Using Intergroup Dialogue Pedagogy in an Employment Course to Explore Resident Assistant Passion, Awareness, Skill and Knowledge Development through a Racial Lens

by

Heather Black

Bachelor of Arts, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2005

Master of Education, The University of Toledo, 2009

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2020

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Heather Black

It was defended on

June 11, 2020

and approved by

Tom Akiva, PhD, Associate Professor and EdD Coordinator, Psychology in Education

Randi Congleton, PhD, Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Dissertation Advisor: Gina Garcia, PhD, Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Using Intergroup Dialogue Pedagogy in an Employment Course to Explore Resident Assistant Passion, Awareness, Skill and Knowledge Development through a Racial Lens

Heather Black, EdD

University of Pittsburgh, 2020

The purpose of this inquiry was to understand how resident assistants (RAs) at Chatham University developed passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge over the course of an employment class redesigned using intergroup dialogues pedagogy (IGD). The inquiry was guided by two questions: (1) In what ways do intergroup dialogue skills explored in an RA employment class at Chatham University promote passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge about racial and social justice?; and (2) Is there a change in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice over the course of an employment class?

The inquiry was guided by improvement science and used a convergent mixed methods research design to analyze and contextualize qualitative and quantitative data that were gathered through class assignments. Fifteen, first-time RAs at a predominately white university served as the sample. Quantitative data were gathered using the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators, which was converted to a survey tool for a pre- and post-measure. Qualitative data included two student journals and sought to contextualize the findings.

The findings showed that RAs improved overall in their passion, personal awareness, and knowledge; however, skill improvement was minimal, which suggests they did not arrive at social and racial justice. Key findings suggest that development of personal awareness and their own identities was more prevalent, skill development was minimal, resistance was prevalent, and IGD pedagogy had an influence. The inquiry provides recommendations to modify the class

assignments, better address resistance, and further develop facilitators who can be used to improve

practice.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Preface

This inquiry is dedicated to those who have supported and challenged me in my EdD journey. First and foremost, thank you to my husband, Ken. I would not have been able to achieve this goal without your unwavering love and humor. Thank you to my Mom and Eddie who have always cheered me on and raised me to accept challenges and persevere. Thank you to my closest friends and family - Justin, Michelle, and Felipe - whom I can always count on for a laugh, a break from studying, and words of encouragement. Thank you to the Residence Life team and Devin for being my co-instructor in the class. Thank you to my Higher Ed cohort and Stephanie for three years of constant motivation and support. Thank you to Team GG - Ashley, Brittany, and Hasanna. I know I could not have finished this without your moral support and encouragement through all the love notes. Thank you to Dr. Akiva for his thoughtful feedback. Thank you to my colleague, Dr. Congleton, who inspires me daily through her work in equity and inclusion and helped me become a better practitioner through this process. Finally, thank you to my advisor, Dr. Garcia, who has made me a critically conscious scholarly practitioner who will continue to center inclusion and equity in my daily practice. I am so very thankful to have had you as my advisor on this journey.

1.0 Chapter 1

1.1 Problem Statement

Diversity training for resident assistants (RAs) at colleges and universities across the United States has declined in the last 15-20 years (Koch, 2016) while the population of college students has become more racially diverse (Espinosa, Turk, Taylor, & Chessman, 2019), prompting the need for additional training to better support diverse students. Instead, Koch (2016) found that when compared to Bowman and Bowman (1995), "Two topics, racism and diversity showed the sharpest drop in delivery at in-service training" (p. 90). This is concerning, especially considering that RAs are thought to be the "backbone" of residential life programs (Blimling, 2015, p. 177). RAs are one of the first resources on campus that residents can turn to for assistance (Blimling, 2015); yet, training on diversity has decreased over time (Koch, 2016). Simultaneously, students of color continue to face a difficult racial climate on campus (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Mwangi, Thelamour, Ezeofor, & Carpenter, 2018). RAs influence the residence hall climate (Blimling, 2015, 2010), thus their lack of diversity training is concerning when you consider the racial climate students of color endure on college campuses.

It is shocking that little has changed since the 1980s when Hurtado (1992) found that "one in four students at all four-year institutions perceive considerable racial conflict" (p. 551) on their campus. Harper and Hurtado (2007) found similar racial climate issues including frustration between "espoused and enacted institutional values concerning diversity" (p. 16), failure to name racism, racial segregation, and "white student overestimation of minority student satisfaction" (p. 18). Moreover, students report experiencing daily racial microaggressions, defined by Solórzano

1

et al. (2000) as "subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and/or visual) directed toward people of color, often automatically or unconsciously" (p. 60), in and outside the classroom from peers, faculty, and staff. Racial microaggressions have been found to impact the self-esteem of students of color and overall student success (Nadal, Wong, Griffin, Davidoff, & Sriken, 2014; Solórzano et al., 2000); yet scholars are reluctant to name racism as a climate issue (Harper, 2012).

Higher education institutions are grappling with the campus racial climate while students of color continue to experience racism (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Mwangi et al., 2018), and white students struggle and resist talking about race (DiAngelo, 2018; Goodman, 2011; Johnson, 2018). Talking about race and inequity is critical but tough, because white individuals are uncomfortable discussing race (DiAngelo, 2018; Sue & Constantine, 2007). Often the mere mention of race is taboo (Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007), which makes it difficult to discuss the prevalent and persistent systems that impact students of color daily. Moreover, white people will overtly or subtly resist discussing race, which means individuals will use varying techniques to dismiss the idea of racial inequality (DiAngelo, 2018; Goodman, 2011). This is done through minimizing experiences or justifying by making claims like "it was not meant this way" or "it was just a joke". Arguably, it will be impossible to improve the racial climate and dismantle systems of oppression if people are unable to name racism and the impact it has on students of color.

Research shows that curricular interventions, such as intergroup dialogues (IGD), can be effective at helping students talk about race, privilege, and oppression (Gurin-Sands, Gurin, Nagda, & Osuna, 2012; Nagda & Gurin, 2007; Gurin, Nagda, & Zúñiga, 2013). IGD aims to help students learn to talk across difference while specifically focusing on understanding structural inequity and systems of oppression (Gurin et al., 2013; Nagda, Gurin, Sorensen, Gurin-Sands, & Osuna, 2009). IGD offers a path of sustained dialogue through exploration of social identities,

privilege, and power that can lead to social justice collective action (Gurin-Sands et al., 2012; Nagda et al., 2009). As college students become more racially diverse (Eagan et al., 2016), campuses need to consider the effect that paraprofessional staff like RAs can have on the experiences of students of color and on the overall climate of the residence halls. Arguably, curricular intervention with RAs, such as IGD pedagogy, could be one way to improve the campus climate.

1.2 Problem of Practice

Declining racial and diversity training for RAs is a national problem (Koch, 2016) that can be seen at my place of practice, Chatham University. I received reports from students of color themselves and from other campus offices of a difficult racial climate, and the Office of Residence Life has received reported incidents of bullying of students of color. Moreover, in the 2018-2019 academic year, the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (previously Multicultural Affairs) received reports about challenges with microaggressions and a lack of RA understanding. The Office of Residence Life greatly depends on the RA staff to create an inclusive community for students, yet we only offered a six-hour training program before student staff began their position and offered no continuing professional development. Student Affairs staff sought additional training as a reactive measure.

I explored this inquiry through my previous role as the Assistant Dean of Students and was promoted to Dean of Students after the conclusion of the course. The Office of Residence Life continues to report directly to me in my new role, and I have observed and discussed with staff the need to disrupt our trainings to include more focus on equity and inclusion based on the reports

we have received within our office and from other offices, such as the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. We know microaggressions are happening in the residence halls, residents lack understanding about racism, and we also have received reports that RAs are not prepared to notice or address these issues. Moreover, Residence Life utilizes a neutral conflict resolution process in handling resident issues, which means that RAs were instructed to be unbiased when they mediated conflicts. This has resulted in RAs not recognizing and/or not addressing microaggressions when they happen in the mediation process. Neutral mediation practices are not uncommon (Wing & Rifkin, 2001), but IGD calls for the use of multipartiality when handling conflict because a neutral perspective does not consider the already inequitable systems and structures in place (Wing & Rifkin, 2001). This inquiry hoped to disrupt the racialized experiences of students of color through the launch of a new curriculum in the RA employment class that focused on IGD pedagogy and skills. IGD pedagogy was used to foster passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills about racial and social justice that are critical for IGD facilitators (Beale, Thompson, & Chesler, 2001). While RAs were not trained to facilitate IGD dialogue classes themselves, they served as facilitators in their residence hall communities, which suggests that IGD facilitation skills can help them foster more inclusive spaces. Moreover, IGD has been found to lead to coalition building and action in addressing inequity (Gurin-Sands et al., 2012; Nagda et al., 2009).

1.3 Purpose of the Inquiry

My problem of practice specifically looked at the use of training to help RAs develop racial and social justice passion, skills, awareness, and knowledge, thus, helping them create more inclusive residential spaces. RAs are on the front lines; they handle student complaints, directly

oversee conflicts in the residence halls, and are often some of the first people a student will turn to for help (Blimling, 2015). Despite their crucial role on campus, RAs have only had a brief, surface level training with diversity, if any at all (Koch, 2016). This can lead to RAs who are not prepared to address the racial climate in the residence halls. Moreover, RAs can perpetrate microaggressions and create a difficult racial climate themselves, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Research shows that students of color face a difficult climate within the residence halls due to microaggressions (Harwood, Huntt, Mendenhall, & Lewis, 2012) and report negative experiences within the halls (Johnson, 2003).

The purpose of this inquiry was to understand the development of RA social and racial justice skills through an employment class focused on IGD skills and pedagogy. The inquiry was guided by two questions:

1. In what ways do intergroup dialogue skills explored in an RA employment class at Chatham University promote passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge about racial and social justice?

2. Is there a change in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice over the course of an employment class?

1.3.1 Intervention

Each new RA must take a credit-bearing course during their first term of employment at Chatham. This class has traditionally focused on leadership with little focus on diversity, equity, or inclusion except for one class facilitated by the IGD program (see previous syllabus in Appendix A). Following reports of racial microaggressions on campus, I led the curriculum redesign of the RA employment course, and it was approved by the Chatham Undergraduate Programs Committee

in spring 2019 to include IGD skills and pedagogy (see new syllabus in Appendix B). The course design was based on a similar class for residence life student staff from the University of Michigan Intergroup Relations Program (Petryk, Thompson, & Boynton, 2013).

Chatham introduced and has seen much growth with our IGD program since its founding in 2017. The program began when two faculty members attended the University of Michigan's Intergroup Relations Institute in 2016. This led to an intensive, on-campus, two-day IGD training for 40 students, faculty, and staff with facilitators from the University of Michigan in spring 2017 and the launch of the curricular program for students in fall 2017. The Chatham IGD program helps students engage across difference and provides a curricular approach to talking about equity. The curricular component began with a facilitator class to prepare students to serve as peer facilitators for traditional dialogue classes in spring 2018. Traditional dialogue classes bring different identity groups together (e.g., white people and people of color, men and women) to engage in deep conversations about difference, which leads to collective understanding, reflection, and action (Gurin et al., 2013). Infusing IGD into the RA class was a new addition to the IGD program at Chatham in fall 2019 and was introduced based on the reports of microaggressions and lack of understanding by RAs. The IGD program provided a framework that helped our RAs gain a better understanding of structural inequity and promoted the development of their passion, awareness, knowledge, and skills about racial and social justice to assist them in their position.

1.3.2 Methods / Approach

In this inquiry I used improvement science, which encourages the use of two types of knowledge – basic and profound. Basic knowledge is the knowledge of the intervention or program (Lewis, 2015). In this case, that means knowledge of IGD. Improvement science also uses a

"system of profound knowledge that includes both generalizable knowledge…and organization-specific knowledge" (Lewis, 2015, p. 54). IGD knowledge was combined with knowledge of the system in which it took place, Chatham's RA employment class and training initiatives. Knowledge of the intervention and institution-specific knowledge worked in tandem in this study by considering that a direct application of IGD needed to be modified to the system using the intervention.

Improvement science follows a plan, do, study, act (PDSA) cycle to guide work (Langley et al., 2009; Lewis, 2015). In this inquiry, I restructured the curriculum for the RA employment course (plan), co-instructed the class in fall 2019 (do), and (studied) student assignments. In chapter 5, I provided suggestions for future iterations and training activities as the last part of the PDSA cycle to use for future courses (act). As one of the co-instructors of the course, I was part of the class and involved directly in the inquiry. The iterative process of the PDSA cycle (Langley et al., 2009; Lewis, 2015) allowed me to critically examine the class and make recommendations for future courses.

I used a mixed methods research design which enabled me to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to better understand my inquiry question (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Mertens, 2015). I used a convergent mixed method design; meaning the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately and then compared and combined to create findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Both quantitative and qualitative methods happened in the same time period (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Mertens, 2015). The quantitative study included the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators, a pre- and post-measure that participants completed at the beginning and end of the term. The PASK is used by the University of Michigan's Intergroup Relations program and was adapted from Beale et al's. (2001) work on

7

facilitator training. This measure had participants reflect on their social justice skills in terms of their personal resources in four main areas: passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge. Passion is a participant's desire and motivation to do social justice work. Personal awareness calls for reflection and understanding of one's own privileged and oppressed identities and the effect identity has on groups. Skills are the abilities to work with groups, challenge others, discuss issues, and take risks. Finally, knowledge encompasses the participant's understanding of systems of oppression and recognition of isms (Beale et al., 2001). The PASK is used for facilitators, but it also provided an important framework and measure for RAs who serve as facilitators in a variety of capacities within the residence halls (Blimling, 2010, 2015).

The qualitative side of the inquiry used student written assignments, specifically two journal entries in a document analysis. Mertens (2015) noted that document analysis can help to understand the inquiry for an "everyday life" (p. 387) view. The written assignments followed a deductive process guided by the PASK (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). Predetermined codes were created and guided by the PASK with intention to include race. One limitation of using the PASK was that it is a raceless document, which means it did not include prompts related to race; however, my inquiry was grounded in race. Therefore, codes were developed related to race and guided by the PASK. For example, codes for personal awareness were developed that were personal awareness of race. I also remained open to emergent codes and themes through the process. Qualitative and quantitative findings were reviewed and analyzed separately but then compared to look for commonalities and differences as part of the convergent approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Mertens, 2015).

1.4 Inquiry Setting

Chatham University is a small, private, predominantly white (PWI), liberal arts college in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Chatham offers 41 undergraduate degree programs along with masters and doctoral programs. The total enrollment is 2,437 with approximately 1,400 undergraduates. Chatham has seen much change over the last five years. The undergraduate college transitioned from all-women to fully co-educational in 2015, launched five new men's athletics teams, and opened the first residence hall and student center at the Eden Hall campus, which houses the Falk School of Sustainability. In addition, the university hired a new President in 2016 and launched additional athletics teams for both men and women. These changes have been fast-paced, exciting, and challenging for the university community. Diversity and inclusion were identified as core values in Chatham's 2017 strategic plan, but inclusion efforts have struggled over the past few years despite the introduction of the Diversity and Inclusion Council and the hiring of Chatham's first Director of Multicultural Affairs who has been promoted to Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

Retention rates of students of color also point to a possible issue with inclusion efforts on campus. This has been inconsistent, while overall student retention has been on the rise, which is concerning for both administrators and students of color. Moreover, until the 2017-2018 academic year, the retention rates of students of color were always below the white student retention rate. The increase proved to be inconsistent with student of color following below white student retention in 2018-2019; however, the gap was closed to 2% between the two groups, which suggests it may be evening. Chatham has also received both formal and informal reports of microaggressions and a difficult racial climate from students of color. Many of these reports began in 2016 when Student Affairs staff participated in a candid conversation to hear more about the

racial climate from students of color; unfortunately, these reports have continued over the last four years. RAs are a critical support structure for students living on campus (Blimling, 2010, 2015); therefore, it is critical that these paraprofessional staff understand structural inequity and how it effects marginalized students.

1.5 Significance of the Inquiry

Students of color persist in higher education at lower rates than their white peers (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). This is problematic and points to serious concerns for higher education. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators, along with the nation, must be concerned about this persistent gap, because this is a problem that affects everyone. The United States is becoming more racially diverse (Colby & Ortman, 2015), and first-year students have become more racially diverse (Eagan et al., 2016). First and most importantly, this is our moral and ethical responsibility given the history of discrimination and oppression against racially minoritized people in the United States. Students of color must be given the same access and opportunity as their white peers, and society must take steps to understand and close the graduation gap. Additionally, retaining students of color will benefit our society and economy. Carnevale, Strohl, and Smith (2009) argued that some form of higher education is needed for mobility within the job market. One of the goals of education is social mobility, which allows the opportunity to move into a new class or achieve the American Dream of wealth and success (Labaree, 1997); yet, there is inequity in the system, because everyone does not start at the same place or receive the same treatment (Ornstein, 2016). Moreover, the pipeline entering higher education favors white students where the majority of white students enter select institutions compared to students of color who disproportionately attend open-

access schools (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013). These stark differences impact the ability of students of color to be successful and attain social mobility, which demonstrates that the American Dream is not accessible to all. This is a problem for all of society and not only people of color as it is so often implied. We must take steps to dismantle systems of oppression within higher education to allow space for marginalized students to succeed.

This inquiry was grounded in race because it is the "ism" that is the foundation for all other "isms" (Ladson-Billings, 1996). Ladson-Billings (1996) argued "issues of race and racism have become marginalized and muted in the multicultural discourse" (p. 254). The campus racial climate greatly impacts the ability of students of color to succeed (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Mwangi et al., 2018), yet racism is often not positioned as normal or even discussed in practice or research (Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Higher education downplays racism as Ladson-Billings (1996) suggested by using multicultural agendas as a means of not talking about race. Critical Race Theorists position race directly in the conversation as "normal" meaning that "racism is difficult to address or cure because it is not acknowledged" (Delgado & Stefanicic, 2017, p. 8). This inquiry was grounded in race because it is the foundation of systems of oppression. After all, "America's understanding of itself as a nation based upon freedom, justice, and equality was predicated on its establishment of antithetical conditions of enslavement, injustice, and inequality" (Ladson-Billings, 1996, p. 250).

Students of color experience a difficult racial climate both in and outside the classroom, including within the residence halls (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harwood et al., 2012; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000), yet higher education will not name racism (Harper, 2012). Furthermore, Chatham University has a two-year living requirement for all first-year students, which means that they must live on campus their first two years or at home with a parent or guardian. Creating a

positive and equitable environment for racially minoritized students in the residence hall is crucial to helping them persist. RAs are a key component to this. These are the trained staff who live with residents, handle conflict, and interact with residents daily (Blimling, 2015). These student leaders play an important role, yet they only received a brief training on identity and bias at the start of their position with no ongoing support during the academic year. This lack of continued training comes to the detriment of students of color and other students with minoritized identities who are often revictimized, albeit unintentionally, when they turn to the student staff member who is meant to support them. Creating a more critical and thoughtful experience in the RA class can help mitigate the issues students of color face in the residence hall.

1.6 Delimitations

The first delimitation of this study is that it does not explore the experiences of students of color as a result of the training that RAs will receive. It sought to provide better skill development for RAs, but there is no connection to the overall effects of IGD training for the students it aimed to benefit most. This is concerning because the ultimate goal was to provide RAs with the skills to create more inclusive spaces, yet this inquiry was not designed to make that connection; therefore the effect of IGD training on positive outcomes for students of color is an area for future inquiry. Residence Life staff should embark on an inquiry about how or if RAs influence student resident experiences within the residence hall. This study also measured RAs' passion, awareness, skill, and knowledge development immediately following the course with no understanding of the longitudinal impact on these four focal areas. This is concerning since most RAs hold the position for two years, and it is unclear whether these areas develop and improve over time.

1.7 Conclusion

RAs are receiving less training on diversity and equity, specifically within the RA academic courses (Koch, 2016) despite higher education becoming increasingly more racially diverse (Eagan et al., 2016). Moreover, residential students of color experience hostile racial climates filled with microaggressions (Harwood et al., 2012) that impact their confidence and ability to succeed (Harwood et al., 2012; Nadal et al., 2014; Solórzano et al., 2000). Higher education institutions rely heavily on their RAs to create meaningful and safe environment for students (Blimling, 2015), but administrators must ask themselves *who* benefits from these environments. Many policies and procedures, such as conflict resolution, are grounded in neutral lenses, which further perpetuates inequities (Wing & Rifkin, 2001). I argued that the RAs needed better equity training, and IGD pedagogy offered a foundation to promote skill and knowledge development hoping this would lead to more inclusive residential communities. The present inquiry explored the possibilities of addressing some of these issues by examining if and how using IGD skills in an RA employment fostered RAs' passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills about racial and social justice through the use of improvement science.

2.0 Chapter 2

2.1 Literature Review

Higher education research and practice tells us that students of color face a difficult racial climate on campus (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harwood et al., 2012; Mwangi et al., 2018; Solórzano et al., 2000). Moreover, this climate is particularly difficult for residential students of color who experience racism in every aspect of their daily life on campus: in the classroom, co-curricular spaces, and residence halls where they live (Harwood et al., 2012). Institutions commit to creating diverse and equitable spaces, but attaining these values does not transcend into practice. It is critical we think about the experience of minoritized students at every level of the institution, including experiences within the residence hall and working with resident assistants (RAs). It is most concerning that diversity and racism are considered critical areas for training (Blimling, 2010, 2015; Karim & Ross, 2010), yet time dedicated to these trainings is decreasing, specifically within the curricular RA classes (Koch, 2016). In this review of literature, I will explore what is known about campus racial climate, intergroup dialogues (IGD), and explore the RA position and training process.

2.2 Campus Racial Climate

The campus racial climate greatly effects the health of the campus community and influences the experiences of students of color in higher education (Harper, 2012; Hurtado, 1992).

While there are many things to be learned from the literature that focuses on campus climate, it was most relevant to this study to focus on higher education's inability to name racism and racial microaggressions experienced by students.

2.2.1 Inability to Name Racism

Race, racism, and racist are all unmentionable words in higher education, whether it be in practice on campus or in research (Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). This theme clearly emerged in Harper and Hurtado's (2007) multicampus qualitative study of racial climates where they shared, "Put simply, race remained an unpopular topic and was generally considered taboo in most spaces, including classes other than ethnic studies" (p. 16). This creates a dichotomy where it is difficult to understand or improve the campus racial climate when faculty, staff, students, and institutional leaders grapple with simply naming racist acts as racist (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Engaging students, specifically white students, in race dialogues is critical, but tough because white individuals seem to be uncomfortable discussing race (DiAngelo, 2018; Sue & Constantine, 2007). Sue and Constantine (2007) reminded us, "because most educational institutions are White European American in orientation, the power to define racial reality and impose it on people of color is highly probable when discussed and analyzed" (p. 139). Moreover, resistance is prevalent in racial and social justice work, which means white people will "refuse to consider alternative perspectives that challenge the dominant ideology that maintains the status quo" (Goodman, 2011, p. 51). Privileged people will resist in a variety of ways including dismissing, minimizing, and blaming the victim (Johnson, 2018). Working with white students is a challenge, but is necessary in order to create a more inclusive and equitable campus climate for students of color.

Interestingly, while many scholars study the experiences of students of color, most are also

reluctant to name racism in their studies (Harper, 2012). Harper (2012) conducted a study where 255 journal articles on racial work were reviewed to understand how scholars were framing race. Surprisingly, racism was rarely seen as a possibility for racial differences in research (Harper, 2012, p. 16). Moreover, when the terms, "racist" or "racism," were used, they were done in singular manner. In fact, "only 16 of the 255 articles used either word three or more times" (Harper, 2012, p. 20). More often scholars used other words like "marginalized," "hostile," and "discriminatory" to name the experiences of students of color. Racism was rarely pointed to as a plausible cause for research findings (Harper, 2012). Arguably, this failure to name racism in research has far-reaching implications in practice, as faculty, staff, and administrators similarly have trouble naming racism. Furthermore, Garcia and Johnston-Guerrero (2016) found the majority of racially biased incidents were overtly racist when they reviewed on-campus incidents reported in the media over a five-year period, yet racist is not how these incidents were described. Failure to name racism and racist behaviors (Garcia & Johnston-Guerrero, 2015; Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007) illustrates the need for training and an increased understanding of systems of oppression that racially minoritized students face each day on a college campus.

2.2.2 Racial Microaggressions

Racial microaggressions are an additional problem that contribute significantly to the campus climate. Solórzano et al. (2000) defined microaggressions as "subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and/or visual) directed toward people of color, often automatically or unconsciously" (p. 60). Microaggressions differ from macroaggressions because they appear seemly small when compared to macroaggressions, "which are overt, conscious, intentional hate acts and crimes" against people of minoritized identities (Berk, 2017, p. 65). Microaggression has become a

common term on college campuses and has led to workshops and campaigns (Schmidt, 2015) to help improve the lives of minoritized people on campus. Critics of microaggressions often say people are being too sensitive because these comments or actions are often committed unintentionally. Furthermore, some have started to raise concerns about the intersections of microaggressions and free speech (Schmidt, 2015, 2016); however, scholars stress it is important to remember that these seemingly small acts can have a significant impact on the victims (Berk, 2017; Harwood et al., 2012; Sue et al., 2007).

Sue et al. (2007) identified three forms of microaggressions: microassault, microinsult, and microinvalidation. Microassaults are traditionally what people think of when discussing racism. These are overt and often deliberate, but the primary difference is they happen in a private or anonymous way. Microinsults target a person's identity and heritage. These communications "represent subtle snubs, frequently unknown to the perpetrator, but clearly convey a hidden insulting message to the recipient of color" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). Microinvalidations dismiss the experiences of people of color. Campuses are more likely to act on microassaults but fail to address the microinsults and microinvalidations. These forms are subtle and often invisible (Sue et al., 2007). Faculty, staff, and students can inflict microaggressions on students of color each day, thus impacting their experience and ability to succeed.

Racial microaggressions affect students daily in the classroom, outside the classroom, and in social spaces (Solórzano et al., 2000; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). Students have reported feelings of invisibility and suffering from the stereotypes they hear in classes from peers and faculty (Solórzano et al., 2000). Harwood et al. (2012) completed a qualitative study with 72 undergraduate and graduate students of color at a Midwest university and found that students regularly experience microaggressions when living in the residence halls. Students shared their

experiences with peers who made racial jokes or comments. The students of color often felt their relationship with the offending student could be at risk if they challenged these comments. Students of color also discussed that many of the offending students did not understand the effect of what they said, but it hurt the student nonetheless (Harwood et al., 2012). Residents are not the only students of color who can experience microaggressions. Harper et al. (2011) studied the racialized experiences of Black male resident assistants and found these student leaders experienced microaggressions in the form of racist stereotypes, feelings of "onlyness" (p. 190) as one of the only staff members of color, and dealt with more scrutiny from their white supervisors. This study illustrates that RAs and residents of color are experiencing a difficult racial climate. Often microaggressions are dismissed, but it is forgotten that these seemingly small comments can greatly influence the recipient's confidence (Solórzano et al., 2000; Yosso et al., 2009). Microaggressions have a long lasting effect on students of color, including a negative impact on student self-esteem (Nadal et al., 2014). Nadal et al. (2014) found that a student of color's self-esteem is lowered as they experience more microaggressions.

Racial microaggressions greatly effect students of color and make it nearly impossible for them to realize the full benefits of the college experience because of the emotional stress it causes students (Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2007, 2009; Yosso et al., 2009) In fact, students of color can experience racial battle fatigue. "Racial battle fatigue is the psychological, physiological, emotional, and behavioral toll placed on People of Color who are responding to daily racial macro- and microaggressions" (Smith, 2010, p. 266). Racial microaggressions lead to racial battle fatigue, which makes it difficult for people of color to realize success in college. Yet, institutions are often not prepared to address microaggressions or the difficult dialogues about race they prompt (Sue & Constantine, 2007; Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). More often, these

conversations take a personal toll on the students where students of color spend considerable emotional labor determining whether they should address the microaggression, how they should address it, and how it will be perceived (Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2009; Yosso et al., 2009). Students of color report lack of support from their white peers and faculty through nonverbals or stereotypical responses like they are "too sensitive" or "everything is not about race" (Sue et al., 2007, 2009; Sue & Constantine, 2007). Research clearly shows that racial microaggressions play a role in the success of students of color (Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2009; Yosso et al., 2009), and we know microaggressions permeate all aspects of the student experience, including living on campus (Harwood et al., 2012). Students of color need support from the institutional offices and staff, including RAs, to promote an equitable experience.

2.3 Intergroup Dialogues

Meaningful dialogue about race and social identities is needed to create a more inclusive campus climate. IGD offers a path to sustained change by creating opportunities for learning across difference through a critical-dialogic approach (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012; Nagda et al., 2009). IGD infuses learning about social identities, privilege, and power in the classroom through "a facilitated educational effort that brings an equal number of students from two social identity groups – white students and students of color, men and women – together in a quarter or semester-long, credit-earning courses" (Gurin et al., 2013, p. 2) . The intent of IGD is to help students talk and gain a deeper understanding of difference through conflict (Gurin et al., 2013; Nagda & Gurin, 2007) whereas other diversity efforts aim to help students see past difference. The ability to engage deeply about difference provides a model that can greatly benefit students,

19

particularly RAs, who live and work closely with their peers. Diversity programming often fails to acknowledge the structural and systemic oppressions minoritized people face each day, but IGD pedagogy places an emphasis on understanding structural oppression (Gurin et al., 2013; Nagda et al., 2009). This section will explore IGD outcomes, pedagogy, and implementation challenges.

2.3.1 IGD Outcomes

Research shows that IGD can have a long lasting impact on participants (Gurin et al., 2013). Nine universities engaged in the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogue Research (MIGR) project to explore whether IGD has the intended impacts of increasing intergroup understanding, intergroup relationships, and intergroup action while examining the overall effects through an experimental study (Gurin et al., 2013). The study compared students who were taking an IGD class on race or gender to students taking a social science course focused on the same topic (Gurin et al., 2013). Students completed a pre-survey and two post-surveys, one at the end of the term and the other one year later, to determine longitudinal gains (Gurin et al., 2013). Results showed significant differences in the semester post-test between the students in IGD compared to the social science students in 20 out of 24 measures, including cognitive involvement, affective positivity, structural understanding of inequalities, intergroup empathy, and intergroup collaboration and action (Gurin et al., 2013). Moreover, these results are striking when you consider that students in both groups scored similarly prior to taking the courses (Gurin et al., 2013).

One concern about the study is that students participated in the survey immediately following the course, which may have affected their post-test results. Students may have felt influenced to respond how they believed the researcher wanted them to based on class activities (Gurin et al., 2013). However, the MIGR Project also conducted a longitudinal study one year later

to determine if IGD had lasting effects. Again, the results were favorable. With an 82 percent response rate, 18 measures still showed significant impacts for the dialogue group (Gurin et al., 2013). These positive outcomes came in both the gender and race dialogue courses. IGD courses show promise for equipping students how to talk across difference and promote social justice action to create change (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012; Nagda & Gurin, 2007; Nagda et al., 2009).

The MIGR project involved nine institutions and the majority were large, research institutions; however, one institution was a small, private institution which illustrates that IGD can have positive outcomes at different institutional types. Ford's (2012) study on inter- and intragroup dialogues at a small, private liberal arts institution in the Northeast showed positive outcomes for white students who participated in IGD, whether through an intergroup (white and students of color) or an intragroup (all white students). Ford (2012) used content analysis of student papers in both sections to understand "how white students make sense of their own racial group membership and how they navigate cross-racial interactions in college" (p.138). Findings showed that students in both dialogue groups were able to learn and make connections about the influence of race in systems of oppression (Ford, 2012). Specifically, students gained understanding of the socialization of race, meaning of whiteness, explored white guilt and privilege, intersectionalism, personal bias, terminology, and responsibility for action (Ford, 2012). The white students navigated these outcomes differently whether they were in the inter- or intragroup dialogue, but overall findings suggest "intentionally structured inter- and intragroup dialogic pedagogies can produce similar results" (Ford, 2012, p. 155).

IGD is also beneficial when adapted to meet different institutional needs. Thakral et al. (2016) conducted a study to examine the effects of a First-Year Dialogue Seminar at the University

of Illinois at Chicago. The course was designed to be one-credit, pass/fail during the first term. The course used influences of IGD pedagogy but made a few key changes: (1) classes had a broader discussion of power and privilege versus one identity; (2) the course was much shorter, which left less time for deeper dialogue; and (3) there was only one facilitator where traditional IGD calls for two of different identities (Thakral et al., 2016). Despite these changes, "the results showed significant gains across measures of intergroup understanding, intergroup collaboration and action, and relevancy of diversity in higher education" (p. 130). This demonstrates that a briefer experience with IGD pedagogy can promote better understanding and may be more practical for higher education institutions (Thakral et al., 2016); however, one limitation is the diverse makeup of the University of Illinois at Chicago. There is no racial majority (Thakral et al., 2016), which suggests that this could be more difficult for PWIs. Despite this limitation, Thakral et al. (2016) suggested "this type of policy paradigm shift of moving diversity education into the credit-bearing structures of institutions helps to move beyond representational diversity, while leveraging and capitalizing on interactive diversity in higher education" (p. 140).

2.3.2 IGD Pedagogy

IGD guides participants through four stages: (1) group beginnings: forming and building relationships; (2) exploring differences and commonalities of experience; (3) exploring and dialoguing about hot topics; and (4) action planning and collaboration (Gurin et al., 2013). Each stage has a specific purpose to help the class progress over the course of the term. The first phase helps participants understand the purpose of dialogue and the course, the second stage, "centers the conversation on identities and inequalities" (Gurin et al., p. 63), the third stage introduces

dialogue about controversial issues selected by the class, and the final stage helps students think about their responsibilities moving forward (Gurin et al., 2013).

This four-stage process is key to the success and progress of the dialogue group, and it is tied together using three key pedagogical features: content learning, structured interaction, and facilitation (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012). Content learning focuses on how students participate in their learning. This is mostly achieved through readings and videos that are incorporated intentionally in classroom activities and assignments (Gurin et al., 2013). Structured interaction includes activities that help students from different backgrounds engage in active learning (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012;). These interactions strategically keep structural inequity in mind. Structured interactions provide space for students to tell and validate one another's stories and experiences (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012;).

The final pedagogical feature is facilitation, which some argue is the most critical component (Yeakley, 2011). Facilitators are asked to guide the dialogue while managing group dynamics, demonstrating vulnerability, and noticing how power and privilege are shaping the conversation (Gurin et al., 2013; Yeakley, 2011). Yeakley (2011) argued that facilitation can lead to both positive and negative processes for student participants. It is key that the facilitators are trained to recognize both because negative processes can lead to increased prejudice, separation, resentment, and disconnection (Yeakley, 2011, p. 27), whereas positive change processes promote increased comfort, connection, understanding different perspectives, and understanding of identity (Yeakley, 2011, p. 26).

A key component of facilitation is practicing multipartiality (Gurin et al., 2013; Wing & Rifkin, 2001). Multipartiality was coined by Wing and Rifkin (2001) as a means of mediation where identity is always shaping the conflict. This means that facilitators strive to be neither partial

23

nor impartial but to notice and name systems of oppression (Gurin et al., 2013; Wing & Rifkin, 2001). The facilitators surface and comment on what is happening in the room related to systems of oppression. This is particularly critical as I consider how RAs can disrupt microaggressions and racial issues in the residence halls, because RAs are trained to be neutral in practice, which can invalidate the students of color's experience.

The pedagogical features are supported by Critical-Dialogic Theory, which IGD uses to promote communication processes in intergroup interaction. "Dialogic" refers to the communication process with emphasis on relationship building while "critical" refers to the examination of structural inequities. This is grounded in Freire's (1970/2000) work on critical consciousness and draws directly on Critical Race Theory. This model seeks to build on diversity and social justice education, while addressing a gap between them (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). Nagda and Gurin (2007) argued "what is missing from these two approaches [diversity and social justice education] is an explicit focus on cross-group interaction in the classroom as a crucial nexus of learning" (p. 36). This model seeks to draw on relationship-building in communication processes, while always situating systems of inequity in the conversation (Gurin et al., 2013; Nagda & Gurin, 2007). This is done through three components – analysis of power and oppression, "discursive engagement across difference" (Nagda & Gurin, 2007, p. 36), and sustained community building (Nagda & Gurin, 2007).

This framework recognizes the challenges of engaging across difference and focuses on ongoing conversations (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). "Critical consciousness cannot be imposed on students, nor is it immediate; it is both developmental and cyclical in nature" (Nagda & Gurin, 2007, p. 36). All activities in IGD are framed through a lens of structural inequity, but students are provided with affirming and challenging environments to personally engage with identity and

inequity. Another component key to fostering the community environment is discursive engagement. Students learn the differences between debate, discussion, and dialogue (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). Emphasis is placed on learning how to be in dialogue, and this leads to appreciating difference, engaging self, critical self-reflection, and alliance building that serve as the processes for the framework (Gurin et al., 2013; Nagda & Gurin, 2007). The final component focuses on sustained community and conflict engagement. Through ongoing conversation, the group learns from one another while surfacing and engaging conflict. In fact, conflict is embraced. Participants learn together how conflict can lead to deeper learning (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). These components work to create a cyclical and ongoing process to support students as they explore their own identity, learn about others, and realize the structural inequities permeating our systems through conversations across difference. This framework provides an approach to support RA development and engagement in equity conversations.

2.3.3 Challenges with IGD Implementation

IGD outcomes are robust due to its intentional pedagogy, but most campus models use a specific curriculum where groups from two social identities are brought together to engage in sustained dialogue over a prolonged time (Gurin et al., 2013). These programs experience challenges – whether following the traditional form of a dialogue class focused on one identity, an approach that looks more generally at systems of oppression like the Thakral (2016) study or an adapted approach that uses IGD skills for an employment class (Petryk et al., 2013). For the purpose of this inquiry, this section will review the challenges faced by the University of Michigan when implementing IGD skills within their residence staff program.

The University of Michigan's Housing Residence Education department partnered with the Program on Intergroup Relations and a faculty member to create an academic course required for all RAs (Petryk et al., 2013). The course created an experiential learning space with "four modules: identity development, power and privilege in intergroup relations, working through conflict, and communication and ally development" (Petryk et al., 2013, p. 71). These were based off the four-stage process of IGD with a specific focus on illuminating structural systems of oppression and helping RAs understand the role they play in fostering inclusive communities (Petryk et al., 2013). The course offered a path to addressing inclusion in the residence halls, but it did not come without challenges. The course aimed to explore social identities, and it could have been challenging for students to understand this with an intersectional lens. Specifically, "… students often default to focusing on their marginalized identities rather than those where advantages are awarded" (Petryk et al., 2013, p. 75). Helping RAs understand their privileged identities is a crucial step in helping them to foster inclusive communities. Thinking one-dimensionally can lead to students perpetuating microaggressions and lack of understanding of the diverse experiences of their residents.

Another challenge is the contradiction students experience between their personal values and the values of the office (Petryk et al., 2013). Authors noted the importance of having clear social justice policies, practices, and values before embarking on a course, which is particularly relevant when employees are faced with value incongruences. Petryk et al. (2013) used the example of a student with a religious identity that conflicts with LGBTQ identity. This is important to discuss with RAs because Residence Life expects RAs to demonstrate ally behaviors (Petryk et al., 2013). Students are encouraged to think deeply about their values and whether the position is right for them (Petryk et al., 2013). Another challenge is that many students view conflict as

negative (Petryk et al., 2013), yet it is a natural part of residence life (Blimling, 2010). Moreover, there is a need to surface how identity plays a role in conflict (Petryk et al, 2013; Wing & Rifkin, 2001). The final challenge Michigan faced was linking what RAs learned in the class with their daily experience in their position. This is an ongoing challenge and needs to be intentionally connected to the supervision of the RAs throughout the year (Petryk et al., 2013).

2.4 Resident Assistant Training and Development

The RA role is crucial to higher education (Blimling, 2010, 2015). In fact, Blimling (2015) asserted that RAs are "the backbone" (p. 177) of any residential life program; they serve as the "frontline" (p. 162) staff who support residents through conflict, homesickness, and overall adjustment to campus life (Blimling, 2010, 2015). Residence life success depends on the quality of the RA staff; therefore, training must be done thoughtfully and strategically (Blimling, 2015). This section reviews the skills RAs need, training topics, and current practices in RA diversity training.

2.4.1 RA Skills

RAs have multi-faceted roles. They are often asked to be a little of everything: "counselors, friends, confidants, role models, programmers, administrators, rule enforcers, and conflict mediators" (Blimling, 2015, p. 162). This position is one of the most demanding on college campuses and research suggests that there are many skills needed to be successful as an RA and peer leader (Blimling, 2010, 2015; Karim & Ross, 2010). Blimling (2010) provided a skill list

needed for all RAs, including conceptual application, counseling, administrative, teaching, leadership, crisis management, and building relationships. The skills were tied to commitments of practice including a commitment to multiculturalism (Blimling, 2010). Blimling has argued that RAs need to be open and accessible to students who are different from themselves. This includes building intergroup understanding around social identities such as race, gender, sexual orientation, and religion.

RAs must build their cultural competence to be successful (Blimling, 2010, 2015; Karim & Ross, 2010). Karim and Ross (2010) argued that cultural competence is critical for peer leaders and defined cultural as the "infinitely complex, continually changing influences of background and preferences on the thoughts and behaviors of people and groups of people" (p. 58). Moreover, it is the responsibility of higher education institutions to provide inclusive spaces for all people (Karim & Ross, 2010). Developing cultural competence will help RAs understand the complexity of privilege and oppression, including critically engaging with how prejudice and discrimination show up within the campus community, specifically within the residence halls. Karim and Ross (2010) provided principles for cultural proficiency for peer leaders, including RAs. These five principles aim to explore assumptions, help leaders learn to suspend judgement, create an understanding for context and content, increase comfort with the discomfort, and foster curiosity. This helps peer leaders understand their own identity, the effect of stereotypes, and what prejudices they hold themselves while grappling with how their own identity and bias influences them and others (Karim & Ross, 2010). Obtaining the skills, confidence, and comfort is not easy, which is why training is a critical process.

2.4.2 Training

The varying and demanding roles of the RA position can make designing impactful trainings challenging (Whitney, Early, & Whisler, 2016). Professional staff must juggle training RAs for these multiple roles, but ultimately training should help RAs build their confidence, promote skill development, and assist with judgment and decision making (Blimling, 2015). There are several types of training RAs can experience: pre-service, in-service, and academic courses (Blimling, 2015). Pre-service trainings typically take place a few weeks prior to the start of the year. They are intense, two to three week experiences that cover a wide range of topics (Blimling, 2015). In-service trainings happen throughout the RA's employment and include one to two-hour sessions. The final area, and most relevant to this study, are academic courses. Academic courses happen in advance of or during employment and are credit-bearing (Blimling, 2015). Koch (2016) found in her study that these courses have been on the decline along with shifts in topics over the past 15 years.

Koch (2016) also found that there was little research in the last 15 years on the design of training programs. This is most concerning given the nature of the role and the critical aspect RAs play to the health of quality residential programs (Blimling, 2015). Koch (2016) sought to better understand training programs by using the Bowman and Bowman (1995) study on training topics specifically within an academic course. Koch (2016) found five similar topics covered when compared to Bowman and Bowman (1995): community development, peer helping and counseling skills, communication skills, leadership, and time management. There was an increase in "six topics – leadership, conflict resolution, ethics and professionalism, goal-setting, history of residence life, and homesickness" (Koch, 2016, p. 87) while seven topics declined. Most prevalent for this study is the decline in racism and diversity topics within academic courses (Koch, 2016).

This is most concerning because research suggests that diversity should be included as a key area for RA training (Blimling, 2010; Karim & Ross, 2010) and undergraduate students are becoming more racially diverse (Eagan et al., 2016).

2.4.3 Diversity Training

It is difficult to find research on the effects of RA diversity trainings despite research suggesting diversity is a critical training area (Blimling, 2010, 2015; Karim & Ross, 2010). Johnson (2003) highlighted the differential experiences between students of color and their white peers and found that students of color were more likely to perceive a negative racial climate. This later inspired the development of the Resident Assistant Cultural Diversity instrument (Johnson & Kang, 2006) where results suggested that the university setting, staff racial composition, and recruitment efforts may influence RA confidence, but there was no connection between a specific training enhancing confidence (Kang, Johnson, & Thompson, 2011).

While finding research on specific training measures is challenging, there are some to consider. As previously discussed, Petryk et al. (2013) have found success with a residence life student staff class at the University of Michigan modeled on IGD skills and pedagogy. The class is not without challenges, and the authors discuss the importance of value congruence with the course, which suggests social justice values must be modeled at every level within the residential life program – mission, vision, hiring practices, and programs – to ensure support of the class. Cook and McCoy (2017) echoed the importance of congruence with values and content in their study that explored the experiences of 12 white RAs who engaged in 12 hours of diversity and social justice training. The researchers discussed unintended outcomes experienced by white RAs including retreating into whiteness and "a deeper retreat into colorblindness" (Cook & McCoy,

2017, p. 77). The design of their training program included affinity groups where students were asked to gather with the other RAs of the same racial identity for the training. Despite being told the benefits, white students felt stunned and concerned that they were practicing segregation (Cook & McCoy, 2017). The response to affinity groups was overwhelmingly discussed in their research study and found to lead to further retreat into colorblindness (Cook & McCoy, 2017). This study illustrated the importance of understanding the implications and importance of structure when planning trainings. IGD also uses affinity groups but with different results. Student participants in IGD dialogue classes can be resistant at first, but ultimately found the benefits; however, affinity groups are not introduced until a later stage after students have spent significant time with one another (Gurin et al., 2013). This structured approach with content learning demonstrates how similar activities can have different approaches and outcomes.

Research demonstrates that building RAs' cultural competence and understanding of diversity and racial issues is critical (Blimling, 2010, 2015; Kang et al., 2011; Karim & Ross, 2010), yet there is a gap on understanding the impact of different strategies for doing so. Petryk et al. (2013) discussed the importance of value congruence and Cook and McCoy (2017) reminded us of the unintended consequences that may be experienced. This should be used to inform practice, but more research is needed to understand how specific programs can affect the development of these skills.

2.5 Conclusion

It is crucial that higher education critically engage RAs in training and dialogue to foster inclusive residential communities. Research shows that students of color are facing a hostile racial

climate when living on campus (Harwood et al., 2012). The United States is becoming increasingly more racially diverse (Colby & Ortman, 2015) and multicultural competency is a critical skill area for RAs (Blimling, 2010; Karim & Ross, 2010), yet training on diversity has declined within academic courses in recent years (Koch, 2016). This review of literature has demonstrated the problematic campus racial climate students face through the impact of racial microaggression and the inability of higher education practitioners and scholars to name racism, reviewed research on IGD, and discussed RA training and development. It is increasingly important that PWIs move through their discomfort to promote equity and help everyone understand the experiences of students of color.

3.0 Chapter 3

3.1 Methodology

This inquiry explored the racial and social justice knowledge and skills that new resident assistants (RAs) developed through an employment class. I led the curriculum redesign to utilize intergroup dialogue (IGD) skills and pedagogy in spring 2019 and instructed the new curriculum in my previous position as Assistant Dean of Students, along with the Assistant Director of Residence Life, in fall 2019. The new curriculum aimed to help RAs foster more inclusive residential communities through the development of IGD skills and using IGD pedagogy. This inquiry was grounded in race; however, the class was designed more broadly to promote understanding of systems of oppression and the role of identity in the residence halls. I grounded the inquiry in race for two reasons: reports of racial microaggressions and the importance of racism in social justice work. First, I came to this inquiry due to numerous reported incidents of racial microaggressions within the residence halls. Second, and most importantly, racism is the "ism" that lays the foundation to all others (Ladson-Billings, 1996). It is key we keep race on the agenda when discussing systems of oppression, given the historical context of the treatment of racially minoritized people (Ladson-Billings, 1996).

The following questions guided this inquiry:

1. In what ways do intergroup dialogue skills explored in an RA employment class at Chatham University promote passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge about racial and social justice?

2. Is there a change in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice over the course of an employment class?

3.2 Inquiry Setting

Chatham University is a small, private institution located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Chatham offers both undergraduate and graduate programs, with 41 undergraduate degree programs, 26 master's degree programs, and four doctoral degree programs. The total enrollment is 2,437, with approximately 1,400 undergraduate students (Chatham University, n.d.). Chatham is a predominately white institution (PWI) in that most of its undergraduate enrollment identifies as white; only 13% of the student population are students of color. Chatham also transitioned from an all-women's college to a fully co-educational undergraduate program in fall 2015. While the graduate population was already co-educational, this represented a significant change for the community. At the time of the study, approximately 73% of undergraduate students identified as female and 27% identified as male. Chatham's full-time faculty and staff was also predominately white (88.5%); only 11.5% identified as people of color.

Chatham has seen a mostly steady increase in retention since 2010, but the retention of students of color has been inconsistent and always remained significantly lower than white students (Chatham University, 2017) until the 2017-2018 academic year where there was an increase in student of color retention. Specifically, the retention rate for students of color was 87.5% compared to white students at 81%. While this was promising, it dipped back below the overall student retention rate in the 2018-2019 year at 78% compared to white students at 80%. In

addition, the two-year retention rate has also shown a consistent drop for students of color when compared to white students.

Retention efforts at Chatham have largely focused on all students with little attention paid specifically to students of color until Chatham hired its first Director of Multicultural Affairs in 2017 who was later promoted to Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in 2020. Retention strategies for racially minoritized students have included a peer program for students of color, but until recently there had been few efforts to address the campus culture and the attitudes of white students, faculty, and staff. In spring 2016, Student Affairs hosted a candid conversation between students of color and Student Affairs staff to discuss the experiences of students of color in response to complaints and a student newspaper article about the lack of support. Chatham students of color shared experiences with microaggressions and racism both inside and outside the classroom with their peers, faculty, and staff. These reports have continued, and the 2018 commencement undergraduate student speaker used her time to go off script and share the hardships of being a student of color, including Chatham's failure to act when racism does happen. Some administrators, faculty, and staff have been quick to discredit the speaker's comments, yet the continuation of informal reports coupled with the varying retention from year to year suggest a problem with the racial climate. Over the course of the 2018-2019 academic year the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (previously Multicultural Affairs) received complaints about microaggressions experienced within the residence halls, while other residence life staff dealt with the mistreatment and bullying of students of color in one of the residence halls. Through these reports, we learned students of color are frustrated with the climate and experienced further microaggressions when turning to their RAs for support.

Due to these reports, the Office of Residence Life partnered with the Intergroup Dialogue program (IGD) at Chatham to promote social and racial justice skill development using IGD pedagogy through the curriculum redesign of the RA employment class, IND 245: Fostering Inclusive Communities in Residential Settings (formerly SDE 138: Peer Educator Training). The former course was more general in its approach whereas the new curriculum focused on developing IGD skills to aid RAs in their ability to create more inclusive spaces within the residence halls. I led the curriculum redesign based off a similar class at the University of Michigan (Petryk et al., 2013) due to my dual role with Residence Life and IGD. The Office of Residence Life reported directly through me, as the Assistant Dean of Students, within the Division of Student Affairs. The Office of Residence Life employed 29 RAs in the 2019-2020 academic year. Over the last five years, Residence Life has focused on recruiting a more diverse staff, but the staff remains predominately white. For the 2019-2020 academic year, five RAs identified as students of color and the remaining identified as white. Sixteen students took the course as first-time RAs and of those, two were students of color.

Chatham launched the IGD program in 2017, which is a peer-to-peer program aimed at helping students talk across difference (Gurin et al., 2013). Traditional IGD models aim to bring together social identity groups who have historical conflict (e.g., white and people of color; men, women, and non-binary folk; heterosexual and homosexual, etc.) in equal numbers to participate in a sustained dialogue over the course of one term (Gurin et al., 2013). Chatham has sent eight faculty and staff members to the University of Michigan's Intergroup Relations IGD Institute from 2016-2019 and hosted a two-day training with facilitators from Michigan in 2017 for 40 students, faculty, and staff to help launch the program. The curricular component began in fall 2017 with IND 246/PSY 646: Intergroup Dialogue Facilitator Training. This class trained 10 facilitators and

helped form our co-curricular component, The Learning Edge, where any office or group on campus can request facilitators to lead a workshop. Two members from the class went on to facilitate for IND 247/PSY 647: Intergroup Dialogue: Race. In the 2018-2019 academic year, the facilitator class was offered for the second time, and the program increased to two dialogue classes (race and gender) for the spring term. Both dialogue classes continued to be offered in the spring 2020 term. This program has grown quickly and receives support from advisors who encourage their students to enroll. The IGD team moved forward with the introduction of the RA employment class and hopes to craft a plan to move toward offering more dialogue classes in the future. The university also plans to utilize the curriculum within our education program both with students who are training to be teachers and in our K-12 learning programs. Infusing IGD skills with the RA employment class was a natural fit to help RAs develop a better understanding of their own identity, systems of oppression, and help them develop skills to create a more inclusive residential space.

3.3 Researcher's Reflexivity

Understanding my own identity was critical as I engaged in this inquiry. I am a white, heterosexual, cisgender woman. My identities influenced how I entered the space as a researcher and instructor. While I have experienced oppressed identities through my gender and my past socioeconomic status, my identity most relevant to this study was my race. I am committed to anti-racist work, but my experiences are shaped from a lens of privilege. DiAngelo (2018) powerfully reminded white individuals that no matter how much effort, learning, or engagement we may pursue, we will always be shaped by our lens within a white supremacist society. I try my best to

be conscious of my actions and how it relates to race, but I commit microaggressions myself. My white identity was crucial to consider in terms of my role as researcher and instructor. Both my co-instructor and I were white, and we strived to engage in critical thought about how we shaped the class dialogues around race. We wanted to be mindful of our racial identity while also recognizing the power of engaging in race work as a white person in a predominately white space. Too often, white people resist seeing issues through a racial lens (DiAngelo, 2018; Sue & Constantine, 2007), and we hoped to role model what it looks like to confront systems of oppression to the RAs. Moreover, people are socialized not to talk about race (DiAngelo, 2018; Tatum, 2017), and specifically, white people become uncomfortable and resistant when asked to talk about race (DiAngelo, 2018; Goodman, 2011; Sue & Constantine, 2007). I hope discussing race and sharing our own struggles as white people helped the RAs engage in more thought about their role with race and social justice.

Equity and inclusion are central to my professional work and personal commitments. I have worked at Chatham University for over 10 years and have held several positions that have helped me think more deeply about my role in inclusion. I was promoted from Assistant Dean of Students to Dean of Students following the completion of the class while I was finishing this inquiry. This change did not impact the inquiry; however, my expanded role now includes providing leadership for the entire division, including the Office of Residence Life, Office of Student Engagement, Office of Counseling Services, and Office of Health Services. Over the course of my time at Chatham, I have continually engaged in equity work in a variety of responsibilities. In the past, I have led programming efforts and oversaw our student of color retention program. Currently, I serve as a staff network member for our student of color retention program, assist with training programs, and I am a member of the IGD instructional team. I co-led efforts in 2017 to bring

38

representatives from the University of Michigan to campus for a student, faculty, and staff two-day training. This helped launch Chatham's IGD program where I served as a co-instructor for the facilitator class in fall 2018 and oversaw the gender dialogue class in the spring 2019 term. These experiences, combined with the continued reports of racial issues, led me to rethink the RA employment class with the Office of Residence Life. I served as a resource and provided training to the RAs, but I had not taught the class since I served as the Director of Residence Life in 2015. I re-engaged as a co-instructor due to my role as a member of the instructional staff with the Chatham IGD program.

3.4 Inquiry Approach / Methods

In this inquiry, I used a mixed methods approach which enabled me to better understand the inquiry questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Mertens, 2015). Through this inquiry I conducted a convergent design where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed within the same period; themes and findings from the two were compared to provide context and further understanding (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Mertens, 2015). I used improvement science to complement the mixed methods approach through a pre- and post-survey format using the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators (Appendix C) and document analysis using student journals. Improvement science intentionally includes the intervention and the knowledge of the system in which it takes place (Lewis, 2015). Many times, a successful intervention is replicated within a new system, but the intervention fails to consider the new system and how this will influence success (Lewis, 2015). Improvement science seeks to incorporate knowledge from both the intervention and system by

understanding that success in one system may need to be modified and/or redesigned to find success in another system (Lewis, 2015). In this inquiry, I introduced a new curriculum for the employment class required for all new RAs during the fall term of their first year. The class curriculum focused on building inclusive communities using IGD pedagogy. IGD is a distinct intervention that typically focuses on one identity and brings equal numbers of the privileged and oppressed group from said identity to learn to talk across difference while always centering systems of oppression (Gurin et al., 2013). This intervention has many successes and presented an opportunity to help RAs learn across difference and gain skill development, but the intervention needed to fit the system at Chatham University. Through improvement science, I modified the intervention to meet the needs of my system (Lewis, 2015).

Improvement science uses the plan, do, study, act (PDSA) cycle as the model for change (Langley et al., 2009; Lewis, 2015). The process starts with planning: identifying goals, intervention, and determining data collection methods. It then moves to do where the plan is enacted. Problems or concerns may be observed, and data collection begins in this phase. In the third step, the researcher studies what happens through reviewing data and summarizing what was learned. The final stage is act where the researcher identifies changes and thinks about the next cycle (Langley et al., 2009). The process can occur rapidly or more slowly depending on the project and intervention (Langley et al., 2009; Lewis, 2015). In this inquiry, I completed one PDSA cycle (see Table 1) with the concluding act cycle providing a report and suggested improvements for future iterations of the class.

Table 1. Plan, Do, Study, Act Cycle Overview

Area of Cycle	Study Overview
Plan	Consulted with Residence Life and IGD staff
	Designed curriculum
	Curriculum approved by Chatham Undergraduate Programs Committee
	Designed classes
Do	Implemented new curriculum in Fall 2019
	Requested consent for study following grade submissions
Study	Reviewed the pre- and post-PASK using descriptive statistics
	Coded and analyzed student journals
Act	Prepared a final report as part of my demonstration of excellence that included four key findings and recommendations for future classes
	Approved to present findings at a practitioner-based conference (cancelled due to COVID-19)

The planning phase began through the redesign of the curriculum based on a similar class at the University of Michigan (Petryk et al., 2013), and the new curriculum was approved by the Chatham University Undergraduate Programs Committee in spring 2019 for implementation in fall 2019. This process involved having conversations with the Office of Residence Life, Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and IGD partners about the concerns we have seen related to race in the residence halls and how IGD can be used within the class. I led the redesign of the curriculum after determining a more in-depth training was needed through the RA employment class.

In the fall, I moved to the do phase of the cycle where the new class curriculum was executed. Following the completion of the class, I studied the intervention using the PASK assignment as a pre- and post-measure and analyzed two student journals. Based off the study, I make recommendations in chapter five and through an internal report on the future iterations of the class. This inquiry helped RAs reflect more on their own identities, reflect on social and racial

justice, and strived to help RAs create a more inclusive community for minoritized students, thus impacting their ability to succeed. This inquiry thought about the larger system and used interventions with the RAs to strive to improve said system.

3.4.1 Sample

The inquiry's participants were first-time RAs at Chatham University enrolled in IND 245: Fostering Inclusive Residential Communities. All new RAs are required to take this class as a condition of their employment. Sixteen students participated in the class and 15 consented to the inquiry: 10 sophomores, four juniors, and one senior. Most students identified as white, which is similar to the returning RAs. Specifically, two were students of color and 13 were white. In this context, students of color referred to any student who self-identified as Black or African American, Latino/Chicano, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian American, Multiracial, or Native/American/Indigenous in the social identity survey that all RAs completed prior to the training (Appendix D). Additionally, most of the sample were cisgender women (9) with five cisgender men and one trans-man, and all respondents identified as heterosexual.

Table 2. Resident Assistant Sample

Student	Pseudonym	Pronouns	Student	Pseudonym	Pronouns
Student1	Jake	He/him/his	Student9	Renee	She/her/hers
Student2	Angela	She/her/hers	Student10	Jessica	She/her/hers
Student3	Nick	He/him/his	Student11	Preston	He/him/his
Student4	Carey	She/her/hers	Student12	Kadence	She/her/hers
Student5	Jill	She/her/hers	Student13	Amy	She/her/hers
Student6	Ben	He/him/his	Student14	Jenna	She/her/hers
Student7	Ken	He/him/his	Student15	Jack	He/him/his
Student8	Izzy	She/her/hers			

Students were asked to provide consent for the study in mid-December 2019 after final grades were submitted. This ensured there was no bias related to my dual role as instructor and researcher. Students were sent a recruitment email (Appendix E) following the grade submissions with the option of declining participation. I followed up with an in-person review of the study on January 3, 2020 during spring training. At this time, I read the consent script (Appendix F), explained the process to withdraw, and answered questions. The data used – the PASK and journals – were all part of their assignments for class so it was not completed anonymously, but all identifying information was removed. Additionally, RAs were asked to complete a social identity survey in advance of the August training (Appendix D). This survey is conducted every year as part of training activities with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion through Google forms and is shared with the Residence Life team. The survey from these data were matched to the students' PASK to provide demographic information for this inquiry. In chapter 4, pseudonyms are used for each student to discuss findings (see Table 2). Only preferred pronouns are used to protect student confidentiality.

3.4.2 Data Sources

My intervention with the RA class aimed to increase the students' awareness and abilities to foster an inclusive community using IGD pedagogy. This inquiry used a mixed methods approach through a pre- and post-survey and document analysis of student journals. Mixed methods "central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007, p. 5). The study used the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators (Appendix C) as the pre- and post-survey and document analysis of student journals in a

convergent mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). This approach helped to triangulate the data and gain a deeper understanding of how the students conceptualized race.

3.4.2.1 Quantitative Data Source

The quantitative data were collected via the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators which was adapted by the University of Michigan from the work of Beale et al. (2001) who explored using PASK as a framework for training peer facilitators. Students self-assessed their resources for social justice through 32 variables in four construct areas: passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge (Beale et al., 2001). Six to 10 statements contribute to each overarching area. Passion focuses on their personal commitment to the work; personal awareness speaks to understanding their own identities and how it influences their group memberships; skills focuses on building capacity to take action; and knowledge "is defined as the information people need to be able to see and act beyond their own individual experience" (Beale et al., 2001, p. 229).

The PASK helped students reflect on their attitudes in terms of their personal resources through a five-point scale ranging from acknowledging they did not have this resource to feeling comfortable and to recognizing they can be a resource for others. This helped the RAs think about social justice in terms of their resources and how they can support others, which is a component of their position. RAs are not traditional IGD peer facilitators, but they do play the role of facilitators within their communities (Blimling, 2010, 2015). Reflecting in terms of the resources they have or need can help students seek support through the process. Moreover, Chatham's overall commitment to diversity and inclusion, combined with the Residence Life department's commitment, created an additional support as well as communicated the expectations to RAs that they must practice inclusive and ally behaviors in their role. Petryk et al. (2013) highlighted the importance of a commitment to equity and inclusion when considering adding a residence life class

focused on inclusion. While this framework was created to support the peer facilitator role, the University of Michigan has also used it within their own Residence Life class (Bhagirathy & Chesler, 2019). It provided an opportunity for students to engage in self-reflection around their own identity and ability to engage in social justice work.

The PASK was given to the 15 participants in this inquiry two times over the course of the term. The first was done as a part of their first journal assignment during the first week of class, and the second was submitted the last week of class as part of their final paper. Students were asked to reflect on the PASK and the role it plays in fostering inclusive communities. The PASK results were transferred to SPSS to assist with analyses. The PASK uses closed-ended questions, which are beneficial to the research because they assist in focusing the participant on the topic of the study (Johnson & Morgan, 2016). The PASK is not a survey tool and is used to help students reflect on themselves, but this inquiry used it as a survey tool. I chose to use it as a survey tool because it provided a framework that can help comprehend RA understanding of social justice in terms of their passion, awareness, skills, and knowledge. Moreover, the scale format created a conducive survey.

3.4.2.2 Qualitative Data Source

The PASK centered on how the RAs understood and/or grew in the areas of passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of social justice in terms of their resources, but one major limitation, as it related to this inquiry, is its lack of focus on race. The qualitative data, therefore, were used to directly address race and helped to contextualize what was learned from the PASK. The class had a broader focus on privilege and oppression, but this inquiry focused on learning about how RAs were thinking about both social and racial justice. Students were asked to complete journals to reflect and share what they learned. One of the prompts analyzed centered

race through the RA reflection of perpetrating a racial microaggression, but the other prompt was raceless and students had the choice on whether to discuss race. The raceless prompt provided insight on whether and how students chose to discuss race without a specific prompt, but there was risk that no one would opt to discuss race.

Specifically, I used two journals to understand how the students were understanding race and racism (see prompts – Appendix G). The first journal prompt used was the participants' "testimonial." Testimonials are used within IGD to help students explore their own identity through storytelling. Students were asked to share and discuss a privileged and marginalized identity. The testimonial helped them reflect on how they have come to understand their identity (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012). This prompt was raceless, which means it did not force the student to reflect on their racial identity. There was a risk that no students would discuss race, but it provided insight on whether they were willing to discuss race. The journal came one-third of the way through the class during week five after considerable discussion and readings about race. I reviewed the journals to see how many students chose to discuss race and used deductive coding with the PASK framework (see Appendix H for full codebook). The second journal used was given in week 10 about perpetrating racial microaggressions. Reported racial microaggressions contributed to the development of the course; therefore, students were asked to reflect on a time they perpetuated a racial microaggression, what they have learned about racism, and how racial microaggressions impact their residents. This was the only qualitative prompt that used race specifically.

3.4.3 Data Analysis

I used descriptive statistics to summarize and examine the data for the PASK (Holcomb, 1998). In this process I described what the data showed through the use of a scale means and standard deviation after the PASK was converted to a numerical scale (Holcomb, 1998; Johnson & Morgan, 2016). The PASK included four construct areas: passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills. Each area had statements that contributed to a deeper understanding of the overall construct (Johnson & Morgan, 2016). In this inquiry, I converted statements to numerical values. A scale from one to five was assigned to the statements where one represented "I do not have this resource" to five which represented "I can be a resource for others". The data were then transferred and analyzed using SPSS. The converted data represented equal interval data (Holcomb, 1998), which were used to create a mean and standard deviation for each statement. In my analysis, I used statements in each construct area to create an overall mean for the four constructs and an overall mean for the entire PASK. These data analyses were completed for both the pre- and post-PASK, and descriptive statistics were used to compare the means between the pre- and post-PASK. This allowed me to understand whether the RAs progressed throughout the course in their passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills for social justice. I specifically compared the pre- and post-PASK overall mean, each construct mean, and the means of each variable to see which had the most improvement. This was later used to compare and further understand the findings from the journals.

I analyzed two student journals for the qualitative side of the inquiry through coding. Saldaña (2016) shared, "A code is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data" (p. 4). Coding mostly followed a deductive process where codes were pre-

determined using the PASK with specific attention to race (Miles et al., 2014). The PASK was used to create twelve initial codes under the four major categories: passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge. These codes were intentionally focused on race to address the gap in the PASK. For example, "Clarity about my identity(ies)" is one prompt in the PASK and was used to create a code for "Clarity of Racial Identity". I was also responsive to emergent themes and added two codes based on what I noticed, which resulted in two additional codes for color-neutral and resistance. The complete codebook is available in Appendix H. The coding process included an initial review to look for codes developed related to the PASK and additional themes. Journals and initial codes were then uploaded to Dedoose, a software that helped me sort and code data. Codes were revised through a second and third review of data assisted by Dedoose. I initially coded manually in Word based on Saldaña's (2016) recommendation that it can help one become more familiar with the process. Following with the Dedoose software helped me organize and make connections with the data.

Following the coding process, I used counting (Miles et al., 2014) to understand which codes were more prevalent than others and compared them to the findings from the PASK. In addition, I counted each time a student used a reference, video, or activity in their journal to understand how IGD pedagogy, specifically content learning and structured interactions, influenced the RA's learning. Major themes emerged when I compared the data. My choice to complete a convergent mixed methods approach resulted in me analyzing the data separately but coming together in the analysis to compare (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

3.5 Limitations

This inquiry had limitations. Participants self-disclosed their attitudes through the PASK survey, and there are limitations with using a survey to measure attitudes (Mertens, 2015). RAs may have over or underestimated their passion, awareness, skill, and / or knowledge (Berger, 2016; Mertens, 2015). However, the use of qualitative data helped to further understand the findings, but all materials used were from class assignments. The two instructors of the course each had supervision responsibilities for the participants, which created an additional layer of power dynamics. While participants were not asked to consent to the study until after grades were submitted, the results may still have been influenced because they may have responded with what they thought the instructors wanted to see rather than how they felt. Survey participants may not have told the truth, because they feared what the researcher would think about them (Berger, 2016). Students could have also written their journals based on what they thought we wanted to hear. This dynamic was further exacerbated because of the instructors' supervisory role.

Two other limitations in this inquiry related to the use of the PASK for the survey measure. First, the PASK was not designed to a be a quantitative survey, and scales were not the traditional Likert-type scales. These had to be adapted to be used as a quantitative measure. The second limitation is that the PASK did not directly address race, but this inquiry was grounded in race. The PASK focused on social justice. Written assignments were used to understand how students were thinking about race; however, one prompt was raceless. There was risk that no students would discuss race, but this allowed me to understand whether the students explored race. The second prompt directly included race so it provided data to analyze related to race, but making connections about race to the PASK was challenging. The final limitation was the use of solely descriptive

statistics when using a pre- and post-measure. This study did not determine whether the differences between the pre- and post-scores were statistically significant.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the methodology for this inquiry. The researcher's epistemology and reflexivity were discussed; this study followed a mixed methods approach through a pre- and post-measure and document analysis of written assignments. The approach was informed by pragmatic views and influenced by the transformative paradigm. A detailed overview of the setting at a PWI with both formal and informal reports of a hostile racial climate were discussed along with an overview of the sample and demographic characteristics. This study used the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators and student journals as the data sources. The PASK measured RA attitudes toward their personal resources with social justice in four concept areas – passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge – and provided a framework for understanding RA growth as facilitators in creating an inclusive community. The journals were coded related to race and IGD pedagogy features and used to contextualize and understand the findings from the PASK.

4.0 Chapter 4

4.1 Findings

This inquiry investigated the influence of a required employment course that infused intergroup dialogue (IGD) pedagogy on resident assistants' (RAs) passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills for racial and social justice. The goal of the class aspired to improve RA skill development related to social and racial justice; however, the outcome of the findings suggest movement in areas of personal awareness related to social and racial identities. This chapter describes the quantitative and qualitative findings that were analyzed separately and then converged to enhance an understanding of the core inquiry questions. Specifically, I sought to explore if there were changes in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice over the course of an employment class, as well as the ways that the intergroup dialogue skills helped to promote passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge about racial and social justice.

In this chapter I begin by concentrating on the quantitative results by focusing on each core area—passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge – using descriptive statistics. I then integrate the findings from the quantitative data and the findings from the qualitative data to make sense of the participants' growth in these four areas through a racial lens. In this section I aim to understand the student self-rating and reflections to determine whether the course promoted a change in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice. Then I move on to explore the second inquiry question related to how IGD skills and pedagogy promote RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice.

51

It is important to note, this inquiry aspired to explore and understand social and racial justice, but the findings suggest an understanding of social identities, prevalently racial identities. I had hoped to see more action moving towards a social and racial justice mindset; however, using the PASK and selected journals centered the findings on the RAs' personal awareness. Understanding of one's own identity is critical in social justice work, but the journals were coded to specifically look at race, which meant there was less to understand through the qualitative data collection about other social identities. This inquiry was grounded in race and further inquiry will be needed to better understand how RAs reflected on their social identities in addition to race.

4.2 Change in RAs' Passion, Personal Awareness Skills, and Knowledge

Fifteen participants took both the pre- and post-PASK with RAs showing overall growth in the PASK score from ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 0.42$) in the pre-measure to ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.43$) in the post-measure. RAs showed improvement overall in the PASK in each area: passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge (see Table 3). These data are promising and suggest RA change in their resources for social justice; however, the PASK presents limitations in understanding whether students saw change in their understanding and engagement in social justice work. Further, students showed a greater change in passion, personal awareness, and knowledge, and less improvement in skills, which suggests students did not move towards "action," which is critical in social justice work (Bell, 2016; Landreman, 2013). Despite the limitations of using the PASK, there are promising findings that can help understand RA development over the course and implications for future iterations of the class.

Table 3. Change in Focal Variables from Pre- to Post-PASK

	Pre-PASK		Post-PASK		Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference
Passion	3.86	0.48	4.52	0.37	0.66
Personal Awareness	3.71	0.57	4.23	0.43	0.52
Skills	3.85	0.63	4.10	0.61	0.25
Knowledge	3.26	0.71	4.05	0.68	0.79
Overall PASK	3.70	0.42	4.21	0.43	0.51

The PASK data were analyzed overall, within the four areas, and by looking at each of the 32 variables. The PASK data show improvement in 31 of the 32 variables; the one variable without improvement was in the skills area. Students saw a half point (0.50) improvement in half of the variables (16/32). These improvements all fall in the passion, personal awareness, and knowledge focal areas. Notably, improvement was much smaller in the area of skills. In fact, this was the focal variable that had the least amount of improvement when compared to the others, which is concerning as this is critical to the RA role as a social justice advocate and ally. Table 4 provides a sample using data from the passion area. Full data are available in Appendix I.

Table 4. Change in Passion from Pre- to Post-PASK

	Pre-PASK		Post-PASK		Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference
Energy for this work	3.60	0.83	4.33	0.82	0.73
Can lead with my heart	3.93	0.96	4.60	0.51	0.67
Deep personal reason for doing this work	3.53	0.74	3.73	1.03	0.20
Commitment on a professional level	3.8	0.56	4.87	0.35	1.07
Commitment on a personal level	3.87	0.83	4.67	0.49	0.80
Can demonstrate compassion	4.40	0.74	4.93	0.26	0.53

The next section reviews each of the core areas – passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge – to understand whether gains were made overall and within individual areas. Qualitative data will be introduced while exploring each of the areas of the PASK to further understanding and introduce race into the results.

4.2.1 Passion

All areas of the PASK are meant to ground the students in a social justice lens as they complete the survey. Specifically, students were asked to rank themselves in terms of their personal resources related to passion for social justice in six areas. In the PASK, "Passion refers to the deep personal reasons and commitments facilitators (or any of us) have for caring about and doing this sort of work" (Beale, Thompson, & Chesler, 2001, p. 230). RAs showed significant gains in passion, moving from a score of ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.48$) to ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.37$). Passion variables looked at RAs' personal and professional commitment, energy to do social justice work, and ability to be compassionate. Improvement was seen in all individual variables that contribute to passion (Table 4). Students' "commitment on a professional level" jumped from ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.83$) during the pre-PASK to ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 0.35$) at the conclusion of the course. This class was created to better support RAs' support for students of color and other marginalized students and these data suggest that RAs are understanding the need to be inclusive of residents with different identities in their role as an RA.

This was further supported within the student journals when exploring race particularly in journal six where students were asked to reflect on a time where they perpetuated a racial microaggression and the impact racial microaggressions could have on their residents. Several students reflected on the importance of creating inclusive spaces. Ken reflected, "As an RA I need

to address these issues [racial microaggressions] to ensure that all of my residents feel safe and included." Moreover, students were demonstrating their professional commitment through references to materials that have furthered their thinking. Kadence referenced the assigned article, "Racial Microaggressions in the Residence Halls: Experiences of Students of Color at a Predominantly White University" by Harwood, Huntt, Mendenhall, and Lewis (2012), and took away that students of color "have a lower initial perception of the college where they are the minority," meaning students of color do not feel included. She went on to reflect,

> Chatham University is a predominately white community, and it is especially important to consider students of color in our residential communities . . . RA staff needs to make sure that they [students of color] feel included and that they belong on campus.

Students discussed inclusion, belonging, and their own awakening to the experiences of students with different identities to frame their commitment to doing this work; however, it is difficult to know if their passion for social justice truly improved as inclusion and belonging are not social justice terms. Students seemed to make a personal commitment and demonstrate an understanding of oppression without critically engaging in the work they would need to do to disrupt structural oppression. While this presents a limitation of the passion area in the PASK, arguably, the creation of the class is one way the institution is beginning to disrupt the structures of oppression that impact marginalized students. Raising RA professional commitment to issues of race, power, and privilege can foster more inclusive spaces.

RAs also showed improvement in the passion variable "energy for this work" with a ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.83$) pre-PASK score improving to ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.82$). RAs are the frontline staff for residence life, and it is critical that these student leaders have energy to engage in social justice, because, arguably, they could have the most direct impact on residents. Energy for work was also

illustrated in journal six where students reflected on being willing to demonstrate vulnerability by sharing their personal struggles with racism and desire to do better in the moment, which meant students wanted to be able to speak up in the moment or share their own growth. Nick reflected on previously thinking of himself as "good" for having a color neutral view. He now understands why color neutral is problematic but implored the need for RAs and privileged people being willing to share to help others and noted:

> By sharing a personal story of growth, it might be a way to crack through a hard shell, essentially, by showing that even people we look up to, like possibly RAs, make mistakes, but the important thing is to correct them, and choose to keep correcting them, day after day.

Nick's reflection shows his desire to share, which is important for facilitators within IGD (Beale et al., 2001). RAs were participants in this class and inquiry; however, we asked them to be facilitators and think specifically about how they impact their residential communities. In addition, it is promising to see his commitment to continue to correct daily actions, which demonstrated an understanding that this is an ongoing process. Jill also reflected on her desire to do better, sharing "I want to be able to correct myself in the moment, rather than not being able to do something hours later when I do recognize what my actions/speech/behaviors have done." RAs demonstrated a willingness to engage with their own behaviors through sharing and striving to recognize problematic behaviors such as having a color neutral view or enacting microaggressions, in the moment.

Journal three, submitted in week five of the class, was particularly enlightening as a raceless prompt where students did not have to reflect on their race. They were instructed to reflect on two identities (one privileged and one minoritized) and tell their story. Most students (9/15)

chose to reflect on their race. This suggests that students became more aware of race, racism, and their own racial identity as the class progressed. This was further supported in the journals where Izzy commented,

> I have a lot of work to do in becoming an ally and to change the racist views of my upbringings, but this class and being at Chatham has definitely made me more educated. I hope to be called out if any of my actions are discriminatory and grow from it to become a better ally.

Findings suggest that the class had an impact on RAs overall passion for learning about their own identities and the impact of said identities, particularly within their professional commitment, personal commitment, and energy. Quantitative findings suggest further growth in their resources for social justice related to energy for this work, commitment on personal and professional level, and demonstrating compassion. Again, these are not typically social justice terms, but the PASK frames the students to answer through a social justice lens.

4.2.2 Personal Awareness

The PASK uses personal awareness to help understand one's own identity and "is defined as the awareness of self as a member of a community, of a particular social group identity, and of self in social system marked by different levels of privilege and oppressions" (Beale et al., 2001, p. 228). RAs entered the class with a combined score of ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.57$) in personal awareness related to the resources they have for social justice, and this improved to ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.43$) at the end of the term. Personal awareness was measured by 10 variables in the PASK that focused on understanding one's identity (privileged and disadvantaged), the impact of said identity and personal style, clarity of values, and triggers. Table 5 shows a sample of the change in mean

scores from the pre-PASK to post-PASK for variables related to personal awareness. Full results are available in Appendix I. RAs showed change with "awareness of my privileged social identities" where the group had a pre-PASK score of ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.80$), and this increased to ($M = 4.6$, $SD = 0.51$). RAs also showed growth in "awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on others" with a ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.99$) pre-PASK score increasing to a ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 0.86$) post-PASK score.

Table 5. Change in Personal Awareness from Pre- to Post-PASK

	Pre-PASK		Post-PASK		Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference
Awareness of my privileged social identities	4.07	0.80	4.60	0.51	0.53
Awareness of my disadvantaged social identities	3.00	1.25	3.93	1.22	0.93
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on myself	3.80	0.94	4.33	0.62	0.53
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on others	3.53	0.99	4.20	0.68	0.67

The quantitative data suggest growth with the individual and structural understanding of social identities, and this was supported with the qualitative data where students often reflected on their own racial privilege. As Jenna reflected in journal three, "I have the advantage of being able to not think about my race every day." Students also began to clarify and reflect on their white racial identity as Ben shared, "I knew I was white, but I didn't see my childhood friends as non-white." Students also critically reflected on their awareness of their own bias. Jill used journal three to acknowledge her racial privilege and to broadly think about the importance of engaging herself around difference. She shared,

…The most important thing is how you choose to learn from these differences. Do you ask questions about why certain things are easier for [some] people compared to others? One example would be thinking of people with different identities walking home in the middle of the night. How are these people perceived by other people? Is there an identity that you would avoid because it is perceived as threatening? Do you question the stereotypes that exist for some people, but not others?

She began to surface questions to help her build awareness around her own bias. Other students began to understand how they personally contribute to a system. Jenna reflected that privilege "… puts me in a position in which my actions can easily continue to support the system in a way that benefits me and harms people of color."

Overall, students were able to raise their personal awareness around their identity, and many did this by reflecting on being color neutral. Color neutral is when a person believes they do not see color. Bonilla-Silva (2018) argued that color neutral racism is the "new racism" in America. We have moved to a much more subtle version of racism where color is simply dismissed to maintain a white supremacist society. This is damaging because it dismisses the experiences of people of color and the structural, racial oppression that is present in all facets of life (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; DiAngelo, 2018; Tatum, 2017). RAs reflected and acknowledged they grew up with a color neutral perspective, which means they were told or learned they were not supposed to see color. One third (5/15) of the RAs made comments in reference to being color neutral or being told to be color neutral at some point in their lives, but their awareness has been raised and they now understand this is problematic. Nick noted, "…I used to tell people that 'I didn't see color; the world was colorful tv in my eyes,' and that is a huge microaggression." Moreover, some RAs referenced a color neutral upbringing and college was the first time this perspective was

challenged. Izzy acknowledged "before coming to college, I was color [neutral]." These statements demonstrate growing understanding and engagement with racial issues, microaggressions, and the learning that students embark on when they enter college. RAs' personal awareness of being color neutral complemented PASK personal awareness findings where RAs saw growth in awareness and impact of their privileged identities.

4.2.3 Skills

Skills are an important outcome for this course, as RAs needed to be able to take what they learned and utilize it in the residential spaces. The PASK shares that "Skill includes the ability to facilitate opportunities for change in individuals or groups, managing critical incidents and developing the capacity for strategic analysis and action" (Beale et al., 2001, p. 230). The PASK framework calls on the individual to use the other PASK areas – passion, personal awareness, and knowledge – to facilitate learning and growth related to social justice (Beale et al., 2001). The PASK is meant for IGD student facilitators, but RAs can use the same skills to address issues within their communities. Students saw an improvement from a pre-PASK score of ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.63$) to a ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.61$) post-PASK score, but it was the smallest area of improvement for students when compared to the other three areas. Students made gains in eight out of nine variables; however, these gains were minimal when comparing to variables in other areas. This was also the section where there was a decline in one variable, "utilize others' support," which decreased slightly from ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.80$) in the pre-PASK to ($M = 4.0$, $SD = 0.76$) in the post-PASK. This is most concerning because social and racial justice work requires action. Bell (2016) shared, "Social justice requires confronting the ideological frameworks, historical legacies, and institutional patterns and practices that structure social relations unequally so that some groups

are advantaged at the expense of other groups that are marginalized" (p. 4). Social justice requires ongoing willingness to engage self and take actions to create an equitable society (Bell, 2016); yet, students did not see movement in the skill area of the PASK. The skill section is critical to understanding the "justice" piece. While understanding one's own identity is a first step in the social justice journey (Adams, 2016; Landreman et al., 2008), the absence of skills in this inquiry make it difficult to understand if the students truly arrived at social justice.

Lack of skill reflection and development was notably absent from student journals where students seemed more comfortable commenting on their own racial identity and/or demonstrating knowledge of racial differences, but students did not discuss skills needed to disrupt racism and/or engage in social justice work. The course curriculum aspired to foster skill development, but reviewing the PASK and journals suggests further attention is needed in the area. Moreover, while some students demonstrated they could identify racial microaggressions and name racism, some continued to resist seeing actions as racist. Amy reflected on committing microaggressions with friends in the forms of jokes, "Many of the jokes that were said could be considered micro-aggressions…" Amy's use of "could be" demonstrates she is still struggling to accept that this was a microaggression and in fact, racist. Preston also used language that suggested resistance where they stated, "I can see how it could be interpreted as a racial microaggression" when reflecting on talking about how an Asian faculty member "spoke very good English" with classmates. The use of "interpreted" suggests he is not acknowledging his individual contribution to racism.

Goodman (2011) shared resistance is when people "refuse to consider alternative perspectives that challenge the dominant ideology that maintains the status quo" (p. 51). This can show up in overt ways where people refuse to engage, challenge every aspect, and actively discount others, but it can also be done in more subtle ways where people stay quiet and refuse to

participate (Goodman, 2011). Ultimately, when people are resistant "they resist information or experiences that may cause them to question their worldview. They dismiss the idea that oppression or systemic inequalities are real" (Goodman, 2011, p. 50). Resistance was evident in student journals. It suggested that while RAs are engaging with racial issues, they are still struggling with seeing personal acts and contributions as racist. Naturally, until they can understand how racism manifests within society and their own individual actions, they will struggle using skills to disrupt and address racism. This is concerning given their role as paraprofessional staff within the residence halls. RAs need to understand their own resistance and how it can impact the student of color experience. For example, if a student of color goes to their RA for support after hearing a racial joke and the RA says, "That might not be what was meant," then the student will be further victimized. Understanding resistance and how it shows up is an important skill that RAs need to help them respond and support marginalized students. Students need skills to become social and racial justice allies within the residence halls, yet these results suggest they did not make significant progress in skill development. Moreover, this suggest that students did not arrive at social and racial justice work.

4.2.4 Knowledge

Beale et al. (2001) defined knowledge "as the information people need to be able to see and act beyond their own individual experiences" (p. 229). The PASK framework contextualizes this around understanding the "nature of prejudice, discrimination, and institutionalized privilege and oppression" (p. 229), along with gaining understanding "about one's own and other's social identity groups' histories, traditions, and values" (Beale et al., 2001, p. 229). RAs showed growth overall in knowledge where they moved from a ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.71$) pre-PASK score to a ($M =$

4.05, *SD* = 0.68) post-PASK score. Table 6 shows a sample of knowledge variables. Interestingly, students saw gains in "recognize -isms" from (*M* = 3.40, *SD* = 0.83) in the pre-PASK to (*M* = 4.33, *SD* = 0.72) at the end of the course. RAs demonstrated this across their journals where they were able to name racist acts through reflecting on microaggressions or engaging with their own identity in the testimonial journal. This learning was done in a variety of ways: reflection of self, the class activities, experiences, and/or readings. Renee reflected on her learning about racism by sharing, "I have also learned that racism is still occurring and that it still occurs because nothing has been done to change the system that keeps it at play".

Table 6. Change in Knowledge from Pre- to Post-PASK

	Pre-PASK		Post-PASK		Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference
Differences between prejudice, discrimination, and institutional -isms	3.73	0.70	4.40	0.74	0.67
Can recognize -isms	3.40	0.83	4.33	0.72	0.93
Group process issues	2.87	0.92	3.87	0.92	1.00
Intergroup issues	2.87	0.92	4.07	0.88	1.20
Theories and terminology which inform and guide intergroup dialogue facilitation	3.13	1.13	4.20	0.77	1.07

Some students were able to reflect through class readings similarly to Izzy who connected learning about different types of microaggressions through the article, "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life" by Sue et al., (2007). Izzy connected the types of microaggressions to the ones she had committed, "Looking back on this situation now, I realize I committed a microaggression. I did not realize at the time this was a microinvalidation, nor did I understand the definitions of microaggressions." Kadence started to recognize how racism had played out in their elementary

school, noticing that the students of color "were always perceived to be the trouble-makers, and not just considered to be a class clown" as other white students. Further she began to connect this to the systemic issue noticing "there was only one kid [of color] in my 'advanced' classes during middles school, and even then they were considered to be lazy and not as smart as the rest of us." This reflection was connected to a class activity where students reflect on their socialization at different points in their life.

In all, 14 students were able to reflect and share the knowledge about racism that they had gained over the course of the semester through two journals entries. Some students only engaged race during journal six where they were asked to reflect on perpetuating a racial microaggression. Others opted to include their racial identity in journal three when sharing their testimonial. Izzy discussed race in her testimonial sharing powerfully, "I did not really understand the issue of more than typical bullying, but now looking back I realize the corruption of that 10-year old's mind". RAs furthered their learning by exploring their own socialization related to race and other -isms. The journal entries combined with the quantitative data suggest that RAs were able to expand their knowledge related to social identities, racial understanding, and the role in structures of oppression. It is important to note that some students were resistant to talking and writing about race. In particular, two students did not submit the journal about perpetuating racial microaggressions. Students rarely failed to submit assignments through the class, so it was particularly striking that two students opted to not turn it in, which suggests they may have been resistant to discussing their racial identity. In fact, one of these students was the only student to not discuss race across either assignment.

4.3 Using Intergroup Dialogue Pedagogy

I also sought to understand the ways IGD skills influenced RA learning and understanding within the course. The PASK includes two knowledge-based questions that provide insight in how students gained IGD knowledge (see Table 6). I coupled these questions with the student journals to understand the ways IGD skills promoted RA growth.

Understanding that people experience the world and our community differently based on their social identities, particularly their marginalized identities, is important as we aim to foster inclusive communities. It is promising that RAs showed significant changes in "intergroup issues" with a score of ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.92$) in the pre-PASK rising to ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.88$) in the post-PASK. These data show they are beginning to understand the historical and current issues between privileged and marginalized groups. Another large jump was in "theories and terminology which inform and guide intergroup dialogue facilitation" with a pre-PASK score of ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.13$) and post-PASK score of ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.77$). Beale et al. (2001) argued that it is important that facilitators understand the frameworks and theory about IGD. For example, "the differences between a dialogue, a discussion, [and] a debate" (Beale et al., 2001, p. 230) can help ground and guide work. These findings suggest that class activities grounded in intergroup dialogues have helped further their knowledge. This was particularly clear in student journals where they were willing to grapple with racism. Izzy wrote, "Coming to Chatham has broadened my perspective and knowledge of racism in today's society . . . I have realized how much racism hurts and how it effects individuals' everyday lives." Jack was able to critically reflect on racism relating it to the election of President Barack Obama, "I certainly wouldn't have dreamed that he was the most hated president of his time the moment he was elected for being black, racism wasn't really a thing

any more." This shows the deep, personal reflection students did when trying to understand how they were socialized in a white supremacist society.

I was also able to see themes in the student journals related to two of the three IGD key pedagogical features – content learning (e.g., readings, videos, etc.) and structured interactions (Gurin et al., 2013). Content learning is the use of materials to further reflection and demonstrates how the use of IGD pedagogy assisted in furthering student learning through the course (Gurin et al., 2013). This was particularly prominent in student journals where 67% of students (10/15) used class readings/videos/handouts to further their learning and thinking. Jenna utilized *White Fragility* by Robin DiAngelo (2018) to further her understanding of perpetuating a microaggression against her friend, sharing

> … my defensive response was a perfect example of white fragility, as I thought she was accusing me of being a bad person and a racist, when in reality she was speaking to her own experience and trying to help me understand the difference between my intent and impact.

Renee used the article, "Racial Microaggressions in the Residence Halls: Experiences of Students of Color at a Predominately White University" by Harwood et al. (2012) article to understand how microaggression victims "… question if where they are living is even safe for them". This helped her think about how racially marginalized residents might be feeling and her role as an RA. Content learning was prevalent in the journals with the majority of RAs using for a total of 22 references.

The other pedagogical feature included by one-third (5/15) was structured interactions. Structured interactions refer to class activities that help students from different identities engage in learning and dialogue (Gurin et al., 2013). This was done by discussing specific class activities

such as the mindful facilitation workshop where Jenna reflected on how to use questions to help others think about what they are saying. Others referenced the timeline recall activity where they were able to connect and understand their own socialization. Although only five students directly referenced structured interactions, journal three was completed by all students and this was used for an in-class structured interaction where RAs shared their personal testimonial with the class.

The final pedagogical feature is facilitation. RAs did not reflect on the facilitation of myself or the co-instructor in these journals. Overall, it is difficult to find conclusive results on whether IGD pedagogy had an influence as only two student journals were used. Further analysis of the other student journals, final papers, and class observations would lead to a better understanding of how IGD influenced RA development through the class.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I reviewed the findings, which are based on a series of data collected over the course of one semester during an RA employment class. Most of the chapter provides a better understanding of the first inquiry question, which I was able to conclude that RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge did improve overall, but the skill area was less prominent than the others. This is most troubling as RAs have a direct influence in the resident experience, yet they are not seeing the same growth in their skills. This also suggests that the students did not arrive at social and racial justice but rather gained a better understanding of their social and racial identities.

I also discussed the ways in which IGD skills promote RA passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge, linking to two questions in the PASK and two IGD pedagogy features –

content learning and structured interactions (Gurin et al., 2013). Content learning was especially prevalent with 67% of RAs referencing content, while structured interaction only saw 33%. Further exploring additional RA journals and/or final papers could lead to better understanding of the influence of IGD pedagogy.

Overall findings suggest a relationship between the growth of RA passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge; however, the absence of skills and racial identity foci of the journals make it difficult to know how the students progressed in social and racial justice. Both the PASK and the student journals provided evidence that students gained understanding of their social and racial identities; however, resistance observed in student writings and/or lack of submissions was noted as well, which suggests that students continue to struggle to discuss and confront racism.

5.0 Chapter 5

5.1 Discussion

In this chapter I discuss four key findings related to the purpose of the inquiry. The chapter begins with a summary of the inquiry, including the purpose and methods, followed by four key findings grounded in literature. The chapter concludes with research and professional practice implications related to the inquiry and a summary of the Demonstration of Excellence for completion of the Doctorate of Education.

5.2 Inquiry Summary

In this inquiry, I aspired to create change within the resident assistant (RA) program at Chatham University by restructuring the RA employment course to promote passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge of racial and social justice through infusing intergroup dialogue (IGD) pedagogy. The inquiry aimed to understand whether there was a change in RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge over the course of an employment class and the ways in which IGD skills promoted this development. The sample included 15 first-time RAs required to take the class during their first term as an RA.

Research shows us that RAs are considered to be the frontline staff for residential programs, and a commitment to multiculturalism is essential to their role (Blimling, 2010, 2015). It is critical that RAs are able to support students different from themselves (Blimling, 2010, 2015);

however, diversity training has decreased over time (Koch, 2016). As critical diversity training has decreased, students of color continue to face a hostile campus climate (Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harwood et al., 2012; Mwangi et al., 2018; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue & Constantine, 2007; Yosso et al., 2009). RAs are the first staff most students will turn to for support; therefore, it is crucial that these paraprofessional staff members receive more training.

This inquiry sought to promote change through restructuring the RA employment course and aligning it with the IGD program at Chatham University. IGD aims to bring students from different identities together to create shared understanding of the impacts of power, privilege, and oppression while promoting allyship and disruption of the systems of oppression (Gurin et al., 2013). Chatham has seen success in the last few years with launching our own IGD program, and incorporating the RA class was a natural expansion. The RA class was modeled after a similar program at the University of Michigan (Petryk et al., 2013) where IGD pedagogy is used through three pedagogical features: content learning, structured interaction, and facilitation (Gurin et al., 2013).

Improvement science was used through a plan, do, study, act (PDSA) cycle to guide curriculum changes and provide a path for continuous improvement (Langley et al., 2009; Lewis, 2015). In this inquiry, I implemented a plan by restructuring the course, acted by facilitating the class (do), studied the results, and will provide suggestions for future iterations of the course. These suggestions will be used for the fall 2020 class that will be instructed by me and the co-instructor. Improvement science was complemented by a convergent mixed methods research design that used both qualitative and quantitative findings to further my understanding (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The primary tool for data collection was the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators as a pre- and post-measure, despite the PASK not being a survey tool. The PASK

provides a framework for understanding development of passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills related to social justice. The PASK was supplemented by two student journals used to understand how RAs passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge developed related to racial justice; however, the inquiry led me to focus more on their racial understanding. A discussion of four key findings are presented in the next section.

5.3 Key Findings

The data suggest that RAs may have shown movement in all major areas – passion, personal awareness, knowledge, and skills – of the PASK and review of two student journals helped to further contextualize findings. While there was movement in all areas, key findings suggest that personal awareness of social identities was prevalent, RAs struggled with skill development, resistance could be observed in the inquiry, and IGD pedagogy influenced learning. Moreover, the inquiry evolved to focus more on personal awareness and was not able to determine student change in social and racial justice. Despite this limitation, the key findings offer insight into RA learning and implications for practice.

5.3.1 Key Finding 1: Personal Awareness and Understanding of Social Identities Appeared to Increase through the Employment Course

The data suggest a heightened awareness of RAs' own identities and the impact of said identities on themselves and others. This is essential, as understanding one's own identity is a critical step in social justice work (Adams, 2016; Hackman, 2005; Landreman, Edwards, Balón,

& Anderson, 2008; Reason & Broido, 2005). The ultimate goal of this class was to help the RAs begin to foster more inclusive communities, and this meant they needed to engage as social justice advocates and allies. This inquiry did not show whether this goal was achieved; however, it is promising to see RAs are gaining a better understanding of their own identities, specifically their racial identity. Landreman et al. (2008) argued, "Because we do not live in a just and equitable society, we must be aware that our own social, historical, and political experiences in an unjust and inequitable society shape our conscious and unconscious perspectives" (p. 3).

Looking solely at the quantitative data, there was improvement in all 10 of the variables in personal awareness with students seeing the most improvement in "awareness of my disadvantaged social identities", "awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on others", "awareness of my privileged social identities", and "awareness of the impact of my personal style on others". This improvement shows that RAs are beginning to understand themselves better and the impact their identities can have on others. This was also supported in the journals where students reflected on their privileged identities and their ability to "not think about race every day" as one student shared. Exploration of one's own identity and the impact it can have on others is needed for them to disrupt systems of oppression (Adams, 2016; Hackman, 2005; Landreman et al., 2008) within residential communities. Hackman (2005) argued that personal reflection is an essential component for fostering socially just teaching environments. This involves remaining committed to continuous "self-reflection and personal interrogation" to foster continuous growth and engagement (p. 107). RAs serve in a unique role as they are not facilitators or instructors, but they are responsible for caring, educating, and assisting residents through community building and events; therefore, the same components important to fostering a social justice minded classroom space can apply to how RAs foster socially just communities.

The quantitative data were further contextualized and more deeply understood when reviewing student journals. RAs began to acknowledge their privilege through an emergent code of color neutral, meaning they reflected on the idea of being taught and/or their belief that they do not see color (Bonilla-Silva, 2018). One-third of students discussed their awareness around growing up and having a color-neutral perspective. Color-neutral is a dangerous form of racism through its dismissal of others experiences while furthering the white supremacist agenda (Bonilla-Silva, 2018). RAs were able to reflect and critically examine why this was problematic. This awareness demonstrates that the class may have helped them surface and better understand their own identities. Arguably, the updated class structure helped students develop their awareness of self, and this understanding will assist them in being more cognizant of their residential communities and the experiences of residents with minoritized identities.

5.3.2 Key Finding 2: Lack of Skill Development within the Employment Course

Skill development appeared to be minimal. RAs showed gains in all core areas of the PASK; however, skills showed the smallest change moving from a pre-PASK score ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.63$) to a ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.61$) post-PASK score. Skill development was a key outcome of this class and a critical training goal for RAs (Blimling, 2010, 2015), yet, there was no clear evidence that student skills were improved. In fact, one could argue the ability to challenge others is critical in social justice and racial justice work, but RAs showed hardly any change in this variable. The lack of improvement in the skill area was particularly striking compared to the other construct areas of the PASK, and this was further supported when reviewing student journals where skill utilization was notably absent. Students were able to begin the process of recognizing inequity

73

issues such as microaggressions, but they did not seem to progress to the skill of disrupting such

inequities, which demonstrated that the class did not arrive at social justice work.

Lack of skill development is troubling because research shows that skills, particularly

multicultural skills, are critical for RAs (Blimling, 2015, 2010). Interestingly, Blimling (2015)

discussed skills in terms of having "understanding" and "ability." For example, Blimling (2015)

noted RAs should have "understanding of cultural, religious, gender, sexual orientation, racial,

physical ability, and social class differences and how those differences may influence the life

experiences of college students" (p. 171). When looking at the list of understanding skills

identified by Blimling (2015), it seems to be guided more on the impact of social identities,

privilege, power, and oppression. This type of understanding was suggested in the data, but the

PASK aligns them in personal awareness and knowledge versus skills. Blimling (2015) also

grouped skills as the "ability" to do something. For example, RAs should have the "ability and

skill in confronting other students' statements or behaviors based on ignorance and prejudice" (p.

172). The ability skills show more alignment with the skills section of the PASK, but Blimling

(2015) suggested that RAs' skill development involves both knowledge and action; however, there

appears to be a gap in research in helping RAs realize the action phase. In this inquiry, skills were

associated with more action although knowledge and awareness are also important. The curriculum

redesign did not seem to address the "action" RAs need to take in terms of skills. Ultimately, RAs

should be able to use their knowledge and personal awareness to act.

5.3.3 Key Finding 3: Resistance to the Curriculum

A key theme that emerged when reviewing the student journals related to racial justice was

resistance. Resistance and prejudice can sometimes be confused and Goodman (2011) shared,

"Resistance is not about people's specific views but about their openness to consider other perspectives" (p. 52). Resistance is always present in work with privilege and oppression as the dominant ideology is being challenged (Goodman, 2011; Johnson, 2018). This can manifest in overt and more covert ways. Overt ways can be refusing to participate, challenging personal experiences of others, and dismissing this as someone's "cause" by saying things like "not everything is about race" (DiAngelo, 2018; Goodman, 2011; Johnson, 2018). Overt resistance showed in that two students did not turn in their journal about a time they perpetuated a racial microaggression. It was particularly striking that they chose not to complete the assignment. Further, one of the students failed to talk about race in either journal. Moreover, students expressed frustration throughout the course that they felt too many conversations were about race.

Resistance also showed up in more covert ways in the way students talked about racism and microaggressions. RAs were able to surface microaggressions, but they showed resistance in how they talked about the microaggressions. Language such as "interpreted" and "could be" were used when giving an example of a clear microaggression, suggesting that the RAs did not fully accept this was a microaggression and their individual action. This form of resistance is minimizing where the perpetrator will acknowledge it but try to dismiss the meaning (Johnson, 2018). The language used seemed to also be done in a way to distance the perpetrator from the act and played into the good/bad binary that DiAngelo (2018) discussed with white fragility. Racism is now synonymous with being a bad or good person, which causes people to defend themselves and resist the idea that they could be racist. DiAngelo (2018) argued, "The good/bad binary makes it nearly impossible to talk to white people about racism, what it is, how it shapes all of us, and the inevitable ways that we are conditioned to participate in it" (p. 72).

Overcoming resistance is key to helping individuals progress and become social and racial justice advocates and allies. Ultimately, RAs are asked to facilitate community and handle conflict between residents. Their use of language and overt resistance was troubling for two reasons: (1) they could be dismissive to a student or color or marginalized student about their experiences, and (2) it shows they have not moved forward in their development to truly acknowledge their role in racism (and other isms). The course redesign included readings on resistance, but I could have been more intentional in discussing and creating reflection points for students. More intentional thought about resistance is needed to help RAs surface and understand their own personal resistance.

5.3.4 Key Finding 4: Intergroup Dialogue Pedagogy Shows Impact

Pedagogy is important to help students better understand themselves and their role in privilege and oppression. Three IGD pedagogy features – content learning, structured interaction, and facilitation (Gurin et al., 2013) – were used to frame learning in the class despite this course being different than the traditional IGD classes where students spend the semester deeply exploring one social identity (Gurin et al., 2013). This inquiry shows that content learning and structured interactions seem to have had a meaningful impact, but it is unable to understand how and if facilitation had any impact because the inquiry did not seek to understand facilitation.

The curriculum was designed with content learning in mind by infusing readings and videos to provoke thought and learning from students. Intention was taken to include readings on white fragility, Ted Talks and other videos to demonstrate the powerful role of storytelling, articles on various microaggressions student face, and IGD selections to help students understand intergroup issues, IGD theories and frameworks, and how they can apply them to their

communities. RAs demonstrated content learning had an influence where 67% of students used this across the two journals analyzed. Students were able to further their thinking and understanding through connections to readings. Particularly DiAngelo's (2018) *White Fragility*, Harwood's et al. (2012) "Racial Microaggressions in the Residence Halls: Experiences of Students of Color at a Predominantly White University", and Sue's et al. (2007) "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life" were the most cited articles, demonstrating use in helping students learn and reflect. DiAngelo (2018) was cited by almost half (7/15) of the students displaying their struggle with their whiteness and fragility. Some students discussed their fragility in terms of how they responded to situations, realizing they needed to be more aware in general, or discussing how this course forced them to confront their fragility for the first time.

The Harwood et al. (2012) and Sue et al. (2007) readings on microaggressions helped the RAs to understand different types of microaggressions and how subtly they can be perpetrated. This led to them being able to recognize times they were perpetrators through action or silence. The Harwood et al. (2012) article also helped RAs think more critically about how their residents experience microaggressions in their community spaces, which caused them to think about their role and responsibility in creating inclusive spaces for minoritized students. Their use of content in their journals demonstrated how it helped them confront their own bias and gain understanding of how others experience the world.

Content learning was also supported with the second pedagogy feature, structured interactions, which are specific activities used to facilitate learning (Gurin et al., 2013). These activities intentionally created opportunities for students to further grapple with privilege and oppression. The curriculum was designed with specific IGD activities such as a timeline recall activity to help students think about how they were socialized and learned oppressive behaviors,

and the student testimonial where students explored a privileged and marginalized identity through storytelling (Gurin et al., 2013; Gurin-Sands et al., 2012). Structured interactions were referenced by one-third of RAs, and the testimonial journal that was analyzed was part of a structured interaction. The activities referenced varied by the students, but they illustrated the importance of utilizing them to help RAs gain a deeper understanding (Gurin et al., 2013). Moreover, activities can also be used to intentionally surface other themes observed throughout class (Gurin et al., 2013).

5.4 Implications for Practice

This inquiry can be used to improve practices at Chatham University and can be used in shaping RA trainings in the future on other campuses. It is most concerning that RAs are expected to have multicultural skills and competence (Blimling, 2010, 2015), yet training on diversity, equity and inclusion has gone down (Koch, 2016). This inquiry sought to foster RA passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge for social and racial justice through redesigning the employment class using improvement science. There are many lessons and key areas to think about when moving into the next phase of the plan, do, study, and act cycle. In this section I provide three recommendations based off the findings from this inquiry.

5.4.1 Recommendation 1: Modify Assignments and Structure to Focus on Skill Development, Resistance, and Racial Justice

It is concerning that this inquiry did not find evidence of skill development for the RAs in the employment course, which suggests they did not arrive at social justice work. A key outcome for this class is for students to gain skills to help them disrupt racism and other isms within their residence halls. While the students gained a deeper understanding of their own identities, there was a disconnect on how they would use what they learned to actively build inclusive communities. It is not enough for an RA to understand these issues, but they must begin to see themselves as allies within their residence hall. Further thought needs to be spent on helping students to develop these skills in a meaningful way.

More time should also be spent on having students surface their own resistance and how it may be contributing to their participation in the class. During the class, time was spent on explaining resistance, but continued reflection is needed. Vaccaro (2013) shared, "Because resistance is inevitable, I discuss it in my sessions instead of allowing it to become the proverbial elephant in the room" (p. 40). While resistance was discussed in the class, there were missed opportunities to engage with students one-on-one about their experiences with resistance. This is key when remembering all RAs are coming into the class in drastically different places with social and racial justice knowledge. It is critical to infuse student development awareness of the individual student to know when and how to challenge them (Vaccaro, 2013).

A limitation of this study was that it sought to foster skill development with racial justice, yet the PASK was a raceless document. Further consideration should be given to how race is framed in the course. This inquiry began from a racial lens both because student comments and feedback related to racial microaggressions and because race is the ism that lays the foundation

for all other isms (Ladson-Billings, 1996); however, we know higher education is reluctant to name race both in practice and research (Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). This class must help RAs confront their bias and build understanding on how race shapes their everyday lives in a white supremacist society.

Skill development, resistance, and race can be better addressed by revisiting the assignments for the course curriculum. Throughout the class, students were asked to complete journals. These journals can be redesigned to promote reflection on skill development, race, and resistance. This could start in the safety of the class by utilizing additional case studies and scenarios to practice how it might feel to have a difficult conversation about oppression. This can help them surface their own resistance and barriers. Students can then move to testing their skills through assignments outside of the class. Race could also continue to be addressed through journal prompts, but it is worth considering using something different than the PASK or modifying the PASK to include race and RA skills more centrally. There are many instruments to consider and the Resident Assistant Cultural Diversity (RACD) Questionnaire (Johnson & Kang, 2006) may present a good option. The RACD was developed to help better understand RA development related to findings from the Perception of Racial Climate in Residence Halls survey (Johnson & Kang, 2006). This instrument relates directly to the RA experience and confidence. It has five main areas, with two focused specifically on race – "Belief in the Existence of Racism in Residence Halls" and "Confidence to Handle Racial Conflict" (Johnson & Kang, 2006, p. 34). I reviewed this instrument originally, but I decided to use the PASK because of the ties to IGD. It is important to expand our thinking and use frameworks and instruments to compliment IGD and facilitate the skill growth of the RAs.

I would also suggest adding two one-on-one meetings with the instructors. This would allow space for greater reflection and opportunities to challenge and support students based on where they are at with the material. Individual meetings can help students engage in more personal reflection about what they experience and how they contribute to the class and their residence hall. Redesigning the journals, updating the PASK or using a new pre- and post-measure, and the addition of individual meetings fosters a stronger model of self-reflection, which is an important piece of Vacarro's (2013) social justice framework that can lead to the action phase, thus further encouraging the use of skills.

Students also completed a reflective final paper, and this does not seem to be the best assignment to help them with their skills. We largely had them reflect on their learning without engaging with the skills they needed to use in their positions. A culminating assignment could be a second "Behind Closed Doors" activity where students are given scenarios to try their skills and receive feedback from instructors, Residence Life staff and IGD instructional members. This could be paired with a shorter reflection paper. A scenario assignment could be a more meaningful way for students to begin utilizing their skills as it will include tangible examples and help build their confidence in disrupting oppression. The University of Michigan class culminates with Behind Closed Doors (Petryk et al., 2013), but I made the decision to use a paper because RAs completed Behind Closed Doors in their summer training. This should be revisited and could be one way to help RAs connect their learning into tangible skills.

5.4.2 Recommendation 2: Revisit Course Curriculum and Align with August Training

The syllabus was modeled after the University of Michigan course and utilized the first third of the class to focus solely on identity development with the culminating testimonial journal.

A key difference with Chatham's program is it was offered after August training and during their first term in the position, whereas the University of Michigan RAs completed the course as a pre-service requirement before starting the position. This means the Chatham RAs entered the class with some base knowledge from the training with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and are more familiar with one another, leading to a willingness to share more quickly.

Developing understanding of social identity is critical in social justice work (Adams, 2016; Landreman et al., 2008); however, the first five weeks of the class should be carefully reviewed, understanding that students experience training around social identities prior to the class and have more familiarity with one another. Chatham uses IGD content and activities to support an equity training day for student leaders, including RAs. Facilitators are given different activities as options to help achieve the learning outcomes, but facilitators are encouraged to use whatever fits their personal style. While this freedom is important from a facilitator perspective, the new RAs were disbursed in different groups and experienced different activities, thus presenting a challenge to the instructors to revisit material. The training day offers a valuable opportunity to pair the students together with their instructors. RAs would then be able to begin their classroom work early, allowing for the course curriculum to adjust and begin to focus on skill development much earlier. In addition, there would be an opportunity to give the pre-measure before training, after training and before the class, and then following the class. This model would allow us to understand RA development in the various phases of training.

5.4.3 Recommendation 3: Continued Development for the Facilitators

Facilitation is a key component of IGD and social justice education (Gurin et al., 2013; Vaccaro, 2013). I facilitated this class with my co-instructor, the Assistant Director of Residence

82

Life, and I would be remiss to not reflect on how our facilitation strategies influenced the outcome of this inquiry. This inquiry did not aim to understand how our facilitation impacted the learning, but this goes together with the other recommendations. Specifically, the instructors should spend time reviewing more social justice education frameworks and resources on skill development and resistance. This can be done through professional development opportunities, reviewing new resources, and engaging in conversations with other IGD instructors. Facilitation is key to supporting the RAs in this process. Specifically, thought needs to be given to how we support participants in their cognitive development, understanding that all participants are in different developmental phases (Vacarro, 2013). This can be done via student journals and individual meetings. We also need to be willing to spend more time on resistance and share candidly about our own resistance (Vacarro, 2013). This may help students become more willing to engage and share about their personal resistance.

Facilitation is a critical component to create meaningful training and engagement experiences on social justice (Gurin et al., 2013; Vaccaro, 2013). "Becoming an effective social justice activist requires much learning and self-reflection" (Vacarro, 2013, p. 37). This applies to both the RAs, the instructional staff who support them in this journey, and the staff who support them in their positions.

5.5 Demonstration of Excellence

The findings of this inquiry will be shared with the IGD and Residence Life staff at Chatham University through an internal report. This has already begun with the Residence Life team through the planning for next year's class. A report outlining key findings and

recommendations will be shared with the staff in IGD and Residence Life. Furthermore, the lessons gleaned from the RA employment course has implications and applications for other student and staff employment trainings. RAs are not the only paraprofessional staff who have high contact with minoritized students. This inquiry can be used to transform other trainings and ensure student staff have the skills and understanding necessary to address equity issues, and the final report offered suggestions to shape future student trainings.

I also planned to disseminate my research through a presentation at a practitioner-based conference as it is important that Residence Life departments begin to explore how they can use their training and employment courses as an opportunity to foster racial and social justice skill development. I had planned to present at the NASPA Region II Conference in June on my findings after being approved through the conference proposal process, but due to COVID-19 the conference was cancelled. I plan to submit for the NASPA Annual Conference, NASPA Region II Conference, and explore regional opportunities that may be available in the fall.

5.6 Implications for Research

This inquiry is grounded in practice, and the goal was to understand whether an employment course could increase passion, personal awareness, skill, and knowledge in social and racial justice using IGD pedagogy, but the findings suggest students increased their passion, personal awareness, and knowledge in racial understanding. While the focus was primarily on improving practice, there are some connections for future research including contributing to the limited number of inquiries available and offering a different way to utilize IGD.

First, this inquiry contributed to the little research available on design of trainings (Koch, 2016), and there were few studies on understanding the impact of diversity trainings for RAs. This inquiry can contribute to the limited research available and further points to a need within higher education. Blimling (2015, 2010) continuously asserted that diversity training and multicultural competence is a key training area, but there does not appear to be research on models that work. This is a small inquiry based on one campus, but it suggests the continued need for broader research specifically within the area of RA training.

Findings reinforced that IGD pedagogy supported student learning, specifically with content learning and structured interactions, two of the three key pedagogical features (Gurin et al., 2013). The PASK helped the RAs think about their personal resources related to social justice but did not include race, which suggests that a modified or new tool such as the Resident Assistant Cultural Diversity questionnaire developed by Johnson and Kang (2006) could be used to better situate race. These data suggest that IGD components can be used and combined with other frameworks to facilitate learning without a traditional dialogues class that brings together students across one identity (Gurin et al., 2013). Additionally, there were links to some of the course challenges described by Petryk et al. (2013) about the University of Michigan class, but this article is more practical in nature. Petryk et al. (2013) discussed challenges with students being able to apply this to their position and this relates to the lack of skill development the data in this inquiry suggest. RAs gained a further understanding of their social identities but lacked skill development to use what they learned to disrupt systems of oppression, which is key in social justice work (Bell, 2016; Landreman et al., 2008). Petryk et al. (2013) related this challenge to the amount of material covered, relating experiences to their positions, and the ongoing supervision needed to be

successful. The third pedagogical feature, facilitation, may have also had an impact; however, this inquiry did not explore it.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview, discussion of key findings, and implications for research and practice on an inquiry focused on a redesigned RA employment class at Chatham University using 15 first-time RAs. The data from the PASK and student journals suggest that a redesigned employment class using IGD pedagogy had an impact on RAs' passion, personal awareness, skills, and knowledge in social and racial justice. Specifically, RAs had a heightened personal awareness of their own social identities and how these can impact themselves and others. While the data suggested improvement in all areas, it was noted that skill development was minimal, resistance was prevalent in the inquiry, and race needs to be better addressed. These findings help shaped recommendations to further redesign the course curriculum to help RAs continue to develop skills and understand their role in building inclusive and socially-just communities.

It is important to remember that this is one, small study grounded in practice that aimed to foster more inclusive communities through RA skill development; however, these small inquiries can help foster a social justice education environment "to explore power, privilege, and oppression to create truly just campuses" (Landreman & MacDonald-Dennis, 2013, p. 14). These practical efforts cannot be ignored, as Landreman and MacDonald-Dennis (2013) reminded us that the challenge in social justice education "is to move the theoretical discourse to an examination of effective education practices that lead to the development of students' critical consciousness and

institutional and societal change" (p. 14). Efforts such as redesigning an RA curriculum are needed to disrupt the systems of oppression that permeate higher education institutions and society.

Appendix A SDE 138: Peer Education Training – RA Class Fall 2018 Syllabus

CHATHAM UNIVERSITY
SDE 138: PEER EDUCATION TRAINING

Instructor:	Shawn A. McQuilan	Office Hours:	By Appointment
Section:	90	Phone:	
Office Location:	▮▮▮	E-mail:	▮▮▮
Class Time:	▮▮▮	Class Location:	▮▮▮

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Peer Education Training is a credit-earning, letter-grade college course designed for emerging student leaders, those interested in the Resident Assistant position, and leadership positions. Peer Education Training is defined as an introduction to higher education, student mentoring, and student leadership. The course is designed to assist student leaders in making a successful transition – academically, professionally, and socially – to leadership positions.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Peer Education Training will cover the following objectives through class discussion, class participation, and/or class assignments.

Students will be able to:
- ✓ Develop the time management skills necessary to make a successful transition into leadership positions.
- ✓ Identify and utilize campus facilities, resources, and services.
- ✓ Exhibit a sense of community among class members based on mutual respect, challenge, and support.
- ✓ Explain leadership skills, abilities, and characteristics.
- ✓ Demonstrate leadership skills and effective approaches to leadership activities.
- ✓ Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.
- ✓ Explore one's own identity by reflecting on personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and aspirations.
- ✓ Demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving skills.
- ✓ Demonstrate awareness, respect, and appreciation for differences among people.
- ✓ Explore opportunities to increase campus and community involvement.
- ✓ Demonstrate the ability to work independently and collaboratively.
- ✓ Understand their strengths and weaknesses as a leader and grow and develop as a leader.
- ✓ Identify campus and community resources available to all at Chatham University and in the local area.
- ✓ Demonstrate community awareness through the participation in service learning.
- ✓ Assess one's own development of leadership skills and abilities.

STANDARDS:

Association for College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I)
- Education/Programming; A. Educational Opportunities; 1. Access to academic experiences and/or services in the residences; 2. Opportunities to develop a mature style of relating to others and live cooperatively with others; 3. Opportunities to appreciate new ideas, cultural differences, perspectives, and sustainable practices; 4. Opportunities for personal growth and development.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)
- Part II: Program; 2.1 The program promotes student learning and development that is purposeful and holistic; 2.2 The program has identified student learning and development outcomes that are relevant to its purpose; 2.3 The program provides students with opportunities designed to encourage achievement of the identified outcomes; 2.4 The program provides evidence of its impact on the achievement of student learning and development outcomes in the domains checked - 2.4.1 Intellectual Growth, 2.4.2 Effective Communication, 2.4.3 Enhanced Self-Esteem, 2.4.4 Realistic Self-Appraisal, 2.4.5 Clarified Values, 2.4.6 Career Choices, 2.4.7 Leadership Development, 2.4.8 Healthy Behavior, 2.4.9 Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships, 2.4.10 Independence

Figure 1. SDE 138: Peer Education Training – RA Class Fall 2018 Syllabus

TEXTBOOK:

There is no textbook for this course. However, readings and articles will be posted online that students are expected to review prior to class each week.

CHATHAM UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE:

Chatham University students pledge to maintain the Honor Code, which states in part: *"Honor is that principle by which we at Chatham form our code of living, working, and studying together. The standards of honor at Chatham require that all students act with intellectual independence, personal integrity, honesty in all relationships, and consideration for the rights and well-being of others."* Information about the Honor Code is available in the Student Handbook.

FORMAT:

This course will utilize a combination of lecture, discussion, small group and individual activities, group work, and out of class assignments and activities.

ATTENDANCE:

All students are expected to attend every class, arrive on time, and remain for the entire duration of the class. Students are permitted one unexcused absence and any additional unexcused absence will result in a lower course grade. Students will be responsible for all material and information given out during class time. This will be applicable whether a student attends a particular class or not. Similarly, there will be no make-up for any missed in-class activities or assignments due to the absence of the student.

Students will be excused from class in the event of a family death, documented medical issue (doctors note will be required), and religious observances. It is imperative that you notify your instructor prior to class if you are going to be absent (not on the day you are going to be absent). If you have an excuse that is determined legitimate by the instructor, it will not impact your participation grade. Students will be responsible for making up any missed work or will be required to submit work prior to their absence. While an absence may be excused, this doesn't exempt a student from completing the requirements of the course.

All class assignments are due at the beginning of each class and no late assignments will be accepted. Missing a class will impact the grade you receive in the course, as participation is a large component of the course grading scale.

HONOR CODE AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

Chatham University students pledge to maintain the Honor Code, which states in part: "Honor is that principle by which we at Chatham form our code of living, working, and studying together. The standards of honor at Chatham require that all students act with intellectual independence, personal integrity, honesty in all relationships, and consideration for the rights and well-being of others." Information about the Honor Code is available in the Student Handbook and online at https://www.chatham.edu/academics/catalog/2018-2019/HonorCode/

As an institution, Chatham University expects all members of its community to hold themselves to the highest standards of academic and personal integrity in living, working and studying together. As a member of this community, students agree to abide by the Honor Code, take responsibility for their actions and to be held accountable for the impact and consequences these actions have on themselves and others. Academic misconduct is a serious and significant violation of the Honor Code which undermines its tenets of intellectual independence, consideration for the rights and wellbeing of others, honesty in all relationships, and personal integrity.

More information about Chatham University's Academic Integrity Policy can be found in the Course Catalog at http://www.chatham.edu/academics/catalog/

Academic Integrity is defined as *upholding* the tenets of the Chatham University Honor Code of intellectual independence, consideration for the rights and wellbeing of others, honesty in all relationships, and personal integrity as they relate to all academic pursuits at the University.

Academic Misconduct is defined as *failure to abide by* the tenets of the Chatham University Honor Code of intellectual independence, consideration for the rights and wellbeing of others, honesty in all relationships, and personal integrity as they relate to academic pursuits at the University.

Figure 1 (continued)

Technical acts of academic misconduct are those reasonably believed by an instructor to be purely technical in nature without intent to achieve an academic advantage. Technical acts include, but are not limited to incorrectly citing, paraphrasing, and attributing sources within an academic course or exercise. Technical acts of academic misconduct do not present egregious and blatant attempts to use sources in a manner consistent with substantiated acts of academic misconduct.

Substantiated acts of academic misconduct are those reasonably believed by an instructor to achieve an academic advantage and violate the tenets of the Chatham University Honor Code of intellectual independence, consideration for the rights and well-being of others, honesty in all relationships, and personal integrity as they relate to academic pursuits at the University. Substantiated acts include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Alteration of University Documents**: Forgery of any signatures; submitting an altered transcript of grades to or from another institution or employer; putting one's name on another individual's work; or falsely altering a previously graded exam or assignment.
- **Cheating**: Cheating includes fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic course or exercise in an attempt to meet academic requirements by gaining an unfair advantage and/or using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids on any academic course or exercise.
- **Disturbance in the Classroom or Lab**: Disturbances in a traditional or online classroom or lab that serve to create an unfair academic advantage for oneself or a disadvantage for another member of the academic community.
- **Facilitating Academic Misconduct**: When an individual helps or attempts to help another individual carry out an act of academic misconduct.
- **False Representation, Fabrication or Alteration of Information**: The unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in any academic course or exercise.
- **Plagiarism**: Plagiarism is when one represents the organizational design, ideas, phrases, sentences or larger units of discourse from another writer and/or speaker without proper acknowledgement in an academic course or exercise. Plagiarism occurs when one fails to document all the sources of text and ideas that derive from someone else's work

---

STUDENT DISABILITY STATEMENT:

Chatham University is committed to providing an environment that ensures that no individual is discriminated against on the basis of their disability. Students with disabilities, as defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and who need special academic accommodations, should notify the director of the PACE Center as soon as possible. The PACE Center will work with students and the course instructor to coordinate and monitor the provision of reasonable academic accommodations.

TURNITIN.COM AND FERPA:

In all classes, faculty must notify students if the Turnitin service may be used. Student papers are protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act as they are educational records that contain personally identifiable information. If faculty submits a paper or an excerpt from a paper on behalf of a student for evaluation by Turnitin, an alias must be used instead of the student's name and faculty will ensure that any identifiable personal information is removed before submission.

NON-REGISTERED STUDENTS POLICY:

In accordance with University policy, only officially registered students may attend this class and all other classes offered at the University after the drop/add period. Please confer with your academic advisor if you need assistance with the registration process or you need additional information.

PERSONAL WELLBEING:

There may be times throughout the semester where you experience illness, personal hardship, stress, anxiety or other physical and/or mental health concerns. You are highly encouraged to utilize Chatham's Counseling and Health Services.

Figure 1 (continued)

Counseling Services at Chatham offer a safe, confidential and non-judgmental space to work through difficulties that you may face. Our mental health professionals at Counseling Services are available to all registered students during the academic semesters. Counseling Services provides caring support, short-term individual counseling, and brief psychotherapy free of charge. Intake assessments, brief counseling, consultation and referrals in the community are offered for full time students. During counseling, students can openly discuss issues that will help their developmental growth so the maximum benefit can be derived from the college experience. To schedule an appointment, call 412-365-1282 Monday-Friday from 9am to 5pm.

Health Services offers a variety of educational programs in health and wellness for the campus community in cooperation with the Office of Student Affairs and various other departments on campus. The Student Health Center provides basic first aid intervention, illness and injury assessment, and starter doses of over-the-counter medication. Chatham has partnered with the UPMC Urgent Care of Shadyside to attend to our students' urgent health needs at their location, a few miles away from our campus. If you are a registered Chatham student, you will be seen for basic services free of charge at that location. No co-payment is required for these services. However, if you visit a UPMC Urgent Care center other than Shadyside the co-payment _**will not be waived**_.

Our Medical Assistant will also help make the necessary arrangements for transportation to the UPMC Urgent Care facility when you are in need of care. Student Health Services is open during the academic year with part-time medical assistant coverage Monday – Thursday 9am to 3pm. Please call 412-365-1714 to talk with the Medical Assistant. If you require medical assessment outside of those hours, please contact public safety at 412-365-1111 for transportation to UPMC Urgent Care. Students that require on-going maintenance care can be referred to numerous physicians in the neighboring area.

COURSE STRUCTURE AND GRADING:

This is a **3 credit course**. The grade you will receive is based on several components:
- Class Participation, Exercises/Activities, Assignments/Homework, & Pop Quizzes **(45%)**
- Service Learning Experience & Reflection **(25%)**
- Group Facilitation **(30%)**

GRADING SYSTEM:
Students will be graded for their work in this course based on their class participation, service learning experience/reflection, and the final project. Students will either be awarded a numerical grade

Grade	Grade Scale	Grade Point Value	Description
A	93% and above	4	Excellent
A-	90-92.9%	3.67	
B+	87-89.9%	3.33	Good
B	83-86.9%	3	
B-	80-82.9%	2.67	
C+	77-79.9%	2.33	Satisfactory
C	73-76.9%	2	Minimal performance
C-	70-72.9%	1.67	
D+	67-69.9%	1.33	
D	63-66.9%	1	
D-	60-62.9%	0.67	
F	59.9% or below	0	Unsatisfactory performance, no credit

Figure 1 (continued)

Any assignments not submitted by the due date will receive a numerical grade of zero and will impact the final grade you receive for this course.

CLASS DISCUSSIONS, ACTIVITIES, AND QUIZZES:

Participating in class discussions and exercises is a requirement of the course; a factor of your course grade will be based upon class participation and performance. Realize it is impossible to earn a high grade for class discussions without attending class, but attending class alone will not result in a strong class discussion grade either. You must come to class prepared to discuss the assigned material and ready to engage in active discussions and activities.

Throughout the semester, you will be asked to participate in classroom exercises and to complete specific assignments while in class. Pop quizzes may occur at random times throughout the course of the semester based on your weekly reading assignments. These quizzes will test your understanding and application of the material covered in the weekly reading assignments.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Students will be expected to complete all out of class assignments as indicated in the course syllabus and by the instructor. The out of class assignments may consist of requiring students to attend special events, reading articles and handouts, completing "written" assignments, and more. All assignments will serve to enhance and compliment the current curriculum of the course as outlined in this syllabus. Failure to complete assignments will impact your final grade. If you cannot complete an assignment for a legitimate academic reason it is your responsibility to speak to your instructor to make other arrangements.

Unless otherwise specified, all written assignments must be submitted electronically through Moodle. No hand written assignments will be collected, with the exception of when you are told otherwise. All assignments must utilize proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

SERVICE LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

Each student will be required to participate in **Make A Difference Day** at Chatham University, which is on Saturday, October 20th at 8:00 a.m. Students who cannot because of other academic conflicts must notify the instructor and will work with them to come up with an alternate assignment, which may be another type of service opportunity or a ten-page research paper. Prior to and after **Make A Difference Day** we will engage in a series of conversations and reflections on your experiences and how they related to your role as not only a leader, but an engaged citizen.

CLASS FACILITATION:

Students will be divided up into group and will facilitate a class. During this class session, students will serve as the instructor and will be responsible for assigning work and class readings for that specific session. Groups must utilize a visual prompt, such as PowerPoint, Prezi, or video. As part of your facilitation, your group will be responsible for engaging the class in an activity. Each facilitation should be at minimum an hour and a half. Further guidelines will be provided by the instructor.

The instructor reserves the right to edit and adapt this document as needed throughout the course of the semester. Students who require consideration due to religious observation or different learning styles should see the instructor.

Figure 1 (continued)

Appendix B IND 245: Fostering Inclusive Communities in Residential Settings – RA Class

Fall 2019

Syllabus approved by Chatham University Programs Committee Spring 2019

Chatham University
Course Syllabus

GENERAL INFORMATION

Course Title**: Fostering Inclusive Communities in Residential Settings**
Course Number: **IND 245**
Semester/Year: **Fall 2019**
Class Meeting Date & Time:
Classroom:
Instructor: **Heather Black and Devin Fabian**
Contact Information:
Office Hours: **By appointment**

COURSE INFORMATION
This course was modeled and adapted from a similar course through the University of Michigan's Program on Intergroup Relations.

Course Description:
Residence Life at Chatham works with residents to build, develop, and nurture a supportive and inclusive community. This course provides student Resident Assistants (current or aspiring) facilitation skills to implement community development and facilitate interactions with your residents. Specifically, we will be focusing on the following 5 skills:
1. Listening
    a. Active Listening: Listening with accuracy and feedback back the content and feeling of the message.
    b. Generative Listening: Listening for strengths, skills, qualities, and values in a person that they may (or may not) recognize they have.
2. Asking questions that produce discussion and reflection. This includes:
    a. Collective Reflection: using individual contributions and connections from group discussions to ask questions that further explore subject and deepen learning.
    b. Asking questions during discussions/conversations.

      c.   Summarizing: Stating concisely the main thoughts.
3. Getting participants/residents to ask each other questions and follow up on ideas
4. Encouraging sharing of experience and ideas: This includes the facilitator being vulnerable and sharing their experience as well.
5. Noticing and managing dynamics: This includes noticing:
      a.   Who's talking? Who's not talking? How do the identities of these patterns impact the group interaction?
      b.   What is not being said in the space? What does the body language look/feel like?
      c.   What does silence mean? Is it because participants/residents are reflecting? Uncomfortable? Are people feeling triggered?

You will gain these skills within four areas that frame what happens within residential communities:
1. **Building Relationships**: Actively creating opportunities for residents to form interpersonal relationships with their peers, fellow residents, classmates, and other community members in meaningful & lasting ways.
2. **Self-Authorship**: Empowering residents to create and write their own narrative and be an active partner in their Chatham University experience.
3. **Fostering Inclusivity**: Intentionally facilitating open engagement and advocating for all residents to feel connected, experience a culture of support & guidance, and a genuine sense of belonging
4. **Engaging Self**: Challenge residents to actively participate and invest time, energy, and commitment to being part of the community development process

The information and facilitation/leadership skills you will take away from this course will be with you for the rest of your life, no matter what work you do or where you live.

Student Learning Outcomes:
This course prepares students to foster inclusive communities through conversations and programs around inequities with non-judgment, understanding, and active listening skills. The goals of this course are to develop students' knowledge and skills as resident assistants. This course is designed to assist student leaders in gaining a deeper understanding of their own identity and how identity impacts community development. We will focus on using Intergroup Dialogue Pedagogy and skills within the residence halls to address conflict and plan programs, but we believe that the skills learned in the course will also enable you (and us) to engage more critically with social justice with our families, among our friends, at our work places, and in our communities.

At the conclusion of the course, the students will use the skills listed in the course description to frame what happens within the residential communities, specifically:
1. Describe identity development through an increased awareness of their own social identities and how it impacts building inclusive communities.
2. Describe and consider the impact of inequality and privilege in fostering inclusive communities.

3. Identify and demonstrate ally behaviors effective for Residence Life staff.

EGR Mission Initiative Learning Outcomes:
1. Students will analyze and differentiate such relevant social and political constructs in relation to, but not limited to, race, social class, gender/gender identity, ethnicity, civil rights, and social justice, and apply those concepts to the topic(s) under study.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to advocate for their own positions through such strategies as attentiveness to the ideas and struggles of others, strong communication skills, and consensus building.

Required Texts and Materials:
> Course pack of Readings (can be found on Moodle)

Course Requirements: (tests, assignments, etc.)
1. Attendance and Participation (65 points – 5 points per class)
> Attendance and participation are critical behaviors for our class. An essential element of informed participation is built upon the foundation of readings, which are expected to be completed in their entirety on the date that they are due. We ask you to join in the educational mission of the class as both teachers and learners. We ask that you do everything possible to not miss a class. Should an emergency arise that prevents you from attending a class session, we ask that you take responsibility for missing a class by contacting one of the instructors before class. We will ask you to make up the missed class by completing an assignment created by the instructors and appropriate to the learning objectives of the missed class. We ask that you turn in make-up work the week after the missed class.

> Due to the importance of class attendance, any unexcused absence, more than one excused absence, or failure to complete the assignment for a missed, excused absence may result in a reduced final letter grade.

> *Attendance and Engagement Philosophy* – This class provides the unique opportunity to learn new information and to attain experiences outside of one's "comfort zone." These issues or ideas may evoke feelings of discomfort (e.g., "I don't like talking about this issue"), resistance (e.g., "this is unimportant information"), and/or judgment (e.g., "that is wrong, sick, or weird"). **<u>Active</u>** participation in the course will help students progress from the aforementioned initial reactions and increase their openness to themselves and to others.

> Credit for participation will also be based on students' utilization of their allyship skills during any course-related interactions (e.g. empathic response, carefully worded speech, clarity, relevance, thoughtfulness, and the civil nature of students' behaviors and comments). Students should also demonstrate their ability to share classroom space with their fellow peers.

95

Students will set their mobile devices to silent and avoid checking email, texting, and engaging in unrelated web browsing on mobile devices during class lectures. Computer use will be limited through class to the dialogic space. Engaging in activities such as using instant messaging, social networking sites (i.e. Instagram, Snapchat, and others), and online shopping unrelated to the course will result in reduction of participation points.

2. Facilitate In-Class Discussion using Readings (15 points)

Students will be placed in pairs and expected to lead a class discussion using the assigned readings for the week. You will need to complete readings in advance, submit discussion questions one week in advance, and complete a short reflection after the discussion on their experience.

3. Journals (35 points – 5 points per journal)

Personal journaling provides a place for addressing your own experiences and reactions to the readings, exercises, films, interactions, discussions, mini lectures, and any other aspect of class material or participation as they relate to the goals and objectives of this course. We ask you to complete these reflections to help structure your understanding, help deepen the learning that comes from course activities, and help surface the multiple thoughts and feelings that arise from social justice education, specifically within residential communities. Journals are opportunities for you to share your questions, frustrations, hopes, fears, satisfactions, and ideas with your instructors. Journals thus serve as a developmental process between you and your instructors. **We ask that journals be submitted on Sunday at Midnight, before the class session on Tuesday. 7 Journals will be required throughout the term.**

Journal Rubric
- 5 points = Submitted on time, includes two citations, and meaningfully reflects to answer question concisely.
- 4 points – Submitted on time, but is missing a citation. Meaningfully reflects to answer question concisely
- 3 – Submitted late, is missing citations, and/or struggles to meaningfully answer question concisely

4. Equity Facilitation in class (45 points)

You will be placed in small groups to identify a topic related to equity and social justice. We will ask you to conduct a 30-minute discussion in the class around this topic. This will include fostering a dialogue space with class participation. The assignment has several parts, each of which will be structured and have its own due date, and culminates with a group presentation and reflection. More information will be shared by the end of September.

5. Final Paper (40 points)

The 10-12 page final paper will be an opportunity to integrate your learning from all aspect of the course. Details will be available by the end of October.

Course Policies:

- Attendance and/or participation:

  o Every student enrolled at Chatham accepts the responsibility to attend all required class meetings. To obtain the fullest benefit from their courses, students must participate fully. This implies attending regularly, engaging in course activity, completing work on time, and making up work missed because of an emergency absence. **It is the student's responsibility to let the course instructor know within the drop-add period if they will have to miss class for religious reasons, athletics, or other.**

  o Due to the importance of attendance and participation, students who have more than one unexcused absent will be ineligible for an A. Reasons for excused absences include:

    o _Serious Illness and Family Emergencies:_ Please inform your dialogue facilitators as soon as possible (in advance of dialogue meetings, if possible) if health or family emergencies arise. Make-up work may be assigned in some instances of these excused absences.

    o _Cultural and Religious Holidays:_ Persons who have religious or cultural observations that conflict with dialogue meetings should let the instructors know the first day of class so we can make sure that you will not be penalized for missing class. We <u>strongly</u> encourage you to honor your cultural and religious holidays. However, if we do not hear from you by then, we will assume that you plan to attend all dialogue sessions and full attendance will be required.

    o _Athletic Commitments:_ Student-Athletes must submit any classes they will miss due to contests by the add/drop period. Only absences that are related to NCAA sponsored contests will be excused (no practices). An additional reflection on that week's readings will be due before the missed class period. Failure to submit the contest schedule by add/drop will result in unexcused absences.

- Grading

  o Criteria for grades in class participation include full, active, attentive, and reflective participation in each scheduled course activity and meeting. For full participation, the course readings should be reflected in your responses. Criteria for written assignments and forums include addressing the given topics/questions with sincere, thoughtful personal reflection and content (i.e., integrating ideas from the assigned readings and activities).

- o Please note that your instructors value your honest reflections, even if those options are critical or if they disagree with us. These reflections should be characterized by respectful speech and as noted earlier, hate speech will not be tolerated and may result in needing to redo an assignment or a lowered grade. **Grades will NOT be influenced negatively by your criticizing or disagreeing with us or with other members of the class.** Speak your mind so that we can learn from you! We believe that diversity in thought, experience, and belief is where real learning takes place, and so we particularly respect and value your critical analysis, engagement, and reflection. Push your learning edge and comfort zone—and help us push ours.

- o Of course, a crucial part of learning from diversity involves our willingness to critique, explore, respect, and challenge our own beliefs and opinions, as well as those of others. In the same way that we value your disagreement with us, we value your willingness to challenge your own thoughts and assumptions. We pledge to do our best to create an environment of safety where such self-exploration can take place, and we ask for your help in creating this environment for others.

- Grade Scale

Grade	Grade Scale	Points for Class	Grade Point Value	Description
A	93% and above	186-200	4	Excellent
A-	90-92.9%	180-185	3.67	
B+	87-89.9%	174-179	3.33	Good
B	83-86.9%	166-173	3	
B-	80-82.9%	160-165	2.67	
C+	77-79.9%	154-159	2.33	Satisfactory
C	73-76.9%	146-153	2	Minimal performance
C-	70-72.9%	140-145	1.67	
D+	67-69.9%	134-139	1.33	
D	63-66.9%	123-133	1	
D-	60-62.9%	120-122	0.67	
F	59.9% or below	119 or below	0	Unsatisfactory performance, no credit

- Missed Exams/Assignments

It is important that work be turned-in on-time. To enhance your learning, instructors need to be able to respond to you in a timely manner. Therefore, late papers and assignments will be penalized. Students will lose 10% per day the assignment is late, and assignments

that are not submitted within 3 days of the due date will not be accepted. Missed assignments may result in failure of the course.

- Behavior: This course involves personal reflection about social identities and multicultural issues that may feel very personal. As such, while students are encouraged to express their honest opinions, they are also required to be reflective and speak in ways that are not intentionally inflammatory or hurtful. We may occasionally and inadvertently hurt or offend someone else. When this happens, students are expected to listen to the feedback, acknowledge the hurt nondefensively and work to change or behaviors and speech. Hate speech will not be tolerated in this classroom and potential consequences may include, but are not limited to: reduced course grade, referred to the honor code, and loss of position.

Appendix C PASK Survey Instrument

PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators

What are some of the personal resources that you bring to your social justice work?
Which areas would you still need to develop in order to be an effective facilitator?

Directions: Under each resource below, think about where you stand at this point in time. Check the box on the right that best reflects this.	I do not yet have this resource	I have some resources but need more	I feel comfortable with this resource	I have strong resources	I can be a resource for others
(P) PASSION					
Energy for this work					
Can lead with my heart					
Deep personal reason for doing this work					
Commitment on professional level					
Commitment on personal level					
Can demonstrate compassion					
(A) PERSONAL AWARENESS					
Clarity about my identity(ies)					
Clarity about my values					
Internal emotional balance					
Awareness of my privileged social identities					
Awareness of my disadvantaged social identities					
Non-defensive acknowledgment of things I am not aware of					
Awareness of the impact of my personal style on others					
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on myself					
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on others					
Awareness of my triggers					
(S) SKILLS (Ability to: ____)					
Work with people from different groups					
Challenge others					
Take risks					
Discuss issues					
Accept others' leadership					
Utilize others' support					
Share feelings with others					
Give feedback					
Receive feedback					
(K) KNOWLEDGE (Knowledge of: ____)					
Differences between prejudice, discrimination, and institutional -isms					
My own group's(s') culture/history					
Other groups' culture/history					
Can recognize -isms					
Group process issues					
Intergroup issues					
Theories and terminology that inform and guide intergroup dialogue facilitation					

*This form is adapted from the "Facilitator Personal Assessment Chart" found in Beale, R.L., Thompson, M.C., & Chesler, M. (2001). Training peer facilitators for intergroup dialogue leadership. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.) *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace* (pp. 227-246). The University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Figure 2. PASK Survey Instrument

Appendix D Social Identity Survey

Survey is administered to all RAs in Summer 2019 prior to training in August

Survey Introduction:

This survey is intended to capture how one self-identifies with various social identities. Please read the questions below and choose the response that best represents how you self-identify based on the social identities most salient to you. This information will be kept confidential.

Survey Questions:
1. Affirmed Name:
2. Pronouns (Why pronouns? https://www.mypronouns.org/):
3. How do you racially identify? Check all that apply.
    a. White
    b. Black or African American
    c. Latino/Chicano
    d. Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
    e. Asian American
    f. Multiracial
    g. Native American/Indigenous
    h. Other:
4. Was born and raised in the United States
    a. Yes
    b. No
5. Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity?
    a. No
    b. Yes
6. Which best represents your gender identity?
    a. Genderqueer
    b. Non-binary
    c. Trans-Male
    d. Trans-Female
    e. Trans-nonbinary
    f. Cisgender female (your personal identity and gender reflects the biological sex assigned to you)
    g. Cisgender male
    h. Intersex
    i. Other:

7. Which best represents your spiritual affiliation or system of belief?
    a. Jewish
    b. Christian
    c. Muslim
    d. Buddhist
    e. Agnostic
    f. Atheist
    g. Pagan
    h. Other:
8. Which of the following statements related to income apply to you? (check all that apply)
    a. I received free and reduced lunch in high school
    b. I am Pell Grant eligible
    c. I am work-study eligible
    d. My family owns more than one vehicle
    e. My family owns our home
    f. I traveled abroad prior to coming to Chatham
    g. My family is not concerned with how to cover the cost of tuition
9. Which best describes your sexual orientation/attractionality (please check all that apply)
    a. Queer
    b. Lesbian
    c. Gay
    d. Bisexual
    e. Pansexual
    f. Asexual
    g. Heterosexual
    h. Other
10. Dietary Restrictions (Please note this is not a social identity. This question is here to help prepare for meals)
11. I am participating in this workshop as part of my commitment to the following program
    a. RA
    b. OL
    c. RISE
    d. Student Success Coach
    e. GRD
    f. CAB

Dear <INSERT NAME>,

      I am writing to let you know of a research study that is being conducted by your co-instructor for IND 245: Fostering Inclusive Communities in Residential Spaces, Heather Black. Heather is a current doctoral student at the University of Pittsburgh and is interested in learning more about your skill and knowledge development within the class.

      The purpose of this research study is to explore the development of your passion, awareness, skills, and knowledge with racial and social justice through the use of the PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators, class journals, and final papers. You completed the PASK twice as part of class activities and this data will be used as a pre- and post-measure along with journal assignments and final papers to understand development within the course. These were assignments so the data obtained will not be anonymous, but all identifiable information and names will be removed. In addition, I will use data collected from the Social Identity Survey you completed in summer 2019 prior to Resident Assistant Training in August 2019 for demographics purposes.

      I will review the study at RA Spring Training on January 3, 2020. At that time, you will be able to ask any questions. You do not need to do anything if you are willing to participate in this study. If you do not wish to participate, please send an email notifying me that you do not wish to be included to hmb59@pitt.edu.

      Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, email Heather Black at hmb59@pitt.edu.

Best Regards,

Heather Black

CONSENT TO ACT AS A PARTICIPANT IN A RESEARCH STUDY
Script to be read to all RA's who completed IND245 in Fall 2019.

STUDY TITLE: Promoting RA Racial and Social Justice Skill and Knowledge Development and through an Employment Course

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather Black, hblack@chatham.edu, 816-210-1559

INTRODUCTION:
I, Heather Black, am completing a research study on the Resident Assistant Class – IND 245: Fostering Inclusive Residential Communities during the Fall 2019 term at Chatham University. This research study aims to understand the development of RA's racial and social justice passion, awareness, skills and knowledge to build inclusive communities prior and after taking the class. As a registered and first-time RA who completed the class in the Fall 2019 term at Chatham University, you are being asked to participate in this study. 16 students are being asked to participate in the study and it will involve providing access to your class assignments for research review.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES:
This study will utilize data collected through the pre- and post-measure – The PASK: Personal Reflection Chart for Facilitators, journals, and final papers. You completed the PASK as part of your class assignment during the first week of classes and as part of your final paper. This data, along with your class journal assignments and final paper will be used within the research project. These were assignments so the data collected will not be anonymous, but all names and identifying information will be removed in the data analysis. In addition, the data collected via the Social Identity Survey prior to Resident Assistant Training will be used for demographic purposes, but all identifying information will also be removed. The aggregate study results will be shared with the Office of Student Affairs and Office of Residence Life. No additional activities are required for participation in this research beyond the use of assignments completed for this class.

RISK/BENEFITS:
This study has a risk of breach of confidentiality and no individual benefits. This data will be used to improve future classes and training, but there are no individual benefits from participating in the study.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Whether or not you choose to participate in this research study will have no effect on your position as an RA, or your relationship with Chatham University or the University of Pittsburgh. If you do not wish to have your class assignments included in this research study analysis, you should email me to request your assignments not be included. Again, if you decide not to participate this will have no impact on your grade (which is already posted), position, or relationship with Chatham University and the University of Pittsburgh.

CONSENT TO PARTICPATE

As a member of the this study, you are encouraged to ask questions, voice concerns, or complaints about any aspect of this research during the course of this study, and that such future questions, concerns or complaints will be answered by a qualified individual or by the investigator(s) listed on the first page of this consent document at the telephone numbers given.

You may always contact me directly with questions, concerns or complaints.. You may also contact the Human Subjects Protection Advocate of the IRB Office, University of Pittsburgh at 1-866-212-2668 to discuss problems, concerns, and questions; obtain information; offer input; or discuss situations that occurred during your participation. Does anyone have any questions?

PAUSE FOR QUESTIONS.

I have now explained the purpose and nature of the research study which serves as your consent to participate. To formally withdraw from the study, you can notify me directly via email at hmb59@pitt.edu.

Appendix G Journal Prompts

- **Journal 3 (submitted week 5):** Choose two of your social identities (race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, ability, size, socio-economic status, gender, national origin/citizenship) that are most salient to you and tell your story about why these identities are important to you. One social identity should be privileged and one should be marginalized. If you do not have one of each then you can write about two in the same group.

  What have you experienced regarding these social identities? How does this affect the person you are today? What experiences growing up helped to shape how you identify? How were you socialized around these identities? What are critical moments in your life around these identities that have shaped you?

- **Journal 6 (submitted week 10):** We have spent the past few weeks discussing microaggressions. We have all perpetrated racial microaggressions through direct action or remaining silent when we see them happen. Reflect on a time that your perpetrated a racial microaggression. What have you learned about yourself and racism since then? How do racial microaggressions and other microaggressions impact your residents?

Appendix H Codebook for Student Journals

Table 7. Description of Codes Related to PASK and Race for Student Journals

Topic Codes	Definition	Example
Passion	Desire and motivation to engage and/or do racial justice work	"As an RA I need to address these issues [racial microaggressions] to ensure that all of my residents feel safe and included" (Student7.Journal 6)
Commitment	Willingness to commit to racial justice work at a personal and/or professional level	"In the residence halls, I believe it should be a safe space away from microaggressions because it is an atmosphere, we [RAs] have an impact in that we can eliminate microaggressions" (Student8.Journal6)
Energy/Desire	Articulates a desire to engage and learn about racial justice	"I want to be able to correct myself in the moment, rather than not being able to do something hours later when I do recognize what my actions/speech/behaviors have done" (Student5.Journal6)
Personal Awareness	Understanding of racial identity and impact on others	"But the most important thing is how you choose to learn from these [racial] differences. Do you ask questions about why certain things are easier for [certain] people compared to others? One example would be thinking of people with different identities walking home in the middle of the night. How are these people perceived by other people? Is there an identity that you would avoid because it is perceived as threatening? Do you questions the stereotypes that exist for some people, but not others?" (Student5.Journal3)
Clarity of Racial Identity	Demonstrates understanding of own racial identity, whether privileged or disadvantaged.	"This helped me understand that although things appear 'equal', equal treatment allows privileged groups to have more of an advantaged over marginalized identities" (Student8.Journal 6)

Table 7 (continued)

107

Impact of Racial Identity	Understands how own racial identity impacts self and others	"I had the privilege of not having to talk about race, or address the systemic issues that stem from racism" (Student12.Journal3)
		"I reacted the way I did because the male's skin color [black]" (Student5.Journal6)
Skills	Ability to discuss issues, challenge others, and take risks related to racial justice	
Challenge others	Demonstrates risk taking and willingly challenges others about race	In our resident hall, we have heard microaggressions and have addressed them by talking to the victim and letting them explain their feelings and the situation; then, trying to educate the residents who use them against someone" (Student8.Journal6)
Knowledge	Understanding of racism at the system and individual level	"Misappropriation of language can be extremely harmful, and when I said those statements I was making very broad, inaccurate statements that perpetuate [racial] stigma and bias" (Student12.Journal6)
Inter-race Issues	Understands issues between privileged and minoritized racial groups	"… I have realized how much racism hurts and how it effects individuals' everyday lives" (Student8.Journal3)
Racial History	Understands long standing racial conflict and history	"I have also learned that racism is still occurring and that it is still occurs because nothing has been done to change the system that keeps it at play" (Studnet10.Journal6)
Recognize Racism	Able to name microaggressions and recognize racism	"Over time, I would notice how these kids [kids of color] were always perceived to be trouble-makers, and not just considered to be a class clown" (Student12.Journal3)

Table 7 (continued)

Color Neutral	Discusses not seeing color either in the past or currently	"… I used to tell people that 'I didn't see color; the world was a colorful tv in my eyes…" (Student3.Journal6) "I grew up in a family where my dad would say 'We don't see race in this household' and never touch the topic of race" (Student12.Journal3)
Resistance	Makes excuses or unwilling to engage racial identity and or seeing how racism manifests	"Racial microaggressions are not really a problem in my resident hall" (Student11.Journal6)

Appendix I PASK Variable Means and Standard Deviations

Table 8. Change in Variable Means and Standard Deviations from Pre- to Post-PASK

	Pre-PASK		Post-PASK		Mean Difference
	M	SD	M	SD	
Passion Overall	3.86	0.48	4.52	.37	.66
Energy for this work	3.60	0.83	4.33	.82	.73
Can lead with my heart	3.93	0.96	4.6	.51	.67
Deep personal reason for doing this work	3.53	0.74	3.73	1.03	.20
Commitment on a professional level	3.8	0.56	4.87	.35	1.07
Commitment on a personal level	3.87	0.83	4.67	.49	.80
Can demonstrate compassion	4.40	0.74	4.93	.26	.53
Personal Awareness Overall	3.71	0.57	4.23	.43	.52
Clarity about my identity(ies)	4.27	.59	4.53	.64	.26
Clarity about my values	4.40	.63	4.73	.46	.33
Internal emotional balance	3.33	1.11	3.80	1.21	.47
Awareness of my privileged social identities	4.07	.8	4.6	.51	.53
Awareness of my disadvantaged social identities	3.0	1.25	3.93	1.22	.93
Non-defensively acknowledging things I am not aware of	3.53	.99	4.0	.85	.47
Awareness of the impact of my personal style on others	3.67	.98	4.2	.86	.53
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on myself	3.80	.94	4.33	.62	.53
Awareness of the impact of my social identity group memberships on others	3.53	.99	4.2	.68	.67
Awareness of my triggers	3.53	1.13	4.0	1.07	.47
Skills Overall	3.85	.63	4.10	.61	.25
Work with people from different groups	4.47	.64	4.6	.74	.13

Table 8 (continued)

Challenge others	3.80	.77	3.93	.88	.13
Take risks	3.40	1.06	3.80	.94	.40
Discuss issues	4.07	.70	4.40	.74	.33
Accept others' leadership	3.80	1.08	4.13	.83	.33
Utilize others' support	4.07	.80	4.0	.76	(.07)
Share feelings with others	3.33	1.4	3.47	1.06	.14
Give feedback	3.80	1.08	4.2	.68	.40
Receive feedback	3.93	1.10	4.4	.63	.47
Knowledge Overall	3.26	.71	4.05	.68	.79
Differences between prejudice, discrimination, and institutional -isms	3.73	.70	4.40	.74	.67
My own groups(s) culture/history	3.73	.96	3.87	.99	.14
Other group(s) culture/history	3.07	.96	3.6	.91	.53
Can recognize -isms	3.4	.83	4.33	.72	.93
Group process issues	2.87	.92	3.87	.92	1.00
Intergroup issues	2.87	.92	4.07	.88	1.20
Theories and terminology which inform and guide intergroup dialogue facilitation	3.13	1.13	4.2	.77	1.07
PASK Overall	3.7	.42	4.21	.43	.51

Bibliography

Adams, M. (2016). Pedagogical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, D. J. Goodman, & K. Y. Joshi (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (3rd ed., pp. 27–53). New York, NY: Routledge.

Beale, R. L., Thompson, M. C., & Chesler, M. (2001). Training peer facilitators for intergroup dialogue leadership. In D. Schoem & S. Hertado (Eds.). *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace* (pp. 227–246). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Bell, L. A. (2016). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, D. J. Goodman, & K. Y. Joshi (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (3rd ed., pp. 3–26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Berger, A. A. (2016). *Media and communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Berk, R. A. (2017). Microaggressions trilogy: Part 1. why do microaggressions matter? *Journal of Faculty Development, 31*(1), 63–73.

Bhagirathy, H., & Chesler, M. (2019). *Proceedings from the National Intergroup Dialogue Institute 2019: PASK (part 1)*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Blimling, G. S. (2010). *The resident assistant* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

Blimling, G. S. (2015). *Student learning in college residence halls: What works, what doesn't, and why*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (5th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bowman, R. L., & Bowman, V. E. (1995). Academic courses to train resident assistants. *Journal of College Student Development*, *36*(1), 39–46.

Carnevale, A. P., & Strohl, J. (2013). *Separate and unequal: How higher education reinforces the intergenerational reproduction of white racial privilege executive summary*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Public Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://cew-7632.kxcdn.com/wp-content/uploads/SeparateUnequal.ES_.pdf

Carnevale, A. P., Strohl, J., & Smith, N. (2009). Help wanted: Postsecondary education and training required. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (146). doi: 10.1002/cc.363

Chatham University (n.d.). Common data set 2019-2020. Retrieved from https://chatham.edu/about-us/institutional-research/common-data-set.html

Chatham University (2017) *Self-study prepared for middle state commission on higher education*. Pittsburgh, PA: Chatham University Retrieved from http://blogs.chatham.edu/middlestates/files/2017/02/2017_Self_Study-print_v2-IP-1sub9pl.pdf

Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). *Projections of the size and composition of the US population: 2014 to 2060. Current population reports*. Washington, D.C.: United States Census Bureau. doi: P25-1143

Cook, K., & McCoy, D. L. (2017). Messages in collusion: Resident assistants and white racial identity development. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, *43*(3), 68–79.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Delgado, R., & Stefanicic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed). New York: New York University Press.

DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for White people to talk about racism.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Espinosa, L. L, Turk, J. M., Taylor, M., & Chessman, H. M. (2019). *Race and ethnicity in higher education: A status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education

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

Garcia, G. A. & Johnston-Guerrero, M. P. (2016). Challenging the utility of a racial micoraggression framework through a systematic review of racially biased incidents on campus. *Journal of Cricial Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, *2*(1), 48-66.

Goodman, D. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people form privileged groups*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gurin-Sands, C., Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Osuna, S. (2012). Fostering a commitment to social action: How talking, thinking, and feeling make a difference in intergroup dialogue. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *45*(1), 60–79. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2012.643699

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). *Dialogue across difference: Practice, theory, and research on intergroup dialogue*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hackman, H. W. (2005). Five essential components for social justice education. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *38*(2), 103–109. doi: 10.1080/10665680590935034

Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*(1S), 9–29. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2012.0047

Harper, S. R., Davis, R. J., Jones, D. E., McGowan, B. L., Ingram, T. N., & Spencer Platt, C. (2011). Race and racism in the experiences of Black male resident assistants at predominantly White universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(2), 180–200. doi: 10.1353/csd.2011.0025

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2007*(120), 7–24. doi: 10.1002/ss.254 7

Harwood, S. A., Huntt, M. B., Mendenhall, R., & Lewis, J. A. (2012). Racial microaggressions in the residence halls: Experiences of students of color at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *5*(3), 159–173. doi: 10.1037/a0028956

Holcomb, Z. C. (1998). *Descriptive statistics*. Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *63*(5), 539–569. doi: 10.2307/1982093

Jankowski, K. R. B., Flannelly, K. J., & Flannelly, L. T. (2018). Research methodology - The t-test: An influential inferential tool in chaplaincy and other healthcare research. *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy*, *24*(1), 30–39. doi: 10.1080/08854726.2017.1335050

Johnson, R. L., & Morgan, G. B. (2016). *Survey scales*. New York: Guilford Publications. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pitt-ebooks/reader.action?docID=4584953

Johnson, V. D. (2003). Cultural group perceptions of racial climates in residence halls. *NASPA Journal*, *41*(1), 114–134. doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.1308

Johnson, V. D., & Kang, Y.S. (2006). Assessing differences in resident assistant confidence in addressing issues of cultural diversity between in three predominantly White universities. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, *34*(1), 31–42.

Kang, Y. S., Johnson, V. D., & Thompson, G. F. (2011). Structural analysis of the resident assistant cultural diversity questionnaire. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, *37*(2), 38–53. Retrieved from

Karim, A., & Ross, R. (2010). Enhancing cultural proficiency. In F. B. Newton & S. C. Ender (Eds.), *Students helping students: A guide for peer educators on college campuses* (2nd ed., pp. 57–93). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Koch, V. A. (2016). Current practices in resident assistant training. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, *42*(3), 80–97.

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal Spring*, *34*(1), 39–81. doi: /10.3102/00028312034001039

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). "Your blues ain't like mine": Keeping issues of race and racism on the multicultural agenda. *Theory into Practice*, *35*(4), 248–255. doi: 10.1080/00405849609543731

Landreman, L., Edwards, K. E., Balón, D. G., & Anderson, G. (2008). Wait! It takes time to develop rich and relevant social justice curriculum. *About Campus*, *13*(4), 2–10. doi: 10.1002/abc.258

Landreman, L. M., & MacDonald-Dennis, C. (2013). The evolution of social justice education and facilitation. In Lisa M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 3–22). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Langley, G. J., Moen, R. D., Nolan, K. M., Nolan, T. W., Normam, C. L., & Provost, L. P. (2009). *Using the model for improvement*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, C. (2015). What is improvement science? Do we need it in education? *Educational Researcher*, *44*(1), 54–61. doi: 10.3102/0013189X15570388

Mertens, D. M. (2015). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mwangi, C. A. G., Thelamour, B., Ezeofor, I., & Carpenter, A. (2018). "Black elephant in the Room": Black students contextualizing campus racial climate within US racial climate. *Journal of College Student Development*, *59*(4), 456–474. doi: 10.1353/csd.2018.0042

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Griffin, K. E., Davidoff, K., & Sriken, J. (2014). The adverse impact of racial microaggressions on college students' self-esteem. *Journal of College Student Development*, *55*(5), 461–474. doi: 10.1353/csd.2014.0051

Nagda, B. A., & Gurin, P. (2007). Intergroup dialogue: A critical-dialogic approach to learning about difference, inequality, and social justice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *111*, 35–45. doi: 10.1002/tl.284

Nagda, B. A., Gurin, P., Sorensen, N., Gurin-Sands, C., & Osuna, S. M. (2009). From separate corners to dialogue and action. *Race and Social Problems*, *1*(1), 45–55. doi: 10.1007/s12552-009-9002-6

National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). College navigator: Chatham university. U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=chatham&s=all&id=211556

Ornstein, A. C. (2016). *Excellence vs. equality: Can society achieve both goals?* New York, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315673981

Petryk, T., Thompson, M. C., & Boynton, T. (2013). Building multicultural residential communities: A model for training student staff. *New Directions for Student Services*, *144*, 69–78. doi: 10.1002/ss

Reason, R. D., & Broido, E. M. (2005). Issues and strategies for social justice allies (and the student affairs professionals who hope to encourage them). *New Directions for Student Services*, *2005*(110), 81–89. doi: 10.1002/ss.167

Ryan, C. L., & Bauman, K. (2016). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2015 population characteristics*. Washington, DC: United States Census Bureau. doi: P20-578

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Schmidt, P. (2015, July 9). Campaigns against microaggressions prompt big concerns about free speech. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/article/Campaigns-Against/231459?cid=rclink

Schmidt, P. (2016, February 29). Speaker beware. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/article/Speaker-Beware/235428

Smith, W. (2010). Toward an understanding of Black misandric microagressions and racial battle fatigue in historically White Institutions. In E. M. Zamani-Gallaher & V. C. Poliet (Eds.), *The state of the African American male* (pp. 265–277). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*. *69*(1/2), 60-73.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, *62*(4), 271–286. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions as instigators of difficult dialogues on race: Implications for student affairs educators and students. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *26*(2), 136–143. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ899387

Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *15*(2), 183–190. doi: /10.1037/a0014191

Tatum, B. D. (2017). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race* (20th Anniv). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thakral, C., Vasquez, P. L., Bottoms, B. L., Matthews, A. K., Hudson, K. M., & Whitley, S. K. (2016). Understanding difference through dialogue: A first-year experience for college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(2), 130–142. doi: 10.1037/a0039935

Vaccaro, A. (2013). Building a framework for social justice education. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 23–44). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Whitney, R., Early, S., & Whisler, T. (2016). Create a better flow through sequencing resident assistant training. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, *43*(1), 28–43.

Wing, L., & Rifkin, J. (2001). Racial identity development and the mediation of conflicts. In C. Wijeyesinghe & B. W. Jackson (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 182–208). New York, NY.

Yeakley, A. M. (2011). In the hands of facilitators: Student experiences in dialogue and implications for facilitator training. In K. E. Maxwell, B. A. Nagda, & M. C. Thompson (Eds.), *Facilitating intergroup dialogues: Bridging differences, catalyzing change* (pp. 1–229). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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), 659–691. doi: 10.17763/haer.79.4.m6867014157m707l