Journal of Student Affairs

**STUDENT AFFAIRS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

Colorado State University
Journal of Student Affairs

Mission Statement

The mission of the Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs* is to develop and produce a scholarly publication which reflects current national and international education issues and the professional interests of student affairs practitioners.

Goals

- The *Journal* will promote scholarly work and perspectives from graduate students and student affairs professionals, reflecting the importance of professional and academic research and writing in higher education.

- The Editorial Board of the *Journal* will offer opportunities for students to develop editorial skills, critical thinking, and writing skills while producing a professional publication.

State of the Program

Dafina-Lazarus Stewart, Ph.D.
Jennifer J. Johnson, Ph.D.
Jody Donovan, Ph.D.
Program Tri-Chairs

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) Master's Program. We celebrated in grand style with a CSPA/SAHE 50th Reunion, July 7-9, 2018, chaired by alumna Mari Strombom ('89). The highlight of the reunion included a presentation on the Past, Present, and Future of SAHE, enhanced by an incredible CSPA/SAHE Timeline Map created by alumna Kriss Wittmann ('93), of Wittmann Studios. Alumni and their families, former and current faculty and assistantship supervisors, and current SAHE students spent quality time together, telling stories, exploring the campus and Fort Collins, and participating in professional development. Consensus is we need to host reunions more frequently than 1 time in 50 years!

We are especially pleased to announce Dr. Dafina-Lazarus (D-L) Stewart joined the SAHE program as the first, full-time, tenured, full professor. Dr. Stewart is highly regarded throughout the profession for zir scholarly interests and research on issues of equity, inclusion, and justice at colleges and universities. The intersection of minoritized students' identities, especially race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, and issues of ability and spirituality, faith and religion, are of primary research focus for Dr. Stewart.

With more than 30 years of experience teaching, advising, supervising, chairing, and overall shepherding the SAHE program, Dr. David McKelfresh ('78) stepped over to co-chair the Higher Education Leadership (HEL) Ph.D. program with SAHE alumna, Dr. Susana Muñoz ('00). We are deeply grateful for the significant leadership Dave has given to the SAHE program and look forward to terrific collaborations between HEL and SAHE.

A tri-chair leadership team was created with Dr. D-L Stewart, Dr. Jen Johnson ('05), and Dr. Jody Donovan to do the work of one Dave Mac. The increased capacity allowed for intentional focus on communication, community building, and curricular enhancements for the SAHE Online Master's and Certificate programs. D-L's leadership within the School of Education serves the SAHE program well in terms of curricular, budget, and faculty decisions. A committee of dedicated SAHE faculty chaired by Dr. Kathy Sisneros and Dr. Pamela Graglia initiated a holistic curriculum review with a goal of new curriculum implemented for the residential and online cohorts in fall 2019. This revised curriculum will provide additional flexibility for focused content areas, increased research opportunities, and continued commitment to the practitioner-scholar preparation for which Colorado State University's SAHE program is known.

As the SAHE program continues to move forward, we welcomed Lucia Delgado as she joined Kerry Wenzler in teaching the residential College Student Personnel Administration course, and Shirl Portillos assumed responsibility for practicum coordination when Jason Foster left for a full-time faculty position in North Carolina. Special thanks to Anne Hudgens, Judy Muenchow, Heather Novak, and Laura Jensen for their long-time service to teaching and advising in the SAHE program as they are stepping away from SAHE responsibilities to attend to other areas of their work and personal lives.

This spring, Drs. Oscar Felix ('93), Kyle Oldham ('04), and Jody Donovan, in partnership with D-L Stewart, and 2 SAHE students (Anica Dang and Amaris Tang), who served as TAs and International Field Experience Coordinators, facilitated the 8-week Global Perspectives in Higher Education course in the fall and led a group of 12 SAHE students to South Korea in January. Learning about higher education, student affairs, and the student experience from a global context prepares future student affairs professionals to better serve international students, work internationally, and be more aware of how global issues impact higher education around the world.

By various metrics such as the number and quality of online and residential applications, graduate student retention, graduation, and job attainment, Colorado State University's SAHE program consistently exceeds expectations. We continue to be the most diverse graduate program at Colorado State with online and residential students from nearly every state and more than 15 countries, working full- and part-time while enrolled, and holding multiple other diverse identities. Our students, faculty, and assistantship supervisors co-create rich learning communities in which everyone is a student and educator at Colorado State University.

Deep appreciation to the SAHE *Journal* editorial board members, content and style readers, and advisors (Karla Perez-Velez and Teresa Metzger) for continuing to produce a quality journal for the student affairs profession. The work of the SAHE *Journal* board is a year-long process requiring numerous hours of training and professional development, meeting, planning, reading, and collaborating. We hope you enjoy this 27th edition of the SAHE *Journal*.

Colorado State University
Journal of Student Affairs

To contact the Editorial Board, please call or write:

Student Affairs in Higher Education
Colorado State University
201 Administration Building
Fort Collins, CO 80523-8004
Phone: 970.491.5312
Email: journal@colostate.edu

The 27th edition of the *Journal* is available online: www.sahe.colostate.edu

Managing Editors' Perspective

Kayla A. Montanez, Managing Editor – Technical
Benjamin Petrie, Managing Editor – Marketing and Outreach
Kristina Miller, Managing Editor – Coordination

The *Journal of Student Affairs* proudly presents it 27th edition, marking 26 years since graduate students at Colorado State University (CSU) began producing this annual academic journal. Since the first edition, the *Journal* has been committed to our mission of promoting the scholarly work of graduate students and student affairs practitioners from around the world. We continue to build on the experience of previous mentors, leaders, and board members to create a publication that is more inspiring than ever before.

As Managing Editors, we believed it important to continue our work throughout the summer months to allow for improved processes and organization for the coming year. This included training with technology to more creatively and smoothly connect our aspirations with final products, improved flexibility to allow for seamless integration of online video software and document sharing during meetings, and stronger marketing tools to sharing with the incoming cohorts of on-campus and online SAHE students. Our combined efforts increased the number of applicants to the *Journal* and allowed for the revitalization of the Training and Development Editing Team with an increased focus on professional development opportunities within the *Journal*, both to Editorial Board members and Reviewers.

We have also continued our collaboration with Chi Sigma Alpha, an honor society for student affairs graduate students, professionals, and faculty, by working with the Pi chapters hosted at CSU. We have worked with them to combine our *Journal* release and the Chi Sigma Alpha induction, opening up both opportunities to a greater number of residential and online students. It also has provided Editorial Board members the chance to share evidence of our strong desire to contribute to academia with our faculty, advisors, and co-workers.

While the Editorial Board has not assigned any overarching themes to editions of the *Journal*, we sought articles that are not typical of the student affairs field and whose stories we had less experience with in our professional and personal lives. We were struck by how the contributing authors' work left us wanting to incorporate their original research or literature reviews into our academia and left us feeling inspired and motivated to continue to engage in the critical and meaningful work of student affairs and higher education.

We have continued the tradition of asking a guest author to contribute to the Journal, and are extremely excited to share with everyone the article by Dr. OiYan Poon, Assistant Professor of Higher Education Leadership in the School of Education at Colorado State University. Dr. Poon's essay, titled "Ending White Innocence in Student Affairs and Higher Education" utilizes the concept of framing to explore the tensions in student affairs and higher education around those who center equity and diversity, and those who do not. Our heartfelt thanks go to Dr. Poon for contributing this essay to the Journal.

We continued to increase our connections to the online SAHE students, through a record number of online students serving as Reviewers. Our combination of alumni, on-campus, and online student Reviewers dedicated four months to three different rounds of reviews, providing detailed and poignant suggestions that guided the Editorial Board throughout our work on the Journal. It is our honor to share this publication with them as their dedication

to the review process were highly appreciated and we could not have completed this process without them.

We would like to thank our advisors, Karla Perez-Velez and Teresa Metzger, for their continued support in our professional and personal lives. Because of Karla's hard work, this is the first year that *Journal* editors will be counting the experience toward credit in the SAHE program. Their work as advisors have allowed for great growth and reflection of the joys of the SAHE program.

We extend our thanks to Dr. Blanche Hughes, the Division of Student Affairs, and the SAHE tri-chairs, Dr. Jody Donovan, Dr. D-L Stewart, and Dr. Jen Johnson, for their continued support of the *Journal of Student Affairs*. Their support, along with the Higher Education Leadership (HEL) doctoral program, provided a chance for the editors to connect with researchers and their research through formal participation at the 2017 ASHE meeting, and informally through a dinner with faculty.

This *Journal* would not be possible without the inspiration, creativity, and dedication of each of our authors. We extend our thanks to the authors for their desire to elevate their work through each round of editing. As you read, we hope that you consider the planning, scholarship, writing, editing, and patience that went in to each article.

Lastly, we would like to thank the Associate Editors, Isabel, Génesis, Patrick and Stephanie, for allowing their excitement to join the Board overcome their hesitation to give up what precious free time they have. We know that the *Journal* will continue to grow and advance as a service to the field of student affairs through their leadership this next academic year.

Advisors Perspective 2017-2018

The 2017-2018 Colorado State University (CSU) Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) Editorial Board for the *Journal of Student Affairs* has brought forward a thoughtful and engaging Journal for Student Affairs practitioners and scholars. We believe you will enjoy reading this year's *Journal of Student Affairs* and appreciate the learning and development the *Journal* provides this year for our profession.

We would like to thank the SAHE Tri-chairs, Dr. D-L Stewart, Dr. Jody Donovan, Dr. Jen Johnson, as well as Tess McGinty for their unwavering support of the *Journal* and Editorial Board. Additionally, we would like to extend our gratitude to the SAHE Supervisors and Faculty for without their support of the students participating in the Editorial Board the work of the *Journal* could not be accomplished. To Colleen Rodriguez and her publishing team, we thank you for your assistance in producing the CSU SAHE *Journal of Student Affairs*.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the leadership of CSU Housing and Dining Services – Christie Mathews the Director of Apartment Life, Laura Giles the Director of Residence Life, and Mari Strombom the Interim Executive Director for the on-going support of us as the advisors of the SAHE Editorial Board.

In 2017, we continued our development of scholarship in attending the annual Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) conference held in Houston, TX with a conference focus of *Power to the People*. Our students were able to connect with scholars, practitioners, and fellow graduate students while attending ASHE in addition to connecting with graduate students in the CSU Higher Education Leadership (HEL) program and faculty including Dr. Susana Muñoz and Dr. OiYan Poon. We extend our appreciation to Dr. Poon for providing a joint venue for SAHE and HEL students and faculty to gather while at the ASHE conference. Finally, we would like to thank Dr. Gene Glockner for his support and gift of appreciation to the Editorial Board while at ASHE.

For our invited article Dr. OiYan Poon, Assistant Professor in HEL, provides us with a discussion on *Ending White Innocence in Higher Education and Student Affairs*. Dr. Poon's article takes us through a personal narrative and observations exploring a conflict between frameworks of diversity and equity within student affairs and higher education. We would like to thank Dr. Poon for her time and dedication in providing us and the profession this article asking us to critically think about centering equity and diversity within student affairs and higher education.

We continue to be honored in serving as the advisors to the Colorado State University Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) *Journal* Board, a group of dedicated young professionals working towards the advancement of scholarship in SAHE through the production of a scholarly journal. We are proud of the seven students we get to work with and their hard work in the production of the 27th *Journal of Student Affairs*.

Lastly, to the 2017-2018 SAHE *Journal* Board, you have strengthened the foundation of the *Journal* and we thank you for your time and dedication. Each of you makes the advisor role a pleasurable experience.

Teresa Metzger	Karla Perez-Velez
Housing and Dining Services	Housing and Dining Services
SAHE Advisor	SAHE Advisor

Acknowledgements

- Contributing *Journal* Reviewers for their hard work and dedication to editing and analyzing articles.

- The authors and contributors who chose to submit articles to the 27th Annual *Journal of Student Affairs*. Your research, dedication, and quality contributions made it possible to produce this edition.

- NASPA, ASHE, and ACPA graduate program directories for assisting the *Journal of Student Affairs* in reaching out to a broader audience of graduate students and new professionals who wish to submit articles for publication.

Past Leadership

As we produce the 27th edition of the Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs,* we acknowledge those who have laid the foundation for our success.

MANAGING EDITORS

2016-2017	Jenny Kim '17, S M Jafar Sadek '17, Myvy Ngo '17, Liz Menter '17
2015-2016	Matthew Dempsey '16, LeRoy Ford '16, Kevin Ngo '16, Colin Watrin '16
2014-2015	Roberto Cruze '15, Henry Duong '15, Ashleigh A. Renteria '15, Tolulope A. Taiwo '15
2013-2014	Christopher R. Carter '14, Emma Hart '14, Maria R. Marinucci '14, Vanessa Santana '14
2012-2013	Jake N. Cohen '13, Olivia Des Chenes '13, Spencer Ellis '13, Joseph F. Kimes '13, Mallory Perkins
2011-2012	Alexis M. Hendrix '11, Anthony G. Pang '12, Marney E. Randle '12, Kristal D. Sawatzke '12
2010-2011	Tyler Cegler '11, Jennifer David '11, Helen Kang '11, Joseph Kowalczyk Jr. '11, Lisa LaPoint '11
2009-2010	Jordan Alexander '10, Kinsey Holloway '10, Joe Levy '10, Nicole Scheer '10
2008-2009	Kyle Carpenter '09, Jeff Rosenberry '09, David Vale '09
2007-2008	Travis Mears '08, Neal Oliver '08, Gretchen Streiff '08
2006-2007	Craig Beebe '07, Timothy Cherney '07, Yulisa Lin '07
2005-2006	Kristen Harrell '06 Brandon Ice '06
2004-2005	Marci Colb '05, Haley N. Richards '05
2003-2004	Ann Dawson '04
2002-2003	Lea Hanson '03
2001-2002	Jody Jessup '02
2000-2001	Chris Bryner '01
1999-2000	Greg Kish '00
1998-1999	Kirsten Peterson '99
1997-1998	Beth Yohe '98
1996-1997	Ray Gasser '97, Jocelyn Lowry '97
1995-1996	DeEtta Jones '96, Michael Karpinski '96
1994-1995	Jeremy Eaves '95, Alicia Vik '95
1993-1994	Mary Frank '94, Keith Robinder '94
1992-1993	Jodi Berman '93, Brad Lau '93
1991-1992	Marie E. Oamek '92

FACULTY ADVISORS

2007-2013	Oscar Felix, Associate Vice President for Diversity; Assistant Professor Faculty, Student Affairs in Higher Education, School of Education, College of Health and Human Sciences, Colorado State University

	Andrea Takemoto Reeve, former Director Academic Advancement Center; former Professor, Student Affairs in Higher Education, School of Education, College of Health and Human Sciences, Colorado State University
2004-2007	Jennifer Williams Molock, former Director of Black Student Services, Colorado State University
2003-2006	David A. McKelfresh, Co-Coordinator for Higher Education Leadership (HEL) Ph.D. program, Executive Director of Assessment and Research; Program Chair for the SAHE Graduate Program, Colorado State University
2000-2003	Paul Shang, former Director of HELP/Success Center, Colorado State University
1996-2000	Martha Fosdick ('95), former Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Colorado State University
1991-1998	Keith M. Miser, former Vice President for Student Affairs, Colorado State University

Ending White Innocence in Student Affairs and Higher Education

OiYan A. Poon
Colorado State University

Abstract

This essay explores a conflict between frameworks of diversity and equity in the field of student affairs and higher education. Presenting personal narrative and observations of a backlash to the ACPA Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization, it utilizes the concept of framing to explain the tensions between those who center equity and diversity in their critical analyses of higher education structures and those who, through a maintenance of white innocence, define and understand equity and diversity as tangential, but still "valued" and relevant to higher education. The essay challenges readers to contemplate questions and issues of equity and diversity to guide systemic transformation that confronts the ways dehumanization is embedded in student affairs and higher education.

Keywords: diversity, equity, frameworks, student affairs, higher education

Ending White Innocence in Student Affairs and Higher Education

The establishment of U.S. higher education rests on the historical foundations and contemporary legacies of chattel slavery, settler colonialism and the expansion of U.S. global empire (Patton, 2016; Wilder, 2013). Entangled with the formation of white European colonies in what is now the United States and with the growth of the nation, higher education has played a central role in advancing white supremacist ideologies in theory, policy, and the exploitation and dehumanization of racially marginalized peoples in the U.S (Patton, 2016; Wilder, 2013). As demonstrated through Wilder's (2013) historical analysis in *Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*, U.S. institutions of higher education were built on and by Black slave labor. Moreover, while President Lincoln's signing of the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act is often celebrated for expanding public investments in higher education as an engine for national development (Thelin, 2004), this historic policy was integral to the settler colonial campaign of "Manifest Destiny," which displaced and destroyed Native American nations (Stein, 2017). These truths challenge sanitized and hegemonic narratives of higher education as a place of enlightenment and humanizing democratic principles (Stockdill & Danico, 2012).

Today, one would be hard pressed to find a college educator or institutional leader willing to state that they and their postsecondary institutions did not value diversity, equity, and social justice (Ahmed, 2012; Berrey, 2015; Patel, 2015; Stewart, 2017; Warikoo, 2016). Ironically, it would likely be equally difficult to find an institutional leader who would openly embrace, discuss, and reckon with the unjust and dehumanizing foundations of their colleges and universities and the ways they remain present, as Carson (2014) called for through his poem and video, "See the Stripes." Although ACPA and NASPA (2015) have outlined a detailed description of "social justice and inclusion" as a key professional competency in the field, notions of social justice, equity, and inclusion remain segregated and marginalized in higher education. Even as systemically dehumanizing practices and policies of oppression set the foundations for U.S. higher education and continue to be perpetuated in various forms throughout the academy, there remains a persistent resistance among student affairs and

higher education professionals to systemically analyze and transform higher education systems in ways that account for organizational realities of racism and settler colonialism.

In the next section, I explore the resistance to structural analyses in higher education that utilize a lens of racial power by applying theoretical concepts of framing (Lakoff, 2004) and white innocence (Gutierrez, 2006). Presenting personal narrative and observations of negative reactions to ACPA's Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization (SIRJD), I demonstrate a conflict in frameworks of diversity and equity in the field of student affairs and higher education, and explain how opposition to centering critical notions of diversity and equity are informed by a desire for white innocence. I end this essay by offering a discussion and questions to promote dialogues toward widespread applications of "an equity-oriented humanist approach [that] necessarily includes an interrogation of the underlying racial ideology, both historical and functional, of the theoretical constructs and frameworks that inform and drive our work" throughout higher education organizational structures (Gutierrez, 2006, p. 224). To do this, student affairs and higher education needs to first end the practice of white innocence.

A Conflict of Frames in Student Affairs and Higher Education

Drawing on the concept of frames or paradigms, we can begin to make sense of the publicly emerging, national conflict over what diversity and equity mean in higher education and student affairs, particularly as highlighted by a backlash against the ACPA Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization. According to Lakoff (2004):

> [Frames] are mental structures that shape the way we see the world… the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as good or bad outcome of our actions. … [Our] frames shape our social policies and the institutions we form to carry out policies. To change our frames is to change all of this. Reframing is social change. You can't see or hear frames. They are part of what cognitive scientists call the "cognitive unconscious" – structures in our brains that we cannot consciously access, but know by their consequences: the way we reason and what counts as common sense…. When you hear a word, its frame (or collection of frames) is activated in your brain. Reframing is changing the way the public sees the world. It is changing what counts as common sense. (Lakoff, 2004, p. xv, emphasis in original)

I begin by presenting Lakoff's quote at length to provide a conceptual context for the current conflict between two paradoxical paradigms of diversity and equity in the field of student affairs and higher education. The relatively recent emergence of a critical race framework in the field seeks to explicitly interrogate and analyze racial power as a central force shaping the ways higher education operates and produces dehumanizing inequalities (Harper, 2012; Patton, 2015). Its rising popularity in higher education, as demonstrated by the increase of special journal issues, articles, and books in the field, counters the deep-rooted abstract liberal framework (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) of color-evasive racism (Annamma, Jackson, & Morrison, 2017), which theorizes race without questioning or examining structural racism in higher education (Harper, 2012; Patton, 2016). As a result of a hegemonic framework of color-evasive racism, diversity and equity is understood as additive and perhaps superficially enriching to one's personal life, but not as concepts with systemic or organizational implications requiring sustained attention or analysis (Warikoo, 2016). The implicit operation of this framework is sustained by white innocence, which prevents the explicit naming and interrogation of

dominant and oppressive frames in education (Gutierrez, 2006). Therefore, I employ a white innocence analysis, which "… involves naming the framework that has been naturalized and that allows the dominant subject position to remain 'innocent' – to claim 'Who knew?' while sustaining the dominant framework and blocking opportunities for non-dominant groups" (Gutierrez, 2006, p. 227). As I illustrate through personal narrative and observations of hostile responses to the ACPA SIRJD, there remains a persistent resistance to centering diversity and equity in the field of student affairs and higher education, which allows for the reproduction of systemic oppressions. It is thinly veiled by the maintenance of white innocence.

The interview: A personal narrative. The interviewer asked: How would you describe your teaching philosophy? I responded:

> It's important for you to know that I center critical frameworks in all of my teaching activities, as I do in my scholarship and organizational leadership. For example, I don't know how to teach classes like Organization and Governance in Higher Education, Higher Education Finance, or Higher Education Policy without challenging students to critically examine the interconnections between structural inequalities, power dynamics, and the ways decisions made in higher education produce disparate impacts for students, faculty, and staff who hold many and varied identities.

As I shared my teaching philosophy, I was fully aware that not all postsecondary organizations are fully invested in these values as core and central to the fields of student affairs and higher education. They may talk a good talk about valuing diversity and equity, but they really don't walk the talk. As Ahmed (2012) has shown, higher education organizations will often co-opt the language of diversity and resist systemically transformative work to maintain the status quo structures that produce inequalities. I felt satisfied with my response, in fulfilling my need to convey exactly who I am and what I bring to the work environment. These prospective colleagues needed to know that I don't just say I value equity and diversity. They needed to know how I engage in an integrated, reflexive process to ensure a congruence between my values and actions as a teacher, scholar, and leader in the field. I view higher education as having a moral imperative to intentionally engage in questions of equity and justice, by continuously identifying and addressing systemic inequities. As with all processes to determine fit in a potentially long-term relationship, it was important to me that any prospective employer and colleagues be fully aware of the critical social and systemic paradigm that guided all of my work, as they contemplated whether I was someone they really wanted as a new employee and colleague.

> Coldly looking at me with a scrutinizing eye, they said:

> This is not a social justice program. This is a higher education program, not a social justice program, just like this is not an ethnic studies program. I recognize and value that social justice is an important component of the program. However, students are not coming to this program for social justice. If it was a social justice program, we would need to admit different students. For example, some students have an interest in internationalization, but not social justice.

Feeling a tension and heat rise in my body, and certain that I was no longer interested in working in this organization with a colleague who seemed wholly invested in avoiding critical questions to analyze organizational structures as complicit in maintaining oppressive outcomes in higher education, I countered:

> Internationalization is an interesting and important area of research in higher education. I don't understand how a paradigm of equity and social justice would be irrelevant in studying internationalization, as you seem to suggest. I would encourage students to consider examining such topics through a critical social justice lens, to engage with questions like "How are colleges and universities balancing interests in global education with fiscal interests through internationalization?" As scholars like Brendan Cantwell (2015) have asked "Are international students cash cows?" This is a sharp and important question that centers ethics and social justice values, and allows for a critical advancement in the scholarly field of international higher education and policy, while centering the humanization of international students as more than objects of financial exploitation. As you can see, I am incapable of engaging in teaching or research in ways that do not center questions of equity and social justice, because this is who I am. And if this lens and my approach to research and teaching is not welcome in this organization, I am no longer interested in working here.

I unclenched my teeth and breathed through the tension, trying to stop my hands from shaking under the conference table. After what felt like a long silence, a tense debate ensued among the group around the table, and soon after, the interview was done.

A significant amount of time has passed since this encounter, but I continue to reflect on my experience to discern lessons from it. At the time, I considered the exchange an isolated one that represented a rare perspective among student affairs and higher education professionals, because for many years I had been protected, mentored, and empowered by colleagues who centered and contemplated questions of social and racial justice in every aspect of their professional responsibilities. In my reflections, I consistently return the question: If notions of social justice are valued in student affairs and higher education, as this interviewer claimed they also valued, then what can explain the resistance to center these principles throughout all aspects of our organizational structures and practices? Over the last year, as I have observed conversations among student affairs professionals on social media and in other venues, I have sadly come to realize that the views of the interviewer are more common and pervasive among student affairs and higher education professionals than I had thought.

Backlash to a counter-hegemonic reframing. The disagreement illustrated in my personal experience above is currently playing out in the field of student affairs as represented by the backlash some ACPA leaders have received as a result of launching the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization. According to the organizational website, the focus of the SIRJD:

> …is on reducing the oppression of communities of color at the intersections of their identities, knowing that all oppressions are linked and that the work is ongoing. Our goal is to provide leading research and scholarship; tools for personal, professional, and career development; and innovative praxis opportunities for members that will actively inform and reshape higher education. We move toward this goal knowing that the roles and daily tasks of our jobs are important to the functioning of colleges and universities. We also know that racial justice and the tasks of our jobs do not sit as dichotomous poles. Racial justice is at our core; it underlies the work we each must do every day, in every way we can. (ACPA, n.d., para. 1)

The framework of equity and diversity ACPA articulated is one that conceptualizes racial justice work as congruent with, and core to student affairs work and professional responsibilities. It is also aligned with a critical race frame, acknowledging the centrality of race and racism, and the need to work toward structural transformation through a humanizing process of learning, development, and dialogue.

Issues and questions of equity and justice, racism, and settler colonialism are not new. In fact, as I argued they have been foundational to higher education. What is new, with efforts like the ACPA Imperative, is the interest, investment, and intentional effort to acknowledge and reckon with uncomfortable truths of racism and settler colonialism in higher education, and to center social and racial justice in the student affairs profession. The SIRJD represents an organizational effort to reframe how the student affairs profession understands equity and diversity as central to the field, challenging hegemonic frames that push these issues to the margins. Although I have seen encouraging responses to the SIRJD, I am also fully aware that some student affairs professionals have expressed dissenting comments and questions, such as "Why do we always have to talk about race? We are a student affairs organization, not a social justice organization." The essence of such a question and comment suggests that racial and social justice concerns should not be considered central to student affairs and higher education as a field and profession. Ultimately, the opposition to the SIRJD in ACPA suggests a conflict in paradigms between those who assert the importance of social and racial justice as core to student affairs and those who would prefer to maintain outdated models of multiculturalism, inclusion, and diversity, the result of which is an apartheid of knowledge.

Limitations of past frameworks of multiculturalism, diversity, and inclusion. What my personal narrative and the backlash to ACPA's SIRJD likely demonstrates is an intensifying discord between two dissimilar conceptual frameworks of diversity and equity in student affairs and higher education on a national level. As research has demonstrated, racism is deeply embedded in the history and contemporary norms, values, and practices in higher education (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Harper, 2012; Patton, 2016; Wilder, 2013). However, in the field, diversity and racial justice remain marginalized and generally treated as being tangentially important to the mission of higher education (Berrey, 2015; Patel, 2015; Warikoo, 2016). Through this hegemonic framework of diversity, organizational structures in higher education are not challenged to change in meaningful or substantial ways (Ahmed, 2012).

It seems that the interviewer and opposition to the SIRJD may be operating through a framework of multiculturalism void of analyses of power and systemic inequalities in higher education (Ahmed, 2012; Rhoads & Black, 1995; Warikoo, 2016). Although "multiculturalism not only relates to the inclusion of diverse peoples, but … also depicts an effort to modify organizational structures and cultures," (Rhoads & Black, 1995, p. 417) the refusal to center notions of racial equity and social justice in the field represent a multiculturalism disconnected from systemic analyses and possibilities for structural and organizational transformations that grapple with oppressive systems. This limited framing of multiculturalism represents a persistent "lack of effort to explicitly grapple with . . . racism/white supremacy . . . that is symptomatic of a society that would rather tiptoe around the issue of race rather than directly address it" (Patton, Haynes, Harris, & Ivery, 2014, p. 136). Moreover, it allows for the maintenance of white innocence in the reproduction of systemic inequalities.

Extending and applying Gutierrez's (2006) definition of white innocence in education research, we can see how narrow frameworks of multiculturalism, void of power analysis, allows the student affairs and higher education professional to also:

…detach herself from historical, social, economic, and political ties to racialized practices and ideologies in her work and in the field. Here the racialized notion of *white innocence* does not refer to the racial category of whiteness but rather to the dominant subject-position that preserves racial subordination and the differential benefits for the *innocent* who retains her own dominant position vis-à-vis the "objects" of study. From this perspective, we are all implicated in some way in maintaining *white innocence*. (p. 226, emphasis in original)

In the case of student affairs professionals, the notion of white innocence can be applied to how we understand our labor and complicit roles within organizations of higher education and their systemic reproduction of inequalities.

Ultimately, the opposition to relinquishing a white innocence in higher education maintains systemic oppressions in the field that demands people with marginalized identities assimilate into status quo structures of dehumanization and oppression. It represents a desire to preserve organizational systems that reproduce inequality, in which participants from culturally different backgrounds are invited to simply co-exist in superficial multicultural harmony, which requires a silencing of systemic critiques.

However, as civil rights activist and leader Fannie Lou Hamer stated, "I don't want equal rights with the white man; if I did, I'd be a thief and a murderer." This quote powerfully articulates the difference between a frame of multiculturalism void of power analysis, which invites diverse individuals to participate in the status quo hierarchical system, and a critical race framework, which seeks to radically transform organizational structures. Perhaps the reactions of the interviewer and opponents of ACPA's Strategic Imperative are grounded in a fear. Their hegemonic paradigm of diversity and multiculturalism is now threatened by a critical race framework of higher education that rejects the invitation to be simply included in status quo structures.

A critical race framework of organizational structures asserts critical analysis of racial power and structures of white supremacy. This counter-hegemonic framework seeks to critique, analyze, deconstruct, and ultimately transform systems of dehumanizing oppression. In this spirit, ACPA's Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization represents a powerful call to reframe and recognize the centrality of racism and settler colonialism in higher education, and to work toward restorative and transformative justice in the student affairs profession.

Critical Hope for Restorative and Transformative Justice

"The functioning of U.S. higher education is intricately linked to imperialistic and capitalistic effort that fuel the intersections of race, property, and oppression" (Patton, 2016, p. 317), resulting in dehumanizing acts that may seem reasonable to corporatized managerial interests in higher education. For example, both public and private university endowments have maintained investments in the private prison industry (Chatterjee & Maira, 2014; Strauss, 2015; Williams, 2016), thus profiting from the mass incarceration of Black and brown bodies (Alexander, 2012). Moreover, Chatterjee and Maira (2014) have shown that "scholars and students who openly connect U.S. state formation to imperialism, war, and racial violence are disciplined" (p. 6), contradicting long espoused principles of academic freedom and open campus discourse in higher education (Schreckner, 2010). Furthermore, higher education has fundamentally maintained a culture of gatekeeping through historical practices of barring and limiting women, people of color, and working-class people from enrolling in college

and working as faculty and staff in higher education (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Goldrick-Rab, 2016; Guinier, 2016). As Rosas (1995) explained, the right to participation in postsecondary education remains contested. These uncomfortable truths, that U.S. higher education is complicit in projects of racism, imperialism, and other forms of oppression, are not simply historical vestiges. They remain present and fundamentally entrenched in higher education organizational structures, cultures, and practices.

At the same time, as employees and leaders in higher education and student affairs, we are also complicit in the historical and contemporary legacies of these disquieting truths that often go unquestioned and unexamined in our field (Gutierrez, 2006). For example, how many course syllabi for Higher Education History classes in student affairs and higher education programs center questions and analyses of racism and settler colonialism as fundamental to the development of higher education in the U.S.? I suspect they are few and far between, but a future study on this matter could be conducted to assess the ways diversity and equity are framed within the field as represented by program curricula.

I do not raise these truths, which some may find uncomfortable, to simply make readers feel guilty or somehow embarrassed by the historical and contemporary projects and reproduction of white supremacist ideologies in higher education. Instead, I am motivated by a critical hope that by gaining a more complex understanding of our field's roots and realities in dehumanizing racism and settler colonialism we can collectively and individually engage in a mindful and methodical deconstructive analysis that illuminates pathways for structural and cultural transformations toward restorative justice and equity. Rejecting groundless notions of hokey hope, mythical hope, and a hope deferred, critical hope draws from the liberatory works of Paulo Freire and requires a humanizing process of contemplative and collective study, reflection, and analysis to identify possibilities for transformative change (Duncan-Andrade, 2009).

As a member of the ACPA SIRJD Curricular Resources Advisory Committee, I am witnessing the ways the organization is intentionally and thoughtfully implementing the Imperative by enacting systemic and cultural changes through the organization. Ideally, the investment in the Imperative will also effect changes throughout the field of student affairs, as it represents one of the two major professional guilds. Because there is no shortage of documentation and evidence of the ways higher education in the U.S. rests on a foundation of racism and settler colonialism, ACPA's Imperative is long overdue. Efforts like ACPA's Imperative and new models of leadership, such as the social action, leadership, and transformation (SALT) model (Museus, Lee, Calhoun, Sánchez-Parkinson, & Ting, 2017), offer insights and possibilities for combatting dehumanizing practices and structures in higher education and society at large.

These critically hopeful developments unquestioningly center equity and diversity in organizational leadership and change in higher education. They can allow the field of student affairs and higher education leadership to embrace, reconcile, and critically analyze the ways the institution of higher education has, and continues to, perpetuate systems of oppression. Additionally, they offer pathways toward leadership and systemic transformation for a more just future.

At the same time, I continue to wonder: What would the student affairs profession look like, if it is to be transformed by large-scale initiatives like the ACPA Imperative? As a faculty member, among many changes I hope for, I want to see sweeping changes in curriculum, teaching, and mentorship in professional preparation programs. When I was a student affairs Master's student, coursework and readings addressing racism were relegated to the "multiculturalism" class and to specific weeks in the student development class that focused

on racial identity development, through a framework of multiculturalism void of a racial or structural power analysis. I was also discouraged by faculty to pursue my desire to engage in research and professional practice that centered questions of race and racism. I was told that my career development would be hindered by focusing on such a "narrow" aspect of higher education. As a faculty member, I center questions of power, privilege, dehumanization, and systemic transformation for a more socially just future throughout my classes, which have included The Student Affairs Profession, Higher Education Policy, Higher Education Finance, Organization and Governance in Higher Education, Critical Social Theories in Higher Education, Dissertation Proposal Seminar, and Analysis of Education Literature. Although it would seem only one of these courses would explicitly center questions of diversity, equity, and social justice, I have found it nearly impossible to avoid a focus on these concepts through a power analysis lens, as I explained in my interview narrative earlier in this essay.

Outside of curriculum in student affairs and higher education, these questions can and should be centered, to strengthen the ways colleges and universities are structured and led. I offer the following questions for professionals in various student affairs functional areas to further dialogues centering critical concepts of social justice, diversity, and equity that can lead to consequential and transformative changes in higher education.

- How might housing and residence life policies and practices produce disparate and unequal experiences for students according to their diverse identities? For example, are students with more financial assets allowed to pay for newer residential accommodations, perhaps closer to academic buildings?

- How might policies and practices in admission privilege wealthier students by placing preferences on students from high performing and ostensibly predominantly white high schools, children of alumni, donors, and parents capable of paying full or near full tuition each year?

- Are students of all demographics equitably accessing the range of student support resources offered by the institution? For example, if a counseling center is at capacity in offering its services but the majority of clients are white women, is there an ethical and professional responsibility for center staff to consider why the full range of students are not accessing their services? What might be some blockages preventing other students from accessing counseling services?

This last question can be adapted to most, if not all, functional areas of student affairs. If a student affairs unit is intended to serve all students regardless of identity, but the demographics of students accessing the organizational services and resources does not seem to mirror the campus enrollment on the whole, important questions should be asked and considered to guide the leadership of the program. On a basic level, staff should reflect on the questions: Is my unit meeting its organizational mission and goals to serve students? Why or why not?

As Freire (2000) explained, the work of transformative educators is to engage in deeply reflexive work and collective analysis of the ways oppression is structurally produced. The constant work of reflection and analysis can inform and lead to transformative action. This is what Freire (2000) defined as praxis, which is an intentional and dialogical practice of combatting dehumanization. Toward this end, I offer these questions, in addition to the ones above, to potentially spark and contribute toward challenging dialogues among student affairs professional communities that claim they value social justice and equity.

- What would higher education and student affairs praxis look like if we acknowledged and reckoned with our dehumanizing roots and their legacies?

- What are the practical implications of reconciling our past with what we claim to be our aspirational values of diversity and equity?

- What are the implications of centering and enacting espoused values of diversity and equity critically coupled with a power analysis through all aspects of organizational structures and actions in higher education and student affairs?

The ACPA Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization marks a transition and effort to reframe and center equity and diversity to transform higher education and student affairs. It seeks congruence between espoused values of diversity and equity with organizational leadership and practices. As Stewart (2017) asserted:

> A truly democratic education must not be ideologically neutral; rather, it must ardently pursue the preparation of students for engaged citizenship in an ostensibly democratic society. Whether [historically white institutional] leaders will gather the institutional will and the moral and ethical courage to provoke and institute real, substantive institutional transformation is unknown. The first step on that road, however, is to make equity and justice the yardstick by which leaders measure progress instead of merely diversity and inclusion.

A narrow framework of diversity and inclusion, void of a critical analysis of power and systemic racism, is no longer sufficient. Systemic and cultural anti-black racism, white supremacy, and settler colonialism have been foundational to the establishment and expansion of higher education in the U.S. Congruently, the resistance to recognize the centrality of systemic oppression in higher education represents an effort to maintain white innocence, which is a mythical notion that reproduces systemic white supremacy. If student affairs and higher education professionals truly value diversity and equity, we need stop marginalizing social justice and equity as additive to the institution. We need to embrace and do the hard work of intentionally and strategically ending white innocence.

OiYan Poon is an assistant professor of Higher Education in the School of Education at Colorado State University.

References

ACPA. (n.d.). *Strategic imperative for racial justice and decolonization*. Retrieved from http://www.myacpa.org/sirjd.

ACPA and NASPA. (2015). *Professional competency areas for student affairs educators*. Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA_NASPA_Professional_Competencies_FINAL.pdf.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Annamma, S. A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison, D. (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 20*(2), 147-162.

Berrey, E. (2015). *The language of race and the limits of racial justice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cantwell, B. (2015). Are international students cash cows? Examining the relationship between new international undergraduate enrollments and institutional revenue at public colleges and universities in the U.S. *Journal of International Students, 5*(4), 512-525.

Carson, A. D. (2014, August 17). *See the stripes [Clemson University]: A poem by A.D. Carson*. [Video]. Retrieved: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tl1cSgbnZTo

Chatterjee, P., & Maira, S. (2014). The imperial university: Race, war, and the nation-state. In P. Chatterjee, & S. Maira (Eds.), *The imperial university: Academic repression and scholarly dissent*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academic: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 169-180.

Duncan-Andrade, J. R. (2009). Note to educators: Hope required when growing roses in concrete. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 181-194.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2016). *Paying the price: College costs, financial aid, and the betrayal of the American dream*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Guinier, L. (2016). *The tyranny of meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Gutierrez, K. (2006). White innocence: A framework and methodology for rethinking educational discourse and inquiry. *International Journal of Learning, 12*(10), 223-229.

Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(1), 9-29.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

Museus, S., Lee, N., Calhoun, K., Sánchez-Parkinson, L., & Ting, M. (2017). *The social action, leadership, and transformation (SALT) model*. National Center for Institutional Diversity and National Institute for Transformation and Equity. Retrieved from: https://lsa.umich.edu/content/dam/ncid-assets/ncid-documents/Museus%20et%20al%20(2017)%20SALT%20Model%20Brief.pdf

Patel, L. (2015). Desiring diversity and backlash: White property rights in higher education. *Urban Review, 47*(4), 657-675.

Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education, 5*(3), 315-342.

Patton, L. D., Haynes, C. M., Harris, J. C., & Ivery, S. M. (2014). Perhaps the field of education isn't so nice after all: A review essay and examination of critical race research in postsecondary contexts. *NASAP Journal, 15*(2), 135-148.

Rhoads, R. A., & Black, M. A. (1995). Student affairs practitioners as transformative educators: Advancing a critical cultural perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(5), 413-421.

Rosas, L. (1995). Is postsecondary education a fundamental right – Applying Serrano v. Priest to Leticia "A." *Chicana/o Latina/o Law Review, 16*(1), 69-89.

Schreckner, E. (2010). *The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Stein, S. (2017). A colonial history of the higher education present: Rethinking land-grant institutions through processes of accumulation and relations of conquest. *Critical Studies in Education.* doi:10.108 0/1750848.2017.1409646

Stewart, D-L. (2017, March 30). Language of appeasement. *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered. com/views/2017/03/30/colleges-need-language-shift-not-one-you-think-essay

Stockdill, B. C., & Danico, M. Y. (2012). *Transforming the ivory tower: Challenging racism, sexism, and homophobia in the academy.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Strauss, V. (2015, September 13). Update: Columbia University divesting from private prison companies. Why other schools should too. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2015/07/15/columbia-university-divesting-from-private-prison-companies-why-other-schools-should-too/?utm_term=.aef363d76584

Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Warikoo, N. K. (2016). *The diversity bargain: And other dilemmas of race, admissions, and meritocracy at elite universities.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.

Williams, A. J. (2016). The road to private prison divestment: Inside the University of California student campaign. *Boom: A Journal of California, 6*(2), 98-103.

Not Non-traditional, the New Normal: Adult Learners and the Role of Student Affairs in Supporting Older College Students

Constance Iloh, Ph.D.
University of California, Irvine

Abstract

The higher education student population is consistently shifting. The financially dependent, 18-year-old high school graduate who enrolls full-time is not the "typical college student." College has increasingly become the pursuit of older students seeking or returning to secure postsecondary credentials and degrees. The author argues that the growing adult student population must be better recognized and prioritized in student affairs to increase access, outcomes, and effectiveness for adult learners. Accordingly, the author highlights the unique and complex profiles of adult learners while also putting forth new directions for improving conditions for adult learners through student affairs practice. In particular, this text addresses the role of institutional research and non-deficit language and practices in student affairs to cultivate supportive and thriving educational spaces for adult learners. Ultimately, this text highlights how radical shifts and changes to our postsecondary education landscape require new and inclusive ways of practice and improving student conditions.

Keywords: adult learners, emerging trends, higher education, higher education practice, nontraditional students, postsecondary education, student affairs

Much of what we know about student affairs practice is largely a result of a focus and research on traditionally-aged college students. While these efforts have provided substantial information to guide the field of higher education, they are inherently limited by their intentional and narrow focus on younger student populations with traditional trajectories. I argue that a continued focus on "traditionally" aged students will only cripple our ability to advance 21st century higher education practice. This text underscores the importance of a student affairs profession that is attentive to the changing landscape of higher education in general, and the growing number of adult students entering college in particular.

Student Affairs and the Changing Student Landscape

If achievement, satisfaction, persistence, and learning are a priority in postsecondary education, institutions of higher learning must have student affairs professionals whose contributions complement and help an institution realize its goals (Whit, 2005). The underlying fundamental mission of student affairs is to serve; the profession exists to ensure that students are safe, cared for, well treated, and (more or less) satisfied with their higher education (Long, 2012). With the growing diversity of the 21st century higher education student population, student affairs professionals and colleges are facing greater challenges in providing multidimensional programs and services necessary for expansive student success and satisfaction (Wang, 2013).

Specifically, many colleges and universities have struggled to adapt to this changing student marketplace, often finding themselves burdened by traditions and practices that prove ill-suited for older students (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, 2000). Adult learners

are largely invisible to higher education (Coulter & Mandell, 2012). An American Council for Education (ACE) survey found that more than 40% of institutions indicated that they "did not identify older adult students for purposes of outreach, programs and services, or financial aid" (Lakin, 2009). When they do, the prevailing view of adult learners is that they are "one-dimensional" (Lakin, 2009) and focused predominantly on lifelong learning. Overall, there is a paucity of research and data on adult learners (Cruce & Hillman, 2012) and what has been conducted has mainly been descriptive analyses in policy reports (Irvine & Kevan, 2017). Between 1990 and 2003, only one percent of articles in seven widely circulated peer-reviewed higher education journals focused on adult learners (Donaldson & Townsend, 2007). Understanding the unique needs of adult learners is critical to designing higher education systems, practices, and policies that support this population and promote their success.

The Post-Traditional Student Population

Adult learners are part of a growing "post-traditional" student population, usually defined as aged 25 and over, but also include those under 25 who have characteristics indicative of adult responsibilities, such as working full-time, being financially independent, having non-spousal dependents, being a single parent, as well as having a nontraditional educational trajectory, such as delayed enrollment into higher education or did not complete high school (Chen, 2017; Soares, 2013). By many measures these "non-traditional" students have become the norm in postsecondary education (Carnevale, Smith, Melton, & Price, 2015; Westervelt, 2016). A key characteristic distinguishing post-traditional from other college students is the high likelihood that they are juggling other life roles while attending school, including those of worker, spouse or partner, parent, caregiver, and community member (Ross-Gordon, 2011). More often, these multiple roles present challenges in students' allocation of time for both academic study and participation in campus-based organizations and activities (Ross-Gordon, 2011).

Adult Learners

Every time we call college students 'kids,' we reinforce a subtle and problematic depiction. The minimized presence of adult learners is rooted in the historic youth-centered focus in postsecondary education (Chen, 2017). College is generally assumed to be a phase of life for young persons, and a milestone for those leaving adolescence and entering into young adulthood (Kasworm, 2005; Kasworm, 2010). Research on higher education has been predominantly based in historical perspectives, beliefs, and curriculum of a traditional student profile. This profile consists of persons between 18 and 22 years of age and who do not have other major responsibilities or roles that compete with their studies (e.g., full-time employment, parenting, and community responsibilities) (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini 2005). However, contemporary higher education reflects increasing diversity and distance from this traditional student profile. As a major grouping, adult students now comprise more than 38% of all students enrolled in higher education (National Student Clearinghouse, 2012).

Some argue that "adult students have particular characteristics that set them apart from nontraditional students" and these characteristics "deserve our attention and the recognition that these students are a distinct group" (Compton, Cox, & Laanan, 2006, pp. 73-74). In Compton et al.'s definition, adult students are 25 years old and older who are, "more likely to be pursuing a program leading to a vocational certificate or degree," "have focused goals for their education, typically to gain or enhance work skills," and "may consider themselves primarily workers and not students" (Compton, Cox, & Laanan, 2006, p. 74). While there are different definitions of nontraditional students, mature students, and adult students, all

three are commonly used to refer to "nontraditionally aged" students. Many of these students are participating in higher education primarily for career-related reasons while having other major responsibilities and roles (Iloh, 2017). Throughout this text, when I reference adult students, this indicates adults age 25 or older participating in higher education.

Adult students have unique needs, especially if they are employed. Among others, these needs include: different kinds of information about their educational options, institutional flexibility in curricular and support services, academic and motivational advising supportive of their life and career goals, recognition of experience, and learning that incorporates previous work experience (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, 2000). Although more adults are enrolling in college, motivated primarily by their potential economic mobility, they must overcome the many economic, personal, interpersonal, community, and institutional challenges in their way. For these reasons, support for post-traditional students in college should be different than the support needed for traditional 18-24-year-olds who have entered higher education immediately after graduating from high school (Chen, 2017).

Using Institutional Research

It is important for student affairs professionals to use institutional research to understand and analyze student adult learner data in order to develop programs and support services. Specifically, student affairs practitioners at any institution can utilize enrollment data to understand trends in their student population as well as certain programs, practices, and efforts that can be scaled up or down, depending on the adult learner population. These practices are especially important for student affairs professionals that work at colleges that are underfunded and must be precise and efficient with every resource. Using institutional research to expand and restrict services, resources, and programs based on demands from adult learners will help institutions better structure the scarce resources, if any, that they are given towards supporting adult learners.

In addition to utilizing data that has already been collected, it will be important for practitioners to collect new information in relation to support and services for adult learners. This might include surveys and interviews to understand the experiences of students ages 25 and older. In some cases, practitioners might invest in understanding if their campus is perceived as accessible to adult learners. While institutions of higher learning may not have policies restricting adult learners from enrolling, the extent to which students feel welcome at that campus is an entirely different matter. Practitioners can utilize these interviews and other instruments to develop data-driven processes and practices to better attract, serve and support prospective and current adult learners on their campus.

Strength-based Approaches over Deficit Perspectives

Colleges and universities are not compromising their academic standards by being intentional about how they can better serve the adult learner population. Rather, it is an opportunity to illustrate their rigor and accessibility, which is a feat not all institutions of higher learning have taken on. In identifying students as adult learners, student affairs professionals have an opportunity to identify and celebrate the assets this population brings to an educational environment. As a result, students would be less likely to be treated less than or encouraged to assimilate to the approaches of their peers. Language plays an important role in restructuring how practitioners, adult learners, and other students, staff, and faculty view adult students (Iloh, 2017). Throughout this text, I refer to students typically labeled as "nontraditional" as "post-traditional", for categorical reasons, but also to challenge problematic terminology (Soares, 2013). The term "nontraditional student" is somewhat of a misnomer, as today's college

student population consists of many adult learners with jobs, families, and responsibilities outside of school (Education Advisory Board, 2016). The continued and frequent labeling of the majority of college students as nontraditional is a form of othering that adversely impacts these students' ability to successfully persist in many educational settings (Yancey Gulley, 2016). Using such language suggests, "We are going out on a limb by letting you attend college because this place is not really designed for you, and you really should not be here" (Yancey Gulley, 2016). Usage of the term nontraditional will not bring us closer to equity-minded and student-centered practices and instead, minoritizes one of the fastest growing student populations in higher education.

In addition to rethinking deficit language and terminology in student affairs practice, it is important to develop campus or online educational climates that honor adult learners as important agents that are changing the culture and mission of higher education for the better. Adult learners are forcing institutions of higher learning to develop practices that do not assume a one-size-fits-all approach is the best approach for students in postsecondary education. Adult learners bring a variety of rich experiences, knowledge, and communities to any educational environment (Ross-Gordon, 2011). On one hand, this could mean academic affairs professionals thinking more intently about curriculum that merges previous experience and advances the ideals of lifelong learning. On another hand, this might mean professionals making sure events for students, especially those events catered to students that often are not served adequately, also welcome their families or are considerate of part-time and full-time schedules. One-stop-shop academic and career counseling services will help ensure adult learners do not need to track down multiple campus resources while also helping campus services became more centralized and cohesive. As a field, large student affairs professional organizations such as NASPA and ACPA can also bring in specialists and students as guest speakers to educate student affairs professionals and scholars on necessary directions for adult learners. Measures such as these at the institutional and professional organization level are useful in ensuring professionals are embedded in ecosystems that support them as they seek to better support adult learners at their institutions.

Conclusion

Equity and excellence are often discussed as ideals and agendas of higher education, although in reality they are much harder to achieve in practice. Higher education cannot consider itself equitable or excellent if it fails to serve or address the presence and needs of the growing majority of 21st century college students. Adult learners represent not only the present, but future of higher education. Accordingly, this text highlights the immense opportunity for the student affairs profession to advance commitments of expansive excellence, through recognition, support, and strength-based solutions for adult learners.

Dr. Constance Iloh is an Assistant Professor of Higher Education at the University of California, Irvine.

References

Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., Melton, M., & Price, E. W. (2015). *Learning while earning: The new normal*. Washington, D.C: Center on Education and the Workforce.

Chen, J. C. (2017). Nontraditional adult learners. *SAGE Open, 7*(1), 215824401769716. doi:10.1177/2158244017697161

Compton, J. I., Cox, E., & Laanan, F. S. (2006). Adult learners in transition. In F. S. Laanan (Ed.), *New directions for student services, No. 114: Understanding students in transition: Trends and issues*, (pp. 73-80). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Coulter, X., & Mandell, A. (2012). Adult higher education: Are we moving in the wrong direction? *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60*(1), 40-42.

Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL). (2000). *Serving adult learners in higher education*. Chicago, IL

Cruce T. M., Hillman N. W. (2012). Preparing for the silver tsunami: The demand for higher education among older adults. *Research in Higher Education, 53*(6), 593-613.

Donaldson J. F., Townsend B. K. (2007). Higher education journals' discourse about adult undergraduate students. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(6), 27-50.

Irvine C. K. S., Kevan J. M. (2017). Competency-based education in higher education. In Rasmussen K, P. Northrup, & R. Colson (Eds.), *Handbook of research on competency-based education in university settings* (pp. 1-27). Hershey, PA: IGI Global

Kasworm C. (2005). Adult student identity in an intergenerational community college classroom. *Adult Education Quarterly, 56*(1), 3-20.

Kasworm C. (2010). Adult learners in a research university: Negotiating undergraduate student identity. *Adult Education Quarterly, 60*(2), 143-160.

Lakin M. B. (2009). Forging new identities: Older adults in higher education. *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, 2*(1), 33-44.

Long, D. (2012). The foundations of student affairs: A guide to the profession, p. 1-39. In: L. J. Hinchliffe and M. W. Wong (Eds.). *Environments for student growth and development: Librarians and student affairs in collaboration*. Association of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, Ill.

National Student Clearinghouse (2012). *More than one third of college students are over 25*. Herndon, VA. Retrieved from http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/about/media_center/press_releases/files/release_2012-04-19.pdf

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students (Vol. 2): A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ross-Gordon, J. (2011). Research on adult learners: Supporting the needs of a student population that is no longer nontraditional. *Association of American Colleges and Universities, 13*(1).

Soares, L. (2013). *Post-traditional learners and the transformation of postsecondary education: A manifesto for college leaders*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Wang, W. (2013). Adult students' learning experiences and their expectations of the student affairs programs in American community colleges. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 4*(6), 858-866.

Westervelt, E. (2016, September 25). Shaken by economic change, 'non-traditional' students are becoming the new normal. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/09/25/495188445/shaken-by-economic-change-non-traditional-students-are-becoming-the-new-normal

Whitt, E. J. (2005). Promoting student success: What student affairs can do (Occasional Paper No. 5). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

Yancey Gulley, N. (2016, August 5). The myth of the nontraditional student. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/08/05/defining-students-nontraditional-inaccurate-and-damaging-essay

A Dual-Process Approach to Testing the Effectiveness of a Social Media Activism Workshop

Drew T. Ashby-King
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Lisa K. Hanasono
Bowling Green State University

Abstract

Drawing from Hanasono and colleagues' (2016) dual process theory of message production and empirical research from student affairs and the communication discipline, this study introduces and tests an innovative social media activism workshop that aims to equip college students with the skills and motivation to use social media more strategically to challenge stereotypes, reduce prejudice, and promote diversity and inclusion. College students (N = 198) were organized into experimental and control groups; those in the experimental condition completed a 75-minute workshop that was strategically designed to enhance participants' motivation and skills to engage in anti-hate social media activism. The results indicated that college students who completed the workshop had significantly stronger social media activism skills than those in the control group and that these skills were predictive of individuals' ability to craft effective messages that persuaded others to take a stand against stereotyping and discrimination. In addition to extending the scope of the dual-process theory of message production into the realm of student affairs research, findings from this study support the continued creation and assessment of programming and interventions by student affairs practitioners that focus on (a) increasing individuals' appreciation of diversity and (b) developing strong social media activism skills to create a more positive online community for college students and university stakeholders.

Keywords: activism, diversity, dual-process, higher education, intervention, social media

Cyberbullying, the use of online communication and social media (SM) to promote repeated, hurtful behaviors by a group or individuals with the intent to harm others, remains a pervasive problem (González-Cabrera, Calvete, León-Meija, Pérez-Sancho, & Peinado, 2017), especially among millennials and students in higher education. Hinduja and Patchin (2015) reported that 34.4% of adolescents have experienced cyberbullying. Zalaquett and Catters (2014) found that nearly 20% of college students were victims of cyberbullying, and the Pew Research Center (2014) indicated that 44% of adult men and 37% of adult women have been the targets of online harassment.

In addition to diversity and inclusion programs and initiatives (e.g., Mercurio, 2009), students affairs staff and university members can engage in anti-hate social media activism to prevent and reduce the prevalence of cyberbullying and online harassment. Anti-hate social media activism – the use of social networking sites (SNS) to promote diversity and inclusion, challenge stereotypical thinking, and advocate against discrimination – allows people to seek and share information over vast geographical distances (Holten, Baek, Coddington, &

Yaschur, 2014), persuade people to attend rallies, community-building events, and protests (Davison, 2015), and raise the public's awareness of social issues and injustices (Min, 2015). Often complementing traditional face-to-face forms of anti-hate activism, social media activism (SMA) provides a dynamic platform for activists to share their messages through electronic word of mouth (Kim, Lee, & Yoon, 2015) thereby opening new possibilities for multimodal communication, such as tweeting images in support of diversity and inclusion, streaming anti-hate vigils on Facebook Live, or circulating online petitions.

Despite the potential effectiveness of anti-hate SMA, challenges persist. Some people may not be motivated to advocate against discrimination and cyberbullying. In their study on social media activism, Meyer and Bray (2013) found that the dominant culture in the United States (U.S.) is grounded upon the notion of "give" and "get." Thus, many people may not act unless they receive something in return, and some people lack the skills and access needed to effectively use SM. Moreover, some people lack an understanding of diversity-related issues and a nuanced vocabulary to craft effective anti-hate messages. As agents of change, it is important for student affairs staff and students to educate people not only about SM, but also about diversity and inclusion.

To create a more positive atmosphere online and promote an inclusive climate on campus, university members should be empowered to use social media to communicate the importance of diversity and inclusion and how to create a positive atmosphere to allow others to share their opinions and learn from one another. These skills can be taught in many different formats, including an anti-cyberbullying SM workshop that focuses on sharing messages about diversity and inclusion. Drawing from the framework of a dual-process theory of message production (Hanasono, Skorupski, Chappuis, Koenig, Brojakowski, Donofrio, & Fang, 2016), we designed and tested a workshop that aimed to empower individuals with the ability and motivation needed to effectively use social media to advocate against hate.

Diversity

Among social scientists who study higher education, researchers frequently define diversity as the variability of ideas, values, beliefs, structures, and people (Ghosh, 2012). Experiences with individuals from diverse backgrounds foster active thinking and encourages people to make decisions using a multifaceted worldview (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002). While the U.S. has benefitted greatly from diversity, with immigrants coming from all parts of the world, acts of discrimination persist (Gin, Martinez-Alemán, Rowan-Kenyon, & Hottell, 2017; Museus, Sariñana, Yee, & Robinson, 2016). For example, Embrick, Walther, and Wickens (2007) documented a case where 90% of management at a company said they would not hire someone who they thought identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or queer. Among college students, Asian Americans, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans are more likely to be cyberbullied than their White peers (Zalaquett & Chatters, 2014). To create a more inclusive society, people need to be educated about the positive impact diversity and inclusion has on their communities, as well as how social biases reinforce cyberbullying and oppression.

Institutions of higher education strive to prepare their students for a wide range of careers and job opportunities. Clark (2011) argued that the U.S. workforce must be diverse in composition and highly culturally competent to ensure continued competitiveness in the world economy. Therefore, students need to be educated about diversity and exposed to diverse communities to become culturally competent (Patton, Shahjahan, & Osei-Kofi, 2010). Umbach and Kuh (2006) reported, "Diversity enhances the educational experience of all students" (p. 169) and promotes cognitive growth. Students who were exposed to more experiences with diversity

reported greater relative gains in both critical and active thinking (Umbach, & Kuh, 2006). These benefits go beyond the classroom and can help individuals in their professional roles throughout their careers. It has also been noted that interacting with others who are different from themselves made students more comfortable working with diverse individuals (Miles, Hu, & Dotson, 2013). This is important because as students move into their professional world, it is highly likely that they will work with or for people who are different from them, and they must be comfortable communicating with others who are different from them.

Diversity education and diverse educational environments develop global citizens by giving people the opportunity to improve their intergroup communication skills and learn about the realities of our multicultural world (Umbach, & Kuh, 2006). However, many students lack a strong foundation in diversity education. Therefore, training sessions may help students develop an understanding of and appreciation for diversity and inclusion (Sorensen, Nagda, Gurin, & Maxwell, 2009). Diversity programming, such as diversity workshops and cultural events, can leave a lasting impact on students. Students who participated in these experiences reported a continued embodiment of awareness of diversity long beyond graduation (Miles et al., 2013). To explain how to effectively educate students about diversity and train them how to engage in anti-hate SMA, we utilized a dual-process framework.

Theoretical Framework: The Elaboration Likelihood Model

The elaboration likelihood model (ELM) uses a dual-process approach to explain how persuasive messages can change recipients' attitudes (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). ELM argues that the degree to which a person elaborates and critically thinks about a message will affect subsequent attitudinal change (Lane, Miller, Brown, & Vilar, 2013). In this model, there are two routes through which a message can be processed: centrally and peripherally. When equipped with sufficient levels of ability and motivation, a recipient should process a persuasive message centrally by thinking critically and carefully about the message's content (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Under these circumstances, high-quality arguments and evidence will be more likely to alter receivers' attitudes and beliefs (Lowry Moody, Vance, Jensen, Jenkins, & Wells, 2012). When processing messages peripherally heuristics, cues including the persuader's characteristics, are more important in altering the receivers' attitudes and beliefs than the content of the message (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). Some characteristics that are taken into consideration when processing messages peripherally are the persuader's credibility, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Heppner et al., 1995).

Central Processing

For someone to process a message using the central route, they must be both highly motivated and able. When using the central processing route, the message receiver will process information deeply using careful thought and logic (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). They will examine the quality of the presenter's argument. If the argument is of high quality, then it is more likely that the message will alter the receiver's attitudes and beliefs (Lowry et al., 2012). When the receiver is motivated, and the content of the message is important to them, the message will be processed centrally (Heppner et al., 1995). For example, when someone is advocating for the benefits of diversity, the receiver could be motivated because they have a diverse group of friends who they value and have active listening and cognitive thinking skills making them able to process the message. Therefore, this receiver will process the message centrally, and it is more likely they will not only agree with the message producer, but they will be more likely to retain the information long term and possibly change their attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs.

Peripheral Processing

Receivers who are not able or motivated will process messages via the peripheral route. When processing messages peripherally, the presenter's characteristics are more important in altering the receiver's attitudes and beliefs than the content of the message (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). Some characteristics that are taken into consideration when processing messages peripherally are a presenter's credibility, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Heppner et al., 1995). Lowry and colleagues (2011) reported that when processing messages peripherally, shortcuts and emotions are used for decision-making. For example, a group of people may listen to a diversity advocate's presentation; however, they are not motivated to think carefully about that person's verbal message because the recipients are from a privileged racial position and do not believe diversity-issues are relevant to them; however, they find the message producer very attractive and they listen anyway. The receivers process the message peripherally because they are not motivated and as such do not retain the information long term. These shortcuts move the focus away from the content of the message and move it toward superficial attributes, such as the source of the message.

According to the ELM, using a central or peripheral route can influence key persuasive outcomes. When recipients are persuaded through the central route, their attitudinal change is more enduring, resistant to counterarguments, and a better predictor of behavior (O'Keefe, 2015). The ELM has provided a strong theoretical foundation within the message *reception* paradigm. However, there is a need to understand how a dual-process approach might increase our understanding of message *production* processes.

A Dual-Process Theory of Message Production

The dual-process theory of message production posits that persuaders need to be both able and motivated to produce effective messages (Hanasono et al., 2016). When educating social media users on how to create effective anti-hate messages on social media, advocates will need to have the ability to do so, through sufficient knowledge of diversity, diversity-related language, and access to social media. SM users need to understand what diversity is and the benefits that it has on oneself, institutions, societies, and our globally connected world. Social media message creators also need to understand diversity-related language. They must understand how to use language to positively and accurately discuss diversity using a mediated communication platform. For example, using inclusive language, such as "y'all" when addressing a group of more than one gender or "partner" when referring to a significant other, creates a safe space for everyone because it does not automatically set an expectation on how someone must identify. Experiences with social media activism during workshops will give participants the ability to participate in a meaningful conversation about diversity and allow them to be a part of an online community all working to share positive messages about diversity and reduce hateful messages on social media. The last factor in one's ability to produce messages is SM access and efficacy; advocates must have access to social networking sites and a sufficient level of technical skills to use SM to advocate against discrimination.

Persuaders need to have the ability to produce effective messages; however, they also need to be motivated. Social media users are motivated to create diversity messages when the content is relevant to them (Hanasono et al., 2016). When message producers identify with the issue, they are more likely to be motivated to contribute to the conversation. Also, when social media users identify as allies to those affected by the issue, they will also be motivated to produce effective messages. Therefore, to motivate message creators, they need to be educated on why diversity is relevant to everyone, including themselves.

In this study, we predict SM users need to attain sufficient levels of ability and motivation to craft effective persuasive anti-hate messages. Specifically, SM users need to have sufficient knowledge about SMA and a nuanced lexicon to talk about diversity-related issues. Second, persuaders must be motivated to create anti-hate messages.

Diversity and Social Media Activism Training

Guided by the framework of Hanasono and colleagues' (2016) dual-process theory of message production, we designed and tested a skills training workshop that aimed to increase participants' ability to produce persuasive anti-hate SM messages. Our training program focused on enhancing participants' abilities by increasing their (a) knowledge about diversity and SMA skills and (b) motivation by increasing their appreciation for diversity (i.e., issue relevance). In doing so, our dual-process training program aimed to develop more effective anti-hate SM advocates.

In this study, we hypothesize that:

> H1: Among those who complete the dual-process workshop on SMA and diversity, (a) SMA skills and (b) issue relevance will be predictive of participants' ability to produce persuasive anti-hate social media activism messages.

> H2: Individuals who complete the dual-process workshop will have stronger social media activism skills than individuals who do not complete the workshop.

Method

Research Design

The purpose of this quasi-experimental study was twofold. We aimed to test the dual-process approach to message production and determine if a theoretically grounded workshop on anti-hate SMA will increase participants' SM effectiveness and appreciation of diversity. Featuring two conditions, an experimental and control group, participants in the experimental condition completed the SMA workshop, while those in the control condition were not exposed to any treatment.

Workshop content. Students in the experimental group participated in a 75-minute, face-to-face workshop that focused on fostering diversity appreciation and developing SMA skills. After indicating their informed consent, participants completed a set of pre-test questionnaires. Next the workshop facilitators invited participants to articulate their definitions of diversity and explain why this issue was personally relevant. By encouraging participants to talk publicly about the importance of diversity and listening to their peers reinforce this issue's relevance, we aimed to increase participants' motivation to promote diversity through anti-hate SMA. For example, some participants discussed how they had been the targets of microaggressions, which are insidious statements that degrade and devalue others but may seem harmless to the perpetrator (Pierce, 1995; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009), on social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter. Once participants reflected on the pervasiveness and problematic nature of online discrimination, microaggressions, and hate speech, the workshop facilitators introduced the notion of SMA and identified tips and strategies for creating persuasive anti-hate messages on social networking sites. Working in teams of three to five students, participants analyzed how everyday people had engaged in anti-hate SMA through social media movements like #BlackLivesMatter and #YesAllWomen. After learning how to create anti-hate SMA messages and assessing real-life examples of SM messages, the workshop

facilitators instructed participants to create their own anti-hate SMA messages that could be posted on Facebook. At the end of the workshop, participants completed a set of post-test measures.

Participants

Participants ($N = 198$) were college students at a medium-sized Midwestern university. Participants in the experimental group ($n = 59$) were part of undergraduate communication courses or student organizations. Control group members ($n = 139$) were enrolled in an introductory communication course or recruited through emails and campus announcements.

Participants included 71 men, 121 women, and 1 trans* person; five individuals elected not to report their gender. Among those who reported their race, participants self-identified as African American or Black ($n = 17$), Asian ($n = 4$), Latino/a ($n = 2$), multiracial ($n = 5$), White ($n = 153$). Participants' self-identified as heterosexual ($n = 165$), gay or lesbian ($n = 4$), bisexual ($n = 5$), asexual ($n = 4$), pansexual ($n = 1$); nineteen people did not report their sexual orientation. Participants also self-reported their religious affiliation as Christian ($n = 136$), Jewish ($n = 3$), atheist ($n = 7$), agnostic ($n = 6$), Muslim ($n = 1$), Hindu ($n = 1$), and 45 people did not disclose their religious affiliation.

Procedure

Participants in the experimental group completed a 75-minute face-to-face workshop. After indicating their informed consent, participants completed a questionnaire packet of pre-test measures. Next, they completed the workshop where they learned about diversity and SMA, and they participated in activities that aimed to increase their knowledge, appreciation, and understanding of both topics. The workshop focused on defining diversity and identifying its positive impact on society, the prevalence of diversity issues on SNS, and anti-hate SMA. At the end of the workshop, participants completed a set of post-test measures.

Control group participants completed an online survey. After indicating their informed consent, they completed the same measures for diversity appreciation and social media activism. Participants in the control group did not take part in the workshop.

Measures

The variables' descriptive and reliability statistic are reported in Table 1. All measures used a 5-point Likert scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). The reliability of each scale was acceptable ($\alpha > .70$).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Item	M	SD	α
SMA Skills: Control Group	3.60	.79	.87
SMA Skills: Experiment Group (Pre-Test)	3.84	.59	.87
SMA Skills: Experiment Group (Post-Test)	4.20	.59	.92
Issue Relevance	3.44	.86	.74
Persuasiveness	3.75	.61	.79

SMA skills. We used an SMA questionnaire that consisted of 11 items. Sample items include "Social media activism is an effective way to advocate for social/political issues" and "I know how to support an issue through social media activism."

Issue relevance. Three items measured the degree to which anti-hate SMA activism was relevant to participants. Sample items include, "The issue directly affects me" and "The issue directly affects my community."

SMA persuasiveness. After creating a sample anti-hate SMA message, participants were asked to evaluate their statement's persuasiveness. Consisting of six items, this scale prompted participants to indicate the degree to which they perceived their SMA message to be helpful, appropriate, sensitive, supportive, effective, and persuasive.

Results

Guided by the principles of a dual-process theory of message production, H1 predicted that higher levels of ability and motivation would result in the production of more persuasive anti-hate SMA messages. Zero-order correlations are reported in Table 2. Results from a multiple linear regression analysis indicated that factors related to ability (SMA skills) and motivation (issue relevance) collectively affected participants' anti-hate SMA persuasiveness, $F(2, 120) = 18.54$, $p < .001$. Together, the factors accounted for 23.6% of the variance in the outcome variable. However, a close look at the data revealed that SMA skills were predictive ($\beta = .49$, $p < .001$), but issue relevance ($\beta = -.03$, $p = .63$) was not. Thus, H1 was partially supported.

Table 2. *Zero-order Correlations*

	SMA Skills	Issue Relevance
SMA Skills		
Issue Relevance	.18*	
Persuasiveness	.47***	.06

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$

H2 tested the SMA workshop's effectiveness by predicting that participants in the experimental group would have stronger SMA skills than those in the control group. Before testing this hypothesis, we completed a paired samples t-test which indicated that participants' SMA skills increased after completing the workshop, $t(58) = 8.02$, $p < .001$. Participants' baseline SMA attitudes ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .59$) increased significantly after completing the workshop ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .59$). Results from an independent samples t-test confirmed H2, $t(189) = 5.18$, $p < .001$. Those who completed the workshop ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .59$) has higher levels of SMA skills than those who were not exposed to the workshop ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .79$). The difference produced a large effect size, Cohen's $d = .85$.

Discussion

Key Findings and Implications

As universities and colleges strengthen their commitment to promoting diversity and inclusion, many student affairs personnel and campus leaders are engaging in innovative methods to make their institutions more welcoming and accessible, including anti-hate SMA. To empower university members to engage in anti-hate SMA more effectively, student affairs students and staff may play a critical role in training individuals how to use social networking sites to promote diversity and inclusion. The results of this study provide empirical support for a dual-process theory of message production and demonstrate how a theoretically grounded workshop can increase individuals' SMA skills. Specifically, the workshop significantly increased participants' SMA skills, which helped them create more persuasive anti-hate SMA

messages than those in the control group. When testing the dual-process theory of message production, the data indicated that participants' ability-related factor (i.e., SMA skills) was predictive of persuasiveness; however, our study's motivation-related factor (i.e., issue relevance) was not. Our findings underscore the importance of empowering people with the ability to create effective persuasive messages, which can be executed through the completion of theory-based workshops like the one described in this study. Although issue relevance was not predictive of persuasiveness, there are other motivation-related factors that might influence individuals' production of persuasive messages, such as their perceptions about the issue's severity or their need for cognition (for a discussion of motivation-related factors in the dual-process literature, see O'Keefe, 2015). As the dual-process theory continues to develop, future research should examine how additional ability and motivation factors influence the message production process. Moreover, the results of this study show that a workshop focusing on diversity and SMA could help people create more effective anti-hate messages, which have the potential to counter cyberbullying and online discrimination.

Implications for Student Affairs Practitioners

Knowing that 34.4% of adolescents and 20% of college students have been the victims of cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015; Zalaquett & Catters, 2014), it is common for student affairs practitioners to interact with students on their campuses who have been involved in some sort of cyberbullying as the perpetrator and/or victim. This study showed how theory-based interventions can have a positive impact on students' ability to engage in prosocial online behavior that advocates against cyberbullying, discrimination, stereotyping, and hate speech. In addition, traditional college students (ages 18 to 24 years) are the most active age cohort on social media (Terracina-Hartman, Bienkowski, Myers, & Kanthawala, 2013), and more than 70% of young people in the U.S. are using social media (Botterill, Bredin, & Dunn, 2015). Therefore, college students are uniquely positioned to engage in anti-hate SMA and serve as allies against discrimination in online contexts. However, our research indicates that college students may lack the knowledge, skills, and motivation to use SM to take a stand against hate. Student affairs practitioners can play an important role in educating and training college students how to use SM to address ongoing issues related to cyberbullying and discrimination. Programming in the form of interventions, like the one developed for this study, can be used to empower students with the ability and motivation to use SM to promote diversity and inclusion.

Limitations and Future Directions

We acknowledge several limitations. First, this study used a quasi-experimental design, where participants were not randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups. Therefore, it is possible that the results for the second hypothesis could have been due to something other than the workshop. However, participants in the experimental condition demonstrated a significant increase in their SMA skills after completing the workshop. In addition, our study employed a subjective, self-rated measure of persuasiveness. Future research should utilize a true experimental design to test the effects of ability and motivation factors on individuals' message production. While true experimental design can be difficult when studying education and activism, designing this type of study would reduce the possibility that the results of the study were not due to something other than the workshop that was being tested. In addition, future research could employ trained research assistants to code the persuasiveness of participants' social media messages.

Second, our study focused on college students' anti-hate SMA. Future research should test the dual-process theory with more diverse samples such as older adults and people outside

of the U.S. In addition, researchers should examine message production processes beyond the realm of anti-hate SMA. For example, studies could explore how ability and motivation impact people's sales pitches or persuasive presentations in online and offline contexts.

Online communication, such as SM (Facebook, Twitter, etc.), texting, instant messaging, and e-mailing, have become a common part of 21st century everyday life (Caron & Light, 2015). Cyberbullying is occurring on college campuses because of differences between students like race and sexual orientation (Washington, 2015); thus, students on these campuses need to be educated on the value of their differences and how to effectively communicate online especially when they disagree with their peers. Implementing a SMA and diversity workshop can help students become more aware of the diversity in their community and on their campus, increase their communication skills, and in turn hopefully help individuals engage in more effective anti-hate SMA.

Drew T. Ashby-King is a Graduate Assistant in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and is a current graduate student in the College Student Personnel program.

Lisa K. Hanasono, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Communication at Bowling Green State University. This study was funded by a grant from the Center of Undergraduate Research at Bowling Green State University.

References

Botterill, J., Bredin, M., & Dun, T. (2015). Millennials' media use: It is a matter of time. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 40*(3), 537-551.

Cacioppo, J. T. & Petty, R. E. (1984). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Consumer Research, 11*, 673-675.

Caron, J. & Light, J. (2015). "My world has expanded even though I'm stuck at home": Experiences of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis who use augmentative and alternative communication and social media. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 24*(4), 680-695. doi:10.1044/2016_AJSLP-15-0010

Clark, C. (2011). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Just how important "is" diversity in higher education? *Multicultural Education, 19*(3), 57-59.

Davison, S. (2015). An exploratory study of risk and social media: What role did social media play in the Arab Spring revolutions? *Journal of Middle East Media, 11*(1), 1-33.

Embrick, D. G., Walther, C. S., & Wickens, C. M. (2007). Working class masculinity: Keeping gay men and lesbians out of the workplace. *Sex Roles, 56*(11), 757-766. doi:10.1007/s11199007-9234-0

Ghosh, R. (2012). Diversity and excellence in higher education: Is there a conflict? *Comparative Education Review, 59*(3), 349-365. doi:10.1086/666545

Gin, K. J., Martinez-Alemán, A. M., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., & Hottell, D. (2017). Racialized aggressions and social media on campus. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*(2), 159-174. doi:10.1353.csd.2017.0013

González-Cabrera, J., Calvete, E., León-Meija, A., Pérez-Sancho, C., & Peinado, J. M. (2017). Relationship between cyberbullying roles, cortisol secretion, and psychological stress. *Computers in Human Behavior, 70*, 153-160. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.054

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330-366.

Hanasono, L. K., Skorupski, V. M., Chappuis, S., Koenig, T., Brojakowski, B., Donofrio, A., & Fang, L. (2016). Communicating change: A dual-process theory to explain social media activism and civic engagement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association. Grand Rapids, MI.

Heppner, M. J., Good, G. E., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., Hawkins, A. K., Hacquard, L. L., Nichols, R. K., … Brock, K. J. (1995). Examining sex differences in altering attitudes about rape: A test of the elaboration likelihood model. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 73*(6), 640-647. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01809.x

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2015). Cyberbullying victimization. *Cyberbullying Research Center*. Retrieved from http://cyberbullying.org/2015-data

Holten A. E., Baek K., Coddington, M. & Yaschur C. (2014). Seeking and sharing: Motivations for linking on Twitter. *Communication Research Reports, 31*(1), 33-40. doi:10.1080/08824096.2013.843165

Kim, S., Lee, J., Yoon, D. (2015). Norms in social media: The application of theory of reasoned action and personal norms in predicting interactions with Facebook page like ads. *Communication Research Reports, 32*(4), 322-331. doi:10.1080/08824096.2015.1089851

Lane, R., Miller, A. N., Brown, C., & Vilar, N. (2013). An examination of the narrative persuasion with epilogue through the lens of the elaboration likelihood model. *Communication Quarterly, 61*(4), 431-445. doi:10.1080/01463373.2013.799510

Lowry, P. P., Moody, G., Vance, A., Jensen, M., Jenkins, J., & Wells, T. (2012). Using an elaboration likelihood approach to better understand the persuasiveness of website privacy assurance cues for online consumers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 63*(4), 755-776. doi:10.1002/asi.21705

Mercurio, Z. (2009). The modern role of diversity and cultural-awareness programs in response to increasing campus diversification: A literature review. *Journal of Student Affairs, 18*, 90-97.

Meyer, M. E., & Bray, C. W. (2013). Emerging adult usage of social networks as sites of activism: A critical examination of the TOMS and TWLOHA movements. *Ohio Communication Journal, 51*, 53-77.

Miles, R., Hu, R., & Dotson, K. (2013). Perceptions of diversity in higher education. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 61*(2), 74-82. doi:10.1080/07377363.2013.796244

Min, S. (2015). Occupy Wall Street and deliberative decision-making: Translating theory to practice. *Communication, Culture, & Critique, 8*(1), 73-89. doi:10.1111/cccr.12074

Museus, S.D., Sariñana, S. A. L., Yee, A. L., & Robinson, T. E. (2016). A qualitative analysis of multiracial students' experiences with prejudice and discrimination in college. *Journal of College Student Development, 57*(6), 680-697. doi:10.1353/csd.2016.0068

O'Keefe, D. J. (2015). *Persuasion: Theory and research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: CA: SAGE.

Patton, L. D., Shahjahan, R.A., & Osei-Kofi, N. (2010). Introduction to the emergent approaches to diversity and social justice in higher education special issues. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 43*(3), 265-278. doi:10.1080/10665684.2010.496692

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Pew Research Center. (2014). Experiencing online harassment. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/10/22/part-1-experiencing-online-harassment/

Pierce, C. M. (1995). Stress analogs of racism and sexism: Terrorism, torture, and disaster. In C. V. Willie, P. P. Rieker, B. M. Kramer, & B. S. Brown (Eds.), *Mental health, racism, and sexism* (pp. 277-293). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sorensen, N., Nagda, B. A., Gurin, P., & Maxwell, K. E. (2009). Taking a 'hands on' approach to diversity in higher education: A critical-dialogical model for effective intergroup interaction. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP), 9*(1), 3-35. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2009.01193.x

Terracina-Hartman, C., Bienkowski, B., Myers, M., & Kanthawala, S. (2013). Social media for environmental action: What prompts engagement and intent toward activism? *International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society, 9*(4), 143-161.

Umbach, P. D. & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Students experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 169-192. doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0008

Washington, E. T. (2015). An overview of cyberbullying in higher education. *Adult Learning, 26*(1), 21-27. doi:10.1177/1045159514558412

Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(4), 659-690.

Zalaquett, C. P., & Chatters, S. (2014). Cyberbullying in college: Frequency, characteristics, and practical implications. *SAGE Open, 4*(1), 1-8. doi:10.1177/2158244014526721

Black Student Involvement: Student Government Associations and Developmental Outcomes at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Travis C. Smith
Clemson University

Abstract

Although higher education scholars have examined the relationship between student involvement and student development, the majority of those studies focused on student governments at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) which totally negates an entire population and creates a gap in the literature. However, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), were uniquely created to serve underrepresented populations and these institutions have a proven track record of producing scholars, researchers, and world leaders. As such this literature review provides a conceptual framework for examining the impact of student government association (SGA) leadership experiences on students' personal development at (HBCUs). It examines the origins and applications of student involvement theory while identifying the outcomes of student involvement throughout college campuses. It also provides a brief historical perspective on SGA, reviews the outcomes associated with students' involvement in SGA, and discusses literature on students' involvement and outcomes at HBCUs.

Keywords: Developmental outcomes, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, student government, Black student involvement.

Student involvement is the foundation of student development on college campuses. (Astin, 1984, 1996; Flowers, 2004; Moore, Lovell, McGann, & Wyrick, 1998). Alexander Astin is referred to as the father of student involvement. He coined student involvement as, "the amount of physical and psychological energy the student devotes to the academic experience" (Astin, 1984, p. 518). Simply put, the greater the involvement, the greater the outcomes. As such, student outcomes have been linked directly to different types of student involvement. Astin (1984) outlined six areas of involvement: residential halls, honors programs, academic involvement, student-faculty interaction, athletic involvement, and student government. These different avenues of involvement have the capacity to boost developmental gains in college students.

Later on, George Kuh advanced Astin's initial work by examining that impact of out-of-class experiences on learning and personal development in undergraduate students. Kuh (1993) reported five domains of outcomes: personal competence, cognitive complexity, knowledge and academic skills, altruism and estheticism, and practical competence. These groundbreaking studies complemented one another by illustrating how student involvement leads to greater developmental outcomes for college students. As such, these gains are transferable to our personal lives, social interactions, and professional careers. The following sections will examine the developmental outcomes associated with student involvement and set the stage for further research on student government associations (SGA) at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

Student Involvement and Outcomes

Residence halls play a pivotal role in student communication. Twale and Sanders (1999) conducted a study that identified the effects of out-of-class peer interaction on critical thinking. They believed students who reside on campus have a greater chance of being exposed to intellectual discussions with peers, which heightened critical thinking. These discussions often take place throughout a variety of residential events such as peer dialogues, game nights, socials, and academic forums. In turn, students are provided with opportunities to share interdisciplinary ideas, political discourse, and creative innovations. This type of incubator sets the stage for reflective thought, social competence, and self-awareness (Kuh, 1993).

Beyond residence halls, participation in honors programs are another outlet for student involvement. Inkelas and Weisman (2003) sought to compare student experiences and outcomes amongst three groups: transition, honors, and curriculum based programs. They reported students who participated in honors programs met with faculty members outside of the classroom in a social setting to discuss sociocultural issues. These meetings are seen as the beginning to advising and mentoring relationships. Additionally, these findings strengthened Astin's initial claims that involvement in honors programs lead to greater gains in interpersonal self-esteem, intellectual self-esteem, and artistic needs which are also supported by Kuh (1993) as confidence and self-worth.

Furthermore, academic involvement and student-faculty interaction are other forms of student involvement. Huang and Chang (2004) researched the relationship between academic and co-curricular involvement. The authors reported a positive correlation between academic and co-curricular involvement as well as student gains in cognitive skills and communication skills. These findings of student gains align with Kuh's (1993) findings of reflective thought and social competence, respectively. Additionally, students' satisfaction with institutional experience can also be linked to student-faculty interaction. Ullah and Wilson (2007) found student-faculty relationship positively influenced academic achievement and recommended that faculty incorporate service learning, collaborative assignments, and integrative learning to enhance student-faculty interaction. Along similar lines, Kuh (1993) classified academic achievement as academic skills and application of knowledge. Hence, student-faculty interaction is imperative to student development in that these relationships lead to greater outcomes in academic skills.

Likewise, Astin (1984) argued that athletic involvement results in a satisfaction among the institution's academic reputation, intellectual environment, student friendships, and institutional administration. Chen, Synder, and Magner (2010) took Astin's argument further by studying the impact of athletic involvement on college students. They found students who participated in team sports reported higher ratings in social relationships. These findings provide a strong justification of the need for athletic involvement on college campuses, because social competence is a desired competency among employers, sponsors, and investors.

Additionally, student involvement in leadership programs produces greater developmental outcomes (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). Using the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Cress et al., (2001) found that students who were involved in leadership programs had a positive growth and change in leadership skills, values, and cognitive understanding. These leadership programs have the capacity to meet the demands of society by equipping students with intangible skills to be successful from their daily experiences. Moreover, SGA is viewed as the pinnacle of student leadership programs in higher education because of its distinctive and robust demands. Hence, the following section will outline reported gains of student involvement in SGA.

Student Government Associations

Since the early 1900s, student government association (SGA) has been defined as, "a type of organization which by virtue of its composition and constitution is entitled to represent the student community as a whole" (Freidson and Shuchman, 1955, p. 6). May (2010) believed, "student self-governance [arose] out of a combination of the need for extracurricular outlets, disengagement with academic curriculum, dissatisfactions with institutional rules and disciplinary procedures, and a desire for student empowerment" (p. 208). Thus, SGA provides opportunities for student development through interactions with faculty, students, staff, administrators, and alumni.

Moreover, participating in SGA exposes students to a wide array of experiences including activism, decision making, and strategic planning. (Astin, 1984; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Pascarella, & Terenzini, 1996). These experiences influence different types of learning and development such as personal, professional, and academic (May, 2010). Kuh and Lund (1994) prove participation in student government leads to gains in self-confidence, sense of purpose, vocational competence, altruism, social competence and practical competence as areas of personal gains. They identified social competence, "working with others, teamwork, dealing with others, public speaking, communication, and patience" and practical competence as "decision-making ability, organizational skills, budgeting, and dealing with systems and bureaucracies" (p. 15), as the most meaningful areas of gains. Similarly, Diorio (2007) conducted a study to examine the beneficial outcomes of being involved in SGA. The participants reported goal setting, personal development, and gaining practical skills as benefits of participating in SGA. These findings lend themselves to the holistic development of students, because participating in SGA leads to professional and personal development. These findings supported Kuh and Lund's (1994) work which illustrated how students involved in SGA develop gains in social competence, autonomy, and practical competence.

Furthermore, SGA leaders are constantly interacting with peers, faculty, administration, and alumni to develop plans, complete tasks, and resolve conflicts. Similarly, these leaders learn how to manage their time, effectively manage the SGA budget, and navigate the systems and bureaucracies of the university and its stakeholders. All of the aforementioned interactions provide everyday training opportunities for social competence and practical competence. In addition, developing practical competence is related to career development. Laosebikan-Buggs (2009) conducted a case study of SGA leaders at an Historically Black Colleges and University (HBCU) aimed to investigate the impact of student government on career choice. The participants attributed career development (budgeting, organizational skills, and interpersonal relationships) to their involvement in SGA. These findings supported the assertions of Kuh and Lund (1994) as well as Diorio (2007) that SGA serves as a developmental hub for social competence and practical competence.

Not only does involvement in SGA have similar developmental outcomes; those outcomes are seen across different institutional types. Miles (2010) examined "how postsecondary institutions from a variety of typologies [faith based college, women's college, research institution, and community college] develop student leaders" (p. 22). Three themes emerged as a result: change, organizational responsibility, and cultivating leadership. Miles (2010) furthered the findings of Kuh and Lund's (1994) reflective thought, practical competence, and altruism outcomes. Aside from Astin's initial work on student involvement, Kuh and Lund (1994) set the groundwork for expected outcomes when students are involved in SGA. As shown in previous sections, several studies (Diorio, 2007; Laosebikan-Buggs, 2009; Miles, 2010) have supported the five domains of outcomes resulting from involvement in SGA. The

next section of this literature review will examine the history of HBCUs and discuss outcomes related to student involvement.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)

HBCUs were created on the premise of equality and dignity. Allen, Jewell, Griffin, and Wolf (2007) stated, "HBCUs play important roles in the perpetuation of Black culture, the improvement of Black community life, and the preparation of the next generation of black leadership" (p. 263). HBCUs were established mostly by freed slaves, and were funded by churches and white philanthropic organizations at the conclusion of the Civil War (Allen et al., 2007). HBCUs began to expand with the adoption of the *Second Morrill Act of 1890* which allowed for the designation of Black public land grant institutions. Coincidently, the Black college and professional student population in southern states increased from 3,380 in 1890 to 29,000 by 1935 as HBCUs began to offer both secondary and college coursework (Allen et al., 2007). By the same token, HBCUs were able to meet the vast educational demands of the black community as well as being amongst the first institutions in the United States to offer admissions to women.

Still today, HBCUs are relevant and active in the Black community. According to Henderson (2001), over half of Black officers in the United States Military, Black physicians, Black attorneys, Black teachers, and Black engineers are products of HBCUs. Additionally, Biehlmann (2016) argued HBCUs play a pivotal role in "maintaining and strengthening a sense of African American identity" (p. 67) through academic, professional, psychological, and personal development. Allen et al., (2007) made similar assertions by stating, "These institutions provide social capital and/or social networks, which serve as pathways to success for their students and graduates." (p. 273). Despite the changing of times, HBCUs are still pertinent to the continued success of African American students.

Correspondingly, student involvement is one of the catalysts to educational success at HBCUs. DeSousa and Kuh (1996) compared the educational gains associated with various types of student involvement amongst an HBCU and a Predominately White Institution (PWI). The students attending the HBCU showed greater gains in personal and social development, critical thinking and science/technology, vocational and career skills, history and cultural awareness, and art and literature as a result of involvement in academic activities. These results further strengthen the need for HBCUs and their relevancy in today's higher education.

Aside from academic activities, institutional environments play a pivotal role in the willingness for students to be involved at a HBCU. Some studies have shown student involvement for African American students is better situated at HBCUs rather than PWIs (Allen, 1992; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996; Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002). Outcalt and Skewes-Cox (2002) examined the relationship between student involvement, HBCU institutional climate, and satisfaction with the college experiences of African American students. They found that African American students at HBCUs demonstrated higher levels of academic involvement, including a strong sense of community, student to student interaction, the availability of leadership opportunities, and satisfaction with having a diverse faculty at higher rates, than their PWI counterparts. Given the environmental factors at the two types of institutions, students are more inclined to get involved if their environment supports a sense of community.

Black Greek-lettered Organizations (BGOs) serve as that community to some students. Moreover, BGOs play an essential role in student involvement at HBCUs. Kimbrough and Hutcheson (1999) investigated student involvement on campus and leadership outcomes of BGO student members. They found students who attended HBCUs and were members of

BGOs were also involved at a greater rate in SGA, academic clubs, honor societies, Black student groups, residence hall assistants, and student ambassadors. BGOs at HBCUs are a catalyst for student involvement. Not only do they boost the development of leadership skills, they act as a gateway to other opportunities for students to be actively involved in other organizations throughout campus.

Conclusion

In conclusion, student involvement is the foundation for student development and success (Astin, 1984, 1996; Flowers, 2004; Moore et al., 1998). The academic experience must be coupled with out-of-class involvement to produce greater gains (Kuh, 1993). As shown by Kuh (1994), SGA is a premiere entity on college campuses for enhancing developmental gains through everyday experiences. These developmental gains include but are not limited to: personal competence, cognitive complexity, knowledge and academic skills, altruism and estheticism, and practical competence.

Although there is substantial research on student involvement, SGA, and developmental gains (Diorio, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2007; Kuh & Lund, 1994; Laosebikan-Buggs, 2009; Miles, 2010; Pascarella, & Terenzini, 1996), little focus is directed to SGA at HBCUs. More specifically, there is a gap in the literature surrounding the impact of SGA leadership experiences at HBCUs on student learning and developmental outcomes. More research must be conducted to 1) narrate the student government leadership experiences at HBCUs and how they differ from TWIs, and 2) identify the impact of those experiences on student developmental outcomes. This research will inform the daily practices of student affairs professionals, faculty members, and administrators at HBCUs by giving voice to SGA leadership experiences, in hopes of furthering and enhancing the opportunities for developmental gains of African American students.

Travis C. Smith is a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership in Higher Education program at Clemson University.

References

Allen, W. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly white and historically black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(1), 26-45.

Allen, W. R., Jewell, J. O., Griffin, K. A., & Wolf, D. S. S. (2007). Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Honoring the past, engaging the present, touching the future. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 263-280.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 123-34.

Biehlmann, P. (2016). The case for Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Understanding race relations in the United States through its HBCUs. *McGill Journal of Political Studies, 7*, 62-71.

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(1), 15-27

Chen, S., Snyder, S., & Magner, M. (2010). The effects of sport participation on student-athletes' and non-athlete students' social life and identity. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 3*(1), 176-193.

DeSousa, D. J., & Kuh, G. D. (1996). Does institutional racial composition make a difference in what Black students gain from college? *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(3), 257-267

Diorio, K. "Perceived benefits of involvement in student government" (2007). *Theses and Dissertations*. 786. Retrieved from http://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/786

Flowers, L. A. (2004). Examining the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6), 633-654.

Freidson, E. & Shuchman, H. L. (1955). Student government in American Colleges. In E. Freidson (Ed.), Student Government, Student Leaders, and the American college (pp. 3-28). Philadelphia: United States National Student Association.

Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for black identity expression and development among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(2), 127-144.

Huang, Y. R., & Chang, S. M. (2004). Academic and cocurricular involvement: Their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 391-406.

Inkelas, K. K., & Weisman, J. L. (2003). Different by design: An examination of student outcomes among participants in three types of living-learning programs. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 335-368.

Kimbrough, W., & Hutcheson, P. (1998). The Impact of membership in black greek-letter organizations on black students' involvement in collegiate activities and their development of leadership skills. *The Journal of Negro Education, 67*(2), 96-105. doi:10.2307/2668220

Kuh, G. D. (1993). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 277-304. doi:10.2307/11632361), 15-27.

Kuh, G. D., & Lund, J. P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government. *New Directions for Student Services*, (66), 5-17. doi:10.1002/ss.37119946603

Laosebikan-Buggs, Morolake, "An Investigation of the Impact of Student Government Involvement at one Public Historically Black University on the Career Choice of African American Student Participants" (2009). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 1102. http://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1102

May, W. P. (2010). The history of student governance in higher education. *College Student Affairs Journal, 28*(2), 207-220

Miles, J. M. (2010). Leadership development among college-age students. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership, 8*(2), 22-29.

Moore, J., Lovell, C. D., McGann, T., & Wyrick, J. (1998). Why involvement matters: A review of research on student involvement in the collegiate setting. *College Student Affairs Journal, 17*(2), 4.

Outcalt, C. L., & Skewes-Cox, T. E. (2002). Involvement, interaction, and satisfaction: The human environment at HBCUs. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*(3), 331-347.

Twale, D., & Sanders, C. S. (1999). Impact of non-classroom experiences on critical thinking ability. *NASPA Journal, 36*(2), 133-146.

Ullah, H., & Wilson, M. A. (2007). Students' academic success and its association to student involvement with learning and relationships with faculty and peers. *College Student Journal, 41*(4), 1192-1203.

An Exploratory Qualitative Study of Work-Life Balance Experiences of Mothers in Doctoral Programs

Ashley L. Isreal, Ph.D.
Clemson University

Tracy D. Butler, Ph.D.
Anderson University

Rebecca A. Garcia, Ph.D.
Co-Diagnostics, Inc.

Author Note

Abstract

The number of doctoral student mothers in higher education is increasing. Research suggests that this population experiences different struggles in academia, unlike the homogenous student population, which also referred to as traditional students. Previous studies point to the need for more research to assess life balance. Limited resources exist for these students on university campuses. In this qualitative research study, we explored the ways in which women manage working, being in a doctoral program, and parenting. The research question that guided the paper was what are the work-life balance experiences of mothers in a doctoral program? Findings from this study indicate that an imbalance between school, work, and family exists. Based on the findings, we discovered how our participants identified their experiences through codes such as (a) Personal; (b) External Organizations; (c) Family (Significant other, children, and other members); (d) Friends; (e) School (general, professors, cohort); and (f) Work (general, supervisors, co-workers). Through the findings, we intentionally developed recommendations for future research and student affairs professionals to support doctoral student mothers.

Keywords: balancing life, doctoral student mothers, life-balance

The prevalence of mass women's movements in the United States during the 20th century is evidenced by their involvement in anti-slavery, the passage of the 19th Amendment, and support for the Equal Rights Amendment. The inequality that women face and have fought to overcome indicate disruptions in life-balance exist. Previous studies point to the need for more research to assess life balance (Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Guest, 2002; Smithson & Stokoe, 2005). Statistics show that, compared with men, by the time women graduate with a bachelor's degree 29% are likely to have married, 16% have children, and 87% to earn a graduate degree (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Currently, doctoral students are highly nontraditional "generally exceed[ing] 30 years of age and are increasingly female, married, and/or have children" (Martinez et al., 2013). In fact, 20% in 1975 and 49% in 2005 of all doctorates were awarded to women (Maher et al., 2004; Hoffer et al., 2000; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2007b).

Although the number of nontraditional doctoral female students is growing exponentially, a recent report indicated that these women frequently find themselves struggling to balance their personal and professional lives (Brus, 2006). Often these struggles are found between balancing their academic work and personal relationships or family (Brown & Nichols, 2013; Moyer, et al., 1999; Springer, Parker, & Leviten-Reid, 2009). Furthermore, marriage and parenthood are both negatively correlated to graduate enrollment for women (U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Sallee, 2015). Scholars such as Stimpson and Filer (2011) highlight challenges that women doctoral students face in the 21st century as though they are being marginalized in the academy. Even scholars such as Chris Golde (2001) provide snapshots of the challenges that a doctoral student faces and tries to pinpoint their needs. However, attention is largely focused on the experiences of women in general (Madsen, 2012; Mundy, Kupczynski, & Spillett, 2015) and doctoral students (Martinez et al., 2013; Reese, 2013). The limited literature specifically on mothers in doctoral programs have another set of challenges (Holm et al., 2015). Furthermore, Golde and Dore (2001) state that attention should be drawn to the needs of doctoral students and understanding their experiences, "this attention has come from both within and outside academia: faculty, administrators, leaders of professional associations and higher education organizations" (p. 6). Considering these factors this study underpins a different approach by targeting mothers in doctoral programs and learning about their experiences, which is significantly underexplored in academia.

In this exploratory qualitative research study, we explore the ways women manage parenting, work, and school. The aims of this study are to (a) identify factors that influence work, school, and parenting balance, (b) identify common elements used by doctoral mother's to balance life, (c) determine facilitators and barriers of balancing life, (d) learn more about experiences in a doctoral program, and (e) develop recommendations for future research and student affairs professionals. Learning about doctoral program experiences contributes significantly to the current research on female doctoral students by providing higher education administrators and practitioners with different perspectives on the students that they are serving. With this effort, student affairs professionals and higher education organizations can learn other perspectives of the demographic of students that they serve by fostering equity (Golde & Dore, 2001; Stimpson & Filer, 2011). In the following section, we provide a brief review of the literature focused on work-life balance for doctoral moms.

The Balancing Act

Attention to issues of work-life balance has been steadily driven by demographic changes in the workforce, making it a heavily studied area across many fields (Martinez et al., 2013; Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Brus, 2006; Kamemou, 2008). Unbalance in the business domain has exposed increased absence, reduced productivity, decreased satisfaction, altered organizational loyalty, increased healthcare costs, and lack of advancement (Ervin, 2012). The entrance of women into the workforce by necessity or desire brings forth additional responsibilities and concerns, expressly exposing the "interrole conflict" or the unsuccessful management of multiple life roles occurring at the same time (Ervin, 2012, p. 17). Women are less satisfied with their ability to balance work and life, in part by being forced to select one role over another (Brus, 2006; Martinez et al., 2013; Stimpson & Filer, 2011). Slaughter's (2012) reflective article about a high-profile career woman who constantly feels the pull of her children's needs and the influence of what other people think or say shows how balancing life can create paradigm shifts. Slaughter (2012) indicated how the woman's way of thinking about a balanced life led the woman to asking her husband to take on more parental responsibilities. However, many women still struggle to balance academics, children, extended family, spouse

or partner, finances, work, health, housing, and transportation (Arndt, 2011; Stimpson & Filer, 2011).

Additionally, with so many struggles to balance life and work, the need for a woman to continue her education could only add to the balancing act. In recent years, women have been enrolling and finishing their graduate education in substantial numbers (Springer, Parker, & Leviten-Reid, 2009). While the median age for women to complete their doctoral degree is 33.6 years, the probability that women's time in graduate school will overlap with their childbearing is significantly high (Hoeffer et al., 2006). For example, 24% of women enrolled in doctoral programs have children, and 42% enrolled in master's degree programs have children (Mason, 2006; Springer, Parker, & Leviten-Reid, 2009). Given these data, Arndt (2001) stated that having children was the highest risk factor that women face for dropping out of school. Furthermore, not only is there a balance of work, homework, and projects, but children need the attention of their mom (Arndt, 2001). The conflicting roles of being a mother and a doctoral student are sources of stress for graduate students (Brus, 2006). A study conducted by Market Reader Pro found that up to 48% of women who had children dropped out of college. A study of 26 student-parents (21 moms and five dads having at least one child) from 2005-2007 highlighted that student-parents face stigmatization as bad parents for not spending the majority of their time with their children (Estes, 2011). Morphology takes place forming a parent-student identity for protection, time-management, and motivation (Estes, 2011). Contrary to what society believes, student-parents think their actions demonstrate to children the value and importance of education and that daycare placement assists in the children's education and social life (Estes, 2011).

At the same time, research suggests that support, finances, and time management influence the success and decisions of student mothers pursuing higher education (Mason & Ekman, 2007; Springer et al., 2009). Family support influences the success of single moms in college programs; unfortunately, some families are not supportive, which negatively affects a woman's decision to finish a degree (Arndt, 2011). Another less influential consideration of mothers in college was dealing with their finances (Brown & Nichols, 2012). For example, Gerrard and Roberts (2006) qualitative study examined the effects of financial hardship on student parents. The researchers revealed that the student parents had an overwhelming amount of credit card debt due to being both a student and a parent. For single mothers, in particular, housing was the biggest issue affecting them with regards to finance (Arndt, 2011). In fact, Miller (2012) states that 62 percent of single postsecondary student parents have an expected family contribution (EFC) of zero, signifying that the federal government considers them to be incapable of contributing financially to their educational monetary needs, in contrast to 20 percent of postsecondary students without children. A year later Schumacher (2013) proposed that institutions address financial concerns by providing financial supports to student parents including, scholarships, emergency funds, grants, and loans. This financial support could cover books and supplies, funding for childcare, and gift cards for groceries and gas (Schumacher, 2013). Time management is equally important concerning the influences and decisions of student mothers pursuing higher education; which is the key to creating some balance between school, work, and family. On the positive side, Ott (2007) reported that women graduate students who are moms are better able to multitask, which is a necessary skill to be successful in graduate school. By having a family to take care of, doctoral moms are often better able to create a balance between school and home. Although this may be true, Mason's (2006) findings contradicted Ott's (2007) by discovering how graduate student mothers spend 102 hours per week on their paid and unpaid duties compared with 75 hours

for childless graduate students (Mason, 2006). Working significantly more than the childless graduate students produced time management concerns for graduate student mothers.

Concerns faced by women have made work-life balance a considerable topic of exploration in the education field (Brus, 2006; Maher et al., 2011; Martinez et al., 2013; Moyer et al., 1999; Stimpson & Filer, 2011). However, the concerns have not fully addressed how student affairs professionals can support student mothers. The literature identifies lack of university support for student-parents as a major problem across disciplines (Estes, 2011; Springer et al., 2009; Anaya, 2012). Springer et al. (2009) surveyed sociology doctoral program directors to determine the level of support available to parents in a graduate program. Similarities between parenting and academia included demands on time and physical taxation on the body, and as a result, neither the children nor the schoolwork received 100% attention (Springer et al., 2009). A major lack of support for parents exists within academia, with few policies in place to assist parents (Springer et al., 2009). Golde and Dore (2001) have produced work that includes challenges and needs of doctoral students in hopes to produce policies and initiatives to assist with work-life balance

Research Design and Methodology

This study looks at both academic and personal components of the doctoral student's life from an interpretive paradigm. Interpretivism attempts use descriptive experiences of persons to understand their situations without losing the individual point of view or context (Sipe & Constable, 1996). Due to the limited knowledge and resources concerning mothers in doctoral programs, we used a phenomenology research approach (Glense, 2011). As student affairs and academic affairs professionals both strive to understand the needs of doctoral students, phenomenological study is highly fitting for this study. A phenomenology study is concerned about the experiences of the participants in a given study (Creswell & Poth, 2017). In more depth, phenomenology is a "procedure for systematically describing categories (kinds, or types) of lived experience within a set of experiential narratives" (Kuiken & Miall, 2001, p.1). Experiences of doctoral mothers must be understood for student affairs and academic affairs professionals to deliver appropriate initiatives to meet the needs for this population of students. Therefore, phenomenology research using an interpretivist paradigm method was appropriate to answer the research question, *what are the work-life balance experiences of mothers in a doctoral program?*

Participant Selection

An exploratory qualitative focus group design was used to explore the life balance experiences of mothers in doctoral programs. Enrollment in the study was open to all mothers enrolled in a doctoral program at a southeastern university. The following inclusion factors were required: completion of one full semester in a doctoral program, parent at least one child under the age of 11, and work at least 10 hours per week. Participants were excluded if they had no children, were not actively enrolled in a doctoral program, and were working less than 10 hours per week. By limiting participation to doctoral students in their second semester of study, we were able to eliminate stressors due to new student adjustment periods and early drop outs. No discrimination was allowed based on race, culture, ethnicity, the age of participant, the program of study, or religious beliefs.

Data Collection

The research was conducted at a predominately White institution (PWI) in the southeastern part of the United States. The university has a total of 18,204 students, in which approximately 78% of the student population self-identified as "White" or "Caucasian". Due to the

circumstances of not being able to identify the number of mothers in doctoral programs at the institutions, participants were recruited through a mass email to all of the female doctoral students. Furthermore, snowball sampling was used to recruit additional participants. Eight female participants were enrolled in the study. Three participants failed to show up for the interview due to conflicting schedules. From the five doctoral mothers who participated, three were enrolled from the Department of Education and two from the Department of Nursing. Participants were Caucasian ($n = 4$) and Middle Eastern ($n = 1$). Four participants were married, one divorced but dating; all were pursuing doctoral degrees; all working at least 10 hours per week; all parents of at least one child less than 11 years old. Focus group participants were asked a series of 20 questions.

Focus groups allowed doctoral mothers the opportunity to interact and understand common experiences in a non-threatening environment. The focus groups were led by at least two researchers who shared the common grounds of being a doctoral student, working, and being parents. The researchers conducting the focus group interviews manually recorded notes based on observations during the interview. Additionally, the focus group interviews were audio recorded. Three researchers analyzed the audio recordings for conceptual categories and informational patterns. Common elements, facilitators, and barriers from each experience were evaluated to create a conceptual framework.

The study was approved by the university's institutional review board for the protection of human subjects in research. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before participation in the study.

Results and Analysis

The initial data was divided into six preliminary categories that were used to identify variables and codes: Personal, External Organizations, Family (Significant other, children, and other members), Friends, School, and Work. The codes are ranked according to their significance.

Table 1. *Categories for Coding*

Personal	External Organizations	Family	Friends	School	Work
Sacrifice	Absence	Support	Expectations	Flexibility	Flexibility
Motivation	Time	Priority	Perceptions	Support	Time
Health	Support	Time	Advise	Availability	Support
Feelings		Rewards	Time	Time	Equality
Time		Health	Support	Equality	Expectation
Support		Expectation			

Support was a major theme across all categories. To standardize the term "support," we defined it as the amount of time an individual or group has and are willing to share with someone presenting a need. Each individual support was different based on the need and location of interaction. For example, all participants needed help with childcare and support was available from multiple resources including friends, family, neighbors, daycare facilities, etc. Other examples of support were based on reflection of experience from other students in a doctoral program who were also working mothers. The majority of descriptions associated support within a contextual environment. Support for childcare came from family, support for education or research came from school, and support for motivation came from peers with similar circumstances.

Coding for each participant was completed and then cross compared to reduce the categories of work, school, and parenting. A new set of codes identified factors that influence each category as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Influencing Factors of Doctoral Moms

Work	School	Parenting
School and parenting obligations	Time	Support
Flexibility	Parenting obligations	Time
Attitudes	Diversity	Protecting
Support	Perceptions	Expectations
Working together	Research topic	Rewards
Time	Support	Health
Expectations	Professor support and availability	
Equality	Cohort support and availability	
Health	Flexibility	
	Working together	
	Quantity or quality of assignments	
	Isolation	
	Expectations	
	Relevant coursework	
	Equality	
	Age	
	Health	
	Direction	

Each of the three categories provided input to the doctoral mother, who then had to process the data and use it to establish boundaries. In this study, we define boundaries as limitations that a person establishes – based on environmental and personal input – for protection, balance, and to maintain a healthy mental and physical lifestyle. The factors in each category influence decisions made by the doctoral mother, in addition to her personal perceptions. All influential input came in the form of verbal, emotional, or physical characteristics of the surrounding environment and personal experience. In each case, a healthy balance of life is maintained by how the mother filters her environmental input. The mother filters input based on many factors but one variable unintentionally noted in this study was personality or self-description. Below is a chart of self- descriptive words used by each participant throughout the interview process.

Table 3. Participant Quotes

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5
Self-sacrificing	Competitive	Opportunity Seeking	Guilty	Experienced
Loving	Preparing	Controlling – "I have to feel in control"	Crying	"I would like to be more social…"
Busy	Willing to sacrifice	"I love going to class"	"I can manage any situation"	Busy
Full-time Student	Enjoyment	"Assignments without relevance – I have no interest"	Sacrificing	"I hate to disappoint or reschedule"
Dependable	Working hard		Fearful	Guilty
"I have to have balance"	"I am an example for kids"			Under pressure
Drive	Worry			Thankful

After cross analyzing the data among all participants, patterns of causal conditions, intervening conditions, action strategies, and consequences began to emerge. The desires or motivations of each participant resulted in acceptance into a doctoral program. Most commonly, the terminology used to express this motivation to enter into a doctoral program was "I want to…" Other motivations for pursuing higher education included money, title, and more opportunities. Secondly, the lack of time always led to limits of participation in every category. When asked about extracurricular activity involvement, one participant explained, "I don't have time to participate, and I don't feel like… if I can't participate then… I've dropped out of everything right now." Another participant mentions time limitations when discussing how to balance work when family and school obligations take priority saying, "I get sick time only at work so I may fake sick if I need time off..." We directly experienced the effects of time limitations based on the number of respondents to the study, and the difficulty in finding a time when all participants could meet for the focus groups. Another causal condition revealed interactions with children causing feelings of reward or joy. The importance of prioritizing children was best described by participants saying, "You are their world…" or "If there is something that comes up with my child then she will come first every time."

Children also serve the role as an intervening condition because their level as a high priority alters the response to school, work, and personal decisions. One mother describes what happens when children intervene due to unforeseen circumstances, "when kids are not healthy things get crazy." This mother continues to describe times when the children are sick and she has to depend on people who are willing to support her going to school or work by taking care of the sick children. The possibility of interventions leads us to also look at action strategies. These strategies are purposeful, goal oriented activities that a mother may preconceive or preplan in order to maintain balance, they include managing, rescheduling, rearranging, hiring or obtaining support, sacrifice, and/or compartmentalize. Of course for every action that is completed, there is a consequence. Consequences discussed in these focus groups identified feelings (i.e. thanks, gratefulness, guilt, relief, fear, joy, etc.), as well as completion, isolation, and connection. The cause and effect evaluation made it easy to identify facilitators and barriers, as every influence produced an effect in the participants' final decision and action. Common facilitators included support, flexibility (especially variable teaching methods), organization, recommendations, age, and ambition or motivations. Barriers to doctoral mothers life balance included time, sacrifice, health, obligations, expectations, in-decision, age, equality, fear, guilt, and stress. Stressors and barriers were associated with unbalance. Each participant was able to

healthily identify when life balance was not achieved. Unbalance was characterized through statements found below in Table 4.

Table 4. Unbalanced Statements

Unbalanced Statements
"…lump in my throat…just feeling like I am drowning"
"…look at the calendar and if there are no check marks then I am very behind"
"Everything is due and the house is a mess"
"Think about all you have to do, hundreds of things to do"
"A perfect balance doesn't exist – do what you can…"

In contrast, life balance was characterized through common elements of setting priorities, relying on a support system, organizing, maintaining normality, and setting or having no expectations. The following statements define balance below.

Table 5. Balanced Statements

Balanced Statements
"…keep as normal as possible…it is what it is,"
"You have to stay on track, not let things go…or everything has a domino effect"
"Work smarter, not harder…you have to let go of the little stuff"
"Compartmentalize…"

Findings

This study highlights the experiences of doctoral student mothers. Based on the findings, we discovered how our participants identified their experiences through codes such as (a) Personal; (b) External Organizations; (c) Family (Significant other, children, and other members); (d) Friends; (e) School (general, professors, cohort); and (f) Work (general, supervisors, co-workers). Coding for each participant was completed and then cross compared to reduce the categories into (a) work, (b) school, and (c) parenting.

Participants in the study acknowledged the critical need to obtain balance in all aspects of their lives. They were intentional about managing their time, continuing to be a flexible person, and knowing their roles and expectations. The participants stated their challenges in being able to balance work, school, and parenting. Furthermore, the participants stated that they relied on support from their spouses, immediate family members, and babysitters. One theme that emerged unanimously was having support, which allowed them to become successful individuals. One participant, for example, stated: "I do not know how I would do this without my husband." By the participant addressing this concern was an implication that mental and physical support is one strong factor that produces more balance in their lives.

The best way to balance life is to find support, whether it is a friend, family, neighbor, co-worker, professor, or combination of several. The best support available is donating time or words of encouragement. In the end, all influences and interactions are input into the doctoral mom, who has to process the information and make decisions that will affect the outcome of everyone and everything around her including herself. Is life balance possible for doctoral moms? In the words of a doctoral mom, "If I can do it, you can do it."

Although the participants had much support from their family members mentally and physically, time is always an issue; when there are constantly so many factors competing for their time. One participant appeared exhausted in the process of her interview. When asked about how she allocated time for her children she became very emotional. Guilt appeared to be the factor that triggered her emotions. While her husband is understanding and is the primary caretaker of the children, she seemed to still battle guilt. With having so many roles and obligations to fill, the participants still have to deal with internal factors that are not issues for students that are not parents.

Some participants acknowledged problematic practices that impeded their efforts to accomplish balancing work, school, and family. Course offerings were a factor that most participants thought was challenging. One participant proposed that more courses should be offered during the day, instead of at night for full-time students. This way the institution could provide more parents with the ability to complete their work during the day. Another participant reiterated this and suggested that the institution should utilize interactive and mobile technologies (i.e., Blackboard, Adobe Connect, Webinars), which would allow students to do work from their homes. This suggestion would make a supportive climate for the participants, in particular, the full-time doctoral mothers.

Evidently, as the participants acquire more support from family and their institution, the internal problems that they face do not diminish. The participants felt as though something will always be neglected. Sacrifice is a daily occurrence for these individuals. For example, one participant stated, "for this period of time, I know that I have to self-sacrifice." Their motivation to continue working hard was looking towards the final outcome and not their current state. They know that being in a doctoral program is temporary and they have to sacrifice to get through their programs. One positive outlook is that the participants all enjoy what they are doing. One participant contributed a great perspective to this study that keeps her going. She stated, "I am blessed to have this opportunity. I hope I reflect something positive because I would not do this if I did not enjoy it." Gathering this information allowed us to gather a much greater perspective, that all of the participants love what they do regardless of their daily struggles.

Recommendations for Research and Implications for Student Affairs Professionals

A primary recommendation for additional research centered on the experiences of mothers in doctoral programs. The current body of literature on the experiences of mothers in doctoral programs is disjointed and sparse. Springer et al. (2009) noted, whereas there is substantive literature at addressing faculty parents, there is much less available for graduate student parents, in particular, doctoral student mothers. Continued research should accentuate effective methods.

In addition, student affairs professionals should evaluate the need to produce a family-oriented environment with the institutions of higher education. The findings of this study emphasize that mothers in doctoral programs are more likely to succeed if they feel supported from their respective university. University-based childcare centers are a step in the right direction. By providing childcare centers on campus, universities send an explicit message to mothers in doctoral programs that they matter. Continuing to immerse these mothers in the campus environment is an essential piece of helping them feel supported thus increasing their likelihood of success. Furthermore, fostering space to show how families are supported on campus contributes to another dynamic of how institutions serve their communities. University-based childcare centers can have the ability to bring families together through hosting an array of events that are welcoming for all family members.

Student affairs and academic affairs professionals should collaborate to determine if they are meeting student parents' needs by assessing best class schedules. Graduate program directors should intentionally link with department chairs to start facilitating these conversations. Course offerings were a factor that most of the doctoral student mothers participants found to be a barrier to their success while taking classes. Through assessing the best hours of course offerings, institutions of higher learning will be sending an explicit message to the population of non-traditional students, particularly to the doctoral student mothers, that they are supported.

Lastly, continued efforts on utilizing more interactive and mobile technologies (i.e., Blackboard, Skype, Adobe Connect, Webinars) will be necessary for doctoral mothers to have more accessibility to be to classes. Due to unforeseen circumstances that come with having a family, student parents may need more class provisions, if necessary. One participant in the study suggested that institutions should utilize interactive and mobile technologies. Therefore, to make sure these students persist through their doctoral programs, the option to use mobile technologies for classes is critical. It may be necessary for faculty to ask a series of questions at the beginning of the school year to start this discussion. Student affairs and academic affairs must collaborate to support doctoral student mother needs also in the area of interactive and mobile technologies services.

Conclusion

Future research is warranted to help improve the educational situation of moms in a doctoral program. Our research was limited by the time constraints of the doctoral moms and a small population size. Other limitations included the limited number of studies and articles that were available for research specific to doctoral student experiences. From our personal experiences, we feel as though we have obtained an accurate snapshot of the experiences of doctoral mothers at a PWI. Further research in this area is recommended to provide a deeper understanding of those experiences. As student affairs professionals develop intentional strategies to support doctoral student mothers, they must also work with academic affairs to be sure their needs are being met inside of the classroom. Intentionally supporting doctoral student mothers is a critical piece to creating family-friendly environments on university campuses.

Ashley L. Isreal is a Postdoctoral Researcher at Clemson University in the Department of Educational and Organizational Leadership Development

Tracy D. Butler is a Professor of English and Literacy at Anderson University in the College of Arts and Sciences

Rebecca A. Garcia is a Technical Advisor at Co-Diagnostics, Inc.

References

Anaya, R. (2012). Graduate student mothers of color: The intersectionality between graduate, motherhood and women of color in higher education. *Journal of Gender and Social Justice, 9*, 13-31.

Arndt, C. M. (2011). Keeping All The Balls in the Air: Women Students Speak Out About School, Family, Work. *Women in Higher Education, 20*(5), 23-24.

Beauregard, T. Alexandra & Henry, Lesley C. (2009) Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 9-22. ISSN 1053-4822

Brus, C. P. (2006). Seeking balance in graduate school: A realistic expectation or a dangerous dilemma. *New Directions for Student Services, 115*, 31-45.

Brown, V., & Nichols, T. R. (2013). Pregnant and parenting students on campus: Policy and program implications for a growing population. *Educational Policy, 27*(3), 499-530.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.

Ervin, S.M. (2012). *A Comparative Analysis of Work-Life Balance in Intercollegiate Athletic Graduate Assistants and Supervisors* (Doctoral Dissertation). Department of Kinesiology and Health at Georgia State University. Retrieved from http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/kin_health_theses.

Estes, D. K. (2011). Managing the student parent dilemma: Mothers and fathers in higher education. *Symbolic Interaction, 34*(2), 198-219.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*, (4th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education* (p. 63). ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from www.phd-survey.org/report.htm.

Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information, 41*(2), 255-279.

Hoffer, T. B., Welch, V., Jr., Webber, K., Williams, K., Lisek, B., Hess, M., et al. (2006). Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Summary report 2005. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Holm, J. M., Prosek, E. A., & Godwin Weisberger, A. C. (2015). A phenomenological investigation of counseling doctoral students becoming mothers. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 54*(1), 2-16.

Kamenou, N. (2008). Reconsidering work-life balance debates: Challenging limited understandings of the 'life' component in the context of ethnic minority women's experiences. *British Journal of Management, 19*, S99-S109.

Kuiken, D., & Miall, D. S. (2001, February). Numerically aided phenomenology: Procedures for investigating categories of experience. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 2, No. 1).

Maher, M., Ford, M., Thompson, C. (2004). Degree progress of women doctoral students: Factors that constrain, facilitate, and differentiate. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(3), 385-408.

Martinez, E., Ordu, C., Della-Sala, M., McFarlane, A. (2013). Striving to obtain a school-work-life balance. The full-time doctoral student. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 8*(39-59).

Mason, M. A., & Ekman, E. M. (2007). Mothers on the fast track: How a new generation can balance family and careers. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moyer, A., Salovey, P., & Casey-Cannon, S. (1999). Challenges facing female doctoral students and recent graduates. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 607-630.

Mundy, M. A., Kupczynski, L., & Spillett, M. A. (2015). Motivation and success of female administrators in distance learning. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 32*(2).

Ott, K. (2007). For a graduate student, parenting is political. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, 23*(2), 131-135.

Schumacher, R. (2013). Prepping Colleges for Parents: Strategies for Supporting Student Parent Success in Postsecondary Education. Working Paper. *Institute for Women's Policy Research*.

Shepherd, J. and Nelson, B.M. (2012). Balancing act: A phenomenological study of female adult learners who successfully persisted in graduate studies. *The Qualitative Report, 17*(39), 1-21.

Sipe, L. & Constable, S. (1996). A chart of four contemporary research paradigms: Metaphors for the modes of inquiry. *Taboo: The journal of culture and education*, 1, 153-163.

Slaughter, A. M. (2012). Why women still can't have it all. *The Atlantic, July/August*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/07/why-women-still-can-8217-t-have-it-all/9020.

Smithson, J., & Stokoe, E. H. (2005). Discourses of work–life balance: negotiating 'gender blind' terms in organizations. *Gender, Work and Organization, 12*(2), 147-168.

Springer, K. W., Parker, B. K., & Leviten-Reid, C. (2009). Making Space for Graduate

Student Parents Practice and Politics. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*(4), 435-457.

Stimpson, R. L., & Filer, K. L. (2011). Female graduate students' work-life balance and the student affairs professional. In P. A. Pasque, & S. E. Nicholson (Eds.), *Empowering women in higher education and student affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Competing Choices: Men's and Women's Paths After Earning a Bachelor's Degree* (Report No. NCES 2001-154). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2001154

Veal, J.L., Bull, M.J., and Miller, J.F. (2012). A framework of academic persistence and success for ethnically diverse graduate nursing students. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 33*(5), 322-327.

Critical Race Reflections on Self-Authorship and the Learning Partnerships Model

Aeriel A. Ashlee
Kyle C. Ashlee
Wilson Okello
Shamika N. Karikari
Miami University

Abstract

Self-authorship – that is one's internal capacity to generate their own beliefs, identity, and relationships – is regularly touted as a core learning outcome in higher education. Many college and university educators employ the Learning Partnerships Model (LPM) as a framework for fostering self-authorship with college students. However, in this article, four doctoral students argue that the LPM may be limited if uncritically applied to diverse populations. Using Critical Race Theory as both a theoretical and analytical framework, the authors critique the misappropriation of the LPM in student affairs. Drawing upon their own experiences as students and educators, the co-authors (1) argue that there are important considerations and cautions in applying LPM to racially and culturally diverse populations, (2) critique the LPM's emphasis on individualism, and (3) explore the unacknowledged benefits to White students' learning, development, and growth at the expense of their Peers of Color. The purpose of this study is to examine the limitations of self-authorship and the LPM in the context of contemporary diversity in higher education, with the aim of moving student affairs educators toward more culturally relevant and inclusive models of student development.

Keywords: college students, critical race theory, learning partnerships, self-authorship

The Learning Partnerships Model (LPM) is an empirically grounded approach to promoting self-authorship and adult development (Baxter Magolda, 2004). Given that self-authorship is espoused as a central goal of higher education, the LPM is regularly referenced as a useful framework for engaging college students in partnerships that promote learning (Baxter Magolda & King, 2004; Quaye, 2012). Unfortunately, this assertion extends beyond the scope of the original study. The LPM was not created as a one-size-fits-all formula for learning. Rather, the LPM was developed based upon a longitudinal qualitative study comprised of 97% White participants (Baxter Magolda, 2004). In this paper, the authors contend that there are theoretical and practical limitations to broadly applying self-authorship and the LPM to today's racially and culturally diverse college students.

To construct this argument, the authors first provide a review of literature related to self-authorship and the LPM in the field of higher education. Then, the authors present Critical Race Theory as both the theoretical and analytical framework for this paper. Next, three of the authors share counterstories of first-hand experience with challenges and limitations in employing self-authorship and the LPM with today's diverse college student populations. The challenges described include: (1) potential complications of applying self-authorship

and the LPM to Students of Color, (2) potential cultural incongruencies when emphasizing individualism within the LPM for students who come from collectivist cultures, and (3) unacknowledged benefits to White students' learning and development at the expense of their Peers of Color. Finally, the authors offer implications and recommendations based upon their analysis for future student affairs practice.

Literature Review

Well-intended attempts by educators to promote college student development may unintentionally misappropriate theories and models beyond the context of their original research. For instance, the LPM was founded through a context-bound study specific to one predominantly-White higher education institution (Baxter Magolda, 2004). For student affairs educators to best serve the individual needs of diverse college students, more attention must be given to how theories and models are utilized as frameworks to promote student development. The authors contend that current student development literature exemplifies and centers whiteness, which precariously minimizes the experiences of minoritized students from races and cultures which are not represented in the sampling that informs contemporary theories and models. The following literature review provides context for the authors' counterstories, which challenge the unequivocal implementation of self-authorship and the LPM.

Self-Authorship

The work of Kegan (1994) is foundational to the self-authorship movement for adults, and particularly for college students, where the focus of our writing is situated. An overview of this theory is necessary as a foundation for our argument regarding the misapplication of the LPM, which is a model to promote self-authorship in college contexts. Self-authorship is the internal capacity to generate one's own beliefs, identity, and relationships (Kegan, 1994). Self-authorship occurs when there is a shift from allowing external authority to influence one's decisions, values, and beliefs toward an internal ownership of one's values and beliefs. This shift from external to internal ideology is central to Kegan's (1994) theory of adult development.

Berger (2012) builds upon the work of Kegan (1994) by discussing adult development in professional contexts by focusing on four forms of mind, including: *self-sovereign*, *socialized*, *self-authored*, and *self-transforming*. Each of these forms of mind represents progression of development. Berger's (2012) first form of mind, *self-sovereign*, is characterized by people thinking primarily about themselves. The second form of mind Berger (2012) describes is the *socialized* form of mind, to be clear this is different from social identity. In Berger's (2012) *socialized* form of mind, individual awareness grows and people begin to see themselves in relation to the rest of the world. The third form of mind described by Berger (2012) is *self-authored*, which is indicated by people's ability to maintain their own values and beliefs while considering multiple perspectives. The final – and least common – form of mind is *self-transforming*, which Berger (2012) describes as a complex process of perspective-taking to transform and expand one's own belief system.

In analyzing Kegan's (1994) theory of self-authorship and Berger's (2012) forms of mind, it is important to note that social identity is not explicitly addressed. Neither Kegan nor Berger explore the role of social identities in adult development or their relation to the ways in which individuals may achieve self-authorship. This absence of identity is a central concern undertaken by the authors as they hold that identity is a critically important aspect of one's developmental capacities. The co-authors of this article argue that leaving social identity unexamined in the context of self-authorship is concerning and irresponsible. It is because of

our unique, complex, and intersecting identities that each person may experience and achieve self-authorship in different ways. This gap in the literature serves as compelling evidence to further examine for whom self-authorship has been constructed and whom it benefits.

Critiques of Self-Authorship

Extending the foundational work of self-authorship Pizzolato (2003) explores self-authorship in the context of the experiences of *high-risk* college students. Pizzolato defines *high-risk* students as those "whose academic background (academic preparation), prior performance (low high school or first-semester college GPA), or personal characteristics may contribute to academic failure or early withdrawal from college" (Pizzolato, 2003, p. 798). Pizzolato (2003) discovered that many of the participants possessed self-authoring ways of knowing prior to college, but the degree to which these ways of knowing were developed in college varied. High-risk students have a differential development toward self-authorship as it relates to (a) disequilibrium in the provocation of self-authorship, and (b) privilege. These two emergent concepts are important in understanding why some students are more likely to fully develop self-authored ways of knowing.

Torres & Hernandez (2007) conducted a longitudinal study that explores ethnic identity and holistic development of Latino/a college students. The results indicate that Latino/a college students have some developmental characteristics which are reflected in self-authorship theories, but also have distinct and separate aspects of development stemming from their ethnic identity. These developmental tasks relate to navigating racism, such as understanding and managing racist stereotypes that influence individuals' self-image and choices regarding who they seek out for support and relationships when dealing with issues of oppression (Torres & Hernandez, 2007). Torres and Hernandez (2007) suggest that recognizing racism and the stratification within society that grants privilege to the majority and oppresses those who are different is an important aspect of Latino/a student development. Additional research is needed to better understand how developmental concepts like self-authorship may be experienced by different racial and cultural student populations. These studies reveal that diverse students have different outcomes and experiences regarding their development, thereby compelling educators to think more critically about how various models of student development are used to inform professional practice.

Learning Partnerships Model

Given that self-authorship is situated as a central goal of higher education, (Baxter Magolda, 2004) the Learning Partnerships Model (LPM) is regularly referenced as a useful framework for how to engage college students in partnerships that promote their learning. The LPM has become one of the most utilized models to promote student development in higher education. The LPM (2004) builds upon Kegan's (1994) work and provides a roadmap for professionals to assist college students in their development. Only three participants in the study were members of underrepresented populations (Baxter Magolda, 2004). Although Baxter Magolda never asserted that the LPM was a one-size-fits-all framework, unfortunately that is how many student affairs professionals have utilized it. This misappropriation does not represent the diverse developmental pathways of all student groups, and specifically fails to account for racially and culturally minoritized communities.

The LPM (Baxter Magolda, 2004) provides three principles for promoting student development: validating learners as knowers, situating learning in learners' experiences, and defining learning as mutually constructed. Additionally, the LPM encourages educators to challenge students through three assumptions: knowledge is complex and socially constructed, self is central to knowledge construction, and knowledge is mutually co-constructed between

students and educators. Maturity along these fundamental dimensions of development converge to form self-authorship. Baxter Magolda (2001) used the term *self-authorship* to describe the pursuit of an internal voice. According to the LPM, development involves movement across a continuum that includes external formulas, crossroads, authoring one's life, and internal foundations.

The fundamental critique of the LPM in this article is specifically regarding its application and implementation when working with racially and culturally minoritized student populations. The current way some student affairs professionals utilize this model does not acknowledge race or culture as an important aspect of student development. For example, self as essential to knowledge construction could be misconstrued to mean that students from collectivist cultures should ignore their families' hopes or desires for their lives. Many college student development theories, like the LPM, do not consider racial identity or culture, which are essential components of development and must be considered when working with today's diverse student populations.

Critical Race Theory as a Theoretical and Analytical Framework

Historically, higher education has functioned from a Eurocentric-White framework that has rendered the histories, experiences, and cultures of Students of Color invisible, if not devalued, misinterpreted, or formally omitted (Moore, 2008). Consistent with the objective of interrogating the implementation of the LPM and the potential misappropriation of the tenets of self-authorship in student affairs practice, Critical Race Theory (CRT) is the theoretical and analytical framework for this study. As a disruptive device to systemic racism, CRT, unapologetically challenges policies and practices that "dehumanize and depersonalize us" (Bernal, 2002, p. 110). CRT thus offers a counter-hegemonic stance against the dominant ways of knowing and begins to offer an alternative to normative Eurocentric-Western approaches to higher education.

According to Solórzano and Yosso (2002), there are five fundamental ways CRT frames its objectives in educational research. First, it calls for the *intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of subordination*. CRT centers race and racism as endemic and permanent; a defining factor in explaining individual experiences, as opposed to viewing it as a marginal. Also, it objects to any theorizing that ignores the intersecting nature of oppression, seeking to make a case for layered analysis (Barnes, 1990). Secondly, CRT articulates a *challenge to dominant ideology*. CRT is committed to challenging race-neutral dominant ideologies such as meritocracy and colorblindness that have contributed to deficit thinking about People of Color, arguing that these constructs serve as a camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of those in power (Solórzano, 1997). In challenging forms of domination, CRT advances *a commitment to social justice*. This commitment endeavors to support a liberatory agenda that leads to "the elimination of racism, sexism, and poverty, and the empowerment of minoritized groups" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 26). Additionally, CRT submits that the empowerment of minoritized people should not happen to them, but build on the *centrality of their experiential knowledge*. Furthermore, CRT contends that the lived experiences of People of Color are instrumental in helping us understand how, and to what extent, race and racism mediate everyday life. In this regard, CRT seeks to legitimate knowledge constructed by People of Color through the explicit use of storytelling, biographies, *cuentos*, *testimonies*, parables, and narratives. Finally, CRT demands that analysis be *transdisciplinary in nature*, by insisting on a view of race and racism in both an historical and contemporary context (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). CRT utilizes the transdisciplinary knowledge and the methodological base of

ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, and the law in constructing its theoretical premise (Malagon, Pérez Huber, & Velez, 2009).

Critical Race Methodology

In addition to scaffolding the theoretical approach using CRT, critical race methodology is used to foreground race and racism in all aspects of this paper. Critical race methodology challenges traditional research paradigms and views the experiences of minoritized students as sources of strength and transformation (Solórzano & Yosso, 2009). Critical race methodology serves as an affront to critiques that aim to render CRT invalid because of its "excessive subjectivity" (Giles & Hughes, 2010, p. 688), as it requires that we confirm the knowledge obtained and shared from these experiences as valid and legitimate sources of data. Taking up this call in what follows, we seek to expose deficit discourses, hidden in student development theory and teaching models, using counter-storytelling. Counterstories, that is the experiences as remembered and articulated by those who occupy the margins of society, are resistant research tools for "exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2009, p. 138). According to Bernal (2002), "counter-storytelling can serve as a pedagogical tool that allows one to better understand and appreciate the unique experiences and responses of Students of Color through a deliberate, conscious, and open type of listening" (p. 116). Furthermore, counterstories must center the experiences of People of Color. As such, critical race narratives from White people are not considered counterstories, in that they describe and depict the experiences of White people (Grillo & Wildman, 1997). Thus, the narrative provided by Kyle, a White person, is not a counterstory, but rather a White critical race narrative informed by and in support of CRT (Bergerson, 2003). Through narrative and testimonial, the authors submit their lived experiences as the subject of analysis with the hope of yielding constructive and critical discourse about the challenges of both theoretical and practical applications of self-authorship and the LPM in higher education.

Findings

We, the authors of this paper, are cohort-mates in a Student Affairs in Higher Education doctoral program in the Midwest, USA. Much of our program's curriculum is built around the LPM. As such, we have spent a great deal of our coursework reading, learning, and discussing together the theory of self-authorship as it relates to higher education and student affairs. Along this academic journey, we found commonality in constructively and critically examining self-authorship and the LPM. What started as a class conversation evolved into this coauthored critical race analysis. The following are three counterstories that demonstrate possible limitations associated with applying the theory of self-authorship and the LPM to today's diverse college student populations.

Lack of Diverse Student Voices – Shamika's Narrative

When I first learned about LPM I did not see myself represented. Our class learned about the theory of self-authorship, mainly how the LPM promotes self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2004). I remember reading about how the LPM was a model to promote development and saw that 97% of the participants identified as White. Even so, we were expected to apply this student development framework to all college students. I felt confused, irritated, and forgotten. When I was in other classes and we were introduced to models based on racially minoritized students, White students would say the framework in question could not be applied to the larger population but why then could the reverse be true? I did not see myself in the model because of the lack of participants that identified like me and it just did not speak to my experience.

I felt like the LPM and self-authorship theory ignored the rich family heritage I came from. In both the LPM and self-authorship theory there is no explicit mention of family or other outside factors can positively contribute to one's development. This omission created in me a pressure to let go of that which had led me to my master's education, namely my family. When I was critical of self-authorship as a theory and the LPM as a framework to promote self-authorship, my White classmates were shocked. They could not believe I would question such a foundational model in our field. I felt like how could I not. How could I drink the Kool-Aid when it was not made for me? How could I accept something that did not consider me? It felt unfair, yet I felt powerless. The LPM and promotion of self-authorship were and still are foundational to the graduate program. How would I cope?

To author my own counterstory, I employ poetry as a vehicle of expression. Writing poetry gives me power, a voice, and a space to express myself in authentic and vulnerable ways. Poetry grants permission to freely express myself in ways other writing genres do not allow. Poetry connects me to people like Maya Angelou and Langston Hughes; Black poets who used their gift of poetry to speak their truths. Expressing myself through poetry fills a void in my life. This specific void that the LPM and self-authorship theory leaves as I do not see myself or my experience in them. Poetry is not just a hobby, but a lifeline and a necessity. Poetry is the place I go to let it all out, to heal. Poetry is a place where I am seen and valued, where my voice – written in my way – is appreciated. I wrote the following poem during the second year of my master's program. I wrote it to express my renewed appreciation of who I was as a Black woman. I did not see myself in the required text of my classes. I had racial slurs yelled at me on the edge of campus during my first year of my master's program. Who I was as a Black woman was not valued the way my White classmates were. Despite all those things, I knew there was beauty in my identity.

> *Beautiful Black Woman*
> *A beautiful black woman, that's me.*
> *From the crown of head to the soles of my feet.*
> *And it's not just my body that makes me beautiful,*
> *It's my mind, confidence and soul that travels through these black veins.*
> *It's the legacy of struggle and triumph, oppression and gain, captivity and freedom.*
> *It's the ability to dictate my own path instead of letting society decide what's beautiful.*
> *See I appreciate the curves I bring, the way my hips swing, and the longing that springs from other women coveting over these characteristics.*
> *I define what's beautiful and it isn't only straight hair, skinny legs, and a high-pitched voice.*
> *Instead it's curls that tell a story, legs that walk with purpose despite their size, and the base that only comes from a voice that knows their worth.*
> *I take back my name to mean more than a mispronunciation that assumes I'm uneducated, not worthy and another statistic.*
> *My name means wealth, which is more than money, inspiration to those who will follow this new path and knowledge beyond imagination.*
> *See I now define my life, my path, and my destiny,*
> *Because I'm a beautiful black woman, a beautiful black woman, a beautiful black woman…that's me.*

Our social identities and histories matter and should be a central part of student development theory and models like the LPM that promotes development. I want students to see themselves in the texts they read, theories they learn about, and conversations the engage in during class. I desire that all students are empowered to bring their full selves to the classroom, not just on the days we talk about individual minoritized identities, but always. I want students to not just know, but also believe, that they matter. All of them. Lastly, I want students to come to this realization prior to their last year of school, because they deserve that.

Overemphasis of Individualism – Aeriel's Narrative

I first met Sarah (a pseudonym) when she was a sophomore at a small liberal arts college in New England. At the time, I served as the Assistant Dean/Advisor to Asian and Asian American students on campus and through that role I had the privilege of getting to know and advise Sarah as an active undergraduate student leader. The daughter of Taiwanese immigrants, Sarah was a high academic achiever, an active campus advocate, and a delightful young learner eager to grow and make a positive impact in the world. Originally a declared economics major, it was the fall of her junior year that Sarah realized her true calling was in the field of education. That summer, Sarah had interned as a tutor and mentor in urban New York City. Sarah found the experience personally and professionally transformative, and returned to college in the fall with the intention of changing her major. While Sarah felt a strong desire to pursue education, she also wrestled with a sense of obligation to her parents and their articulated desire for her to complete her intended major in economics. As Sarah weighed her options, she sought advice from her friends, from her professors, and from me.

One afternoon, as we were sitting in my office drinking tea and talking through some of the pros and cons of her academic dilemma, Sarah shared that multiple people had encouraged her not to worry about her parents and to, "just follow her heart." As Sarah told me this her brow furrowed and she grew quiet, staring silently into her steaming mug of tea. After a few minutes passed, I asked Sarah how this advice made her feel, to which she responded in an exasperated tone, "I don't know! Torn, I guess. I love my parents and I deeply respect them. I cannot simply disregard their wishes." As the Assistant Dean to Asian Students at a small, predominantly White, liberal arts college in New England, I had conversations like this on a regular occurrence. Time and time again, Asian and Asian American students would seek me out for guidance as they sought to navigate the difficult crossroads between their emerging academic interests and their parents' desires for their academic pursuits.

Unfortunately, because of the focus on autonomy and independence in the LPM and self-authorship literature, many well-intended student affairs educators mistakenly advise students like Sarah to prioritize their own interests over their families. Regardless of the good intentions undergirding this advice, it may be culturally incongruent and thereby problematic because such an approach fails to acknowledge the nuance of supporting students from collectivist-oriented cultures (Guiffrida, Kiyama, Waterman, and Museus, 2012). According to Guiffrida, et al. (2012) collectivist cultures "value interdependence, group synchronization, emotional attachment to families or parents, societal norms over individuality, and the subordination of individual aspirations to the aspirations of the collective." (p. 68). This may directly compete with Eurocentric-White ideals of autonomy and independence (like those foregrounded in self-authorship).

While the advice to "follow your passion" may inspire some college students, it also conveys a very Western and White value of education. Specifically, that a student's academic path is highly individualized and should be driven primarily by the student's desires. As college student populations continue to diversify, and more students from collectivist cultural

contexts come to study in the U.S., this individuation-centric advice may minimize and thus dismiss this growing demographics' experiences. As Pizolatto, Nguyen, Johnston, and Wang (2012) describe, there are individualistic notions which ground self-authorship and privilege ideas of autonomy and independence. This may be problematic when advising, mentoring, and supporting the development of East Asian students or students from cultures in which collectivist values emphasize family and group goals above individual needs and desires. The tension of trying to reconcile personal and parental expectations means that students from collectivist cultures may face additional challenges (Torres & Hernandez, 2007) adapting to and navigating the Eurocentric-Western norms of predominantly White institutions (Guiffrida et al., 2012). In the case of Sarah, and for other East Asian students like her, advice grounded in a Western approach to student development may unintentionally and unfortunately neglect the cultural dissonance and complicated competing interests of navigating personal and familial responsibilities.

To respectfully and responsibly support all college students' learning and development – including those from collectivist cultures – educators need to be willing to engage with students holistically. This includes giving weight and consideration to parents and community, if these are salient factors in the student's life. A core tenant of the LPM centers meaning-making (Baxter Magolda, 2004); and for students from collectivist cultures meaning-making happens in conjunction with family and group values. The LPM may still be an effective learning framework for these students. However, future empirical research is needed to verify this and the ways that student affairs educators facilitate these students' development may need to differ based on the how students' familial, national, and cultural contexts shape their development.

Unacknowledged Benefits to White Students – Kyle's Reflection

I sat staring at the participant binder on my lap, feeling overwhelmed with guilt. Never had I felt so inadequate. I was a sophomore in college and thus far, my experience as a participant of the Intergroup Dialogue (IGD) class was mostly positive. The IGD class focused on issues related to diversity and how those issues would be important in our roles. Much of the content that we had covered up to that point was very interesting, but none of it felt as personally challenging as the assignment for this session.

The facilitators requested that we each tell our identity timeline. By this, they meant that we each tell our life's story in the context of our racial identities. Honestly, it was a topic that I had not given much thought to at that point my life. As the exercise continued, many of my peers shared incredibly powerful stories about their experiences as people of different races. One woman shared that she had been called the N-word in her high school. Another shared how growing up on a Native American reservation allowed her to stay connected with her family and her culture but also resulted in a lack of opportunities.

Having grown up as a White person myself in a White family in a nearly all-White town, I felt completely stumped by the assignment. I learned so much from hearing about the diverse experiences of my peers, but I believed I had nothing of value to offer the group. I was in the earliest stages of White identity development where my lack of experience with race reinforced my assumption that racial differences were unimportant (Helms, 1997). I was oblivious to racism and my own place within racist systems of oppression. I thought I was just a regular person, void of any culture or racial identity. On the other hand, I saw my Peers of Color as experts in race. While I did not believe that I had anything of substance to contribute (DiAngelo, 2012), I learned much about race from their stories.

This story from my college career is a snapshot into my development at the time. The thoughts I had and the observations I made were representative of my cognitive and interpersonal

development as an undergraduate college student. The instance of hearing stories about racial discrimination in a dialogue class is one example of the many times throughout my college career when my own understanding about the world grew because of being exposed to the experiences of my racially minoritized peers. As a straight, White, man from a middle-class community in the United States, I had never thought about issues related to race and racism. Many Students of Color whom I met in college, however, were well-versed and acutely aware of these same issues. Due to their willingness to share their racialized life experiences with me, I could better understand race and the racist systems that oppress People of Color.

Considering the outcome of my learning and development, many student affairs educators might conclude that the Intergroup Dialogue experience was effective. But, educators and scholars must critically analyze the assumptions embedded in these learning goals. The LPM calls for educators to create spaces for students to co-construct knowledge, but there is tension and unequal power dynamics that can arise when students are asked to mutually construct knowledge; especially related to racial identity. The gaze of diversity efforts like Intergroup Dialogue may focus on and benefit White students like me, who have little to no experience confronting the realities of race and racism. Conversely, diversity dialogues may require racially minoritized students to educate their White peers, lifting them up on the same shoulders that have been burdened by racism. When this inherent imbalance is left unaddressed, educators striving for student development can be complicit in reinforcing systems of racial oppression.

Implications for Student Affairs Practice

The authors' Critical Race Theory (CRT) counterstories have several implications and considerations for the field of student affairs. First, given that this paper evolved from a class conversation in a doctoral seminar, we believe it is important that as critical race scholars and culturally aware student affairs educators we read *with* and *against* the theories and models of our field. With regards to Shamika's narrative, it is imperative that educators critically examine the communities that have traditionally been centered in the creation of student development theory, and relatedly acknowledge which communities, experiences, and voices have been historically and systemically excluded. In thinking about Sarah's story as recounted by Aeriel, it is essential that student affairs educators diligently consider the students with whom we work and whether the developmental theories learned in our graduate preparation programs are culturally appropriate. Finally, as demonstrated in Kyle's reflection, student affairs educators need to be cautious of asking students with minoritized identities to co-construct knowledge with their peers from privileged backgrounds. We, as student affairs educators, must be conscientious when thinking about whom we are teaching, and at whose expense.

Applying self-authorship and the LPM across diverse student communities may have disparaging effects when practiced with impunity. The LPM, at its best, depends on the learner as the essential member in knowledge production. This is important and can be empowering for individuals with minoritized identities, as evidenced by CRT and the use of counterstories. However, without a critical race lens, the effectiveness of the LPM as a tool to facilitate equitable learning may be compromised. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that student affairs educators regularly question who has been included – and thus also who has been implicitly excluded – in the creation of student development models that inform our contemporary professional practice. It is essential that we foreground critical race and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Lynn, 1999) so that we can intentionally interrogate how we implement tools such as the LPM in ways that are racially and culturally

inclusive. Finally, is it imperative that we continually ask ourselves as educators at what cost and at whose expense we are asking students to co-construct knowledge.

Conclusion

Through a CRT lens, we have endeavored to acknowledge and unpack potential limitations and challenges of applying self-authorship and the LPM to racially and culturally diverse college populations. By centering our own counterstories and considering the implications these narratives may have for student affairs educators broadly, we have attempted to identify some of the most troubling concerns associated with broadly applying self-authorship and the LPM. As doctoral students, we acknowledge that we are part of the next generation of critical race scholars. As such, we feel a responsibility to reflect upon existing student development theory and extend this important scholarship to better serve the changing demographics of the college students of tomorrow. As our campuses continue to diversify, existing theories must be analyzed and expanded to consider the needs and perspectives of the changing demographics in higher education. By using critical reflection and appreciative inquiry as tools, we aim to advance research and practice that equitably serves the needs of all college students and we seek to amplify the voices of those students who have historically been silenced in college student development theory. In utilizing the strengths of existing research and identifying areas for improvement, as we have attempted here, we believe scholarship can continue to serve the purpose of inclusively informing college student development theory and practice in higher education.

Aeriel A. Ashlee, M.Ed., is a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.

Kyle C. Ashlee, M.S., is a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.

Wilson Okello, M.S., is a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.

Shamika N. Karikari, M.S., is a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.

References

Barnes, R. (1990). Race consciousness: The thematic content of racial distinctiveness in critical race scholarship. *Harvard Law Review, 103*, 1864-1871

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Self-authorship as the common goal of 21st-century education. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self authorship* (1-35). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. & King, P. M. (2004). Preface. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship* (xvii-xxvi). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Berger, J. G. (2012). *Changing on the job: Developing leaders for a complex world*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bergerson, A. (2003). Critical race theory and white racism: Is there room for white scholars in fighting racism in education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 51–63. http://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000033527

DiAngelo, R. (2012). Nothing to Add: A Challenge to White Silence in Racial Discussions. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege, 2*(1), 1–17.

Grillo, T., & Wildman, S. M. (1997). Obscuring the importance of race: The implications of making comparisons between racism and sexism (or other isms). In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 619–626). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Guiffrida, D. A., Kiyama, J. M., Waterman, S. J., & Museus, S. D., (2012). Moving from cultures of individualism to cultures of collectivism in support of students of color. In S. D. Museus & U. M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations* (68-87). New York, NY: Routledge.

Helms, J. E. (1997). Toward a model of White racial identity development. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity*, pp. 49-66. New York: Greenwood/Praeger.

Hughes, R., & Giles, M. (2010). CRiT walking in higher education: Activating critical race theory in the academy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 13*(1), 41-57.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Lynn, M. (1999). Toward a critical race pedagogy. *Urban Education, 33*(5), 606-626.

Malagon, M. C., Pérez Huber, L. P. & Velez, V. N. (2009). Our experiences, our methods: Using grounded theory to inform a critical race theory methodology. *Seattle Journal of Justice, 8*(1), 253-272.

Moore, L.W. (2008). *Reproducing racism: White space, elite law schools, and racial inequality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Pizzolato, J. E. (2003). Developing self-authorship: Exploring the experiences of high-risk college students. *Journal of College Student Development. 44*(6), 797-812.

Quaye, S. J. (2012). Think before you teach: Preparing for dialogues about racial realities. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(4), 542-562.

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*, 5-19.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*(1), 23-44.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2009). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, and G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education*, pp. 131-147. New York, NY: Routledge.

Torres, V., & Hernandez, E. (2007). The influence of ethnic identity on self-authorship: A longitudinal study of Latino/a college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 558-573.

Sense of Belonging Among American Indian/Alaska Native Students

Elena Nourrie
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Abstract

This manuscript will include analysis of the connection between sense of belonging and indigenous cultural values grounded in relationships and reciprocity. Belonging is central to clan membership, tribal identity, and one's contributions to the community. In contrast, cultural discontinuity, or the absence of belonging, attributes to feelings of marginality and is a detriment to student success. A review of existing literature regarding AI/AN students and AI/AN representation in higher education will illustrate the critical need to facilitate sense of belonging for this population. Finally, recommendations will be provided for student affairs practitioners to understand how they may foster involvement and engagement of AI/AN students in a culturally relevant way in order to demonstrate that AI/AN students are valued and respected in higher education.

Keywords: American Indian/Alaska Native, belonging, higher education, inclusion, Native American

The inherent value of inclusion and at its foundation, sense of belonging, cannot be underrated. Sense of belonging is positively related to academic achievement, retention, and persistence in higher education (Hausmann, Schofield, & Woods, 2007; Rhee, 2008). Several well-known professional organizations reiterate the importance of inclusion. The mission of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) is to make liberal education and inclusive excellence the foundation for institutional purpose and educational practice in higher education (AACU, 2012). Likewise, the leading student affairs professional associations, American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), maintain the Social Justice and Inclusion (SJI) competency area as a necessary proficiency for higher education professionals (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). This competency area highlights the role of constructing learning environments that foster the equitable participation of all groups while seeking to address and acknowledge issues of oppression, privilege, and power (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). A recent change in the country's leadership and resulting uncertainty augments the role of social justice and belongingness for underrepresented students and further affirms its role in contributing to student success.

Cultivating a sense of belonging for American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) students is integral to higher education's values for social justice and inclusion. Historical mistreatment of AI/AN individuals through education continues to affect this student population in a myriad of ways within institutions of higher education (IHE) today. This paper examines the literature on sense of belonging among AI/AN students within IHE to help discern the effects of such historical mistreatment and instead deliver a truly inclusive higher education experience at non-Native Colleges and Universities (NNCUs) (Shotton, Lowe, & Waterman, 2013, p. 4). The abbreviation NNCUs will be used in reference to Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). Referring to institutions in this way reframes positionality and centers the experiences of AI/AN students rather than their peers (Shotton, et al., 2013, p. 4; Tachine,

Cabrera, & Yellow Bird, 2016). The purpose of this paper is to provide recommendations regarding sense of belonging for student affairs educators as it pertains to working with and advocating for AI/AN students in higher education.

Unpacking Sense of Belonging

At its core, belongingness is a basic human motivation. All people share an implicit need to belong (Maslow, 1962). Belonging follows satisfaction of basic physiological needs such as water, food, and rest, and safety or security needs. Belonging allows individuals to develop esteem needs and reach self-actualization (Maslow, 1962). Within IHE, sense of belonging is defined as "the perceived social support on campus, a feeling or sensation of connectedness, the experience of mattering or feeling cared about, accepted, respected, valued by, and important to the group or others on campus" (Strayhorn, 2012, p. 3). AI/AN students belong at IHE.

Belongingness is facilitated within academic and social settings through relations with friends and family, faculty, professional staff, peers, student organizations, and learning communities. Hurtado and Carter (1997) note that sense of belonging is particularly meaningful to students of color and those who "perceive themselves as marginal to the mainstream life [of higher education]." Strayhorn (2008a; 2012) adds that this may include women, racial and ethnic minorities, low-income students, first-generation students, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer students. Sense of belonging also impacts students' achievements in college and their ability to become engaged and involved – two actions connected to persistence and student success (Strayhorn, 2012). Further, research demonstrates that institutional integration and cultural integrity significantly contribute to AI/AN students' sense of belonging (Brayboy, Fann, Castagno, & Solyom, 2012; Oxendine, 2015). In contrast, lack of a sense of belonging, or marginality, can undermine academic performance (Schlossberg, 1989; Walton & Cohen, 2007) and even one's plans to stay in college (Berger, 1997). Sense of belonging is integral to retention and plays a significant role in student success.

Sense of belonging is fitting to AI/AN epistemologies in that it is centered on the reciprocal quality of relationships and group, or clan, membership. Strayhorn (2012) refers to this as the "'I am we and we are each' phenomenon" (p. 3). Similarly, indigenous epistemological and knowledge systems are based on respect, reciprocity, and relationships (Minthorn & Chavez, 2015). Extensive familial and social ties are central to indigenous students' upbringing. Traditional ways of being value the role of one's place within the immediate and extended family as well as one's contribution to the tribal and extended community. In this way, one's actions and relations are critical not simply to one's own life but also to those within one's inner and extended circles. Indigenous education incorporates communal values through centrality of elders, respect, reciprocity, and relationships; these aspects will be revisited in subsequent sections of this manuscript.

Cultural Discontinuity as a Function of Marginalization

NNCUs have historically developed around the experiences of heterosexual upper-class White males. This history has influenced campus climate and marginalized underrepresented students. Gusa (2010) refers to this phenomenon of systemic discrimination as White institutional presence (WIP) within NNCUs. This may be seen through institutional policies as well as overt individual acts of racism against students of color. Gusa (2010) highlights the salience of Whiteness and racism in NNCUs through four attributes: *White ascendancy* or privilege, *monoculturalism* or the belief that individuals come from one worldview, *White estrangement* or the physical and social distance from people of color, and *White blindness*.

Such tradition steeped in WIP has had negative implications for students of color. WIP is illustrated through orientation programs that intentionally separate students from their families. This practice does not reflect the cultural orientation of many students (Holm, Pearson, & Chavis, 2003; Tierney, 1992). From the start, this creates a binary and sets the distinction that one must choose between campus culture and one's traditional culture.

AI/AN students, in particular, are immersed "in the racial battle lands" between their own traditional culture and that of the normative, Eurocentric NNCU culture (Brayboy, 2015). Springer, Davidson, and Waterman (2013) explain "[AI/AN] students are striving to be human as they journey through an experience that may not always value who they are or what they know" (p.120). This conflict has detrimental implications for student persistence and success. "Cultural discontinuity or inconsistency between the student's home culture and that of the institution arises as Native students feel a conflict in perspectives and values" (Waterman, 2007). Such cultural discontinuity leads students to question their degree of belonging at an institution. Further, when students' needs are not met, research demonstrates that students' motivation declines, their development is impaired, and they perform poorly on tests and assignments (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 2000). To further unpack cultural discontinuity, the following section provides a brief overview of existing literature and examination of the representation of AI/AN individuals in IHE.

Existing Literature Regarding AI/AN Students

Existing literature regarding AI/AN students is extremely limited. Still, educators should look to such literature to help foster a sense of belonging for this student population (Shotton, et al., 2013). Regrettably, "A recent review of two well-known student affairs association journals, the *Journal of College Student Development* and *NASPA Journal* (now the *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*) from 1991 to 2011, revealed that only 1.5% had Native American or American Indian in the title or abstract" (Emery, Sands, Raucci-Youngster, & Waterman, 2011). This population is inadequately represented at all levels within higher education and existing literature reflects this underrepresentation. Clearly, more research is needed to gain further understanding of this student population in efforts to establish sense of belonging.

From 1990 to 2013 AI/AN undergraduate enrollment increased from 95,500 to 147,800 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016). Despite increasing enrollment, AI/AN students in higher education are extremely marginalized. In the academic year 2012-2013, the share of bachelor's, master's and doctor's degrees earned by AI/AN students was just one percent (NCES, 2016). AI/AN students represent disproportionately low student enrollment and matriculation rates within higher education (Brayboy, 2012). The lack of research limits opportunities for others to learn about or even understand these students. In turn, such invisibility reduces students' experiences and makes it difficult to initiate a relationship if professionals have limited, or no knowledge, of this student population.

For too long this population has been deemed invisible within the academy in part as a result of low representation but also from a lack of research and understanding of AI/AN students. Each of these detrimental truths perpetuates the other. Tierney (1992) writes:

> American Indians are of the smallest ethnic minorities of the United States population, and AI students are among the most underrepresented groups in academe. In part, because of both factors there is little research about American Indian undergraduate experiences in higher education (p. 93).

AI/AN students are "often excluded from institutional data and reporting, omitted from the curriculum, absent from the research and literature, and virtually written out of the higher

education story" (Shotton, et al., 2013, p. 2). In doing so, institutions ignore AI/AN students and issues of social equity among an increasingly diverse student population. Fryberg & Townsend (2008) explain that invisibility is an intentional act involving an active "writing out" of the story of a particular group often serving to maintain the status quo that benefits the dominant group (p.175). Further, "Native American students live on land that was colonized by the very institutions from which they seek an education. Treaties and other policy agreements, laws, and sovereignty are part of our students' experiences. No other population comes to college with these characteristics" (Springer, et al., 2013, p.112). Establishing a sense of belonging challenges the status quo by addressing issues of oppression, privilege, and asymmetrical power to counter such exclusion. Student affairs professionals have significant roles in writing these stories in to ensure AI/AN students' needs are met.

Representation in Higher Education

AI/AN students represent 1% of the total college student population (NCES, 2016; Aud, Hussar, Kena, Bianco, Frohlich, Kemp & Tahan, 2011). AI/AN enrollment and retention in institutions of higher education remain the lowest compared to other populations. Among first-time, full-time undergraduate students who began seeking a bachelor's degree at a four-year degree-granting institution in fall 2007, AI/AN students had the lowest graduation rate at 38% compared to Asian students at 68%, white students at 61%, students of two or more races at 60%, and Black students at 40% (NCES, 2016). Research also reflects that attrition rates are disproportionately high for AI/AN students as this population is least likely to graduate from college (Shotton, et al., 2013; Tachine, 2016). It is evident more must be done to increase enrollment and graduation rates of AI/AN students within institutions of higher education.

To analyze this further one may consider the prevalence of AI/AN role models within IHE. AI/AN individuals are scarcely represented within faculty, professional, and nonprofessional staff roles as well as within professional or graduate degree programs. In the fall of 2009, 0.5% of full-time faculty at colleges and universities identified as AI/AN compared to 77.3% who identified as White (*Almanac of Higher Education*, 2011). The absence of key role models within higher education negatively impacts AI/AN students as such role models have the potential to change and positively influence "self-concept and self-esteem of young indigenous students" (Pewewardy, 2013, p.141). Pewewardy (2013) argues that increased representation of indigenous faculty will help recruit and retain indigenous students. The absence of potential role models extends beyond the classroom as AI/ANs in professional staff and executive, administrative, or managerial positions constituted only 0.5% of the total population while those in nonprofessional staff positions comprise just 0.8% of the total population (NCES, 2010). Additionally, Native graduate students constitute a mere 0.6% of total graduate enrollment (NCES, 2010). The absence of role models with similar racial backgrounds that may serve as key mentors for these students amplifies adversities in establishing a sense of belonging in the academy and reflects the need to foster equitable learning environments for all students.

Recommendations to Promote Sense of Belonging

"Acknowledging the gifts that students bring" is essential (Shotton, et al., 2013, p. 46). This sentiment challenges cultural deficit approaches and helps promote sense of belonging through recognition and respect for indigenous cultures. Connecting students to others, services, socials, programs, and organizations is key to ensuring students are welcome on campus. Professionals may consider adopting the 4Rs approach as well as the *peoplehood sense of belonging* (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991; Tachine, et al., 2016).

The 4Rs approach (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991) incorporates four principles of r*espect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility*. Professionals may demonstrate *respect* for AI/AN students by validating students, respecting and recognizing spirituality, and recognizing the history of the land where the institutions stands. Educators may also demonstrate *respect* by expanding their understanding of AI/AN students' cultural norms as well as ways of interacting, speaking, listening, and communicating. Educators may develop culturally *relevant* programming for AI/AN students by establishing a tribal advisory council, incorporating tribal elders and community members, and strengthening connections with inter-tribal resources and comforting students. Educators may model the *reciprocal* quality of AI/AN ways of being by creating alliances between faculty and professional staff, providing mentoring opportunities, and familiarizing themselves with local inter-tribal community resources to help deter feelings of marginalization and cultivate sense of belonging.

To explore Native-specific sense of belonging, Tachine et al. (2016) integrated the peoplehood model creating *peoplehood sense of belonging* (p. 6). The peoplehood matrix is a holistic framework comprised of four intertwining factors: language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle, and land (Holm et al., 2003). The term peoplehood was deliberately chosen as a way to "transcend the notions of statehood, nationalism, gender, ethnicity, and sectarian membership" (Holm et al., 2003, p. 11) that are regularly used to identify and classify AI/AN people. Each of the intertwining factors within the matrix illustrates the nuances and interconnected perspectives of Native peoples and provides the theoretical foundations of a Native-specific sense of belonging (Tachine, et al., 2016, p. 6). The four intertwining factors of language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle, and land are significant to understanding AI/AN students and cultivating *peoplehood sense of belonging*. Language refers to the intimate connection between the environment and shared language; language can include nuances, references, physical or nonverbal gestures, and grammar (Tachine, et al, 2016). Sacred history refers to the acknowledgement of a "shared understanding of where Native people come from and presents the concept of kinship, or one's ancestral relationship with others" (Tachine, et al., 2016, p. 6). Ceremonial cycle includes the integral role of spirituality on Native people's livelihood and worldview. Land refers to the essential connection between Native identity and their environment (Cajete, 2000).

Peoplehood sense of belonging proved beneficial in working with AI/AN students. In Native American Student Service Units "where Indigenous peoplehood was validated and affirmed, students expressed the greatest amount of social comfort and social validation" (Tachine et al., p. 16). Tachine et al. (2016) also found that "the degree to which Native students can be connected to their cultural heritage increases their peoplehood sense of belonging" (Tachine et al., p. 16). This finding supports the idea that cultural integrity contributes to sense of belonging and student success (Oxendine, 2015). Cultural integrity is defined as "the ability to maintain a strong cultural identity through engaging one's culture as an anchor" (Oxendine, 2015, p. 11). In this respect, the anchor serves as AI/AN students' foundation and strength.

Incorporating the 4Rs of *respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility* in the work of student affairs professionals can facilitate a sense of belonging. The four interconnected factors of the peoplehood model, language, sacred history, ceremonial cycles, and land are instrumental to demonstrating understanding of this student population and confirming to AI/AN that they matter on campus. These two frameworks contribute to social justice and inclusion goals as they move beyond affecting perception and initiate critical thinking and action toward fostering equitable learning environments in higher education.

Conclusion

There is a considerable amount of work to be done for institutions of higher education to truly model social justice and be inclusive for AI/AN students. Professionals must be intentional about seeking resources and understanding students with limited literature that centers the experiences of these students. Educators maintain integral roles in influencing progress and inspiring future tribal leaders that may impact our nation and Native nations. Further, it is crucial how low representation of AI/AN individuals within higher education influences students' sense of belonging. This marginality undermines academic performance and intensifies cultural discontinuity (Schlossberg, 1989; Walton & Cohen, 2007; Waterman, 2007). Educators may review and adopt Kirkness & Barnhardt's (1991) 4Rs: *respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility* and also incorporate understanding of the four interconnected factors of the *peoplehood sense of belonging*: language, sacred history, ceremonial cycles, and land (Holm, et al., 2003; Tachine, et al., 2016) to demonstrate that AI/AN students matter on their campuses. Such work is feasible and conceivable. Ultimately this work is the manifestation of social justice and inclusion goals of the profession and provides opportunities for professionals to learn how to support AI/AN students and foster their success in higher education.

Elena Seymana Nourrie completed her M. Ed. at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and serves as the Coordinator of the Native American Student Center at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

References

Almanac of Higher Education. (2011). *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from http://chronicle.com/article/Almanac-2011-Accessand/128457/

American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2015). *ACPA/NASPA professional competency areas for student affairs practitioners*. Washington, DC: Authors.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2012). Mission Statement. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/about/mission

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K. Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Tahan, K. (2011). *The Condition of Education 2011*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Berger, J. B. (1997). Students' sense of community in residence halls, social integration, and first-year persistence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 441-452.

Brayboy, B., Fann, A., Castagno, A., & Solyom, J. (2012). Postsecondary education for American Indian and Alaskan Natives: Higher education for nation building and self-determination. *ASHE Higher Education Report* (37)5. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Brayboy, B. (2015). Indigenous peoples in the racial battle land. In Fasching-Varner, K., Albert, K. A., Mitchell, R. W., & Allen, C.M. (Eds.), *Racial battle fatigue in higher education* (pp.45-58). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Cajete, G. (2000). Indigenous knowledge: The Pueblo metaphor of Indigenous education. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 181-191). Vancouver, BC, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.

Emery, K., Sands, T. L., Raucci-Youngs, M., & Waterman, S. J. (2011, April 8). *Native American college students: A group forgotten roundtable session*. New Orleans, LA: American Educational Research Association.

Fryberg, S. A., & Townsend, S. S. M. (2008). The psychology of invisibility. In G. Adams, M. Biernat, N. R. Branscombe, C. S. Crandall, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Commemorating Brown: The social psychology of racism and discrimination* (pp. 173-193). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gusa, D. L. (2010). White institutional presence: The impact of Whiteness of campus climate. *Harvard Educational Review, 80*(4), 464-490.

Hausmann, L. R. M., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(7), 803-839.

Holm, T., Pearson, D., & Chavis, B. (2003). Peoplehood: A model for the extension of sovereignty in American Indian studies. *Wicazo Sa Review, 18*(1), 7-24.

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 324-345.

Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four Rs—respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education, 30*(3), 1-15.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: von Nostrand Reinhold.

Minthorn, R. S., & Chavez, A. F. (2015). *Indigenous Leadership in Higher Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic minorities: 2010-15*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2016). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2016*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Oxendine, S. D. (2015). *Examining the impact of institutional integration and cultural integrity on sense of belonging to predict intention to persist for Native American students at non-native colleges and universities* (Order No. 3708162). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (1696290508). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1696290508?accountid=3611

Pewewardy, C. (2013). Fancy War Dancing on Academe's Glass Ceiling: Supporting and increasing indigenous faculty role models in higher education. In Shotton, H. J., Lowe, S. C., & Waterman, S. J. (Eds.), *Beyond the asterisk: Understanding native students in higher education.* (pp. 139-150). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Rhee, B. (2008). Institutional climate and student departure: A multinomial multilevel modeling approach. *Review of Higher Education, 31*(2), 161-183.

Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. *New Directions for Student Services, 48*, 5-15. doi:10.1002/ss.37119894803

Shotton, H. J., Lowe, S. C., & Waterman, S. J. (2013). *Beyond the asterisk: Understanding native students in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Springer, M., Davidson, C. E., & Waterman, S. J. (2013). Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships: Native American Student Affairs Units. In Shotton, H. J., Lowe, S. C., & Waterman, S. J. (Eds.), *Beyond the asterisk: Understanding native students in higher education.* (pp. 109-123). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Strayhorn, T. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Tachine, A. R., Cabrera, N.L., & Yellow Bird, E. (2016). Home away from home: Native American students' sense of belonging during their first year in college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1-23.

Tierney, W. G. (1992). Official encouragement, institutional discouragement: Minorities in academe, the Native American experience. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 82-96.

Waterman, S. J. (2007). A complex path to Haudenosaunee degree completion. *Journal of American Indian Education, 46*(1), 20-40.

Comprehension in a Crisis: Evaluating the Readability and Translation of Emergency Response Messaging

Zachary W. Taylor
The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract

From April 2016 to June 2017, the University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin) witnessed two of its students murdered on its campus (Jacobo, 2016; Norris 2017), and UT-Austin Police reported multiple incidents of sexual assault, vandalism, trespassing, and public intoxication in the first five months of 2017 alone (The University of Texas at Austin, 2017). Like many other institutions of higher education, UT-Austin has adopted an emergency response messaging system to send all UT-Austin stakeholders a text message and email whenever an emergency situation arises on campus. However, no extant research examines whether these emergency messages are readable – and therefore understandable and actionable – by its recipients in a crisis. This study examines the readability of emergency response messaging (n = 20) at one public flagship institution over a one-year period and finds that messages are composed above the 13th-grade reading level and potentially unreadable by educational stakeholders. Implications for student affairs practitioners are addressed.

Keywords: communication, comprehension, emergency response, emergency technology, readability, student affairs, translation

Many higher education scholars point to the Virginia Tech shooting tragedy in April 2007 as a prime example of college and university officials being too slow to alert the campus community of an impending or ongoing emergency (Gow, McGee, Townsend, Anderson, & Varnhagen, 2009). Since, institutions of higher education across the country have engaged with rapidly-advancing Web 2.0 mass-messaging technologies and have adopted emergency response communication strategies to alert the campus community of an impending or ongoing crisis, as well as provide critical information for the safety of all campus stakeholders (Connolly, 2013). These technologies include the use of email, text messaging, and social media to disseminate emergency information on a large scale in the most time-efficient manner available (Romano, 2013).

However, hazards exist when institutions of higher education employ these emergency response communication strategies: social media users can suffer from information overload during a crisis that results in confusion (Imran, Castillo, Diaz, & Vieweg, 2015), stakeholders may not have access to Internet or smartphone technology used to convey emergency messages (Mills, Chen, Lee, & Rao, 2009), malicious users can forge emergency email and text messages to lead victims to the threat or provide false information (Bambenek & Klus, 2008), and stakeholders may not perceive an event as an emergency even though campus communication defines the event as such (Sheldon, 2017). For as important as these concerns are, extant research has not addressed whether the recipient can read and comprehend the message, nor whether the message is made available in multiple languages to reach diverse language populations on campus.

Recent research contends that the average American adult reads and comprehends just above the 7th-grade reading level (Clear Language Group, 2016), and only 37% of high school graduates could read and comprehend at the 12th-grade reading level in 2015 (National Assessment Governing Board, 2016). Furthermore, extant research has suggested that reading comprehension abilities go down in times of stress (Rai, Loschky, & Harris, 2015). Therefore, it seems logical to examine the readability of emergency response messages to learn whether first- and second-year students and other educational stakeholders without college degrees (i.e. maintenance staff, international study abroad students) are likely able to read and comprehend emergency response messages under stress, thus promoting a safer campus environment in times of a crisis.

This study examines the readability of one-year of emergency response messaging (n = 20) from one public flagship institution to answer a simple question: at what reading comprehension level and languages are emergency response messages composed? Findings of this study will inform institutions of higher education and their student affairs and emergency professionals whether their emergency communication is or is not readable, as well as encourage these professionals to audit their communication strategies to ensure that all campus community members can read and comprehend emergency communication to mitigate campus crises if and when they occur.

Literature Review

Institutions of higher education commonly use one or a combination of emergency response communication strategies including text messaging, emailing, and social media (Connolly, 2013). However, each communication strategy has its strengths and weaknesses, urging the institution to learn more about how their unique stakeholders engage with these technologies to best communicate with their campus community.

As cell phone technology has rapidly advanced in the 21st century, a majority of educational stakeholders on a college campus – including students, faculty, and staff – have access to a cell phone and can, therefore, receive an emergency text message. However, not all stakeholders may regularly check their cell phone for an emergency message, nor will all of these stakeholders sign up for emergency text messaging services at their campus (Sheldon, 2017). Furthermore, malicious users can hack into institutional databases and gather phone numbers to send malicious messages appearing to have been sent by the institution itself (Bambenek & Klus, 2008). There is also a common sense drawback of institutions solely employing text messaging services to communicate emergencies: all stakeholders may not carry their phones on their person at all times.

Emailing educational stakeholders also has its benefits and drawbacks. It is common knowledge that all members of an institution are provided institutional (.edu) emails, ensuring that all stakeholders with an email receive the emergency message. However, some stakeholders may not incorporate email into their mobile devices, and not all stakeholders are always near a computer to receive an email, rendering this technology less appealing to communicate emergencies (Choney, 2010; Todd, 2013). In addition, email technologies are vulnerable to the same pitfalls as text messaging services, as malicious users only need access to an institution's email database to send false email alerts to educational stakeholders (Bambenek & Klus, 2008).

Institutions of higher education are increasingly using social media to not only communicate with students, faculty, staff, and other educational stakeholders but also communicate with these stakeholders during a crisis (Imran, Castillo, Diaz, & Vieweg, 2015). These institutions often cite the popularity of social media – especially Facebook and Twitter – as a reason for engaging with these technologies, while also preferring their low cost of operation (Romero, 2013). In addition to their popularity and affordability, engaging in social media outlets allow for instantaneous messaging across multiple platforms, especially important for educational stakeholders who may only use one social media outlet such as Twitter (Mills, Chen, Lee, & Rao, 2009). Extant research has also shown social media outlets such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube to be helpful in facilitating "continuous open communication and improved situational awareness," given that these outlets allow for the sharing of simple, to-the-point messages while also letting the user embed audio-visual aids such as pictures and videos into the message to better illustrate a situation (Connolly, 2013, p. 41).

All three modes of communication – text messaging, emailing, and social media – suffer from similar limitations. Hacking and phishing are concerns for all three forms of communication, as malicious users can gain access to text and email services as well as social media platforms to send false emergency messages (Bambenek & Klus, 2008). For this reason, institutions of higher education often use multiple messaging services to communicate with stakeholders in a crisis situation (Choney, 2010). In the event of a natural disaster, it is possible for the Internet to crash or institutional electronic services to be interrupted by inclement weather, rendering it much more difficult for an institution to deliver a mass message to all its educational stakeholders (Romero, 2013). Furthermore, Sheldon's (2017) study found that college students may not perceive a real threat as such, as the students in the study felt that an on-campus shooting alert was more serious than a tornado alert, even though a tornado has the capacity to put many more lives in danger. Ultimately, Sheldon (2017) asserted:

> A statement that emphasizes the seriousness of a threat should be included in an emergency text alert. Considering that cell phone towers might be down during natural disasters, emergency professionals should develop an alternative plan of contacting students and family when a crisis occurs. (p. 13)

However, no extant research addresses specifically how to compose emergency response messaging at certain readability levels. Moreover, crisis communications best practice has not addressed differentiating emergency response messaging across multiple languages, even though institutions of higher education in the United States continue to educate larger numbers of students who are still learning English as undergraduates (Robertson & Lafond, 2016). As a result, this study seeks to examine emergency response messaging to inform future best practices in terms of readability and translation into other languages.

Hypothesis

Given the material in the literature review, it is clear that crisis communication best practices would benefit from an analysis of the readability and translation of emergency response messaging from institutions of higher education in the United States. The two primary goals of this study are to evaluate the readability levels of emergency response messaging and analyze whether these messages are differentiated across multiple languages. Given these goals and the

gap in the research that this study intends to fill, two hypotheses emerge. First, it is predicted that emergency response messaging is written at or above a first-year postsecondary reading level (13th). Second, it is predicted that emergency response messaging is written in English only. Building on these hypotheses, this study seeks to demonstrate the readability levels and translation of emergency response messaging and how to best leverage modern technology to provide intelligible crisis communication for all institutional stakeholders.

Methodology

All emergency response messages were collected from August 2016 until August 2017. UT-Austin Campus Safety emergency response emails were targeted specifically for this study as all campus stakeholders with an official (.edu) email account were sent these emergency response messages, whereas not all campus stakeholders may use social media or use text messaging (Mills, Chen, Lee, & Rao, 2009). Furthermore, the emergency text messaging system used by this public flagship is strictly opt-in, meaning that not all campus stakeholders receive emergency text messages. Overall, twenty emergency response messages were collected and analyzed for this study. Metadata of each message was extracted and organized into a database including the title, day, time, and full text of the message.

After text extraction, all emergency messages were uploaded to Readability Studio – a quantitative linguistics software program – which then calculated the readability levels of each message and the corpus (collection of messages), as well as the word count of each message and the language of the message. Although no readability measure specifically examines college and university communication, this study employs Taylor's (2017) series of readability measures used to examine graduate student admissions materials. These readability measures include the Automated Readability Index (ARI) (Kincaid & Delionbach, 1973), the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Test (FK) (Kincaid, Fishburne, Rogers, & Chissom, 1975), the Gunning-Fog Index (GFI) (Gunning, 1952), and the Simple Measure of Gobbledygook (SMOG) Index (McLaughlin, 1969). These measures are appropriate for measuring emergency communication as each readability measure analyzes different semantic (word choice) and syntactic (sentence structure) elements of nonfiction text. This allows for accurate, semantically- and syntactically-triangulated estimates of the reading comprehension level necessary to read and comprehend emergency response communication.

The database of all messages, their metadata, and all readability measures can be provided upon request from the author.

Findings

Readability levels and language of emergency response messages (n = 20) over a one-year period at one public flagship university can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1. *Readability Levels and Language of Emergency Response Messages (n = 20) Over One-Year at One Public Flagship University*

	Readability level (by grade)

Average readability
   Average ARI
   Average FK
   Average GFI
   Average SMOG
	13.47
	  13.32
	  13.34
	  12.92
	  14.13

High readability level, low readability level Range	high = 17.9, low = 9.4 8.5 grades
Average word count High word count, low word count Range	162 words high = 292, low = 10 282 words

% of emergency response messages written:
   at or below 10th grade reading level
   at or below 11th grade reading level
   at or below 12th grade reading level
   at or below 13th (1st yr. undergraduate) reading level
   at or below 14th (2nd yr. undergraduate) reading level
   at or below 15th (3rd yr. undergraduate) reading level
   at or below 16th (4th yr. undergraduate) reading level
   at or below 17th (1st yr. graduate) reading level
   at or below 18th (2nd yr. graduate) reading level
	
	5%
	5%
	15%
	20%
	70%
	95%
	95%
	95%
	100%

% of emergency response messages written in: English-only	 100%

In terms of readability, the average emergency response message is composed above the 13th-grade reading level, with the SMOG measure registering the highest average readability levels, just above the 14th-grade reading level. The SMOG measure examines word choice and diction complexity, meaning that emergency response messages often suffered from complex word choice, which led to high readability levels. In a surprise of the findings, the most complicated and the simplest emergency response messages were composed at the 17.9th- and 9.4th-grade reading level, respectively, representing a range of over eight grade levels of reading comprehension. Furthermore, the average length of a message was 162 words, while the longest and shortest emergency response messages were 292 and 10 words respectively, representing a range of 282 words. Considering both the readability range and word count range of the emergency response messages in this study, it is clear that emergency response messages are composed in radically different fashions depending on the content of the message.

Findings of this study also reveal that most emergency response messages are composed at or below the 14th-grade reading level: 70% of the messages in this study are considered readable by someone who has demonstrated a 14th-grade reading level or higher. However, it is important to note the sizable gap between messages composed at or below the 13th- and 14th-grade level: 20% and 70% of the messages were composed at or below these grade levels, respectfully. This finding indicates that messages composed at or below the 13th-grade level and messages composed at or above the 15th-grade level were outliers in this study, speaking to the consistent difficult reading level of emergency response messages in this study's sample. Contributing to this difficulty for English-language learners is the fact that all emergency response messages were written exclusively in English, rendering it potentially difficult and stressful for English-language learners to read and comprehend the emergency response message.

Implications for Student Affairs Practitioners

First, student affairs practitioners, especially those involved in crisis management and institutional communication, should re-examine their emergency response messaging protocol(s) to learn whether their messages are composed at readable levels. Since the 1970s, the United States Department of Defense composes armed forces recruitment materials at or below the 8th-grade reading level to ensure that prospective and current service people understand how to enlist and where to find more information (Kincaid, Fishburne, Rogers, & Chissom, 1975). Perhaps institutions of higher education should consider adopting this approach when composing material meant for a student audience, especially communication informing the campus community of an impending or ongoing crisis. By composing emergency response messages at lower reading levels, institutions of higher education can more clearly communicate with a wider range of educational stakeholders, including those who read at lower levels or those who struggle with reading comprehension, such as individuals with reading disabilities or English-language learners. Furthermore, all educational stakeholders should be able to select the language in which they wish to receive emergency response messaging, especially given how language translation technologies have rapidly advanced in the past decade, rendering machine translations nearly as accurate as human translations (Simonite, 2016). Institutions of higher education should prioritize polylingual emergency response messaging to ensure that students learning English will not be marginalized and put in unsafe situations based on their language.

Second, student affairs practitioners should consider standardizing content across multiple platforms, including text messaging services, email, and social media, to ensure that all educational stakeholders receive a unified, clear message. The average message in this study was 162 words, however, social media outlets such as Twitter only allow 140 characters per message (Mills, Chen, Lee, & Rao, 2009). This indicates that if the institution in this study sent an emergency response message across multiple platforms including email and Twitter, the message was longer over email than Twitter. For instance, a first-year student may follow the institution on Twitter and has their institutional email setup on their phone. This student is likely to receive both emergency response messages conveying, perhaps, the same content in two different ways. This situation may result in a sense of information overload that could confuse the student or educational stakeholder (Imran, Castillo, Diaz, & Vieweg, 2015). Institutions of higher education could avoid this confusion by standardizing emergency response messaging content across platforms.

Furthermore, standardizing emergency response messaging content across platforms also mitigates the dangers of hacking and phishing (Bambenek & Klus, 2008). For instance, malicious text messaging is a relatively simple process. One must simply gain access to a user database and then employ a mass text messaging service to deliver a malicious message to all users in the database. The same procedure applies to malicious emailing. However, it is far less likely for malicious users to be able to simultaneously hack into an institution's social media accounts while also gaining access to the institution's phone and email database to send a malicious, cross-platform message to all educational stakeholders. Here, disseminating the message across multiple platforms – via text, email, and social media – coupled with standardizing emergency response messaging content across these platforms, would greatly assuage any malicious act that a user could perform.

Finally, institutions of higher education should survey their educational stakeholders – including students, faculty, staff, and community members – to learn which mobile technology or technologies are most frequently used or preferred. Extant research has already

demonstrated the positive benefits of employing text messaging services (Connolly, 2013; Imran, Castillo, Diaz, & Vieweg, 2015), social media outlets (Mills, Chen, Lee, & Gao, 2009), and other forms of mobile technology to communicate with educational stakeholders during a crisis situation (Gow et al., 2009; Sheldon, 2017). However, access to mobile technology and mobile social media applications can vary from campus to campus, especially given the cost of incorporating the Internet into a smartphone device, which can range from $20 to $100 per month, depending on the service provider, smartphone device, and cellular data plan (Levy, 2017). Even though this cost has dropped yearly over the past decade (Levy, 2017), it is possible that this cost is still unaffordable for educational stakeholders occupying lower socioeconomic levels. As a result, some educational stakeholders may be socioeconomically excluded from access to some mobile channels that an institution of higher education uses for emergency response messaging. For this reason, it is important for institutions of higher education to learn more about how their educational stakeholders receive emergency response information to appropriately differentiate the content for diverse audiences.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study are institution type, sample size, and method of crisis communication. Limiting the study to a single institution was made due to access to data, and as a member of the public flagship in this study, I was assured that I received every emergency response email over the course of a year through my institutional email account. Given the frequency of violent crime on UT-Austin's campus in the previous year as cited in the abstract, this study was also limited to a single year of data, resulting in twenty emergency response emails. In the future, I plan to expand my sample size to multiple years to learn whether emergency response communication readability and translation fluctuates from year to year. Ultimately, given these limitations, it is difficult to generalize this study's findings, although this study is the first of its kind in crisis communication research in higher education.

Therefore, future research should address different institution types, a larger volume of crisis communication, and different methods of crisis communication, including text message, email, institutional website postings, social media accounts, and other Internet and mobile technologies that may emerge over time.

Conclusion

As Internet and mobile technologies advance further into the 21st century, institutions of higher education must be aware of a logical aspect of emergency response communication: the readability and language of the message itself. In short, institutions of higher education must ensure comprehension in a crisis across diverse stakeholder groups such as students, faculty, staff, and other members of the campus community.

However, being aware of an institution's stakeholder base and the technologies used by that base is equally important in understanding how to reach each educational stakeholder in a crisis situation. Too often, college campuses are sites of violent acts of hatred and bigotry, which renders the campus an unsafe, unstable learning environment (Binkley & Kunzelman, 2017). A safe campus environment is essential for the success of all educational stakeholders, and institutions of higher education should ensure that their emergency response communications are readable and reach their intended audiences.

Zachary W. Taylor is a graduate research assistant and second-year Ph.D. student in the Program in Higher Education Leadership at the University of Texas at Austin.

References

Bambenek, J., & Klus, A. (2008). Do emergency text messaging systems put students in more danger? *Educause Quarterly*, (3), 12-16. Retrieved from https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eqm0833.pdf

Binkley, C., & Kunzelman, M. (2017, August 18). The entire dynamic has changed: Colleges are bracing for more violence. Retrieved from http://www.businessinsider.com/ap-colleges-brace-for-more-violence-amid-rash-of-hate-on-campus-2017-8

Choney, S. (2010, April 15). Campus alerts go beyond text messaging. Retrieved from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/36566978/ns/technology_and_science-security/t/campus-alerts-go-beyond-text-messaging/#.WZ3Bw5OGPWw

Clear Language Group. (2016). Readability: What is readability? Retrieved from Clear Language Group website: http://www.clearlanguagegroup.com/readability/

Connolly, M. (2013). Community alert: Using text messaging and social media to improve emergency planning. *Community College Journal, 84*(2), 38-42.

Gow, G. A., McGee, T., Townsend, D., Anderson, P., & Varnhagen, S. (2009). Communication technology, emergency alerts, and campus safety. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, 28*(2), 34-41. https://doi.org/10.1109/MTS.2009.932797

Gunning, R. (1952). *The technique of clear writing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Imran, M., Castillo, C., Diaz, F., & Vieweg, S. (2015). Processing social media messages in mass emergency: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys, 47*(4), 1-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2771588

Jacobo, J. (2016, April 8). UT Austin murder: How the investigation into the death of student Haruka Weiser unfolded. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/US/ut-austin-murder-investigation-death-student-haruka-weiser/story?id=38262608

Kincaid, J. P., & Delionbach, L. J. (1973). Validation of the automated readability index: A follow-up. *Human Factors, 15*(1), 17-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872087301500103

Kincaid, J. P., Fishburne, R. P., Rogers, R. L., & Chissom, B. (1975, February). *Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count, and Flesch reading ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel* (Research Report No. 8-75). Retrieved from US Department of Commerce website: http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a006655.pdf

Levy, A. (2017, June 11). The cost of wireless service is plummeting as price war rages on. Retrieved from https://www.fool.com/investing/2017/06/11/the-cost-of-wireless-service-is-plummeting-as-pric.aspx

McLaughlin, G. H. (1969). Clearing the smog. *Journal of Reading, 13*(3), 210-211. Retrieved from ERIC database. (Accession No. EJ012666)

Mills, A., Chen, R., Lee, J., & Rao, H. R. (2009). Web 2.0 emergency applications: How useful can Twitter be for emergency response? *Journal of Information Privacy and Security, 5*(3), 3-26.

National Assessment Governing Board. (2016). *The nation's report card*. Retrieved from National Assessment of Educational Progress website: https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/

Norris, C. (2017, May 1). One dead, three wounded after stabbing at UT Austin. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/one-dead-three-wounded-stabbing-ut-austin/

Rai, M. K., Loschky, L., & Harris, R. J. (2015). The effects of stress on reading: A comparison of first-language versus intermediate second-language reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(2), 348-363. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037591

Robertson, K., & Lafond, S. (2016). Getting ready for college: What ELL students need to know. Retrieved from http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/getting-ready-college-what-ell-students-need-know

Romano, A. J. (2013). *The use of social media during a crisis on campus* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://cardinalscholar.bsu.edu/handle/123456789/197836

Sheldon, P. (2017). Emergency alert communications on college campuses: Understanding students' perceptions of the severity of a crisis and their intentions to share the alert with parents and friends. *Western Journal of Communication*, 1-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2017.1308005

Simonite, T. (2016). Google's new service translates languages almost as well as humans can. *MIT Technology Review*. Retrieved from https://www.technologyreview.com/s/602480/googles-new-service-translates-languages-almost-as-well-as-humans-can/

Taylor, Z. W. (2017). Speaking in tongues: Can international graduate students read international graduate admissions materials? *International Journal of Higher Education, 6*(3). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n3p99

Todd, D. M. (2013, April 19). Safety solutions: Local colleges are going beyond text and email alerts to warn students about emergencies on campus. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, Business, pp. 10-11.

The University of Texas at Austin Police Department. (2017). Campus watch archives, January 2017 to August 2017. Retrieved from https://police.utexas.edu/campuswatch/archives/?year=2017

A Review of Sense of Belonging for LGB Fraternity and Sorority Members: Recommendations for Research and Practice

Michael D. Giacalone
Rhode Island College

Abstract

Developing a sense of belonging is important to a student's college experience. Belonging is associated with retention, psychological well-being, and serves developmentally as a prerequisite to self-actualization (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Strayhorn, 2012). Fraternities and sororities can be one way in which students develop a sense of belonging, however these organizations do not always extend that opportunity equally, if at all, to lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students. This literature review will provide recommendations for research and practice based on four streams of related research: (1) general research on sense of belonging, (2) LGB students' environments on development, (3) fraternity and sorority member attitudes toward LGB students; and (4) experiences of LGB fraternity and sorority members. Based on the findings from this review, more research is needed on lesbian and bisexual sorority women, on different types of fraternities and sororities, and at the chapter level. In practice, student affairs professionals can support open recruitment policies and collaboration with LGBTQ+ centers on campus.

Keywords: belonging; fraternities and sororities; lesbian, gay, and bisexual students

College fraternal organizations have been a part of the higher education landscape since 1776 (Syrett, 2009). Since their inception, they have provided students the opportunity to connect with one another outside of the classroom. The adoption of familial terminology (i.e. brothers, sisters) in these organizations is indicative of one of the purposes of fraternities and sororities – to create a surrogate family in the college setting in which one feels a sense of belonging (Syrett, 2009). Unfortunately, that sense of belonging is not always extended to lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students who are currently, or interested in becoming, members of fraternities or sororities. The purpose of this paper is to review the literature associated with LGB students' sense of belonging in fraternities and sororities, and provide recommendations for research and practice. While no studies directly addressed this topic, four areas of research emerged that can inform future work: (1) sense of belonging research in general; (2) the effects of environments on LGB students' development; (3) fraternity and sorority member attitudes toward LGB students; and (4) the experiences of LGB fraternity and sorority members.

Sense of Belonging

Strayhorn (2012) framed belonging as a fundamental human need which drives behaviors. "Sense of belonging develops in response to the degree to which an individual feels respected, valued, accepted, and needed by a defined group" (p. 87). It is a fluid experience that is affected by a variety of factors. Cultivating a sense of belonging is important for a variety of reasons including psychological well-being, self-actualization, and retention (Hausmann, Ye, Schofield, & Woods, 2009; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Strayhorn, 2012). In

the college setting, there are a number of experiences that can positively influence sense of belonging including peer and faculty interactions, interacting with diverse groups of students, smooth academic and social transitions, awareness of campus resources, and campus involvement, including joining a fraternity or sorority (Hausmann et al., 2009; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Johnson et al., 2007; Maestas, Vaquera, & Zehr, 2007; Strayhorn, 2012; Vaccaro & Newman, 2016, 2017).

While their history is rooted in debating academics, fraternities and sororities have evolved to become more social in nature (Syrett, 2009). A review of contemporary research has yielded mixed outcomes from the fraternity and sorority experience (Biddix, Matney, Norman & Martin, 2014). A wealth of research, however, points to the positive effect they have on sense of belonging (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, 2010; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Kase, Rivera, & Hunt, 2016; Long & Snowden, 2011; Maestas et al., 2007).

Even so, belonging is multifaceted and not experienced equally among all students. For example, two national studies have found that students of color feel a lower sense of belonging on campuses than White students (Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Johnson et al., 2007). More broadly, privileged and minoritized students defined belonging differently. Privileged students equated belonging with a fun environment where they could build relationships with their peers. While minoritized students were looking for similar experiences, it was more important for them to develop deep and authentic, rather than superficial, relationships. Minoritized students, including LGB students, also reported the need to feel accepted and safe in order to belong (Vaccaro & Newman, 2016, 2017).

LGB Students' Environments on Development

Vaccaro and Newman's (2016, 2017) findings support previous work that indicated the perception of a hostile or unsafe environment reduced students' sense of belonging. Drawing from Maslow's (1962) work, Strayhorn (2012) argued that belonging is an intermediary requirement between acting to ensure safety and engaging in higher levels of self-actualization like identity development. For LGB students, the perception of safety in an environment affects the extent to which they choose to come out, if at all (Abes & Jones, 2004; Evans & Broido, 1999; Stevens, 2004). One study of 1,669 LGBTQ students, faculty, and staff from 14 universities found that 19% of participants feared for their physical safety and 36% of undergraduates experienced harassment due to their sexual identity (Rankin, 2004). These experiences could deter one from coming out, which is an important process in sexual identity development, and one that can allow students to feel relieved about being and expressing their full selves (Evans & Broido, 1999; Evans, Nagoshi, Nagoshi, Wheeler, & Henderson, 2017; Stevens, 2004).

Environments, however, are complex and multi-layered, nesting their inhabitants in multiple environments of various magnitudes simultaneously (Bronfenbrenner, 1993). Sense of belonging for LGB students occurs at different levels within an institution's structure and may vary between and within each level (Vaccaro & Newman, 2017). The most immediate spaces a student occupies are microclimates: the "settings where daily interpersonal interactions shaped people's perceptions and experiences" (Vaccaro, 2012, p. 440). Microclimates could be a workplace or residence hall, but can also extend to a fraternity or sorority as a subgroup of the larger campus population. Thinking of a microclimate as a group of people instead of a physical space is important because it is the people within a particular setting that engenders the perceived level of safety associated with coming out, which is why a student may be out in some spaces but not in others (Stevens, 2004). Indeed, even the most recent cohort in

Rankin, Hesp, and Weber's (2013) study included students who were out in some spaces, and not others.

Fraternity and Sorority Member Attitudes Toward LGB Students

National cross-sectional research on LGB fraternity and sorority members has suggested a positive shift in straight members' attitudes towards them over time, however, negative attitudes still persist (Case, Hesp, & Eberly, 2005; Rankin et al., 2013; Worthen, 2014). Some of the variance may have to do with the larger campus environment in which the campus-based entities of national organizations which students join, hereafter called chapters, are located (McCreary, Bray, & Thoma, 2016). Still, chapters tend to be homogenous in a number of ways, including race, socioeconomic status, and sexuality (Matthews et al, 2009; Rankin et al., 2013).

Homogeneity in a chapter's membership, however, does not just happen; it begins with the recruitment process. Sorority chapters have been found to show disinterest in recruiting women who differ from the current members (Edwards, 2009), going so far as to mock those students to one another (Matthews et al., 2009). One study found that sorority women would be supportive of lesbian and bisexual chapter sisters so long as they ascribed to gender-typical expression, but they were not interested in actively recruiting them (Neumann, Kretovics, & Roccoforte, 2013). Two concerns arise for fraternities about recruiting gay and bisexual men. First is the stigma of getting labeled as the "gay chapter" on campus (Windmeyer, 2005), and second is the fear these men will be sexually attracted to the other members (DeSantis & Coleman, 2008); both of which could be due to homophobic attitudes held by fraternity men (e.g. Worthen, 2014).

The challenge with homogeneity beginning in the recruitment process is that it can become cyclical. Broido (2000) found that lack of exposure to LGB students leads to negative attitudes. Those attitudes held by members can either deter LGB students from joining or coming out once they are members. In turn, there is a missed opportunity for straight students to interact authentically with LGB students as members of the same chapter, which in turn can perpetuate the negative attitudes of the chapter.

Experiences of LGB Fraternity and Sorority Members

Much of our understanding of the experiences of LGB members in fraternities and sororities began with a study by Case (1996) and expanded upon by Case et al. (2005). This study surveyed over 500 LGB fraternity and sorority members who joined between the 1950s and early 1990s. Rankin et al. (2013) conducted a similar study with gay and bisexual fraternity members who joined as late as 2007. While these studies are primarily limited to members of historically White organizations, they indicate that LGB students join for the same reasons as their straight peers – friendship, social experiences, and to develop a sense of belonging. Depth to our understanding has been provided through the stories of LGB fraternity and sorority members gathered by Windmeyer (2005) and Windmeyer and Freeman (1998, 2000). Yeung (2009) added to this body of work by examining the member experiences of Delta Phi Lambda, one of more than a dozen LGBTQ+ Greek-letter organizations that have been founded since 1985. An important finding from this collection of studies is that the experiences for LGB students have improved over time.

Even with improvement, the experience is not positive for all. Some fraternity and sorority members still exhibit homophobic and heteronormative behaviors and attitudes (Case et al., 2005; DeSantis & Coleman, 2008; Evans et al., 2017; Rankin et al., 2013). These types of behaviors and attitudes can inhibit development (e.g. Evans & Broido, 1999), with some

students even intentionally sectioning off parts of their identity, finding it easier to "keep [their] identity hidden or pushed down rather than deal with any pain or rejection" (Trump & Wallace, 2006, p. 12). Even though only some outcomes for LGB fraternity and sorority members do not differ significantly from their straight peers, they do report lower sense of belonging levels in their chapters (Dowiak, 2016; Long, 2011).

The variances in experiences regardless of cohort studied indicates that the chapter may play a mediating role in sense of belonging. In a supportive environment, the fraternity or sorority chapter creates a smaller group on campus can provide a more intimate space for a student to come out, which can lead to coming out in other spaces (Strayhorn, 2012). For fraternities, a developed sense of brotherhood can also assist the coming out process (Windmeyer & Freeman, 1998). McCreary and Schutts (2015) found that fraternity members define brotherhood along four dimensions and developed a scale to measure them. The two most altruistic dimensions – belonging and accountability – centered on accepting members for who they are and holding them to the written and values-based standards of the organization. While a scale has yet to be developed, initial qualitative research found similar dimensions about sisterhood for sorority women (Cohen, McCreary, & Schutts, 2017). It would follow that chapters with members who strongly believe in the most altruistic dimensions of brotherhood or sisterhood would be a place where LGB students would thrive.

Recommendations for Research and Practice

The review of the literature points to ways that can increase LGB fraternity and sorority members' sense of belonging through research and practice. To begin, it is clear that most of the research only tangentially or superficially explores sense of belonging among LGB members. Sense of belonging should be studied in depth among unaffiliated and fraternity/sorority-affiliated students who are both LGB and straight, with the aim of drawing comparisons among groups. Specifically, an emphasis should be placed on the experiences of lesbian and bisexual sorority members since most of the current research is on fraternity men. One avenue could be to continue the work Case et al. (2005) began, which stopped with women in the early 1990s.

Research on LGB members also focuses either primarily on historically White fraternities and sororities, or does not differentiate between the various types of college fraternal organizations (culturally-based, LGBTQ+-interest, service, professional, etc.). This deficit can be addressed partially in surveys by allowing students to fill in the organization or type of organization to which they belong as opposed to only asking if they are a fraternity or sorority member (Biddix et al., 2014). Qualitative methodologies also should be used to gain a richer understanding of LGB students in various organizational types.

Lastly, research needs to be done at the chapter level. McCreary et al. (2016) explored how tolerance for hazing on campus influenced chapter culture. This idea could be extended to explore how a campus' LGB climate affects chapter climates. For example, is there a relationship between general campus political leanings and chapter-level acceptance of LGB members? Another question to consider is do chapters on campuses with a positive LGB climate reflect that larger campus climate, or do they serve as bastions for conservative ideologies? Another aspect to study is the relationship between the understanding of brotherhood and sisterhood (Cohen et al., 2017; McCreary & Schutts, 2015) and acceptance of gay and bisexual members and other interested students.

In practice, the most important inference the literature suggests is to support open and unstructured recruitment policies. Open processes would allow LGB students time to develop

the deep relationships necessary to feel like they would belong in a particular fraternity or sorority (Vaccaro & Newman, 2017), especially if they do not view themselves as students who would typically join (Kase et al., 2016; Stevens, 2004). Recruitment policies also need to be supplemented with institutional messages and policies that communicate to LGB students they are welcomed and belong in the fraternity and sorority community (Zemsky & Sanlo, 2005).

Collaboration with campus LGBTQ+ centers also emerges as a way to improve the sense of belonging among LGB fraternity and sorority members. Building relationships with LGB students is a way for straight students to increase their support, develop positive attitudes, and become allies (Broido, 2000; Worthen, 2014). Teaching fraternity and sorority members how to be supportive of their peers can create a more welcoming chapter environment (Evans & Broido, 1999; Vaccaro & Newman, 2017). The collaboration could also expose unaffiliated LGB students to fraternities and sororities, which they may otherwise avoid due to negative perceptions (Stevens, 2004).

Conclusion

Developing a sense of belonging is important to a college student's success. Fraternities and sororities have the opportunity to develop a sense of belonging among their members, however the attitudes toward LGB students do not always create environments where these students feel like they can belong while representing their whole selves. A broader and deeper understanding of how LGB students do or do not develop a sense of belonging in fraternities and sororities can be explored through research. In practice, the experience for LGB members and interested students can be improved through opening and welcoming policies combined with LGBTQ+ resources. Collaborating with LGBTQ+ resource centers can further improve the experience for LGB members by connecting them with a larger support network and developing their straight brothers and sisters as allies.

Michael D. Giacalone is the Interim Assistant Director of Student Activities at Rhode Island College and a student in the University of Rhode Island/Rhode Island College joint Ph.D. in Education program with a concentration in adult and higher education. His research interests include fraternity and sorority life, sense of belonging, and commuter students. Michael would like to thank Dr. Annemarie Vaccaro and Dr. Julie Coiro for their feedback in preparation of this manuscript.

References

Abes, E. S., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6), 612-632.

Atkinson, E., Dean, L. A., & Espino, M. M. (2010). Leadership outcomes based on membership in multicultural Greek council (MGC) organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 5*(2), 34-48.

Biddix, J. P., Matney, M. M., Norman, E. M., & Martin, G. L. (2014). The influence of fraternity and sorority involvement: A critical analysis of research (1996-2013). *ASHE Higher Education Report, 49*(6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 3-18.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. H. Wozniak & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments* (pp. 3-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Case, D. N. (1996). A glimpse of the invisible membership: A national survey of lesbigay Greek members. *Perspectives, 23*(3), 5-8.

Case, D. N., Hesp, G. A., & Eberly, C. G. (2005). An exploratory study of gay, lesbian, and bisexual fraternity and sorority members revisited. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 1*(1), 15-31.

Cohen, S., McCreary, G., & Schutts, J. (2017). The conceptualization of sisterhood within the collegiate sorority: An exploration. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 12*(1), 32-48.

Corprew III, C. S., & Mitchell, A. D. (2014). Keeping it frat: Exploring the interaction among fraternity membership, disinhibition, and hypermasculinity on sexually aggressive attitudes in college-aged males. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(6), 548-562.

DeSantis, A. D, & Coleman, M. (2008). Not in my line: Attitudes about homosexuality in Black fraternities. In G. S. Parks (Ed.). *Black Greek-letter organizations in the 21st century: Our fight has just begun* (pp. 291-312). Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Dowiak, S. M. (2016). An analysis of the leadership, student, and moral development gains of NIC fraternity men controlling for sexuality and institution size. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 11*(1), 31-47.

Edwards, J. T. (2009). Sorority members' perspectives of chapter racial integration. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 4*(1), 42-54.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (1999). Coming out in college residence halls: Negotiation, meaning making, challenges, supports. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(6), 658-668.

Evans, R., Nagoshi, J. L., Nagoshi, C., Wheeler, J., & Henderson, J. (2017). Voices from the stories untold: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer college students' experiences with campus climate. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian social Services*, 1-19. doi: 10.1080/10538720.2018.1378144

Hausmann, L. R. M., Ye, F., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2009). Sense of belonging and persistence in White and African American first-year students. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(7), 649-699.

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 324-345.

Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J. B., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., & Longerbeam, S. D. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525-542.

Kase, C., Rivera, N., & Hunt, M. G. (2016). The effects of sorority recruitment on psychological wellbeing and social support. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 11*(1), 1-16.

Long, L. (2011). An exploration of the sexual orientation and educational outcomes of undergraduate fraternity members. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 6*(1), 23-38.

Long, L. D., & Snowden, A. (2011). The more you put into it, the more you get out of it: The educational gains of fraternity/sorority officers. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 6*(1), 1-13.

Maestas, R., Vaquera, G. S., & Zehr, L. M. (2007). Factors impacts sense of belong at a Hispanic-serving institution. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 6*(3), 237-256.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Matthews, H., Featherstone, L., Bluder, L., Gerling, A. J., Loge, S., & Messenger, R. B. (2009). Living your letters: Assessing congruence between espoused and enacted values of one fraternity/sorority community. *Oracle: The Research Journal of Fraternity Advisors, 4*(1), 29-40.

McCreary, G., Bray, N., & Thoma, S. (2016). Bad apples or bad barrels? Moral disengagement, social influence, and the perpetuation of hazing in the college fraternity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 11*(1), 1-15.

McCreary, G., & Schutts, J. (2015). Toward a broader understanding of fraternity – Developing and validating a measure of fraternal brotherhood. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 10*(1), 31-50.

Neumann, D. C., Kretovics, M. A., & Roccoforte, E. C. (2013). Attitudes and beliefs of heterosexual sorority women toward lesbian and bisexual chapter members. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 8*(1), 1-15.

Rankin, S. R. (2004). Campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. *The Diversity Factor, 12*(1), 18-23.

Rankin, S. R., Hesp, G. A., & Weber, G. N. (2013). Experiences and perceptions of gay and bisexual fraternity members from 1960 to 2007: A cohort analysis. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(6), 570-590.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stevens, R. A., Jr. (2004) Understanding gay identity development within the college environment. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(2), 185-206.

Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of White college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Trump, J., & Wallace, J. A. (2006). Gay males in fraternities. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors, 2*(1), 8-28.

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 44*(4), 429-226.

Vaccaro, A., & Newman, B. M. (2016). Development of a sense of belonging for privileges and minoritized students: An emergent model. *Journal of College Student Development, 57*(8), 925-942.

Vaccaro, A., & Newman, B. (2017). A sense of belonging through the eyes of first-year LGBPQ students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 54*(2), 137-149.

Windmeyer, S. L. (Ed.). (2005). *Brotherhood: Gay life in college fraternities*. New York, NY: Alyson Books.

Windmeyer, S. L. & Freeman, P. W. (Eds.). (1998). *Out on fraternity row: Personal accounts of being gay in a college fraternity*. New York, NY: Alyson Books.

Windmeyer, S. L. & Freeman, P. W. (Eds.). (2000). *Secret sisters: Stories of being lesbian and bisexual in a college sorority*. New York, NY: Alyson Books.

Worthen, M. G. F. (2014). Blaming the jocks and the Greeks?: Exploring collegiate athletes' and fraternity/sorority members' attitudes toward LGBT individuals. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(2), 168-195.

Yeung, K. (2009). Challenging the heterosexual model of brotherhood: The gay fraternity's dilemma. In C. L. Torbenson & G. S. Parks (Eds.). *Brothers and sisters: Diversity in college fraternities and sororities* (pp. 184-209). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Zemsky, B. & Sanlo, R. L. (2005). Do policies matter? In R. Sanlo (Ed.). Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Research, Policy, and Personal Perspectives. *New Directions for Student Services* (111), (pp. 7-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Class of 2018 – Graduates

Zachery Arellano

Jennifer Campfield

Jaelyn Coates

Anica Dang

Bailey Dunn

Dylan Dunn

Jenny Duong

Raghda Eldeeb

Tyler Fultz

Kelly Guerriero

Benjamin Herdt

Casey Marshall

Kayla Montanez

Benjamin Petrie

Kodi Phelps

Kelly Pizarro

David Polizzi

Katherine Price

Andres Schemel Ramella

Juan Ruiz

Rhonda Stallings

Amaris Tang

Megan Walter

Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs* Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation

Purpose:

Manuscripts should be written for the Student Affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Articles with specialized topics, such as harassment, should be written to provide the generalist with an understanding of the importance of the topic to Student Affairs. Such an article should not take the form of one program specialist writing to another program specialist.

The Editorial Board invites submissions of the following types of articles

- Quantitative, Qualitative, or Emancipatory Research Articles
- Editorial Articles
- Historical Articles
- Opinion/Position Pieces
- Book Reviews

Research articles for the Journal should stress the underlying issues or problem that stimulated the research. Explain the methodology in a concise manner, and offer a full discussion of the results, implications, and conclusions.

Procedure

Literature Review manuscripts should not exceed 3,000 words (approximately 12 pages of double-spaced, typewritten copy, including references, tables, and figures) and should not be fewer than 1,000 words (approximately four pages). Exceptions should be discussed with the editors at the time of submission.

Original Research manuscripts should not exceed 6,000 words (approximately 24 pages of double-spaced, typewritten copy, including references, tables, and figures) and should not be fewer than 3,000 words (approximately 12 pages). Exceptions should be discussed with the editors at the time of submission.

Guidelines for Writing

1. Prepare the manuscript, including title page and reference page, in accordance with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, Sixth Edition.

2. Include an article abstract and brief description of the author, including professional title and institutional affiliation. Details on how to do abstract are on page 25 of the *Publication Manual.*

3. Double-space all portions of the manuscript, including references, tables, and figures.

4. Avoid bias in language; refer to page 70 of the *Publication Manual* for assistance.

5. Do not use footnotes; incorporate the information into the text.

6. Use the active voice as much as possible.

7. Check subject/verb agreement.

8. Use verb tense appropriately: past tense for the literature review and description of procedures and present tense for the results and discussion.

9. Proofread and double-check all references and citations before submitting your draft.

10. Use Microsoft Word (2000) or higher so that editors may utilize the "insert comment" function.

11. Never submit manuscripts under consideration by another publication.

12. Lengthy quotations (a total of 300 or more words from one source) require written permission from the copyright holder for reproduction. Adaptation of tables and figures also requires such approval. The author is responsible for securing such permission. A copy of the publisher's written permission must be provided to the editors immediately upon acceptance of the article for publication.

13. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of references, quotations, tables, and figures. Authors should make sure these are complete and correct.

* Adapted from the *Journal of College Student Development's* "Submission Instructions"

Colorado State University
Dr. Grant P. Sherwood SAHE Fund

Enclosed is my/our check for a gift of: ☐ $500 ☐ $250 ☐ $100
☐ Other $ _____ (*Payable to the **Colorado State University Foundation***)

Name _____

This gift is from: ☐ me ☐ my spouse and me ☐ my partner and me

Spouse's/Partner's Full Name _____

Address _____

City, State, ZIP _____

Home Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____ ☐ Home ☐ Work

☐ Charge this gift of $ _____ to my/our: ☐ VISA or MasterCard or American Express
  Card Number_____ Expires_____/_____
  Name on Card _____
  Signature_____

☐ I/We prefer to pledge $ _____ to be paid:
  ☐ Monthly ☐ Quarterly ☐ Semi-Annually ☐ Annually
  ☐ First payment of $ _____ is enclosed.
  ☐ Will be sent : _____ (mm/dd/yy)
  Signature_____

Please apply this gift to:

☐ $ _____ Dr. Grant P. Sherwood SAHE Fund (56255)

☐ $ _____ Other: _____
  (*College, department, or fund name*)

☐ A matching gift form is enclosed.

For more information, please contact:
  Colorado State University
  Dr. David A. McKelfresh
  201 Administration
  Fort Collins, CO 80523-8004

  E-mail: david.mckelfresh@colostate.edu
  Phone: (970) 491-4722

Please return this form with your gift to:
CSU Foundation, P.O. Box 1870, Fort Collins, CO 80522-1870

56255/S1399