions and interests that were kindled on the retreat. If you are not focused on something it is easy to forget it exists, and so to have a continuous reminder of these realities is crucial and important and I am really glad I went.

Susan discussed the identities she learned about and had not thought about before:

That retreat especially the breaking down the wall activity, there were so many groups that I really don't ever think about. There were a few I was

very passionate about, but many fleeting thoughts in the back of my mind that I don't really think about what kinds of discrimination they face daily, so I think just being more aware of what is out there.

The activities that the students experienced on the SJLR helped them gain new knowledge about different identities, made them more aware of different identities, helped them think about those identities in different ways, and caused them to continue to want to learn more upon returning to campus. Additionally, the SJLR created space for these conversations to occur.

During the individual interviews, students discussed their increased motivation and learning through the "space" that was created at the retreat. Space was a central theme that emerged in participant interview responses. Vivian elaborated on the space of the retreat during her interview:

Something about the environment made it ok to have meaningful conversations. I think when you are in a college dorm or class or with friends it is harder to have those meaningful conversations. So, coming from an environment of just being so open and just letting things out, and having those conversations, and being vulnerable and seeing other people have that courage as well. Coming out of that couple day experience, and coming back to my college experience I felt more able to approach it.

Carrie discussed space from the perspective of exploring others' identities. Carrie noted, "I think it was a safe space for me to start exploring that and start having those conversations with people I don't know, but want to get to know." Because several of the

individual interviews included mention of “space”, I followed up with additional questions to examine this theme in their answers.

During the focus group interviews the participants described the “space” that was created at the retreat as being instrumental in helping them be vulnerable with each other. By vulnerable, I am referring to their being willing to share in depth personal information about their identities with each other as well as listen to the stories of others. Susan captured this sentiment well in the focus group interview:

I got to share stories that deeply affected me because I don’t get to share these things with my family and friends and don’t usually choose to bring up, so the fact that these questions were asked and I was asked to reflect on these deeper levels and I liked it.

It allowed them to share stories and experiences with each other as well as learn from, inspire each other. Sophia captured that well in her comments:

The creation of rules at the beginning, and the purpose of creating a safe space were very successful at the retreat. I realized how much growth you can go through when you feel like you can ask the hard questions, and have the hard conversations. Race and oppression is something that people have strong opinions about, and experiences that they have had with them resonate very deeply. They are not always the conversations that you want to have with someone you run into on the street. Even though most of us at the retreat did not really know each other before, I think by the end of those 3 days we had built a strong connection with each other that we were able to talk about those things.

Another participant, Mandy, described the space as making it feel more safe to learn, “I can ask questions and I can make mistakes and ask stupid questions too, and that really gave us the opportunity to do anything we wanted to.” Others used words such as “creating a sense of community” and “ability to fully share my thoughts” and “felt like people were really listening”. Additionally, some of them described the space as a “brave space”, such as illustrated by Rose:

Someone had told me on the retreat and they were talking about the space, and that I was going to like the wall of oppression, and I thought I am not going to go up there because I am super shy. She was talking about them as being safe spaces, but called them brave spaces, so thinking more in terms it will never be super safe, more uncomfortable, so think of it as a brave space, so that encouraged me to go up there and talk and that is how I view it now.

One participant noted although the space was safe at the retreat, it was an adjustment coming back to campus. The participants described it as challenging to find those spaces to have those conversations on campus.

The activities and discussion in this space allowed participants to fully share their experiences and hear others’ experiences, and engage and learn about the experiences. Sophia said that exposure to others who were willing to share and engage was an important motivating factor for her:

I think that the social justice leadership retreat definitely showed me that there are other people in my immediate environment that have the same views, and have different experiences that lead to the same ambitions about making the environment more open to everything.

The participants noted that seeing others share their experiences, and hearing stories about how others had engaged and grappled with their learning about these topics was also motivating.

Another part of this research examined students' belief in their ability to take action. I asked the participants during the focus group interview about how the SJLR affected their belief to make a difference and be a leader around social justice. Participants used phrases like, "I believe I can take action" and "I have the ability to make a difference" and "I know how to make a difference constructively" and lastly, "knowing that making a difference to even one person is important". All of the participants reported that the SJLR had empowered them, and helped them believe that they could make a difference in regards to social justice. For example, Brad said:

What [the retreat] really did was empower me, and gave me techniques that I could use. It really affirmed that I could do what I was doing, and it gave me the confidence to go forward and evolve from where I entered the retreat.

In a similar vein, Becky shared:

I am more confident in saying "That's not how you should think. Hey try this instead." I think I have a more guided way of doing that, and I think the retreat definitely pushed me. I think it helps me with awareness and pushed me to think I can learn more about this stuff and actually with not just your friends, and use it more in everyday life.

The students' belief in their own abilities was instrumental in their engagement following the retreat.

Behavior Related to Social Justice Action

The focus of the last research question was: How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action. The Social Justice Leadership Retreat created opportunities for students to begin to take action related to social justice. The primary opportunity for action included the participants developing an action plan. During the retreat participants also gained new knowledge, awareness, and skills that could assist them in accomplishing their goals. More importantly, the knowledge, awareness, and skills learned could assist in creating new goals or taking direct action in regards to social justice. During the individual and focus group interviews, students shared how they enacted the action plans; they developed and engaged in social justice activities and leadership following the retreat.

As a part of the SJLR, participants created an action plan focused on a social justice issue that they committed to work on upon leaving the retreat. These action plans did not necessarily revolve around race, since the retreat focused on other identities as well. Rose explains an example of one of the action plans:

I decided I was going to come up with something more tangible like a curriculum. I will practice within my Community Advisor position with what works and what doesn't work. I am going to take a year off, and I am going to use that curriculum. It will be relevant to a population of high school students, and I am going to go back to my small town and my own community. Basically, I am going to try to get in there, maybe during a study hall. I can have a discussion group, and show clips of films, music, and deconstruct the lyrics music videos. I am essentially going to put something together with how media portrays gender,

and other identities based on what I am learning in my third wave feminism. I would also bring in a historical point of view, so they know that it has always been this way. I want to make it engaging to their lives so they can think critically about things in their life. It was a vague idea in my mind, but the social justice retreat actually made it more of a reality, like I can do this.

The next step was to begin working on those plans and carrying them out.

By the time of the post-retreat interviews, each of the participants had begun to work on the action plans that they developed. Once the retreat ends there is no follow-up from the facilitators to see if students work on the action plans that were developed at the retreat. Each of these students had begun to work on their plans within the two to four weeks following the retreat prior to their individual interview. I have chosen two examples to share. The first comes from Mandy: “The first place we can make an impact is here in the dorms, and calling others out when they make insensitive comments.”

Becky shared a second example:

Mine was to put myself out of my comfort zone more. I remember I promised to sit in different places in class next to new people, and that I would look into more multicultural organizations. The class thing I am doing, and it is cool. I have met some great people. The organization thing I think I need to go to the organization fair. I have been looking on line, and I just need to get myself to do it because it's easy to say I don't have time for that. I'm pleased with how things are going in the action perspective, and I have been slowing exposing my friends to like... “Hey that's not an appropriate word to use.” That's been going decently.

The fact that students created action plans, and had begun to work on them by this point demonstrates greater intercultural maturity than was exhibited through the pre-retreat autobiographies. The focus group interview three months after the retreat revealed that work on these action plans continued.

During the focus group interviews, I asked the participants to talk about the progress on their goal, and if they had developed new goals. All of the participants in the focus group were actively pursuing their action plans. Sophia excitedly responded to this question:

One of the things I am very passionate about is working with kids at camp and with the counselors. I have been asked to do the diversity awareness training during staff training, and I am working on that curriculum. Working on the curriculum been really fun. Working with my boss to create something that will be interesting and educational for the counselors, so they can take those ideas with their work with the kids.

Some had to adjust the scope of some of the parameters of goals, but all of them were making progress toward completing their goals.

Four of the participants discussed the skills they felt they had acquired at the retreat, and had established new goals as a result of having attended the retreat. Becky offered one example:

Since we talked I found out I will be a Community Advisor next year, and one of my first thoughts was what can I do with this? I will definitely be recommending the retreat to all my residents and such. I also plan to take what I have learned

there, and figure out the most effective way to open up that dialogue and give people the space to talk about it.

Sophia discussed some career related goals:

I would really like for a masters or something work on researching where these ideas of race, racism, and privilege come from, and whether that comes from class or race or a combination of things. I also want to know at what point during your child development does that come in and I think that working in the camp world is somewhere I would probably start with that.

In total, four of the participants had established new goals, and two were working on older goals.

Becky and Mandy were working on their original goals but had made some adjustments due to obstacles and circumstances. For example, due to her schedule Sam was unable to join an organization on campus. Instead she focused her attention on confronting behavior or comments in her residence hall, classes, and around campus. The participants resoundingly agreed that the retreat had encouraged their engagement, motivated them to work on the action plans that they established, and motivated more than half of them to establish new goals relating to social justice. The work on these goals also demonstrates the students' desire for engagement and motivation to act as citizens in a global community.

The participants all reported during their focus group interview that attending the SJLR had encouraged them to become more engaged with diversity and social justice. One of the participants discussed becoming involved in the classroom as a result of the experience as a teaching assistant. Brad discussed this during the focus group:

I am a teaching assistant for a diversity and social justice course, and what I didn't realize at the beginning of the semester was how many was how many conversations we were going to have about certain issues surrounding race, to be specific racism. Helping students understand where their privilege is coming from has been a really rewarding experience. When they would say in class that had an underlying tone of you might be privileged, or you might not be privileged, really validating that and helping them see the other side of things.

The other participants expressed a desire to become more engaged since the retreat, but mentioned some difficulty becoming engaged. These participants reported instead that they looked to find what they can help with and make happen in their everyday lives.

Mandy provided an example in her response:

A lot of the things that I wanted to do fell when I had class, so instead of going and seeking an organization that targeted those concerns, I tried to open up an organization that I am already in. I'm in the Student Association, which is the student government on campus. Next year I will be chairing a committee on outreach and engagement, and as chair I really want us to open it up to all students, and help students have an avenue to talk and get change on campus.

Though some of the participants had to alter or change the ways in which they engaged with diversity and social justice, all of them were motivated by the SJLR to engage more with this work on campus and in their lives.

In review, the Social Justice Leadership Retreat played an important role in the development of students' intercultural maturity, and involvement in social justice actions following the retreat. I was excited to discover the changes students exhibited with

regard to intercultural maturity. I was unsure what the data would reveal or if the cognitive element of students' intercultural maturity was changing throughout my study. It was incredible to view the growth of all of the students, but several students in particular who experienced major changes between their guided autobiography and the focus group interview. Though consistent with the literature, I was not sure if White students or students of color would experience more change with regard to intercultural maturity. The evidence indicated White students' experienced more development than the students of color. I was pleased that I was able to detect benefits for both White students and students of color that attended the retreat.

I was anxious to learn about the effect of the retreat on social justice action for the students who attended. I found it remarkable that all of the students I interviewed had begun work on their action plans following the retreat. Considering there is not an accountability mechanism for follow up on action plans, I would not have guessed that all ten students would be actively working on these plans. I expected that a few may not have done anything with their plans, and was excited to discover they were working on these plans and making progress.

I was surprised during the focus group interview to realize that all six students again had continued work with their action plans three months following their retreat experience! I was certain a few might not have continued their work, or that they would be done upon completion of their action plan, which made my next discovery nothing short of amazing. Four of the participants informed me during the focus group interview they had built upon and developed new goals and action plans relating to social justice as they completed their original ones.

I believe this demonstrated development in regards intercultural maturity. Additionally, I argue that development and social justice action continues over time. I believe finding that adds a missing piece to the conversation on diversity experiences. I was unable to find research that measures effects of intercultural experiences over time. My study provides an initial basis to understand the effect of these experiences over time. Lastly, the students attribute their intercultural maturity, belief in leadership, and social justice actions to attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Implications, Limitations and Conclusions

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the effects of the Social Justice Leadership retreat. Specifically this study set out to understand the following research questions.

- *How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus?*
- *How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice?*
- *How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action?*

In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the results of the study. Then, I outline implications for research, theory, and practice. Following the implications, I discuss the limitations of this study and provide my conclusions.

Discussion

During the literature review I found little research that examined how diversity retreats affect how students make meaning of race and racism, how students understand campus racial climate, learning outcomes associated with democratic outcomes, and students' subsequent social justice action. The results of this study begin to fill in those gaps in the literature.

I believe that this study demonstrated that the Social Justice Leadership retreat had a strong effect on the way students perceive and make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate. The evidence demonstrates that the change in perception and

meaning making was especially powerful for White students who attended the retreat. The change in perception and meaning making was less pronounced for students of color, with the exception of campus racial climate. Specifically, the students of color who participated in the study gained awareness of the impact campus racial climate had on them that was not present at the beginning of the study.

Reviewing each component of the study it becomes clear that the way in which White students made meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate evolved throughout the study. Five of the six students (all White) who completed the study specifically spoke in the interviews and focus group interview of an increased awareness of racism, privilege, and other forms of oppression learned from the SJLR. One participant did not verbally respond to the question during the focus group, but agreed nonverbally with the responses of the other participants. The participants cited examples of increased awareness of race and racism in the textbooks for their classes, in the videos they viewed, in the racial composition of their classes, in advertisements they saw around campus, and in their daily interactions with other students.

The intercultural maturity of the participants evolved over time as a result of attending the SJLR. A prime example of this was Mandy. Mandy began the study unclear about what race meant to her. She thought it was biologically based, did not understand the concept of racism, and was unaware of the campus racial climate. By the end of the study, she had come to understand and make meaning of her race, had a better understanding of racism and what that meant as a White woman, and had a new awareness and understanding of the campus racial climate. Mandy is one example, but

each of the other focus group participants also experienced changes in the ways in which they made meaning about race, racism, and campus racial climate.

As previously mentioned no students of color completed the entire study. However, from the information gathered during the first three segments of the study it was clear that the students of color understood the concept of race, and how they made meaning of race coming into the retreat. Their original understanding of race and how they made meaning of race differed from the White students in the study, and the retreat did not impact the intercultural maturity of the students of color as much as it did the White students. Each of the students of color reported experiencing racism, and understood the concept through lived experience. The campus racial climate piece was an area in which the students of color seemed to gain some knowledge: these students developed a greater awareness of how the racial climate impacted them on campus, and were able to discuss with their White peers their experiences and learn from each other about campus racial climate.

The development of meaning making around race, racism, and campus racial climate also speaks to the development of the intercultural maturity of the students who participated in the retreat. The change in intercultural maturity for the participants demonstrated that the students' thinking grew more complex during the study. As noted in the literature, complex thinking is a necessary component for cognitive and individual development (Gurin 2002; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Initial levels of development include: assumes knowledge is certain (cognitive), demonstrates a lack of awareness of one's own values (intrapersonal), and exhibits dependence on relations with similar others as a source of identity and social affirmation (interpersonal) (King and Baxter

Magolda, 2005, p. 576). Examination of the pre-retreat guided autobiographies demonstrates that many of the White students were in initial or early intermediate levels of development in the realms of cognitive development, intrapersonal development, and interpersonal development as outlined by King and Baxter Magolda (2005).

An intermediate level of development includes an evolving awareness about their own and acceptance of uncertainty (cognitive); an evolving sense of identity separate from others (intrapersonal); a willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; and a reliance on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist (interpersonal) (King & Baxter Magolda, p. 576). Examination of responses from each of the portions of this study reveals subtle changes in each of the White students who attended the SJLR. Comparing the responses from the guided autobiography to the interview and focus group interview showed development on the part of the participants with many moving solidly into an intermediate level of development in each of these realms and a few showing some signs of mature development. A majority of the participants were in initial stages for the guided autobiography. By the interview and focus group many had a better grasp on how they made meaning of their race, showed awareness of their own values, were more accepting of others. All of this demonstrates more complex thinking and movement toward greater intercultural maturity. There were two examples from the study that demonstrated this point.

The first was Brad. Brad understood privilege and race as a social construct prior to coming to the retreat. During the interview and focus group it became clear that Brad was actively wrestling with the realms of his own intercultural maturity. Brad was grappling with his own privilege and seeking to understand how racism exists in his life.

He wanted to know more about how others experienced oppression and how to use stories to motivate his work with advocacy. He was experiencing cognitive dissonance as he was integrating these concepts and constructs into his own ways of making meaning and his interactions and relationships with others. Cognitive dissonance is a sign of cognitive growth and more developed cognitive maturity. When comparing Brad to the other White students in the study, he showed the deepest level of engagement and thinking about his own intercultural maturity during the research process.

An intermediate level of development includes an evolving awareness about their own and acceptance of uncertainty (cognitive); an evolving sense of identity separate from others (intrapersonal); a willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; and a reliance on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist

Another example is Mandy. As detailed in Chapter 4, Mandy is probably the best example of developing intercultural maturity during the study. She began the study thinking race was a biological classification. By the end of the study, she was more aware of her own race, understood what White privilege was, engaged with classes and other students in new ways, and showed greater awareness of her own values than when she began the study.

Comparing the pre-retreat data to the interviews and focus group indicates that the retreat played a major role in causing the students to think critically, and learn about race, racism and campus racial climate. Enhancements to critical thinking and learning about race linked to increased development of a students' intercultural maturity as noted in the framework. Increased critical thinking and learning about race also support learning outcomes (Bowman, 2010a; Bowman, 2010b; Engberg, 2007; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al.,

2002; Hurtado, 2005; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005).

The impact of the SJLR on intercultural development and learning outcomes is an important finding not previously studied with a retreat like the SJLR. The information adds to the conversation within the literature on the potential impact that experiences like this can have on students.

In the data, the participants attributed the development of intercultural maturity, learning outcomes, and democracy outcomes to three elements of the SJLR. Examination of the data and results indicates that these elements more than others affected these outcomes. The elements include activities that allowed for exposure to different identities, creation of safe spaces, and stories and community development.

The first was activities that allowed the participants to engage with identities that were different from their own identities and learn about these identities. As indicated in the results, participants noted in their autobiographies and interviews that exposure to different identities was a key factor in their learning. In particular, participants noted The Wall of Oppression, Star Power, and the life map activities allowed them to engage with their peers and learn about identities with which they were not familiar.

The second area was the creation of a safe space in which to engage their peers. Throughout the interviews and focus groups, participants mentioned the importance of the safe space that the SJLR created. The discussion of safe space was prevalent enough in the interviews that I added a question in the focus groups about safe space. The data indicated that having a space where students could engage in genuine open conversation, and feel safe enough to ask questions and learn was not an environment that they experienced on campus or in the classroom. The environment created at the SJLR being

away from campus and having an opportunity to engage in large and small groups, get to know each other, and form community was important for creating this space.

The last theme mentioned by participants was learning about stories and building community. In their small groups, participants were able to hear life maps from the rest of their small group and engage in conversations as questions came up. I was not able to observe the small groups because there were eight. The theme of learning about others stories in the data indicated that students were able to learn about others' identities on a deeper level than they would in a classroom or on campus. The connections formed helped create a sense of community, and according to the data a sense of safety. The students reported in the results that they had others from the retreat on campus that they could go and talk to if they needed to discuss issues or had questions that came up in regards to social justice.

The study also compared the impact of institutional diversity inside and outside the classroom to the SJLR in order to understand where students were learning more about diversity and social justice. In the literature, retreat experiences are either not included or the data is inconclusive on the impact it can have on students. Understanding the impact these experiences have on students helps to further understand how these experiences influence leadership and democracy outcomes. The participants reported that diversity in the classroom was important, which is consistent with the literature (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Lopez, 2004; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado 2005). All six of the White students in the focus group conducted in my study indicate through their comments that White students benefitted more within the classroom. The students

of color reported that the SLJR was helpful, but their responses indicated that it was not as helpful as it was for the White students in the study.

The data from the interviews indicate that both students of color and White students participating in my study benefitted from the SJLR. According to participant responses, the SLJR provided greater opportunities for interactions with diverse peers than their classrooms. The interactions in turn created motivation on the part of the participants to increase their knowledge, skills, and awareness about issues of race.

The SJLR provided greater exposure to different identities, stories, and experiences than the students received inside the classroom. The participants reported that the exposure to the life experiences about others, and learning about others' identities had increased their motivation to expand their knowledge, skills, and awareness around social justice. Racial engagement and learning are both linked to learning and democracy outcomes (Bowman, 2010b; Engberg, 2007; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). All of the participants who completed the study indicated that the knowledge and skills they gained from attending the retreat had increased their engagement and motivation. Each of the four students who did not complete the full study, but did complete the interview, mentioned similar themes in their individual interview. The diverse learning environment at the SJLR created opportunities for students to engage across race and learn from each other.

According to student comments, the institutional diversity on campus in the classroom does not necessarily provide the environment for students to feel safe to fully bring themselves to these conversations and learning. The ground rules and norming

developed at the SJLR as noted in the interviews and focus group created a meaningful and safe space to explore and discuss these topics that was not usually seen in the classroom according to participants. The “safe space” allowed the participants to interact, engage in dialogue, and learn about the identities, experiences, and stories of others that they were not getting in the classroom. The creation of ground rules, facilitation of activities, and dialogues that occurred at the retreat are consistent with the findings on safe spaces created during intergroup dialogues from the literature review (Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Zúñiga & Nagda 2003; Zúñiga, Nagda, Sevig, 2002). The literature on diversity courses touches on the creation of a safe space (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Lopez, 2004; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007; Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). However, information on safe space at experiences like the social justice leadership retreat is absent, since little research has been done on these types of experiences. The safe space that the retreat created is a contribution to the conversation on social justice initiatives that was previously deficient. The findings of this study also add further support to the importance of facilitation, dialogue, and the creation of safe spaces in student learning.

Further, the findings indicate that the retreat motivated students to be more involved in society, which is an important measure of democratic outcomes (Bowman, 2010b; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). Examination of the students’ pre-retreat autobiographies, interviews, and the focus group interview provides overwhelming support that the SJLR experiences empowered students to believe that they could be leaders for social justice. All six students who completed the full study indicated that the

SJLR had made them believe that they could do something. One student described the retreat as transformative. Moreover, students reported feeling empowered and equipped with the necessary tools to help them take action. The belief that the SJLR created within the students pushed them forward is noted by Becky, “It pushed me to where I would not have gone on my own.” It is difficult to understand the impact on the students who did not complete the study, since they were not directly asked a question about their belief in their capacity for leadership and democratic action during the individual interviews.

Ellen, Joy, Carrie, and Vivian all discussed wanting to be leaders and take action during their individual interviews, but it is unclear what impact the SJLR retreat had on their belief to take action. All of the participants completing the study showed an increased awareness of culture and racial understanding along with a belief that they could make a difference in regards to social justice. The participants also gained an appreciation and willingness to engage in constructive conflict and learning around issues of social justice in safe spaces.

The current study also provides powerful data on the social justice actions that students took because of attending the SJLR. The retreat helped participants to understand a variety of actions that they could take to address issues of social justice. All six of the students who completed the study had created action plans while at the SJLR. All six had begun to work on completing these goals by the time of their individual interview. The four students who did not complete the study had also begun work on completing their goals by the time of the individual interview.

Three months later at the focus group interview all six were still working on and making progress toward completing their goals. Several had discussed some obstacles to

completing their goals. The obstacles did not deter the participants; instead they adjusted their goals in order to keep moving forward. The excitement and momentum they had gained in regards to taking social justice action was still present three months following the retreat, and propelled them to action. Four of the participants had created new goals as they were completing the goals they had originally set. Over and over in both the interviews and the focus group interview these students specifically referenced the SJLR as the catalyst to the social justice action they were taking following the retreat.

The literature reviewed for this study contained no studies examining the social justice actions with which students engage in following this type of experience. This is a key piece of the conversation that is absent about retreat experiences. The studies examined contained data on diversity and social justice initiatives discuss curriculum and extracurricular activities, and their ability to impact social justice motivation and action (Engberg, 2007; Hurtado, 2005; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007; Zúñiga, Williams, & Berger, 2005). The studies measure motivation and action after these experiences. I was unable to find any studies that examined these factors over time. Further, I did not find any studies in which students developed action plans at the retreat and research that followed the progress toward those goals. The data collected from students completing this study show that the SJLR increased their motivation for social justice actions and that each of the students sustained this motivation and built on it over time.

Implications for Research

My preliminary results suggest that social justice retreats can affect participants' understanding of social justice and racism, but further research is needed to fully understand the effects of intensive intercultural experiences, such as the Social Justice

Leadership Retreat, on college students. My study begins to fill some of the gaps in the conversation about intercultural experiences, and to provide insight into the ways in which these experiences impact intercultural maturity, leadership outcomes, and democracy outcomes. Additional research on intercultural experiences that utilize additional research methods, or focus intentionally on intercultural maturity, leadership outcomes, or democracy outcomes will help further the research on these experiences. I will outline four ways in which researchers can foster additional research on these topics.

One possible research project includes more in-depth observation of the participants at the retreat. Interviews and responses within the focus groups seem to indicate that participants engaged in deeper conversations on some of the topics explored in this research in small group sessions. I would hypothesize that the participants felt a stronger connection within their small group, and that the space seemed to be safer for the participants based on the responses given in the interviews and focus group. Further planning with the retreat coordinators could be done to see if it would be possible to place all of the participants in one small group. Otherwise, I would recommend a team of researchers to observe the retreat with a researcher in each group. More researchers would also allow more data to be captured during the large group activities that one observer might not have been able to capture.

Another way to further the research would be to balance the study with regards to race. Though two students of color were a part of the interviews, only White students completed the entire study. I believe that future research needs to be conducted with a greater balance of race. As noted in the literature, different racial groups experience campus racial climate differently, and bring different life experiences with them to

campus (Ancis et al., 2000; Hurtado & Harper 2007; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Suarez-Balcazar et al., 2003). While I was able to gain some information from the students of color who participated in portions of the research, it is important that their voices be added to this discussion as well.

A third recommendation would include increasing the length of the study. The study provides information at two points following the retreat. The data indicate that the retreat impacted the ways that students made meaning of race, racism, and campus climate. There is also evidence that the retreat positively affects learning and democracy outcomes. Additionally, evidence indicates that the retreat increased students' beliefs and actions as they relate to social justice. Increasing the length of the study would help provide additional data to ascertain if the positive outcomes from the retreat are sustained over time. Moreover, it would also provide additional information about how the intercultural maturity of the students in the study changes over time, and how leadership and democracy outcomes are impacted. Longitudinal data such as this would fill a gap in the research on retreat experiences. Due to the lack of research on retreat experiences, tracking the impact over a longer period would be valuable.

Additional longitudinal data would help researchers and practitioners understand if the changes in meaning making and behavior are sustained over time, or if they fade over time. Extended data would also increase knowledge of students' actions as they relate to social justice. I recommend a longitudinal study that would conduct either additional individual interviews or group interviews at six months and twelve months following the retreat.

My fourth suggestion would be adding quantitative data. The qualitative data collected in this study was rich and informative. I believe that making adjustments listed above would greatly increase the robustness of the data. However, I believe that it would also be helpful to develop surveys or other quantitative measures that would supplement the qualitative data. I think that quantitative measures of intercultural maturity and leadership and democracy outcomes would further enhance the qualitative data. I think that it would advance scholars' understandings of changes in intercultural maturity and leadership and democracy outcomes that are difficult to measure with only qualitative data. Additionally, I think that use of quantitative data could be used to further measure the impact of the retreat on both students attending the retreat, and students not attending the retreat. I think that data collected from both sets of students would further illuminate the impact that the social justice retreat on students, and demonstrate development in students who do not benefit from this experience.

Implications for Theory

My study provides additional support to the theories set forth in the theoretical framework of this research. During the literature review, I was not able to find any research that utilized the intercultural maturity model to assess the cognitive development of students participating in an intercultural experience like the social justice retreat. I believe that my research demonstrates that the social justice leadership retreat had positive effects on the intercultural maturity of the students attending. My data therefore provide support to the model of intercultural maturity presented.

Further research is needed to fully recognize the impact of intensive intercultural experiences on intercultural maturity. My research raised a number of questions. I

believe that researchers need to understand the roles that the different identities of the students play in the development of their intercultural maturity. How does the retreat experience affect intercultural maturity over time if at all? My research indicates that there were changes in the level of intercultural maturity as a result of the retreat, but I only looked at a short window of time. How do these changes impact the students' intercultural maturity over longer periods of time? What other kinds of research designs are needed to further understand and capture the development of intercultural maturity of students participating in intensive intercultural experiences like the SJLR? Answers to these questions would further research and assist in understanding intercultural maturity.

In addition to the intercultural maturity model, my research also provides support for the social justice leadership retreat as a tool to positively impact leadership and democracy outcomes. During the literature review, I did not find studies that specifically looked at learning and democracy outcomes in an intercultural experience, and the impact of the experience on these outcomes. My study demonstrated that the participants developed cognitive skills and experiences that they described as helping to prepare them to be a part of a global society. The participants provided many examples in the data of utilizing these skills when returning to campus when interacting with others.

Additionally, through their social justice actions and engagement upon returning to campus, I believe that the participants showed their desire to be engaged in achieving these outcomes and working with others to achieve these outcomes. I would argue that the data supports democracy and learning outcomes.

My study showed that the social justice leadership retreat positively affected learning outcomes for the participants. My data confirmed that the diverse learning

environment of the retreat fostered active learning and complex thinking. In regards to the measures of learning outcomes, participants indicated that they had motivation to engage in social justice actions, increased the complexity of their thinking, and felt that they would be able to apply these skills after college. My research indicates that additional research on intense intercultural experiences is needed in order to more completely understand the impacts on leadership outcomes. I believe that supplemental research that focuses specifically on leadership outcomes in relation to the retreat would help to illuminate how the retreat affects these outcomes. One of the elements of leadership outcomes is the application of these skills following college. I would argue that engagement in social justice actions could be an indicator of students applying their skills. However, I believe further research on the ways students apply their learning and skills following college would provide additional support for leadership outcomes, and research currently does not exist that examines post graduate experience.

Analysis of my study also shows that the retreat positively affected democracy outcomes. The retreat was a catalyst in preparing students to be a part of a society that is becoming more global. The participants realized and were excited about the opportunities working with diverse groups of people. They also indicated that they were motivated to become more involved in society, politics, and community service. The retreat sparked an interest in learning more about other cultures and gaining further understanding as evidenced by the actions they took following the retreat. Further research on intense intercultural experiences is needed to fully understand the impact on democracy outcomes. Additionally, data following the students post-graduation would help to determine if the students follow through on this motivation.

Researchers should continue to study the SJLR model and experiences like it, since the data support the importance and positive impact of this experience on intercultural maturity, leadership outcomes, and democracy outcomes. Further research on the social justice leadership retreat and experiences like it could provide additional useful information on student development concerning intercultural maturity. The intercultural maturity model was designed from a variety of theories. The intercultural maturity model touches on many theories in the areas of cognitive development, interpersonal development, and intrapersonal development. Research that focuses on some of the other theories specifically within the realm of intercultural maturity could reveal further insights that may provide further support for the theories used to develop this model. These theories were not the focus of this dissertation, but were a part of the development of the intercultural maturity model. I will briefly discuss some of the pertinent theories within each domain of the intercultural maturity model, which may benefit from further research.

Within the cognitive domain, I believe the data provide positive support for the development of how students think, reason, and make meaning with regards to social justice. I would argue this has positive implications for student development within the cognitive structural theories like Perry's (1968) Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development and Baxter Magolda's (1992) Model of Epistemological Reflection, which are a part of the cognitive domain of the intercultural maturity model. These theories focus on development through the processes of cognitive dissonance. There were many examples in the data of students experiencing dissonance as a result of experiences and

new learning that occurred at the retreat or following the retreat on campus as the interviews and focus group indicated.

Further, the data support development within the interpersonal domain of the intercultural maturity model. Specifically, this domain touches on theories like Chickering & Reiser's (1993) Theory of Identity Development, for students of color Cross's (1991) model of Psychological Nigrescence, and for the White students Helm's (1995) White Identity Development Model. These theories specifically examine how students define themselves internally, their relationships with others, and how they understand and make meaning of their identity and racial identity. The data showed a number of students who through the SJLR, new knowledge they gained at the retreat, and when they returned to campus were working on developmental tasks within some of these theories. The participants demonstrated more complex ways of the ways in which they made meaning of their identities.

The last domain was the interpersonal domain. This domain includes theories like Chickering and Reiser (1993), Gilligan (1977), and Kohlberg (1984). These theories focus on relationships that we have with others, awareness of social systems and how they affect relationships between groups. I think that the participants showed a greater understanding of their relationships with others, and were beginning to see how social systems can impact groups and others through their experience at the retreat and following the retreat.

Implications for Practice

My research brings forward a number of implications for practice for institutions, faculty/staff, and students. Institutionally, I will discuss the importance of structuring

and situating a retreat within an institution based on my research. There are also important implications for faculty and staff as far as lessons for classes and activities as well as for individuals who facilitate at the SJLR. Lastly, I consider implications for students with regard to benefits of the retreat, learning, and action as a result of attending the retreat.

The first implication for practice surrounds the structure of higher education and the situation of a retreat like the Social Justice Leadership Retreat within that structure. The institution hosts the retreat situates the retreat within the housing department. The housing department collaborates with the office of the VP for Student Affairs and the VP for Auxiliary Services. The retreat is open to all students on campus. As I reflect on the retreat, I think that where it is situated at this institution works, however I do not know that there is wide knowledge about it with faculty or academic practitioners other than a few majors that align with the purpose of the retreat and have been involved since the beginning.

I believe that partnership between student affairs, the provost office, and the diversity and equity offices at an institution could provide some powerful additions to the retreat. I think that working together these offices could provide additional resources and funding. More importantly, I think that it could bring faculty and academic folks into the development of this experience, and increase its notoriety on campus. I think that bringing these groups together could have powerful influence on the curriculum and the experience of those attending the retreat. I think that my research would be helpful in convincing all of these parties of the importance of experiences like this on their campus, and can demonstrate the positive results students gain.

As diversity and inclusion are becoming increasingly important goals on campus, and creating experiences like the retreat could help institutions realize this goal. Many campuses over the last ten years have been creating welcome week experiences where students return to campus up to a week before classes. An interesting question I would pose to faculty and practitioners would be what would happen if all students went through an experience like this during a welcome week on campus? How would this influence the campus and the students?

The second implication for practice I discuss is for faculty and staff. I believe that my study provides useful information for faculty and staff to apply in their classrooms and in activities on campus. My research demonstrated that proper facilitation of groups and the ability to interact with diverse identities is important to cognitive development and student learning. Both faculty and staff could utilize promising practices in the realm of group dialogue and facilitation that make dialogue easier, and actively engage their students in meetings, events, interaction with student groups, and campus programs. I think that faculty and student affairs practitioners would benefit from taking some courses on facilitation techniques, and group dialogue. I would recommend courses designed to engage classes or groups in difficult dialogue about identities, how identities present themselves in classrooms/activities, and how identities are present in the course materials. I think too many student affairs practitioners and faculty shy away from having dialogue about identity or the impact of identity in the classroom due to discomfort in facilitating the conversation properly.

I think that in classrooms and within activities, it is critical to establish ground rules for conversations in that space, so that students begin to feel that they can share and

bring their whole selves to that space. Safe space was a common theme discussed by students in my study. Additionally, though it takes extra time, I would argue it is important for the individuals in that class or activity to take some time to get to know each other. Without knowledge and engagement with others, it is difficult to create a space where students feel safe. Devoting time to creating safe spaces in the classroom and within campus activities could help students engage in difficult dialogues more often, and get more out of them. I think that the retreat provides some simple activities and a good list of ground rules that transfer to the classroom and activities outside the classroom.

I argue that the lack of engagement impacts both White students and students of color in the classroom. I think that White students especially need to engage with other racial identities in the classroom and do not know how. I also believe that the lack of conversations often leaves students of color feeling tokenized or experiencing microaggressions that go unaddressed. The participants in my study noted that they learned about diverse identities in the classroom; however, they also noted that the environment did not always feel safe to engage in difficult dialogue around issues of diversity and social justice.

I think that in classrooms and within activities, it is critical to establish ground rules for conversations in that space, so that students begin to feel that they can share and bring their whole selves to that space. Additionally, though it takes extra time, I would argue it is important for the individuals in that class or activity to take some time to get to know each other. Without knowledge and engagement with others, it is difficult to create a space where students feel safe. Devoting time to creating safe spaces in the classroom

and within campus activities could help students engage in difficult dialogues more often, and get more out of them. I think that the retreat provides some simple activities and a good list of ground rules that transfer to the classroom and activities outside the classroom.

Lastly, I explore implications for practice with regard to students and the ways in which students benefit from the retreat, and the learning and action they take because of attending the retreat. I think that it is important to practice to examine the areas where the retreat is beneficial, but also other areas that may benefit students of color or White students more. The retreat does a good job of motivating White students to engage with social justice, and provides benefits to both students of color and White students. I think that the retreat helps the participants to form a community that will be there when they get back to campus.

Though students of color benefit from the retreat, I think that spaces on campus like student organizations around their identities, Living & Learning Communities devoted to specific identities, and programs that study specific identities may provide needed safe space for these students on campus. The community created at the retreat can be helpful, but research also has shown that it is important for students of color to be able to feel safe and at home in the college environment especially at PWI's, and these groups could provide that more than the retreat community could. I would contend students of color experienced benefits and development, but not to the extent of the White participants based on the data collected. I do think that there are some ways in which the retreat could be more impactful for students of color, and at the same time provide benefit to White students as well. I think that having some caucus groups during

the retreat could be helpful for these groups. Caucus groups would allow for some time with those who share the same racial identity as you, and could help to build some community in another way at the retreat. I did not have any students of color complete the whole study, which only allows me to infer that students of color experienced some motivation as noted in their interviews by working on their action plans.

I contend that the retreat is most beneficial to first and second year White students who come to college with little exposure or engagement with diverse identities. Based on my experience facilitating the retreat and having researched it, I truly think it engages and influences almost all students who attend. Throughout my experience, I have seen a minimal amount of students who had a bad experience or were not impacted. I would say these students had rigid ideologies and were not willing to listen to the stories of others or engage. Students falling into this category may not be best suited to attend the retreat. However, I have a number of stories of students who meet this description who had transformative experiences on the retreat.

The retreat has begun recently to incorporate Brene Brown and Gallup Strengths into the retreat experience, which could provide some additional benefits. Examination of my data also leads me to believe that White students are more motivated to engage in creating change after attending the retreat. One of the goals of faculty and student affairs practitioners is to help students develop intercultural maturity and develop cognitive thinking skills in order to prepare them to be a contributing member of society. My research demonstrates that the social justice leadership retreat can help to accomplish this goal.

The participants also took action with regard to social justice following the retreat. They worked on their goals, developed new goals, and sustained their actions related to social justice for three months following the retreat. As our society becomes increasingly diverse it is more important than ever that faculty and student affairs practitioners do all that is possible to provide opportunities for students to interact with their diverse peers, and encourage action with regard to social justice. These actions are a key component of democracy and leadership outcomes, which are important outcomes for students to achieve while in college.

As much as possible, student affairs practitioners and faculty should try considering thoughtfully how to promote diversity in educational experiences of all kinds, and encourage students to engage meaningfully with their peers. Exposure to different identities introduces students to new ways of thinking and making meaning of their experiences at college. As a result, the students' cognitive maturity develops along with their leadership and democracy outcomes. My study showed that the SJLR was impactful for student learning and cognitive growth along with other studies examined in the literature review.

Limitations

My study began with twelve participants who participated in the pre-retreat autobiography. The original participants included a mix of racial identities as well as one male participant. The racial balance of the participants who continued and completed the study was more heavily White with only two students of color who completed the interview portion of the study.

I had one participant who identified as male, Brad. Brad carried with him some other oppressed identities, which I think enabled him to better understand the concepts. The retreat in general if you examine the numbers in appendix A show that the retreat attracts mostly female students. Brad came to the retreat with more knowledge and awareness than most males. Based on my experience co-coordinating, I feel that White males are a group that could benefit greatly from attending the retreat, since they possess the most privilege with regard to race.

Throughout the study some participants either decided to leave the study, or were not able to participate in the final focus group. The final total of participants that completed the entire study was six. All of these participants identified as White.

In the results I have included data and findings from the participants who participated in each portion of the study, as I believe that it adds to the richness of the data. Additionally, some of the key findings reported by the participants who completed the whole study mirror some of the data that was collected during the individual interviews from participants who were unable to complete the focus group interview.

The observation portion of data collection also presented a limitation of this study in that it was difficult for one researcher to observe so many participants throughout the large group activities. Additionally, I did not observe participants during the small group time. Small group time was more intimate, and participants got to know the people in these groups more closely. The safety provided in the small group may have encouraged participants to share more personal and additional information that they were not comfortable sharing in the larger group. Adding these data could enrich the depth and breadth of the findings.

Conclusions

This research study examined an intensive intercultural experience, the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. Specifically this study set out to examine how experiences like this impact the way students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate, as well as the impact on students' beliefs about capacity for action, and how their behavior is affected.

The study also demonstrates that retreat experiences like the SJLR can have a positive impact on students, help students develop intercultural maturity, assist with learning and democratic outcomes, and increase their motivation to take action with regard to social justice. This research fills important gaps in the literature about intercultural maturity and learning and democratic outcomes. There was an absence of literature that examined intercultural maturity or application to leadership and democracy outcomes. The positive results from the study show that further study of these experiences is necessary for scholars to understand the impact of this experience on students.

As educators and scholars, it is our vocation to educate students and prepare them to live in a global society. In order to do that, we must understand campus climate, the barriers that exist for students, and the many methods through which we can foster intercultural maturity in our students and help them achieve learning and democracy outcomes while they are attending institutions of higher education. As the landscape of higher education in this country continues to become more diverse, and society becomes increasingly interconnected, it is more important than ever that students learn skills that will help them be successful in a multicultural society.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Allen, W. R. (1985). Black student, white campus: Structural, interpersonal, and psychological correlates of success. *Journal of Negro Education*, 54 (2), 134-147.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E. & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78, 180-185.
- Magolda, M. B. B. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development*. Jossey-Bass.
- Belue Buckley, J., & Quaye, S. J. (2014). A vision of social justice in intergroup dialogue. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2014.969221.
- Bowman, N. A. (2010a). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 80(1), 4-33.
- Bowman, N. A. (2010b). Promoting participation in a diverse democracy: A meta-analysis of college diversity experiences and civic engagement. *Review of Educational Research* 81(1), 29-68.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010) *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism & racial inequality in contemporary America*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Boysen, G. A., & Vogel, D. L. (2009). Bias in the classroom: Types, frequencies, and responses. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36(1), 12-17.
- Broido, E. M. & Manning, K. A. (2002). Philosophical foundations and current theoretical perspectives in qualitative research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4), 434-445.
- Cabrera, A. F., & Nora, A. (1994). College students' perceptions of prejudice and discrimination and their feelings of alienation. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 16, 387-409.
- Cabrera, A. F., and Nora, A. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 119-148.
- Cabrera, N. (2014). But we're not laughing: White male college students' racial joking and what this says about "post-racial" discourse. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 55 (1), 1-15.
- Cabrera, N. (2012). Exposing whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. *Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education*, 17:1, 30-55.
- California Newsreel (Producer). (2003). *Race: The power of an illusion* [DVD]. Available from California Newsreel, University of Iowa Library.
- Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter? The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 377-395.

- Chang, M. J. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The Journal of General Education*, 51(1), 21-42.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cole, E. R., Case, K. A., Rios, D., & Curtin, N. (2011). Understanding what students bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity courses on student attitudes. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(4), 397-405.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cresswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Temple University Press.
- Denson, N. (2009). Do curricular and co-curricular diversity activities influence racial bias? A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 46, 322-353.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical orientation to sociological methods* (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Stewart, T. L., Esses, V. M., Vergert, M., & Hodson, G. (2004) From intervention to outcome: Processes in the reduction of bias. In: Stephan, W. G., and Vogt, W. P. (eds.), *Education Programs for Improving Intergroup Relations*, Teachers College Press, New York, 243-265.

- Downey, J. P. & Stage, F. K. (1999). Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (1), 3-9.
- Engberg, M. (2004). Improving intergroup relations in higher education: A critical examination of the influence of educational interventions on racial bias. *Review of Educational Research*, 74 (4), 473-524.
- Engberg, M. (2007). Educating the workforce for the 21st century: A cross-disciplinary analysis of the impact of the undergraduate experience on students' development of a pluralistic orientation. *Research in Higher Education*, 48 (3), 283-317.
- Farrell, W. C. Jr. & Jones, C. K. (1988). Recent racial incidents in higher education: A preliminary perspective. *The Urban Review*, 20 (3), 211-226.
- Feagin, Vera, Imani (1996) *Agony of Education: Black students at white colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.
- Franklin, J. D., Smith, W. A., & Hung, M (2014). Racial battle fatigue for latina/o students: A quantitative perspective. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 13(4), 303-322.
- Fisher v. University of Texas, at Austin, 631 F.3d 213 (5th Cir. 2011) *cert. granted*, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 1652 (Feb. 21, 2012).
- Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: A and B.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard educational review*, 47(4), 481-517.
- Gonzalez, K. P. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly white university. *Urban Education*, 37, 193-218.

- Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244 (2003).
- Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
- Gurin, P. (1999). Selections from “The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education,” Expert reports in defense of the University of Michigan. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 32(2), 36-62.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(1), 17-34.
- Harper, S. R. & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, winter, 7-24.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms’s white and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M., Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (p. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hopkins, L. E. & Domingue, A. D. (2015). From awareness to action: College students’ skill development in intergroup dialogue. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 48 (3), 392-402.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63 (5), 539-569.

- Hurtado, S. (2003) Preparing college students for a diverse democracy: Final report to the U. S. Department of Education, OERI, Field initiated studies program. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education.
- Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 61(3), 595-610.
- Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In Smart, J. C. & Paulsen, M. B. (eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research 27*. Springer Science + Business.
- Hurtado, S., & Cade, H. W. (2001) Time for retreat or renewal? Perspectives on the effects of Hopwood on campus. In: Heller, D. E., *The state and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hurtado, S., & Engberg, M. E. (2011). Developing pluralistic skills and dispositions in college: examining racial/ethnic group differences. *The Journal of Higher Education* 82(4): 416-443.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Higher Education* 4 (3), 235-251.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., and Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity through educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education* 21 (3): 279-302.

- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., and Allen, W. R. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports Series 26* (8). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kendall, F. E. (2006). *Understanding white privilege: Creating pathways to authentic relationships across race*. New York: Routledge.
- King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 571-592.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. *The psychology of moral development*.
- Levine, A. L. & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lopez, G. E. (2004). Interethnic contact, curriculum, and attitudes in the first year of college. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(1), 75-94.
- Mack, D. E., Tucker, T. W., & Cha, S. O. (2000). Inter-Ethnic relations on campus: The color of hatred. *Paper presented at the 108th Annual convention of the APA*, Washington, D. C., August 5.
- Mack, D. E., Tucker, T. W., Archuieta, R., DeGroot, G., Hernandez, A. A., Oh Cha, S. (1997). Interethnic relations on campus: Can't we all get along? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 25(4), 256-268.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Deluca Fernandez, S. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31 (1), 55-80.

- McCormack, A. S. (1998). Revisiting discrimination on campus, 1988, 1992 and 1996. *College Student Journal*, 32(3), 378-394.
- McClelland, K. E. & Auster, C. J. (1990). Public platitudes and hidden tensions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(6), 607-642.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). *White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack*. Peace and Freedom Philadelphia, PA: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, July/August.
- McKinney, K. D. (2005). *Being white: Stories of race and racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., and Antonio, A. L. (2005). Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*.
- Muller, J. T., & Miles, J. R. (2016, January 25). Intergroup dialogue in undergraduate multicultural psychology education: Group climate development and outcomes. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. [Http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040042](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040042).
- Museus, S. D., & Park, J. J. (2015). The continuing significance of racism in the lives of Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, (56) 6, 551-569.

- Nagda, B. R. A. (2006). Breaking barriers, crossing borders, building bridges: Communication processes in intergroup dialogues. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 553-576.
- Nagda, B. A., Spearmon, M. L., Holley, L. C., Harding, S., Balassone, M. L., Moise-Swanson, D., and De Mello, S. (1999). Intergroup dialogues: An innovative approach to teaching about diversity and justice in social work programs. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 35(3), 433-449.
- Nagda, B. A., Kim, C., & Truelove, Y. (2004). Learning about difference, learning to connect, learning to transgress. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(1), 195-214.
- Nagda, B. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2003). Fostering meaningful racial engagement through intergroup dialogues. *Group Process and Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 111-128.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Engberg, M. E., & Hurtado, S. (2005). Modeling accentuation effects: Enrolling in a diversity course and the importance of social action engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 448-476.
- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(4), 365-387.
- Olivas M. A. (2005) The legal environment: The implementation of legal change on campus. In: Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., and Gumport, P. J. (eds.) *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges (second ed.)*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 226-252.

- Pascarella, E. T., Martin, G. L., Hanson, J. M., Trolian, T. L., Gillin, B., and Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(1), 86-92.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Volume 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1968). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*(65), 85-103.
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(1) pp. 43-61.
- Saenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(1), 1-38.
- Smith, D. (1981). Social and academic environments of black students on white campuses. *Journal of Negro Education, 50*(3), 299-306.
- Smith, W. A. (2004). Black faculty coping with racial battle fatigue: The campus racial climate in a post-civil rights era. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students* (p. 171-190). New York: Peter Lang.

- Smith, W. A. (2009). Campuswide climate: Implications for African American students. In L. C. Tillman (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of African American education* (p. 297-309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the position...you fit the description": Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(4), 551-578.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college Students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69 (1/2), pp. 60-73.
- Solórzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4, 272-293.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2013). Measuring race and gender differences in undergraduate students' perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in black and white. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(2), 115-132.
- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Orellana-Damacela, L., Portillo, N., Rowan, J. M., & Andrews-Guillen, C. (2003). Experiences of differential treatment among college students of color. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(4), 428-444.
- Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., Torino, G. C. (2007a). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(1), 72-81.

- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007b). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003). African American college students' experiences with everyday racism: Characteristics of and responses to these incidents. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 29, 38-67.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. New York: Back Bay Books; Little, Brown and Co.
- The Prejudice Institute (2004), *Fact sheet on Ethnoviolence*. Retrieved 04.02.07
<http://www.prejudiceinstitute.org/factsheets.html>.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2012), *Race, about race*. Retrieved from
<http://www.census.gov/population/race/>
- U.S. Department of Education, *National Center for Education Statistics 2015, Digest of Education Statistics, 2015 (NCES2009-020)*, Chapter 3.
- Vidich, A. J., & Lyman, S. M. (1994). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 23-59.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latino/a undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659-690.
- Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. A., and Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(1), 7-17.

Zúñiga , X., Williams, E. A., & Berger, J. B. (2005). Action-oriented democratic outcomes: The impact of student involvement with campus diversity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 660-678.

APPENDIX A: Past Retreat Participant Demographic Information

	January 2005	November 2005	January 2006	November 2006	January 2007	November 2007	January 2008	January 2009	Grand total
Students Attending	61	44	69	62	49	59	59	40	443
Male	11	9	17	23	7	13	14	5	99
Female	50	35	52	39	42	46	45	35	344
Year in School									
First Year	16	11	No Data	17	13	23	15	10	105
Sophomore	11	11	No Data	17	11	10	10	7	77
Junior	17	8	No Data	18	10	11	15	11	90
Senior	12	11	No Data	6	10	11	17	11	78
Grad Student	5	3	No Data	4	5	4	2	1	24
Major									
Hard Sciences	8	2	6	10	4	11	6	3	
Grad Student	5	3	0	48	5	4	2	1	
Lib. Arts, Soc. Sci, Art/Hum, Educ, other	48	39	63	4	40	44	51	36	

APPENDIX B: Retreat Overview

Social Justice Leadership Retreat Program Overview

Program Philosophy

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat (SJLR) is an experiential based initiative designed primarily for undergraduate students. The retreat is designed to introduce concepts of social justice, challenge students based on those concepts, and to inspire them as change agents to take action to create a more socially just campus community. This is achieved through the use of large and small group activities, storytelling, movies, and short presentations.

For the purpose of the SJLR, social justice is defined as working to end the cultural and systematic nature of United States culture that results in some people have power over others on the basis of social identities (race, ethnicity, gender, sex, age, religion, economic class, ability status, and sexual orientation). Those identified as having cultural and systemic power on the basis of social identities are white, heterosexual, male, temporarily able bodied, Christian, upper-class, and adults between the ages of 25-45. These identities are often referred to as agents of oppression and people with identities that do not have power are known as targets of oppression.

A common confusion is the belief that all identities have experienced some form of oppression. The organizers of this retreat, and many leaders in this work around the country, do not agree. In order to experience oppression, you must be without cultural and institutional power. Those identities outlined above as agents of oppression cannot experience oppression on the basis of those identities. They may experience oppression on the basis of other identities that are not agent identities. That said, individuals of all identities can act with discrimination and prejudice towards any person on the basis of a social identity. The key difference is whether or not acts of discrimination and prejudice have cultural and systemic power roots or whether they are individual acts outside the power structure. A white person will always have cultural and systemic power over people of color and incidents that demonstrate that power would be called racism or oppression. When a person of color acts with discrimination or prejudice towards a white person or another person of color it is not considered oppression or racism. While all students will not agree with or reach this level of understanding at the retreat, it is important that all facilitators represent this widely agreed upon distinction.

The overall desire is for all students with at least one agent identity to understand the power and privilege that goes with that identity and instill a sense of obligation to use that power and privilege as an ally. For students with at least one target identity, the goal is to empower that student by developing an environment that will validate their life experiences as being true and provide a community committed to taking action.

As a developmental process, the retreat seeks to do the following things in order:

1. Build a foundation using basic social justice concepts

2. Build trust within the large group and small group
3. Identify social identity differences
4. Identify social consequences of social identity differences in the form of stereotypes and language
5. Simulate the cultural and systemic nature of oppression and the behaviors, emotions, and reactions to both agent and target experiences.
6. Outline the nature of cultural and systemic oppression and the power/privilege that people with target identities have.
7. Name real life experiences by providing language that matches their simulated experience.
8. Explore social identity difference, cultural and systematic oppression, and privilege on an individual level through the listening and sharing of personal narratives.
9. Encourage students to take responsibility for continuing their own self discovery and learning through the use of provided media.
10. Introduce the concept of Social Justice Allies and explore the skills and behaviors that are required.
11. Translate weekend learning into individual and group action planning.
12. Maintain ongoing development once group has returned to campus.

Facilitator Roles and Expectations

- **Role Modeling** – Inclusive language, retreat philosophy, risk taking, sharing, and developmental approach.
- **Developmental Approach** – Understanding that student learning around social justice is a process and we want to move that process forward. A developmental approach requires patience, especially when it comes to your own identities. Keep in mind that at times one student's learning is another student's pain.
- **Facilitation of Conversations** – The facilitator role is designed to assist students in having conversations with each other. Facilitators set the tone by role modeling risk taking and sharing and then let students retain most of the focus. The facilitator role is not one of judge or jury, but one of developmental accountability and creating an open space for dialogue.
- **Support of Target Populations** – It is critical that facilitators are aware of students who have targeted identities and provides the support that is needed. This often comes in the form of validating experiences and being an ally if needed. Facilitations from identities underrepresented at the retreat may be sought out by students for additional support.
- **Admitting Privilege** – It is critical that all facilitators with privilege openly own that privilege. This is especially important for men, white people, and heterosexual people.
- **Admitting Mistakes** – Facilitators are expected to be honest about their mistakes to each other and to the student participants.

- **Students First** – The retreat experience is designed to put the student experience first. This means that facilitators should do their own work prior to the retreat and allow student voices to be heard.
- **Partnership** – Each facilitator will work in a small group partnership. This partnership takes planning and time to prepare for.
- **Feedback** – All facilitators must be open to feedback from other facilitators. Additionally, facilitators are expected to give each other feedback. Egos and fear of hurting someone's feelings need to take a back seat. The goal of feedback should be a better experience and allowing all parties to retain their dignity.

APPENDIX C: Description of Activities

Welcome Activities

As students arrive, we will take pictures of them and give them small sheets to fill out with some very basic information. They will hang these pictures/sheets on a poster board with the rest of their small group. Meanwhile, other facilitators will pass out nametags, mingle and answer questions, etc. until we get started.

Icebreakers (Large Group)

- "Move if" – Arrange group in a large circle with one person in the middle. This central person says "move if...you wore sandals yesterday (for example)" - everyone who wore sandals yesterday finds a new space and there is a new person in the middle. The game continues until an appropriate ending point.
- Teddy Toss – Arrange group in circles of 15-20 people, have soft objects to throw to someone else in the circle - say their name when you throw, they thank you, using your name, thus we learn others names - add more than one throwing object to increase difficulty.
- Similarities and Differences - Have small groups (4-6 people) find four things unique to each individual and four things that all group members have in common. Share with larger group.
- Silent Introductions - Have pairs or trios introduce themselves to one another without using words or sounds. They must use gestures and motions or things which happen to be lying around the room to point out important things they want their partner to know. (For instance, someone who is a member of a Greek organization may be wearing a shirt or have some letterhead in their backpack. Someone who loves swimming may make swimming movements to make the other person understand.) You may play so that the partner who is not introducing themselves can or cannot talk – however you want to play.
- Nametag switch - Have people introduce themselves to someone including their name and two or three interesting things about them. They then switch identities (nametags) and introduce themselves to other people with their new identity.

Cultural Pursuit

This is a simple energizer activity similar to human bingo in which participants are given a handout with a five by five grid on it. Each grid space has a question related to some aspect of culture and participants are asked to go around the room, meet people, and find people who know the answer to a given question. A person who knows the answer will then sign their grid and they will move on to find another person.

Ground Rules

Facilitators will help with the process of laying down ground rules – time permitting, we will ask the group to generate these rules and add on anything we feel needs to be added. These rules apply to large and small group activities. Our generated list is:

- Really listen – don't talk over others
- Treat each other with respect
- Be fully present
- Take risks, lean into discomfort
- Ask clarifying questions when you don't understand
- Notice and name group dynamics in the moment
- Agree to disagree
- Consider how/why you've got where you are today
- Speak from personal experience: use "I" statements to share thoughts and feelings
- Participate fully (at your own comfort level)
- Take responsibility for the group
- Confidentiality is expected, but not guaranteed – safe space
- Self attribute your motives and thoughts, do not assume about others
- Respect that we are all at different places
- Attribute the best motive to other

Definitions and Language –

Mattering and Marginality Model

From Nancy Schlossberg's work on the subject, this model shows a continuum of community with mattering at one end and marginality at the other. Silence, ignorance, fear, separateness, shunning, and avoidance characterize marginality. Mattering is characterized by identification, attention, importance, interdependence, and appreciation. Students should be asked to identify a person to whom they matter, an environment in which they matter, and the same for feeling marginal. Ask the group what behaviors make them feel one way or the other. Students should connect these feelings to story telling and how learning about one another, sharing their own story with others, and listening intently to others' stories helps one to feel as though they matter. Our goal is to make everyone feel as though they matter – this is a very simple way of viewing social justice work in general. If mattering brings understanding, appreciation, and interdependence, then we are moving in the right direction towards social justice. This model will hopefully provide a framework for discussion and for creating the life map. Handouts of questions and the continuum will be provided.

Johari's Window

The Johari's Window was introduced and conceived by Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham and also was used in an information session at the Western Training Laboratory in Group Development in 1955. This conceptual model can be used and implemented for describing, evaluating and predicting aspects of interpersonal communication especially

during teaching and learning activities in the classrooms as it gives us the opportunity to explore and understand ourselves and those around us. The Johari's window represents four areas between a person and those around him or her called Public, Blind Spot, Hidden and Unknown (other terms are also used). The greatest value for using this exercise is to establish the benefit of disclosing things we know about ourselves and becoming aware of how much of our behavior and beliefs is not known to ourselves. One of the greatest demons we face is our ability to lie or be ignorant about ourselves.

Step-In Activity

This is an activity that will help the group understand the very diverse demographics of the group at the retreat. A subcommittee will come up with a variety of statements pertaining to the origin and identity of different individuals. One facilitator should make it clear that confidentiality is important in this exercise and what individuals choose to reveal about themselves should be kept in the room and not disclosed to individuals outside of the retreat without permission from a specific individual. Another important ground rule in this activity is that responding to a given statement, whether it is true of you or not, should be based on your desire to reveal this fact and one's own perception of her or his identity (Challenge by Choice). Facilitators will read the statements one at a time and everyone who that statement pertains to will step forward (if comfortable). For example, a facilitator might read, "is a woman" and all the women in the room will step forward. After a moment, the facilitator will ask all of those people to step back into the circle/line. Statements will cover gender, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic class, ability level, sexual orientation, religion, age, rural and urban backgrounds, involvements (e.g. is an athlete, is an artist, etc), and there are many other possibilities as well. Following the last statement, participants should be thanked for their willingness to share and their involvement in the activity.

Icebreakers (Small Group)

During the first meeting with your small group, we suggest that you facilitate one or two additional name games or icebreakers (in addition to the ones done in the large group). Here are a few suggestions or feel free to use any others with which you are familiar.

- ❖ *Do You Like Your Neighbors*- Participants stand in a circle with one person in the middle. The person in the middle will approach someone in the circle, address them by name and ask "Do you like your neighbors?" The person being addressed responds "Yes, I like my neighbors _____ and _____ (referring to the people on either side of them by name), but I really like people with _____." (any other attribute a person might have, e.g. blue eyes, who have been to another country, or who are wearing sandals.) The people who this latter statement applies to must move to another place in the circle, and the person in the middle moves into one of their slots. One person is left in the middle and the game continues.
- ❖ *Name Origins* – Have participants stand in front of the class one at a time and write their full name on a large piece of paper. Be sure to have a variety of colored markers. The person then explains anything interesting about his or her name. One can talk about why their parents chose the name, the ancestral significance of their

name, why they chose a certain color to write it in, any nicknames they have, or anything else they want to share. You may also ask participants to share what they would change their name to if they were to change it.

- ❖ *Memory (also known on this campus, with a little variation as Big Booty)*- Have participants sit in a circle on the floor. One person will start out; he or she will pat both hands on their lap, then clap their hands together, then snap the fingers on one hand, then snap the fingers on the other hand, and then repeat. This establishes a rhythm. All participants will copy the motions giving a four count, on counts three (the first snap), the starting person will say his or her own name and on the fourth count (the second snap) they will say the name of someone else in the group. Then the person whose name was said will say his or her own name and someone else's on these counts. The game continues until someone misses a name or does not stay on the rhythm. When someone makes a mistake, he or she will move to the seat on the right hand side of the person who started the round and everyone else will shift to their left. The object is to get into the seat of the person starting each round.
- ❖ *M & M Game* – Present a bag of M & M's or another multicolored candy. Ask each participant to take three candies, each a different color. Pre-brainstorm questions to be paired with each color. Thus, if someone draws a yellow M & M, they may have to say what their favorite book is and why, or if they pick a red M & M, they will answer the question, if you could change your name to anything what would it be? Then go around the room and have each participant answer the three questions corresponding to their candy colors.
- ❖ *Two Truths and a Lie* – Instruct participants to think of three facts about themselves, two which are true and one which is a lie. (e.g. my high school soccer team won the state championship, I play the piano, or I used to work in a fast food restaurant.) Then go around the room, one at a time, and have participants state their facts. The rest of the class will guess which facts are true and which one is the lie.
- ❖ *Mapping our Diversity* - Each group will be given a small map of the world and three colors of small sticker dots (red, blue, and green). Have each member of the group put a green sticker where they were born, a blue dot where their ancestry lies, and a red dot where their heart would be (if they could be anywhere in the world, where would they go). Allow group members to place more than one dot of a given color (especially the blue dot) if they want to do so.
- ❖ *Or any other activity you know of.*

Wall of Oppression - A separate sheet is attached for this.

Concentric Circles

Have everyone form two circles, one within the other. Everyone should be directly across from one other person. We will ask a series of questions, beginning at low risk and moving to higher risk and more in-line with retreat content. After each question, the facilitator will ask one of the two circles to rotate (e.g. “inner circle, move two spaces to your right”). Participants should get to meet several people and get moving for the day. Brian has generated the questions to be used, listed below. Facilitator should be sure that

their circle rotation pattern does not result in the same two people talking more than once.
Prompts:

1. What was the last movie you saw and did you like it?
2. Talk about your favorite musician.
3. Talk about your favorite hobbies/pastimes
4. Thinking back over your years in school, what grade was your favorite and why?
5. What has been your favorite class at UVM?
6. When you were a child, what was your favorite book?
7. Talk about someone who has been a mentor to you.
8. Talk about a time when you felt silenced.
9. Why are you here at this retreat? What made you decide to come this weekend?
10. Talk about any expectations and anxieties you have about today's activities.
11. Thank the person (you're talking to) for the information they shared with you and the other people here.

Star Power – Copyrighted simulation

Presentation on Privilege –

Small Group Story Telling – Life maps

This is the primary, small group, story telling activity of the retreat. Students will be given a piece of newsprint or poster board and asked to draw a map which shows their journey through life. Participants should be given 20-30 minutes or so to make their map with markers, pencils, pens, and other materials we will bring. Each person in the small group will then share their life map with the other group members. It is generally good for one of the facilitators to start off, reminding the group of ground rules, and then role modeling the level of depth we are hoping students to share. The other facilitator will either wait until the end or for a serious lull. Some of these can get pretty deep and evoke a lot of emotion so take your time and make sure people can tell their whole story as safely as possible. If you have time, allow individuals to process a little afterwards, ask each other appropriate questions in the small group or one on one.

It is very important before this activity to accentuate the mattering and marginality model and how it relates to this particular life map. This is a Social Justice Life Map – areas of focus are thus:

- When did you first realize you were different
- Significant times feeling different/treating other's differently
- Acts of or witnessing activism
- How has this changed you
- Etc.

Videos

This session is meant to give participants a chance to view and discuss a video that is predominately about a specific "ism." Two facilitators will lead the discussions

afterwards and should guide the group to pull out how some of the film themes might relate to the lives of people today. The film options include: In Whose Honor?, Dream Worlds 2 or 3, Life and Times of Harvey Milk, Killing us Softly, Scout's Honor, Traces of the Trade (if released), Southern Comfort, Hate.com, and/or others (based on availability, facilitator group, and identity issues that require additional attention).

Ally Session –

Action Planning

Participants will be given a sheet with some questions on it related to their future plans for social justice, activism, and allyism. Students will seal their sheet in a sealed envelope and print their address on the envelope. We will mail these out to the participants approximately six weeks after the retreat.

Small Group Closure

- Individual Time for Action Planning
- Reflection on Weekend
- Sharing Action Plans
- Wrap-Up other topics
- Group Appreciation Activity (ideas to be provided)

Group Appreciation

We will have small paper bags in the central area with each participant and facilitators name on it. Each participant will also receive several small sheets of paper. Everyone will be encouraged to write appreciative notes and place them in the bags over the weekend. At the end of the weekend, everyone will take his or her bag. Small group facilitators should check the bags of their small group to make sure they have a few notes by the end of the weekend, to avoid anyone feeling unappreciated.

The Wall of Oppression “The Wall”

Overview

The Wall of Oppression is a powerful activity in which students literally build a wall of oppression representative of our collective history out of boxes. Participants in the activity will also have the opportunity to tear down this wall at the end of the activity, which brings to them a sense of tangible action, and leaves them with a reminder to be active in their daily lives surrounding issues of oppression.

Learning Objectives

1. To name the words, phrases, and symbols that creates the collective history of these boxes.
2. To demonstrate the power behind the words, symbols, and phrases.
3. To understand that these words, symbols, and phrases are a part of our institutions, culture, and unconscious.
4. To understand that placing someone in a box can create power for those not in that box.
5. Setting the table for a discussion/activity on privilege (the rich, male, and white boxes cause pain, but it is important to not let people think that they are the same as targeted identities).
6. To help us understand and empower us to take action to tear down these walls around us.

Needed for Activity

- 12-16 paper or legal boxes are wrapped in poster paper (all boxes need to be same size)
- 30-40 markers
- Kleenex
- 25 or more participants

Activity

Prior to the participants arriving, the boxes will have an identity written large and bold on one side of the box (the same side for all the boxes). See below for identity ideas, but the idea is to represent the identities within the group. After arriving, participants are divided into enough small groups so that each small group can be given one or two boxes. Small groups should not be smaller than 4 participants and it is okay for some groups to have one box and other groups to have two boxes (though, it is ideal for all the groups to have the same number of boxes).

Phase One - The small groups use the markers to write or draw on the box all of the nasty stereotypes, symbols, and phrases they can think of about the identity on the box. It

is important that the participants are empowered to write down every phrase, word, or expletive without fear that they will be judged as bad people or as using that language regularly. Facilitators should walk around the room helping the groups come up with material for each boxes. This is an ideal place to role model the use of horrible words or phrases that they might not feel comfortable saying. The goal is to try and get all of the commonly and lesser known stereotypes and nasty language on the boxes. The groups should be given 20 minutes to complete this part of the activity and should be pushed throughout to think of more things that they have heard, seen, or witnessed.

Phase Two - One member from each group getting up in front of the entire group to read off all of the words and phrases on each box. The group should be asked to remain silent and each box will be placed at the front of the room (in the form of a wall) after it has been read out loud. This phase will take about 30 minutes.

Phase Three - One or more facilitators make the key educational points about the wall. This includes, but is not limited to, the following possible points:

- The wall reflects real pain for real people
- All of these words hurt people differently
- There is no truth in these word or phrase, but the assumed truth has real consequences.
- The wall symbolizes how we are held back from having authentic relationships with each other and represents the burdens, expectations, and challenges that people experience.
- The wall was not created or maintained through just conversation, it is institutionalized and a part of the fabric of our culture (how easy was it to come up with these words or phrases).
- The boxes in this wall are very real boxes that people experience on a daily basis.
- The wall represents part of the challenge that exists and the work that needs to be done.
- Just because you do not see these boxes or the wall daily does not mean that it is not there and experienced daily by countless others.
- Some people may feel that be writing these down that we are perpetuating the problem, but the fact is that we are naming the problem and only then can we address it.

This part of the exercise should be impassioned and educational. It is important to link the mind to the heart and vise versa. These words and phrase have powerful meaning, impact, and implications. This phase should take about 10 minutes. It is important to be powerful, educational, passionate, but not too long-winded.

Phase Four – It is import to close the educational points with an empowering speech about their ability to change the world and take down this wall. They have the ability to challenge people, institutions, traditions, etc and work to create a world in which these boxes and walls do not exist. Finally, in an effort to prove that it can be done, invite 2-3 people forward for each box to talk for 1-2 minutes about why they want to take down that box (do this one box at a time). It is key, as a facilitator, to role model the first box

and to share some powerful emotion in why you want to take the box down (this will set the tone and allow those emotionally impacted to feel safer coming forward).

Phase Five – When the wall is completely taken down, it is important for the facilitators to make the following points and then transition to a discussion about the experience:

- Remember what you experienced tonight (the emotion, the pain, the anger)
- I hope those who were able to come forward or saw boxes that they face taken down feel empowered by this experience. For some of you, this may have been your first opportunity to really challenge these boxes or see them challenged by others.
- Know that these boxes are real, but they do not represent truth.
- To understand that we all have a responsibility to take down these walls and challenge them.

Identities to Consider

Male/Men

Female/Women

White

Black

Asian/Pacific Islander

Hispanic, Latino/a, Chicano/a

Native American or Native People

Arab

Christian

Jewish

Muslim

GLBT

Disabled

Poor

Rich

Elderly

Teenager

College Student

Greek

Athlete

International

Body Image

APPENDIX D: IRB Forms

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Research Exempt from IRB Committee Review**Category 2:**

**SURVEYS/INTERVIEWS, STANDARD EDUCATION TESTS &
OBSERVATIONS
OF PUBLIC BEHAVIOR**

Route this form to:

U Wide Form:

UM 1571

See instructions below.

April 2011

IRB Use Only

#

Submission Instructions:

E-mail a copy of this application and any other materials required to the Research Subjects' Protections Programs Office:

RSPPeRev@umn.edu

Electronically submitted protocols must be sent from a University of MN e-mail account. Original signatures are not required. U of M x.500 IDs have been deemed by the University of Minnesota to constitute a legal signature.

Academic Advisors and Co-Investigators should be carbon copied (Cc) on the submission e-mail.

For help with this form and to download additional appendices: see <http://www.research.umn.edu/irb/download/> or call 612-626-5654

1.1 Project Title (Project title must match grant title. If different, also provide grant title):

The Social Justice Leadership Retreat: A Phenomenological Case Study of Students' Construction of Race and its Influence on Beliefs, Behavior, and Actions

1.2 Principal Investigator (PI)

Name (Last name, First name MI): Bettendorf, Anthony J.	Highest Earned Degree: Master's Degree
Mailing Address: 100 Burge Hall #3108 Iowa City, IA 52242	Phone Number: 319-335-2976
	Pager or Cell Phone Number: 612-867-2993
	Fax: NA
U of M Employee/Student ID: 1799048	Email: Bette018@umn.edu
U of M x.500 ID (ex. smith001): Bette018	University Department (if applicable): NA
Occupational Position: <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Fairview Researcher <input type="checkbox"/> Gillette Researcher <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Human Subjects Training (one of these must be checked--refer to training links at the end of this section): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CITI, <input type="checkbox"/> Investigator 101, <input type="checkbox"/> NIH training (EXCEPT for 5/8/06 to 2/29/08), <input type="checkbox"/> UM/RCR (between 1994-2003) <input type="checkbox"/> Other - Indicate training received, when and from which institution:	HIPAA Training (Required if Data Contains PHI): <input type="checkbox"/> HIPAA
As Principal Investigator of this study, I assure the IRB that the following statements are true: The information provided in this form is correct. I will seek and obtain prior written approval from the IRB for any substantive modifications in the proposal, including changes in procedures, co-investigators, funding agencies, etc. I will promptly report any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse events or unanticipated problems or incidents that may occur in the course of this study. I will report in writing any significant new findings which develop during the course of this study which may affect the risks and benefits to participation. I will not begin my research until I have received written notification of final IRB approval. I will comply with all IRB requests to report on the status of the study. I will maintain records of this research according to IRB guidelines. The grant that I have submitted to my funding agency which is submitted with this IRB submission accurately and completely reflects what is contained in this application. If these conditions are not met, I understand that approval of this research could be suspended or terminated.	
Bette018	12/11/2012
x.500 of PI	Date

Training Links:

FIRST (Fostering Integrity in Research, Scholarship and Training): <http://cflegacy.research.umn.edu/first/humansubjects.htm>

HIPAA: <http://www.research.umn.edu/first/AdditionalCourses.htm>

- "UM/RCR" includes all human subjects protection training offered in-person or online at the University of Minnesota from 1994-2003.

- The online NIH tutorial offered during the period May 8, 2006-February 29, 2008 is NOT acceptable to meet this requirement.

- If you completed a version of this training not included on the list provided, provide details as indicated

- The University of Minnesota uses two methods to verify records about completion of human subjects protection training: 1) training registration online, or 2) researcher must provide copy of completion certificate. To check your online training record, go to

<http://www.research.umn.edu/first/Reports.htm>

1.3 Department, Division Head, or Dean Information

Please note as the researcher, you are responsible for confirming and following your departmental standards and requirements for research. **Rebecca Ropers-Huilman**

Name of Department Head, Division Head, or Dean

1.4 Are there additional Co-Investigators and Staff?

Yes. Download an [extra personnel sheet](#) and include it with your application. 

No. Continue to 1.5.

1.5 Is the PI of this research a student?

Yes. . Include [Appendix J](#). 

Electronically submitted protocols must be carbon copied (Cc) to their advisor.

No. Continue to 2.

Academic Advisor to the Student Investigator	
Advisor's Name (Last name, First name MI): Rebecca Ropers-Huilman	University Department: Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development
Mailing Address: 330 Wulling Hall 86 Pleasant St. SE Minneapolis MN 55455	Phone Number: 612-626-5996
	Email: ropers@umn.edu
	U of M x.500 ID (ex. smith001): ropers

2. Funding**2.1 Is this research funded by an internal or external agency?**

Yes. Include [Appendix A](#). 

No.

If no, explain how costs of research will be covered:

Any costs will be covered by the researcher.

3. Institutional Oversight**3.1 Is this research proposal being reviewed by any other institution or peer review committee?**

Yes.

It is the responsibility of the PI to secure the appropriate approval from these committees and document that approval to the IRB. Attach a copy of documentation of approval, if received, and indicate committees below.

If yes, please list which committees will review this proposal:

--

No.

4. Conflict of Interest

Federal Guidelines emphasize the importance of assuring there are no conflicts of interest in research projects that could affect the welfare of human subjects. Reporting of financial interests is required from all individuals responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of the research. If this study involves or presents a potential conflict of interest, additional information will need to be provided to the IRB. Examples of conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:

- A researcher participating in research on a technology, process or product owned by a business in which the researcher or family member holds a significant financial interest or a business interest
- A researcher participating in research on a technology, process or product developed by that researcher or family member
- A researcher or family member assuming an executive position in a business engaged in commercial or research activities related to the researcher's University responsibilities
- A researcher or family member serving on the Board of Directors of a business from which that member receives University-supervised Sponsored Research Support
- A researcher receiving consulting income from a business that funds his or her research
- A researcher receiving consulting income from a business that could benefit from the results of research sponsored by a federal agency (i.e. NIH)

“Family Member” means the covered individual's spouse or domestic partner, dependent children, and any other family member whom the covered individual reasonably knows may benefit personally from actions taken by the covered individual on behalf of the University.

“Business Interest” means holding any executive position in, or membership on a board of a business entity, whether or not such activities are compensated.

For additional details and definitions, please refer to the appropriate policy:

University of Minnesota Researchers, please refer to:

<http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Operations/Compliance/CONFLICTINTEREST.html>

University of Minnesota Researchers involved in clinical health care in the Academic Health Center, also refer to:

http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Operations/Compliance/CONFLICTINTEREST_APPA.html

Fairview Health System Researchers, please refer to:

<http://www.fairview.org/Research/index.htm>

Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare Researchers, please refer to:

<http://www.gillettechildrens.org/>

4.1 Do any of the Investigators or personnel listed on this research project have a business interest or a financial interest of \$10,000 or more (\$5,000 or more if involved in clinical health care with an appointment in the Academic Health Center, AHC) associated with this study when aggregated for themselves and their family members?

No.

Yes.

If yes, identify the individual(s) and complete section 4.3:

4.2 Do any of the investigators or personnel (when aggregated for themselves and their family members) listed on this research have:

Ownership interests less than \$10,000 (\$5,000 if in clinical health care with an appointment in the AHC) when the value of interest could be affected by the outcome of the research?

No. Yes.

Ownership interests exceeding 5% interest in any one single entity?

No. Yes.

Compensation less than \$10,000 (\$5,000 if in clinical health care in the AHC) when the value of the compensation could be affected by the outcome of the research?

No. Yes.

If yes, identify the individual(s) and complete section 4.3:

4.3 Has the business or financial interest been reported?

No.

If you are a University of Minnesota researcher, please report your business or financial interest online via the Report of External Professional Activities (REPA) at:

http://egms.umn.edu/quickhelp/EGMS_Instructions/prepa.html

If you are a Fairview Health System researcher, please complete the Fairview Health Services Conflict of Interest Disclosure forms at:

<http://www.fairview.org/Research/BusinessOperations/ConflictsofInterest/index.htm>

and submit the completed forms to the Fairview Office of Research.

If you are a Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare researcher, please contact the Director of Research Administration, at 651-229-1745.

Yes.

If yes, have you been informed that a Conflict of Interest Review Committee is reviewing the information you reported on your REPA? No.

Yes.

The IRB will verify that a management plan is in place with the Conflict of Interest (COI) Program. If the COI Program does not have an approved management plan in place for this research, they will contact the individual(s) listed in question 4.1 for additional information.

Final IRB approval cannot be granted until all potential conflict matters are settled. The IRB receives a recommendation from the Conflict of Interest Review Committee regarding disclosure to subjects and management of any identified conflict. The convened IRB determines what disclosure language should be in the consent form.

5. Summary of Activities

Use lay language, do not cut and paste from or refer to a grant or an abstract.

5.1 Briefly state your research question.

How does involvement in a social justice leadership retreat affect how students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate? In what ways does their involvement affect their beliefs about social justice, leadership and democracy outcomes? In what ways does their involvement affect action they take related to social justice?

5.2 Describe the tasks subjects will be asked to perform.

Describe the frequency and duration of procedures, psychological tests, educational tests, and experiments; including screening, intervention, follow-up etc. *Reminder:* No personal or sensitive information can be sought under exempt guidelines. (If you intend to pilot a process before recruiting for the main study please explain.)

Students will initially be asked to participate in a guided autobiography where they will answer six questions. The students will be observed while on a social justice leadership retreat. Following the retreat 12 students will be asked to participate in one interview within a month of the retreat, and a focus group three months after the retreat.

Attach all surveys, instruments, interview questions, focus group questions etc. 

5.3 Describe what non-participants will do during this period (activities and supervision if applicable):

If your subjects will be students, it is important that the study design not penalize students who will not be participating if not all students will be participating.

There will be no penalty for students not participating. The autobiography is voluntary as are all other portions of the research. During the retreat, I will be observing students who have volunteered to participate.

5.4 How long do you anticipate this research study will last from the time you are determined to meet the criteria for exempt research?

Exempt research is generally considered short-term in nature. This office routinely inactivates exempt applications after five years from the time it was determined to meet the exempt criteria. If you think your project will extend beyond five years, contact the IRB office (612-626-5654 or irb@umn.edu).

I anticipate it will last from mid December 2012 through the end of May 2014

6. Participant Population

6.1 Expected Number of Participants: 12

# of Male: Unknown	# Female: Unknown
-----------------------	----------------------

6.2 Expected Age Range

Please confirm subjects are at least 18 years old, checking all that apply (you may not conduct research with subjects younger than 18 under exempt category two, if you would like to include

subjects younger than 18, you must complete the full IRB application requesting expedited review if appropriate):

- 18-64
 65 and older

6.3 Describe the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of subjects in this research study.

Inclusion Criteria:

Participants will be chosen from students who are accepted to attend the Social Justice Leadership Retreat. The primary criteria for inclusion will be race, since that is the focus of the study. The goal will be to have even numbers of White students and students of color (6 and 6). I will utilize the information in their autobiographies to determine their race. The retreat application asks for information on gender, academic major, leadership involvement on campus, and academic year. I will examine all of the data in the applications to provide as much of a balanced mixture of students in these areas as is possible with race being the criteria with the greatest emphasis.

Exclusion Criteria:

All students participating in the Social Justice Leadership Retreat will be considered for inclusion.

6.4 Location of Subjects during Research Data Collection

Check all that apply:

- Elementary/Secondary Schools (*include Appendix M*) 
 Community Center, specify: _____
 University Campus (non-clinical), specify: On campus interviews, Observation of Student Retreat
 Subject's Home, specify: _____
 International Location (*include Appendix K*): _____
 Other special institutions, specify: _____

7. Compensation

7.1 Will you give subjects gifts, payments, compensation, reimbursement, services without charge or extra credit?

- Yes.
 No.

If yes, please explain:

I will be providing each of the interview participants with a 25.00 gift card to the University of Minnesota Bookstore. Additionally, students participating in the focus group will be provided a meal during the focus group.

8. Recruitment

8.1 Are subjects chosen from records?

- Yes. *Complete 8.1a-c*
 No. *Continue to 8.2*

8.1a What type of records:

- Medical
- Educational
- Employment
- Other: Program Application

8.1b Are the records publicly available?

- Yes. Proceed to question 8.2
- No. Proceed to question 8.1c

8.1c Do you already have permissible access to the private records? (i.e. through your job, volunteer work, internship, etc.)

- Yes. Describe how you have permissible access.

As a co-organizer of the original retreat, I have contacted my former colleague on campus to discuss the potential of doing research, utilizing participant applications, and attending the actual retreat. He has agreed to allow me access to the information gathered for the participants attending the retreat this year. The organizer will send the initial email to the students about the autobiography and informing participants about my research.

- No. You must ask the custodian of the record to make initial contact for you (describe how they will do this in question 8.2) and let the potential subject contact you if they are interested. Attach a letter of cooperation from the custodian of the record indicating that they will make initial contact on your behalf. Please note that even if the custodian is willing to give you the private list, if you do not have permissible access to the records, the fact that the custodian will give you the list does not create permissible access. The custodian will still have to make initial contact.

8.2 Describe the recruitment process to be used:

Attach a copy of any and all recruitment materials to be used e.g. advertisements, bulletin board notices, e-mails, letters, phone scripts, or URLs. 

An initial email will be sent to the participants prior to the retreat asking for their participation and explaining the process of my research by the retreat organizer. A second round of emails will be sent to the 12 students selected to participate in the interviews and focus groups. I am attaching the emails that will be distributed at the end of this form.

8.3 Explain who will approach potential subjects to take part in the research study and what will be done to protect individuals' privacy in this process:

Initial contact of subjects identified through records search must be made by the official holder of the record, i.e. primary physician, therapist, public school official.

All records including paper, recordings, and electronic will be kept in a safe in the primary investigator's apartment or on a password protected computer. All records will be destroyed after they have been analyzed.

9. Confidentiality

See [Protecting Private Data Guideline](#) from the Office of Information Technology (OIT) for information about protecting the privacy of research data.

9.1 Describe provisions that will be taken to maintain confidentiality of data (e.g. surveys, video, audio tape, photos):

Completed autobiographies will be stored on a flash drive and secured in a safe when the researcher is not working with the data. The original emails back from the participants will be deleted and purged immediately upon transfer to the flash drive. All notes from candidate interviews, observations, and focus groups will also be stored in the safe when the researcher is not working with the data. Audio recordings of interviews and focus groups as well as the transcriptions will be kept in the safe when the researcher is not utilizing the data. All of the writing that is done on this research project including the final dissertation will be stored in a password-protected folder on the PI's laptop.

9.2 Describe the security plan for data including where stored and for how long, noting that you may not keep identifiable data indefinitely:

The flash drive, notes, audio tapes, and transcriptions will be stored in a safe when not in use. Any items on the PI's laptop will be password protected. Once the data has been analyzed they will be destroyed through purging the files electronically, shredding any paper notes, and destroying any audio recordings of the participants.

9.3 Will the PI have a link to identify subjects?

- Yes.
 No.

9.4 Will identifiable data be made available to anyone other than the PI?

- Yes.
 No.

If yes, explain who and why they will have access to the identifiable data:

10. Informed Consent Process

Reminder: If you are mailing a survey to subjects and asking them to return it to you, or doing a phone interview, you must send or read a consent statement which includes the same information as the consent form but is not signed.

10.1 Describe who will conduct the consent process with subjects and how consent will be obtained:

The students who participate in the research will be asked to complete two different consent forms. The first will be for the guided autobiographies, and the second will be for the interviews and focus groups. The first consent will be emailed along with the guided autobiography questions. The second consent for the interview and focus group will be verbally explained and gone through with participants and signatures will be obtained at that time.

10.2 Recognizing that consent itself is a process of communication, describe what will be said to subjects to introduce the research: Do not say “see consent form”. Write the explanation in lay language.

If you are using telephone surveys, attach telephone scripts. 

The PI will go through a brief explanation of what the research is about and the research questions being examined. I will explain that their participation is voluntary and that they can decide to stop participating at any point in time, or not answer any of the questions being asked. I will also discuss the procedures for keeping their information private and the ways I will secure responses and data for this study. I will inform them that once the research is complete and has been analyzed that their data will be destroyed. I will also inform them that their actual names will not be used within the writing about the research.

10.3 Prepare and attach consent forms for review. For exempt category two research, it is not necessary to obtain signed documentation of consent (i.e. a signature). Please submit a ‘consent information sheet’ which does not include a signature line. The IRB office reserves the right to require that you obtain signatures, but in most cases it is not necessary.

Even though the IRB may determine that some research is exempt from the federal regulations, adequate provisions still need to be in place to protect research participants.

In making its consideration of exempt status, the HRPP/IRB office still has to determine that:

- a) The research involves no more than minimal risk to participants
- b) Selection of participants is equitable
- c) If there is recording of identifiable information, there are adequate provisions to maintain the confidentiality of the data
- d) If there are interactions with participants, there will be a consent process that will disclose such information as:
 - that the activity involves research
 - a description of the procedures
 - that participation is voluntary
 - name and contact information for the investigator
- e) There are adequate provisions to maintain the privacy of participants.

Consent for Participation in Guided Autobiography Research
Anthony J. Bettendorf, Doctoral Candidate and Principle Investigator
University of Minnesota Dissertation Research
100 Burge Hall #3108, Iowa City, IA 52242, bette018@umn.edu, 612-867-2993

Study Title: The Social Justice Leadership Retreat: A Phenomenological Case Study of Students' Construction of Race and its Influence on Beliefs, Behavior, and Actions

Purpose: This study will examine the Social Justice Leadership Retreat and how it impacts students. The research seeks to answer the following specific questions. *How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus? How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice? How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action?*

This study is being conducted in fulfillment of the final academic requirements for a Doctorate in Philosophy in Higher Education.

My participation in this project is voluntary. I understand that as a participant in the autobiography portion of this research, I may withdraw or discontinue participation without penalty.

I understand that I will be asked reflective and thought-provoking questions. However, I have the right to decline to answer any of the guided questions.

I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports or articles using information obtained from this guided autobiography. My confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure through the assignment of a pseudonym. A separate list matching participants' names with their pseudonyms will be filed and secured in a safe in the researcher's home. All information collected will remain confidential except as may be required by law.

The researcher conducting this study is Anthony Bettendorf. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact them at 612-867-2993 or bette018@umn.edu, or you may contact my advisor Rebecca Ropers-Huilman at 612-626-5996 or at ropers@umn.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

I have read the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questioned answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records

Please sign below if you are willing to participate in this study:

Participants Signature

Date

Recruitment Text for Autobiographies

Dear [STUDENT]

I am a graduate student in the College of Education and Human Development, Department of Organizational Development Leadership Program at the University of Minnesota. I am writing to you to invite you to participate in my dissertation research project. I am exploring how students make meaning of their race, racism, and campus racial climate. Further, I will be examining how the Social Justice Leadership Retreat affects the ways in which you make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate as well as its impact on actions you may take after attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat.

Your initial participation will include a written response to six questions, which will ask you to reflect and think about your experiences prior to attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat.

After the retreat, I will conduct further research, and will be contacting students again to solicit participation in an interview with you that will last approximately an hour to an hour and a half. Students participating in an interview will receive a \$25.00 gift card to the University Bookstore. I will provide you with a transcript of our interview and invite you to make any additions or changes you would like to make. Finally, three months after the interview, I will invite interview participants to come together to participate in a focus group and discuss your experiences over a meal or snacks.

The study would be shared with my dissertation committee and other appropriate members of the University of Minnesota community. The results of the work will be published. However, every attempt would be made to protect your confidentiality and anonymity. If you agree to participate we would discuss this in more detail and you would be asked to sign a consent form.

If you are willing to participate, please let me know via e-mail at bette018@umn.edu or by phone at 612-867-2993.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Anthony Bettendorf
Doctoral Candidate
University of Minnesota

Recruitment Text for Interviews and Focus Groups

Dear [STUDENT]

I am a graduate student in the College of Education and Human Development, Department of Organizational Development Leadership Program at the University of Minnesota. I am writing to you to invite you to participate in my dissertation research project. I am exploring how students make meaning of their race, racism, and campus racial climate. Further, I will be examining how the Social Justice Leadership Retreat affects the ways in which you make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate as well as its impact on actions you may take after attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat.

Your participation will include an interview lasting approximately 60-90 minutes and a focus group in three months lasting approximately an hour and a half to two hours. The interviews and focus groups will be asking you to reflect and think about your experiences attending the Social Justice Leadership Retreat.

Students participating in an interview will receive a \$25.00 gift card to the University Bookstore. I will provide you with a transcript of our interview and invite you to make any additions or changes you would like to make. Finally, three months after the interview, I will invite interview participants to come together to participate in a focus group and discuss your experiences over a meal or snacks.

The study would be shared with my dissertation committee and other appropriate members of the University of Minnesota community. The results of the work will be published. However, every attempt would be made to protect your confidentiality and anonymity. If you agree to participate we would discuss this in more detail and you would be asked to sign a consent form.

If you are willing to participate, please let me know via e-mail at bette018@umn.edu or by phone at 612-867-2993.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Anthony Bettendorf
Doctoral Candidate
University of Minnesota

Consent for Participation in Interview and Focus Group Research
Anthony J. Bettendorf, Doctoral Candidate and Principle Investigator
University of Minnesota Dissertation Research
100 Burge Hall #3108, Iowa City, IA 52242, bette018@umn.edu, 612-867-2993

Study Title: The Social Justice Leadership Retreat: A Phenomenological Case Study of Students' Construction of Race and its Influence on Beliefs, Behavior, and Actions

Purpose: This study will examine the Social Justice Leadership Retreat and how it impacts students. The research seeks to answer the following specific questions. *How do intensive experiences focusing on students' cultural awareness affect the ways students make meaning of race, racism, and campus racial climate on their campus? How do those experiences affect students' beliefs about their capacity for leadership and democratic action, especially as it relates to social justice? How do those experiences affect students' behavior as it relates to social justice action?*

This study is being conducted in fulfillment of the final academic requirements for my Doctorate in Philosophy in Higher Education.

My participation in this project is voluntary. I understand that as an interview participant, I will receive a 25.00 gift card to the University of Minnesota Bookstore at the end of the interview. I know that I will be provided lunch, dinner, or snacks as a part of the focus group. I may withdraw or discontinue participation without penalty.

Interviews will last approximately 60-90 minutes. The focus group will also last approximately 60-90 minutes. Notes will be taken during the interview and focus group. The interview and focus group will be recorded and transcribed. The participant will review the transcriptions to ensure the primary investigator has captured accurately their thoughts and reflections. Participants will be able to provide feedback to the primary investigator. Notes and transcriptions will be destroyed after they are analyzed.

I understand that I will be asked reflective and thought-provoking questions. However, I have the right to decline to answer any question or to end the interview at any time.

I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports or articles using information obtained from this interview. My confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure through the assignment of a pseudonym. A separate list matching participants names with their pseudonyms will be filed and secured in a safe in the researcher's home. The researcher cannot guarantee confidentiality of information shared during the focus groups by other participants. All information collected will remain confidential except as may be required by law.

The researcher conducting this study is Anthony Bettendorf. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact them at 612-867-2993 or bette018@umn.edu, or you may contact my advisor Rebecca Ropers-Huilman at 612-626-5996 or at ropers@umn.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

I have read the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questioned answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records

Please sign below if you are willing to participate in this study:

Participant Signature

Date

Interview Protocol

The questions listed below were the interview questions for the individual interviews.

Interview Questions

- How would you identify your race?
- What does it mean to you to be (racial identity)?
- What did you learn about your racial identity as you grew up? Are there any specific stories or experiences that you remember?
- How has what you learned about race changed through the years?
- Please explain how you view the racial climate at the University of Minnesota.
- How did attending the SJLR affect your motivation to increase your knowledge, awareness, and understanding of race?
- What effect if any has the SJLR had on the way you view your racial identity?
- What action plans did you develop during the SJLR? Specifically, what did you promise to do? What would you like to do? And what are you considering doing?
- Have you started working on any of the action plans you developed at the retreat? If so, what have done?
- How would you describe the racial diversity at the University of Minnesota? On campus, in the classroom, with any groups you are involved with on campus.
- What influence do you believe the racial diversity at the University of Minnesota has had on your learning inside the classroom and outside of the classroom?
- How if at all has the racial diversity at the University of Minnesota affected your motivation to learn about race?

- How if at all has the racial diversity at the University of Minnesota prepared you to work and live with others who are racially different from yourself?
- What impact if any has the retreat had on you feeling prepared to work and live with others who are racially different from yourself?
- How motivated are you to be involved in society, politics, and community service after school?
- Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience at the SJLR as it relates to race?

Focus Group Interview Protocol

I developed the focus group interview questions based on data and information gained during the autobiographies, observations, and individual interview.

- How, if at all, have your thoughts, ideas, and beliefs about racism and campus racial climate changed as a result of attending the SJLR?
- How, if at all, have you been involved or engaged with diversity and social justice organizations, activities, or leadership since the retreat ended?
- What impact, if any, did the retreat have on your decisions to get or stay engaged?
- During interviews I asked about the action plans you developed at the retreat. How have you worked on your action plans, and what have you accomplished since you left the retreat three months ago?
- What new social justice related goals, if any, have you developed since your interview?
- What social justice skills do you feel you learned from the retreat, and how have you used what you learned since you left the retreat?
- How has attending the social justice leadership retreat affected your belief in your ability to make a difference and be a leader for social justice?
- During interviews many of you discussed the retreat creating a safe space for conversations and self-explorations. Could you please describe what impact, if any, the space created at the retreat had on you?
- Is there anything that I did not ask you during the individual or group interviews about the social justice leadership retreat that you would like to tell me?

Guided Autobiography

Everyone has a racial background. The following questions attempt to understand how you make meaning of your race, racism, and the racial climate on your campus. Please take some time as you read the questions and reflect on your thoughts and experiences. Be sure to mention any important stories or events that were important to you in regards to the development of your thoughts and beliefs on these issues.

- Please explain in your own words what race means to you, and how you identify racially.
- What are some of your first memories of recognizing racial differences?
- Please explain in your own words what racism means to you.
- Have you experienced or witnessed racism? If so, please describe.
- Please explain how you view the campus racial climate on your campus.
- Do you think that the racial climate on your campus is becoming more of a problem, less of a problem, or not changing? If you think it is a problem, what do you think are the best solutions?