Spring 6-11-2022

A Phenomenological Exploration of the Experience of White Students at a Mission Based University

Suzanne Kilgannon
DePaul University

DePaul University

College of Education

A Dissertation in Education with a Concentration in Curriculum Studies

A Phenomenological Exploration of the Experience of White Students at a Mission Based University

Suzanne M. Kilgannon

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June 2022

Signatory Page

We approve the dissertation of Suzanne M. Kilgannon.

Amira Proweller, Ph.D. — February 14, 2022

Amira Proweller, Ph.D. — **Date**
Associate Professor, Educational Policy Studies and Research
DePaul University
Chair of Committee

Karen Monkman — February 14, 2022

Karen Monkman, Ph. D. — **Date**
Professor Emerita, Educational Policy Studies and Research
DePaul University

Darrick Tovar-Murray — February 12, 2022

Darrick Tovar-Murray, Ph.D. — **Date**
Associate Professor, Counseling
DePaul University

Signature: *Amira Proweller*
Amira Proweller (Feb 14, 2022 13:20 CST)

Email: aprowell@depaul.edu

Signature: *Darrick Tovar-Murray*
Darrick Tovar-Murray (Feb 14, 2022 14:34 CST)

Email: dtovarmu@depaul.edu

Signature: *Karen Monkman*
Karen Monkman (Feb 14, 2022 15:55 PST)

Email: kmonkman@depaul.edu

Certification of Authorship

I certify that I am the sole author of this dissertation. Any assistance received in the preparation of this dissertation has been acknowledged and disclosed within it. Any sources utilized, including the use of data, ideas, and words, those quoted directly or paraphrased, have been cited. I certify that I have prepared this dissertation according to program guidelines, as directed.

Author Signature _____ Date February 3, 2022

ABSTRACT

Diversity is an articulated value for higher education throughout the country. This research builds on existing research about how White students experience diversity and how they make meaning of their Whiteness and White privilege. This qualitative study utilized a phenomenological approach to understand White student leaders' experience on a campus with a mission that emphasizes diversity. Eight White senior student leaders in the Division of Student Affairs were interviewed. These students experienced the campus ethos and messaging around the institutional values and mission. They also experienced leadership and diversity training in preparation for their roles. The participants discussed how they understood the mission, the values of the university, their experiences with diversity, and what it was like for them to come to understand their Whiteness and White privilege. The findings that emerged include the impact of a consequential interaction or relationship with a person of color on White student's ambivalence toward issues of race. The mission and values of inclusion and diversity had a positive impact on the students by providing important context within which they grew. Finally, the participants report that the structures and support provided by the staff who engaged with the participants was a significant positive influence on their growth. These findings show the need for the university to create opportunities to leverage opportunities for White students to explore their identity development so they can engage in critical processing to become non-racist citizens.

Keywords: White identity development, meaning-making, phenomenology, campus ethos, Catholic higher education, White dialectics

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I extend my deepest gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. Amira Proweller, who guided me with a deft and caring hand. Your patience and wisdom empowered me to sharpen my thinking and brought my work to a higher level.

To Dr. Monkman and Dr. Tovar Murray, thank you for being wonderful teachers and committee members. You pushed me to think beyond what I believed I already knew and challenged me to be open to seeing other ways of knowing.

Dr. Colette Thélémaque-Collier is a classmate who grew into a dear friend. Our belly laughs and late night texts always provided, support, challenge, guidance, and inspiration to me.

Thank you to Dr. Tara Ross who provided valuable feedback throughout my writing process.

Thank you to my family, given and chosen. Thank you to Mom and Dad who raised me to wonder why things are the way they are and to not accept the status quo. Those debates about politics and society really paid off. I only wish you were here to see me now.

Thank you to my sister who works for social justice and has never met a structure she did not challenge! Her tenacity amazed me.

I am deeply indebted to my chosen family of sorority sisters especially Leah Dooley Eickhoff, Dr. Grace Moody, and Kristi ‘Mac’ MacKenzie. I am blessed that Alpha Sigma Alpha brought us together. You always know when to push and when to listen. I am lucky to have you in my life.

To my spouse, Deb. My life changed because of you. You are my biggest fan and I know it every day. You put up with my fits of frustration and impatience and I love and thank you for believing in me always.

Thank you to all my friends across the country who believed in me when I did not and who cheered for me long distance throughout my work.

I am especially appreciative of the White student leader who was brave and authentic in sharing her frustration with me. That exchange set me on my path of research. Finally, thank you to the participants in my study. You were brave and generous in giving of yourselves. I never could have done this work without you.

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Diversity and inclusion have been long-held values of higher education because of the myriad positive outcomes for students (Bowman et al., 2016; Denson & Bowman, 2013; Denson et al., 2017; Ragins & Ehrhardt, 2020). Diversity on campus also supports higher education's social contract to prepare citizens for success in an increasingly global world (Denson & Bowman, 2013; Denson et al., 2017).

Though higher education is often a microcosm of the larger society suffering from issues of racism and inequity, it still is often seen as a place where intentional programming, education, and leadership development can help students learn how to dismantle racist structures and learn to be non-racist.

Catholic universities have a unique place in higher education in educating about the value of diversity as an extension of Catholic social justice teachings about respecting the human dignity of all people (Morey & Piderit, 2006). The context of a Catholic university provides a setting through which diversity can be enhanced by ensuring access and inclusion, addressing societal issues of racism, and helping White students learn to be non-racist (Bahr, 2021).

Problem Statement

Higher education could support White students in embracing diversity and becoming non-racist, but faculty and staff may not know how best to engage White students to support them in their growth. It is a challenge because White students typically do not see themselves as raced because they are socialized that White is the dominant culture in society and other ethnicities are subordinated (Banks, 2009). White students often do not know how to fight racism (Kivel, 2017) and grow uncomfortable and resistant during discussions about racism or inequity

(DiAngelo, 2018). Additionally, students of color on campuses are tired of working alone for racial justice on campus (Gorski, 2019). In order to appropriately support White students as they experience diversity, learn about racism and how to be non-racist, institutions need to understand what White students' experience is on campus, especially campuses with an emphasis on diversity and inclusion.

This research was conducted at a Catholic university that explicitly supports diversity as a manifestation of the Catholic and institutional values of respect for the individual and human dignity, and an urban character that values diversity and serves the underprivileged. To effectively leverage that context of a commitment to diversity, we need to understand what it is like for White students on a campus which embraces diversity as a value.

Purpose Statement

This purpose of this research is to examine the experience of White student leaders on a campus which emphasizes racial diversity through its mission, values, and campus ethos. This qualitative, phenomenological research aims to understand how White students experience a mission-based institution that emphasizes diversity and inclusion. This research will provide important insight into what it is like for White student leaders on a campus that emphasizes the value of racial diversity through its mission, values, and campus ethos.

The research was conducted at a large, four-year, private, Catholic, mostly non-residential institution located in an urban setting that values diversity and inclusiveness. While the university is still majority White, students of color comprise over 40% of the student population.

Research Question

The main question researched in this study is: How do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity? Sub-questions were also addressed as follows:

- How do the students experience the institution's definition of diversity?
- How do students experience the institution's mission and values?
- How do the students make meaning of the university mission?

Brief Overview of Methodology

This research is a qualitative study exploring how students experience and make sense of the world in which they live. I used qualitative phenomenological research methods to understand the lived experiences concerning a phenomenon described by the participants and how it impacted their lives (Moustakas, 1994).

I conducted two in-depth interviews with each participant to understand their experience on campus. The interviews were audio-recorded, and I took notes throughout. I posed semi-structured, open-ended questions to them so the participants could share their stories and experiences in their own words. As I moved into analysis, I explored emergent themes grounded in supporting data and examined how they were inter-related.

Rationale and Significance

Students at this university experience messaging about the importance of diversity on campus through new student orientation, student leader training, and through parts of the university liberal studies curriculum. I wondered how the White student leaders experienced their racial identity as they learned about these values and experienced this messaging.

It has been over a century since W.E.B. Du Bois wrote about White entitlement to space and power in “The Souls of White Folk” (Hughey, 2020). Du Bois maintained that whiteness and White identity are central to White domination and are weaponized against people of color. This weaponization continues today as White people call the police when Black people participate in everyday activities like going to the pool, grilling, golfing (Farzan, 2018) or birdwatching (Nir, 2020). Whiteness continues to be weaponized in higher education through campus practices, policies, traditions, and understandings of knowledge that are taken as the norm in higher education (Gin et al., 2017; Gusa, 2010).

The university explicitly supports diversity as a manifestation of the Catholic and institutional values of respect for the individual and human dignity and an urban character that values diversity and serves the underprivileged. The value of diversity is expressed through "concern about including those who have been excluded by society, by the economy, by the church, or by any human system” (Murphy, 1991, p. 155). The university's commitment to diversity manifests in multiple ways, including its mission statement, values statement, and statement of diversity, its diverse student population, and its broad curricular and co-curricular offerings.

While these institutional values and guiding documents embrace diversity, there have been hate incidents on campus and backlash from students rejecting diversity Karimi (2019). These instances occurred periodically throughout the university’s history, as early as 2006 and as recently as 2020. During that period of time, a series of incidents of hate on campus took place, which included nooses, anti-Semitic flyers, racist graffiti in residence halls, anti-affirmative action activities, and anti-Mexican chalking on sidewalks. In addition to these incidents on

campus, many students challenged the university for what they perceived to be the lack of faculty of color receiving tenure, and a lack of diversity in hiring of faculty and staff. A faculty council committee was created to address the tenure process. In response to the hate incidents, the university administration released statements reinforcing the university values and its commitment to those values, but many students did not feel like enough was done to address the issues.

These cases are not unique to this university as incidents occur across the country at various institutions (Bauman, 2018; Karimi, 2019; Rivas, 2014). While hate, violence and bullying have increased across the United States since 2016 (Levin, 2017; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016), concern over increased racial conflict has been growing on college campuses (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Museus et al., 2015). Racial incidents on campus, including racial slurs, cultural appropriation, blackface, and swastikas have been increasing (Jaschik, 2016). One campus reviewed data from a campus wide survey and found that almost 60% of student participants reported being victimized (Dekeseredy et al., 2019).

Many students of color at historically White institutions face racial hostility negatively influencing their sense of belonging and subsequent success (Gusa, 2010; Harper & Yeung, 2013; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Additionally, while universities welcome the exchange of ideas through discourse including even intolerant and offensive discourse, they are often challenged as to how to manage when members of the community feel threatened because intolerance is weaponized. The university community is caught in a tension between free speech and the desire to protect members of the university community who feel threatened (Welshon, 2020). Administrators, who are often White, are challenged to enact systemic change to address racism

and violence. “They fail to recognize their own position of power and leverage it for the greater good, and they are faced with competing priorities regarding other university stakeholders including donors (p. 50).” This study provides a firsthand perspective into the meaning making and White identity formation of student leaders on a college campus. Prior research shows White college students have different ways of conceptualizing race on campus and understanding their own identity (Johnston, 2014). This study can provide these students a lens into White students' experiences and how they experienced their racial identity development.

Staff and faculty on college and university campuses will benefit from this study by understanding the experiences of White students. They will also benefit by understanding the important role that staff and faculty play in exploring race and its impact on institutions. Additionally, faculty and staff at Catholic institutions may benefit from this study because of the unique commitment they have to diversity because of Catholic social justice teachings emphasizing human dignity. Ropers-Huilman, Winters, and Enke (2013) highlighted the importance of staff and faculty engaging in the challenging work of examining race on Catholic campuses and how race manifests itself in power on campus. Faculty and staff bring a powerful voice to centering racism within the social justice values of the university (Bahr, 2021). They also can access systems within the university bureaucracy that students often cannot access in order to affect change.

This study will provide insight to campus professionals about how White students experience and make meaning of the Catholic mission, values, expectations, and campus messages around diversity. The findings of this research may influence the program and training offerings of those departments to better meet the needs of their students.

Role of the Researcher and Researcher Assumptions

As a former student affairs professional, I was aware of the role the Division of Student Affairs played in bringing the university mission and values to life for the student community. To address any assumptions that may have impacted my lens as a researcher, I was deliberate and purposeful in not interpreting any meaning of what the participants' said too quickly to allow for time to process and check my perspectives. In keeping with the phenomenological method, I examined my thoughts and attempted to set them aside through mindful journaling. This journaling allowed me to remain conscious of my thoughts and when they may impact my ability as a researcher to remain open to what the participants are sharing with me.

During the analysis of the data, I was purposeful in returning frequently to the audio recordings of the interviews to listen for tone, inflection, and any other indicators that may help in understanding what the participants were saying. I also read and re-read the transcripts multiple times to best describe what I was hearing in the audio recordings.

Definition of Key Terminology

This study will focus on the experience of White students at an institution that emphasizes diversity. The following terms are explained for this study:

Campus ethos - A college or university's ethos is a belief system widely shared by the campus community, including faculty, students, administrators, and others (Kuh, 1993) Ethos is the character of a culture that underpins policy, procedure, and practice at an institution.

Diversity – The term diversity has various definitions based on the contexts it is used. According to O'Mara (2015) in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence*, diversity refers to "the variety of differences and similarities/dimensions among people, such as in gender,

race/ethnicity, tribal/indigenous origins, age, culture, generation, religion, class/caste, language, education, geography, nationality, disability, sexual orientation, work style, work experience, job role and function, thinking style, and personality type" (p. 268). In higher education, diversity has had various meanings depending on the time in history. In the early 1900s, college staff used diversity to exclude students from institutions. By mid-century, campuses opened to diversity including a range of ideas and people (Stulberg & Chen, 2011). Since the 1960s and 70s, diversity in admissions meant the inclusion of historically excluded groups (Karabel, 2005). Considering the context of the Catholic university where this study was conducted, it is important to note that Catholic Social Justice Teaching acknowledges and encompasses each human as different and unique. All humans' dignity is the foundation of a moral vision for society and creates inclusive environments where human diversity is valued (Schnurr, 2020)

Inclusion – According to O'Mara (2015), inclusion is defined as, "How diversity is leveraged to create a fair, equitable, healthy, and high-performing organization or community where all individuals are respected and feel engaged and motivated, and where their contributions toward meeting organizational and societal goals are valued" (p. 268).

Racial identity development – Helms (1990) explains racial identity development as concerning the psychological implications of racial group membership; that is, belief systems that evolve in reaction to perceived differential racial-group membership" (p. 4).

White racial identity – White racial identity is a process where White people form self-identity as part of America's dominant culture. Helms described this process (1990): "He or she must accept his or her Whiteness, the cultural implications of being White, and define a view of

the self as a racial being that does not depend on the perceived superiority of one racial group over another" (p. 49).

Conclusion

This study includes a review of existing literature related to the topic of racial identity development. Chapter Two follows, in which I examine the various perspectives of prior research, issues, and challenges related to this topic. A summary of the existing literature provides a context that shapes this study. Chapter Three provides insight into the research methodology used for this study. An extensive explanation of the methodology's history and its relevance for exploring my research question is presented. There is an explanation of how participants were identified and selected and how data were collected and analyzed. Limitations and delimitations of the chosen methodology are also discussed. Chapter Four is the presentation of the background of the eight participants and the findings from the data collected for the study through the two interviews conducted with each participant and from the notes and journaling I engaged in through analysis. In Chapter Five, the findings are analyzed within the context of the frameworks of phenomenology and White dialectics to show how this research connects to the current literature in the field of Whiteness and White identity work. Finally, Chapter 6 presents the conclusion to the study summarizing the findings and presenting recommendations for policy and practice based on the findings. Suggestions for future research are also provided.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore the research question, how do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity? Sub-questions were also addressed, including how the students experience the institution's definition of diversity, how the students experience the institution's mission and values, and how students make meaning of the university mission. To elucidate the issues these questions explore, the literature review covers topics including racial diversity in higher education, campus ethos, White racial identity, and the social construction of Whiteness. This literature review largely pulls from the disciplines of education, psychology, and sociology and explores the existing literature in these areas of scholarship to provide a description, summary, and evaluation of these pieces in relation to the main research question examined in this study. The theoretical framework of the study is also discussed.

Racial Diversity in Higher Education

Institutions throughout the United States define and promote racial diversity on their campuses in unique ways related to their campus mission and values. Within higher education, student affairs has always played an important role in addressing issues of diversity (Karkouti, 2015). Generally, student affairs work traditionally focuses on campus climate and out-of-classroom growth of students (Pope et al., 2009). This research focused on student leaders on campus, so the literature is situated in a student affairs perspective.

In student affairs literature, the term diversity is used in three ways. It is used to describe structural diversity which is the institutional demographics of students, faculty, and staff (Hart &

Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado et al., 1998). Curricular/co-curricular diversity describes the learning opportunities in and out of the classroom for students (Denson, 2009; Denson & Bowman, 2017; Denson et al., 2020). Interaction diversity describes the effects of student interactions across different populations (Hurtado et al., 2012). The following section provides a more comprehensive explanation of these types of campus diversity.

Structural Diversity

Structural diversity refers to the university community's make-up, including the diversity found among the faculty, staff, and students. The demographics of the campus do positively impact students by providing a context for academic success and student development (Jones, 2013). There are positive effects in various outcomes including academic development, personal development, and social development (Fischer, 2008; Gottfredson et al., 2008; Smith, 2015). This literature is particularly significant because of its breadth, as it represents hundreds of institutions and tens of thousands of students.

Democratic values and civic engagement among college students were positively affected by institutional structural diversity by enhancing critical thinking, civility, and participating effectively in society (Astin, 1984). These findings were affirmed by a variety of researchers, including Peifer, Chambers, and Lee (2017), Park and Kim (2013), Engberg (2007; 2011), and Jayakumar (2008). They found that structural diversity helped students enhance their pluralistic orientation, which supports diverse people, perspectives, and beliefs. Students with enhanced pluralistic perspectives are prepared to engage in our diverse democracy.

Additional studies found that structural diversity positively enhanced cognitive ability, leadership skills, cultural knowledge and understanding, and citizenship skills (Astin, 1993;

Denson & Chang, 2015; Hurtado et al., 1998). These growth areas are all key to enhancing students' ability to function effectively in a pluralistic, democratic society.

While the research on structural diversity reveals that having a diverse student, faculty, and staff population only lays the groundwork for student growth, on campus diversity merely reflects numbers on campus. Diversity must be carried out as a process in intentional ways to bring out and enhance the educational benefits of diversity for students and for the institution (United States. Department of Education. Office of Planning & Development, 2016).

Curricular/Co-curricular Diversity

Curricular/co-curricular offerings consist of programs designed to help students engage in diversity of ideas as well as people (Denson, 2009; Denson & Bowman, 2017; Denson et al., 2020). These experiences on campus may include activities in a course, workshops hosted by departments, courses focused on diversity, and social justice education (Byrd et al., 2020). Co-curricular diversity programs occur across campus through various campus programming, training for student leaders and employees, and programming and training for special populations like residential students, fraternity and sorority members, and athletes. The literature reveals that both curricular and co-curricular offerings enhance campus structural diversity, particularly in addressing racial bias (Bowman et al., 2016; Parker et al., 2016). Co-curricular activities have also been found to motivate students to challenge their own biases and promote inclusion and social justice (Denson, 2009; Milem et al., 2005; Zuniga et al., 2005).

The effects of curricular/co-curricular diversity are enhanced through cumulative learning and interaction across groups (Chang et al., 2006; Hurtado et al., 2012; Legare, 2017). Chang (2002b) revealed that students who had completed their curricular diversity requirement

experienced more significant positive effects on racial attitudes than students who had just started their coursework. Bowman (2010b) also found that students who took two diversity courses have greater gains in well-being and diversity orientations than those who take only one course. Students who took more diversity courses are more comfortable with differences, have a greater appreciation of diversity, and have more diversity in their social contacts (p. 554).

While curricular/co-curricular diversity is important in enhancing learning outcomes, it is interaction across diverse groups of people that emerged as a critical element of student growth and development around diversity, regardless of the structural diversity on campus or the curricular/co-curricular offerings on campus (Denson & Chang, 2009). That interaction is called simply, interaction diversity.

Interaction Diversity

Research exploring the significance of interaction diversity has expanded in the last 20 years. Interactions happen across campus in classes, through campus activities, by living in residence halls, or through acquaintances and friendships. Growth through interaction occurs in a variety of areas of development, including improved intercultural competencies, increased openness to new experiences and people, and enhanced tolerance for ambiguity (Bowman, 2010b; Peifer et al., 2017). Students who engage in frequent interactions with diverse peers show a greater openness to diverse perspectives and a willingness to challenge their own beliefs (Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2013). Interaction diversity enhances moral and intellectual development (Jayakumar, 2008) and cognitive development, including the ability to integrate ideas and multiple perspectives, academic self-confidence, social agency, and critical thinking (Nelson Laird, 2005). Two different meta-analyses of the literature illustrated that interaction diversity's

most significant cognitive effects come through interpersonal engagement with diversity. Such engagement allows students to apply their abstract knowledge to real-world interactions (Bowman, 2010a)

Out-of-classroom interaction with racially diverse individuals and groups was found to have positive effects on social self-confidence (Chang, 1999), democracy outcomes (Cole & Zhou, 2014; Hurtado, 2005; Spanierman et al., 2008), and interpersonal skills development (Antonio, 2001). Villalpando's (2002) research examined four years of national data where it was found that, regardless of race, students' overall satisfaction with their college experiences was positively influenced.

Interaction diversity contributes to positive race relations on campus and results in more inclusive social conditions and equity for people of color. There is decreased reported prejudicial attitudes and discrimination (Davies et al., 2011; Gottfredson et al., 2008), higher levels of cultural awareness (Antonio, 2001), and increased pluralistic orientation among students (Engberg & Hurtado, 2011; Hurtado, 2005; Jayakumar, 2008).

A key factor to the positive outcomes of interaction diversity are the conditions of that interaction. Hurtado (2005) revealed that negative interactions with diversity led to lower self-confidence and cultural awareness and reinforced stereotypes and differences rather than providing an opportunity for building on commonalities across difference. Hurtado showed that the quality of student interactions with diverse peers is essential (positive and meaningful interaction) in producing a host of essential outcomes, noting that “[if] interactions are left to chance, students will likely revert to familiar and solidified positions when encountering conflict” (p. 610).

The frequency of interactions across difference was also found to have a significant impact on student growth. Not surprisingly, the more interaction that occurs, the more students grow accustomed to social difference, hone intergroup skills, and are prepared for diverse workplaces through enhanced openness to diversity, cognitive development, and self-confidence (Antonio, 2001; Chang et al., 2006; Kwak et al., 2019; Park & Chang, 2015). Frequent interactions were also found to positively affect cross-race relationships (Saenz et al., 2007), reduce prejudice, and help students' ability and willingness to consider different perspectives (Gottfredson et al., 2008) Clarke and Antonio (2012) asserted that interaction across difference through weak ties rather than close friends produced the strongest positive effects for cognitive and democratic outcomes. Loose ties with students who are different from each other provide new information that stimulates growth (p. 34).

Overall, the literature about interaction diversity reveals its positive impact on student growth. While the mere presence of diversity on campus does positively affect students, the most significant growth occurs through intentional, structured interactions among diverse communities on campus, facilitated by skilled faculty and administrators. Interaction diversity enhances student affective and cognitive growth, and better prepares students for citizenship in a diverse democracy. Finally, institutional efforts around interaction diversity should be directed to ensure that the interactions are positive, and that growth can occur.

While interaction with diversity does provide myriad positive outcomes central to preparing all students for success in an increasingly diverse world including student satisfaction (Chang, 1999; Denson, 2009; Lin et al., 2019) and cognitive and affective development (Bowman, 2010a; Jayakumar, 2008; Pascarella et al., 2014), there is more recent literature that

highlights the importance of student affairs educators' focus on designing and delivering programming for White students. Programming should challenge White people to understand systemic racism (Foste, 2019; Foste & Jones, 2020; Karkouti, 2015). These studies assert that student affairs plays a significant role in programming for White students in order to move them away from merely acknowledging their White privilege to collectively challenging White complicity in systemic racism. This suggested shift in emphasis addresses the systemic nature of racism, rather than focusing on individual bias and hatred. The focus on individual bias allows Whites to marginalize racism as something done by others like racists and bigots, rather than to appreciate the pervasive nature of systemic racism and the complicity of Whites in those systems. Foste (2019) argues that shifting the focus will lead to disrupting the status quo of Whiteness on campus.

This section examined the use of the term diversity in higher education including structural diversity, the demographics of the institution; curricular/co-curricular diversity, the learning opportunities about diversity across campus; and interaction diversity, the interactions that students have across diverse student groups. These three types of campus diversity each provide different experiences and outcomes to students. To achieve the best learning and civic outcomes, campus leaders need to focus on all three types simultaneously while committing to providing challenge and support to White students so they can grow.

The next section focuses on the campus environment and the expectations that are set through campus ethos for the community around diversity and inclusion.

Campus Ethos

While the three forms of diversity on campus are significant for student learning and development, campus ethos is also essential because it shapes the campus community by communicating the expectations and unique qualities that distinguish one institution from another (Howman Wood, 2011; Kuh, 1993; Kuh et al., 2011). Understanding the campus ethos at the researcher's university provides insight into the institutional expectations for diversity. It also provides context for the experience of the participants in this study. The perception of the campus commitment to diversity is a powerful mechanism for shaping its mission, policies, and procedures regarding diversity.

When there is a culture of expectation for the value of diversity, students report more growth. The literature shows that institutions with a strong campus ethos around engaging with diversity and having a racially diverse student population have more substantial positive outcomes for students. Parker, Barnhardt, Pascarella, and McCowin (2016) found that a campus ethos that expressed an institutional commitment to diversity was the most significant predictor of positive moral development. Chang (2002a) also found that students report an ethos of commitment to diversity when the campus not only offers a variety of diversity-related opportunities but actively encourages students to take advantage of them.

Research shows the campus ethos is communicated in many ways, but the university mission statement is particularly powerful. LePeau (2015) examined partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs creating diversity education on campus. In this study, the participants shared that they looked to the mission and institutional documents to understand

what values the institution espoused. They indicated that they used the mission to frame their educational initiatives (p. 110).

Engberg (2007) highlighted that a demonstrated commitment to diversity is essential regardless of whether the campus is diverse or not. His finding that students at homogenous liberal arts colleges report more frequent and more meaningful experiences with diversity than students at other colleges and universities reveals the importance of campus ethos. These interactions were shaped by the unique ethos of liberal arts colleges and their specific commitment to a liberal studies curriculum. Umbach and Kuh (2006) also found that liberal arts colleges' ethos influences policies and procedures that encourage engagement with diversity and enhance student learning.

Catholic institutions are another type of campus that have a unique opportunity to establish clear expectations for diversity on campus. The strong commitment of Catholic universities to Catholic social justice teachings and to the dignity of all people creates an opportunity for these institutions to foster an ethos around diversity (Morey & Piderit, 2006). While Catholic colleges and universities may display their commitment to diversity in a range of ways, one university president asserted that Catholic institutions display "an openness to all, a welcoming aspect toward many different kinds of individuals from different races, creeds…" (p. 157).

Additionally, Catholic colleges and universities have historically served marginalized populations by providing education to those students who did not have access to education through other institutions (Gallin, 2000). Often those populations were racially diverse, especially for those institutions based in urban settings (Holtschneider, 2013). There is a scarcity

of literature examining the unique setting of Catholic institutions and the impact of diversity. This research can contribute significantly to initiating a vital conversation, especially because Catholic institutions are not immune to racial tension and incidents (Clark, 2009; Jones, 2007; Rivas, 2014).

The literature reveals the important role campus ethos plays in shaping the expectations for the campus community about diversity. These expectations are communicated through campus policies, procedures, and mission. Specific to this research it was revealed that Catholic campuses are uniquely positioned to serve diverse student populations and to enhance diversity education throughout the campus community. However, students have experienced many influences prior to their arrival on campus which impact their attitudes about diversity education. This next section examines pre-college factors that affect the views of students towards diversity initiatives on campus.

Pre-College Attitudes and Experiences

Students do not come to campus as a blank slate. Rather, they bring their lifetime of experiences with them. While the positive effects of diversity on students and campus ethos are critical in setting expectations for the campus community, the students' pre-college experiences influence the impact of diversity on students. Pike and Kuh (2006) highlighted that student attitudes, perceptions, and outcomes involving diversity are mediated by myriad factors that are mostly beyond the control of the university or college. The pre-college experiences of students before college do influence student openness to diversity.

Two studies examined national data sets exploring student openness to diversity. One study examined student openness after the first year of college (Pascarella et al., 1996) and a

second study examined openness after the second and third years of college. Whitt et al. (2001) found that a student's level of openness to diversity when they come to campus was the strongest predictor of openness to diversity on campus even as upperclassmen. However, this literature does not identify the specific pre-college factors contributing to openness to diversity.

Milem (2003) found that interaction with diversity before college was a positive predictor for involvement in diversity-related activities on campus. This was found mostly the case for White students. However, additional literature reveals that universities that are more structurally diverse and that foster more diverse curricular and co-curricular activities positively impact the students' level of interactions with diverse peers, regardless of how much interaction there was for the students before college (Jayakumar, 2008; Saenz, 2010).

Pre-college factors may also consider the influence of families on students' attitudes. While there is a lack of literature examining parents' influence on White students' racial attitudes, the research that does exist examines how families socialize their elementary school students about race and ethnicity (Cabrera et al., 2017; Zucker & Patterson, 2018). Studies reveal that White families are reluctant to acknowledge racial disharmony with their White children, so they adopt a color-blind approach to race issues to promote a viewpoint that all people are equal. This approach creates dissonance for the students as they grow and experience systems of inequity in society (p. 3906). As students grow, the influence of other factors beyond the influence of parents come into play on students' attitudes. There is literature examining the impact of parental racial attitudes on older students. That literature focuses on the impact of parental racial attitudes on the students' cross-race relationships (Edmonds & Killen, 2009).

The experiences that colleges students had during their K-12 education also shapes attitudes and perspectives once they get to college. K-12 students do not have the opportunity to explore issues of racism and White supremacy for several reasons. Most public school teachers in the United States are White. A 2017-18 survey shares that almost 80 percent of public school teachers are White (Taie & Goldring, 2020). The White teachers often struggle to address issues of race because of their resistance to and discomfort with talking about race (Sleeter, 2017). The teachers grow defensive, avoid talking about race, and explain away racial inequity by using notions of meritocracy in the United States (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). This defensiveness and avoidance inhibit the ability of White teachers to understand the racial identities and experiences of students of color, or their own identity as Whites. Because the teachers are not comfortable addressing racial issues, their students do not have an opportunity to fully examine race and racism during their K-12 education. This leaves them unprepared for the new experiences they may have once they get to college.

White Students Adjusting in Higher Education

White students are likely to have grown up in homogenous neighborhoods and have not had much exposure to diversity before coming to a college campus (Bernstein et al., 2020; Bowman & Denson, 2012). While the literature reveals the positive effects structural, curricular/co-curricular, and interaction diversity have on White college students, White students typically find themselves having to adjust to engaging with more racial diversity than they had experienced before coming to college.

In addition, Banks (2009) asserted that White students do not understand where they belong in the context of diversity. White students typically do not see themselves as raced

because they are White, so they do not feel the need to be included in discussions about diversity. They do not feel they are part of any initiatives to enhance diversity (p. 153). Initiatives that demonstrate to White students the importance of diversity in their education and how diversity positively impacts their future success in the global community are most effective in affecting change (Banks, 2013; Banks & Banks, 2019; Banks, 2009; Quaye et al., 2008).

White students feel a great deal of discomfort as they experience a more diverse campus demographic, are exposed to new concepts in the curriculum, and have interactions with diverse populations through classes and programming on campus. White students are challenged to integrate these new experiences into their attitudes and values, causing disequilibrium and discomfort for them (Bowman, 2009; Bowman, 2010a; Cabrera & Corces-Zimmerman, 2017; Denson & Bowman, 2017). They learn that they enjoy White privilege that provides them access to resources and systems that students of color do not. They are also challenged to validate the experiences of students of color on campuses which may be uncomfortable for them to hear (Vianden, 2018). White students also report experiencing significant feelings of White guilt.

White guilt is an emotion experienced by White people in reaction to being confronted with racism (Grzanka et al., 2020). Helms (1994; 1990) asserted that White guilt is part of the process of White identity development. Tatum (1992) asserts that it is imperative to warn White students of the discomfort they may experience.

> Students' emotional responses to talking and learning about racism are entirely predictable and related to their racial identity development. Unfortunately, students typically do not know this; thus, they consider their guilt, shame,

> embarrassment, or anger an uncomfortable experience that they alone are having (p. 19).

White guilt is manifested in myriad ways including anger, denial, fragility, discomfort, and sadness (Cabrera, 2014; Cabrera & Corces-Zimmerman, 2017; DiAngelo, 2018; Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015). Applebaum (2017) argued that White guilt is often used by Whites as a weapon to avoid responsibility for racism and having agency to affect change. The impact of White guilt is that it focuses on the emotional response of White people to learning about racism and deflects away from the power and privilege of Whiteness in society and the impact of racism on people of color.

However, White guilt does not always have a negative effect. Often White guilt can motivate White people to engage in civic action for social justice (Selvanathan et al., 2018; Stewart, 2009). Other research suggests White guilt is predictive of supporting efforts at compensating people of color for past racism or oppression such as support for affirmative action initiatives (Stewart et al., 2012).

This literature shows that White students experience discomfort, disequilibrium, and White guilt when engaging diversity in college. They also may manage their discomfort in a variety of ways. This next section explores the challenges of engaging with White students who are experiencing discomfort and White guilt.

Engaging White Student Discomfort with Diversity

Despite the positive educational outcomes of diversity education and diversity on campus, White students experience discomfort with diversity. This discomfort has to do with how Whites are socialized. Tatum (1992) found that they are socialized to believe that the United

States is a just society. When Whites engage with diversity and learn about systemic racism like the lack of equitable access to financial and educational resources or the disproportionate violence against people of color by police, they experience discomfort. There is debate in the literature about how to engage White students' discomfort.

Leonardo (2004; 2009) asserted that educational strategies addressing discomfort should not shame White students but help them understand that discomfort. Strategies that help White students understand that they are raced individuals, that they enjoy privilege in society because of their Whiteness, and that this privilege impacts those around them creates opportunities for growing by engaging in discussions about diversity more fully (p. 141). Strategies addressing White student discomfort help them understand the positive and vital role they play in fighting racism (Giroux, 1997; Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017; Kivel, 2017). By helping White students acknowledge that systems are based on White dominance, those systems can be transformed to be more inclusive and fair structures. This transformation helps all students fully embrace all racial identities without subordinating one group to another so all can reach their full humanity (Chubbuck, 2006).

DiAngelo (2018) also argues for strategies to challenge White students about the discomfort that they feel when discussing diversity. She commented that strategies that comfort White students make them victims, decentering people of color as the true victims of racism and marginalization (p. 152). Leonardo (2004) argues that

> supporting but not alleviating white students' discomfort necessitates that the genealogy of the emotions that circulate in the classroom and their discursive effects be interrogated. Most significantly, supporting will avoid comforting only

if critical analysis begins from the objective experiences of the oppressed" (p. 141).

Leonardo (2009) and DiAngelo (2018) challenge educators to refrain from soothing White students' discomfort. They contend that by being in that discomfort, Whites can experience the objective struggle of the oppressed. By not relieving White students of their discomfort, they can begin a critical analysis of the structures that exist to maintain racism in the country rather than focusing on their anxiety about their Whiteness.

Applebaum (2017) further asserts that educators help White students develop vulnerability to counter White fragility and discomfort. Applebaum (2017) asserted that Whites should be challenged to lean into their discomfort by encouraging vulnerability through critical hope. Critical hope is a framework that acknowledges the tension of critiquing despair, privilege, inequality, but also acknowledges the positive change that can come from that critique (Grain & Lund, 2016). Encouraging vulnerability through critical hope can help White students embrace their discomfort and be willing to be open to struggle.

This literature illustrates the positive effects of diversity education. Through structural diversity, curricular and co-curricular offerings, and cross-racial interaction, all students enjoy increased satisfaction, increased cognitive and personal development, and an increased appreciation for difference. The literature also reveals that diversity and engagement with diversity positively impact one's racial identity development. Conversely, it has also been found that one's identity development impacts the effect that diversity has on the individual.

White Racial Identity

The focus of this study is based on the racial identity development of college students. Understanding racial identity development provides a context for appreciating how students view themselves, their position in the world, and their relationship to those who are different from them. It is essential to clarify the use of the terminology found in this area of the literature. The terms 'ethnic' and 'racial' have been used interchangeably when exploring identity development. The definitions were once believed to be biologically determined. However, there is now agreement that both terms are considered social constructs (Cooper & Leong, 2008) (Frankenberg, 1993; J. E. Helms, 1994; Torres, 2009; Trimble, 2007).

The social construction of identity occurs in different contexts on campus, including student organizations or through the social identities of those in leadership positions on campus and those who are not (Torres, 2009). Torres explained that identity development includes the process of students learning how to balance their needs with those of others (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Identity development is flexible and influenced by science and political contexts (Cokley, 2007; Rowe, 2006).

In particular, ethnic identity is defined as the subjective identification an individual has with a segment of society whose members have a common origin and share common values, language, and other symbolic indicators of that ethnic group (Neville et al., 2001; Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007). Racial identity is defined as the social construction used to identify with any group socialized to think of themselves as a group based on physical characteristics and other hereditary traits (Cokley, 2007; J. Helms, 1994).

For this research, the term racial identity is used rather than ethnic identity. This is intentional because this study examined White identity, and Whites do not identify with their ethnic background as they once did during the immigration wave into the United States in the early 20th century (McDermott & Samson, 2005). Over time, White ethnic immigrants assimilated into American society. Further, the physical characteristic of their White skin color is what impacts how Whites perceive themselves and how they are treated in society (Cokley, 2007; Helms & Tallyrand, 1997; Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007; Trimble, 2007).

Early Work on Racial Identity Development

Racial identity theories in psychology argue that everyone belongs to a racial identity group, though the extent to which everyone identifies with the group differs. Racial identity theory positions race as a sociopolitical and cultural construction, rather than a scientific category (Giroux, 1997; Helms & Tallyrand, 1997; Omi & Winant, 1994). These identity models describe how one goes through stages of identity development to understand one's shared common heritage with a group. The stage models of the late 1980s and 1990s assumed growth occurred linearly with individuals moving from the realization and awareness of one's own racial identity to self-acceptance and pride (J. Helms, 1994; Helms, 1990; J. E. Helms, 1994; Helms, 1995; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991). As research in racial identity development progressed, the models became more complex to address identity development's cognitive dimensions and the behavioral and affective expressions of one's identity development (Carter, 1995; Helms, 2014; Umaña-Taylor, 2015). Over the last decade, racial identity development research focuses on understanding three aspects of self, including one's view of their race, racial

views concerning other groups, and the dominant group's impact on their group status. This development is a process that occurs over a lifetime (Ong et al., 2010; Phinney, 1996).

Initial racial identity research primarily focused on the development of people of color. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the racial identity of White individuals was explored, primarily focused on growth toward a nonracist identity (Helms, 1984; Sabnani et al., 1991). The following section explains the expansion of White identity development models.

White Identity Development

The first approaches to White identity development helped researchers understand how one moves from low racial awareness to a more sophisticated understanding of oneself and their relation to others (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984; Sabnani et al., 1991).

Hardiman's model (1982) was one of the first White identity models presented. It is based in five stages - Whites face including Naivete, Acceptance, Resistance, Redefinition, and Internalization. The Naivete stage is typically found in children who have little awareness of race, though they may wonder why another person's skin is different from their own.

In the Acceptance stage, White people believe that the United States affords every individual an equal chance for success (p. 166). People of color who face challenges or issues like unemployment or poverty experience those difficulties because of their own personal struggles or because they do not try hard enough, rather than any structural, systemic context that may inhibit people of color from succeeding. Many Whites remain in the Acceptance stage throughout their lives.

Some White individuals move into what Hardiman called the Resistance stage (p. 181). In this stage, Whites face the realities of racism in the U.S. and their own racist views.

Individuals in this stage may feel uncomfortable around people of color fearing that they may inadvertently offend them. Additionally, Whites in this stage many also feel negatively towards their own White race.

Beyond Resistance is Redefinition where Whites examine their own Whiteness, including the biases they may hold against people of color and the unearned benefits they may enjoy because they are White (p. 194). White people in the redefinition stage begin to feel more comfortable with people of color.

The final stage in Hardiman's model is Internalization where the individual has become conscious of their own White identity but is also motivated to work towards changing the status quo of racism personally and structurally (p. 200). An individual in this stage needs support to stay in this stage without regressing back to a lower stage of development.

Helms' (1984) work was based on the belief that all people in the United States possess a racial identity developed and experienced within the social constructions of privilege and oppression. Helms' model of White identity development presented a five-stage model consisting of Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo independence, and Autonomy. The stages focused on raising awareness of White people about their role in creating and maintaining a racist society and the need for them to act responsibly by dismantling it (1984). This linear, stage-based development model is grounded in the vital function of moving away from racist attitudes and beliefs to a more mature racial identity with non-racist attitudes and actions.

The first status, Contact, is when the White person does not reflect upon his or her race, or race in general (p. 154). An individual operating within the Contact status has little understanding or acknowledgement of racism and does not believe that Whites have any racial

advantages over people of color. When those individuals who are operating in the Contact status are confronted with contradictions to their oblivious views on race, they enter the Disintegration status.

Disintegration status may bring up feelings of anger or guilt about the privileges that come with being White while also feeling pressure to maintain the status quo of obliviousness to societal racism (p.156). The uncertainty of the Disintegration status may lead Whites to move to the next status, Reintegration. In Reintegration, Whites may experience feelings of White superiority to try to resolve feelings of guilt about White privileges (p.157). They blame people of color for their own disadvantages and believe that Whites earn their success. Movement into Pseudo independence status may be prompted by the White individual's confrontation with an undeniable racist event, compelling the individual to come to a deeper understanding of structural racism and actively work against it (p. 158). Whites in Pseudo independence may seek friendships with people of color and feel a disconnect from their own Whiteness. Advocacy for racial equality may unwittingly encourage people of color to adapt to White society rather than society adapting to them.

Additional literature reveals criticism of Helms' model. Sabnani et al. (1991), Phinney (1996), Mercer and Cunningham (2003), and Rowe (2006) argued that White identity development is not the linear and autonomous process that Helms presents. They argue that development occurs by examining the interactions across race in relationship with others, and through the continual questioning of one's own ethnic/racial identity and healthy acceptance of others (Phinney, 1996). Through such interactions, an individual dispels stereotypes or learns to

assimilate or accommodate ideas and people that are different from oneself (Mercer & Cunningham, 2003).

Rowe et al. (1994) also challenged the Helms model. They asserted that White racial consciousness must be employed for White people to understand their attitudes about themselves and others. White racial consciousness is explained as one's awareness of being White and what that implies concerning those who are not White. Throughout life, White racial consciousness is developed through dissonance and resolution in contrast to the linearity of Helms' model, moving from the belief that Whites are superior to understanding the complexities of racial issues and working to foster social change.

In response to these criticisms, Helms revised her model to include the Immersion/Emersion stage (1990) where White individuals continue to redefine themselves and grow to accept a new definition of their own Whiteness (p. 183). They move from trying to help people of color adjust to mainstream White society to trying to encourage other White people to change society. They find like-minded White people to fight racism and become aware of their own role in the hegemony of a racist society

Helms (1995) reconceptualized the stage model as a status model. The statuses are less linear, actualized through life experiences, and address the intersection of others' racial perceptions and oneself. These statuses are composed of attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors toward self and others, moving Whites from being unaware of racism and racial stereotypes to developing an awareness of racism and stereotypes to developing a non-racist identity where Whites work as advocates and form meaningful cross-racial relationships.

Sabnani et al. (1991) presented an integrative approach to racial identity development, presenting a model that combined elements of the earlier identity development models. They asserted that Whites move through developmental changes, starting from when Whites are initially unaware of differences based on race, moving through discomfort from this growth, and finally to developing a healthy White identity to work against racism and oppression. Sue's model (2003) also moves White people from an ethnocentric focus to understanding the impact Whiteness has on others to finally achieving a non-racist White identity.

In these models, Whites progress at various points throughout life through a process moving from lack of awareness of racism, through confusion about what impact racism has on them, growing to racial sensitivity, to finally a non-racist White identity. Travel through this process is not linear, often includes regression, and does not occur at the same rate for everyone.

Later research focused on Whites' attempts to define a positive and non-racist sense of Whiteness as a cultural identity (Howard, 2016; Spanierman & Smith, 2017) (LaFleur et al., 2002; Sue, 2003). The key to these models is that Whites with a positive racial identity understand that racism is maintained through White privilege and that they are responsible for dismantling it. They see the good and the bad in their racial group, just as they do in any other social group. A positive White identity is non-racist and empowers Whites to fight oppression. Flexibility and openness are present in Whites with a positive White identity because they appreciate cultural learning activities of other ethnic groups.

McDermott and Samson (2005) argued that White racial identity is complex, situated, and intersects with other identity dimensions. In their research, Branscombe et al. (2007) found that the awareness of White privilege is often mediated by the intersection of other identities,

including socioeconomic status, political affiliation, or faith beliefs. Croll (2007) developed this even further in his exploration of what it means to be White. In his national study, Croll examined the geographic, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds of Whites and found that all these factors impacted the strength of their racial identity. The most significant finding was that Whites with a strong racial identity might manifest that identity in either progressive or defensive beliefs. Whites who hold progressive beliefs use their White identity to combat racism and inequity, while Whites with defensive beliefs are more racist than those with progressive beliefs.

The conversation in the literature about White identity development illuminates its complexities. White racial identity models' common goals include acceptance of and appreciation for diversity, greater inter-racial comfort, openness to racial concerns, awareness of one's responsibility for racism, and evolving non-racist identity. These goals cannot be achieved without understanding the entitlement that comes with Whiteness. This sense of entitlement is understood by examining the meaning of Whiteness.

The Meaning of Whiteness

Being White comes with a commodity called Whiteness. Whiteness is the label for Whites' socially constructed characteristics that affect one's relation to the world. Whiteness was considered challenging to label and understand because it was typically not acknowledged. Though Whiteness was a significant social, political, and economic influence in the United States, it was mostly unexamined until late in the 20th century. It was then that Whiteness's history was revealed to be directly connected to the struggle for control of resources throughout the world (Lewis, 2004). Whiteness was normative, used to marginalize others and to justify

colonization throughout the world. The characteristics that were valued and used to describe Whites were also used to argue that other characteristics and peoples were inferior (Wander et al., 2005). Whiteness's superiority was even preached as a moral imperative in churches (Bedard, 2000; Kincheloe et al., 2000)

The study of Whiteness emerged from a variety of disciplines, including feminist studies (Frankenberg, 1993; Sidanius et al., 2000), critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) (Tate IV, 1997) and multicultural education (McIntyre, 2002). Each of these disciplines focuses on the social construction of identity and exposing systems of power and privilege.

The power and privilege of Whiteness come from the essential characteristic of invisibility (Dyer, 2005; Helms, 2017). Whiteness is considered the default in society and is the standard by which various people are othered. The invisibility of Whiteness allows White supremacy to be maintained in society. This invisibility allows Whites not to acknowledge or own their Whiteness as a racial identity, whereas other groups are always aware of theirs (Willis, 1997).

Whiteness gives Whites the privilege of unearned benefits over others (Fine et al., 1997; Helms, 2017; Linder, 2015). The privilege can be on a macro level, where structures are developed that afford Whites benefits, rights, and other unearned advantages central to understanding Whiteness. It can also be on a micro level where privilege is afforded at the individual or group level (Neville et al., 2001).

Peggy McIntosh (1988) addressed Whiteness's power and privilege in her seminal article "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." In it, McIntosh defined White privilege as "invisible systems conferring unearned dominance and power upon Whites" (p. 14). She

acknowledged that Whites typically do not realize the privilege they enjoy. However, it is critical to identify and understand the privilege to effectively address its injustices.

Frankenberg's (1993) seminal research revealed how privilege perpetuates inequality even when White people regard themselves as antiracist. She asserted that Whiteness is a location of structural privilege, a standpoint from which White people are seen. It is a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed. This definition positions privilege as a central feature of Whiteness that leads to power in society.

As research about Whiteness grew, it addressed those central underpinnings of Whiteness, building on the concept of positionality in society and its relationship to power and influence. This approach has been criticized as an attempt to be overly politically correct and seen as an attempt to abolish race and Whiteness as part of an overemphasis on multiculturalism in education (Kolchin, 2002). However, Kincheloe et al. (2000) asserted that one must understand oneself concerning the rest of the world. If Whites understand their positionality, they can understand how people of diverse backgrounds make meaning and view Whites and Whiteness (Kivel, 2017; Sue, 2017) . It can also help Whites work to abolish the racist elements of Whiteness (Helms, 2017). These features are critical for Whites to function as agents of change and allies in addressing human rights (Chubbuck, 2006; Spanierman et al., 2012; Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015; Spanierman & Smith, 2017).

Whiteness in Higher Education

Education plays a key role in developing an engaged citizenry to participate fully in our democracy. Additionally, since the early 1900s, scholars have called on education to be more socially just to help people develop the skills necessary to fulfill their human potential and to do

the work that needs to be done for the common good (Novak, 2000). Key to a socially just education is addressing diversity by challenging forms of injustice, not just by recognizing and celebrating difference.

There is a great deal of literature that asserts that Whiteness has an impact on the ability of education to achieve a socially just pedagogy. This is asserted by educators including Beverly Tatum (1992; 2019), Christine Sleeter (1996; 2017), Gary Howard (2007, 2016), and Zeus Leonardo (2004; 2009). All agree that in order to work to ensure a just education for all, Whites must acknowledge and understand the privilege from which they benefit. The challenge remains, however, to help students acknowledge Whiteness when it so often remains unlabeled and unknown by those who possess it. Key to this is getting students to acknowledge Whiteness even exists.

The examination of Whiteness on college campuses started in the curriculum, particularly in the fields of communications and rhetoric (Feagin, 2013) and teacher preparation (Matias et al., 2017; Sleeter, 2017) focusing on helping students understand Whiteness, its associated privilege, and the impact Whiteness has on others around them. Whiteness also has an impact on the institution itself through campus climate (Cabrera et al., 2017; Rudge, 2017). In this research, Whiteness was found to have significant impact on student satisfaction and level of comfort on campus. Students of color may come to feel the institution devalues them, making them feel marginalized on campus (Park et al., 2017). White students who do not understand the privilege that comes with their Whiteness, may be viewed by others to be, and may in reality be, involved in the perpetuation of White dominance on campuses (Brooks-Immel & Murray, 2017). In

keeping with prior research, Whiteness continues to impact life on campus because it is not recognized, and the associated privilege Whites have on college campuses is not acknowledged.

Scholars have called on education to be more socially just to help all people develop the skills necessary to fulfill their potential and work for the common good (Jupp et al., 2016; Picower, 2009). The key to a socially just education is addressing diversity by challenging injustice in its multiple forms. Injustice is found in education through systemic racism which is perpetuated by the impact of Whiteness on educational systems. (Howard, 2007; Leonardo, 2009; Sleeter, 1996; Tatum, 1992). To ensure justice in education, Whiteness must be highlighted and dismantled. Whites must also acknowledge and understand the impact of Whiteness on education, and the privilege their Whiteness affords them.

Confronting Whiteness is to confront racism in our educational systems. Critical race theory (CRT) emerged during the 1990s to reveal the persistent structural racism that exists in the United States and to begin to eliminate it (Crenshaw, 2002; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Though originally developed as a legal theory, taught mainly in graduate and law school programs, CRT shaped scholarship in many fields including education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). The main idea of CRT is that race is a social construct, and that racism is not only a product of individual bias or prejudice, but something that is embedded in our societal structures including the legal and political systems (Sawchuck, 2021).

In 2020, politicians began to ban teaching CRT in schools because they believed it was being used to shame White students, making them feel like they are racist, and damaging their sense of self. Educators argue that CRT is not being taught in schools, but that schools should

address race, inequity, and discrimination as part of learning about the history of the United States.

Despite the ongoing political debate about CRT in our country, Critical Race Theory continues to be used in a variety of fields including education to expose and understand the systemic inequity that disproportionately impacts marginalized populations. The continued hegemony that affirms Whiteness and its dominance in society and education must be addressed to attain a socially just education addressing injustice in society.

College Students and Whiteness

The examination of Whiteness and college students emerged to examine the role of Whites and Whiteness in racism in the United States. Delgado and Stefancic (1997) trace its study to the late 19080s and early 1990s, though Rodriguez (1999) suggests that "the study of whiteness began with the formation of traditional university curricula" (p. 21) because all curricula was developed with the singular voice of the majority. The examination of Whiteness in curriculum emerged in other fields including the fields of communications and rhetoric (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Rowley et al., 2002) and teacher preparation (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Leonardo, 2009; Levin, 2003; Swank et al., 2001). Both fields focused on helping students understand Whiteness, its associated privilege, and the impact Whiteness has on others around them. Whiteness also impacts the institution itself through campus climate (Gusa, 2010; Hurtado et al., 1998; Kuh, 1993; Whitt et al., 2001).

Whiteness was found to impact student satisfaction and level of comfort for students of color on campus. Whiteness makes students of color feel marginalized on campus (Cabrera et al., 2017). White students who do not understand the privilege that comes with their Whiteness may

be viewed by others to be involved in the perpetuation of White dominance on campuses (Chesler et al., 2003; Jackson & Heckman, 2002). As in other settings, this research reveals that Whiteness impacts the campus because it is not visible and because Whites do not acknowledge their privilege.

Universities no longer have to be explicitly racist to create a hostile environment for students of color. Hiring practices have historically been structured in ways that inhibit the ability of people of color to succeed (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Campus traditions, ideologies, policies, and practices maintain systemic racism (Cabrera et al., 2017; Gusa, 2010). White students do not recognize systems of oppression, so through their ignorance of these systems, they allow the perpetuation of hostile racial climates.

Those racial climates have typically been disrupted by students of color and White allies (Cabrera, 2012; Cabrera & Corces-Zimmerman, 2017; Foste & Jones, 2020). When an incident occurs on campus, there is often a great deal of immediate reaction. There are calls for change, pressure on the administration but no sustained, strategic, meaningful engagement to address these issues (Tatum, 2019).

Various strategies have been developed to address the challenges on university campuses presented by Whiteness. Strategies encompass a holistic approach emphasizing the importance of multiculturalism and illuminating Whiteness's underlying influences in society (Cabrera et al., 2017; Cabrera, 2014; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000). These strategies focus on helping students work through the resistance and backlash that could occur when examining Whiteness. There is often discomfort that comes from confronting the history of this country and race. Whites may

experience a wide range of emotions, including guilt, tension, and frustration, that can shut down conversation (Kincheloe et al., 2000).

Whites feel that Whiteness is viewed as a negative attribute that places them at a disadvantage in society (Martin et al., 2010; McKinney, 2008; Solomona et al., 2005). The students reported that they feel that students of color see Whiteness as an indicator of racism. These situations leave White students feeling helpless, angry, and resistant to worthwhile messages about diversity. Some White students feel threatened by what is perceived as a loss of position and power in society. They feel that addressing Whiteness diminishes them and leaves them at a disadvantage and in competition with people of color for limited resources (Cabrera et al., 2017; Hurtado, 1992; Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015).

Despite these challenges, and perhaps because of these challenges, Whiteness must be acknowledged, examined, and understood. To do that, Kincheloe (1999) asserted that exposing White students to minority perspectives of the dominant culture challenges them to examine their power and privilege. White students can then learn how students of color see them and the impact that White privilege has on them. Hopkins-Gillispie (2011) encouraged the use of case studies as an effective way to teach Whites about their privilege. Because case studies are processed in small group learning environments, they encourage students' valuable interactions in a more controlled, non-threatening environment. Such interactions reveal White students' assumptions about race and privilege and open them to being challenged by their peers to change their attitudes.

Applebaum (2005) suggested an approach that shifts from focusing on race or Whiteness to focusing on social groups' relationships. She found this useful because, typically, students

were unwilling to acknowledge different types of racism, including systemic racism. Whites resisted because they wanted to be viewed as useful, antiracist Whites. By focusing on the relationships, she found that systems of hegemony can be exposed, and the White students can begin to understand how they are involved in racializing others.

Finally, it was found that White students benefit from learning about their Whiteness. While guilt and discomfort may be excellent reasons for Whites to avoid the impact of their Whiteness, research shows that there are psychological and interpersonal stresses created by bearing the privilege that comes with Whiteness (Chubbuck, 2006). This stress inhibits one's ability to fully embrace their educational experience and connect with those of other backgrounds. This is supported by many in the field of education who assert that examining Whiteness could be utilized to create a space to foster ways that White students can use their Whiteness and its power and privilege in positive, productive ways, rather than seeing their Whiteness as something terrible to be disavowed (Cabrera, 2017; Cabrera et al., 2016; Howard, 2016).

Conclusion

This literature review focuses on the importance of understanding White students' experience with diversity on campus. It provides an overview of the different types of diversity on campus and the impact of diversity and diversity education on student growth. Student growth depends on racial identity development, so this literature review also explores the existing research about identity development, focused mainly on White students and their racial development complexities.

Diversity on colleges and universities remains critical to helping students prepare to engage in society and democracy effectively. However, it also prepares them for success in increasingly diverse and global communities. Said (2004) argued that effective education happens through self-knowledge and awareness from experiencing others' beliefs and backgrounds. Diversity programming on campus does just that.

The positive effects of diversity are myriad and occur in three main ways on campus, including structural diversity, curricular and co-curricular diversity, and interaction diversity. The positive effects occur across a broad range of outcomes, including cognitive development, social and affective growth, student satisfaction, leadership skills, and enhanced participation and community engagement. It was found that the most growth occurs through interactions on campus. However, the literature shows that the interactions must be designed and managed positively to be effective.

This literature review shows that one of the most challenging areas in engaging diversity is working with White students. They often display resistance to diversity for various reasons, but White Racial Identity development is a key factor. Identity development can be understood by examining and understanding traits an individual exhibits, revealing where they are attitudinally, cognitively, and behaviorally along their developmental journey. By examining these traits, it is possible to understand better the underlying assumptions about identity and development related to the world.

Successful engagement of White students helps them acknowledge that they are raced individuals by being White, understanding the privilege they have in society because of their Whiteness and its impact. The literature highlights those educational strategies must not shame

or guilt White students but help them understand the positive and essential responsibilities they hold in fighting racism.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework in research limits the scope of the pertinent data by focusing a particular perspective, or lens, through which to examine a topic (Creswell, 2013). It helps the researcher refine the study's goals, develop research questions, and determine the study's appropriate method (Collins & Stockton, 2018).

The purpose of this research is to explore the question - How do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity? Phenomenology and White dialectics were the theoretical framings used for this study. The following section provides a background on phenomenology and illustrates its relevance to the research design for this study.

Phenomenology

Phenomenology is both a philosophy and a research methodology. In phenomenology, knowledge is understood as socially constructed rather than objective truth. Vagle (2018) shared that phenomenology is an "encounter . . . a way of living . . ., and a craft" (p. 12). Humans often move through life, taking for granted everyday experiences with the world around them. Sokolowski (2000) explained that in phenomenology, intentional consciousness is raised to bring meaning to those encounters and experiences with the world. As a methodological approach, phenomenology applies its theoretical concept to exploring the participants' lived experiences and their meaning-making processes of their experiences (Van Manen, 2014).

Phenomenology addresses the question of how people conceptualize the world around them. As a research orientation, phenomenology adheres to a social constructivist philosophy of human development. Experience with sociocultural and historical processes is central to one's interpretation of his/her own life (Dowling, 2007). Phenomenology attempts to explain how people make meaning of their interactions and experiences with the world around them (Dowling, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Phenomenology attempts to describe what is given to us in our experiences.

This social constructivist philosophy maintains that reality, knowledge, and learning are not discovered but created through interaction with society and individuals (Schwandt, 1994; Smith, 2003; Tindall, 2009). Individuals create meaning through their interactions with each other and with the environment in which they live. For example, students may learn about certain professions by reading a text. However, if a student had an internship, they would learn about that profession by experiencing social interaction with those already in that profession.

Husserl is considered the founder of phenomenology (Cohen, 1987) (Moustakas, 1994). He asserted that knowledge is discovered through the external and defined by the individual from examining their lived experiences (Van Manen, 2014). Husserl posed the key question of phenomenology: “What is it for an individual to know or be conscious of a phenomenon?” (Moustakas, 1994). He asserted that consciousness is intentional where there is always an act of knowing to point toward an object.

Husserl believed that the thinking person is always conscious of the world. Husserl's phenomenology focused on examining a phenomenon through intentionality, described as the internal experience of being conscious of something (Moustakas, 1994). In Husserl's

phenomenology model, there is a natural attitude of how people go through the world where reality is separate from its experience. The natural attitude of the world is the familiar world of everyday life.

Husserl proposed that by intentionally directing one's focus toward the object of examination, one could develop a deep understanding of the experience. The 'phenomenological attitude' of going through the world suspends the natural attitude and allows the consciousness of our experience to get to the essence of the experience. This state is achieved through a series of reductions to bracket off previous understandings, past knowledge, and assumptions about the phenomenon of interest. Husserl called this bracketing 'epoche' (Jacobs, 2016), a Greek word for suspending judgment (Epoche., 2021). Husserl described it as a process involved in blocking biases and assumptions to explain a phenomenon in terms of its inherent system of meaning. Epoche is a general predisposition one must assume before commencing phenomenological study (Van Manen, 2017).

Once conscious of our experience, any phenomenon could be described and analyzed through sensory perception. The person is conscious of perceiving an object but does not understand its meaning or essence. People can also experience the phenomenon through memory, intuition, and self-reflection, which provides insight into the essence and meaning of the object through the experience of that object (Neubauer et al., 2019). Through this consciousness, the individual examines the phenomenon to get to the true essence of the phenomena.

Heidegger was once an associate of Husserl, but in the 1920s, he broke from Husserl, arguing that bracketing was not possible because he believed it was impossible to set aside all

preconceived notions and assumptions (Vagle, 2018). Heidegger argued that the subject always brings their history or context to inform their consideration of an object or phenomenon. Meaning cannot come only in isolation and self-reflection but through an interpretive process of being with others through shared interactions in the world (Van Manen, 2014). Heidegger rejected the notion that humans are spectators of an object but asserted that humans and objects were inseparable. They are intertwined, acting upon each other (Vagle, 2018). One of Heidegger's philosophical goals is to expose the meaning of everyday human existence, focusing on humans' existence in the world as individuals and within their social context. He argued that both world and being are inseparable (Van Manen, 2014).

Heidegger is interested in human beings as players in the world. He focuses on the relationship between an individual and his/her “lifeworld” (Inwood, 2000). Heidegger’s term lifeworld referred to the idea that individuals’ realities are influenced by the world in which they live. Given this focus, individuals are understood as always understanding themselves within the world, even if they are not aware of that understanding.

Heidegger rejected Husserl's notion of the human being as a separate observer of objects and argued that both subject and object were inseparable. A key tenet of Heidegger’s phenomenology is the concept of ‘dasein’ which refers to being-in-the-world (Sokolowski, 2000). Heidegger explored the who in the world in everyday existence through interaction with others, and asked, from a philosophical stance, "what does it mean to be?". Dasein is being in the world by considering the individual within a specific context, doing things while seeing oneself in a particular way through mood and emotions that impact our experiences (Horrigan-Kelly et al., 2016). Dasein deals with meaningful presence while being aware of the reality and

consciousness making meaning by acting upon each other (Sokolowski, 2000). One sees themselves in a certain way in a particular social circumstance.

Heidegger further asserted that all humans move throughout life in the direction of their full potential. Their meaning-making leads them toward an inauthentic or authentic life (Sherman, 2009). An inauthentic life comes from becoming complacent in making meaning daily and losing one's potential (Horrigan-Kelly et al., 2016). We surrender our individuality and give up our meaning-making to others. Complacency diminishes the ability of humans to reach their potential.

People who realize that they could move toward their full potential begin to live authentic lives. Once human beings realize they have their destiny to fulfill, then their concern with the world will no longer be the concern to do as the masses do but can become an 'authentic' concern to fulfill their real potential in the world (Sherman, 2009).

As a theoretical framework, phenomenology fits the objectives of this study to examine how White student leaders experience the institutional messages of diversity on campus. because it attempts to explain how people make meaning of their experiences with the world around them. Specifically, this research explores the White student leaders' meaning-making processes as they connect to the larger context of the campus values around diversity and inclusion. White student leaders on this campus experience their roles as leaders and move through campus in their daily lives as scholars. As White student leaders, their being in the world is impacted by the interactions with others within the context of the institutional values. As the White students raise their consciousness of their world and their experiences, they ask themselves the critical question of Dasein - 'what does it mean to be". In particular, they examine what it is to be a White student

through interactions with other students and make meaning while being aware of how they act upon the other. The participants may then lead what Heidegger called authentic lives as individuals making meaning in their own lives as White students on campus (Horrigan-Kelly et al., 2016).

Phenomenology also provides the researcher space to be reflexive – to examine their role in research and the lens that researcher brings to the research design, conduct, and reporting out findings. I examined the relationships between the participants and my role as a researcher, and how my beliefs and values affected the research. I examined my experience as an employee at the university, contemplated how my background affected the study, what questions I asked, and how I interpreted the participants' responses.

White Dialectics

This section provides historical background on dialectics and explains the concept of White dialectics and how it is used to examine the experiences of White students. Using dialectics, one can establish the truth through reasoned arguments (Maybee, 2020). Like phenomenology, dialectics is a constructivist knowledge base that addresses an individual's essence and meaning.

Plato presented the classic version of dialectics (Adorno, 2017). Plato presented his philosophical argument of dialectics as a back-and-forth dialogue or debate. He asserted that debate between opposing sides produced an evolution of ideas or positions leading to a refined understanding of issues (Adorno, 2017; Maybee, 2020). Plato believed dialectics were not used to persuade others to change their position but used to search for the truth.

In the 19th Century, Hegel expanded the use of dialectics. The dialectical process reflects a struggle with apparent contradictions where individuals may shift and move along a continuum while working through these contradictions (McTaggart & McTaggart, 2011). He also proposed a special meaning of the word dialectic, which addresses external and internal contradictions. Hegel believed that every being contains their own contradictions that are resolved through dialectics (Adorno, 2017). When the internal contradictions resolve, the individual can grow from a less sophisticated understanding of issues or concepts to a more complex one. The resolution of internal contradictions allows individuals to become actualized people.

Dialectics is used in various disciplines, including philosophy, sociology, political science, and education. Todd and Abrams (2011) applied dialectics to White students in higher education to explore the students' understanding of power, race, racism, and White privilege (p. 334). White dialectics are the tensions that White people inherently experience as dominant group members in the United States. The authors identified six dialectics, including Whiteness and Sense of Self, Closeness and Connection in Multiracial Relationships, Color Blindness, Minimization of Racism, Structural Inequality, and White Privilege (p. 370).

In the dialectic Whiteness and Sense of Self, Whites begin to understand their sense of self and their location in society as a White person. At one end of the dialectic is awareness of and identification with being White. At the other end there is denial, distortion, or unawareness of being White (Abrams & Todd, 2011; Todd & Abrams, 2011). This dialectic also considers the extent to which the individual appreciates the social power of being White.

Closeness and Connection in Multiracial Relationships is the dialectic that addresses the tensions that White people feel in multiracial relationships. One end of the continuum is the

perception that multiracial relationships are close and deep, while at the other end is that relationships are shallow or nonexistent (Todd & Abrams, 2011). The Closeness and Connection dialectic allows White people to examine the tension experienced by the lack of relationships with people of color.

The dialectic of Colorblindness examines how White people recognize or deny racial differences (p. 373). On one end Whites are conscious of race, recognizing and acknowledging that people of color have different experiences, opportunities, and access to resources than White people do. The other end of the continuum represents the point of view that race does not/should not matter. The tension exists because it is difficult for White people to resolve the United States' egalitarian myth and structural challenges people of color experience.

The Minimization of Racism dialectic explores how White people understand racism as something personal and part of society. The opposite end of that dialectic keeps racism as an abstract concept that they are not a part of or may not even exist (p. 375). Racism is something that others do, happens in other places, or no longer exists.

The Structural Inequality dialectic refers to the understanding of power and how systemic racism affects the opportunities available to Whites and people of color (p. 376). At one end of the continuum, there is a level playing field for everyone, and power does not impact one's opportunities or success. At the other end is the understanding that there is no level playing field and that institutional power and racism continue to affect people of color and Whites differently.

Finally, the dialectic of White Privilege provides an understanding of White privilege and the benefits that come from it (p. 377). On the other end is the denial of individual advantage due

to privilege by denying privilege exists or that even if it does exist, its impact is minimal to privileging Whites. Privilege is often attributed to other factors beyond race.

In a subsequent examination of their model, Abrams and Todd (2011) acknowledged that each dialectic has cognitive, emotional, and behavioral tensions that Whites exhibit when engaging with or reflecting on their whiteness. People may move along the dialectics in each of these dimensions at different rates. The movement on each dimension may also be interconnected with the other dimensions. One dimension may create additional tension along the other dimensions, thereby creating additional tension that needs to be resolved in that individual.

Sue (2011) found that the dialectics identified by Todd and Abrams (2011) emphasized the conflict and discomfort that Whites experience when they are challenged to understand their own biases, prejudice, fears, and personal beliefs. He argued that Whites might resist dialectic change to not appear racist, to not confront their racism, or so they do not experience discomfort. In that case, Sue argued that Whites may continue to minimize other races' experience in the country. In keeping with Hegel's assertion about dialectics' significance in attaining authenticity, Whites will not achieve an authentic life.

Toporek (2011) asserted that the White dialectics reflect the complexities of the context of the individual's experiences, environment, and identity (p. 5). Growth and development are impacted by the constantly changing context within which the experiences occur and the context of the meaning making of those experiences. The impact of context on movement along the White dialectics is demonstrated when the participants experienced discomfort because of the tension created by their prior context of their upbringing and experiences and their new

experiences and knowledge. Movement through their conflicting thoughts or experiences cannot be described as moving smoothly along poles of the dialectics from one end to another, but rather a constantly changing process where

> opposing forces comprise dialectics and gradual change results from points when one force overtakes the other. This may be followed by the reverse or by continuing the original path. Either way, there is change. There is never a true return to the original state, even when forces alternate in their power. Thus, the process of change resembles a spiral rather than a circle in that it may seem that the situation, belief, or condition has returned to the original position; however, the action of each force has permanently affected the other (p. 5).

Toparek asserted that this perspective of movement in the dialectics is useful for when White students become frustrated with the process of becoming more racially aware. This frustration and tension facilitate growth and understanding, influenced by their prior context and identity development. This dialectic process is constant throughout life.

The use of White dialectics as part of my theoretical framework is applicable for several reasons. Many White people deny and make rationalizations about racism, so they do not have to address it. Whites have also been socialized to believe that society is a meritocracy where anyone can succeed merely through hard work (Feagin, 2013; Kincheloe et al., 2000; Lensmire, 2010). However, when Whites learn of structural racism and unfairness in our systems, that tension must be resolved. The White dialectics help White people pull apart the socialization tied to the false narrative of equality and equity in our country.

People move along a continuum in the White dialectics, very much like they move along a continuum in their White identity development (Abrams & Todd, 2011; Todd & Abrams, 2011). Growth is not sequential and does not occur at even rates. White dialectics provide the researcher with a framework to understand the development of the participants and their struggle to grow as White people.

White dialectics is the examination of contradictions or tensions that occur within White people. By deconstructing the tensions that White students experience through the dialectics, Whites resolve to grow closer to a non-racist actor in society and emerge as a more authentic person.

The next chapter describes the methodology used in this qualitative research. It includes a detailed description of the research design and procedures including the research setting and sample and closely outlines the data collection and analysis methods that were used. Finally, the next chapter includes the research methodology and rationale for its fit to address the research questions and also addresses the limitations and delimitations of the study, ethical considerations, and strategies used to enhance the overall validity of the study.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology used to explore how students experience and make sense of the world in which they live. In this chapter, the research design is explained, the research method is explained including the setting for the research, the ways the data were collected and analyzed, and issues of validity are discussed. Finally, limitations and delimitations of the study are addressed.

This research is based on a constructivist knowledge claim where knowledge is understood as created by the person rather than objective truth (Crotty, 2020). As a socially constructed knowledge claim, there is no one truth to be found, but the truth as it is experienced by each individual who lives it (Creswell, 2013). Therefore, this research used qualitative phenomenological research methods to understand the lived experiences concerning a phenomenon described by the participants and how it impacted their lives (Laverty, 2003; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 2014).

The question researched in this study was *How do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity?* Sub-questions were also addressed, including *how the students experience the institution's definition of diversity, how students experience the institution's mission and values, and how students make meaning of the university*. The phenomenon explored in this study was the experience of students who identify racially as White on a campus that emphasizes diversity.

Rationale for Research Design

There are many approaches to phenomenological research. For this study, I used interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). IPA aims to illuminate insights into how a

particular person, in a particular context, makes meaning of a particular phenomenon (Alase, 2017). Usually IPA focuses on how people make sense of the lived experiences of everyday life that take on special significance (Tindall, 2009). Through IPA, the individual's reflections about that experience are explored as they work through what the experience means. Like other phenomenological approaches, IPA extends from Husserl's and Heidegger's philosophical perspectives, both of whom asserted an inseparable connectedness between the individual and their experience of the world. People do not go through the world objectively as prior philosophers taught but are connected to it.

A relationship the individual has with the world may manifest itself differently (Vagle, 2018). Husserl's approach was concerned with what an individual knows of one's own experiences. He focused on descriptive phenomenology, which uses systemic reflection to direct the participant to the consciousness or awareness of the phenomenon. Through reflection, the participant comes to know the essence of the experience and can describe it. The focus on the essence called for setting aside any pre-conceptions that might distract from the true essence of experience in a technique Husserl called bracketing. Through bracketing, any prior assumptions about the world and the phenomenon are set aside to free the individual to truly see the phenomenon as it presents itself (Moustakas, 1994). Interpretive phenomenological analysis draws from Husserl through its emphasis on reflection. However, IPA is used to address the impact of a particular experience for a person in a particular setting, rather than just the essence of experience (Vagle, 2018).

Heidegger's approach was to examine what it is to be in the world. He focused on interpretive meaning-making, known as hermeneutics, where the individual is embedded in the

world and seeks to understand what it is like to be in the world, rather than to know the essence of it (Moustakas, 1994). The world provides context for meaning making. Therefore, Heidegger rejected bracketing because he believed it was impossible to set aside all preconceived notions or assumptions (Vagle, 2018).

Researchers use interpretive phenomenology to approach and explore the object of one's attention as it shows itself as itself. Through one's perceptions, thoughts, memories, emotions, and actions, the individual gives meaning as they seek to understand a particular phenomenon for themselves. The practice of IPA uses Heidegger's hermeneutic circle in its analysis (Creswell, 2013). A hermeneutic circle method of analysis occurs through continual review, analysis, and interpretation of the relationship between the parts shared by the participant and the greater context within which the participant is positioned. Analysis occurs through the researcher's constant back and forth to interpret the data (Van Manen, 2014). Additionally, IPA uses a double hermeneutic because the researcher is making sense of the participants' sense-making (Vagle, 2018). The IPA researcher offers an interpretive account of what the experience means for the participant within their context.

Interpretive phenomenological analysis emerged in the 1990s in psychology and moved into other disciplines as a research approach. IPA's first goal is to understand the participant's world and describe what it is like, knowing that it cannot ever be a first-person account (Larkin et al., 2006). However, because the researcher and participant always construct the account, the researcher tries to get as close to the participant's view as possible. The researcher must approach the subject of the experience of the participant with great compassion and understanding.

Additionally, the researcher must be flexible to adjust ideas and assumptions about the subject matter as it presents itself during the research.

The second goal of IPA is to position the interpretive analysis in the broader contexts of the world. IPA examines what it means for the participant to have had the feelings, concerns, or reactions they had in that particular situation. IPA addresses the individual's relatedness to the topic of interest to identify, describe, and understand the critical object of concern and the participant's experiential statements.

IPA brings great detail in the depth of analysis (Vagle, 2018). Therefore, IPA typically uses a small number of purposively selected participants to reveal something of each individual's experience. Small sample sizes are used in IPA to find more homogenous participants so that the differences and similarities across participants of the phenomenon can be examined and analyzed in detail. Generalizations are made from the findings only by positioning them within the specifics of the phenomenon and the individual (Larkin et al., 2006).

Research Context and Sample

This study took place at a large, four-year, private, Catholic, mostly non-residential institution located in an urban setting. The university provides a liberal arts education, serves a predominantly undergraduate student population, but also offers professional, master's, and doctoral degrees. I selected this institution because of the emphasis it places on diversity in its mission, admissions practices, student demographics, and campus programming. From its varied curricular and co-curricular offerings, its diverse student population, its guiding documents, and strategic plan, this institution expresses a commitment to diversity and serving a diverse student population.

The University's Institutional Review Board approved the study before it began. I used purposive sampling to identify participants for this study. Both Seidman (2019) and Creswell (2013) explained purposive sampling to mean that the researcher selects individuals for the study because they can offer insight into the particular experiences explored. The researcher identified participants who were White seniors who served as student leaders within the Division of Student Affairs. This was done through referrals from the institution's staff and faculty, and through opportunities based on personal contacts and snowballing, where I sought referrals from the participants themselves. Additionally, I sent emails and made phone calls to staff and faculty seeking referrals of participants. I explained the research to these colleagues so they could make well-informed referrals.

Eight students participated in this study: one male and seven females. This sample size is in keeping with IPA's practice of exploring the experiences of a few participants deeply (Vagle, 2018). In keeping with the criteria for the sample selection, all the participants identified as White, were all senior standing academically, all between the ages of 21 and 23, and were all enrolled full time at the university. They were student leaders in the Division of Student Affairs serving in a variety of roles including peer mentors, resident assistants, community service coordinators, and campus programmers. I did not directly supervise any of these student leaders. In these roles, the student leaders worked on behalf of the departments in the Division of Student Affairs. They all participated in diversity training as part of their preparation for servings student leaders for that department. The training consisted of lessons about the university mission, connection to the work of the university patron saint, and basic concepts of identity, diversity, and inclusion. The identity, diversity, and inclusion lessons included self-reflection about the

identities the students possess, and strategies to work across differences, listening skills development, and developing empathy.

Data Collection

In keeping with the phenomenological approach, I conducted in-depth interviews during the Spring of 2015 to "…understand the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience" (Seidman, 2019, p. 9). Seidman (2019) presents a three-part interview structure that is phenomenological in orientation where the first interview focuses on the participants' life history, the second interview focuses on the participants experience of the topic of examination, and the third interview includes the participants' reflection on the meaning of their experience. I modified this structure and conducted two interviews combining the examination of their backgrounds and their experiences of the research topic into one interview. The first interview included the participants' background and their experience of the topic of examination. This allowed for context setting for their experiences by learning the participants' background, while spending more time on the experiences of the participants with the subject of study. The second interview allowed for reflection by the participants on the first interview and their experiences. The second interview then expanded on their experiences on campus and examined additional questions that I posed to them.

These in-depth interviews provided the researcher with a way to understand the participants' attitudes, giving context to their behaviors and actions. I minimized my involvement in the interview by posing open-ended questions and focusing on the participant as they told their own story in their own words. A general principle of phenomenology is to minimize structure and maximize the depth of information. I did not ask the participants structured research

questions but, rather, posed semi-structured questions to facilitate the discussion of relevant topics so that the answer to the research question emerged organically during the data collection process.

I conducted two interviews with each participant, with each interview lasting between 45 and 90 minutes. The interviews were recorded using a portable digital audio recorder. I selected a study room in the university library which would provide privacy for our discussion. This neutral location was agreed to by all the participants. The participants felt comfortable and able to speak freely. At the start of the interview, I established a good rapport and trust with the participants to obtain useful data (Moustakas, 1994). I did so by explaining the purpose of my research, sharing my prior role as a staff member on campus, and by expressing my gratitude for their participation. The focus of establishing rapport was to help the participant be comfortable and open to talking. Before starting the interview, I gained informed consent. I explained the study's purpose and provided each participant with the institutional IRB consent form they reviewed and signed.

Vagle (2018) recommends that the interviewer take notes, jotting down words or phrases that seem essential to capture reactions and observations as they occur, but not taking so many notes to put the participant off. I sought clarification throughout the interview if I did not understand what the participant said. All the interviews were audio-recorded with the consent of the participants. After each interview, the recordings were transcribed verbatim, including notations of all non-verbal utterances and pauses throughout the interview. I conducted member checking with each participant after the first interview was transcribed by asking each participant

to confirm or reject how I had interpreted our conversations. This was done before the second interview occurred.

One other source of data were the notations and reflections I made during and after each interview. These notes captured what I saw, heard, experienced, and reflected upon throughout the research process. I was able to use these notes to better understand and interpret what the participants were saying about their experiences.

Data Analysis

Analysis began after I gathered data during the first interview round. That analysis guided decisions related to further data gathering. As mentioned before, IPA is an inductive and iterative process, and the researcher must remain open to changes and additions throughout data collection and analysis.

The interviews were then transcribed verbatim. Data analysis began with an initial reading of the transcripts and listening to the audio recording of the interviews with the intent to immerse myself in the data. Listening to the audio recording allowed me to hear the participant's tone to allow for the most thorough analysis.

Through my initial review of each transcript and tape, I captured my first impressions. I then began making initial notes of anything of interest, descriptions of things that seemed to matter to the participant, and how they made meaning. My notes included descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual comments (Smith, 2003). I culled emergent themes from the transcripts and my notations taken during the interview following the hermeneutic circle. The hermeneutic circle refers to the notion that one’s understanding of the world is established within the context of one’s understanding of their individual context in the larger world (p. 63). Throughout my

analysis, I moved back and forth between examining the participants' description of their experience, identifying common themes across the participants, and then returning again to the participants' descriptions of their experiences again to continually review and analyze their meaning making within the larger context of their world.

A significant component of qualitative research is researcher reflexivity. Reflexivity in phenomenological research is critical to being self-aware of any personal influences that could impact the collection of data or the analysis of it (Mortari, 2015). It provides the researcher with a way to explore the effect of one's position in the research and viewpoint on the phenomenon being examined. Through reflexivity, the researcher can glean insight into the phenomenon through probing the personal responses and reactions during the data collection and analysis (Finlay, 2002).

Researcher reflection is an important part of phenomenological research because it allows for deeper examination of the meaning making process that takes place as data is shared (Eatough & Smith, 2008). Hermeneutic phenomenology is grounded in the belief that knowledge comes from making meaning of an experience through reflection and interpretation (Laverty, 2003). My reflections throughout the data collection and analysis provided me with insight that contributed to my analysis of the data.

I kept a reflective journal throughout the process of data collection and analysis. I described my feelings, thoughts, reactions, and reflections about the research. I reflected on the practice of the research, but also my experience as I constructed meaning of the research. I noted my assumptions, biases, expectations about the research, questions that arose, and reflections

after each interview. I also noted the thoughts, feelings, reflections, and connections to theory and existing literature during the process of data analysis.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1986) outline ways to strengthen the trustworthiness of qualitative research through using four evaluative criteria including credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility addresses the confidence in the integrity of the findings. Lincoln and Guba (1986) assert that credibility is enhanced through several ways including prolonged engagement and member checking. As the researcher, I had prolonged engagement with the research process and analysis as well as conducted member checking with each participant. After the first interview was transcribed, I asked each participant to confirm or reject how I had interpreted our conversations. I did this before the second interview occurred.

Transferability is concerned with showing that the findings can be applied in contexts other than the one in which the study was conducted. I employed thick description to address transferability (Creswell & Miller, 2000). I described the phenomenon of the research and the research methods in rich detail so that it is transferable to other settings and participants. I used rich detail in describing the experiences of the participants and the themes of the study. These descriptions provide deep and detailed accounts to provide the reader with a greater sense of the experience of the participants.

Confirmability can be established through an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). I kept detailed records of this research process from start to finish including my audio recordings, transcripts, research notes, reflective notes, and data analysis. This is available for review. Additionally, reflexivity is a strategy to address confirmability. This was done through keeping a

reflexive journal where I made regular notations of my thoughts and reactions throughout the research process. This allowed me to reflect on my values and beliefs, my understanding of what the participants were telling me, and to address any preconceived notions that may influence the research process.

Finally, to foster credibility in this study, I ensured that the interpretation of the participants' experience was represented accurately. I sought reflections from each participant after both rounds of interviews. I did not review the transcripts verbatim after the first interview because I did not want to influence the participants' responses to the questions posed in the second interview. After both interviews were complete and initial coding was complete, I shared with the participants what I understood I heard from them and my thoughts about themes that may be emerging from what they shared.

Researcher bias is addressed by identifying and highlighting biases to ensure they do not influence the research results (Laverty, 2003). In phenomenology, bracketing is often used to set aside biases, with the understanding that biases can ever be fully set aside because they are part of the person. The researcher can only be aware of the biases and any effect they may have on the study. To do so I noted my assumptions, biases, expectations about the research, questions that arose, and reflections after each interview.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were made in keeping with the constructivist paradigm of revealing what knowledge and truth according to the participants rather than an objective truth to be known. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that no risks were identified for the participants in this study. I explained that I maintained the participants' anonymity by using

pseudonyms and keeping the audio recordings and raw transcripts secured in a locked filing cabinet in my home.

Positionality

To address the researcher's position in this study, I explained to the participants that I am a former student affairs professional with experience at a variety of institutions and that due to that experience, I had some knowledge of what their training may have been like. However, I explained to them how I am using a journal to explore my thoughts and experiences of what I believe I know of their experience. I was also clear in explaining to the participants that I was setting those notions aside because I wanted to learn about how they experienced the campus as students, and as student leaders.

As a former employee in higher education, I also worked to be conscious of my reactions to what I heard about the student experience. I was careful to not react to any criticism of the university so as to not influence or inhibit the participants from sharing as fully as they could about their experiences. Finally, I considered that I am White and the impact my racial identity might have had on the participants and what they chose to share and how they chose to share their experience with me. I took every precaution to ensure that the participants felt safe, comfortable, and unjudged.

Limitations and Delimitations

The Division of Student Affairs' diversity training components for student leaders in the division were newly developed and not fully adopted by all offices in the division. It is unknown to what extent the offices used those components during their student leader training, including if the departments supplemented it or not. If there was inconsistency in using the diversity

components of the training, the student leaders may not have been operating from the same baseline of knowledge grounded in their training.

The delimitations of my study were senior leaders in leadership positions within the Division of Student Affairs. I sought seniors to account for cumulative learning and the students' time in the campus culture. All the participants had several years of experience on the campus and more time to be cognizant of the university values and ethos. There may be different findings in the research if the participants were not seniors and had not had as much exposure to the culture of the campus. I also chose to research senior leaders who supported the departments in the Division of Student Affairs. I did so because of the close connections the students have with members of the departmental staffs. The staff members served as supervisors, advisors, or mentors as the student leaders executed their responsibilities and may have been influential in the students' meaning-making as the students moved through their experiences.

Finally, a delimitation of this research is that it does not examine any other population on campus except student leaders. Future research could include replicating the study to include faculty and/or staff populations. That data could be compared to this current research to identify any trends about the meaning-making of those members of the university community.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the methodology used in this study to explore how students experience and make sense of the world in which they live. The research design, research method, location the research was conducted, the ways the data were collected and analyzed were addressed. Chapter Four shares the findings as organized around key themes that emerged from the data collection process.

CHAPTER FOUR FINDINGS

This chapter presents a detailed background of each participant and a presentation of findings from the themes that emerged through the analysis. The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to examine the lived experiences of White student leaders at a mission-based institution that emphasizes diversity in its mission statement, institutional values, and training for student leaders. The research question is, how do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity? Sub-questions were also addressed, including how the students experience the institution's definition of diversity, how students experience come to know the institution's mission and values, and how students make meaning of the university. What follows is an introduction to the participants.

The Participants

The participants in this research were all White students who were leaders in the Division of Student Affairs. They were all between the ages of 20 and 24. The participants were all seniors to account for the effects of cumulative learning throughout their college career and the level of exposure students had to the university's mission, values, and ethos. Seven of the participants started as freshman at the institution. One transferred to the university. Seven of the participants identified as female, and one identified as male.

Chely was born in South Africa and grew up in an upper-class family. Her father was an executive for a multi-national corporation, and they often moved all around the world. She lived in various countries in Europe, southeast Asia, Mexico, and the United States. Despite living in many international locations, she shared that her family kept a homogenous circle of friends and

acquaintances. She indicated that diversity was experienced differently across the globe than in the United States. Her first exposure to racial diversity was when her family lived in Mexico City. Chely's family moved from Mexico to an upper-class neighborhood in Ohio when she was a sophomore. Her high school was almost all White, upper-class students. Chely missed the excitement of a big city she enjoyed in Mexico City, so she sought an urban institution for college. In college, Chely served as a student leader for the department of residence life where she held a position as an officer for the residence hall council and was a resident assistant for a few years. She also served as an orientation leader for the office of new student programs on campus. In that role, she helps new freshman learn the campus and become acclimated to the university. She also served as a co-captain of the hip hop dance club on campus.

Beth majored in history in college. She grew up in the suburbs and considered her family upper middle class. She lived in a diverse neighborhood until middle school when her family moved to a different suburb that was not racially diverse, and her high school had little racial diversity. She shared she was attracted to the little diversity there was in her high school and dated mostly students of color. This university was the only school she applied to because she loved being in the city, it had a good history program, and she was accepted through early admission. On campus, she supported the work of the office of multicultural student affairs where she served as a peer mentor. In that role, she advised and mentored first-generation, low-income students and students of color to help them achieve academic success and navigate the university.

Mary was a sociology major with an emphasis on race and ethnicity. She grew up in the suburbs of a city in Nebraska. She considered her family upper middle class. She was raised by

her mother after her parents divorced when she was young. Mary shared that her mother is gay and was in a committed relationship until her death when Mary was a college freshman. Mary experienced diversity throughout her upbringing because her family had a diverse circle of friends. Her high school was also socio-economically and racially diverse. Her family did not practice any faith tradition. She wanted to attend a university in an urban setting. She also sought a campus that was racially diverse. Once on campus, Mary was the community service chairman of her social sorority. She was also engaged with the office of community service. She became one of the coordinators of community service for the department. In that role, she coordinated weekly service activities across the city.

Stacy grew up in rural New Hampshire in an upper-class family. Her parents were divorced. Her upbringing was homogenous, and her first interaction with diversity was at the boarding high school she attended. Stacy started her college career at a small liberal arts college on the East coast. She stopped out of college after an incident occurred on that campus. The term 'stopped out' refers to when students withdraw from college temporarily and re-enroll at a later time (Adamchik, 2018). She then transferred to the university as a second semester sophomore. Stacy majored in intercultural communications. Her campus involvement was as a resident assistant for a year and then as a peer mentor supporting first-generation, low-income students and students of color for the office of multicultural student affairs.

Heather grew up in a small town in Michigan. She was raised Baptist and traveled on a mission trip to Ghana with her church in high school. The town she grew up in was home to an international corporation, so her neighborhood was comprised of a variety of racial backgrounds including Whites, Asians, and South Asians. She came to the university seeking a sociology

degree but changed her major to be a peace, justice, and conflict major. Her leadership roles including serving the office of new student programs as a first-year experience class mentor. In that role she co-taught a class designed to help students acclimate to the university and the city. Heather then served the community service office on campus as a community service association coordinator and as a leader on the Spring Break community service immersion trips. She helped coordinate weekly service trips in the city and helped facilitate the service experiences of the participants during those weekly trips and during the Spring Break trips.

Ellen is the daughter of a Lutheran pastor. She was the born in a homogenous town in Minnesota, and they later moved to a wealthy, homogenous suburb of a city in Wisconsin. Her father is a Lutheran pastor, the family was provided with housing as part of his role, so she considered her family as lower-middle class socio-economically. She attended a small Lutheran high school with a significant population of Latino and African American students and had interaction across the groups through her involvement in sports and student government. When she got to college, Ellen served as a resident assistant and a member of the university programming board which planned and executed campus programming including movie nights, comedic events, musical concerts, and a speaker's series which addressed myriad contemporary societal issues.

Peter also grew up in a homogenous suburb of a city in Wisconsin. His family is middle class. He was raised Catholic, attending Church on a regular basis. He attended Catholic school until high school when he attended the area public high school. Though he had a small group of friends of different ethnic backgrounds including African American and South Asian, he had little interaction with diversity in general. He purposely sought a university in a city to take

advantage of the opportunities for entertainment in the city. Peter was a writing, rhetoric, and discourse major. His involvement was as a first-year experience class mentor, serving the office of new student programs. In that role he co-taught a class designed to help students acclimate to the university and the city. He then worked with the office of Catholic campus ministry as a ministry peer leader. In that role, he helped facilitate spiritual exploration and growth within the context of Catholic teachers. He also served the office of community service as a community service association leader working on the weekly service trips in the city the department hosted.

Megan was a psychology major from a small town in Iowa. She grew up in a homogenous, lower-middle-class neighborhood. Both of her parents worked but were not able to meet a lot of school events or to attend college without taking loans. Her parents divorced when she was in high school. She was raised Methodist but did not follow a faith tradition any longer after she lost faith because of her parents challenging relationship. In college, Megan became a leader in the Residence Hall Association and worked with the office of residence life as a resident advisor for two years where she served as a resource, mentor, and advisor to the students who lived in the halls.

These eight participants shared their experiences and backgrounds throughout the research process and the findings are presented in what follows. Three themes emerged in the data. The themes are:

- A Significant Experience as a Catalyst for Change
- The Power of the Institutional Values and Mission on Meaning-Making
- The Structure and Support Through Co-Curricular Involvement is Most Powerful

A Significant Experience as a Catalyst for Change

Students do not come to campus as a blank slate. They bring their life experiences, upbringing, and ideas about all sorts of issues, including diversity. The participants indicated that they had not thought much about diversity because their families did not ever discuss race. Beth shared that her family believed that 'good people' never discussed race: "Nobody ever talked about race. It just wasn't done. I think our families just wanted us to be good people."

As the participants discussed their experiences, they explained that a significant, personal situation impacted their view of themselves and diversity. They began to understand themselves, their privilege, and their position in the world. They all indicated that they had not thought much about their racial identity development before participating in this research. As they shared their stories, the participants revealed that it was a critical personal situation or relationship with a person of color that moved the White students to begin to understand their own identity and make meaning of the privilege they enjoy as White people. Through these interactions, the participants reported experiencing meaningful insight into their identity and raised consciousness about their position in the world. While the participants may have experienced diversity before, learned about racism, or even had relationships with people of color, it was that significant interaction, relationship, or emotional moment that personalized how they made meaning of diversity and their Whiteness. Additionally, the participants indicated that the deeply personal and meaningful situations affected them so deeply that they stay with them, and they continue to reflect upon them.

Though Mary grew up in a predominant White suburb, she had several experiences with diversity before starting college. She attended a diverse, urban high school where she

experienced positive interactions across a racially diverse student population. Her mother also had a diverse circle of friends that Mary interacted with frequently throughout her childhood. She said those interactions helped her learn "that there is richness in everyone's backgrounds, that traditions in people's houses were different, and that people's life experiences could be different." Mary's circle of friends and family connections were diverse. That diversity was something she took for granted. Two incidents occurred that raised her consciousness of the impact of discrimination on her friends and the privilege she enjoys as a majority group member.

Mary shared that her mother was gay. She shared that there were times when she did not disclose her mother's sexual orientation so she would not suffer any discrimination.

> You know as a child to be told 'Sarah is not coming to this because. . . '. My Mom would never say we don't want people to know about her, but sort of [an] understanding that was true. My Mom was the only one who took me to teacher conferences because that kept me safe in spaces where teachers might otherwise not be kind to me if they knew [about Mom being gay].

Mary came to realize that there is a difference between visible and invisible identities. She observed, "I can hide the fact that my mom is gay. People don't need to know that." In her mother's situation, the family had the privilege to disclose her sexual orientation or not. She acknowledged that people of color do not have that same luxury.

Mary then shared an experience she had when she was shopping with a Black friend who was followed throughout the store. Mary witnessed her friend profiled by the store staff.

> You know, for the first time of having to face that reality with [my friend] at a young age. I think that was influential as far as I was never going to have that

> experience. No one was ever going to follow me around a department store. But they followed her, and to know what that looked like, really helped to put into perspective for me things that are now sort of national news as far as [racial] things.

The contrast of Mary's mother's invisible identity as a gay woman and her friend's visible racial identity as a person of color was so striking to Mary that it raised her consciousness about her own privilege, especially as a White person. "Here were two people so important to me, and they were both treated so poorly. It really woke me up about how lucky I am, but how unfair it is. It is something that I always remember about being White and straight."

Ellen did not have much interaction with diversity as a young child, but she said she had positive interactions with diversity once she started high school. Though she lived in a primarily White suburb, the high school she attended had many African American and Latino students. Ellen said it was not a shock to her when she started high school because she attended some high school events with her older brother. She remembers positive interactions with her brothers' friends of color. "The diversity wasn't shocking like 'oh my goodness, what are black people doing at this high school?'. I didn't think about it. I had already had good experiences with those kids."

However, Ellen revealed that she was surprised by seeing the students of color, including some of her friends, in the cafeteria sitting with each other.

> All the Latino students would be sitting together. All the Black kids sitting together. I thought it was curious because we all got along so well. I mean, why didn't they sit with us? It was never like there was tension among us, and I didn't

> have animosity that I felt about them all sitting together. There was no racial tension, or I'm sure it's there, but you know, being like the White majority, I probably wouldn't have felt any racial oppression, but I'm sure some of my black counterparts did, you know. You just don't necessarily think about that. So, I didn't realize how important it was for them to be together. Now in college I still think about it and I kind of understand.

Ellen expressed some sadness and hurt that her friends of color wanted to sit with other students of color during lunch. She believed her high school was diverse, but she did not appreciate the need for the students of color to spend time together, separate from the White students. Ellen also shared some frustration with herself that she "didn't get it" until one of her friends explained it to her.

> Now I look back and feel awful that I had to have my friend explain why he wanted to sit with the other Black kids! He should not have to explain himself! Especially not to me as his friend. I am mortified that I put him in that position! How embarrassing!

Ellen's reflection on the experience of her friend having to explain to her why students of color wanted to sit together was a pivotal moment in heightening her awareness of her privilege.

Beth grew up as a young child in a diverse neighborhood comprised of families from various backgrounds. She felt immersed in different cultures. Beth felt very connected to her neighborhood and has fond memories of the diversity of it.

> You could go from house to house to house. I had a diverse group of friends. I was good friends with these two Russian girls who were adopted, and my best friend was Puerto-Rican. When we were growing up, we had a babysitter, and she was from Pakistan. So, we grew up almost in a Pakistani household. The food, it smells so good. It reminds me of home.

When Beth was in the fifth grade, her family moved to a more rural and homogenous town. “It was all White, kind of a culture shock . . . I felt totally out of place.” When she started high school and lost the diversity she once enjoyed, she began seeking out that diversity for herself.

> Oh, I found diversity! My first boyfriend, Hispanic . . . the more I think about it I did seek people out. Both my prom dates were Latino, and my homecoming dates were African American. And I think there was only like five African American boys at our school. I went out with two of them.

Beth experienced a very personal situation that left a lasting mark about her Whiteness and her privilege. When she was in a car accident with her boyfriend, who is Latino, she was upset with how the police officer treated her boyfriend.

> We got in a car accident, and my boyfriend went to talk to the police officer, and the police officer was so rude. And it was like this White Polish man, and then I got out of the car, and suddenly the situation like turned around.

She was astounded that the officer treated her differently than he treated her boyfriend. "I'm witnessing it, and I just can't believe. It shouldn't have to be like that. You don't always see those things until you're with someone who is being prejudiced against."

Beth acknowledged that she had the privilege of being able to distance herself from discrimination. The experience with her boyfriend personalized the issue for her. Beth also connected that experience to her training as a peer mentor. While she better understood the concept of White privilege, she also expressed frustration with what she felt were assumptions made about White people.

> Some of it felt like generalizations made about White people. But you must understand it's happening, and even if it's not happening with you, and you're not the one doing that, and you're an ally, and you're here to support students of color, it still needs to be discussed and you have to be aware of it.

While Beth's personal experience with her boyfriend made her privilege and discrimination real for her, she still struggled to understand the systemic nature of White privilege.

> You don't always see those things until you're with someone who is being prejudiced against. Like you watch on TV, someone being prejudiced. Then you're put in situations, and with the training where you see, that is a majority of like, what's happening right now. It's happening, and even if it's not happening with you and you're not the one doing it, but you're an ally and you're here to support them, it still needs to be addressed, and you have to be aware of it.

Beth's comments reveal how she is increasing her awareness of systemic discrimination in society but that she still needs to increase her awareness of her own privilege.

Heather shared that a trip to Ghana with her church was her first exposure to diversity. However, she also said that she experienced what it was like to be the minority. "They had never seen White people with red hair before. I felt a lot of exoticism. Which was very weird." Heather

was uncomfortable with being viewed differently but indicated that the group accepted her as she spent more time with them.

Heather's experience of being treated differently by the Ghanaian people because she is White serves as motivation for her to consciously push to connect with those who are not necessarily like her. Her pain of being treated differently is a check so that she makes sure not do the same to others. She recognizes this will involve ongoing work on her part as she fights how she has been socialized to think about people of color.

> Now, back in Chicago, when a friend will invite me to a party where I know I am going to be the only White person there, sometimes I check myself when I find I am thinking 'It's ok; I can do this. I got this.' Then I think, 'why am I having these thoughts?' I'm the type of person who's comfortable going places where I don't know anybody and making friends there. It makes me question things.

Heather now wonders about why she is having those thoughts when she faces the potential of being the only White person at a party. This indicates a heightened awareness of how she has been conditioned to believe as a White person that she would never experience discomfort because Whites and Whiteness are dominant in society. When Heather realizes she may not be in the majority at the party, she experiences discomfort at that prospect. However, she now also experiences discomfort realizing that, even though she believes she has grown in her identity, she still has those thoughts creep back into her consciousness.

Megan shared a time when she was one of only a few White people at a predominantly Black funeral. She was surprised when someone asked her if she was lost.

"It's like I am not supposed to be there. I don't fit into this group." Then she realized through that interaction that her privilege allows her to expect to be in whatever spaces she wants, even when others think she does not belong. "There's always a sense of privilege that, as a White person, I can belong in any space, and it be ok."

The experience helped Megan understand that her race privilege allowed her to be in that space in the first place. She shared that as a critical interaction that shaped her. She also said that critical interaction helps her think through how she should situate herself in the primarily Black community where she will serve as a Teach for America Corps member.

> This brings up all sorts of questions for me! What is my responsibility as a person of power? What is my responsibility as a White person to people of color? How do I support students as a White person in that space and allow an opportunity for them to grow and experience race in a way that builds them up as people of color, rather than through my eyes?

Megan's awareness helped her understand her identity development as a White person and how her Whiteness affects those around her.

Peter shared a poignant experience he had when he attended a forum about racism on campus. The forum was hosted by the cultural center on campus to provide students of color an opportunity to share their experiences after a racist incident occurred on campus. Peter shared that he experienced what he perceived to be 'looks' as he was only one of a few White people at the forum. He said "you know, I went to listen to their stories so I could be a good ally. I didn't mean to make them uncomfortable."

Peter realized that the students of color may have reacted to his Whiteness and the racism and oppression that it may represent to them. “Here is the one place that they can go and not worry about race, and here I am representing everything that makes them feel devalued and oppressed.” Peter realized his shortcomings in understanding of the impact of his Whiteness on the students at the forum and he used this as an opportunity to learn from the discomfort he experienced because of the stares he received.

Peter shared that he stayed quiet and listened to the stories of the students of color. He found the forum powerful and compelling. "I just felt very touched, just hearing the human experience and the human stories and hearing people talking about their first experience when they started realizing that racism is not dead here." He shared that listening to those firsthand stories gave life to the challenges of racism that he studied in his coursework.

> It validated the formal school setting, like reading different theorists saying, 'this is still a part of life.' Having [the Black students'] feelings validated when they came (to the forum), it was just really powerful to hear those stories. That inspired me, knowing that there aren’t a lot of people trying to change things in the world, but who might want to. It moves me and inspires me too.

While Peter admitted he was uncomfortable hearing the sadness and discomfort the African American students experience on campus, he also acknowledged that what the students were sharing was their reality and an important voice for him to hear as a White student. "They're just talking about their background of experiencing racism and how can they expect to fully commit to their studies when they have to deal with this stuff." He acknowledged that his experience listening to the stories at the forum helped him grow:

> Just dealing with the fact of White privilege and that they're pushing against that in spaces and how that can complicate their studies when they have to focus on that too . . . that wasn't something I thought about until now.

Peter realized that his discomfort manifested itself as White guilt. He acknowledged that his Whiteness had privileged him over people of color. He said his guilt created so much discomfort that he often would not want to discuss it when it came up in processing with the community service team or with his friends. However, Peter indicated that over time he learned to push himself to talk about his guilt.

> I realized that feeling guilty doesn't really do anything to help. I have to not let those feelings of guilt sort of overwhelm me but recognize that being privileged, that comes with a responsibility to use that privilege in a way that helps those that are underprivileged by our world.

Peter realized his guilt was an obstacle to working to fight injustice. He knew that with his privilege comes responsibility to work toward justice. Though Peter's desire to use his privilege to help others may be viewed as a White savior mentality, his work in community service and social justice through campus ministry is grounded more in Paolo Freire's (2018) approach to working with the oppressed. Freire argues that trust and respect is developed across the groups to create a culture of care. Peter leverages his guilt to acknowledge his responsibility to work in cooperation with those less privileged than he is, rather than to engage with them as a savior.

Beth shared that she experienced discomfort during parts of the peer mentor training, especially when the topic of White privilege was addressed. She realized she was feeling guilt

and discomfort but because she had strong relationships with the other peer leaders, she pushed herself to work through it. As training went on, she learned to reframe her discomfort. “Once you get past that no one's attacking me personally . . . the understanding becomes easy again. It was just something that I had to go through.” She learned that she had to shift her thinking from a negative outlook on discussing issues of privilege to view it as a positive opportunity for growth to work for positive change.

> If you do get stuck on the negativity, I think that you could almost end up not being an ally because you could get upset. You have to take yourself out of the situation. At first, yeah, it's uncomfortable. And you're just like, ‘oh, wow. I don't know anyone who personally does these things, but I've seen it.’

Beth recognized the continuous work it will take for her to be a positive change agent. These participants revealed growth in their White identity development through personal situations, through the larger context of the university, and when they experienced some discomfort, which forced them to reckon with their feelings.

The participants in this research shared that these personal experiences helped them understand their positionality in the United States. The participants experienced a heightened awareness of racial inequity and a greater understanding of how their White identity impacts those around them. The White students were also aware of the iterative ways they negotiated and renegotiated their identity through the impact of their personal experiences and interactions with students of color. The relationships with the students of color were so personal that the participants were open to being aware of their Whiteness. The awareness of their Whiteness helps the White students make meaning of their interactions with students of color and how they

engage as leaders in the Division of Student Affairs by serving the diverse population on campus and providing equity in services and resources available to the student population through their offices.

The Power of the Institutional Values and Mission on Meaning-Making

The participants felt strongly that the Catholic nature of the university and its values shaped by its patron saint provided context for their experience which framed their meaning-making around issues of diversity. They shared that the institutional messaging around diversity communicated during new student orientation, through their first-year experiences in class, and in their training as student leaders helped frame their understanding of diversity.

Catholic colleges and universities have a unique connection to diversity through Catholic social justice teachings that recognize all persons' dignity and understand and appreciate human differences and cultures. This institution grounds its focus on diversity in the teachings of the Catholic church and its patron saint’s teachings, primarily focusing on the dignity of every individual. Every interaction matters with its unique history, experience, and culture, and those unique perspectives are valued.

As student leaders in the Division of Students Affairs, all the students participated in training about institutional values, including the university mission and the connection to the school's patron saint's work. This training provided the participants with a framework through which they grew to experience diversity and their own development.

All of the participants shared that they thought the university did a good job in promoting a welcoming and inclusive campus. Several of the participants actually shared that they believed the university was ahead of other institutions in creating an inclusive campus. Chely shared:

> I believe our mission sets us apart from other campuses that are stuck in old ways or that are not open to change and inclusion. When I go home and see my friends from high school who are at other campuses, and I hear the things they say, I just know they don't discuss issues like we do here. I know they're still stuck in their old ways and don't interact with diversity like I do here. The campus has really brought their commitment to diversity to life for me.

Chely shared that she experienced the institutional value of diversity coming to life during training for her leadership roles and shared its impact on her development.

> I think my experiences with . . . the diversity that I've been exposed to is just giving me, blessed me with ways of doing things differently, of just thinking about things differently and having my own, kind of perspective, and my own way of seeing things . . .that I can use to be a better adult . . .that I can be more understanding, more tolerant, more connected to others.

Chely thinks differently about diversity after the training and sees the value of that growth as she moves forward in her life.

Peter's involvement with the community service office provided him a context within which to bring the mission to life through his work as a servant leader to those who are marginalized. He shared that his involvement challenged him to consider how to enter a relationship in service to others. "How do we, as outsiders coming into these communities, how do we honor the dignity of those that we're serving, focus on building relationships, building community." This approach is grounded in the philosophical framing of Paolo Freire (2018) who argued that trust and respect is developed across the those who are serving and those who are

served to create a culture of care. This approach moves Peter from being a White savior to being of service to others in cooperation with them.

Peter further indicated that the university mission provided him a framework to position his service to others.

> I think encountering the mission, that's all about building community amongst all people and honoring the dignity of all people. I think the beauty of the mission is that it recognizes that all people have something to contribute, and that we form each other in that.

The mission also framed how Peter experienced diversity on campus. His experiences with people from diverse backgrounds humanized those who are different from him. Once the other is humanized, Peter said, it was challenging to marginalize them.

> I think it's also much harder to fall back on stereotypes and sort of othering others when you have personal experience and know someone who fits that group. It's harder to fall back on certain racial stereotypes or sexual orientation stereotypes when you have friends that fit those because that humanizes them. And so, I think that diversity also feeds in with that, too, because it helps to sort of humanize what sort of could be positioned as sort of the other.

Peter's meaning making directly connected the human dignity of every individual to the way he enters into a relationship with others.

The university context of its mission was significant in helping the participants appreciate their identity and the value of diversity on campus. Chely felt that there were very clear expectations of her as a student, but especially as a student leader.

> It is clear to me that the university has expectations for the kind of place they want campus to be for everyone. From orientation, yes. Through my class freshman year, yeah. To our leadership training, absolutely! There is no way you can't know that diversity is important here. As leaders they want us to emanate the values of [the patron saint].

The culmination of those three significant moments of messaging about the mission, values, and expectations for diversity and inclusion created a cumulative effect of messaging about expectations that framed Chelly's embrace of and openness to diversity.

The importance of the cumulative messaging of expectations based on the mission and values of the university is further highlighted through Stacy's experience. As a transfer student, Stacy did not participate in orientation or the first-year class that the other participants experienced as freshmen. Stacy became a peer mentor for the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs where she supported first-generation students and students of color. While she experienced the Division of Student Affairs training as a peer mentor, Stacy appeared to lack the deeper context of the mission than the other participants because she did not attend new student orientation, nor did she take the first-year class that all freshmen take. It also appears to have affected her understanding of her White identity.

Stacy struggled with understanding her identity and actually talks about her Whiteness being bad. Sometimes I just feel like things I do are like 'so White'. I don't wanna say the term 'ignorant', but I almost feel like things I say are really dumb." Her account reflects a lack of awareness of her Whiteness and the subsequent privileges associated with it, she also joked about how students of color see her. When asked how students of color see her, Stacy laughed

and responded, [They see me as] “So White. So unbelievably White. I don’t take it as an insult. I used to. I don’t anymore. I think it is what it is.”

Stacy expressed excitement about diversity, describing it as “wonderful, exciting, amazing, incredible.” She even praised the institution for its values and its work around issues of diversity. However, she did not understand the impact of her Whiteness and her positionality as a White student. The peer mentors of color explain cultural terms and racial situations to her. Stacy said she "feels very confused half the time because I don't understand cultural references." Stacy did not understand the frustration the other mentors have with explaining issues to her. She chooses to maintain her ignorance of issues rather than internalizing her learning, growing in appreciation of the cultural difference she is learning about, and taking positive non-racist action. Stacy leveraged her privilege to remove herself from uncomfortable situations rather than leaning into that discomfort to learn and grow. She lacked the depth of understanding of the institutional context compared to the other student leaders.

The participants shared that they could place themselves within a context that created meaning in their White identity development and an appreciation for the impact of their Whiteness. They indicated that through the institutional values, the diversity training they received, and their courses, they grew to appreciate diverse perspectives and people and understand the connection between their identity and their position in the world.

Heather and Peter were student leaders in University Ministry and shared a deeper understanding of the meaning of Catholicism and the values of the patron saint. However, both continued to minimize the significance of the Catholic nature of the institution. Heather shared, "I think [the university’s] Catholic can be as Catholic as you want it to be. It could be, that's

Catholic with a capital C, but if you do Catholic with a lower-case c, it's mostly values of being a good person that transcends religion."

Peter specifically focused on an understanding of the values of the patron saint and the connection to the institution's commitment to diversity:

> It's all about building community amongst all people and honoring dignity amongst all people . . . I think one of the beauties of the mission is that it recognizes that all people have something to contribute, and we form each other in that.

Through his involvement with University Ministry, he had space to process and reflect more deeply on the university's mission.

> Through my [involvement] experience I encountered Catholic social justice teaching and getting more involved in the social justice and community service organizations - through University Ministry and the Community Service Officer, and going on service immersion trips, and doing weekly service. . . just having those conversations about, you know, what is the mission? And then doing reflection after we're doing service. I discovered what the mission is and understood it better. [Our Saint] was all about serving those who were marginalized. So, we do that now. And we talk about it all the time.

The participants consistently reported that the institution promoted diversity and inclusion positioning it as an extension of Catholic social justice teaching and the university mission.

Structure and Support Through Co-Curricular Involvement is Most Powerful

The participants acknowledged the impact of the various types of diversity displayed at the host institution. They did notice the institutional efforts to create structural diversity through a student population comprised of students from diverse backgrounds. It is noticeable to them on campus. Megan said, "you can see they make an effort to bring in people who are not White, male, or Catholic." Peter shared that "looking at the student body . . . while it's still kind of lopsided in some areas, it does look diverse."

Despite the structural diversity they experienced on campus, some of the participants expressed disappointment that their curricular diversity was not more significant than it was. They found their class composition very homogenous. Chely said, "in my first year immersion class, mostly White kids. And all of my business classes? Mostly White kids. I wasn't really getting exposed to this diversity that the university kept talking about."

They also shared that aside from their first year experience class, their courses lacked a focus on diversity, the mission, or institutional values. Ellen shared that "these classes could have been anywhere, not at a campus that talks about diversity so much."

The participants shared that the structure and support provided to them through their on-campus involvement helped make those experiences meaningful. That structure included the explicit expectations for their roles as leaders on campus, and the role of the staff and student mentors in supporting and encouraging the participants.

Their involvement on campus allowed them to make meaning of the institutional value of diversity and become more connected to the campus mission. Chely shared:

> I think through my positions at the school, and just really like branching out, and getting involved and going to things, going to events, you know getting to know my floor or just my RA and well, all those combined, I really see the diversity being played out.

As her involvement gave her the opportunity to see the values played out, she also shared that it was the professional staff that helped her make meaning.

> When we did the role play in training, the professionals would come in, and like talk about what the scenario was we were dealing with. That students on campus really do deal with this. I was like, 'wow, this is real.' Kids really do go through this? I want to be able to support them and help them.

The staff support through training helped Chely appreciated the experience of other students on campus and encouraged her to support students through those experiences.

Peter also discussed how his staff advisors supported his group as they processed their training and their experiences throughout their year as student leaders. He shared how he experienced support from the staff as he came to understand the negative impact of stereotypes.

> We just had that space us to just talk. They [the staff] would not talk much, but they asked questions to pull us out more so we could all just process. As we processed, we learned how much harder it is to fall back on stereotypes and othering others. They helped us remember who the kids are that we know who fit into the different groups and they helped us connect the dots.

Interactions with the staff and other student mentors created space where the participants felt supported and understood what was expected of them in their roles, but also as they learned

about diversity and about themselves. Ellen shared the support she felt from the advisors for her organization. “I knew that I had allies in the advisers, even when I didn't have allies in like my peers, I think was really important.”

Megan indicated that because the staff she worked with reflected the diversity they talked about as student leaders, she knew she had to work to be inclusive and learn about others. “I mean because through training it's about like sharing who you are with other people, and learning about others, and it’s so important because, even the staff is so diverse too. That demonstrated how important it was for us to do our work.”

Ellen developed an openness to new experiences because of her involvement on campus. She said, “my advisors really helped connect the dots on how all this work will help me in my future.” She feels like they made an investment in her that she must continue to build on.

> I can’t go back to like I may have before I came here . . . I had so many great experiences here and everyone across campus was so supportive. Every department I worked with. Now I want to work in a very multicultural or global setting. I have this drive to sort of, just get out and experience new things. They empowered me to do that.

Stacy's experience was different from the other participants because she transferred to the university in the middle of an academic year. She did not experience new student orientation and did not take the freshman year experience course the others did. "I transferred in the middle of a year, so there was no like opening ceremonies where they quoted the patron saint or anything like that." Stacy indicated that the staff played a critical role in helping her learn about the mission. They encouraged her to become a peer mentor and to break down stereotypes she held.

> I owe everything to them. She [the staff member] called me during the summer and asked me if I would be interested in being a transfer mentor. And I was like yeah, absolutely, if I can give back in any way, absolutely. They were adding transfers into their program that already serves people of color, low income families, first generation college students. Even though I didn't fit into any of that criteria, I became submerged in a world where that's all it was. She reached out to me and gave me that chance.

Stacy felt supported by the staff when she experienced tension with the other student mentors because she did not fit the criterial of being low-income, first generation, or student of color.

> I had a very hard time connecting with the other mentors because they all fit, they were all somehow in that in one of those three brackets and they just knew looking at me that I wasn't. And they made it perfectly known and clear that they knew I wasn't one of them.

She persisted because she felt like the departmental staff invested in her.

> I just really appreciate what they've done. They stuck with me. I would go into them crying and all they did was support me. They just work so hard to make people feel like they matter, and I just think it's incredible.

The staff played an important role in supporting Stacy and ensuring she persisted in her leadership role. Their investment in her made Stacy want to stay engaged.

Megan's interaction with diversity through her involvement on campus made her aware of the wide variety of student organizations supporting various backgrounds,

interests, and ethnicities of students on campus. While she appreciates the variety of organizations, she said she walked in one day to a staff member to express concern about how isolated those student organizations seem to be from the other groups on campus.

> When I asked the staff why some student orgs are isolated from others, they helped me see that sometimes students of color need their own space where they don't have to work so hard to get people who are not like them understand what it is like for them on campus. They helped me understand that just as there are places to come together, even though it feels really separated and segregated to me, part of diversity and inclusion is having time to be together and apart.

There were structures in place for the participants to bring issues and concerns forward. The staff successfully helped these students feel supported even while they were being challenged in their beliefs. These staff and the structure helped the student leaders grow.

Conclusion

This chapter presented background about the experiences of the eight participants in this study and presented the themes that emerged from the two interviews that were conducted with each participant and from the notes and journaling I performed through analysis. The first theme A Significant Experience as a Catalyst for Change, reveals the lasting memory of an emotional incident of racism against someone close to them and how it affected their understanding of their Whiteness. The second theme - The Power of the Institutional Values and Mission on Meaning-Making - focuses on the extent to which the university's Catholic nature, mission, and values provided a framework that the participants used to make meaning of diversity. Finally, I identified a third theme - Structure and Support of Co-curricular Involvement is Most Powerful

where the participants narrated that of all the ways they experienced diversity on campus, through the structural diversity of campus, through interactions on campus, or through the curriculum, it was through the interactions with staff and the structures in place to help them in their campus leadership roles that impacted them most.

Chapter Five is presented next. In the chapter, the findings are analyzed within the context of the theoretical frameworks of phenomenology and White dialectics to show how this research connects to the current literature in the field of Whiteness and White identity work.

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION

Introduction

The research I conducted explored the participants' meaning-making about diversity on a campus that emphasizes diversity in its mission and values. This chapter discusses the meaning and significance of the findings presented in Chapter Four. The discussion is framed by the theoretical lenses of phenomenology and White dialectics and connects to the existing literature presented in Chapter Two. The themes identified in the findings were A Significant Experience as a Catalyst for Change, The Power of the Institutional Values and Mission on Meaning-Making, and Structure and Support Through Co-Curricular Involvement is Most Powerful.

Phenomenology and White dialectics served as the theoretical frameworks through which the data were analyzed. The phenomenological framework allowed me, as the researcher, to analyze relevant literature with what the participants shared about their meaning making of their experiences. It also allowed me to engage in reflective research activities to help facilitate my meaning making.

White dialectics refer to the struggle with apparent contradictions in the narratives that White people inherently experience as dominant group members in the United States. Individuals may shift and move along a continuum while working through these contradictions (McTaggart & McTaggart, 2011). There are six dialectics, including Whiteness and Sense of Self, Closeness and Connection in Multiracial Relationships, Color Blindness, Minimization of Racism, Structural Inequality, and White Privilege (Todd & Abrams, 2011). Researchers use White dialectics to explore the understanding of power, race, racism, and White privilege (Todd & Abrams, 2011).

Additionally, because this research is about the growth and development of White people and the impact of their experiences on that growth, White identity development models are used to frame the participants' experiences (Helms, 1990; J. E. Helms, 1994; Sabnani et al., 1991).

Both Hardiman (1982; 2012) and Helms (1984; 1994) present movement for White people from a lack of awareness of racism, through confusion about what impact racism has on them, to increasing racial sensitivity, then to a non-racist White identity. In these models, movement through this process is not linear, often includes regression, and does not occur at the same rate for everyone

Interpretation of the Findings

The themes presented in the prior chapter illustrate the emotional, complex, and constant struggle of the White student leaders as they grapple with working toward a non-racist identity on a mission-based campus emphasizing diversity and inclusion. The participants still struggle to break from how they were socialized as White people by society, even though they said that a significant relationship or incident was transformative in moving the participants to recognize their Whiteness. They still struggle to live in congruence with the mission and values of the university even though the participants indicate that the mission and values provide them a strong framework for them to use to move toward a non-racist identity. The participants still struggle with resistance to concepts of diversity and Whiteness offered by the staff during student leader training, even though they shared that the support and structure they received from staff ding their co-curricular engagement made the most positive impact on their development. This research highlights the struggle White people experience moving back and forth along the continuum of White dialectics of Whiteness and Sense of Self, Closeness and Connection in

Multiracial Relationships, Color Blindness, Minimization of Racism, Structural Inequality, and White Privilege (Todd & Abrams, 2011) and as they work through myriad tensions and challenges experienced through their identity development. By working through those tensions, White people move closer to a non-racist identity.

The participants experience tension as they struggle to reconcile their view of themselves as "good people." Beth shared that good people do not discuss race in society. "Nobody ever talked about race. It just wasn't done. I think our families just wanted us to be good people." This notion of 'good people' not discussing race sets the students up for limited ability to acknowledge racism and inequality, keeps them from realizing their privilege, or from acknowledging that we live in a raced and racist society. They view themselves along a binary perspective of good or not good if they talk about race.

Because the participants see themselves as "good people", when they did notice race, they quickly minimized its importance. This struggle is revealed in the White dialectic of Color Blind and Color Conscious (Todd & Abrams, 2011). Stacy displayed movement toward the White dialectic of Minimization of Racism when she discussed her first exposure to people of color. "I remember seeing people who were a completely different than me, like Black, Asian, Latino, everything. But it didn't mean anything really. I was just excited to meet new people."

The minimization of race is intriguing because while some of the participants indicated they perceive themselves as good people because they don't see color, they still exhibit a color-blind ideology that does not reflect an appreciation for difference, or for the impact of race and racism on people of color (Reason & Evans, 2007). The colorblind strategy of minimizing race

neglects a critical consciousness of race or the impact of racism, creating the unintended consequence of denying the experiences of people of color.

The color blind ideology remained a struggle for the participants throughout their experiences on campus. Peter exhibited this as he reflects on his upbringing and on his friends in high school. “I had a mix of friends in high school, but we were all just buds, so I didn’t consider them as Black, or Asian, or whatever.”

While Peter displays colorblindness in high school, as he interacts with more students of color in a variety of settings on campus, and learned more about the university mission, he indicated he began to understand the injustice that students of color experience because of their race. During a forum on racism that he attended, he moved toward a color conscious acknowledgement that students of color do experience the world differently than he does as a White person. “When they shared what happens on campus, I just had to admit they have different experiences on the campus than I do.”

However, Peter still reveals a notion of colorblindness through his reaction that the students of color should not have to experience racism on the campus. He shared that he was deeply saddened by their stories. “No one should have such a rough time on their own campus.” That perspective is still a position of colorblindness that encourages not seeing race so the students of color do not have to experience discomfort and racism, or perhaps so he does not have to experience discomfort knowing the students of color are (Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017).

This movement along the White dialectics illustrates the many contradictions the participants experienced. The participants did not want to notice race, but they noticed it. Intellectually, they believed they had to acknowledge race to understand that students of color do

in fact experience the world differently than White students do. At the same time, emotionally the White students experience significant reactions to acknowledging race and its associated injustice.

Peter's experience at the forum on racism demonstrates this contradiction. His emotional reaction and outrage to the experiences of the students of color came from his feelings of guilt and moral outrage at the injustice the students of color face. Though his reaction may be similar to demonstrating colorblindness, he did in fact recognize and appreciate the different experiences of the students of color, rather than minimize it. Through his condemnation of racism, he displayed empathy for the students of color and may be at a starting point of becoming a racial ally (Souto-Manning, 2019; Sue, 2017). Peter's reaction may be indicative of awareness development by "making it personal" (Sue, 2017, p. 712) to him and overcoming obstacles that discourage his growth toward becoming non-racist.

Through a White identity development lens, the participants display movement within the early stages of development. The participants moved from colorblindness and notions of 'being good people' who did not consider race, to recognizing the oppression of others and having emotional responses to that oppression. The participants rejected difference between Blacks and Whites and accepted how they were raised with little critical analysis but then recognized difference and recognized the racism that people of color experience.

This movement is consistent with White identity development as presented by Hardiman (1982; 1994; 2012) and Helms (1984; 1990; 1995). In the early phases of White identity development, there is lack of awareness of race which these participants displayed by admitting that they were taught to not consider race. Once the participants experienced the racism that their

friends of color experience, the participants were saddened, some even enraged by their friends' treatment. This emotion was a catalyst to moving toward an identity of awareness of the difference in how Whites and people of color are treated in society.

Throughout the interviews, the participants shared several insights about their meaning-making for when they began to understand their Whiteness, their position in society, and the impact of Whiteness on those around them. The participants were open in sharing the pain, frustration, and helplessness they experienced in high school and on the college campus when they experienced people of color being treated in a racist manner. These situations were emotional for them and stuck with them throughout their college experience.

The students also shared how particularly unsettling it was for them to experience the incidents involving their friends and how helpless they felt at the time. They acknowledged that these situations helped them realize their Whiteness and the privilege they enjoy as White people because they realize that they would not be treated poorly because of their Whiteness. They also came to understand the role that Whiteness plays in causing the painful racism their friends in high school and peers on campus experienced. This could reflect the start of a process for the participants that Cabrera, Franklin, and Watson (2017) called "reserializing Whites to be racial justice allies" (p. 9). The student leaders' experiences of the oppression of the students of color raised their consciousness of racism so they can begin to become non-racist.

The students shared that they did not realize their privilege as White people until they experienced the significant incidents they spoke about with students of color. These incidents caused the participants to move along the White dialectic of White Privilege. McIntosh (1988) defined White privilege as "invisible systems conferring unearned dominance and power upon

Whites" (p. 14). She acknowledged that Whites typically do not recognize their privilege, which perpetuates the harm of privilege. Similarly, the participants noted that they were unaware of their privilege until these incidents transformed how they see themselves. They students became aware of their privilege when they realized that they would not be treated the way people of color were. They realized that they are treated differently than people of color because they are White.

The invisibility of Whiteness perpetuates its power and privilege in society (Helms, 2017; Sue, 2006, 2011; Todd et al., 2010). In order to dismantle Whiteness, it must be made visible (Kivel, 2017). Kivel asserted that if Whites understand their privilege and positionality, they can understand how people of color view Whites and Whiteness and then learn to dismantle racism (p. 123).

When the participants experienced the incidents where their friends were mistreated, their Whiteness was made visible to them and their view of what they understood about themselves as White people changed. These incidents raised the students' consciousness as they became aware that they would not experience the same racist treatment as the people of color did. Though the students did not move entirely through the Whiteness and Sense of Self dialectic, they did acknowledge some movement when they came to see that they were treated differently than people of color.

The participants' reflections on their experiences reveal ongoing internal tensions they continue to grapple with. They experienced significant emotional reactions to what happened to their friends, expressing outrage and disgust that their friends were treated in such a racist manner. Beth said, "Am I really witnessing this? I just cannot believe it!". Mary said she cried

with her friend after the friend was followed in the store. “My God, no one should be treated that way!”.

Beth and Mary both shared that their solution to their friends’ treatment would be to keep it from happening again. Beth said she was glad she was there to keep the situation from escalating more. “I'm glad I was here because we're going to get out of this now.” Mary indicated that next time she went shopping with her friend, she would not leave her alone in the store. “Next time, when we go back to that department store, I would not I have not left her . . . we would walk around the store together the whole time.”

Mary and Beth’s desire to protect their friends and keep them from experiencing hurt through racism demonstrates the complexities and interconnectedness of White dialectics. For instance, an overlap is present between the dialectics of Minimization of Racism and Color Blindness (Todd et al., 2010). The basic assumption is that color blindness is racist; if one does not see race, then one does not see another person fully or acknowledge the experiences they have as a person of color. The belief that race should not matter for people of color, minimizes the experience of people of color and the racism they endure. Mary and Beth were in the space of both Minimization of Racism and Color Blind dialectics where their close relationships with their friends shifted them in the dialectic processes of moving to acknowledge that racism exists and to be color conscious rather than color blind.

However, as Mary and Beth acknowledge that racism does occur, they experience tension because admitting racism means they have to suffer the pain of their friends’ experience of racism. Their response is to protect their friends from racism by staying with them in the store and being with them throughout the police officer’s stop. While it is admirable to want to keep

their friends from pain, their plan to protect their friends centers the White participants in the situation, rather than putting their friends of color at the center.

The participants desire to save their friends of color from racism also indicates a belief that as White people, they have a role to play as savior to people of color. While it may seem selfless to want to protect their friends from racial hostility, it can have unintended consequences for people of color including perpetuating the notion that Whites need to save them. This robs people of color of their own agency and enables White people to continue thinking they need to be saviors.

Whiteness and White Privilege intersect here in how the participants put themselves at the center of the racist situation, rather than centering the students of color. By wishing to protect their friends, Beth and Mary made the incidents about themselves, positioning their Whiteness as a tool to keep the students of color safe. While this reflects movement along the White dialectic of awareness and acknowledgement of being White, it also displays a lack of appreciation for the privilege they enjoy as White people.

Additionally, the savior role reflects deficit thinking about their friends; that they cannot take care of themselves. While it is not the role of the participants to protect people of color, the desire to do so is indicative of an acknowledgement of the power and privilege the participants have as White people. This is reflective of movement along the dialectic of White Privilege. The participants recognize the importance of using the privilege and power they have as White people. Sue (2011) stated that "the ultimate White privilege for White folks is the ability to acknowledge its existence and do nothing about it." (p. 419). While the participants arguably intend to do something with their privilege by protecting their friends, Mary and Beth need to

find a balance of sensitivity and awareness of race with the power of their White privilege so that they support their friends rather fall into unintentional racist tropes that people of color need to be protected.

They intense emotion and strong memories of the incidents stayed with the participants. The emotions and memories moved from merely a cognitive recognition of their Whiteness to something the participants appear to have internalized and used to shape their involvement on campus once in college. This finding confirms Kivel's (2017) assertion that Whites can become part of dismantling racism once they understand that they have privilege and positionality.

When the incidents occurred, the students may have had only a cursory understanding of their privilege. Sue (2017) stated that most Whites are socialized throughout their lives to deny, distort, and rationalize to avoid discomfort and to keep from facing the harsh reality of their race privilege and racism (p. 417). When the incidents occurred, the participants could still keep the discomfort of their friends' experience with racism distant from themselves. They felt bad for their friends of color at the time, but they were indeed only bystanders to the racism at that moment. If another incident did not occur, or at least one they did not witness, life went on for the White students.

The literature on White identity development suggests that the students may have been in what Helms (2014; 2017) called the pseudo-independence phase when the incidents occurred. This phase is where an individual experiences a painful or insightful encounter or event and begins to understand racial differences. However, that understanding is primarily intellectual and conceptual. The participants' understanding of racial issues at the time of the incidents seems not to have reached their identity's experiential and affective domains. They could keep the incident

and the associated discomfort as an isolated incident their friend experienced, not a situation that occurred as an outcome of the systemic racism that exists in our country.

From a phenomenological viewpoint, participants continued making meaning of the incidents as college students. Though the participants' consciousness of their Whiteness surfaced as the situation shook them, their meaning-making occurred over time by tapping into emotions, memories, and self-reflection, which provided insight into the meaning of their Whiteness. Vagle (2018) explained that from a phenomenological perspective, one's history always informs the significance of the phenomenon. The participants' meaning-making of Whiteness was situated within the emotion of the incident and their feeling of helplessness to impact how their friends were treated. Reflection of the incident during this research helped the participants continue their meaning-making. It was not until the reflection and processing of their recognition of Whiteness and its associated privilege that the students moved toward a deeper, more meaningful understanding of their relative position in society.

As the participants matured through high school and college, they carried the incidents they witnessed into their college careers. They shared that they purposely wanted to attend this university because of its commitment to social justice and equity. Once on campus, they voluntarily joined departmental teams that support equity and access on campus. This finding is indicative of the participants functioning in what Helms called immersion/emersion state of White identity development (J. Helms, 1994; Helms, 2014). In this stage, the individual tries to connect to their own identity as Whites and be non-racist in their thinking. This stage is often accompanied by a strong interest in connecting with other Whites who are working to fight racism. The participants in this research continued their White identity development journey

from the shocking incident, through their inaction at the time, on to act against racism and inequity through their on-campus involvement.

The emotions the participants experienced after witnessing their friends' mistreatment reflect the tension they felt as they navigated internally through the White dialectics of Whiteness and sense of self and White privilege (Todd & Abrams, 2011). This dialectic explores how the sense of self is linked with their location in society as a White person (p. 370). At one point of the dialectic is the awareness of and connection to being White. The other end of the dialectic is the lack of awareness of being White. As these participants discussed the incidents where they witnessed their friends of color being discriminated against, they shared that experience highlighted their positionality in relation to others.

The White privilege dialectic positions the acknowledgment of being advantaged from being White on one end and the lack of acknowledgment of being White on the other end (Abrams & Todd, 2011; Todd & Abrams, 2011). The participants shared that they grew to recognize their Whiteness and the privilege it affords them. They acknowledged that they would not be treated the way their friends of color were treated.

The experiences of the participants highlight the significant complexities and tensions of White dialectics. If the dimensions of the dialectic of White privilege are made visible to them, they see the unfair advantage being afforded to Whites. If the participants acknowledge that privilege, they can work to dismantle it, or continue to ignore it. However, if they ignore it, they continue to enjoy the unfair advantage of Whiteness and White privilege. Once that privilege is acknowledged, the White students struggle with how to be White without being racist or how to

be White without experiencing any discomfort because they know of their White privilege (Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017).

Chely's experience as a leader of the university hip-hop dance team highlights her struggle as she reconciled her privilege. She shared that had not given much thought to what it was like to dance hip-hop as a White person. "I just didn't think about it. I was just like, 'I'm dancing hip-hop.' End of story." The notion of not having to think about dancing hip-hop reflects how pervasive White privilege is in society (Davis, 2020; Poole et al., 2018). This privilege allows Whites to be in spaces without having to think about it.

However, as she explained more about an upcoming show that was African themed, she revealed her process toward more awareness and consideration of her privilege that occurred as she experienced the discussions the team had.

As Chely continued to process their discussion, she displayed an awareness and appreciation of hip hop's cultural significance. She acknowledged that while she can dance and enjoy hip hop, she realized it is not necessarily her dance to own or appropriate. "It needs to be respected. It cannot be done like it's a caricature. Hip hop is purely African American. It's something that they came up with, they started, they should really be recognized for that, not any White person."

Her movement along the White privilege dialectic was enhanced through the conversations the hip hop dance team had with each other. They were supported by each other as they wrestled with the complex dimensions of how to portray and perform hip hop. Through those difficult conversations, Chely was able to reaffirm and enhance her acknowledgement of her privilege.

Reckoning with their Upbringing

The participants discussed the emotional pressures they experienced as they worked to reconcile the way they were raised and their growing knowledge of themselves, their values, and their awareness of their Whiteness and privilege. Some grew up in segregated areas and witnessed racism in their schools and neighborhoods, while others lost the diversity they once had when they moved or changed schools. Some shared that their family members used racist language.

The participants also discussed the segregation of their K-12 education. They shared that most of their teachers were White and did not have an opportunity to address issues of race during their K-12 education. This reflects what Taie and Goldring (2020) found about the characteristics of teachers in the United States - most are White. As noted by Sleeter (2017), White teachers struggle to address issues of race because of their resistance to and discomfort with talking about race. The participants likely did not have a chance to learn about racism or explore issues of race in school because their teachers were reluctant to bring it up.

In reaction to their upbringing, the participants desired a more diverse college setting. Between their segregated upbringing, lack of exposure to issues of racism in their schools, and the attitudes of their family and friends, the participants shared that they actively sought to attend a college that would provide a more diverse environment and address issues of diversity and racism. This desire for diversity extends the literature showing that pre-college experiences of students with diversity have an influence on student openness to diversity once on campus (Bowman, 2014; Shim & Perez, 2018; Whitt et al., 2001). These students were not only open to diversity on campus; they actively sought it in their collegiate experience.

The literature about White identity development explains the desire for the participants to experience more diversity at their college campus. As the students grew to examine their upbringing, they may have moved from low racial awareness to a greater understanding of themselves and their relationship to others. Their growth is congruent with White identity development literature where Whites attempt to define a positive and non-racist sense of Whiteness as a cultural identity (Howard, 2016; LaFleur et al., 2002; Spanierman & Soble, 2010; Sue, 2003). As Whites develop a positive racial identity, they grow to appreciate cultural learning activities and interaction across diversity. The participants have decided to seek more diversity in their environment as they increased their racial awareness.

Phenomenology provides a context to explore how people make meaning of the world around them (Moustakas, 1994). As these students matured and attempted to understand the meaning of diversity in their upbringing, they appeared to seek to understand their positionality in the world. This is important as Dowling (2007) asserted that ones' sociocultural and historical experiences are central to one's interpretation of his/her own life. Additionally, Husserl asserted that by intentionally focusing on the object of examination, the diversity in one's life in this situation, one could develop a deep understanding of the experience(Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 2014, 2017).

The students' questioning of diversity in their lives appears to reflect their attempt to understand what Heidegger calls dasein or being in the world (Van Manen, 2014). One's being in the world or dasein is always in the social context of being in relation to others (Horrigan-Kelly et al., 2016). One sees themselves in a certain way in a particular social circumstance. The lack of diversity in the participants' life experiences appears to have compelled them to change

something about their dasein or how they were being in the world. They were motivated to intentionally seek a different social context that included more diversity in college to help their meaning-making in their lives. The students intentionally focus on diversity as they sought to develop a deeper understanding of it.

As the participants sought a more profound comprehension of their dasein, White dialectics described the students' understanding of power, race, racism, and White privilege (Todd & Abrams, 2011). Abrams and Todd (2011) shared that Whites experience emotional, cognitive, and behavioral tensions or dialectics when they reflect on their Whiteness. Whites are challenged to understand their own biases, prejudice, fears, and personal beliefs through those dialectics.

Additionally, the students seem to have moved along the dialectic of minimization of racism (Todd & Abrams, 2011). This dialectic explores how individuals discussed racism as close and personal or as far away and abstract. Participants considered racism as personal, part of current culture, and close to them at one end of the continuum. At the other end of the dialectic, participants saw racism as far from them and abstract (p. 376). Though the students saw themselves as racially ambivalent for most of their lives and considered racism as something that happened somewhere else, their college experiences helped them to recognize and question the racism they saw as they grew up. Again, Vagle's (2018) explanation that one's history informs the significance of the phenomenon applies to the participants and their meaning-making as they reflected upon their experiences with diversity throughout their lives. Whether their families were racist or embraced diversity, the participants were influenced by those prior experiences as they considered racism and how they engaged diversity on campus.

As the participants resolved the tension between their upbringing and how they see themselves now, they realized that racism was incongruent with their beliefs about injustice. They moved from racial neutrality to seeking diversity in their college experiences. This movement reflects Helm's (2017) Disintegration phase of White identity development where there is a conscious acknowledgment of Whiteness and its privileges, which conflicts with one's moral socialization.

Impact of Mission and Campus Ethos

Throughout their college career, the participants integrated their racial identity development, leadership development, and understanding of the university mission to become active in fighting racism and inequity through their leadership roles on campus. The participants frequently shared how important the university's mission and ethos was in shaping their desire to be involved on campus and their expectations for inclusion and diversity on campus. This finding is an extension of existing literature from Kuh (1993; 2011; 2006) and Kezar (2007) about the significance of campus ethos on student expectations for their campus experience. Kezar argues for the importance of aligning practice and policy with the ethos of the campus to enhance the impact of the ethos on the campus community (p. 14). Because an ethos does not develop on its own, educators must purposely connect clear and powerful messaging through its mission and campus ethos to students' racial identity development.

The participants in this study acknowledged a clear understanding of the expectation of them as student leaders to combat inequity on campus. They shared that they made meaning consciously within the context of the campus ethos of diversity and inclusion, and the mission of the university. They felt they experienced such strong messaging about diversity and inclusion in

their leadership roles, that it set an expectation the students had for themselves about their involvement in working against racism. As they grew in their racial identity development, the participants actively pursued opportunities to connect to the university's mission through their leadership involvement, and they desired to move toward anti-racism as they grew in their racial identity development.

Realizing the Work Continues

We hear from the participants about the conscious effort they make as they work to reconcile their White positionality and fight against the superiority that their families taught many. Samm shared that "I am nervous about leaving here because I worry I will slip back into my old ways of thinking." This reflects an acknowledgement that their work on their White identity and to combat racism would be an ongoing process throughout their lives. This is consistent with findings from a study that explored Whites committed to antiracism action who openly acknowledged that they recognized they had to made ongoing efforts to manage their racism (Malott et al., 2021).

Additionally, the participants may have been moving along a continuum of the dialectic of Whiteness and sense of self. They were likely experiencing tension about acting against their upbringing. The participants seem to have been trying to reconcile their White positionality and fighting against the superiority that their families taught.

The participants struggled through this process, but they also acknowledged that their work to be non-racist was not complete, nor would it ever be. They continued to fight against how they were socialized to think about people of color. They checked themselves when they realized they were falling back into old stereotypical thinking about race and people of color.

Their conscious acknowledgment of the need to continue their work reflected their work in the White dialectic of Whiteness and sense of self. Through this dialectic, the participants worked through the tension of how they were socialized and their newfound awareness and knowledge of being White, and the power associated with it (Todd et al., 2014; Todd & Abrams, 2011).

The active work against how the students were socialized about people of color also reflects the assertion of Toporek (2011) that the dialectics echo the complexities of the context of their experiences, environment, and identity (p. 5). The competing beliefs and values of their upbringing and their newfound knowledge create a critical tension that moves the students along the dialectics. The participants are intellectually aware that they may move back and forth in their growth and may be able to leverage that awareness to keep moving toward a non-racist identity. The impact of the students' upbringing drove the students to move in their White identity development, along White dialectics, and to realize the continuing struggle they will have to fight how they were socialized to think about people of color. Because the participants acknowledged their pre-college experiences and their current struggle to overcome their ingrained beliefs that they learned from their upbringing this research extends the research of Kuh (2011) and Whitt (2001) who found that pre-college experiences impacted student openness to diversity. The pre-college experiences of the participants impacted not only their openness to diversity, but their active pursuit of non-racist work.

Growth through Discomfort

Several students shared occasions when they experienced feelings of guilt and discomfort. They also shared their conscious struggle with their White identity development, Whiteness, and moving beyond their upbringing. One student described it using the term 'no

pain, no gain' to describe the discomfort she felt with those struggles. Despite the discomfort, she acknowledged that it was vital to work through. Rather than withdrawing from discomfort, they recognized the importance of leaning into that discomfort and working to reconcile it. They recognized that feelings of guilt are unproductive and that their desire to be non-racist outweighed their desire to retreat from the discomfort.

Having space where the students could work through their discomfort was essential to their growth. The participants felt safe with the other student leaders they worked with because they believed they were like-minded and did the same work to embrace diversity. The participants spoke of the diversity of their teams, the casual, late-night conversations they had with one another about their engagements with diversity, and how they experienced campus. These discussions facilitated the White student leaders' work through the White dialectics they grappled with (Abrams & Todd, 2011; Todd & Abrams, 2011; Todd et al., 2010).

These leaders felt supported in their struggle with discomfort by their peers because they worked together to help other students succeed. Their purpose as teams was to help acclimate students to the university, navigate the university effectively, and enjoy the campus. The shared purpose of their work as student leaders was a powerful conduit for the White students to be open to diversity and to be challenged by their peers. The White students had space to learn, examine their experiences, explore the meaning of their experiences, and push back and forth on each other about the issues. This finding reveals that having space where conditions could be designed to challenge White students on their racism while supporting them to explore their backgrounds and move towards an non-racist identity may be useful to dispel the resistance and

fragility that Whites often display when their Whiteness is challenged, or they are confronted with racism (Applebaum, 2017; DiAngelo, 2018; Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017).

Because the White students felt part of a team working for a common purpose with the students of color, they were open to being challenged by the students of color and each other to develop more of a non-racist identity. The team's connection through the common purpose of their leadership roles allowed the White students to be challenged and supported without having to be coddled or become defensive. This is consistent with the research of Dugan and Komives (2010) and Dugan, Kodama, and Gebhardt (2012) who found that conversations about social and cultural issues with peers is an important factor in leadership development and effectiveness.

From a phenomenological stance, individuals move through life making meaning of their experiences moving toward either an inauthentic or authentic life (Sherman, 2009). An inauthentic life comes from becoming complacent in making meaning daily and losing one's potential (Horrigan-Kelly et al., 2016). Authenticity entails a shift in attention and engagement from the way we typically move through our everyday ways of being concerned about others to focusing on our individual possibilities for existence (Sherman, 2009) .

People who realize that they could move toward their full potential begin to live authentic lives. Once people realize they have a destiny to fulfill, then they are no longer concerned with what the masses do. They work to live an 'authentic' life to fulfill their real potential in the world (Sherman, 2009).

The participants in this research moved toward their full potential to live authentic lives. The White student leaders knew they had the support of their peers to engage in the difficult work of moving toward their authentic selves. The students were comfortable enough with each

other to delve into reflection, which is vital to meaning-making (Van Manen, 2014). The students realized that their closeness as a leadership team provided a comfortable space where they allowed themselves to navigate their path toward understanding their lived experience of diversity on the campus together. The interpretive process of being with others through shared interactions in the world gave the students time to work through issues with each other, understand different perspectives, and even be challenged by their peers of color. This process advanced the phenomenological growth of the leaders toward their authentic selves.

Their purpose as a team gave the White students the support and the strength to stay engaged in the discomfort to grow towards becoming non-racist people. The team's shared purpose allowed the White students to be engaged on campus as leaders working for various departments to help the university achieve its mission. They are working to reach their full potential. They displayed some level of commitment to their role as a student leader and to the university's mission, which highlights the importance of equity and inclusion.

This chapter reveals how complicated, emotional, and constant the struggle is of the White student leaders as they work toward a non-racist identity on a mission based campus emphasizing diversity and inclusion. They struggle to break from how they were raised. They had a significant emotional experience seeing people of color being oppressed which served as a catalyst for them to acknowledge racism and for their Whiteness to be made visible to them. They shared how important the campus context of its mission and values were in supporting their growth. They also shared how the support and structures they experienced through their leadership were to their positive growth. The participants also shared that they have anxiety

about leaving the supportive campus for fear they will regress in their development. They acknowledge they must be proactive and purposeful to continue their positive growth.

All of this reveals the intricate journey White students experience as they move through their own identity development and struggle to resolve myriad tensions and challenges while they move along the continuum of White dialectics. By working through those tensions, White people move closer to a non-racist identity.

The next chapter is the Conclusion, where implications of the research findings are presented, and recommendations are made for consideration for campus implementation. Recommendations for additional research are also made.

CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION

The White student leader who marched into my office frustrated with having diversity "jammed down her throat" initiated my journey of exploration about what it was like to be a White student on a campus with a deep commitment to diversity. It was difficult for me to hear her anger and pain. It was challenging to realize that somewhere along her journey as a student and as a campus leader, she felt antagonized and let down by the university she served. I wanted to understand what the experience may have been like for students like her.

My study was a phenomenological exploration of the lived experiences of White students on a Catholic university campus committed to diversity. The research question was How do students who identify racially as White experience their racial identity at an institution with a mission emphasizing diversity? There were also sub-questions including how the students experience the institution's definition of diversity, how students experience come to know the institution's mission and values, and how students make meaning of the university mission.

This research provides a firsthand account of White students' experience at a particular institution that values diversity because of its mission and Catholic values. This study provides informative descriptions about White students' experiences and meaning making by utilizing interpretive phenomenological analysis. The participants shared their backgrounds and upbringing, their engagement with diversity before college, and what it was like for them as White students as they moved through this mission-based institution.

The themes that emerged in this research are: *A Significant Experience as a Catalyst for Change; The Power of the Institutional Values and Mission on Meaning-Making, and The Structure and Support Through Co-Curricular Involvement Most Powerful.* The participants

shared that a significant emotional experience seeing people of color being oppressed was a catalyst for them to acknowledge racism in society and for them to recognize their Whiteness. They shared how important the campus context of its mission and values was in helping them make meaning as they worked through their identity development. They also shared that the supportive staff and structures allowed them the space to work through the struggles of their growth.

Implications of Research Findings

The following recommendations are presented as programmatic and policy strategies to foster an inclusive campus environment, help the university attain its goals regarding diversity and inclusion, and support White students in their developmental struggles as they work to become non-racist allies in their communities.

There is a pattern in higher education of focusing only on the students of color who are harmed by policies and practices of discrimination. Institutions do not engage White students in addressing campus issues (Cabrera et al., 2017; Foste, 2019). While this acknowledges the problem of racism on campus, it fails to include White people in the institutional response which may only serve to enable White people who are already inclined to deny racism or acknowledge their White privilege (Ropers-Huilman et al., 2013; Saul & Burkholder, 2020).

The participants in this research shared frustration that they were left out of those discussions and that only students of color were brought to the table. The university can engage the White students in these discussions as well, so they realize and reaffirm their role in fighting racism on campus. This would help the White students hold the university community accountable when an incident occurs, support students of color, support other White students

who may not be as engaged in issues of anti-racism as the participants are, and have them be part of the non-racist solution on campus.

Institutional Programs

From a programmatic perspective, the university can provide more purposeful and structured opportunities for meaning-making with White students, especially student leaders who are closely connected to the Division of Student Affairs. The participants shared how important the processing with their peers was to their growth and development. They also shared that the support and structures provided to them in their leadership roles by the staff had significant positive influence in their development.

Purposeful opportunities fostered by the institution would provide students valuable occasions to dialogue and process their experiences on campus (Dugan et al., 2012; Dugan & Komives, 2010). These occasions could be facilitated by a mentor or a staff member, or by peer leaders. It would be another chance for the university to foster an environment for students to move through their racial identity development process.

Since the participants shared that they were influenced by their upbringing and prior experiences with diversity, these opportunities could also include an examination of the students' backgrounds to help them make meaning of their lives before college and the growth they have experienced on campus. This could occur through facilitated team meetings to share students' backgrounds, connect to the mission, and process their growth as they experienced the campus. These experiences could also be tightly connected to the mission of the university, its Catholic identity, and the ethos of the campus around diversity and inclusion to reinforce institutional

messaging around diversity and help the students understand the context within which they function (Karkouti, 2015; Lin et al., 2019).

Strategic and explicit connections to the university mission as well as to Catholic social justice teachings would also help the student leaders understand the connection between the non-racist work they are doing and the institution's values (Bahr, 2021; Kuh, 2011). This would also provide a clear articulation of the university's interpretation of Catholicism to prevent the university community from making assumptions about what they believe they know of Catholic social justice teachings and how it informs anti-racism. Some of the participants made wrong assumptions about Catholicism and even subordinated it to the tenets of the institution's patron saint. When the university can create explicit connections to its mission and Catholic social justice teachings, context is created so the university community can hold one another accountable to the mission as well as set clear expectations for the conduct of the community. When more opportunities are provided for the White students to engage in non-racist work, the campus ethos and university mission are broadened and deepened.

I used the theoretical framework of phenomenology to uncover how the students developed a focus on becoming their authentic selves. The university can develop strategies to leverage the work the students are doing to become their authentic selves. Programs and strategies can be developed to facilitate this growth. Because these participants were student leaders tied to a department in the Division of Student Affairs, the university can set certain expectations of them as part of their role as a leader. The university administration can learn from the growth the students are experiencing to inform educational strategies to enhance student growth around racial identity, in particular. Staff can connect to those points of growth that the

participants indicated movement in, away from their prior thinking and toward a more non-racist attitude.

Institutional Practices

While the university seeks to employ a diverse pool of student leaders and employees, the university does not provide standardized diversity and perspective taking training for all student leaders and employees of the Division of Student Affairs. These leaders and student staff serve as an extension of the university and its mission. The university would benefit from having these leaders and staff reflect consistency. The Division can partner with the university leadership institute to create a comprehensive curriculum. Based on the lack of consistency the participants reported in their leadership training, a standardized curriculum could be used along with the functional training for each department's leaders/employees. This standardized training would address inconsistencies across the division.

Student leader training that included perspective taking training would teach student leaders how to put themselves in the shoes of other people (Englander, 2014; Hatcher et al., 1994; Kezar, 2007; Ragins & Ehrhardt, 2020). The leaders would have a better appreciation and awareness of the challenges another person experiences. The development of empathy as perspective taking was critical for the participants who shared how powerful it was for them to witness their friends' racist treatment. That empathy helped the participants understand their position of privilege and the racism that still occurs in society. Additionally, the participants who served as leaders in campus ministry expressed a more transparent connection between the university's mission and values and diversity issues. They expressed solidarity with diverse populations more than the participants who were in other leadership positions. Perspective taking

is also consistent with the university's Catholic character, which seeks to develop an appreciation for everyone especially those who are marginalized.

An orientation program offered by the university to all incoming new students, not just first-year students, would address the gap between incoming first-year students and transfer students and help both groups acclimate to the university. Orientation programs are found to have a positive impact on teaching academic skills, setting expectations for the campus community, communicating institutional values, and creating community among the new students (Ackerson, 2018; Renn & Reason, 2021). Orientation that included a standardized messaging and programming about the university's patron saint and his values would allow for students to understand the greater context of the university mission and how it connects to inclusion.

A Diversity Ambassador program comprised of students, faculty, and staff of all ethnicities, including Whites, would allow for a diverse cross-section of the university community to address issues of racial injustice on campus. The ambassadors would bring a level of authenticity and credibility to university policy. Rather than having the community respond to issues by edict or through the development of more policies, the ambassadors serve as peer educators and mentors addressing difficult issues of racial inequity on campus (Tullis & Goldstone, 2020). The White students, faculty, and staff members would model their vital role in dismantling racist structures and challenging racism. The ambassadors would work for social justice on campus. They would also serve as a broader coalition of community members working across the university to address inequity issues and enhance the campus ethos of inclusion. These Ambassadors would expand the reach and impact of the few staff presently charged with

advancing diversity and addressing issues that arise. They would work in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity and the Division of Student Affairs to respond to incidents, educate the campus community, and enhance the campus climate regarding diversity and inclusion.

The diversity ambassadors' peer model builds upon the literature about the positive impact of peer education models in higher education (Ender & Newton, 2010). Peer education has been found to be a significant influence on college students' values, beliefs, and even conduct (Renn, 2020). Research shows that students positively respond to peers because they connect them to resources on campus, serve as coaches and confidantes, and serve as role models who they wish to emulate (Peregrina-Kretz et al., 2018).

Finally, the university can provide increased opportunities for purposeful interaction across diverse student populations through structured events, facilitated dialogue groups, or through campus work groups that are focused on common non-racist goals. These opportunities would increase a sense of belonging for the students, create a positive perception of the campus climate, and increase student satisfaction (Denson & Chang, 2015; Karimi & Matous, 2018; Roksa et al., 2017).

Policies and Procedures

Greater inclusion and equity across all parts of the university could be attained by developing institutional diversity and equity strategies reflected through policies and procedures of the university (Nishimura et al., 2019; Parker et al., 2016). The campus community experienced challenges because of a lack of faculty of color and people of color in university leadership positions. Tenure requirements and procedures that use inclusive research methods

and provide equal significance to diverse paradigms of research would create more opportunities for faculty of color to be hired and retained by the university (Griffin, 2019). That would allow students to see greater representation within the faculty thereby enhancing learning. Each college and department should set goals to develop a diverse faculty that would empower faculty to develop strategies to mentor and support faculty of color through the tenure process (Griffin et al., 2020). These strategies would provide a faculty that reflects the demographics of the student population.

The university currently requires all undergraduates to take a Liberal Studies course that addresses diversity in the United States. As a mission-based institution focusing on inclusion and equity and as one of the largest grantors of graduate degrees in the city, the university could build a component of diversity education into the curriculum of the university's graduate programs as well. Issues of diversity should not be addressed solely with undergraduates. Additionally, the university needs to live out its mission through the curricula such that students recognize the institutional values. Issues of diversity and inclusion should be present in all courses, not only in one course in Liberal Studies.

Enrollment Management that provides explicit, purposeful, and consistent messaging about the university's values through its branding and recruiting allows for more overt connection to Catholicism, the values of the patron saint, and diversity and inclusion . Institutional messaging that is consistent across the general website, advertising, admissions, and social media would send a powerful message about the expectations for the campus community (Ackerson, 2018; Ropers-Huilman et al., 2013). Presently there is little reflected about the university's values on the main webpage or in admissions materials. Additionally, the university

should emphasize recruiting students of color in colleges where the demographics do not reflect the institution's demographics.

Recommendations for Future Research

Every study provides an opportunity for additional research. This study can be modified to include more participants than the eight used in this study. A larger group of participants could add different elements to examine by contributing new themes, strengthening existing themes, or differing themes from this study.

This study could be replicated at other institutions with a strong campus ethos around diversity and inclusion. Additional research could be conducted in different settings, including smaller campuses, residential campuses, and non-urban settings. Further study would provide multiple perspectives about the experience of White students to inform leadership development strategies and campus programming.

Whiteness, diversity, and racism are not issues solely for Catholic institutions to address. Though Catholic institutions do have a unique obligation to engage the community in eliminating racism, all institutions of higher education have a role in this work. Future research could examine the experience of White students on campuses from other faith traditions as well as secular campuses.

There could also be further exploration that purposefully includes more men as participants. This study involved only one student who identified as male. There may be important perspectives revealed about the impact of involvement, campus diversity, and institutional values on men.

Future research could be conducted by varying the backgrounds of the participants. In this study, the participants were all from the middle and upper socio-economic groups. Potential studies could include participants from lower socio-economic backgrounds to add a different dimension to the perspective of race, ethnicity, and privilege. All the participants in this study were senior students. Additional study could be conducted with first-year students. The results might be dubious because first-year students have spent less time on campus, thus reducing the possibility of their deep understanding of the campus mission, values, and ethos. However, the perspective of the first-year students could provide valuable insight into their experience with new student orientation and the first-year experience course. This additional research could also provide a more in-depth examination of how the students experience the admissions process, branding, and messaging to prospective students.

An additional recommendation for future research is to examine how the leadership of the university operationalizes the campus ethos of diversity and inclusion. This exploration would provide an understanding of what strategies the university administration currently employs and could provide additional insight into what the leadership could do to enhance the ethos.

Finally, future research can examine the post-graduation experience of the participants from this study. Researchers could explore how the participants make meaning of their college experiences in their work, communities, and personal lives.

My research journey began with an extremely frustrated White student leader who was rattled by campus circumstances involving diversity. Through my study, I examined the experience of White students on campus to better understand how they make meaning of their

development and how the university can best support White students in their growth and development.

Educators, researchers, and other proponents of equity can contribute to the continued exploration of these issues to compel action to fight racism and inequity. The work does not end with this contribution to scholarship. It leads to further inquiry that leads to engagement to create a better world.

APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT COMMUNICATION

Script for Colleagues to Use When Contacting Students

Greetings! A colleague is conducting research to complete her doctorate. She will interview students who identify as White, who are of senior standing academically, and who have participated in diversity training within the Division of Student Affairs. She came to me to see if I could pass her information on to any students I could think of who might meet these criteria and I thought of you. If you are interested in participating in these interviews, please contact Suzanne Kilgannon directly at smkinmo@gmail.com or call her at XXX.XXX.XXXX. She can provide you with all the details of the project and answer your questions. Thanks for considering participating in this study."

Script for Students Who Contact Me Upon Colleague Referral

"Thank you for contacting me. I am a doctoral student in the College of Education and am seeking participants for my research to complete my degree. I am conducting research on what it is like on campus for students who identify racially as White, who are of senior standing academically, and who have participated in diversity education programs in the Division of Student Affairs. I will be conducting two interviews with each participant lasting approximately 90-120 minutes each. There will be a final meeting with each participant for you to review my initial analysis and provide me feedback. This meeting would take approximately 60-90 minutes. This research will contribute to existing knowledge about White racial identity, Whiteness, Catholic higher education, and diversity.

The interviews will be scheduled at your convenience and at a location we agree upon where we can talk freely. If you meet the participation criteria, would this research be something you would be interested in participating in?

- If no, "thank you very much for reaching out to me and I appreciate your time and consideration. Best wishes for the rest of the academic year."
- If yes, "Thank you for your interest. Before we can confirm your participation, I need to determine if you meet the criteria needed. May I ask you a few questions to confirm that?"
    - If no, "Thank you for your interest and I appreciate your help. We will not be able to move forward at this time."
    - If yes, "Thank you. Do you identify racially as White? Are you of senior standing academically? Have you participated in diversity training through the Division of Student Affairs on campus?"

If no to any, "Thank you for your interest and I appreciate your help. We will not be able to move ahead at this time."

If yes to all, "Thank you. You are eligible to participate. Let's go ahead and schedule our interviews."

Script for Snowballing

If necessary, I will seek referrals from the participants in the study. I will ask for students whom the participants believe to meet the criteria for participation. I will ask them to use the following script when contacting the students face-to-face, through email, or over the phone:

"Greetings! A graduate student in the College of Education is conducting research to complete her doctorate. She will interview students who identify as White, who are of senior standing academically, and who have participated in diversity training within the Division of Student Affairs. She came to me to see if I could pass her information on to any students, I could think of who might meet these criteria and I thought of you.

If you are interested in participating in these interviews, please contact Suzanne Kilgannon directly at smkinmo@gmail.com or call her at XXX.XXX.XXXX. She can provide you with all the details of the project and answer your questions. Thanks for considering participating in this study."

APPENDIX B: ADULT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

HOW WHITE STUDENTS EXPERIENCE WHITENESS ON A DIVERSE CAMPUS

Principal Investigator: Suzanne Kilgannon, graduate student

Institution: DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

Department (School, College): Curriculum Studies, College of Education

Faculty Advisor: Amira Proweller, PhD. Associate Professor, College of Education

What is the purpose of this research?

We are asking you to be in a research study because we are trying to learn more about the experiences of White students on a campus that emphasizes diversity. This study is being conducted by Suzanne Kilgannon, a graduate student at DePaul University as a requirement to obtain her Doctoral degree. This research is being supervised by her faculty advisor, Dr. Amira Proweller in the College of Education. We are seeking five to twenty participants to include in the research.

Why are you being asked to be in the research?

You are invited to participate in this study because you are of senior status academically, have participated in diversity training with the Division of Student Affairs, and identify racially as White.

What is involved in being in the research study?

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in two interviews involving 6-10 open ended questions. These questions will cover areas including your pre-college experiences with diversity and what it is like for you on a campus that emphasizes diversity. The interview will be audio taped and I will take occasional notes. The audio tape will be transcribed into

written notes later to get an accurate record of what you said. The interviews will take place at a location to be agreed upon. After the interviews are transcribed, we will meet a third time for you to review my initial findings and provide me feedback and insight. This last meeting may last approximately 60-90 minutes.

How much time will this take?

Each of the two interviews will take about 90-120 minutes of your time. A third meeting for you to review the initial findings may take 60-90 minutes. Each of these will occur approximately three weeks apart from the other. This will occur over a period of approximately three months, depending on our scheduling.

Are there any risks involved in participating in this study?

Being in this study does not involve any risks other than what you would encounter in daily life. You may feel uncomfortable or embarrassed about answering certain questions. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to. Because interviews will be held in semi-private locations, will be audio taped, and the audio tapes will be sent to a transcription company, there is a potential risk of a breach of privacy. However, since we will work cooperatively to find a location with minimal public exposure, we are using pseudonyms, and the transcription company has signed a confidentiality agreement, this risk is minimal.

Are there any benefits to participating in this study?

You will not personally benefit from being in this study. However, you may gain greater insight into your experiences through reflection as a part of the interview process. We hope that what we learn will help educators to better understand the experiences of White students on a campus that

emphasizes diversity and contribute to the existing body of knowledge about diversity and Whiteness in higher education.

Are there any costs to me for being in the research?

There is no cost to you for being in the research. You are responsible for any costs related to getting to and from the location where you will participate in the research.

Can you decide not to participate?

Your participation is voluntary, which means you can choose not to participate. There will be no negative consequences, penalties, or loss of benefits if you decide not to participate. If after the research has begun and you wish to withdraw from the research, I will want to use the existing data you provided up to that point.

Who will see my study information and how will the confidentiality of the information collected for the research be protected?

The research records will be kept and stored securely. Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study or publish a paper to share the research with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. We will not include your name or any information that will directly identify you. We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. However, some people might review or copy our records that may identify you to make sure we are following the required rules, laws, and regulations. For example, the DePaul University Institutional Review Board may review your information. If they look at our records, they will keep your information confidential. Because we will use pseudonyms throughout the research project, you will not be

able to be identified. A transcription company will be used to transcribe the audio recording of each interview. They signed a confidentiality agreement. They will hear only the audio tape for transcription purposes. The audio tapes will be erased upon successful completion of dissertation. All research records including consent documents, copies of IRB application and forms, and copies of IRB approvals will be kept in a locked file in the home of the principal investigator for at least three years.

Who should be contacted for more information about the research?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study or you want to get additional information or provide input about this research, you can contact the researcher, Suzanne Kilgannon at XXX.XXX.XXXX or via email at smkinmo@gmail.com or Dr. Amira Proweller at aprowell@depaul.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the DePaul Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Susan Loess-Perez, DePaul University's Director of Research Compliance, in the Office of Research Services at 312-362-7593 or by email at sloesspe@depaul.edu.

You may also contact DePaul's Office of Research Services if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.

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

Statement of Consent from the Subject:

I have read the above information. I have had all my questions and concerns answered. By signing below, I indicate my consent to be in the research.

Signature: _____

Printed name: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview One:

This conversation is being recorded for research purposes. Please let me know now if you do not agree to being recorded. You may request that the recording stop at any time.

Tell me about yourself. What is your age? How do you identify racially? Socio-economically? What year are you in school? How do you identify your gender? What leadership roles have you held during college?

Tell me about your upbringing.

How would you describe your community?

What kind of racial diversity did you experience growing up?

What was that like for you?

Why did you choose to come to school here?

What do you understand to be the values of the university?

How did you learn about them?

What do they mean to you?

Prompt may be used at this time: This is a statement on the University website. What is your reaction to this statement?

"Diversity at Your Institution"

Diversity is a core value at Your University and has been since its founding. All members of our campus community bring their own cultures, unique talents, skills, and perspectives that combined, at Your University. Collectively, we enrich the work and academic environment to fulfill our . . . university mission. This is the strength of our institution and what makes us

unique. At The University we understand that a diverse workforce and education environment is directly related to our success and is essential in preparing students to live and work in a global community."

What does diversity mean to you?

Do you think this university values diversity?

How do you know the university values diversity?

What is it like for you being at a university that values diversity?

How do you see yourself relating to that value?

Tell me about your diversity education on campus.

What has it involved?

What is it like for you as a White student?

How do students of color see you?

Additional prompts and questions to clarify meaning may be utilized, as necessary.

Interview Two:

This conversation is being recorded for research purposes. Please let me know now if you do not agree to being recorded. You may request that the recording stop at any time.

What kinds of reflections have you had about the first interview?

Several years ago, there were some racial incidents on campus that caused tension. There was an affirmative action bake sale, there was some racist graffiti written on the walls in the halls, students were upset that there were faculty of color who were denied tenure that they believed were deserving of it. What kind of reaction do you have to those incidents?

As you come to the end of your college career, how do you see yourself in the future working for diversity?

Additional prompts and questions to clarify meaning may be utilized, as necessary.

REFERENCES

Abrams, E. M., & Todd, N. R. (2011). White Dialectics as Multidimensional, Contextual, and Transformational. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(3), 423-437. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010394207

Ackerson, B. V. (2018). The influence of Catholic culture type on the spiritual lives of college students. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *21*(2), 133-163.

Adamchik, K. G. (2018). *""Why am I in school?": a mixed methods investigation into stopping out of college."* (Publication Number 3095) University of Louisville]. Louisville, KY.

Adorno, T. W. (2017). *An introduction to dialectics*. John Wiley & Sons.

Alase, A. (2017). The Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Guide to a Good Qualitative Research Approach. . *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.2p.9

Antonio, A. (2001). The role of interracial interaction in the development of leadership skills and cultural knowledge and understanding. *Research in Higher Education*, *42*(5), 593-617.

Applebaum, B. (2005). In the name of morality: Moral responsibility, whiteness and social justice education. *Journal of Moral Education*, *34*(3), 277-290.

Applebaum, B. (2017). Comforting Discomfort as Complicity: White Fragility and the Pursuit of Invulnerability. *Hypatia*, *32*(4), 862-875. https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12352

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

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change*, *25*(44-49).

Bahr, K. (2021). *Anti-racism is part of Catholic identity on these campuses.* US Catholic. Retrieved July 2, 2021 from https://uscatholic.org/articles/202102/anti-racism-part-of-catholic-identity-on-college-campuses/

Banks, J. (2013). The Construction and Historical Development of Multicultural Education, 1962–2012 [Article]. *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(sup1), 73-82. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.795444

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2019). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Banks, K. (2009). A qualitative investigation of white students' perceptions of diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *2*(3), 149-155. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016292

Bauman, D. (2018, December 30, 2019). *Hate Crimes on Campuses are Rising, New FBI report shows*. Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved 1 from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Hate-Crimes-on-Campuses-Are/245093

Bedard, G. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness: Pedagogical implications for anti-racism education.

Bernstein, R. S., Bulger, M., Salipante, P., & Weisinger, J. Y. (2020). From diversity to inclusion to equity: A theory of generative interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *167*(3), 395-410.

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. A. (2000). "I Am Not a Racist But...": Mapping White College Students' Racial Ideology in the USA. *Discourse & society*, *11*(1), 50-85.

Bowman, N. (2009). College diversity courses and cognitive development among students from privileged and marginalized groups. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *2*(3), 182.

Bowman, N. (2014). Conceptualizing Openness to Diversity and Challenge: Its Relation to College Experiences, Achievement, and Retention [Article]. *Innovative Higher Education*, *39*(4), 277-291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9281-8

Bowman, N., & Denson, N. (2012). What's Past is Prologue: How Precollege Exposure to Racial Diversity Shapes the Impact of College Interracial Interactions [Article]. *Research in Higher Education*, *53*(4), 406-425. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-011-9235-2

Bowman, N. A. (2010a). College diversity experiencs and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *80*(1), 4-33. Retrieved October 10, 2011, from

Bowman, N. A. (2010b). Disequilibrium and resolution. The nonlinear effects of diversity courses on well-being and orientations toward diversity. *The Review of Higher Education*, *33*(4), 543-568. Retrieved September 25, 2011, from

Bowman, N. A., Denson, N., & Park, J. J. (2016). Racial/Cultural Awareness Workshops and Post-College Civic Engagement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(6), 1556-1587. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216670510

Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Schiffhauer, K. (2007). Racial attitudes in response to thoughts of white privilege. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 203-215. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.348

Brooks-Immel, D. R., & Murray, S. B. (2017). Color-blind contradictions and Black/White binaries: White academics upholding whiteness. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, *39*, 315-333.

Byrd, C. M., Rastogi, R., & Elliot, E. R. (2020). Engagement with Diversity Experiences: A Self-Regulated Learning Perspective. In *Teaching and Learning for Social Justice and Equity in Higher Education* (pp. 137-156). Springer.

Cabrera, N., Franklin, J., & Watson, J. (2017). *Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses: ASHE Higher Education Report, Volume 42, Number 6* (1119374626).

Cabrera, N. L. (2012). Working through Whiteness: White, Male College Students Challenging Racism. *Review of Higher Education*, *35*(3), 375-401.

Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: white male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. *Race ethnicity and education*, *17*(1), 30-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.725040

Cabrera, N. L. (2017). White immunity: Working through some of the pedagogical pitfalls of "privilege". *JCSCORE*, *3*(1), 77-90.

Cabrera, N. L., & Corces-Zimmerman, C. (2017). An Unexamined Life: White Male Racial Ignorance and the Agony of Education for Students of Color [Article]. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *50*(3), 300-315. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2017.1336500

Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2016). Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses [Article]. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *42*(6), 7-125. https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20116

Carter, R. T. (1995). *The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racially inclusive model*. Wiley.

Chang, M. (1999). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development*, *40*(4), 377-377. http://library.depaul.edu/CheckURL.aspx?address=http://search.proquest.com/docview/195171720?accountid=10477

http://AN6TQ9PG6N.search.serialssolutions.com/?SS_Source=3&genre=article&sid=ProQ:&atitle=Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population&title=Journal of College Student Development&issn=0897-5264&date=1999-07-01&volume=40&issue=4&spage=377&SS_docid=43247286&author=Chang, Mitchell J

Chang, M. (2002a). The impact of an undergraduate diversity cousre requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The Journal of General Education*, *51*(1), 21-42.

Chang, M. (2002b). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity? *Review of Higher Education*, *25*(125-140). Retrieved October 20, 2011, from

Chang, M., Denson, N., Sáenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The Educational Benefits of Sustaining Cross-Racial Interaction among Undergraduates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(3), 430-455. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838696

Chesler, M., Peet, M., & Sevig, T. (2003). Blinded by Whiteness: The develop of white college students' racial awarenss. In A. Doane & E. Bonilla Silva (Eds.), *White Out: The continuing significance of racism.* (pp. 215-230). Routledge.

Chubbuck, S. (2006). Whiteness Enacted, Whiteness Disrupted: The Complexity of Personal Congruence. *American Education Research Journal*, *40*(2), 301-333. Retrieved June 27, 2011, from http://aer.sagepub.com/content/41/2/301

Clark, T. (2009). SJU Partners with Anti-Defamation League. *St Joseph University News and Events*. Retrieved June 11, 2014, from http://www.sju.edu/news-events/news/sju-partners-antidefamation-league

Clarke, C. G., & Antonio, A. L. (2012). Rethinking research on the impact of racial diversity in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*(1), 25-50.

Cohen, M. (1987). A historical overview of the phenomenologic movement. *IMAGE -Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *19*(1), 31-34.

Cokley, K. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(3), 224-234. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from

Cole, D., & Zhou, J. (2014). Do diversity experiences help college students become more civically minded? Applying Banks' multicultural education framework. *Innovative Higher Education*, *39*(2), 109-121.

Collins, C. S., & Stockton, C. M. (2018). The Central Role of Theory in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 160940691879747. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918797475

Cooper, S., & Leong, F. T. L. (2008). Introduction to the special issue on culture, race and ethnicity in organizationalconsulting psychology. *Consulting psychology journal: Practice and research*, *60*(2), 133-138. Retrieved August 15, 2011, from

Crenshaw, K. (2002). Critical race studies. *UCLA Law Review*.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Croll, P. R. (2007). Modeling Determinants of White Racial Identity: Results from a New National Survey. *86*(2), 613-642. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/86.2.613

Crotty, M. (2020). The foundations of social research. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003115700

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *15*(4), 332-351.

Dekeseredy, W., Nolan, J. J., & Hall-Sanchez, A. (2019). Hate Crimes and Bias Incidents in the Ivory Tower: Results From a Large-Scale Campus Survey. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 000276421983173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219831733

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1997). *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror*. Temple University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). An introduction to critical race theory. *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (Vol. 20). NYU press.

Denson, N. (2009). Do Curricular and Cocurricular Diversity Activities Influence Racial Bias? A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(2), 805-805-838. http://library.depaul.edu/CheckURL.aspx?address=http://search.proquest.com/docview/214135628?accountid=10477

http://AN6TQ9PG6N.search.serialssolutions.com/?SS_Source=3&genre=article&sid=ProQ:&atitle=Do Curricular and Cocurricular Diversity Activities Influence Racial Bias? A Meta-Analysis&title=Review of Educational Research&issn=0034-6543&date=2009-06-01&volume=79&issue=2&spage=805&SS_docid=1740241211&author=Denson, Nida

Denson, N., & Bowman, N. A. (2017). Do diversity courses make a difference? A critical examination of college diversity coursework and student outcomes. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 35-84). Springer.

Denson, N., Bowman, N. A., Ovenden, G., Culver, K. C., & Holmes, J. M. (2020). Do diversity courses improve college student outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000189

Denson, N., & Chang, M. (2009). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American Educational Research Journal*, *46*(2), 322-353.

Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2015). Dynamic Relationships: Identifying Moderators that Maximize Benefits Associated with Diversity [Article]. *Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(1), 1-37. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0002

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

Dowling, M. (2007). From Husserl to Van Manen. A review of different phenomenological approaches. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *44*(1), 131-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.11.026

Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C. M., & Gebhardt, M. C. (2012). Race and leadership development among college students: The additive value of collective racial esteem. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *5*(3), 174-189. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029133

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on College Students' Capacities for Socially Responsible Leadership. . *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(5), 525-549.

Dyer, R. (2005). The matter of whiteness. *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism*, 9-14.

Edmonds, C., & Killen, M. (2009). Do adolescents' perceptions of parental racial attitudes relate to their intergroup contact and cross-race relationships? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *12*(1), 5-21.

Ender, S., & Newton, F. (2010). *Students Helping Students: A Guide for Peer Educators on College Campuses.* Jossey Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA

Engberg, M. (2007). Educating the workforce for the 21st century: A cross-disciplinary analysis of the impact of the undersgarduate experience on students' development of a pluralistic orientation. *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 283-317. Retrieved April 27, 2012, from

Engberg, M. E., & Hurtado, S. (2011). Developing pluralistic skills and dispositions in college: Examining racial/ethnic group differences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *82*(4), 416-443.

Englander, M. (2014). Empathy Training from a Phenomenological Perspective. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *45*(1), 5-26. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/15691624-12341266

Epoche. (2021). Epoche. . In *Merriam-Webster*. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/epoche

Farzan, A. N. (2018, October 19, 2018). *BBQ Becky, Permit Patty and Cornerstore Caroline: Too 'cutesy' for those white women calling police on black people?* Washington Post. Retrieved February 20, 2021 from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2018/10/19/bbq-becky-permit-patty-and-cornerstore-caroline-too-cutesy-for-those-white-women-calling-cops-on-blacks/

Feagin, J. R. (2013). *The white racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing*. Routledge.

Fine, M. E., Weis, L. E., Powell, L. C., & Wong, L. (1997). *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. Taylor & Frances/Routledge.

Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, *12*(4), 531-545.

Fischer, M. J. (2008). Does Campus Diversity Promote Friendship Diversity? A Look at Interracial Friendships in College [Article]. *Social Science Quarterly (Blackwell Publishing Limited)*, *89*(3), 631-655. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2008.00552.x

Foste, Z. (2019). Reproducing Whiteness: How White students justify the campus racial status quo. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *56*(3), 241-253.

Foste, Z., & Jones, S. R. (2020). Narrating whiteness: A qualitative exploration of how white college students construct and give meaning to their racial location. *Journal of College Student Development*, *61*(2), 171-188.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White Women, Race Matters: the social construction of whiteness*. University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury publishing USA.

Gallin, A., O.S.U. (2000). *Negotiating identity. Catholic higher education since 1960*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Gin, K., Martínez-Alemán, A., Rowan-Kenyon, H., & Hottell, D. (2017). Racialized Aggressions and Social Media on Campus. *Journal of College Student Development*, *58*(2), 159-174. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0013

Giroux, H. A. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Toward a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(2), 285-320.

Gorski, P. C. (2019). Racial battle fatigue and activist burnout in racial justice activists of color at predominately white colleges and universities. *Race ethnicity and education*, *22*(1), 1-20.

Gottfredson, N. C., Panter, A. T., Daye, C. E., Allen, W. A., Wightman, L. F., & Deo, M. E. (2008). Does diversity at undergraduate institutions influence student outcomes? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(2), 80-94. https://doi.org/10.1037/1938-8926.1.2.80

Grain, K. M., & Lund, D. E. (2016). The Social Justice Turn: Cultivating "Critical Hope" in an Age of Despair. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0023.104

Griffin, K., Bennett, J., & York, T. (2020). Leveraging promising practices: Improving the recruitment, hiring, and retention of diverse & inclusive faculty.

Griffin, K. A. (2019). Institutional barriers, strategies, and benefits to increasing the representation of women and men of color in the professoriate: looking beyond the pipeline. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 35*, 1-73.

Grzanka, P. R., Frantell, K. A., & Fassinger, R. E. (2020). The White Racial Affect Scale (WRAS): A measure of White guilt, shame, and negation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(1), 47-77.

Gusa, D. L. (2010). White Institutional Presence: The Impact of Whiteness on Campus Climate. *Harvard Educational Review*, *80*(4), 464-489.

Hardiman, R. (1982). *White identity development: A process oriented model for describing the racial consciousness of White Americans* ProQuest Information & Learning]. US.

Hardiman, R. (1994). *White Identity Theory: Origins and Prospects* [Interview]. Microtraining Associates. video.alexanderstreet.com/watch/white-identity-theory-origins-and-prospects database

Hardiman, R., & Keehn, M. (2012). White Identity Development Revisited; Listening to White Students. In B. W. J. Charmaine L. Wijeyesinghe (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Racial Identity Development: Integrating Emerging Frameworks* (Second ed.). New York University Press.

Harper, C. E., & Yeung, F. (2013). Perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity as a predictor of college students' openness to diverse perspectives. *The Review of Higher Education*, *37*(1), 25-44.

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.254

Hatcher, S. L., Nadeau, M. S., Walsh, L. K., & Reynolds, M. (1994). The teaching of empathy for high school and college students: Testing. *Adolescence*, *29*(116), 116.

Helms, J. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A black and white model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *12*(4), 153-165.

Helms, J. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity. In T. Trickett, R. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspective on people in context* (pp. 285-311). Jossey-Bass.

Helms, J., & Tallyrand, R. M. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist*(November), 1246-1247. Retrieved August 1, 2011, from

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity and other "racial" constructs.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' Whtie and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-191). Sage.

Helms, J. E. (2014). A review of White racial identity theory: The sociopolitical implications of studying White racial identity in psychology. In *Psychology serving humanity: Proceedings of the 30th International Congress of Psychology, Volume 2: Western psychology.* (pp. 12-27). Psychology Press.

Helms, J. E. (2017). The challenge of making Whiteness visible: Reactions to four Whiteness articles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(5), 717-726.

Holtschneider, D. H. (2013, October 26, 2013). What Shall We Do: The Eroding Social Compact Toward U.S. Higher Education. St. John's University, Queens, NY.

Hopkins-Gillispie, D. (2011). Curriculum & schooling: Multiculturalism, critical multiculturalism and critical pedagogy. *South Shore Journal*, *4*.

Horrigan-Kelly, M., Millar, M., & Dowling, M. (2016). Understanding the Key Tenets of Heidegger's Philosophy for Interpretive Phenomenological Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *15*(1), 169-180. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406916680634

Howard, G. R. (2007). As diversity grows, so must we. *Educational Leadership*, *64*(6), 16.

Howard, G. R. (2016). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. Teachers College Press.

Howman Wood, C. (2011). Institutional ethos: Replicating the student experience. *New directions for higher education*, *2011*(155), 29-39.

Hughey, M. W. (2020). "The Souls of White Folk" (1920–2020): a century of Peril and prophecy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *43*(8), 1307-1332. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1674349

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *63*(5), 539-569.

Hurtado, S. (2005). The Next Generation of Diversity and Intergroup Relations Research. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 595-610. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00422.x

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 41-122). Springer.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. A. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(3), 279-302.

Inwood, M. (2000). *Martin Heidigger: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R. L., & Heckman, S. M. (2002). Perceptions of white identity and white liability: An analysis of white student responses to a college campus racial hate crime. *Journal of Communication*, *52*(2), 434-450.

Jacobs, H. (2016). Husserl on Reason, Reflection, and Attention [Article]. *Research in Phenomenology*, *46*(2), 257-276. https://doi.org/10.1163/15691640-12341338

Jayakumar, U. (2008). Can Higher Education Meet the Needs of an Increasingly Diverse and Global Society? Campus Diversity and Cross-Cultural Workforce Competencies. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*(4), 615-651.

Jayakumar, U. M., & Adamian, A. S. (2017). The fifth frame of colorblind ideology: Maintaining the comforts of colorblindness in the context of white fragility. *Sociological Perspectives*, *60*(5), 912-936.

Johnston, M. P. (2014). The Concept of Race on Campus: Exploring the Nature of College Students' Racial Conceptions. *Journal of College Student Development*, *55*(3), 225-242.

Jones, V. (2007). 'They're sitting right next to us'. On college campuses, students continue to struggle with ethnic tensions and racist attitudes. *Boston.Com*. Retrieved June 11, 2014, from http://www.boston.com/lifestyle/articles/2007/12/05/theyre_sitting_right_next_to_us/?page=full

Jones, W. A. (2013). The Relationship Between Student Body Racial Composition and the Normative Environment Toward Diversity at Community Colleges [Article]. *Community College Review*, *41*(3), 249-265. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552113497090

Jupp, J. C., Berry, T. R., & Lensmire, T. J. (2016). Second-wave white teacher identity studies: A review of white teacher identity literatures from 2004 through 2014. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1151-1191.

Karabel, J. (2005). *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Houghton Mifflin.

Karimi. (2019). *There have been at least 5 hate incidents on college campuses this week.* CNN. Retrieved August 12 from

Karimi, F., & Matous, P. (2018). Mapping diversity and inclusion in student societies: A social network perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *88*, 184-194. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.07.001

Karkouti, I. M. (2015). The role of student affairs practitioners in improving campus racial climate: A case study. *College Student Journal*, *49*(1), 31-40.

Kezar, A. (2007). Creating and sustaining a campus ethos encouraging student engagement. *About Campus*, *11*(6), 13-18. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.190

Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). The Struggle to Define and Reinvent Whiteness: A Pedagogical Analysis. *College Literature*, *26*(3), 162-194.

Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., Rodriguez, N. M., & Chennault, R. E. (2000). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. Palgrave Macmillan.

King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(6), 571-592.

Kivel, P. (2017). *Uprooting racism-: How white people can work for racial justice*. New Society Publishers.

Kolchin, P. (2002). Whiteness studies: The new history of race in America. *The Journal of American History*, *89*(1), 154-173.

Kuh, G. (2011). Understanding campus environments. *The handbook of student affairs administration*, 59-80.

Kuh, G. D. (1993). Ethos: its influence on student learning. *Liberal Education*, *79*(4), 22-33.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2011). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J. L., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature* (Vol. 8). National Postsecondary Education Cooperative Washington, DC.

Kwak, N., Gavrila, S. G., & Ramirez, F. O. (2019). Enacting diversity in American higher education. In *Universities as Agencies* (pp. 209-228). Springer.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2006). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song*, *11*, 30.

LaFleur, N. K., Rowe, W., & Leach, M. M. (2002). Reconceptualizing White racial consciousness. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *30*(3), 148-152.

Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 102-120.

Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Phenomenology: A Comparison of Historical and Methodological Considerations. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, . *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *2*(3).

Legare, C. H. (2017). Cumulative cultural learning: Development and diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(30), 7877-7883. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1620743114

Lensmire, T. J. (2010). Ambivalent white racial identities: fear and an elusive innocence. *Race ethnicity and education*, *13*(2), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613321003751577

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The Color of Supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege' [Article]. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, *36*(2), 137-152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00057.x

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. Routledge.

LePeau, L. (2015). A grounded theory of academic affairs and student affairs partnerships for diversity and inclusion aims. *The Review of Higher Education*, *39*(1), 97-122.

Levin, S. (2003). Social Psychological Evidence on Race and Racism. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Higher Education*. Stanford University Press.

Lewis, A. E. (2004). What group?" Studying whites and whiteness in the era of "color□ blindness. *Sociological theory*, *22*(4), 623-646.

Lin, S., Salazar, T. R., & Wu, S. (2019). Impact of academic experience and school climate of diversity on student satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research*, *22*(1), 25-41.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, *1986*(30), 73-84. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1427

Linder, C. (2015). Navigating Guilt, Shame, and Fear of Appearing Racist: A Conceptual Model of Antiracist White Feminist Identity Development. . *Journal of College Student Development*(6), 535-550. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0057.

Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2013). Examining the educational benefits of interacting with international students. *Journal of International Students*, *3*(2), 85-101.

Malott, K. M., Schaefle, S., Paone, T. R., Cates, J., & Haizlip, B. (2021). Strategies Used by Whites to Address Their Racism: Implications for Autonomous White Racial Identities. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *49*(3), 137-151. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12220

Martin, J. N., Trego, A. B., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). College students' racial attitudes and friendship diversity. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, *21*(2), 97-118.

Matias, C. E., Nishi, N. W., & Sarcedo, G. L. (2017). Teacher education and whiteness and whiteness in teacher education in the United States. In O. U. Press (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.279

Maybee, J. E. (2020). *"Hegel's Dialectics"*. Stanford University. Retrieved March 2021 from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/hegel-dialectics/

McDermott, M., & Samson, F. L. (2005). White racial and ethnic identity in the United States. [Article]. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*(1), 245-261. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.31.041304.122322

McIntosh, P. (1988). White Privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In W. C. C. f. R. o. Women (Ed.), *"White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming To See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies"* Wellesley MA.

McIntyre, A. (2002). Exploring whiteness and multicultural education with prospective teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *32*(1), 31-49.

McKinney, K. D. (2008). Confronting young people's perceptions of Whiteness: Privilege or liability? *Sociology Compass*, *2*(4), 1303-1330.

McTaggart, J., & McTaggart, J. M. E. (2011). *Studies in the Hegelian dialectic*. Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, S. H., & Cunningham, M. (2003). Racial identity in white American college students; issue of conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *44*(2), 217-230.

Milem, J. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, E. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education.* (pp. 126-169). Stanford University Press.

Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Association American Colleges and Universities Washington, DC.

Morey, M. M., & Piderit, J. J. (2006). *Catholic Higher Education - A Culture in Crisis*. Oxford University Press.

Mortari, L. (2015). Reflectivity in research practice: An overview of different perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *14*(5), 1609406915618045.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage publications.

Museus, S. D., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2015). *Racism and Racial Equity in Higher Education: AEHE Volume 42, Number 1*. John Wiley & Sons.

Nelson Laird, T. (2005). College Students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*, 365-387.

Neubauer, B. E., Witkop, C. T., & Varpio, L. (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *8*(2), 90-97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-0509-2

Neville, H. A., Worthington, R. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2001). Race, Power, and Multicultural counseling psychology. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M.

Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 257-288). Sage Publications.

Nir, S. (2020). *The Bird Watcher, That Incident and His Feelings on the Woman's Fate*. The New York Times. Retrieved August 24, 2020 from https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/27/nyregion/amy-cooper-christian-central-park-video.html

Nishimura, M., Kim, A., & Bhatt, B. S. (2019). Policies and Practices of Diversity and Inclusion in Liberal Arts Colleges. In (pp. 107-120). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2877-0_9

Novak, M. (2000). Defining social justice. *First things*, 11-12.

O'Mara, J. (2015). Diversity and inclusion, definitions of. *The SAGE encyclopedia of intercultural competence*, *2*, 268-269.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ong, A. D., Fuller-Rowell, T. E., & Phinney, J. S. (2010). Measurement of ethnic identity: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *10*(1), 39-49.

Ortiz, A. M., & Rhoads, R. A. (2000). Deconstructing Whiteness as Part of a Multicultural Educational Framework: From Theory to Practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, *41*(1), 81-93.

Park, J. J., Buckley, J. B., & Koo, K. (2017). " How Do I Quantify This?": Students Reflect on Survey Items Related to Diversity and Cross-Racial Interaction. *Journal of College Student Development*, *58*(5), 733-751.

Park, J. J., & Chang, S. H. (2015). Understanding Students' Precollege Experiences with Racial Diversity: The High School as Microsystem. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*(4), 349-363.

Park, J. J., & Kim, Y. K. (2013). Interracial friendship and structural diversity: Trends for Greek, religious, and ethnic student organizations. *The Review of Higher Education*, *37*(1), 1-24.

Parker, E., Barnhardt, C., Pascarella, E., & McCowin, J. (2016). The impact of diversity courses on college students' moral development. *57*(4), 395-410. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.depaul.edu/10.1353/csd.2016.0050

Pascarella, E., Edison, M. I., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(2), 174-195.

Pascarella, E. T., Martin, G. L., Hanson, J. M., Trolian, T. L., Gillig, B., & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, *55*(1), 86-92.

Peifer, J. S., Chambers, K. L., & Lee, E. M. (2017). Examining the Role of Structural Diversity in Intercultural Competence. *International Research and Review*, *7*(1), 1-10.

Peregrina-Kretz, D., Seifert, T., Arnold, C., & Burrow, J. (2018). Finding their way in post-secondary education: the power of peers as connectors, coaches, co-constructors and copycats. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(5), 1076-1090.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: the role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(2), 143-152.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race ethnicity and education*, *12*(2), 197-215.

Pike, G., & Kuh, G. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions and perceptions of campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*, *29*(4), 425-450. Retrieved September 17, 2011, from

Ponterotto, J. G. (1988). Racial consciousness development among White counselor trainees: A stage model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *16*(4), 146-156. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.1988.tb00405.x

Ponterotto, J. G., & Park-Taylor, J. (2007). Racial and ethnic identity theory, measurement, and research in counseling psychology: Present status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(3), 282-294. Retrieved August 1, 2011, from

Quaye, S. J., Lin, D. K., Buie, C. R., Abad, M., Labonte, A., Greenberg, J., & Hall, J. W. (2008). Student voice and sensemaking of multiculturalism on campus. In S. Harper (Ed.), *Creating inclusive campus environments for cross-cultural learning and student engagement.* (pp. 19-44). NASPA.

Ragins, B. R., & Ehrhardt, K. (2020). Gaining perspective: The impact of close cross-race friendships on diversity training and education. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Reason, R. D., & Evans, N. J. (2007). The complicated realities of whiteness: From color blind to racially cognizant. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2007*(120), 67-75. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.258

Renn, K. A. (2020). The Influence of Peer Culture on Identity Development in College Students. *Journal of College and Character*, *21*(4), 237-243.

Renn, K. A., & Reason, R. D. (2021). *College students in the United States: Characteristics, experiences, and outcomes*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Rivas, R. (2014). Black Students make demands of SLU after campus hate crimes. *St Louis American*. Retrieved June 11, 2014, from http://www.stlamerican.com/news/local_news/article_060568ca-d606-11e3-90e6-001a4bcf887a.html

Rodriguez, R. (1999). The Study of Whiteness. (Caucasians). *Black Issues In Higher Education*, *16*(6), 20-25.

Roksa, J., Kilgo, C., Trolian, T., Pascarella, E., Blaich, C., & Wise, K. (2017). *Engaging with Diversity: How Positive and Negative Diversity Interactions Shape Students' Cognitive Outcomes* (Vol. 88). https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1271690

Ropers-Huilman, R., Winters, K. T., & Enke, K. A. (2013). Discourses of whiteness: White students at Catholic women's colleges (Dis) engaging Race. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 28-55.

Rowe, W. (2006). White racial identity: Science, faith, and pseudoscience. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *34*(4), 235-243. Retrieved August 2, 2011, from

Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White Racial Identity Models:A Critique and Alternative Proposal. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *22*(1), 129-146. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000094221009

Rowley, L. L., Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2002). Organizational rhetoric or reality? The disparities between avowed commitment to diversity and formal programs and initiatives in higher education institutions. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association., New Orleans, LA,

Rudge, L. T. (2017). Different Experiences and Perceptions of Campus Climate Among Minority Students at a Predominantly White Institution. *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education (IJBIDE)*, *2*(1), 40-56.

Sabnani, H. B., Ponterotto, J. G., & Borodovsky, L. G. (1991). White Racial Identity Development and Cross-Cultural Counselor Training:A Stage Model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *19*(1), 76-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000091191007

Saenz, V. B. (2010). Breaking the Segregation Cycle: Examining Students' Precollege Racial Environments and College Diversity Experiences. *Review of Higher Education*, *34*(1), 1-37. http://ezproxy.lib.depaul.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/757593033?accountid=10477

http://AN6TQ9PG6N.search.serialssolutions.com/?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rfr_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Aeducation&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.jtitle=Review+of+Higher+Education&rft.atitle=Breaking+the+Segregation+Cycle%3A+Examining+Students%27+Precollege+Racial+Environments+and+College+Diversity+Experiences&rft.au=Saenz%2C+Victor+B&rft.aulast=Saenz&rft.aufirst=Victor&rft.date=2010-10-

01&rft.volume=34&rft.issue=1&rft.spage=1&rft.isbn=&rft.btitle=&rft.title=Review+of+Higher+Education&rft.issn=01625748

Saenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors Influencing Positive Interactions Across Race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White College Students [Article]. *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(1), 1-38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9026-3

Said, E. W. (2004). *Humanism and democratic criticism*. Columbia University Press.

Sawchuck, S. (2021). *Wat is crtiical race theory and why is it under attack?* Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. Retrieved July 26, 2021 from https://www.edweek.org/leadership/what-is-critical-race-theory-and-why-is-it-under-attack/2021/05

Schnurr, D. M. (2020). *Seven Themes of Catholic Social Teaching*. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Retrieved December 22 from https://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/seven-themes-of-catholic-social-teaching

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *1*, 118-137.

Seidman, I. (2019). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Selvanathan, H. P., Techakesari, P., Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Whites for racial justice: How contact with Black Americans predicts support for collective action among White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(6), 893-912.

Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). “We Are All for Diversity, but...”: How Faculty Hiring Committees Reproduce Whiteness and Practical Suggestions for How They Can Change. *Harvard Educational Review*, *87*(4), 557-580.

Sherman, G. L. (2009). Martin Heidegger's Concept of Authenticity: A Philosophical Contribution to Student Affairs Theory. *Journal of College and Character*, *10*(7). https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1440

Shim, W., & Perez, R. (2018). A Multi-Level Examination of First-year Students’ Openness to Diversity and Challenge. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *89*(4), 453-477. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2018.1434277

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Liu, J., & Pratto, F. (2000). Social dominance orientation, anti egalitarianism and the political psychology of gender: An extension and cross cultural replication. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*(1), 41-67.

Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural Education as Social Activism*. STate Unviersity of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2017). Critical race theory and the whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education*, *52*(2), 155-169.

Smith, D. G. (2015). *Diversity's Promise for Higher Education: Making It Work*. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=VUC4CAAAQBAJ

Smith, J. A. (2003). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Sokolowski, R. (2000). *Introduction to Phenomenology*. Cambridge University Press.

Solomona, R. P., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B. J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege'. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(2), 147-169.

Souto-Manning, M. (2019). Toward praxically-just transformations: Interrupting racism in teacher education. *Journal of education for teaching*, *45*(1), 97-113.

Spanierman, L., Neville, H., Liao, H., Hammer, J., & Wang, Y. (2008). Participation in formal and informal campus diversity experiences: Effects on students' racial democratic beliefs. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(2), 108.

Spanierman, L. B., Beard, J. C., & Todd, N. R. (2012). White Men's Fears, White Women's Tears: Examining Gender Differences in Racial Affect Types. *Sex Roles*, *67*(3), 174-186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0162-2

Spanierman, L. B., & Cabrera, N. L. (2015). The emotions of White racism and antiracism. *Unveiling Whiteness in the 21st century: Global manifestations, transdisciplinary interventions*, 9-28.

Spanierman, L. B., & Smith, L. (2017). Roles and Responsibilities of White Allies: Implications for Research, Teaching, and Practice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(5), 606-617. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017717712

Spanierman, L. B., & Soble, J. R. (2010). Understanding Whiteness: Previous approaches and possible directions in the study of White racial attitudes and identity.

Stewart, D. L. (2009). Perceptions of multiple identities among Black college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(3), 253-270.

Stewart, T. L., Latu, I. M., Branscombe, N. R., Phillips, N. L., & Ted Denney, H. (2012). White Privilege Awareness and Efficacy to Reduce Racial Inequality Improve White Americans' Attitudes Toward African Americans. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(1), 11-27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01733.x

Stulberg, L. M., & Chen, A. S. (2011). A Long View on Diversity - A century of American college admissions debates. In L. M. Stulberg & S. L. Weinberg (Eds.), *Diversity in American Higher Education* (pp. 51-62). Taylor Francis.

Sue, D. W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W. (2006). The Invisible Whiteness of Being: Whiteness, White Supremacy, White Privilege, and Racism. In *Addressing racism: Facilitating cultural competence in mental health and educational settings.* (pp. 15-30). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Sue, D. W. (2011). The challenge of White dialectics: Making the "invisible" visible. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(3), 415-422.

Sue, D. W. (2017). The Challenges of Becoming a White Ally. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(5), 706-716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017719323

Swank, E., Asada, H., & Lott, J. (2001). Student acceptance of a multicultural education: Exploring the role of a social work curriculum, demographics, and symbolic racism. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *10*(2), 85-103.

Taie, S., & Goldring, R. (2020). *Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the United States:*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Studies Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020142.

Tate IV, W. F. (1997). Chapter 4: Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of research in education*, *22*(1), 195-247.

Tatum, B. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*(1), 1-24.

Tatum, B. D. (2019). Together andAlone? The Challenge of Talking about Racism on Campus.

Tindall, L. (2009). JA Smith, P. Flower and M. Larkin (2009), Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research. London: Sage. In: Taylor & Francis.

Todd, N., McConnell, E., & Suffrin, R. (2014). The role of attitudes toward white privilege and religious beliefs in predicting social justice interest and commitment. *American journal of community psychology*, *53*(1-2), 109-121.

Todd, N. R., & Abrams, E. M. (2011). White Dialectics: A New Framework for Theory, Research, and Practice With White Students 1Ψ7. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(3), 353-395.

Todd, N. R., Spanierman, L. B., & Aber, M. S. (2010). White students reflecting on whiteness: Understanding emotional responses. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *3*(2), 97-110. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019299

Toporek, R. L. (2011). Finding richness in conflict and context: The shimmer and shadow of dialectics. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(3), 405-414.

Torres, V., Jones, S. R., & Renn, K. (2009). Identity development theories in student affairs: origins, current status, and new approaches. 50, 577-596. *Journal of College Student Development*(50), 577-596.

Trimble, J. E. (2007). Prolegomena for the connotation of construct use in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(3), 247-258. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from

Tullis, J. G., & Goldstone, R. L. (2020). Why does peer instruction benefit student learning? *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications.*, *5*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00218-5

Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2015). Ethnic identity research: How far have we come? In *Studying ethnic identity: Methodological and conceptual approaches across disciplines.* (pp. 11-26). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14618-002

Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*, 169-192.

United States. Department of Education. Office of Planning, E., & Development, P. (2016). *Advancing diversity and inclusion in higher education: key data highlights focusing on race and ethnicity and promising practices*.

Vagle, M. D. (2018). *Crafting phenomenological research*. Routledge.

Van Manen, M. (2014). *Phenomenology of Practice Meaning-Giiving Methods in Phenomenological Research and Writing*. Routledge.

Van Manen, M. (2017). But Is It Phenomenology? *Qualitative Health Research*, *27*(6), 775-779. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570

Vianden, J. (2018). " In All Honesty, You Don't Learn Much": White College Men's Perceptions of Diversity Courses and Instructors. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *30*(3), 465-476.

Wander, P. C., Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2005). The roots of racial classification. *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism*, 29-34.

Welshon, R. (2020). Hate Speech on Campus: What Public Universities Can and Should Do to Counter Weaponized Intolerance. *Res Publica*, *26*(1), 45-66. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11158-019-09424-5

Whitt, E., J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(2), 172-204.

Willis, D. B. (1997). An Outsider's View Inside: 21st Century Directions for Multicultural Education. *Multicultural Education*, *5*(2), 4-10.

Zucker, J. K., & Patterson, M. M. (2018). Racial Socialization Practices Among White American Parents: Relations to Racial Attitudes, Racial Identity, and School Diversity. *Journal of Family Issues*, *39*(16), 3903-3930. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x18800766

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