Journal of Student Affairs

XVIII Edition | Published May 2022

About

The Journal of Student Affairs (JoSA) is an annual peer-reviewed publication exploring contemporary issues and current trends in the field of higher education. As a student-run publication, we aim to highlight research and scholarship of graduate students and new professionals to further develop best practices within higher education and student affairs.

Our Values

The Journal of Student Affairs is committed to showcasing our values in every publication.

Diversity in Knowledge & Practice

The higher education landscape is becoming more diverse as increasing amounts of students pursue post-secondary education. Therefore, it is critical for new and established professionals to expand their understanding of scholarship to serve various subpopulations and transform outdated practices.

Learning & Development

Our publication disseminates valuable insights that help readers advance their professional development and learn about evolving practices. Because graduate students are contributing authors and editors in the production of the journal, they are able to learn a wealth of knowledge about how academic journals are run.

Equity

We support students and new professionals who are typically unable to publish in other academic journals due to educational requirements or lack of research experience. Our editors support authors, so, regardless of educational background, both editors and authors develop effective communication skills.

Innovation

As we move into the twenty-first century and technology is more ingrained in the operations of higher education, professionals must be creative and innovative in their approaches to student support. The Journal of Student Affairs is an outlet for practitioners to share techniques, programs, and ideas that they have used to enhance the college student experience.

Executive Editorial Board

Internal Review Board

The Internal Review Board (IRB) is comprised of current part-time and full-time graduate students who review a single manuscript during three editing cycles in preparation for publication. They uphold APA guidelines, collaborate with a peer editor, and develop their professional network through social events. JoSA is committed to serving graduate students through academic exploration, professional development and the publication process. Being an Internal Review Board editor is an excellent way to learn about and gain experience with the publishing process for an academic journal.

External Review Board

The External Review Board (ERB) is composed of current full-time student affairs professionals, faculty, and administrators with at least a masters degree. They have a thorough understanding of APA guidelines and use their expertise to provide feedback to authors. Articles are assigned based on ERB applicants' stated areas of interest in higher education and student affairs.

Faculty Advisor

External Review Board Spotlight —

The Journal of Student Affairs would cease to exist without the generous commitment from our editors. Graduate students and full-time professionals work with authors to produce quality academic writings to share with the higher education and student affairs community. This year, we wish to recognize two of our External Review Board Members:

Buffy Stoll Turton and Daniel Esquivel. Together, Buffy and Daniel have contributed to 14 editions of this journal.

Daniel Esquivel

Daniel Esquivel has been an active member of the JoSA for 13 years. He served as an Internal Review Board editor during his first year of graduate school and progressed as a member of the Executive Editorial Board as a Copy Editor in 2010. With a desire to stay abreast of current topics in higher education, he serves as an External Review Board member to explore his research interest in LGBTQ+ affairs, student life activities, and international higher education. For Daniel, editing is therapeutic and allows him to stay connected to the Higher Education and Student Affairs community despite physical distance. Daniel continues to be a vital member of JoSA, and we are grateful for his contribution.

Buffy Still Turton

Dr. Buffy Stoll Turton is the Director of First-Year Experience at Central Oregon Community College and has served as an External Review Board member for the Journal of Student Affairs since 2008. She earned her doctorate from Miami University, where she worked as Director of Orientation and Transition Programs and conducted narrative research on the lived experiences of first-generation students. As a scholar-practitioner, Buffy strives to advance her understanding of the diverse needs of new college students and create learning environments that engage, educate, empower, and support them. She values student mentoring and advocacy opportunities and is always ready to listen to others' stories or share her own. We cherish her expertise and involvement in JoSA.

Preface

We are living in a world of in-betweens. In the wake of an ongoing pandemic, we began this process with a shared vision but could not anticipate some of the challenges ahead. Managing a team of this magnitude comes with many complications, especially as we navigate a system that is struggling to awake after two years of hibernation. As cultivators of personal growth, we met every challenge as an opportunity for excellence and are proud of the way this publication has developed. Our team is equally passionate, excited, and dedicated to student affairs research. We are grateful for their ongoing support and commitment to the excellence of this literature.

Authors and the editing team have invested countless hours in perfecting manuscripts to provide insightful content that reflects contemporary issues and current trends in the field of higher education. We would like to recognize our 24 editors who were committed to JoSA throughout each cycle and our Executive Editorial Board, who facilitated the process from recruitment to publication. And thank you to our Faculty Advisor, Dr. Erich Dietrich, for his support and guidance to our team.

The 2021-2022 Executive Editorial Board has selected 10 manuscripts that further our values surrounding diversity in knowledge and practice, learning and development, equity, and innovation. In total, 11 authors, 7 institutions, and 2 countries are represented in this volume. We want to recognize these authors for the time and energy they have poured into these manuscripts, contributing to the field in a substantial and notable way.

This year, we publish research that highlights our values and challenges our practices. Through this literature, we hope educators and learners will gain the opportunity to enhance their work and, possibly, spark interest to produce scholarly work of their own.

Our vision for JoSA included building our legitimacy, fostering community, and highlighting the beauty of literature. We believe that this year's diverse authorship, collective effort, and overall quality bear the fruit of our vision.

Access and Inclusivity

History and Context for Underrepresented Groups

Policies and Systems

Identity Development

We would like to present to you the XVIII edition of the Journal of Student Affairs!

Sincerely,
Aliya Syed & Michael Calla
Co-Editors-in-Chief

Table of Contents ────────────

Theme I: Access and Inclusivity

Theme II: History and Context for Underrepresented Groups

Theme III: Policies and Systems

VIII

Table of Contents

Theme I: Access and Inclusivity

Beyond Access: Exploring Support & Services for Students with ASD that Lead to Success

Alex Bronz

Introduction

Twenty years ago, it was estimated that 1 in 150 children would be diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). In 2021, that estimation has risen to 1 in 59 (Cox, Edelstein, Brogdon & Roy, 2021). Viezel, Williams, & Dotson (2020) estimate that in 2020, over 430,000 students (1.9%) enrolled in US higher education institutions will meet the diagnostic criteria for this condition. Students with ASD (SwASD) are eligible for reasonable accommodations and support at their institution through the Americans with Disabilities Act and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Viezel et al., 2020). These laws, along with a growing body of research that supports the implementation of successful early intervention techniques alongside school-based services, may facilitate an increase of promising students with ASD entering higher education in the future - especially as an estimated 50,000 youth with ASD turn 18 each year (Shattuck et al., 2014). Despite the gains in enrollment and the availability of legally mandated accessibility services post-enrollment, fewer than 40% of SwASD who start college will earn a postsecondary degree compared to 60% of their neurotypical peers (Accardo, Kuder, & Woodruff, 2019). The achievement gap for SwASD indicates a need for higher education institutions to explore how this population can engage with their school beyond access and identify which services will lead to student success. This review of literature will identify the challenges and needs of SwASD, explore potential methods for supporting the success of this student group, and offer suggestions for future research that will benefit institutions, practitioners, and college-going individuals with ASD and their families.

Student affairs professionals must have a working knowledge of the characteristics of autism spectrum disorder to begin understanding the needs of this student population. In addition, it is important to note that medical definitions and diagnoses are dynamic and thus subject to change over time or individually. Per the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Text Revision Fourth Edition, ASD is a lifelong neurodevelopmental condition, typically characterized by "difficulties in social interaction and communication, in addition to repetitive behaviors and restricted interests [which may also be accompanied] by a high degree of rigidity" in day-to-day life (White, Ollendick & Bray, 2016, p. 684). It is important, however, for practitioners to remember that the symptomology and severity of ASD is heterogeneous, meaning that individuals each uniquely experience these traits along a 'spectrum' of severity (Gobbo & Shmulsky, 2014, Obeid, Bisson & Cosenza et al., 2021). From these general guidelines, an institution can expect that SwASD will need support with "social communication, handling the lack of structure and routine in college, executive functioning requirements, managing time and unexpected change, and managing comorbid

conditions" to varying degrees (Accardo & Kuder et. al, 2019, p. 574). These needs may create challenges for college students with ASD, including accessing and receiving appropriate support services, navigating academic campus spaces, and adjusting to the new social environments presented in the collegiate experience.

Challenges for Students with ASD

While appropriate accommodations for SwASD can be accessed via an institution's federally mandated disability services office, Viezel et al. (2020) found that only 36.7% of SwASD "felt they were getting the appropriate amount of support" through their college-based accommodations, while an additional 54.1% of SwASD did not receive any college-based accommodations (p. 236). One potential contributor to these low percentages may be tied to internalized social stigmas held by SwASD. White et al. (2019) notes that misconceptions about autism often contribute to the stigmatization and exclusion of this population, driving them to ignore or downplay their diagnosis. A 2002 National Center for Education Statistics report found that while 9% of students nationwide enrolled in disability services, only 4% regarded themselves as having a disability (Horn et al., 2002). Similarly, when Shattuck et al. (2014) studied a group of 120 SwASD, they discovered that around a third of participants reported not perceiving themselves as "disabled or having a special need" at all (p. 1). Another possible reason for this low rate of participation is difficulty in obtaining an autism diagnosis. White et al.'s (2016) survey-based study of the prevalence of autism at a large, public southeastern university in the United States uncovered five students who met diagnostic criteria but were unaware they qualified for a diagnosis. Considering that

their institution's disability office reported a total of just 10 enrolled SwASD at the time, this 50% increase in known students with autism via a single study may be an indicator that a significant number of students nationwide are also undiagnosed. Additionally, significant delays in diagnosis for "racial and ethnic minority groups, economically disadvantaged children, and girls" have been consistently documented in autism research, potentially compounding the challenges that many low-income, female and people of color already face when trying to access higher education (Obeid et al., 2021, p. 106, Mandy & Lai, 2017).

Even after students have obtained a diagnosis, they often face challenges registering at their school's disability office. Some students reported needing recent diagnosis and extensive documentation in order to receive accommodations, a challenge for both students with a history of accommodations but no recent diagnostic paperwork and those with recent diagnosis but no history of accommodations (Cox, Edelstein, Brogdon & Roy, 2021). Armstrong & Hamilton (2018) observed that at-risk students struggling at college are often "ill-equipped" to seek out support or unaware that they need help (p. 17). With the onus for requesting these services placed on individual students, navigating this challenging bureaucracy with the typically limited social and/or communication skills that accompany ASD can be a major hurdle. The combination of stressful new social situations and lack of information about how to access support services doubly burdens SwASD. The stress of navigating these extensive bureaucratic processes drive some students to 'mask' their neurodivergent characteristics or delay the disclosure of their diagnosis until their challenges have become too overwhelming to handle alone (Viezel et al., 2020, Nachman, Miller & Vallejo Peña, 2020, Accardo & Bean

et al., 2019).

Another prevalent challenge for SwASD is engaging in academic spaces, including classrooms, group work, and faculty interactions. As difficulties with social communication are common with this student group, student performance can be affected by difficulties in "understanding classroom norms, rules, and expectations" as well as struggling with recognizing appropriate tone and topics in the class, frequency of speech during discussions, and interpreting the perspectives of their peers while working in groups (Viezel et al., 2020, p. 235, Gobbo & Shmulsky, 2014). Interacting with faculty one-on-one can pose additional challenges. SwASD reported that faculty members regularly pushed them to other school entities (i.e., advisors or disability offices) and often appeared uncomfortable with discussing ASD-related topics (Cox et al., 2021). There may be several reasons for this discomfort, including valid concerns about violating well-known federal laws such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). On the other hand, some hesitancy to interact with SwASD may stem from misconceptions about the disorder. White et al. (2019) found that individuals who did not know anyone with ASD often drew from larger social stereotypes about disability, leading them to assume that those with ASD had more severe cognitive deficits than actual symptomatology; this contributed to less positive attitudes and more biases toward their peers with ASD. However, ignorance cannot be an institutional barrier to success. Cox et al. (2021) and White et al. (2019) call for all members of college staff to engage in critical conversations with ASD students to end the misunderstanding, stigmatization, and exclusion that hinders integration and acceptance of this population.

Outside of the classroom, a student with ASD must face challenges relating to various aspects of 'college life,' including independent living, socializing, and encountering traumatic or victimizing events. The social aspects of campus life are a common topic for postsecondary ASD literature. Researchers have found that SwASD required support in cultivating daily life skills, ranging from maintaining schedules of basic functions such as regularly eating, to managing roommate conflicts, to navigating transportation between their classes and residence (Gobbo & Shmulsky, 2014, Cullen, 2015). It is worth noting that Viezel et al.'s (2020) review of ASD-focused support programs found that only 30% offered "independent living support" such as on-call residential support to assist students in this area (p. 236). The authors suggest that this may point to a larger institutional-level assumption that SwASD are relatively independent and do not need accommodations or extra support in this area, despite evidence to the contrary emerging in the related literature (Viezel et al., 2020).

Socialization outside of the classroom can become a flashpoint for a student with ASD. Despite stereotypical depictions of SwASD as anti-social, this population desires healthy social interactions with their peers. Having a positive social life may be even more crucial for SwASD as healthy social interaction can help strengthen their social communication skills and combat the social isolation, anxiety, and depression that can occur during the tumultuous transition from high school to college (Viezel et al., 2020). Several issues can complicate the act of meeting peers and making friends on campus. First and perhaps less well known is anxiety: anxiety is estimated to be a comorbidity in 40% of cases of ASD. Students with both autism and anxiety often express the former

in atypical ways that may be challenging for non-neurodivergent students to encounter, such as irritability or increased ritualistic behavior (Zaboski & Storch, 2018 & White et al., 2016). In addition, having multiple minoritized identities can raise questions for SwASD about where and how they feel comfortable socializing. One example concerning these intersecting identities is that SwASD are "more likely to identify as gay and lesbian in their sexual orientation and as transgender or genderqueer in their gender identity compared with neurotypical peers" - thus, students who identify as being on the autism spectrum and the LGBTQ+ spectrum must grapple with where they can 'come out' with their multiple identities (Nachman et al., 2020, p. 104). SwASD experiencing these moments of intersectionality may feel "invisible," have a difficult time navigating social spaces and situations with other LGBTQ and/or autistic students and are at a higher risk of being marginalized for these multiple identities - and the way in which they "highlight or downplay" them - in various situations (Nachman et al., 2020, p. 105). These identities, and the general symptomatology of ASD, may contribute to autistic students becoming socially isolated (33% of SwASD experienced exclusionary behavior in college), prone to experiencing victimization (SwASD reported higher rates of unwanted sexual contact than non-disabled peers), and vulnerable to bullying (33% of SwASD said they did not feel safe in their classroom) (White et al., 2011, Brown, Vallejo Peña & Rankin, 2017, DeNigris, Brooks & Obeid, et al., 2018).

Discussion: Supports & Solutions for Students with ASD

When considering supports and solutions for SwASD, it is crucial that practitioners remember that their role "is to help students navigate these challenging and complicated moments in ways that do not minimize their multidimensional lives": no two SwASD will be exactly alike due to the heterogeneous nature of autism and identity (Vallejo Peña et al., 2016, p. 92). Institutions must be aware of potential fallacies in their assumptions of the desires of this student group and plan their services based on the voices of the students they serve. Listening to stories is key to understanding an individual's intersectional personhood as well as a crucial aspect of connecting students with the best resources for their unique situation. One way to begin these listening-forward conversations is to help SwASD define what success would be for them during their postsecondary period. Accardo & Bean et al. (2019) found in their interviews with SwASD that the most common markers for success were earning a high grade point average, building awareness of self and identity formation, engaging in campus activities or organized social activities, and fostering relationships with professors and peers. These four identified areas can be serviced in multiple ways (see Table I).

Academic support for students with autism typically consists of accommodations and support services. Academic accommodations though a disability center may include an advisor, a tutor, receiving copies of notes, allowances for assistive technology or modifying testing procedures, all of which are generally well received by SwASD (Accardo & Kuder et al., 2019, Accardo & Bean et al., 2019). Support services vary much more by the institution and often integrate a social aspect in such programming, including supervised social activities, peer or faculty mentoring, and vocational support (Accardo & Kuder et al., 2019, Viezel et al., 2020). Accardo & Kuder et al. (2019) and Accardo & Bean et al. (2020) found in their research that despite the preva-

Table I: Common Markers for Success in SwASD and Their Correlating Supports	
Marker for Success	Correlating Supports & Accommodations
Earning a high grade point average (GPA)	Academic accommodations though a disability center (advisor, tutors, course notes, allowances for assistive technology, modified testing procedures)
Building awareness of self and identity formation	Strengths-based approach for staff/faculty (highlighting and nurturing the traits of SwASD that positively align with higher education)
Engaging in "campus activities" or "organized social activities"	Program-sponsored supervised social events, social groups, self-advocacy training, vocational support
Fostering relationships with professors and peers	Peer and/or faculty mentoring, opportunities to engage in intergroup dialogues, functional updates to traditional college life events (for example, orientations) to make them more ASD-friendly, ASD training for faculty & staff

alence of social-emotional support services for ASD students on campus (i.e., peer mentoring, social groups, self-advocacy training), students with autism were generally uninterested in participating in them or ranked them as least preferred among other support services, despite otherwise being interested in socially engaging at their institution. This suggests a need to revisit how these programs are packaged and delivered to students with ASD, as helping SwASD improve their social and communication skills is necessary for them to reach their goals in and out of the classroom (Accardo & Bean et al., 2020).

One potential method for assisting this population with their identity development is by adopting a strengths-based approach. Literature in this area often focuses on the 'deficits' of students with autism. However, Cox et al. (2021) argue that the "characteristics of autism could be viewed as strengths if they were not devalued within socially constructed environments" (p. 255). Indeed, individuals with autism possess many strengths that make them right at home in academia: their restricted area of interest may support the specialized knowledge that comes with a major or graduate-level study; they are often described as intelligent; their keen desire to analyze details and gain accurate knowledge lends itself to research skills; and they work well within the clear rules and structure often found in organized classroom settings (Viezel et al., 2020, Gobbo & Shmulsky, 2014). Viezel et al. (2020) argues that these features can position students for success in college and make their areas of challenges more manageable if they are highlighted by faculty and nurtured by staff, accommodations, and support programs.

Multiple authors advocated for institution-wide change to support students

with autism in their goalsto positively engage with their campus, peers, and faculty. Cox et al. (2021) and White et al. (2019) criticized the institutional paradigm that expects students to completely adapt to their institution, rather than the institution (and its staff) adapting to their specialized needs. It is reasonable for institutions to expect SwASD to prepare socially, emotionally, and academically for the transition to college. On balance, White et al. (2019) argue that it is equally reasonable for a student with autism to expect that their institution will not only "provide appropriate academic accommodations" but also plan for "campus wide acceptance and opportunities for social integration and more quality contact between students with and without disabilities," thus ensuring a safe environment for the student to learn and live alongside their neurotypical peers (p. 2704). These support opportunities for SwASD might include opportunities to engage in intergroup dialogues or functional updates to traditional college life events (such as orientation) to make them more ASD-friendly (White et al., 2016, Cox et al., 2021). Institutions must also consider support interventions that do not directly involve the student or disability office staff, but rather all the other groups that interact with them - for example, regular faculty training on neurodiversity topics to improve ASD student-faculty interactions, or "incorporation of disability policy discussions into classroom lectures" to reduce the stigmatization of these students (Cox et al., 2021, p. 267). "Acceptance and change in attitudes will only come about when individuals with disabilities are routinely served by universities," but this requires system-wide change on all levels to ensure that all institutional support systems are strong enough to allow students with autism to confidently "navigate the higher education landscape, find a sense of belonging, and successfully graduate from the institution" (White et al., 2019, p.261)

Suggestions for Future Research

While the literature on postsecondary education for individuals with autism is growing, many areas remain unexplored. Investigating these questions is not only crucial for practitioners, but also for SwASD and their families who are preparing to transition to college and need this information to navigate the complex landscape of higher education accessibility. One potential area for further research is creating a comprehensive inter-university database for practitioners working with SwASD to connect, compile data and share analysis of best practices at their institution. There is a rapidly growing institutional interest in providing such resources: a study in 2016 yielded thirty autism-specific college support programs (Barnhill, 2016). Just four years later McDermott & Nachman (2020) listed seventy-four colleges offering such programs in the US. Though this rapid growth is promising it is worth noting that Viezel et al.'s (2020) research process, which included a vetting process to confirm each program's operational status, yielded only fifty-five active ASD support programs. This suggests that some programs in McDermott & Nachman's (2020) listing were inactive or discontinued despite being posted online (see Table II).

Despite the growth in programming, multiple researchers found that few universities in their studies reported collecting data on the outcomes of their programs and many institutional offices/programs were simply unreachable even for their highly organized research teams (Barnhill, 2016, Viezel et al., 2020, Accardo & Kuder et al., 2019). Few rigorous, quantitative research designs for programs created to serve SwASD

re available: only an estimated seven or eight programs have been externally evaluated (Cox et al., 2021). In addition, published data on SwASD has been largely qualitative and based on small sample sizes (see Table III). 62% of studies of SwASD in this review had sample sizes smaller than 30. Though there are no exact sample size requirements for research, small samples prevent extrapolation and may cause discrepancies in comparing data across studies (Faber & Fonseca, 2014). All future data in terms of types of service, outcomes, post-graduation tracking, or even just how many SwASD are served at each institution could make a significant difference in shaping ASD support programming at the postsecondary level (Lombardi, Rifenbark, Monahan, Tarconish & Rhoads, 2020).

Additionally, there is a great need for further research on SwASD's intersectional identities. The reflex to "isolate the identity and oppression, and not fully... understand the complexities of an intersectional lived experience" is problematic both in research and in practice and can have unintended negative consequences for students who are receiving services based on a singular aspect of their identity (Vallejo Peña et al., 2016, p. 90). SwASD often struggle with other mental health diagnoses while simultaneously navigating the racial, ethnic, gendered, sexual, and socio-economic aspects of their personhood, making them "multiply-burdened" and further compounding the challenges they face in college (Nachman et al., 2020, p. 104). Literature on SwASD who identified as LGBTQ+, female, or as an ethnic/racial minority was scarce if not altogether nonexistent in higher education publications. On average, the participant dem-

	Barnhill, G. P. Supporting students with Asperger syndrome on college campuses: Current practices.	Viezel, K. D., Williams, E., & Dotson, W. H. College-Based Support Programs for Students with Autism.
Table II: College Support Programs for SwASD Growth & Change Over Time*		
Year Published	2016	2020
# of Active College ASD Support Programs Identified	30	55
% of Programs Offering Social Skills Group	50.0%	36.3%
% of Programs Offering Group Therapy/Counseling	17.0%	29.0%
% of Programs Offering Social Events	57.0%	30.9%
% of Programs Offering Tutoring	97.0%	9.0%
% of Programs Offering Life Coaching	80.0%	10.9%
% of Programs Offering Peer Mentoring	73.0%	49.0%

*Only overlapping data between the two studies has been included in this chart

ographics of the studies that focused on SwASD (8) were 65.3% white and 74% assigned male at birth (see Table III). Higher education professionals should examine these underrepresented populations to discover how autism, its challenges, and its strengths are impacted by privileges and/or forms of oppression. These efforts may challenge the stereotype of SwASD as solely white males, as well as give practitioners more specialized insight on how to best support the entire student rather than a single aspect of their identity.

Finally, the current canon of postsecondary SwASD literature could greatly benefit from an examination of the impact of successful autistic representation on campus or mentoring from ASD-diagnosed faculty and staff on their SwASD. Mentoring has shown promising results for other minority student groups such as people of color and LGBTQ+-identifying people, and in general people with ASD have shown to benefit from some form of mentorship; however, little has been done to observe the potential effects of a successful faculty or staff member with autism mentoring a college student with the same diagnosis (Cox et al., 2021, Lombardi et al., 2020). This form of mentoring could potentially take the place of less desired neurotypical peer mentoring and may be more appealing to SwASD who want a deeper relationship with a knowledgeable faculty member who shares their specific interests (Accardo & Bean et al., 2019). This may be challenging to execute as there are no statistics available on how many faculty members may have ASD, but Kaupins, Chenoweth & Klein (2020) speculate that faculty with ASD "represent a percentage that is greater than the general population due to work work activities that are more compatible with such individuals" p. 534). Facilitating

a mentorship or role modeling relationship between faculty/staff with ASD and SwASD may lead to positive outcomes both academically and socially for students.

Conclusion

The population of college SwASD will continue to grow in the years to come, and institutions must prepare for the future needs of these students. Student affairs practitioners must consider how their approach to SwASD can "challenge normalcy," "change our thinking on one-dimensional services," and shift away from a deficit-based approach to focus on SwASD's positive contributions to their campus community (Vallejo Peña et al., 2016, p. 93). It is the responsibility of a higher education institution and its staff to understand this unique population, identify challenges, seek solutions, share outcomes, and continue to improve existing services based on emerging research. Colleges, postsecondary practitioners, and their students with ASD should not just settle for access: together, they can strive for success.

Table III: Students with ASD Study Participant Sample Sizes & Demographics

Study Title	Authors	Sample Size	% White Identifying	% Assigned Male at Birth
Disability Identification and Self-efficacy Among College Students on the Autism Spectrum	Shattuck, PT, Steinberg, J, Yu, J, Wei, X, Cooper, BP, Newman, L et al. (2014)	120	83.0%	85.0%
Aided by Extant Data: The Effect of Peer Mentoring on Achievement for College Students with Disabilities	Lombardi, A., Rifenbark, G.G., Monahan, J., Tarconish, E., Rhoads, C., (2020)	24	Not Disclosed	58.3%
Navigating Challenges to Facilitate Success for College Students with Autism	Cox, B.E., Edelstein, J., Brogdon, B., & Roy, A. (2021)	8	100.0%	100.0%
Bullying and Identity Development: Insights from Autistic and Non-autistic College Students	DeNigris, D., Brooks, P.J., Obeid, R. et al. (2018)	22	86.0%	54.5%
College Access, Success and Equity for Students on the Autism Spectrum	Accardo, A.L., Bean, K., Cook, B. et al. (2019)	48	83.0%	86.0%
College Students on the Autism Spectrum: Prevalence and Associated Problems	White, S. W., Ollendick, T. H., & Bray, B.C. (2011)	13	69.2%	62.5%
Accommodations and Support Services Preferred by College Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Accardo, A.L., Kuder, S.J., & Woodruff, J. (2019)	23	Not Disclosed	87.0%
Unwanted Sexual Contact: Students With Autism and Other Disabilities at Greater Risk	Brown, K.R., Vallejo Peña, E., & Rankin, S. (2017)	158	39.2%	74.0%

References

Accardo, A.L., Bean, K., Cook, B. et al. (2019). College access, success and equity for students on the autism spectrum. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders,* 49,4877–4890. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-019-04205-8

Accardo, A.L., Kuder, S.J., & Woodruff, J. (2019). Accommodations and support services preferred by college students with autism spectrum disorder. *Autism: the international journal of research and practice*, 23(3), 574–583. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318760490

Armstrong, E. A., & Hamilton, L. T. (2018). *Paying for the party: How college maintains inequality.* Harvard University Press. Barnhill, G. P. (2016). Supporting students with asperger syndrome on college campuses:

Current practices. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 31(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357614523121

Brown, K.R., Vallejo Peña, E., & Rankin, S. (2017). Unwanted sexual contact: Students with autism and other disabilities at greater risk. *Journal of College Student Development* 58(5), 771-776. doi:10.1353/csd.2017.0059.

Cox, B.E., Edelstein, J., Brogdon, B., & Roy, A. (2021). Navigating challenges to facilitate success for college students with autism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 92:2, 252-278, doi: 10.1080/00221546.2020.1798203

Cullen, J.A. (2015). The needs of college students with autism spectrum disorders and asperger's syndrome. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 28, 89-101.

DeNigris, D., Brooks, P.J., Obeid, R. et al. (2018). Bullying and identity development: Insights from autistic and non-autistic college students. J*ournal of autism and developmental disorders*, 48(3), 666–678. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-017-3383-y

Gobbo, K., & Shmulsky, S. (2014). Faculty experience with college students with autism Spectrum Disorders: A qualitative study of challenges and solutions. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities,* 29(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357613504989

Horn, L, Peter, K, Rooney, K. (2002). Undergraduate profiles editorial note. *Education Statistics Quarterly,* 4(3), 79-86.

Kaupins, G., Chenoweth, T,. & Klein, F. (2020). Should college instructors reveal their high functioning autism in the classroom?. *Journal of Education for Business,* 95:8,534-540, doi: 10.1080/08832323.2020.1716204

Lombardi, A., Rifenbark, G.G., Monahan, J., Tarconish, E., Rhoads, C., (2020). Aided by extant data: The effect of peer mentoring on achievement for college students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability,* 33(2), 143-154.

Mandy, W., & Lai, M.C. (2017). Towards sex- and gender-informed autism research. *Autism*, 21(6), 643–645. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361317706904

McDermott, C. T., & Nachman, B. R. (2020). *United States college programs for autistic college students.* https://collegeautismnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Autism-College-Programs-PDF-McDermott-Nachman-2020-05-14.pdf

Nachman, B.R., Miller, R.A., & Vallejo Peña, E. (2020). "Whose liability is it anyway?" Cultivating an inclusive college climate for autistic LGBTQ students. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership,* 23(2), 98–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1555458919897942

Obeid, R., Bisson, J.B., Cosenza, A. et al. (2021). Do implicit and explicit racial biases influence autism identification and stigma? An implicit association test study. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders,* 51, 106–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04507-2

Shattuck, PT, Steinberg, J, Yu, J, Wei, X, Cooper, BP, Newman, L et al. (2014). Disability identification and self-efficacy among college students on the autism spectrum. *Autism Research and Treatment*, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/924182

Vallejo Peña, E., Stapleton, L.D., & Schaffer, L.M. (2016), Critical perspectives on disability identity. *New Directions*

for Student Services, 154, 85-96. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20177

Viezel, K. D., Williams, E., & Dotson, W. H. (2020). College-based support programs for students with autism. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities,* 35(4), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357620954369

White, D., Hillier, A., Frye, A., & Makrez, E. (2019). College students' knowledge and attitudes towards students on the autism spectrum. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders,* 49(7), 2699–2705. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2818-1

White, S. W., Ollendick, T. H., & Bray, B.C. (2016). College students on the autism spectrum: Prevalence and associated problems. *Autism: the international journal of research and practice*, 15(6), 683–701. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361310393363

Zaboski, B. A., & Storch, E. A. (2018). Comorbid autism spectrum disorder and anxiety disorders: A brief review. *Future neurology,* 13(1), 31–37. https://doi.org/10.2217/fnl-2017-0030

This page has been intentionally left blank.

The Use of Language in Gender-Inclusive Housing Practices and Research

Steven Feldman

Recent scholarship indicates a growing emergence in research on the experiences of transgender[1] and gender non-conforming (TGNC) college students and on the ways in which colleges and universities do or do not address the specific needs of TGNC students (Beemyn, 2005; Beemyn, 2012; Goldberg et al., 2018; Nicolazzo, 2015). As visibility increases for TGNC individuals, the higher education industry, specifically student affairs (HESA), is tasked with keeping up with the movement to provide adequate services for its students (Nicolazzo, 2017). In this article, I will delve into examples of gender-inclusive housing practices, examine policies and institutional environments, and will discuss the implications of using and misusing language on gender-inclusive housing practices and, by extension, the students that utilize them.

---

1   *Throughout this paper, when referring to the language used by various scholars, I will use the terminology they used to highlight the intricacies of language. For example, some scholars use the phrase "trans*," where the asterisk refers to computer search engine functions in which one could search for any words beginning with the prefix "trans-". While some trans* scholars embrace the term for its textual ability to highlight the variety of ways people come to identify within the trans community, other trans scholars reject the term, claiming it puts a spotlight on divisions and differences within members of the trans community. Those scholars argue that while "trans*" was meant to be a more inclusive term, the word "trans" was already inclusive to begin with. While there is validity to both positions, I personally choose to use "transgender" or "trans."*

The Structural Oppression of TGNC College Students

Although they are often viewed as progressive spaces compared to the corporate sector, most colleges and universities are still ill-equipped to serve the needs of TGNC students (Goldberg et al., 2018). Even schools that have already expanded their nondiscrimination policies to protect students based on gender identity or expression often have given little thought to how their own physical and social structures uphold binary conceptions of gender (Gardner, 2017; Seelman, 2014). These structures reinforce heteronormative conceptions of relationship-building and put TGNC students at further risk of harassment and discrimination. Additionally, most higher education institutions do not meet the comprehensive healthcare needs of transgender students either in terms of student health insurance plans or the specific healthcare services offered by the institutions (Beemyn, 2005; Lawrence & Mckendry, 2019). The current literature on transgender healthcare shows that healthcare providers often misgender, exoticize, or even refuse treatment for transgender individuals (McKinney, 2005; Santos et al., 2021). The medicalization of gender identity ensures that in order to be prescribed hormones, transgender individuals are required to undergo psychological evaluations and therapy appointments. However, since college and university counseling staff typically lack training or education on supporting transgender students, they often are unable to adequately support TGNC students (Beemyn, 2005; Lawrence & Mckendry, 2019).

It is essential for colleges and universities to provide sufficient healthcare support for all their students given the epidemic rise in mental health cases across the country (Turetsky & Sanderson, 2018). Often, students who can find healthcare staff who respect their gender identity and provide informed treatment nonetheless are unable to receive medical treatment, as "most college insurance plans specifically exclude coverage for gender reassignment surgeries and related conditions, including hormone replacement therapy" (Beemyn, 2005, p. 79). As of December 2021, more than half of the states in the United States do not provide LGBTQ-inclusive insurance protections, with one state explicitly allowing insurers to refuse coverage for gender-affirming care (Movement Advancement Project [MAP], 2021). Additionally, 20 states do not include transgender and transition-related healthcare in their state employee health benefits,

with an additional 12 states explicitly excluding those services in their state employee health benefits (MAP, 2021). With many colleges and universities taking their lead from state or federal guidelines, exclusionary and transphobic practices remain the norm at far too many institutions. These institutional forms of discrimination exist across functional areas outside of healthcare. They are pervasive in academic affairs, athletics, admissions, and perhaps most visibly in housing and residence life.

Current Definitions and Implementations of Gender-Inclusive Housing

First introduced in the early 1960s, coeducational housing quickly expanded its prevalence across American colleges and universities with over 90% of students living in coeducational college housing by 2009 (Taub et al., 2016). More recently, gender-inclusive housing has begun to gain major traction semi-nationally across the United States with an emphasis in the Northeast, Midwest, and West Coast (Taub et al., 2016; Willoughby et al., 2012). Research within HESA has consequently invested more time into documenting gender-inclusive housing initiatives as well as the experiences of students residing in gender-inclusive housing (Nicolazzo, 2015; Nicolazzo, 2017; Taub et al., 2016; Willoughby et al., 2012).

As more colleges and universities have begun to adopt gender-inclusive housing practices, the language around gender-inclusive housing policies have also changed to reflect shifting ideologies. For example, many scholars and practitioners alike have used terms like gender-neutral housing, gender-blind housing, and all-gender housing (Krum et al., 2013). For the purposes of this article, I have chosen to use the term gender-inclusive housing because gender itself is not neutral; gender is political. While many individuals identify outside of the gender binary (such as gender non-binary and gender non-conforming), the greater college culture still forces those people into gendered spaces such as locker rooms, bathrooms, athletic teams, and residence halls. In addition, even so-called gender-neutral housing initiatives that claim to be inclusive of all genders are riddled with gendered politics and gendered administrative decisions (Krum et al., 2013; Nicolazzo & Marine 2015; Nicolazzo et al., 2018). Although each college administration operates differently, at many institutions, cisgender administrators often create policies and enact change

from a top-down approach, rather than gaining insight from the communities of students who are likely to utilize gender-inclusive housing.

Even the definitions of gender-inclusive housing vary between institutions as well as between scholars. For example, Ratliff (2014) defined gender neutral housing as "housing options tailored for transgender students, non-gender-conforming students or students looking to room with members of the opposite sex" (p. 29). Krum et al. (2013) wrote that "[gender-inclusive housing] allows students of different legal sexes to live together in the same residence hall room, suite, or apartment" (p. 65). Similarly, Taub et al. (2016) defined gender-neutral housing as "the practice of allowing students of different biological sexes to share college housing, such as the same apartment, suite, or room" (p. 77). These definitions, which notably were all published in scholarly journals within the last decade, define gender-inclusive housing based on sex, or sex assigned at birth, as it is more commonly referred to nowadays. Even though scholars across disciplines (especially in the fields of gender studies, queer studies, and trans studies) have written extensively that sex and gender are two separate phenomena, much of the language around definitions of gender-inclusive housing remains rooted in the conflation of sex and gender (Butler, 1990; de Beauvoir, 2010; Stryker, 2008). Unfortunately, ignorance and a lack of intentionality often cause this conflation to occur in higher education spaces, especially ones where gender is not at the forefront of someone's daily responsibilities.

The sex/gender binary debate permeates student affairs. In the realm of residence life, the idea that sex is a biological concept whereas gender is a cultural construct has drastic implications for students living in housing on campus. Furthermore, the conflation of female/woman and male/man allows cisgender administrators in power the ability to grant or deny access to students seeking gender-inclusive housing. Nicolazzo and Marine (2015) wrote of a case study at Miami University in Ohio, where a trans student named Kaeden Kass had applied to be a Resident Assistant (RA). Kass, who openly identified as transmasculine, was told that if he were to be accepted, he would be placed according to his gender identity. However, when Kass was offered the RA position, he was placed in a female suite and would have been required to live with female roommates. This assignment erased Kass' identity as transmasculine, forcing him into a living situation based on his sex as opposed to his gender

identity. When asked about gender-inclusive housing options at Miami University, Kass responded by saying that

> [gender-inclusive housing is] only available for second-year students and up…It's very small, secretive, and hard to get into. You have to be interviewed and basically out yourself to do it…And even if that was presented as an option for me, it's the principle of the thing. Why should I have to be slotted into the 'miscellaneous' category instead of being put in the same pool of job candidates as the gender that I am? (Kingkade, 2012, para. 11)

Since gender is embedded in the very fabric of college campuses and gender non-conforming people make up a small number of college students, it becomes our imperative, as student affairs scholar-practitioners, to consider the ways in which gender-inclusive housing impacts the larger campus climate. The eradication of binary concepts of gender will create an equitable and socially just world for individuals of all gender identities, gender expressions, and sexualities.

Hobson (2014) wrote that "GNH [gender-neutral housing] forces questions about gender normative acculturation, gender construction, and gender identity and expression" (p. 34) into the dialogues we have regarding the merit of gender-inclusive housing. Gender-inclusive housing initiatives do far more in practice than simply demonstrating a first step towards a commitment to diversity and inclusion. When administrators create gender-inclusive housing as a means of checking off a box on a list of diversity initiatives, they fall short of creating effective, long-lasting change that makes a meaningful impact on the students. Ahmed (2012) describes this as "tick box diversity," where diversity becomes a means to an end rather than an end in and of itself. This approach to diversity places the institution as the priority, rather than the students at the institution.

An important note to make about gender-inclusive housing practices is that there is no consistency among colleges and universities. Krum et al. (2013) stated that most forms of gender-inclusive housing fall into one of five different categories of housing styles. These include:

- same room/different sex pairings: allows students to live in the same room with one or more roommates of any assigned sex or gender identity.
- apartment style: students of any assigned sex or gender identity live in an apartment space and share the living room, kitchen, and one or more bathrooms.
- gender identity assignment: allows students to request to be housed based on their gender identity as opposed to their assigned sex.
- evenly split groups: students apply for an apartment-style housing as groups that are evenly divided by assigned sex.
- self-contained single rooms: students live in single rooms as necessary.

The authors of the study found that participants of gender-inclusive housing are "significantly more likely to attend an institution with apartment-style housing and self-contained single units over the three other options" (p. 75). However, at many institutions, apartment-style housing and self-contained single units are only available for returning and transferring students, and sometimes at a higher cost as well (Krum et al., 2013).

Due to the high costs associated with construction and maintenance, many schools continue to use cheaper housing options such as dormitories or residence halls, which often take the form of double-occupancy rooms lining a hallway with a common bathroom. Although these options are less preferential for many students, they do keep costs down for both the institution as well as for students. With that said, these options typically remain segregated based on gender. In creating gender-inclusive housing on campuses, administrators would be wise to hear from current students regarding their housing preferences. However, research has found that in most situations, students are often left out of conversations around implementing gender-inclusive housing (Krum et al., 2013; Nicolazzo et al., 2018; Willoughby et al., 2012).

Suggestions for Future Practice and Research

As gender-inclusive housing continues to pave its way on college campuses across the United States, I offer several points for consideration for implementation. First, I would like to reiterate the argument made by Nicolazzo et al. (2018) that we need to move from

First, I would like to reiterate the argument made by Nicolazzo et al. (2018) that we need to move from implementing gender-inclusive housing as a best practice towards implementing gender-inclusive housing as an intentional practice. As they pointed out, "although there is a growing sentiment that [gender-inclusive housing] is necessary for forwarding equity and justice alongside trans* collegians, there is a lack of institutional support for the intentional implementation of this practice" (p. 226). While standardizing gender-inclusive housing as a practice at residential colleges and universities is a positive indication of support for TGNC individuals, administrators should be wary of simply placing gender-inclusive housing on the list for tick box diversity. To avoid this, institutions should move toward the creation of gender-inclusive housing as an intentional practice, one that is specific to the institution, meets the needs of all students at the institution (while paying close attention to the needs of TGNC individuals), and has support from administrators in senior leadership positions. The standardization of gender-inclusive housing is a positive step in the right direction, but only if institutions are implementing it in ways that support their TGNC student population.

Since many TGNC individuals have emphasized that educating other students on gender diversity would be beneficial for creating a more trans-inclusive campus culture (Goldberg et al., 2018), one solution could be to incorporate gender-inclusive housing into living-learning communities. Future research should look at institutions that have considered and implemented this approach to better assess the benefits and consequences of such a practice. Additionally, it could be useful to have more research surrounding the transition of TGNC individuals from high school to college. College students are largely socialized based on their lived experiences and the world in which they grew up. Their understanding of college and university life often depends on the exposure they had to it growing up. Research has begun to explore the impact of school environments on shaping one's decision to apply to and attend college, but to better understand the needs of TGNC first-year students, we should take a more active approach in understanding TGNC youth before they arrive at college (Aragon et al., 2014; Feldman et al., 2020).

Finally, research must explore the trends in language development within the fields of gender studies, queer studies, and trans studies. As I sifted through research, too often I found literature that used outdated language. Though they once served an important purpose in the history of the transgender movement, terms such as "transsexual," "MTF," "FTM," "biological sex," "legal sex," etc., are now relatively frowned upon by TGNC individuals (youth in particular) as well, as by scholars of gender studies. Without research on the ever-evolving nature of language around LGBTQ topics, we are doomed to use language without consideration to its meaning and purpose.

If we are to encourage administrators around the country to consider implementing gender-inclusive housing not only as a best practice, but as an intentional practice, then we must first implore them to become familiar with the appropriate terminology and, more importantly, the meaning behind it. It is far more important for an administrator to understand why TGNC individuals use the language they do than for them to understand what TGNC means. For example, I have seen countless examples of staff and faculty who attend LGBTQ trainings where they learn what they/them pronouns mean but they still do not understand their relationship with their own pronouns, let alone the implications of using gender-inclusive language in their policies and practices. Terminology and language may help start the conversation, but it cannot be the end of the conversation.

In academia, we have the ability to shape discourse and inform practice. In HESA, we hold a tremendous amount of power and responsibility. If we are to be truly inclusive scholar-practitioners, we owe it to the students we serve to stay up-to-date on the terminology and concepts that have been explored in depth in our sibling fields of gender studies, queer studies, and trans studies. For too long, these three fields of study have been ignored by academia and equally as much by the field of higher education and student affairs.

Concluding Thoughts

For all the progress that we have made, we have a long way to go. Despite the increase in transgender visibility, there has also been an increase in transgender violence, with transgender people of color facing the bulk of it (Strangio, 2018). With social media making activism easier to partake in from the comfort of one's own home, it is easy to engage in performative allyship rather than sustainable advocacy. Although gender

studies, queer studies, and trans studies have gained significant headway in paving a path for themselves within the stubborn world of academia, we cannot read scholarship in isolation disengaged from the realities of our time. We must continue to reflect on the ways that our field of study impacts the lived realities of students on college and university campuses.

There are more TGNC students entering college than ever before (American College Health Association, 2000, 2019; Duran & Sopelsa, 2018). We have more colleges and universities engaging in conversations around gender-inclusive housing. We have sessions on LGBTQ identities at NASPA and ACPA conferences. We have more institutions rewriting their nondiscrimination policies to be more inclusive of gender identities and gender expressions. We put gender-inclusive restrooms in several popular buildings on campus. We put our pronouns in our email signatures. And still, we have yet to see the momentous, necessary, and long-overdue changes that will truly spark a societal shift towards transgender acceptance, understanding, and safety. HESA has been playing catch-up for far too long and must make the shift to become the bold leaders for gender equity that we claim to be.

References

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

American College Health Association. (2000). *American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment: Reference Group Executive Summary Spring 2000*. American College Health Association. Retrieved February 12, 2022 from https://www.acha.org/documents/ncha/ACHA-NCHA_Reference_Group_ExecutiveSummary_Spring2000.pdf

American College Health Association. (2019). A*merican College Health Association-National College Health Assessment II: Reference Group Executive Summary,* Spring 2019. American College Health Association. Retrieved February 12, 2022 from https://www.acha.org/documents/ncha/NCHA-II_SPRING_2019_US_REFERENCE_GROUP_EXECUTIVE_SUMMARY.pdf

Aragon, S. R., Poteat, V. P., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. W. (2014). The influence of peer victimization on educational outcomes for LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ high school students. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 11(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2014.840761

Beemyn, G. (2005). Making campuses more inclusive of transgender students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 3(1), 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v03n01_08

Beemyn, G. (2012). The experiences and needs of transgender community college students. Community College *Journal of Research and Practice,* 36(7), 504–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2012.664089

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. Routledge.

de Beauvoir, S. (2010). *The second sex*. (Borde, C. and Malovany-Chevallier, S., Trans.). Vintage Books. (Original work published 1949).

Duran, E., & Sopelsa, B. (2018). More Harvard, Yale freshmen identify as LGBTQ than as conservative, surveys find. *NBC News*. Retrieved February 12, 2022 from https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/more-harvard-yale-freshmen-identify-lgbtq-conservative-surveys-find-n909781

Feldman, S., Watson, R. J., & Gallik, C. (2020). College aspirations, gender sexuality alliances, and teacher support among diverse LGBTQ youth. Educational Review. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1816907

Gardner, L. (2017, February 23). Why trans* students matter. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved February 12, 2022 from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Why-Trans-Students-Matter/239305

Goldberg, A. E., Beemyn, G., & Smith, J. Z. (2019). What is needed, what is valued: Trans students' perspectives on trans-inclusive policies and practices in higher education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 29(1), 27-67. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2018.1480376

Hobson, A. (2014). Designing and implementing a successful gender-neutral housing community. *Journal of College and Character*, 15(1), 33–38. https://doi.org/10.1515/jcc-2014-0005

Kingkade, T. (2012, March 23). Kaeden Kass, transgender student, alleges housing discrimination at Miami University of Ohio. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved February 12, 2022 from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/21/kaedan-kass-transgender-housing-discrimination_n_1370431.html

Krum, T., Davis, K., & Galupo, M. (2013). Gender-inclusive housing preferences: A survey of college-aged transgender students. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 10(1), 64–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2012.718523

Lawrence, M., & Mckendry, S. (2019). *Supporting transgender and non-binary students and staff in further and higher education*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

McKinney, J. S. (2005) On the margins: A study of the experiences of transgender college Students, *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 3(1), 63-76. https://doi.org/10.1300/J367v03n01_07

Movement Advancement Project. (2021). Equality maps: Healthcare laws and policies. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from https://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/healthcare_laws_and_policies.

Nicolazzo, Z., & Marine, S. (2015). "It will change if people keep talking": Trans* students in college and university housing. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 42(1), 160–177.

Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). Introduction: what's transgressive about trans* studies in education now? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 30(3), 211–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1274063

Nicolazzo, Z., Marine, S., & Wagner, R. (2018). From best to intentional practices: Reimagining implementation of gender-inclusive housing. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice,* 55(2), 225–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1399896

Ratliff, M. (2014). Breaking down walls: Gender inclusive housing gains momentum on campuses nationwide. *Multi-Housing News.* Retrieved from https://www.multihousingnews.com/breaking-down-walls/

Santos, T. C., Mann, E. S., & Pfeffer, C. A. (2021) Are university health services meeting the needs of transgender college students? A qualitative assessment of a public university. *Journal of American College Health,* 69(1), 59-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2019.1652181

Seelman, K. (2014). Transgender individuals' access to college housing and bathrooms: Findings from the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 26(2), 186–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2014.891091

Strangio, C. (2018). Deadly violence against transgender people is on the rise. The government isn't helping. *ACLU.* Retrieved December 14, 2021 from https://www.aclu.org/blog/lgbt-rights/criminal-justice-reform-lgbt-people/deadly-violence-against-transgender-people-rise

Stryker, S. (2008). *Transgender history.* Seal Press.

Taub, D., Johnson, R., & Reynolds, T. (2016). The implementation of gender-neutral housing: A mixed-methods study across ACUHO-I member institutions. *Journal of College and University Student Housing,* 42(2), 76–93.

Turetsky, K. M., & Sanderson, C. A. (2018). Comparing educational interventions: Correcting misperceived norms improves college students' mental health attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 48(1), 46–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12489

Willoughby, B., Larsen, J., & Carroll, J. (2012). The emergence of gender-neutral housing on American university campuses. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 27(6), 732–750. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558412447852

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Making the Invisible Visible: Current Practices and Perceptions of Internationalization of the Curriculum

Lucie Weisova & Ann Johansson

Globalization and technological development are steadily reshaping the landscape of higher education (HE) and making new demands on higher education institutions (HEIs) to prepare their graduates for the challenge of living and working in a globally connected world. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), social challenges including globalization, migration, and increased social and cultural diversity, will affect the future of education. Global awareness and social and cross-cultural skills were highlighted as 21st-century skills that students need to succeed in their future careers (OECD, 2018). Universities can address these challenges and foster active, responsible, and engaged global citizens by incorporating deliberate interventions within their formal curriculum. According to Leask (2015), an internationalized curriculum has the power to acknowledge the importance of intercultural and international skills and knowledge, as well as cultural awareness and the ability to think in a local, national, and global context. Data from the Global Survey Report of the International Association of Universities (IAU) indicated that 88% of HEIs globally considered Internationalization of the Curriculum (IoC) as important (Marinoni, 2019). Yet, most HEIs find it challenging to pursue an inclusive and systematic approach toward the IoC (Killick & Foster, 2021).

This article explores current Internationalization of the Curriculum practices and perceptions among teaching staff at a middle-sized Swedish University. Further, this article elaborates on enablers and blockers that local teaching staff face in their efforts to internationalize the curriculum. This work will serve as a foundation for stimulating the reflection and discussion amongst teams of teaching staff about the IoC in their disciplines and how to navigate future opportunities to further internationalize curricula.

Background

Leask defined the term curriculum as "the process which we, as educators, select and order content, decide on and describe intended learning outcomes, organize learning activities, and assess learner achievement" (2015, p. 8). She recognized formal (curriculum documented in course syllabi); informal (extra-curricular activities), and hidden curriculum (unspoken social and cultural messages communicated to students). The formal curriculum is influenced by institutional (university priorities); local (social, cultural, political, and economic conditions); national (economic strength, international status of the predominant language, academic reputation and population size), and global (the dominance of Western educational models) context.

The most widely used definition of IoC describes it as a process of "the incorporation of international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study" (Leask 2009, p. 209). The IoC concept is related to the concept of 'Internationalization at Home' (IaH). "Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students, within domestic learning environments" (Beelen & Jones, 2015, p. 69). These concepts are often used interchangeably both in the academic literature and in the European educational policy documents (European Commission, 2013). Both IoC and IaH stress the importance of inclusiveness as their aim is to reach all students. The intentionality as well as the fact that learning is also taking place outside the campus walls are other important factors.

During the last decade, IoC/IaH have received increased attention in European, national, and institutional policy documents. The European Commission included the IoC in European educational policies for the first time in 2013. The document 'European Higher Education in the World' underlined the importance of IoC as one of the three key priorities

for European HEIs and member states. It says: "Higher education policies must increasingly focus on the integration of a global dimension in the design and content of all curricula and teaching/learning processes (sometimes called "internationalization at home"), to ensure that the large majority of learners, the 80-90% who are not internationally mobile for either degree or credit mobility, are nonetheless able to acquire the international skills required in a globalized world." (European Commission, 2013, p. 6).

On the global level, the Nelson Mandela Bay Global Dialogue Declaration on the Future of Internationalization of Higher Education declared "increasing focus on the internationalization of the curriculum and of related learning outcomes" as one of the three integrated areas of development (IEASA, 2014, p. 2).

IoC received more attention as some of the limitations of student mobility (students moving to another institution outside their country to study for a limited time) have been highlighted. A predominant limitation is its exclusivity, as only 2.5% of the student population worldwide participate in student mobility (UIS, 2018); in addition, its uncertain effectiveness in developing students' intercultural competencies (Taskoh, 2014) and its negative impact on the global climate crisis have been discussed in the literature (de Wit & Altbach, 2020). It is also worth noting that the COVID-19 crisis has clearly demonstrated how student mobility is vulnerable to changes caused by global pandemics.

Despite some HEIs' attempts to embark on IoC, research indicates that the ways HEIs understand the IoC are still coated by myths and misconceptions which impede the implementation of IoC (Beelen & de Louw, 2020). For example, many HEIs erroneously believe that the mere presence of international students will automatically lead to the internationalization of the curriculum for all students. In their study, Spencer-Oatey & Dauber (2015) highlighted the critical need for the intentional integration of all students, as having a diverse study body does not automatically mean that education or campus is internationalized. The requirement of teaching in English in order to fulfill IoC efforts is another recorded misconception as IoC is not language-dependent and can be delivered in the local language (Jones & Reiffenrath, 2018). That curriculum taught 'offshore' is internationalized, or that more study abroad opportunities (outbound mobility) are equivalent to a more internationalized curriculum,

are additional misconceptions (Leask, 2015). The perception that cross-cultural capability must be pervasive in all courses in order to achieve IoC is one more misconception. As Caruana (2011) indicated, a significant impact can be made by making small changes to the current curriculum. Finally, the belief that a curriculum is already internationalized because of the inclusion of international literature or international guest lectures is also mistaken (Zou et al., 2019).

The first conceptual studies on IoC, its impact, and its meaning were conducted in the late 1990s (Mestenhauser, 1998). Attention has been given to several specific traits of IoC: student graduate attributes (Jones & Killick, 2013), the embedding of intercultural competencies (Deardorff & Jones 2012), global citizenship (Lilley, Barker & Harris, 2015), and intended international learning outcomes (IILOs) with related assessments (Deardorff, 2015).

IoC is a promising approach to developing intercultural and international perspectives and global learning for all students at HEIs, however, Green and Mertova (2016) argued that there is a gap between the theoretical framework and practice, particularly at the faculty level. De Wit & Hunter (2015) argue that there is still much to be done in terms of institutional implementation and engagement of academic staff, as it is not always clear to them what IoC means in practical applications. Once these obstacles are overcome, IoC "can become a driving force for change" (p. 52).

Conceptual framework

The IoC framework and IoC process created by Leask (2015) serve as a conceptual framework for this study. At the core of Leask's framework is interdisciplinary knowledge. The factors that affect disciplinary knowledge are the dominant and emerging paradigms present in the design and the scope of a curriculum. These paradigms determine whose knowledge is valued. Challenging the central paradigms in the existing curriculum is a necessary part of the IoC, which requires that academics move away from predominant Western models and search for new ways of thinking and teaching. Preparing students for professional practice and citizenship is an essential part of the curriculum and it should nurture students' emergence as "ethical and responsible citizens and human beings" (Leask, 2015, p. 30). The activities in the informal curriculum should also enhance the rigor of the formal curriculum. A core tenet of every curriculum is the assessment of student learning. Students following an IoC should be

assessed on how well they achieve international and intercultural learning outcomes. The IoC should be systematically developed to enhance the achievement of desired learning results. This requires cooperation among colleagues across a study program and support from the institutions' student services staff.

The process of IoC (Leask, 2015) is similar to a traditional curriculum review, wherein program and course goals, intended learning outcomes, teaching & learning activities and assessment tasks are designed. Still, the IoC process is more critically reflective and encourages teaching staff to think of new possibilities in their teaching planning process. The first stage, the "review and reflect" stage, embraces initial discussions about IoC. According to Leask (2015), this stage should provide us with the following answers: "To what extent is our curriculum internationalized? What is already happening?" (p. 44-45). At this stage IoC definitions, purposes, and goals should be explained to teaching staff. Then, the existing curriculum is reviewed to lay the foundation for the next phases of the IoC process. In the second stage, "imagine," teaching staff is encouraged to challenge traditional paradigms and think about alternative knowledge traditions. In the third stage, "revise and plan," decisions are taken about what short-term and long-term changes and actions will be made in the curriculum. "Act," stage four, focuses on the implementation of the IoC plans selected and the impact evaluation methodology. The effectiveness of the changes and actions is assessed during the fifth and final stage, "evaluate". As the curriculum development process is cyclical, the results are assessed and participants start again at the "review and reflect" stage (Leask, 2015).

Based on the literature, it is apparent that the IoC as a concept has a range of interpretations, and that the core meaning of IoC may be challenging to grasp (Caruana, 2011). As a result, it is not easy to understand what it means to practice IoC at a HEI. The lack of support for teaching staff to work with IoC compounds these issues (Zou et al., 2019). De Wit and Hunter appeal to HEIs to contextualize and institutionalize the approach to IoC to facilitate its implementation (2015). This article addresses this call and maps to what extent the curriculum is internationalized within different programs at the School of Health and Welfare. Furthermore, the article identifies enablers and blockers that local teaching staff encountered in their efforts to internationalize the curriculum.

Study context

IoC received long-awaited attention in a proposal for a new national internationalization strategy for 2020-2030. It proposed, among other things, that all students who attend the institution should have "developed their international understanding or intercultural competence" by graduation (SOU 2018:3, p.130). Unfortunately, the Swedish government has not yet acted upon this proposal (Myklebust, 2021). Thus, the responsibility remains with individual HEIs, which do not always have the right competencies and infrastructure in place to implement IoC/IaH (SOU 2018:3).

In December 2020, the Swedish Government presented new research propositions for 2021-2024 (Prop. 2020/21:60). One of the outcomes was a modernization of the Higher Education Act on internationalization: "the collected international activities of each higher education institution must enhance the quality of its research and education, and make a national and global contribution to sustainable development" (Prop. 2020/21:60, p. 179). The change entailed a stronger mandate, which is expected to lead to a strategic review of HEIs' internationalization and result in new ways of working and forms of collaboration. This new shared goal should serve as a strategic guide for HEIs in their internationalization work (Prop. 2020/21:60).

This study was undertaken at the School of Health and Welfare (HHJ) at Jönköping University (JU) during May and June 2020. In total, JU has approximately 12,000 registered students (including 2,400 international students) and roughly 800 employees. HHJ has approximately 1,650 full-time students and 140 employees. HHJ offers programs at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels (JU, 2020). "To develop IoC in program and course syllabi according to programs' needs and conditions" is one of the recently implemented long-term goals in HHJ's strategic plan 2021-2024. At the institutional level, internationalization is a part of an overall institutional strategy that emphasizes worldwide engagement and collaboration across borders, but neither IoC nor IaH are embedded in the strategy (JU, 2020).

The Swedish government decides the central (national) intended learning outcomes for each degree. The outcomes for Bachelor of Science degrees are stated in the Qualification Ordinance of the Swedish Higher Education Ordinance from 1993 (SFS 1993:100 with subsequent amendments) and for the Master of Science from 1992 and revised 2006 (SFS 1992:1434

revised 2006:173 1 Ch. 9 §). In addition to the national learning outcomes for each degree, every program of study can create its own 'local' program-specific learning outcomes.

Methods

Design

This study combined quantitative data with qualitative data (Sandelowski, 2000) to capture the participants' experiences of internationalizing the curriculum.

Sample

Eight undergraduate and six graduate programs participated in the study. Table 1 describes them in detail. The program managers and the board members in the HHJ's International Council were identified as appropriate participants for this study, 24 persons from 14 programs in total. All participants are active teachers in their study programs.

Data collection

For the purpose of this study, a modified web-based version of the Questionnaire on Internationalization of the Curriculum (QIC) was created to fit the needs of HHJ. It is a combination of three existing QIC versions created by Leask (2015): the original questionnaire with many qualitative open-ended questions (QIC1); the quantitative, five-point scale questionnaire with limited space for written comments (QIC2), and the shortened version of the original questionnaire (QIC1 Abridged). QIC was designed to stimulate the first stage discussion ("review and reflect") about IoC and what actions would best internationalize the curriculum within study disciplines. The modified version with many open-ended questions and space for comments and reflections are more qualitative in nature, but even here respondents are asked to assess different statements on a continuum of 1-4 where one represents a localized curriculum and four an internationalized curriculum.

Additionally, the Enablers and Blockers Questionnaire (Leask, 2015) was included in the modified version. Leask used the terms enablers and blocker to illustrate any factors that can support/inhibit staff in the IoC development. She recommended using this questionnaire later, during the "revision and planning" stage. However, it was in the interest of the studied program managers to know the current situation and challenges the teaching staff faces to be able to adapt effectively for the next steps of IoC wor-

k. Overall, the questionnaire contained 27 questions designed to challenge myths and misconceptions related to IoC and let teaching staff reflect upon their curriculum holistically from learning, teaching, and assessment perspective.

The questionnaires' purpose is not gathering data for statistical analysis or measuring the programs' performance. Instead, they should help HEIs gain insight into what is already happening in various study programs; explore the international dimensions of the curriculum's different elements; note the attitudes the teaching staff have toward internationalization of their programs; assess the importance of IoC, and ultimately answer the question "to what extent is the curriculum internationalized?" (Leask, 2015). As the questionnaire was intended to be filled in by the program managers and not all teaching staff at the School of Health and Welfare, the questions focus only on the program level (and not the course/module level). Despite the omissions, the questionnaire still shed light on the individual elements of the curriculum such as content, teaching and learning arrangements, assessment and the context within which the program is taught.

The survey was created in the esMaker software, version 3.0 (© Entergate AB). Before filling out the survey, participants from each program took part in an introductory meeting where the concept of IoC and the purpose of the study were explained, and the QIC's rationale was clarified. After that, the online link and detailed instructions for the QIC were sent to the participants via email.

Data analysis

The responses from the survey were analyzed with the support of esMaker software and summarized by the first author. Afterwards, both authors worked together on developing themes and selecting quotes. To give a complete picture of how the participants experienced internationalizing the curriculum, quantitative data and qualitative data were combined. The different sections in the survey with similar contents were merged into themes. The results are reported in the following three sections: the preconditions for effective work on the IoC; teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements; and enablers and blockers. Each theme provides quotations from the participants to further illustrate their responses.

Table 1 *Participating programs*

Academic level	Programs
Undergraduate programs (n=8)	Biomedical Laboratory Science - focusing Laboratory Medicine
	Biomedical Laboratory Science - focusing Clinical Physiology
	Dental Hygiene
	Diagnostic Radiology Nursing
	Nursing
	Occupational Therapy
	Prosthetics & Orthotics
	Social Work
Graduate programs (n=6)	Gerontology
	Nordic master's degree program in Gerontology
	Occupational Therapy
	Quality Improvement and Leadership in Health and Welfare
	The specialist nursing program with a focus on district nursing
	The specialist nursing program with a focus on health and care for children and youth

Ethical considerations

The participants were informed about the process, possible consequences, and risks of participating in the study; how the data would be managed; and how they could obtain the study results, and gave their consent to participate. The participants remain anonymous to maintain confidentiality, and the results are reviewed and compiled as a group. All 14 programs were described in alphabetical order, Program A – N.

Results

The results are organized into three sections covering the preconditions for effective work with IoC; teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements; and enablers and blockers of IoC.

The preconditions for effective work with IoC

Importance of IoC

All the participating program directors agreed on the importance of IoC in their programs. On a scale of 1 - 4 (1 meaning not important at all, 4 meaning essential), four programs perceived IoC as essential (1), nine programs chose 3, and one program 2. This result was bolstered by open-ended comments from participants which explained why IoC is important for their programs. The answers reflect the universal responsibility to prepare students to work in a global and local context; improving research and keeping track with new methods; delivering more concrete, hands-on benefits to students such as treating patients with different cultural backgrounds, and providing students with information concerning how their profession varies in other countries. Providing relevant support to international students; supporting internationalization at home through enhancing integration of Swedish and international students in the classroom, and developing courses with clear international perspectives were also mentioned. "Internationalization abroad risks missing 'local' students (e.g., training of local leaders), however, it is also important for local students to become more aware of global issues" (Program C).

Intended international learning outcomes (IILOs) in undergraduate and graduate program syllabi

There were three programs, all on the bachelor level, that defined IILOs in their program curricula. For example, "demonstrate the ability to see welfare inter-ventions in a global and intercultural context" (Program K). In the master-level programs, there were no explicit IILOs. However, international contexts were mentioned in three program curricula, i.e., "discuss and argue for theory and evidence, both orally and in writing, in national as well as international contexts" (Program G).

Rationale for IoC

Ten program directors answered that the rationale for IoC in their programs is frequently discussed and debated by members of the program team. Three programs indicated that IoC is sometimes discussed but never seems to reach a resolution, and thus, no action is taken. One program indicated that IoC is understood and agreed upon by the entire program team. No program director indicated that the rationale for IoC is never discussed. The open-ended comments from the participants revealed that some of the programs discuss how to internationalize at home, but this has not been implemented systematically. Additionally, a participant from "program G" mentioned that not all staff is included. "The staff at the program have a positive attitude in this subject, but not all have internationalization as priority number one".

Teaching staff understanding of the international context of the discipline and related professions

This section discloses the leadership approach toward teaching staff understanding of the international context of their discipline and related professions. The questionnaire asked if this is required from all staff or only from some of them, and if leadership encourages their staff to have such an understanding.

In seven programs, all teaching staff are encouraged and required to continually develop their international understanding of the discipline and related professions. In three programs, some teaching staff are required to have a good understanding of the discipline and associated professions internationally. In two programs, some teaching staff are encouraged to have a good understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally. Only one program neither encouraged nor required their teaching staff to develop these qualities

Teaching staff confidence in internationalizing the curriculum

For the question "how confident teaching staff currently are about their ability to internationalize the curriculum" (on a scale of 1-4, where four indicates very confident and one little confidence), eight programs assessed themselves as a 3, five programs chose 2, and one program each chose 1 and 4. One reflection from one program director stated, "The question is: Is it necessary to be at 4 [the highest score]? For whom? We are working on demand. Who is asking for this? Maybe it is ok to be on a 3" (Program I).

Teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements

In this section, the importance of the central elements of IoC (teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements) are described.

Encouraging and supporting students to work effectively in cross-cultural groups and teams

On a scale of 1 - 4 (1 meaning not important at all and 4 meaning essential), two programs found themselves at scale 4 to support students working in cross-cultural groups and teams. Eight programs assessed themselves on scale 3, and two programs chose scale 1 and 2. Participants from "program H" stated, "We encourage [this] from day one in the program through group work and appreciation of background" (Program H). Some of the programs expressed the expectation to increase all students' intercultural competence by simple integration with international students. "When the opportunity is given, students from our program work together with students from partner universities. Because it creates an increased cultural awareness and understanding among students" (Program K). At the same time, other programs found it impossible to internationalize a curriculum without international students (in this context: students coming to Sweden for credit or degree mobility). "We do not have students from other countries in our program" (Program D).

Development of students' international and intercultural skills and knowledge

The importance placed on teaching and learning arrangements in assisting all students in developing international and intercultural skills and knowledge varied across the different programs. On the same continuum (1-4), no program indicated scale 4. Nine

programs chose 3; four programs chose 2 and one program 1. One participant expressed: "We have learning outcomes that support these skills, but we have to work more systematically and progressively with the competencies and skills" (Program G). Some participants' comments presuppose that intercultural interaction and international experience must happen when students study abroad. "We give our students the possibilities to study abroad" (Program I).

However, there are also other examples of intercultural interactions and international experiences being encouraged at home through international teachers and international students:
"We have a lot of teachers from abroad, by web or other possibilities like pods" (Program I). "We encourage building engagement between students, and since our students are international this happens naturally. We try to build groups so that they become as international as possible" (Program F).

Cultural perspectives in assessment

The extent to which the assessment tasks across the program required students to recognize intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice is discussed in this section. Most of the programs placed themselves at a 3 on the scale. However, open-ended comments confirmed that cultural competencies in the various assessments are still in the early stages of development: "[They are] part of assignments in four courses, but the teaching and teacher input needs to be developed to enable a consideration of a larger variety of issues" (Program F). "[A] workshop is planned for June 2020 to lay down concrete plans for how to integrate language and background diversity into both learning exercises and assessment activities" (Program H). There were a few concrete examples of assessment: "It occurs in seminars and reflection assignments. Ethical aspects" (Program B).

Enablers and Blockers

The predefined enablers supporting the development and provision of an internationalized curriculum were chosen as follows: one's own international experience and personal commitment to and understanding of what internationalization of the curriculum means (n=9); teaching staff are encouraged, supported, and rewarded to attend international conferences, including those operating outside of the dominant disciplinary paradigm (n=7); local, school-based experts and enthusiasts who know what internationalization of the curriculum means in my discipline and for my teaching and can assist in practical ways (n=5), and a balanced

and comprehensive international strategy in both policy and practice (n=4).

Other enablers identified by respondents include: a balanced and comprehensive strategy and support from the International Office, International Council, and the group of contact teachers. Some programs disclosed ways they work to strengthen the IoC. Here, student exchange and clinical placements abroad, providing lectures with international guest professors, discussions involving talks about sustainability and sustainable development goals, and teaching staff's interest in working internationally were among the reported practices. One program expressed that they are already aware of the challenges, and all teaching staff were involved in working through them.

The most common blockers that teaching staff faced when internationalizing the curriculum are the following: workload formulae that do not include allocation of time for degree program team meetings and engagement in scholarly activity related to teaching and learning, including curriculum design and internationalization of the curriculum (n=8); lack of support for the practical issues of internationalization of the curriculum at the degree program level (n=6); leaders who are not committed to or informed about the internationalization of the curriculum at institutional, school, and degree program level (n=5), and insufficient funding and support provided to enable teaching staff to attend international conferences, visit international colleagues, or participate in other international experiences related to their work (n=4).

Other blockers respondents identified were: the lack of an institution-wide internationalization strategy; increased workload due to Covid-19; frequent leadership changes; an unstable working situation with a high turnover rate; not all staff perceiving internationalization as a priority; staff questioning why this should be done, and uncertainty in using English as a language of instruction.

What type of support and assistance is needed?

This section investigates how teaching staff can be supported in their work with IoC. The responses indicate that time and competence development are crucial so that teachers can learn concrete methods for internationalizing learning activities and outcomes. Also needed is support on how to engage cultural diversity in the classroom and an ongoing discussion and reflection upon international differences and similarities. First-hand international experience through teacher exchange as well as international contacts with other universities globally were mentioned several times as an effective way to create a greater understanding and insights into IoC. The answers concerning the question of how teaching staff should be rewarded for IoC were not united. Some participants mentioned participation in international conferences as a reward. For others, IoC was a natural part of their work and did not require extra rewards. Additionally, some of the participants disclosed that there is much work to be done in this area. One comment describes that if teachers are supposed to do this work, the decision should be made on the institutional level.

Discussion

The present study focuses on mapping to what extent the curriculum is internationalized in the School of Health and Welfare (HHJ), as well as staff-identified enablers and blockers to achieving this task. The data collected indicates that most of the programs at HHJ acknowledge the importance of IoC in their programming. There is a clear presence of international spirit, interest, and a desire among teaching staff to work with internationalization; however, the results are lagging. Several IoC activities are taking place in the program curriculum currently, but these are not explicitly specified in IILOs nor strategically developed throughout the program. Similar to Leask & Beelen (2009) and Green & Mertova's (2016) findings, our study finds that without comprehensive IoC planning, there is a risk that these initiatives will remain fragmented and sporadic which will lead to unequal opportunities for students. Making the invisible visible by specifying the IILOs in every program may be a crucial first step in IoC planning. The results show that without specified IILOs, the international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions in content, learning, teaching, and assessment are vague.

It is necessary to dig deeper into this issue and explore why IILOs are not as prevalent in the programs. One explanation might be at the time this study was conducted, there was no direction, regulation, or support from university leadership to internationalize the curriculum. Another explanation is the prevailing student mobility mindset among staff presented by the belief that internationalization equals student mobility only. Health-related curricula are often highly regulated and program managers can feel there is not enough space for IILOs. Furthermore, the central (national) intended learning outcomes for each degree have no specific internationalized dimensions. It is worth

noting that the Qualification Ordinance of Swedish Higher Education was created already in 1993. In 1993, internationalization work at Swedish HEIs was not so widespread and was not as high a priority as it is today. Additionally, if study programs have no local program-specific learning outcomes within their study program plan, there are no incentives for creating IILOs in program courses.

The encouragement of student engagement in intercultural interaction and international experiences was high overall. However, assisting students in developing international and intercultural skills and knowledge is an area that still requires further improvement. Likewise, assessments are only vaguely described, so it is difficult to accurately judge what is being assessed in these courses/modules. This is somewhat surprising as Leask's (2015) process of IoC is similar to traditional curriculum development and constructive alignment (Biggs & Tang, 2007).

Personal international experiences and commitment to internationalization are identified as the primary enablers for staff to work with IoC. In this context, it is not surprising that "personal international experience" in the form of teaching mobility (teaching staff spending a limited time teaching at the partner institution in another country) is frequently mentioned as an effective tool for IoC in our findings. The teaching staffs' mobility is a strong card at the HHJ as many teachers spend one-week teaching at the partner universities. Teaching staff mobility can bring new perspectives, inspiration, and teaching practices that can concretely benefit the internationalization of the curriculum. If this international engagement of teaching staff is incorporated into the structure of their study programs, this could allow for thus-far untapped opportunities for advancing IoC. However, even teaching staff mobility, much like student mobility, contributes to negative climate effects. The emerging virtual forms of teaching staff mobility can balance this downside.

Lack of time and support is the main blocker to the IoC process. Surprisingly, the lack (or poor communication) of institutional vision and policy, and the missing link between institutional internationalization strategy and the formal and informal curriculum concern only one third of participants. No participants mentioned inflexible curricula as a blocker in internationalizing the curriculum, even though curricula at the School of Health and Welfare are highly regulated, which typically impedes internationalization activities.

There is a determination to develop IoC among the teaching staff in this study. Still, it is not always clear what IoC means in the reality of each discipline/ program, which is a known problem (Zou et al., 2019.) Consistent with previous findings, many common misconceptions are present in this study. Some of the respondents assert that they have accomplished IoC on account of the presence of international students and staff in their program. Consistent with van Gaalen & Gielesen's (2016) findings that some participants assumed that students would automatically increase their intercultural awareness by working in mixed groups with international students (Zou et al., 2019). On the contrary, some programs believed that they could never achieve IoC due to the absence of study abroad possibilities or international staff/students, or because the curriculum was already too packed. This pinpoints the mobility mindset among participating teaching staff.

Methodological considerations

This study has some limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the results. The modified version of the original survey (QIC) might have been too extensive. Even though an introductory meeting took place where the purpose of the study was explained and the QIC's rationale was clarified before the survey was distributed, some of the participants found the questions hard to understand. This lack of understanding might have affected the validity of our findings. This study was based upon a survey with open-ended answers, and therefore, the results contain quotations reflecting some of the participants' voices. However, as the open-ended responses are not answered by all participants, the qualitative responses submitted may not represent the whole group. The descriptive design was considered more feasible as a starting point but a qualitative design with interviews might have been a potential alternative.

Recommendations and further research

It will require more support and awareness of IoC's individual elements to improve IoC efforts and observe a meaningful shift in teaching staff mindset toward IoC. Recommendations include: local program-specific IILOs be created in the study program plan; IILOs be incorporated into course curriculum; benefits of IoC be explicitly explained to students; teaching approaches be employed to engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds and their prior learning experiences and international, intercultural, and global dimensions be referred to throughout the entire cycle of curriculum

development. A top-down strategy at the institutional level would also be helpful in underlining the importance of IoC. A holistic approach and staff engagement at all levels (i.e., academic staff, management, and administrative support) is needed to facilitate this long-term transformative process and shift toward a fully internationalized curriculum. Professional development opportunities, leadership support, and allocation of time for IoC development are necessary - without this, this work will not move forward.

Our data contribute to a clearer understanding of how IoC is perceived in different programs, their strengths and weaknesses, their current standing, and their future trajectory. The results indicate that the participating programs are at different stages in the IoC process; this is most likely because each program has different conditions, requirements, priorities, and levels of available support. Further research on the state of IoC efforts at the course level within individual programs would provide a more comprehensive picture. Identification and dissemination of best practices would also be beneficial. The presented data will serve as a foundation for future actions and steps toward a more internationalized curriculum.

Conclusion

This article explores the current practices and perceptions of Internationalization of the Curriculum (IoC) among teaching staff within The School of Health and Welfare at Jönköping University in Sweden. It provides information about the background and theoretical framework, explaining the main concepts and the growing importance of IoC in the last decade, touching common myths and misconceptions and introducing Leak's (2015) conceptual framework of IoC. The findings from the Questionnaire on Internationalization of the Curriculum (QIC) identify to what extent the curriculum is internationalized at different programs of the participating department, taking into account the individual elements of the curriculum such as intended learning outcomes, program content, and teaching, learning arrangements, and assessment. The participants' responses, comments, and reflections provided a blueprint for the next steps in this IoC planning. Results show that these programs are situated at various stages of the IoC process. The essential enabler identified is teachers' individual international experiences and personal commitments, while the heavy workload required to implement this practice is the biggest blocker for the IoC work. The

authors conclude with a few recommendations: taking a holistic approach to getting academic staff on board with the IoC process; creating intentional local program-specific international learning outcomes; employing teaching strategies that engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds; utilizing global dimensions throughout the entire cycle of the curriculum, and finally, employing a top-down institutional strategy that provides competence development and time for teaching staff to pursue this goal.

References

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalisation at Home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area* (pp. 59–72). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Using Constructive Alignment in Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning Teaching for Quality Learning at University* (3rd ed., pp. 50-63). Open University Press.

Caruana, V. (2011). *Internationalising the curriculum - Exploding myths and making connections to encourage engagement.* https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/internationalising-curriculum-exploding-myths-and-making-connections-encourage

Deardorff, D. (2015). *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators; A practical approach.* Stylus.

de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). Understanding Internationalization of Higher education in the European context. In H. de Wit et al. (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education* (pp. 41-58). Brussels: European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies. http//10.2861/444393

de Wit, H. (2020). Internationalization of Higher Education: The Need for a More Ethical and Qualitative Approach. *Internationalization of Higher Education. Journal of International Students,* 10(1), i–iv. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1893

de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2020). Internationalization in higher education: global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 5(1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.10 0/23322969.2020.1820898

Deardorff, D., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural Competence: An Emerging Focus in International Higher Education. In *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 283–303).

European Commission. (2013). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: European higher education in the world* (COM (2013) 499 final). https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2013/EN/1-2013-499-EN-F1-1.Pdf

Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2016). Transformalists and transactionists: Towards a more comprehensive understanding of academics' engagement with "internationalization of the curriculum." *Research in Comparative and International Education,* 11(3), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499916662372

IEASA. (2014). *Nelson Mandela Bay Global Dialogue Declaration on the Future of Internationalization Higher Education.* https://www.ieaa.org.au/charters/global-dialogue-declaration#:~:text=January%20 2014,with%20ethical%20considerations%20and%20inclusivity'.

Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312473655

Jones, E. & Reiffenrath, T. (2018, 21 August). *Internationalisation at home in practice*. EAIE. https://www.eaie.org/blog/internationalisation-at-home-practice.html.

Jönköping University. (20201). About the University. https://ju.se/en/about-us.html

Jönköping University. (20202). Vision. https://ju.se/en/about-us/jonkoping-university/vision.html

Killick, D., & Foster, M. (2021). *Learner relationships in global higher education. A critical pedagogy for a multicultural world.* Routledge.

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curriculum to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329786

Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2009). Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education. *Proceedings of a Joint IEAA-EAIE Symposium* (pp. 28-40). International Education Association of Australia. https://www.academia.edu/12870810/Leask_B_and_Beelen_J_2010_Enhancing_the_engagement_of_academic_staff_in_international_education

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum. Routledge.*

Lilley, B., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2015). Educating global citizens: a good "idea" or an organizational

practice? *Higher Education Research and Development,* 34(5), 957–971. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729460.2015.1011089

Marinoni, G. (2019). Internationalisation of Higher Education: An Evolving Landscape, Locally and Globally (IAU 5th Global survey). IAU.

Mestenhauser, J. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J. Mestenhauser, & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus.* American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Myklebust, J. P. (2021, 20 January). *Internationalization goal set to be missed, says report.* University World News. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210120135323211

OECD. (2018). *The future of education and skills. Education 2030.* https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health,* 23(4), 334–340.

SCB. (2019). *Utrikes födda i Sverige. [Foreign-born person in Sweden].* SCB. https://www.scb.se/hitta-statistik/sverige-i-siffror/manniskorna-i-sverige/utrikes-fodda/

SFS 1993:100. *Högskoleförordningen. [Higher Education Ordinance].* https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/hogskoleforordning-1993100_sfs-1993-100

SFS 1992:1434. *Högskolelag. [Higher Education Act].* https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/hogskolelag-19921434_sfs-1992-1434

SOU (2018). *En strategisk agenda för internationalisering. [The need to integrate internationalization in the management of and at higher education institutions].* Statens Offentliga Utredningar, SOU 2018:3. https://www.regeringen.se/490aa7/contentassets/2522e5c3f8424df4aec78d2e48507e4f/en-strategisk-agenda-for-internationalisering.pdf

Spencer-Oatey, S., & Dauber, D. (2015). *How internationalised is your university? From structural indicators to an agenda for integration.* UK Council for International Student Affairs.

Taskoh, A. K. (2014). *A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalisation in Postsecondary Education: An Ontario Case Study.* Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1933

UIS, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2018). National monitoring. http://data.uis.unesco.org/?fbclid=IwAR1OtoGMb_VJODpsMLzIo8n8QsU6TsURCbm65z5YwmFjzIV8q4k2AXJrrTA

van Gaalen, A., & Gielesen, R. (2016). Internationalization at home: Dutch higher education policies. In E. Jones, R. Coelen, J. Beelen & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Global and local internationalisation* (pp. 149-154). Sense Publishers.

Zou, T., Chu, B., Law, L., Lin, V., Ko, T., Yu, M., & Mok, P. (2019). University teachers' conceptions of internationalization of the curriculum: a phenomenographic study. *Higher Education.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00461-w

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Theme II: History and Context for Underrepresented Groups

Modern Orthodox Jews at American Colleges: History and Current Issues

Jonathan Schwab

Introduction

The history of Jews in American universities is far from simple. With their roots in Christianity, institutions of higher education were not always welcoming to Jews. Yet despite historical exclusions, Jews presently enjoy nearly unfettered access to higher education, becoming proportionally well-represented in student and faculty bodies. But acceptance and belonging and does not hold true across different types of Jews. A small subset of the American Jewish population, Modern Orthodox Jews – and specifically college-going ones – are worth careful examination, as a group of deeply faithful people who want to be part of broader communities.

Despite a well-worn narrative of rivalry between the ivory towers of higher education and the solemn houses of prayer, modern student affairs as a profession is increasingly embracing of faith and its role in student development. At a moment when questions abound about the future of American institutions of higher education, the Modern Orthodox experience may be a bellwether for increasingly diverse campuses. Or their experience may remain in the margins, misunderstood and mischaracterized.

This paper is divided into three sections. First, a general and brief history of Jews of all types in American universities will give broad context. Second, Modern Orthodoxy will be described in the present and through its emergence. Third, an analysis of how campus-based Modern Orthodox institutions have changed in the past few decades will shed further light on this population.

Finally, these ideas will be put into context of larger trends in higher education.

Part I: A History of Jews in American Universities

Jews have been part of the broad multicultural fabric of society in America since its inception as a nation. The American Jewish experience has been a quintessentially immigrant one, as many arrived seeking refuge from discrimination, expulsions, or extermination elsewhere. Like many areas of American life, higher education was closed entirely or restricted greatly to Jews until relatively recently, an exclusion that seems shocking contrasted to today's reality. Currently, Jewish students are present in substantial numbers, and Jewish faculty are even more visible across numerous disciplines.

From a small number of colonial-era Jews based in New England and predominantly based in banking and merchant work, the Jewish American population grew and diversified through waves of immigration (Sarna, 2019). In the mid-nineteenth century, Jews from Central Europe began to arrive in greater numbers, often working as peddlers or small-time shopkeepers. Later, more moneyed and educated German Jewish immigrants brought with them professional aspirations and the denominational schisms that had emerged alongside their economic attainments in Germany, both of which contributed to changes in the American Jewish community.

Throughout most of the 1800s, Jews were still largely absent in America's universities, even as higher education expanded in that century (Marsden, 1994; Sarna, 2019). By a combination of explicit exclusion and veiled quotas, Jewish numbers remained low. But higher education was not yet the pathway to success for most Americans, and many Jews were content to live relatively insular lives. Most importantly, institutions of learning on American soil – both secular and Jewish – did not have the aura of the venerated halls of Europe. Jews wanted their rabbis and leaders trained in the Old World, able to translate erudition into English only when necessary, so their exclusion from the American academy did not generate the ire it later would.

By the turn of the century, however, this began to change. Between 1881 and 1920, Jews began to enroll in greater numbers at many universities, most heavily at schools in and around New York City and at the Ivy League institutions that would accept them (Marsden, 1994). New generations of Jews – born and educated on American soil or arriving young with a hunger for

education as a fulfillment of the American dream – flocked to campus (Thelin, 2011). The expansion of American universities created opportunities and these Jews took full advantage, vaulting to nearly 10% of the total American undergraduate student body in 1918. In New York City, then and now the population center of Jewish America, two colleges especially enrolled huge numbers of Jewish men (Gurock, 1988). At the City College of New York (CCNY), as many as 80% of students were immigrants from Eastern Europe or their descendants, with a large portion being Jews. In fact, New York University (NYU) was sometimes derogatorily referred to as "NY Jew" for its high proportion of Jewish students and faculty.

Orthodox Jews, though, faced an uphill battle for full participation as they felt unwelcome and unwanted in an academic environment intolerant of the religious Jew (Gurock, 1988). Committed to an extensive schedule of holiday observances, Orthodox Jews found it hard to persist in their studies; CCNY observed the High Holidays, but NYU did not. Neither school observed other Jewish holidays, which could interrupt midterms, finals, and homework. And, as Sabbath observers, Orthodox students could not take courses that met on Friday afternoons or evenings – or would learn from an informal network to avoid those professors who punitively assigned hours of extra work for missing those classes. All too often, those faculty were Jews themselves who looked down on Orthodox students as insufficiently integrated into America and punished their co-religionists for this (Kraut, 2011).

Orthodox Jews also struggled to maintain their identity and devotion amid the excessive strains of the modern campus, which were harsh to those devoted to firm theologies. Coming from the sheltered Jewish parochial school system, these students were unprepared for the clash between the religious studies that many of them undertook off-campus, and college life (Gurock, 1988). One student described college life as having "antagonistic forces…and the dark abyss of unending conflict" (p. 86). Trying to find a more integrated balance, a group of students and supporters dissatisfied with the CCNY experience lobbied Bernard Revel, the head of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS) rabbinical school, to start an academic institution that could rival others in New York City. By 1924, Revel was raising funds for a Yeshiva College, and in addition to financial support was inundated by letters from unemployed Jewish academics who, prevented by antisemitism from holding jobs elsewhere, hoped for positions at this new college.

At the same time, another factor in favor of Yeshiva College was the backlash against the "Jewish problem," as the presidents of Harvard and Columbia openly called it (Thelin, 2011, p. 197). As numbers of Jewish students had steadily grown, subtle policies were put in place to stop this trend, but soon stronger strategies were employed. After measures of academic ability failed to keep out Jews, universities set maximum percentages of their student body that could be Jews. This backlash against Jewish enrollment is understood in several ways: colleges exercising greater selectivity as interest in higher education boomed; anxiety about preserving the "Christian character" of colleges; or a reflection of the rising antisemitism everywhere. The end result was the exclusion of Jews in many places (Marsden, 1994).

The exclusions of the late 1920s and 1930s reversed drastically following World War II. With Jews recast as important partners in American "Judeo-Christian" heritage, their numbers on campus boomed and their experiences changed (Marsden, 1994). Jews used their newfound clout and wealth to advocate for themselves and others. Jewish college students became vocal supporters of the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and later, of Israel, especially following the Six Day War of 1967 (Sarna, 2019). The Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ) was founded in 1964 by college Jews as a movement to energetically, idealistically, and fervently condemn the injustice foisted on their brethren half a world away (Ferziger, 2015). In contrast to what they felt the previous generation had done during the Holocaust, these college students – led by a visible vanguard of Orthodox Jews – were the newly powerful voice of American Jews.

Jewish college students pursued political causes because of how positive their university experiences had become. With exclusions being a thing of the past, hundreds of thousands of Jewish students enjoyed the full embrace of their campuses. As Hillel's leader noted in 1961: "They are third-generation Americans and at home in America. There is no underprivileged position. There is no quota system." (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018, p. 103). The flourishing of Jewish life on campus was also reflected in the classroom, on both sides of the lectern. The number of dedicated Jewish Studies professors nationwide went from a dozen in 1945 to sixty in 1965, and the Association for Jewish Studies, founded in 1969, enrolled hundreds of new

academics over the following decades, boasting nearly 2,000 individuals and 70 institutions by 2021 (Sarna, 2019). A 2005 survey found that nearly half of Jewish-identifying college students had taken at least one course in Jewish Studies (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018). As the "Christian character" of nonsectarian institutions have weakened, and as Jews have adopted complex, combined American identities, Jews seem to have firm footing in the modern American academy, poised to continue evolving with their American haven (Marsden, 1994).

Part II: Modern Orthodox Jews and Education

Modern Orthodoxy, as a distinctive sect that was rooted in an American attempt to bridge rabbinical traditions of Europe to a new home, emerged in the 1920s (Ferziger, 2015). In broad strokes, Modern Orthodox Jews philosophically believe in observance of traditional rabbinic law, or halacha, alongside participation in American culture.[1] In addition to the tension between halacha and what is often called "secular values," there is a third contending force: that of Modern Orthodox culture, with semi-insular communities tending toward the upper middle class and concentrated in certain major metropolitan areas. These tensions lead to numerous contradictions and complications, but it is especially in education – and higher education – that they can be seen.

The 2015 Pew Center Survey on Jewish Americans shows Modern Orthodox numbers as a small subset of America's relatively minor Jewish population. Of the 5.3 million American Jews, around 10% identify with Orthodoxy, the most traditional denomination, which is significantly fewer than Reform (35%), Conservative (18%), and Jews of no denomination (30%). Of the half a million Orthodox Jews, 31% describe themselves as Modern Orthodox, which puts estimates of their American population between 150,000 and 200,000.

Most other Orthodox Jews identify as Haredi or Ultra-Orthodox (Pew, 2015). Haredi Jews avoid shifts from ancestral practices of pre-war Eastern European Jewish life. By contrast, Modern Orthodox Jews claim that integration into American society need not come at the expense of religious observance (Ferziger, 2015).

[2]For Modern Orthodox Jews, there were and are strict barriers to what innovations can take place. Synagogue services could be modernized to include singing and English sermons, but the text would not be changed, and seating would remain separated by sex. Holidays would not be abridged or abrogated, and the Sabbath would be kept, with electricity ruled to be forbidden. Torah study would be a necessary part of daily life alongside prayer. Dress, in the form of head coverings for men and more vaguely defined rules of modesty for women, was similarly restricted. And strict kosher observance was expected and facilitated by an expanding industry of preparation and certification. One avenue of expression with almost no restrictions, though, was education, and Modern Orthodox Jews embraced it wholeheartedly (Heilman, 2006).

In addition to demographics and history, any understanding of Modern Orthodoxy should also consider major forces currently shaping the community. The four themes outlined by Heilman (2006) are: 1) socioeconomic and class issues surrounding a movement that is largely for and of upper-middle-class Americans; 2) an unrelenting devotion to education in which children and young adults are expected to excel in both secular and religious studies at the most demanding levels; 3) a move toward fundamentalism that seems to be accelerating; and 4) unflinching support for Israel as a Jewish state and the associated role this plays in further shaping domestic political views. All of these directly impact the experiences of Modern Orthodox college students.

1) Socioeconomics of the Upper-Middle-Class

The upper-middle class status of many Modern Orthodox Jews is now almost necessary for living within the community. More than 37% of Modern Orthodox adults report annual household income higher than $150,000 (Pew, 2015). Any understanding of contemporary Modern Orthodox life must come with an appreciation for its costs. Practicing Modern Orthodoxy comes with bills that seem truly shocking to most Americans. Kosher food for a family of four costs about $8,000 more per year than non-kosher food, home

---

1 Because there is no consensus on a leader or founder of the movement, it is difficult to articulate the precise mission statement and values of Modern Orthodoxy, and this broad description does not encompass all views.

2 These descriptions of Haredi and Modern Orthodox Jews are necessary simplifications that hide a more complex reality. These generalizations focus mostly on Ashkenazi Jews, rooted in Eastern Europe, without describing Sephardic Jews, originating in Spain, Portugal, and North Africa. And the boundaries between Haredi and Modern Orthodoxy are more permeable than ever, as described far more fully in Beyond Sectarianism (Ferziger, 2015)

prices within walking distance of a Modern Orthodox synagogue are typically 10-20% higher than those just a ZIP code away, and dues to various organizations can cost thousands of dollars per year.

The largest price tag on Modern Orthodox life is education, as more than 80% of Modern Orthodox Jews send their children to full-time Jewish day schools (Pew, 2015). With K-8 education often followed by private high school as well, and then further education during or before college, more than twenty years of schooling can expect to cost nearly a million dollars per child. With the pressure to be able to pay for this lifestyle, Modern Orthodox Jews need to earn, and they largely see higher education as the route to socioeconomic success. Modern Orthodox Jews currently attend college almost universally, with some reports indicating upwards of 80% of Modern Orthodox Jews starting college. 33% of Modern Orthodox adults hold post-graduate degrees, more than any other Jewish group and more than triple the rate of the U.S. public (Pew, 2015). In fact, fully half of Yeshiva University's graduating class of 2018 enrolled directly in a graduate program (Yeshiva University, 2020).

2) Devotion to Education

The intense devotion to a private education that is rigorous in both secular and religious subjects is a strong feature of Modern Orthodox development since the mid-twentieth century. After World War II, Yeshiva College, with its dual curriculum, was seen as a center of learning only for very few students (Gurock, 1988). But its enrollment doubled in the late 1940s, then doubled twice more in the early 1950s, which also saw the opening of Stern College for Women.

The students arriving on campus reflected the rapidly changing Modern Orthodox community. In 1945, nearly half of Yeshiva College students had a public-school education; by 1955 it was fewer than three in ten, and by the end of the 1960s, it was fewer than one in ten. Modern Orthodox Jews – or their intellectual forebears without that title – had previously gone to public schools and received supplementary Jewish education through synagogue-based Hebrew schools, but by the early 1960s, they were educated within the robust community system (Ferziger, 2015).

This motivation toward high levels of education reflects other factors in addition to earning potential. The value of study itself is stressed endlessly throughout all aspects of Modern Orthodoxy. Though there is a hesitation to equate the value of learning secular subjects with sacred ones, there is an undeniable focus

on being conversant with the highest levels of both (Riley, 2005). Statistics that reflect the extremely high rate of graduate degree attainment in the community do not even include the large number of Modern Orthodox men who are ordained as rabbis, many of whom do not serve professionally in that capacity (Ferziger, 2015).

For the average Modern Orthodox Jew, education is no longer just twelve expensive years of private school followed by college and likely a graduate degree; it also includes a year or more of full-time religious study in Israel following high school. More than 80% of high school graduates join an accredited program in Israel for a year or more (Berger, Jacobson, & Waxman, 2007). Environments at these "Year in Israel" programs are intensely rigorous, with ten hours or more of study per day, and students often undergo powerful changes during this time.

3) Accelerating Move Toward Fundamentalism

For students and their parents, this Year in Israel is frequently assumed to provide the framework for increased religious devotion both short-term and long-term (Spierer, 2018). And it often does, through intense and insular environments. The environments of Year in Israel programs, which increasingly resemble more insular, Ultra-Orthodox institutions, are nearly all separate-sex, even though about half of high school graduates come from coeducational schools or will continue on to coeducational colleges. (Ferziger, 2015). The entirely closed campus, insulated from outside influences, creates an idyllic setting that is restrictive but also freeing from many previous limits, especially the presence of parents and the demands of any grades (Heilman, 2006). This, during a key time in adolescents' lives, sets the stage for incredible leaps in identity formation among these students. They emerge from the year – and go to college – seemingly having "solved the problem of their identity," (Heilman, p. 116) with future challenges seen as "trials to be passed," not spaces to incorporate future change.

The Year in Israel and the religious changes wrought on students is one of the contributing factors in an emerging trend over the last few decades: what Heilman (2006) calls the "slide to the right" as Modern Orthodox Jews become more insular and conservative. Modern Orthodox Jews are withdrawing from a public sphere that they increasingly view as hostile to traditional religious practice. This phenomenon is not unique to Modern Orthodox Jews; it can be viewed as part of a similar migration by several groups to

a modern American religious right. Increasingly, American acculturation as a value is being replaced by defensive traditionalism. And it is not just the wider American sphere from which the Modern Orthodox are withdrawing; gone are the days of "Solidarity Orthodoxy" which emphasized partnering with or leading other denominations in common causes. This impulse has now waned, with Modern Orthodox Jews almost exclusively focusing on the issues most important to them (Ferziger, 2015).

4) Support for Israel

In addition to the religious environment of the closed campus steeped in study, the Year in Israel experience sharpens an emotional connection between Modern Orthodox Jews and the Jewish State. More than three-quarters of Modern Orthodox Jews profess a strong emotional attachment to Israel and a similar number (79%) say that attachment to Israel is a crucial part of their Jewish identity (Pew, 2015). No other Jewish group professes such a high degree of attachment to Israel, with less than half of American Jews agreeing with the same statement. Modern Orthodox synagogues, schools, and camps nearly all fly the Israeli flag alongside the American one, as Yeshiva University does (Ferziger, 2015).

Attachment to Israel takes many forms for Modern Orthodox American Jews. Some offer political support, lobbying the US government or advocating for Israel on college campuses (Berger et al., 2007). For many families, frequent trips to Israel further their bond to the country, help the economy, or fulfill a religious obligation to visit (Ferziger, 2015). The devotion to Israel is inseparably political and religious: in addition to mundane methods of connection, Modern Orthodox Jews pray for Israel, fervently and regularly. Rare is the congregation that does not recite the Prayer for the Welfare of the State of Israel on the Sabbath, and a prominent New York City rabbi recently noted that it is the only time during Sabbath prayers that the entire crowd at his storied synagogue will be completely silent (Frieden, 2021).

Modern Orthodox Trends in the College Context

Modern Orthodoxy is, by many measures, a successful movement. The community's economic power has been channeled into a dizzying array of infrastructure, with schools, synagogues, camps, and community centers abounding. This is true not just of the population center in the Northeast, but also for vibrant and growing communities in Chicago, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Cleveland, Houston, and South Florida. Demographically, Orthodox Jews do not have as high attrition as the more liberal denominations, with most Orthodox Jews – but by no means all – remaining in the religious community in which they were raised.

Despite its accomplishments, Modern Orthodoxy is beset with divisions on all sides. The community's inclusion of LGBTQ members and the place of women in leadership roles are among the issues that demand a balanced and nuanced approach (Hain, 2012). Financially, the entire enterprise seems to balance on a knife's edge; as Ferizger (2015) notes, cost-of-living is so high that a major financial upheaval would leave institutions and families particularly vulnerable.

Even more troubling to Modern Orthodox leaders is a seeming dispassion among young adherents. The religious commitment seen during the Year in Israel is well-noted, but there is much alarm about those who seem to buck this trend, leaving behind their Orthodoxy during the "odyssey years" of adolescence and emerging adulthood (Ferziger, 2015; M. W. Sarna, 2012). Several writers and thinkers have begun to talk about the "passionless" practice, even among those who commit large portions of their days and lives to Modern Orthodoxy (Y. Sarna, 2012). These troubles may be the logical outgrowth of a relentless focus on economic ladder-climbing and building, with Modern Orthodoxy becoming a victim of its own success. Or they may be evidence of larger American shifts to which no one is immune. Perhaps most frighteningly, Modern Orthodoxy may have reached natural limits to its possibilities. Born into paradoxes, it can never become a mass movement (Hain, 2012). But if the past century is instructive, it is most likely that new innovations will seek to counter the rising tides of troubles; the coming demise has been too often prematurely and wrongly predicted.

Part III: Modern Orthodox College Organizations in the Last Six Decades

To Modern Orthodoxy's great internal threat of youth attrition, the college campus is an all-too-easy bugaboo. Colleges, perceived to contain the twin evils of secularism and sexuality, are places where good Modern Orthodox Jews have been under assault. Acceding to an overwhelming demand for higher

education and its earning rewards, Modern Orthodox leadership has not openly discouraged participation in that great symbol of American ascendance. Some students and parents opt for the safe environment of Yeshiva University, which blends Jewish and secular education through a dual curriculum, or for the similar but more right-wing Touro College. The community has also created a variety of supports for Modern Orthodox life on college campuses, replacing a grassroots system originally founded by students.

The first generation of Modern Orthodox Jews entering college in the 1950s encountered an unfriendly world and did so alone. Hillel had rapidly expanded to a robust shape by the early 1960s, with seventy-seven foundations by 1963 (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018). But for Modern Orthodox students, Hillels, usually led by Reform and Conservative Rabbis, were not the havens they had become for other Jews (Kraut, 2011). After the rupture of World War II, each denomination tensely saw the others as enemies in the pursuit of their movement's future. Orthodox students' complaints about lack of accommodations were often seen as a lack of gratitude for newfound Jewish access and acceptance, especially in its institutions of higher education – or worse, a self-aggrandizing view typical of the Orthodox (Heilman, 2006).

Into this gap sprang a grassroots student organization founded in February 1960: Yavneh, the National Jewish Religious Students Association. Though not labeled "Orthodox," Yavneh was committed to Modern Orthodox life on campus, and not just maintaining but enhancing and growing it (Kraut, 2011). The organization protected Orthodox observances by sharing tactics for combating reticent administrators, but it also brought scholars to campus for inspiring educational talks. Among various iterations of its stated goals were lofty statements like that of National President Zvi Gitelman's in 1962: "…the development of a constant religious consciousness which is not an artificial appendage or theoretical construct apart from a person's inner self but which is the very essence of his being." (Kraut, 2011, p. 38)

Yavneh was founded and run entirely by college students like Gitelman, who in 1962 was a Columbia University undergraduate, but the Modern Orthodox college experience of today is far more ministry-driven. As the pre-college Year in Israel became more popular, students lost interest in discussion groups on Modern Orthodoxy's philosophical underpinnings, instead hoping to continue the Talmudic learning they had experienced in Israel (Kraut, 2011). As battles for basic accommodation faded into the past, Modern Orthodox students were more concerned with enriching their lives than with banding together to justify their place on campus. This could be done with local rabbis rather than with student representatives (Ferziger, 2015).

As Yavneh's presence faded in the early 1980s, institutions stepped in to address a different set of concerns. Responding to the student desire for advanced Jewish learning and parental worries about assimilation, the Orthodox Union (OU) partnered with Hillel to create the Jewish Learning Initiative on Campus (JLIC). According to their website, JLIC "places Orthodox rabbinic couples on over 20 college campuses in the U.S. and Canada to serve as Torah educators and role models" (JLIC, n.d.). On their 21 American campuses, the JLIC educators, always a husband-and-wife team "help young men and women thrive and observe key aspects of Jewish life in secular campus environments" (JLIC, n.d.). As a project of one of Orthodoxy's largest institutions, beholden to the board and donors of the OU, JLIC is the opposite of Yavneh's grassroots, student-driven model.

Serving almost exclusively Orthodox students on campus, JLIC also demonstrates the Modern Orthodox shift toward "inreach" at the expense of interdenominational dialogue. Gone are the days of the wide-appealing Orthodox-led Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry; now, Modern Orthodox institutions cooperate less with institutions representing other Jews (Ferziger, 2015). Nor does JLIC perform kiruv ("drawing-close") work of attempting to inspire Jews toward religion. The resources exist for the already educated post-gap-year college students to further and deepen their knowledge. More teaching also comes with stricter practices and often a more insular approach, another manifestation of Heilman's "slide to the right" (2006).

The denominational emphasis of Modern Orthodoxy is also seen in changing Hillel policies. Once proud to be the "all-inclusive Jewish agency on campus" (Kraut, 2011, p. 95) that would not countenance "divisive" programs, Hillel now allows under its aegis the factional work of JLIC. In the 1960s, Yavneh and Hillel struggled to find common ground, with Yavneh promoting what they perceived to be authentic and genuine Jewish practice while Hillel defended a Jewish pluralism of equally legitimate expressions. Hillel blocked some attempts by Yavneh to claim a monopoly on defining Jewish law, including at the University of

Chicago, where the local Hillel opposed a strictly Kosher dining hall that would "serve a segment of Jewish students in such a way as to alienate other segments of Jewish students" (Kraut, 2011, p. 118). Today, the place of Orthodox groups within Hillel differs greatly: Hillel often hosts the official campus kosher dining programs, and Orthodox groups have unfettered ability to host lectures in Hillel space that promote sectarian Orthodox views. Many Orthodox students, even while entering daily into Hillel buildings, see themselves as part of an Orthodox community on campus, not a Hillel one. In fact, the Orthodox Community at the University of Pennsylvania (OCP) is merely housed at Penn Hillel according to their website (OCP, n.d.,).

JLIC and Hillel both reflect a trend that is not solely Jewish but true across many faiths as the model of campus religious organizations has shifted. Religious ministries have replaced staid models of local churches on campus with "religio-cultural communities" that bring revived warmth to college students (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018). Hillels focus less on promulgating a view of Jewish pluralism and more on engagement, a trend started with the 1998 new mission of "maximizing the number of Jews doing Jewish with other Jews" (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018, p. 116). Despite retaining sectarian elements and focusing strongly on learning, JLIC also emphasizes community: "If you are looking for a Jewish community on campus, OU-JLIC can be your place to hang out with friends and meet new people" (JLIC, n.d.).

Finally, the current discourse around Israel in campus-based Modern Orthodox organizations has shifted greatly from earlier hesitations about Zionism. As American Modern Orthodox Jews have become very emotionally and politically devoted to Israel, nearly all of their institutions reflect this (Pew, 2021). JLIC lists the goals of their activities as "to promote Jewish awareness, love of Israel and learning" (JLIC, n.d.). It is telling that love of Israel is second only to Jewish identity, and even ahead of learning. And when listing the resources available to Orthodox students on different campuses, a category of "resource" is the presence of pro-Israel student groups focused on advocacy, politics, or business (Dickter, 2016).

Criticism of Israel on college campuses may be one of greatest contemporary challenges for American Modern Orthodox college students. Discussions about Israel hit a sensitive nerve for students who built close attachments through years spent thinking about Israel and a year or more physically there. While advocates for Palestinian rights see this work as part of a constellation of progressive activism, Modern Orthodox students can see political support of Israel as part of a religious expression, and may view criticisms of Israel as antisemitic (Farber & Poleg, 2019). Jewish students of all denominations have faced discrimination on campus for pro-Israel views and have sometimes been held out of leadership positions because of these beliefs. Jewish organizations such as Hillel have been pushed by campus partners to distance themselves from political statements vis-à-vis Israel if they want to claim to be "Jewish."

Modern Orthodoxy's central challenge has always been attempting the contradictory, and this challenge is especially borne out on campus. While on one hand, Modern Orthodoxy preaches a full and uncompromising commitment to traditional rabbinic Judaism, on the other it attempts to articulate an integration with Western political, philosophical, and social thought. A myriad of challenges abounds in this effort to synthesize the incongruous, and even greater variety of opinions about resolving those challenges. Modern Orthodox Jews proudly go to the quads of American higher learning, for both the promise of practical capital success and the best secular education that can be offered. But they – and their parents and rabbis even more so – also fear the dangers and the fine tightrope they must tread in navigating their college years. More than ever, there is great emphasis placed on the formative time in Israel to inoculate students from these dangers, and campus organizations can boost these inoculations to ensure that students remain resistant to the pulls of the larger world.

Part IV: Modern Orthodox Jews and Religion's Role on the Contemporary Campus

Despite many claims to the difficulty of contemporary integration on campus, Modern Orthodox Jews have never been more present in the American higher education system. The numbers of Modern Orthodox Jews at elite colleges have grown rapidly, and they represent larger and larger groups at a widening circle of campuses. This has not come at the expense of faith-based campuses: Yeshiva University's student numbers have held steady for some time, and Touro University's colleges for men and women are smaller but not insignificant (Yeshiva University, 2020). Some campuses have become the sites of communities that

are surprisingly large given the small overall number of Modern Orthodox Jews: Queens College is estimated to have more than 500 students of Modern Orthodox background, an outsized representation by several orders of magnitude (Dickter, 2016).

These increasingly large body of Modern Orthodox students have access to more resources and acceptances than in the past. Kosher food is not only available on campuses but is often prepared fresh and at a reasonable price. Far in the past are the days of wrapped sandwiches in a vending machine being the only kosher option at City College of New York. As their communities grow larger, they advocate for accommodations that would have been unheard of in Yavneh's time. Yavneh students fought so that they could eat and not be punished for skipping class on Shabbat. Today at the University of Pennsylvania, the OCP has organized an eruv, a religious device encircling the campus that defines it as a community, allowing students to carry items between one building and another on Shabbat (OCP, n.d.). And at Yale in the late 1990s, students sued for the ability to not live in university housing if it was an affront to their sensibilities (Glaberson, 1997).

All of this points to changing attitudes toward religion on campus. Embracing religious diversity, colleges have made space for student practices (Schmalzbauer & Mahoney, 2018). If work remains to be done, it is in the area of understanding and appreciating student beliefs, especially when such beliefs may run counter to the notions of diversity and pluralism that are needed to support them. The conflict of Hillel and Yavneh, though long since having passed, is yet to be fully disentangled on campuses as a whole: what does it mean to be tolerant of different views when some of those views reject tolerance? Put specifically, can campuses find a way to communicate about safe sex while also remaining sensitive to students who believe premarital sex is a sin and feel viscerally uncomfortable discussing sexual topics?

Scholarship and practice in student affairs have caught up to the idea of religion as an important part of students' identities and essential to their growth, but much of this understanding is still grounded in research based on majority religions. Where literature has ventured beyond Christian students, "Jewish" has often meant everyone but the Orthodox. While that does represent most Jews especially on college campuses, care must be taken to understand that Orthodox Jews can and often do differ radically from other denominations.

So while Astin et al. (2010) report that Jews score the lowest of almost any organized religion on measures of "religious commitment" and "religious engagement," this is painting with a broad brush. Orthodox Jews would likely score incredibly high on frequency of attending religious service, reading sacred texts, prayer and discussions of religion/spirituality (Pew, 2015).

Additionally, many current models of faith development are oriented around beliefs and changes in those beliefs, assuming they are the basis for practice. Modern Orthodox perspectives, contrastingly, stress behaviors and ritual observances that bring about beliefs (Berger et al., 2007). Both Berger et al. (2007) and Spierer (2018), in studying Modern Orthodox Jews during the Year in Israel, found only very slight changes in belief in an all-powerful God or the historicity of the Bible. When they looked at behaviors such as setting aside daily time for Torah learning, though, they found significant changes.

The story of Modern Orthodox Jews on American college campuses is one of growth and gains. From the hard-fought battles of Yavneh in the 1960s, Modern Orthodox Jews have risen to a level of acceptance and accommodation that allows for a rich religious life during the college years. The question of the years ahead for Modern Orthodox Jews is whether fundamentally religious outlooks can continue to be compatible with the academy of higher learning, or if this too will fade into the past as a once-tenable synthesis that no longer works.

References

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2010). *Cultivating the spirit: How college can enhance students' inner lives*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Berger, S. Z., Jacobson, D., & Waxman, C. I. (2007). *Flipping out?: The impact of the 'year in Israel' on students and the Jewish community.* Yashar Books.

Dickter, A. (2016). The OU JLIC Guide: Jewish Life on the College Campus. Retrieved from New York, NY: https://oujlic.org/content/uploads/2016/10/JLIC_16-17CampusProfiles-1.pdf

Farber, B. A., & Poleg, A. (2019). Campus diversity, Jewishness, and antisemitism. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 75(11), 2034-2048. doi:10.1002/jclp.22862

Ferziger, A. S. (2015). *Beyond sectarianism the realignment of American Orthodox Judaism* (1st edition. ed.). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

J. Frieden (Producer). (2021). Anatomy of a Jewish Leader [Podcast]. Retrieved from https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/rabbi-haskel-lookstein-pt-1/id1550883368?i=1000516789277

Glaberson, W. (1997, 9/7/1997). Five Orthodox Jews Spur Moral Debate Over Housing Rules at Yale. *New York Times,* p. 45. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/1997/09/07/nyregion/five-orthodox-jews-spur-moral-debate-over-housing-rules-at-yale.html

Gurock, J. S. (1988). *The men and women of Yeshiva: Higher education, orthodoxy, and American Judaism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hain, S. (2012). The future of modern orthodoxy. In S. Hain (Ed.), *The next generation of modern orthodoxy.* Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Publishing House.

Heilman, S. C. (2006). *Sliding to the right: The contest for the future of American Jewish Orthodoxy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

JLIC. (n.d.). About OU JLIC. Retrieved from https://oujlic.org/about/

Kraut, B. (2011). *The Greening of American Orthodox Judaism: Yavneh in the nineteen sixties*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.

Marsden, G. M. (1994). *The Soul of the American University: From protestant establishment to established nonbelief.* Oxford University Press.

OCP. (n.d.). Orthodox Community at Penn. Retrieved from http://www.pennocp.org/

Pew. (2015). *A Portrait of American Orthodox Jews.* Retrieved from https://www.pewforum.org/2015/08/26/a-portrait-of-american-orthodox-jews/

Pew. (2021). Jewish Americans in 2020. Retrieved from https://www.pewforum.org/2021/05/11/jewish-americans-in-2020/

Riley, N. S. (2005). *God on the quad : How religious colleges and the missionary generation are changing America* (1st ed. ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sarna, J. D. (2019). *American Judaism: A history, second edition* (2 ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sarna, M. W. (2012). An emerging approach to emerging adulthood and modern orthodoxy. In S. Hain (Ed.), *The next generation of modern orthodoxy*. Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Publishing House.

Sarna, Y. (2012). The end of the middle of the road: Re-envisioning modern orthodoxy for the twenty-first century. In S. Hain (Ed.), *The next generation of modern orthodoxy. Jersey City*, NJ: KTAV Publishing House.

Schmalzbauer, J. A., & Mahoney, K. A. (2018). The resilience of religion in American higher education. Baylor University Press.

Spierer, J. A. (2018). *Religious beliefs in emerging adulthood: The effects of the freshman year of college on religious beliefs in the context of a gap year in Israel*. ProQuest LLC, Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/docview/2123080112 Available from EBSCOhost eric database.

Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed. ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Yeshiva University, O. I. R. A. (2020). Spring 2020 Fact Book. Retrieved from https://www.yu.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/FactBook%20Spring%202020.pdf

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Skin Hue as a Barrier to Education: A Historical and Contemporary Analysis Understanding the Impact of Colorism on Black students from American Slavery to Modern Higher Education

Natasha McCombs

Introduction

While watching the remake of The Wonder Years I overhear a conversation between my parents. I notice my mother say, "You see a lot of Black families on television, but never families dark like that. They may be black but definitely not dark-skinned." This remake features an all-Black main cast, which is the opposite of the original show created in 1988. Television shows like this spark conversations in American households. In the past, films like Spike Lee's School Daze used songs to describe Black people from different skin tones as Jigaboos and Wannabees, dark-skinned people, and lighter-skinned people, respectively. I always thought, "well aren't we all just black?"

Margaret Hunter defines systems of racial discrimination on at least two levels: race and skin color (Hunter, 2007). The first system of racial discrimination is differential treatment and trajectories based on race. Regardless of appearance, skin color, height, weight, or facial features, Black people are subject to discrimination and dehumanization. Although the definition of racism shifts based on the space occupied, discrimination based on racial background is a clear example of racism. For example, white people may describe racism as prejudice towards non-white people, whereas Black people and other people of color may define racism as a systemic barrier to opportunities and resources (Bonilla-Silva, 2006).

The second system of racial discrimination is skin tone bias or colorism. Colorism is concerned with how dark or light the skin tone is and not solely on racial, ethnic, and/or socialized identity. Hunter (2007) describes colorism as "the process of discrimination that privileges light-skinned people of color over their dark-skinned counterparts" (Hunter, 2007).

As a concept, colorism elevates and values white aesthetics, so that positive characteristics are associated with whiteness and negative characteristics with blackness and indigenous identities (Hunter, 2016). Additionally, colorism affects the experiences of people with a marginalized racial identity not only in media as described previously but in areas ranging from education and societal mobility to relationship building. Therefore, it is essential to understand colorism to fully understand racism, intersectionality, and the wealth and education gap.

This paper aims to analyze and discuss the psychological and sociological effects of colorism on the Black community and how that affects matriculation in education and social mobility. Moreover, the research will answer the following question: How does colorism affect dark-skinned Black students' social mobility, sense of belonging, and engagement in education?

The research compiled in this analysis will add to the existing literature around colorism while focusing on the experiences of darker-skinned students. Currently, there is limited research about how colorism affects engagement, sense of belonging, and access to education, however, this paper hopes to fill the gap.

Methods

The purpose of this study is to examine how colorism impacts the experiences of dark-skinned Black students in secondary and higher education and how those experiences affect social mobility and success. Utilizing a series of peer-reviewed articles and books, the author examined how colorism affects the experiences of Black students to answer their research question.

Positionality

The author of the current study identifies as a dark-skinned Black woman who has attended and graduated from predominantly white institutions. Additionally, their lived experiences during both K-12 and undergraduate education informed their desire to go into education. Having encountered colorism on playgrounds, teachers mistaking them for other Black students in class, and lacking educators who looked or sounded like them, it became clear that becoming an educator and researching colorism would be pivotal to their future. Although the author has lived experiences and understands the impact bias and bullying have on racial and social development, they wanted to cultivate a deeper understanding of how research analyzes colorism and its long-term effects on students and professionals.

Systematic Review

In this study, the author sought to understand how colorism impacts the educational opportunities and social mobility of Black students, specifically how it impacts the success and advancement of dark-skinned Black students. As the author analyzed their experience, they used the words bullied, dark-skinned, light-skinned, self-worth, biases, and dissonance to describe how they felt and what they experienced. While analyzing data for this study, other scholars frequently used similar words and phrases in their research which provided insight and showed that there is a community of people who face similar challenges with colorism and skin bias.

The author narrowed the focus to articles about Black people and experiences with colorism. Once the author compiled the articles they were interested in, they searched for articles with a focus on colorism in education. Using online databases and publications, the author used the following keywords and phrases: colorism, bullying, skin tone biases, house vs field slave mentality, higher education, social mobility, and colorism in the Black communit-y. As a method of collecting data, the author specifically looked at book chapters, academic journals, blogs, and testimonials. Amongst the existing data, scholars discussed how colorism affects racially marginalized groups (i.e., Black people, Asian people, Latinx people, etc.), the impact of colorism based on gender, and how colorism impacts romantic and platonic relationships. Because the current study focuses on the experiences of Black students, the author excluded articles solely focusing on the experiences of Latinx and Asian people from the analysis. Additionally, multiple articles discussed colorism from a historical standpoint and while those articles were included in the analysis, the author narrowed the focus to colorism and how it affects education, learning, job access, and social mobility.

Colorism researchers primarily rely on anecdotes, qualitative data, and historical artifacts in academic journals. The author was not expecting to find articles incorporating quantitative metrics into their colorism and social mobility assessments; however, those articles were crucial for the analysis.

Colorism and Slavery

Color-based discrimination, or colorism, focuses on the comparative advantages or disadvantages people of the same race have based on their skin hue and other traits, such as hair texture, facial features, and so forth (Keith & Monroe, 2015). The relationship between skin tone and societal privilege became prevalent during slavery. Keith and Herring (1991) suggest that white Americans in the early periods of slavery placed more value on slaves of mixed heritage and used skin tone or the ability to pass as white as a basis for treatment and economic value. "The ability to buy light-skinned "fancy slaves" with long hair and European features was a marker of wealth" as they were sold for higher prices in slave auctions (Kerr, 2005).

Slaves of mixed descent worked in the main house on the plantation and slave masters named them house servants. Assigned by slave masters, the house servants had more desirable positions such as cook, personal companion, butler, caretaker, and so forth (Keith & Herring, 1991). Black slaves with pure African ancestry worked in the fields with crops and slave masters and overseers assigned more physically demanding tasks (Keith & Herring, 1991).

Following the abolition of slavery,

"lighter-skinned Black people continued to set themselves apart from darker-skinned Black people by socializing, marrying and procreating" with each other (Wilder, 2009). As a result, lighter-skinned individuals became more successful than their darker-skinned counterparts and passed on generational wealth and education (Keith & Herring, 1991). Colleges and universities further enforced this separation. For example, in educational systems like historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), mixed-race students were the first to be accepted to college and allowed Black people to move toward educational equity (Reece, 2018).

History of Colorism in Education

Although the first HBCU was founded in 1837, abolitionists created interracial schools and colleges in the mid-1900s to undo the prevailing misconception that people with darker skin are uneducated (Bell, 2019). Oberlin College and New York Central College admitted students of different skin complexions to emphasize their commitment to racial equity and justice.

Although Oberlin College believed in a commitment to racial justice and equity through skin tone differences, this strategy backfired because many Black students felt singled out by faculty and other students. Darker-skinned students often felt like a minority within a minority at Oberlin College, even though the institution prohibits mistreatment of students (Bell, 2019). Additionally, several professors believed that mixed-race students deserved more empathy and were more capable than Black students with dark skin (Bell, 2019). Although this was centuries ago, systems such as schooling still reinforce these skin tone hierarchies. Researchers can use psychological phenomena such as the halo effect to further understand how people evaluate and understand each other in education and beyond (Hunter, 2016).

The Halo Effect and Education

The halo effect is the phenomenon that allows people to positively analyze and make assumptions about specific traits, such as physical attractiveness. Oftentimes, people use physical attractiveness to influence and analyze intelligence, kindness, or rela-

tability (Hunter, 2016). Perceived physical attractiveness and value are often directly correlated to white or white adjacent physical attributes such as a smaller nose, lighter skin, straighter hair, and so forth (Ryabov, 2013).

As a result, lighter skinned people are often viewed as more attractive which leads to the idea that lighter-skinned Black people are smarter than their darker counterparts (Monroe, 2015). Consequently, the halo effect largely benefits lighter skinned students in the classroom because of teacher favoritism and higher expectations in learning and behavior.

Though unintentional, teachers do not evaluate darker-skinned students using the same standards and often neglect darker-skinned students during classroom activities and instruction. "If lighter-skinned Black children are more likely to experience the halo effect with their teachers, they are also more likely to have positive relationships with their teachers," (Hunter, 2016) which in turn leads to a more positive schooling experience. Researchers suggest that educators should be more aware of their unconscious color bias, preference for lighter-skinned parents or children, and have intentional conversations about self-image, standards of beauty, and stereotypes (Monroe, 2015).

Apart from interactions with teachers, social interactions with peers have a profound effect on schooling experiences. From choosing friends, to dates to school dances, acceptance is highly influenced by beauty standards. Coined by Margaret Hunter, the beauty queue is a "theory that describes how skin tone affects rank-ordering of women by skin tone, with the lightest women who gain the most privilege near the front of the queue and the darkest women who experience the most discrimination near the back" (Hunter, 2012, p.57). Given the historical praises of white standards of beauty across the globe, narrow noses, fairer skin, straight hair, light-skinned students are more prone to gaining popularity in schools. In a study about colorism and internalized biases, one student recalled the experiences she had in elementary school. She expressed that the young boys in her school were "enamored" with the "light" and "Spanish-looking" girls (Wilder, 2009). The idea that the young boys were more interested in lighter skinned girls led to the student internalizing negativity placed on her darker skin and comparing her skin tone to other students

Empirical Measures of Colorism in Education

(Wilder, 2009). Comparing skin tone to other people is not uncommon and researchers have researched both skin color satisfaction and colorism within groups. In a study about Black students and experiences on a college campus, when asked if they would rather be 3 shades lighter or 3 shades darker, 75% of the participants shared that they would rather be 3 shades lighter (Stephens & Thomas, 2012). Measuring skin tone within groups became a norm, resulting in prejudice and colorism among groups. Consequently, as a form of research and analysis, skin color satisfaction scales and questionnaires were developed to assess self-perceived skin color and satisfaction.

Skin Color Satisfaction Scale

The Skin Color Satisfaction Scale (SCSS) was developed to examine various components of skin color (Jameca & Neville, 2000, Burns 2021). Bond & Cash's 3-item Skin Color Questionnaire Scale, or SCS, is the first component of the SCSS, and it assesses skin color satisfaction, self-perceived skin color (light-dark), and ideal skin color (Bond & Cash, 1992, Jameca & Neville, 2000). Researchers included four additional items to create the SCSS, a narrower analysis of skin color satisfaction.

[Sample items from SCSS: (a) "How satisfied are you with the shade (lightness or darkness) of your skin color?"1 (less satisfied) to 9 (most satisfied) (b) "Compared to most African American people, I believe my skin color is . . ." Responses range from 1 (extremely light) to 9 (extremely dark). (c) "If I could change my skin color, I would make it lighter or darker." Responses range from 1 (much lighter) to 9 (much darker). "I wish my skin was lighter;" "Compared to the complexion (skin color) of other African Americans, I am satisfied with my skin color."].

Skin color satisfaction was associated with higher overall scores, and this led to the conclusion that women who were less satisfied with their skin color were also less satisfied with their physical appearances (Jameca & Neville, 2000).

Following the SCSS, Keith & Monroe (2015) explore how colorism and colorist ideologies disturb conversations that celebrate racial and ethnic improvements in education. They argue that although conversations about race and awareness

of identities have improved, racial "progress" is "unmeasurable and uneven across people who are within the same race" (Keith & Monroe, 2015). Using this argument, it should be impossible to measure how colorism impacts ingroup prejudices.

In-Group Colorism Scale

Harvey et al., (2017) challenge this idea with the development of the In-Group Colorism Scale or ICS. The ICS is a 20-question questionnaire using statements regarding personal opinions regarding skin tone. Researchers created this scale to measure how important skin tone variation is among five essential categories, including self-concept, affiliation, attraction, impression formation, and upward mobility (Harvey et al., 2017). The scale was tested and duplicated using two samples totaling 783 Black American participants averaging 41 years of age. Additionally, the ICS results highlighted other topics such as skin tone, self-esteem, stereotypes, and socioeconomic status (Harvey et al., 2017). Although the ICS was not created to detect preferences of skin tone, researchers concluded the ICS scores were less biased towards lighter-skinned Black people (Harvey et al., 2017).

According to the ICS, participants' thoughts about skin tones and their actions encourage colorism in their communication and behaviors (Harvey et al., 2017). The study concluded that self-esteem was not lower for the participants who had darker skin but was lower for the participants who reinforced negative stereotypes and language related to colorism.

The Importance of Language Surrounding Colorism

Charles Parrish (1946) studied students at Louisville Municipal College to analyze language as a means describe Black people with different skin tones. Examples of words or phrases used in the study to describe these skin tones were tar-baby, rusty black, high yellow, and fair (Parrish, 1946). When asked to describe the behaviors of people in these color groups, participants described lighter skin people as "cute because they look white," "teacher's favorites", medium, brown-skinned people "nice looking and very lovable" and darker-skinned people as "evil and hard to get along with" (Parrish, 1946).

Ironically, these terms have not shifted much in the past 75 years. In a later study using the same research techniques as Parrish, JeffriAnne Wilder examined the

nine terms originally used in the Parrish study used by Black people to describe people of different skin tones and hues (Wilder, 2009). In the Wilder study, respondents used words such as "trustworthy, amiable, nonthreatening, and comfortable" to describe light-skinned women (Wilder, 2009).

Moreover, these labels point toward the favorability of lighter-skinned people. The most held view from participants regardless of their skin tone was that light skin is equal to beauty. However, the idea that light-skinned women are more attractive results in the expectation that they are superior and more deserving of opportunities (Wilder, 2009).

Brown Paper Bag & College Sororities

Historical accounts recall specific skin tone tests, such as the brown paper bag test, to determine if someone was light enough to have access to success. The brown paper bag was used to determine acceptance and inclusion; if one was fairer than a brown paper bag they were accepted while people who were darker were excluded (Kerr, 2005). Used by the Black American community in the 20th to 21st century, the phrase "paper bag test" was traditionally used to distinguish skin tone at paper bag parties, college Greek organizations, and brown bag social clubs. The implementation of skin tone standards and the creation of skin tone biased social clubs deepened the color divisions in Black America which shaped socially constructed ideas about skin tone (Wilder, 2009).

One subject described a college on-campus invitation-only graduation party as "hosted by the beautiful people" and named the paper bag party. This event used brown paper bags to describe skin tones allowed to enter this event (Kerr, 2005). There are two issues; the lighter-skinned people calling themselves the "beautiful people" which furthers the stereotype that light-skinned people are more beautiful, and the exclusion of darker-skinned people because of their skin. Because darker-skinned people were often excluded by lighter-skinned people from social activities, the stereotype of lighter skinned people being snobbish and arrogant erupted (Parrish, 1946; Wilder, 2009). Based on Parrish's study, 75% of participants believed that dark-skinned women would be excluded from sororities (Parrish, 1946).

In the recreation of Parrish's Color Names and Color Notions, one lighter skinned participant noted that people shared that she would, "…make the perfect AKA [Alpha Kappa Alpha]" because she was lighter-skinned and presumed to be because she was lighter-skinned and presumed to be stuck up (Wilder, 2009). Historically, stereotypes such as delicate, pretty, dainty, snobby, prissy, and light-skinned with long hair were used to describe members of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Inc., the first black sorority (Tindall et al., 2011) Two other participants from the Wilder study who self-identify as people with darker skin noted, "because we are a little bit darker than a paper bag, people assume that we wouldn't be AKAs." (Wilder, 2009).

Although these stereotypes are not true, they dictate how students interact with different organizations and peers on campus.

College Student Experiences

As previously discussed, colorism impacts self-esteem, classroom engagement, and social status in primary and secondary education. In a study using the terms black, dark brown, medium brown, and light brown to describe skin tone, adolescents with "black" skin tone were less likely than adolescents with medium and light brown skin to attend college (Ryabov, 2013). However, when attending college, some students face issues in their social groups as well as in the classroom.

Heckstall (2013) conducted a research study to explore two research questions specifically in higher education: "Are non-white students aware of colorism at a predominantly white collegiate institution? Is colorism a significant problem as indicated by intragroup division, prevalence, or another impact upon students?" The researchers administered a survey to 12 non-white students who attended a predominately white institution. The study showed that 75% of the respondents knew what colorism was, however, only 41% thought colorism was a significant issue. As a response to a question about combating colorism, some students responded with "go to Africa", "die," "fight," or "live through it" (Heckstall, 2013). The study showed that students believe that colorism is inevitable and will continue to negatively impact their success and overall well-being. In another study identifying the relevance of skin color and dating on a predominantly white college campus, when asked if participants experienced differential treatment in settings such as school and work, 75% or 21 out of the 28 of the participants felt their skin color influenced how people behaved towards them on at least one occasion (Stephens & Thomas, 2012).

One participant recalled getting confused with another darker-skinned Black student in the classroom for the entire semester because of their skin tone (Stephens & Thomas, 2012). Such interactions can make a student feel unsafe and unsupported at their college, resulting in higher dropout rates, lower retention rates, and lower rates of professional success (Stephens & Tomas, 2012).

Impact on College to Post-College Transition

Ryabov (2013) discusses the impact of skin tone on social mobility and professional success of Black people.For this study, Ryabov studies the impacts of colorism during the college transition. This article found that Black males with lighter skin were more likely to find a job and enroll in college than Black males with darker skin tones. Additionally, the odds of completing college education were higher for adolescents with lighter skin tones (i.e., medium brown and light brown shades) (Ryabov, 2013). This study also suggests that lighter-skinned women also achieved social mobility at a higher rate than their darker-skinned counterparts (Ryabov, 2013).

Utilizing data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health Survey), Ryabov collected data about family background, school environment, and neighborhood context. The researchers evaluated professional participation patterns by socioeconomic status, family background, and other factors. Researchers collected data in three waves, one in 1994-1995, 1996, and 2001-2002. The survey had a response rate of 79% and had a sample of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 21 years old. The research acknowledges Black people of all skin types face obstacles to social mobility advancement however because of colorism, darker-skinned people face challenges at a higher rate (Ryabov, 2013).

Recommendations

Post-secondary institutions and colleges can increase social mobility and create networks and friendships for students by educating the student population about colorism and anti-Black history. Students tend to understand what colorism is but do not know how to combat it (Heckstall, 2013). Researchers should study colorism more thoroughly across educational settings - including student organizations, classroom interactions, and social settings - to better understand

how it affects Black students and professional staff. Moreover, studies on ingroup privilege for historically minoritized people should be one of the many focuses in diversity and equity research (Brown et al., 2021).

Analyzing both in-group colorism as well as skin color satisfaction is crucial to understanding how colorism impacts Black students' sense of self. The connection between colorism and skin tone satisfaction can help researchers understand how Black people subconsciously implement in-group prejudice and how they view and rank themselves in racial groups. As a result, researchers can better und-erstand how people of color and white people understand and internalize skin tone hierarchies and how they impact education.

Blackness as we understand it is not a monolith and background, income and familial structure influences the experiences of Black students. Therefore, more programming should seek the opinions and lived experiences of Black students. Oftentimes, the educational diversity training use history and documentation of discrimination however, including the voices of students from the specific campus could be more beneficial for educating the campus community. Additionally, universities implementing implicit bias training, training series about diversity including a colorism discussion, and open dialogue about how historical instances of colorism impact the way colleges work will impact the way colorism and racism occur on campus.

Limitations

The articles selected for this analysis expand on the diverse ways colorism impacted Black people in the past and present. However, colorism is such a broad topic it is impossible to discuss the layers and impact of colorism in society. As such for the scope of this paper, I focused primarily on Black identities without acknowledging how colorism affects people of Asian descent, Latinx identified people, Indigenous people, and other non-white ethnic groups. These identities experience colorism within their culture because of white dominance, colonialism, and white preference. Other works of literature fully examine the experiences of Latinx people and their proximity to blackness. Additionally, this paper examines the Black commun-

ity as a whole and not based on gender. Black women and Black men have different experiences with colorism and an additional analysis is necessary to further understand the effects of colorism on personal development and racial identity by gender.

Additionally, the research examined in this paper expands on the experiences of Black Americans and not Black people from different countries. This analysis did not examine the experiences of immigrants who identify as black. Furthermore, since Blackness is not a monolith, the experiences of Black people differ based on factors such as environmental impacts, generational wealth, or a lack thereof and cultural awareness.

Results

Colorism emerged to create a structure of hierarchy and division within Black and Brown communities (Wilde, 2009). This system reflects biases toward skin tone variation such as lighter skin versus darker skin in racial groups rather than between them. Colorism impacts education, interpersonal connections, relationships, and social mobility. Consequently, lighter-skinned students are more likely to benefit from skin tone hierarchies while darker students are discriminated against because of internalized racism stemming from white supremacy and anti-Blackness. The use of skin-biased language in school systems inherently dictates how Black students view other Black students with different skin hues. As a result, educators must discuss colorism to work against issues that impact our education system.

Based on both qualitative and quantitative studies, the results indicate that darker-skinned Black students are denied employment and educational opportunities at a greater rate than their lighter-skinned counterparts. Consequently, the larger population view lighter skinned people as more attractive, pure, feminine, and dominant (Keith & Monroe, 2015) while darker-skinned Black people are viewed as unattractive, masculine, and misbehaved. In addition, darker-skinned students struggle with a sense of belonging both in the classroom and in extracurriculars. Researchers acknowledge that all Black people encounter discrimination in their attempts to achieve social mobility, but darker-skinned individuals are more likely to encounter these issues.

Conclusion

Society embedded colorism or skin tone bias through years of race trauma and white supremacy. Understanding how white supremacy and white dominance overwhelmed a variety of racial groups is crucial to our education system. By educating each other and shifting our focus to understand how colorism and racial dominance impact our curriculum and systems, we can shift our educational system to be more inclusive and informative.

References

Bell, J. F. (2019). Confronting colorism: Interracial abolition and the consequences of complexion. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 39(2), 239-265. doi:10.1353/jer.2019.0027

Bond, S., & Cash, T. F. (1992). Black beauty: Skin color and body images among African-American college women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 22(11), 874–888. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00930.x

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brown, L. C., Williams, B. M., Williams, Q. A. S. (2021). Melanin messages: Black College Women's experiences and reflections on navigating colorism. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000347

Burns, K. (2021). "Exploring the Effects of Colorism on Relationship Quality". T*heses and Dissertations--Family Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.13023/etd.2021.092

Colorism. (2021). In Oxford Online Dictionary. Retrieved from oed.com/view/Entry/424803.

Keith, V. M., & Herring, C. (1991). Skin tone and stratification in the Black community. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 760–778.

Keith, V. M., & Monroe, C. R. (2015). Histories of colorism and implications for education. *Theory Into Practice,* 55(1), 4–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1116847

Kerr, A. E. (2005). The paper bag principle: Of the myth and the motion of colorism. *Journal of American Folklore,* 118(469), 271-289. doi:10.1353/jaf.2005.0031

Harvey, R. D., Tennial, R. E., & Hudson Banks, K. (2017). The development and validation of a colorism scale. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 43(7), 740-764.

Heckstall, S. E. (2013). Playing the game of colorism. Journal of Educational and Social Research. https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2013.v3n2p31

Hunter, M. (2007). The persistent problem of colorism: Skin tone, status, and inequality. *Sociology Compass,* 1(1), 237-254. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00006.x

Hunter, M. (2012). The consequences of colorism. *The Melanin Millennium,* 247–256. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4608-4_16

Hunter, M. (2016). Colorism in the Classroom: How skin tone stratifies African American and Latina/o students. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(1), 54-61. doi:10.1080/00405841.2016.1119019

Jameca, W. F., & Neville, H. A. (2000). African American College Women's Body Image: An Examination of Body Mass, African Self-Consciousness, and Skin Color Satisfaction.*Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 24(3), 236–243. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb00205.x

Monroe, C. R. (2015). Race and color: Revisiting perspectives in Black education. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(1), 46–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1116876

Norwood, K. J. (2015). If you is White, you's alright: Stories about colorism in America. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev., 14,* 585.

Parrish, C. H. (1946). Color names and color notions. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 15(1), 13. doi:10.2307/2966307

Reece, R. L. (2018). Genesis of US colorism and skin tone stratification: Slavery, freedom, and mulatto-Black occupational inequality in the late 19th century. The Review of Black Political Economy, 45(1), 3-21.

Ryabov, I. (2013). Colorism and school-to-work and school-to-college transitions of African American adolescents. Race and Social Problems, 5(1), 15-27.

Stephens, D., Thomas, T. L. (2012). The influence of skin color on heterosexual black college women's dating beliefs. Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 24(4), 291–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/08952833.2012.710815

Tindall, N., Hernandez, M., & Hughey, M. (2011). "Doing a Good Job at a Bad Thing: Prevalence and Perpetuation of Stereotypes Among Members of Historically Black Sororities," *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* https://doi.org/10.25774/8b9j-wc32

Wilder, J. (2009). Revisiting "color names and color notions". Journal of Black Studies, 41(1), 184-206. doi:10.1177/0021934709337986

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Theme III: Policies and Systems

How the College Bookstore Lost its Groove

David Paul Morales Carrera

The Educational Mission of the College Bookstore

American higher education institutions must pay special attention to the importance of a quality, mission-driven college bookstore that prioritizes student success over pure profit. These two goals are not oppositional—college bookstores rely on revenue to stay operational to provide students the services and resources conducive to their success (Angelo, 2021). But according to Laurie Martinez Massie, Public Affairs for the National Association of College Stores, college bookstores are called such because they "exist to support the educational mission of the colleges and universities they serve" (Kim, 2014, Question #3 section). The sale of course materials provides students with crucial learning tools meant to facilitate that mission, yet they are often hidden behind aisles of embroidered hoodies or "mom" and "dad" mugs. The problem is not this influx of non-educational material or branded merchandise. It lies with more college bookstores prioritizing profit over students, to the point where they no longer sell physical course materials (Anderson, 2016). Though many modern college bookstores are a prime example of this, they are more the targets of this shift in mission rather than the agent. Corporate America first began commercializing higher education through college athletics and continues in the competitive marketplace through college bookstores. For higher education institutions to mitigate the commercialization of higher education, the college bookstore must reorient itself back to a student-first approach.

To call the college bookstore a "college bookstore" is a bit deceptive as out of the 4,000 existing in the U.S (National Association of College Stores [NACS], 2020), only around 2,000 remain operated by institutions (Rosen, 2017). According to Robert Walton, CEO of the NACS, "leased stores may significantly outnumber indies [independent college bookstores] as early as 2025" (Rosen, 2017, para. 3). These college bookstores tend to be outsourced to private businesses, such as Follet Corporation or Barnes & Noble Education. Other college bookstores run by non-profit organizations such as the NACS, the Independent College Bookstore Association (ICBA), or entirely institutionally operated have omitted the word "book" from the name (Rosen, 2016). Examples of this can be seen from The LCC Lincoln Store at Southeast Community College to The Cornell Store at Cornell University (Independent College Bookstore Association [ICBA], n.db). Though the NACS and ICBA support a college bookstore's institutional and educational goals to facilitate student success, they also refer to them as campus stores to more accurately account for their variety of services (ICBA, n.da; NACS, n.d). With the increasing digitization of education and partnerships with tech giants such as Amazon, some college bookstores have moved exclusively online (Rubin, 2016). The use of language is a powerful tool, and this rebranding reflects how higher education and outside organizations view the purpose of the college bookstore to serve consumers, not students. To understand the increasing commercialization of college bookstores, it is important to consider the transactional and social roles it assumed throughout its beginnings and expansion into the marketplace.

Three Centuries of the College Bookstore in the United States

The Moravian Book Shop, founded by members of the Bethlehem church in 1745 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, is the oldest continuously operating bookstore in the United States, selling a "curated selection of books and iconic Moravian- and Bethlehem-themed gifts" (Moravian University, n.d). While the money was likely used to keep the church afloat rather than benefit stakeholders, it solidified the inherent transactional nature of the bookstore. In the 19th century, the retail bookstore (precursor to the modern bookstore) emerged and attracted residents to explore a bustling metropolis and purchase products (Highland, 2016). With intentional efforts, the retail bookstore became a community space allowing for participation in social relationship building, intellectual pursuits, and access to the elites (Highland, 2016). This focus on community building is a niche some modern independent bookstores rely on to survive while directly competing with companies

like Amazon (McDonough, 2017). Independent college bookstores also rely on their community on campus to sustain it and can use any additional income to fund the institution or funnel money into specific programs and scholarships that help students (Kim, 2014). This is in contrast to for-profit businesses managing college bookstores primarily to profit rather than benefit students. Their growth contributes to the dwindling number of independent college bookstores (Lederman, 2017), resulting in more institutions outsourcing to businesses. This mass outsourcing can potentially lead to the reality of a "quasi-monopoly campus bookstore" (LaFaive, 2000, p. 12), which will be mentioned later in the text.

Though the bookstore is more than 300 years old, the concept of a college bookstore selling course materials originated approximately 120 years ago at the University Book Store; it was the first college bookstore, opening at the University of Washington in Seattle (Macdonald, 2020). In contrast to privately owned bookstores, the University Book Store was founded and run by students for students who were dissatisfied with the "uncertain and inefficient service of the city bookstores" (Macdonald, 2020, para. 1). It officially opened in a small room on-campus in Denny Hall in January 1900, where it had no textbooks, no capital, and relied entirely on a credit system to trade for limited course materials (Macdonald, 2020). Though it had no benefactors, financially sound foundations, or goals of generating profits for its host institutions, the University Book Store quickly generated enough capital to expand and subsequently charge students for ever-expanding course materials. While the University Book Store operates on a transactional model, it remains relatively autonomous because its "[a]ccumulated cash from operations and mortgage loans have been its only source of capital to this day" (University Book Store, n.d, para. 2). And though it has since become a trust by handing ownership from the Student Assembly to a board of trustees and shareholders, it has not abandoned its student-first approach (University Book Store, n.d). The trust explicitly lists students as its beneficiaries, and nearly half the board of trustees is composed of student representatives (University Book Store, n.d). It continues the "original purposes in starting the store—serving the academic needs and saving money for [students] whenever possible" (University Book Store, n.d, para. 11).

The University Book Store serves as an example of how college bookstores could avoid commercialization, continue following their institution's educational mission and student-first approach, and most impressively—generate a profit. To Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) leaders in the 1920s, however, it seemed there was more to benefit from in athletics (Dorpat, 2001). Despite the organization's name, the ASUW includes outside entities and enterprises in its administration—potentially including leaders without any affiliation with the University (University of Washington, n,d). The ASUW leaders focused on creating a sports pavilion over the proposed Student Union building where the University Book Store was to be transferred, forcing its relocation to an evicted pool hall off-campus (Dorpat, 2001). Despite the University Book Store continued financial success to this day, the University of Washington had bet on its potential financial success in athletics as a Division I institution and member of the Pac-12 Conference (Pac-12 Conference, n.d). This prioritization of athletics over educational missions reflects American higher education's enduring investment in athletics.

Athletics and the Introduction of Branded Merchandise

While the focus on athletics seems economically sound with the millions of students and viewers with no academic ties watching in-person or televised broadcasts, very few institutions net any revenue (National Collegiate Association [NCAA], 2020). This is due to athletic departments being designated as non-profit entities, meaning they are tied to their institution, and their focus is not to generate profit (Dosh, 2017). According to Bok, "athletics, as practiced by most major universities, are the oldest form of commercialization in American higher education," beginning with intercollegiate competitions between Harvard and Yale oarsmen in 1852 (2004, pg. 35). This aligned with the institutions' goals to develop students holistically through participation in extracurricular activities but allowed for the commercialization of higher education. Though the rowing standoff was initially self-contained and included very few spectators (if any), the first intercollegiate sporting event had expanded in both in-person attendance and television broadcasts to see which institution won (Veneziano, n.d). This set the stage for future professional intercollegiate events to be publicized by sports media goliaths and consumed

by millions while few institutions benefit financially (NCAA, 2020).

According to Edelman, athletic departments served as an "invaluable marketing opportunity" to have institutional branding broadcasted to millions that could attract prospective shareholders and the occasional student (2020, p. 3). This marketing opportunity brought athletic apparel companies to higher education, leading to agreements where their logos are advertised for free on uniforms in exchange for equipment and supplies (Bok, 2004). The money an athletically successful institution can receive is astonishing; according to Ken Sugiura (2017), Georgia Tech (top 47 in 2016-2017) received $2.1 million between 2016 and 2017 alone. Not all of that revenue is accessible as the amount a school receives is often split unequally between discretionary funds and capital earmarked explicitly for product allotment (Kleinman, 2019).

Despite the ludicrous benefits, it is important to keep in mind that most NCAA participants generate no revenue and often lose money (NCAA, 2020). Less academically successful schools can make no liquid money in apparel contracts, but they might still receive branded merchandise rights to purchase and sell (Brown, 2020). For all branded merchandise the institution sells under contract, apparel companies profit from 85%-90% of that revenue, leaving little income for the college bookstore (Kleinman, 2019). Apparel companies seek these binding contracts to monopolize an institution's merchandise and generate more revenue than what they spent on the licensing agreement (Kleinman, 2019). In addition, uniform advertisement on broadcasts increases the company's presence in the institution's community (Kleinman, 2019), allowing new and old consumers—students and their families—to purchase their merchandise.

These apparel contracts have made it more appealing for college bookstores to sell these products—a practice that continues today in the many aisles of branded merchandise. The issue is not that institutions can profit from the sale of non-educational merchandise. Some college bookstores (such as Montana State University) rely entirely on these sales as they purposely price their educational materials to break even and save students money (Angelo, 2021). The issue arises from an institution's tactics to receive this discretionary money and what they do to maintain it. Even if institutions are not contractually obliged to push branded merchandise onto students,

having them near entrances and occupying many aisles does not contribute to their educational mission. And while the discretionary money undoubtedly benefits institutions, it can be impossible to trace spending due to "discrepancies in how universities report outside income and vague guidelines …" (Kish, 2013, para. 4). Research is limited on whether that money is funneled to scholarships and programs that benefit students or if college bookstores can even do so with low revenue. Higher education institutions leave merchandise for college bookstores to sell like retailers, where the definition of retail is "the sale of commodities or goods in small quantities to ultimate consumers" (Merriam-Webster, n.d). As stated earlier, college bookstores are designated to sell educational products meant to benefit students and their academic attainment, not to target consumers. Through athletic apparel companies and branded merchandise, higher education institutions seemingly bow to corporate America (Seybold, 2008), leaving college bookstores less choice on what they should sell.

Marketplace Competitiveness and some Unintended Effects of Commercialization

Despite the college bookstores' educational mission, their transactional nature means they are "professionally run retail operations" (Kim, 2014, Question #4 section) in the marketplace. College bookstores must juggle generating profit to "support operations, scholarships and other [campus wide] needs as well as drive down prices" for students (Editor, 2017, para. 3). They must also attract students to spend more on required course materials than before (NASC, 2020). Larger organizations like Follet Corporation and Barnes & Noble Education have the resources and partnerships with textbook publishers to provide better student deals (McKenzie, 2020). While lack of resources hurts the competitiveness of smaller, independent college bookstores, they can benefit from their niche of a community-oriented approach and greater student support (Ommen, 2015). They have more control over pricing if they rely on used textbooks and can potentially increase sales by having the store to reflect the culture of their community (Ommen, 2015). However, this may not be enough in the long term. Though only 7% of all college bookstores in 1982 were part of the private sector, that number has skyrocketed to 30% in 2000 and

could increase in the coming years (LaFaive, 2000).

Individual college bookstores sometimes compete directly with each other, such as the University Book Store and the nearby, privately-owned Washington Bookstore (MacDonald, 2020). Despite selling what should be similar academic products of equal quality, the Washington Bookstore shut its doors within 50 years of being founded while the University Book Store still perseveres (Macdonald, 2020). While it likely benefited from a nearly 40-year head start, consumer tax exemptions likely contributed to its competitiveness and success (Fiore, 1996). According to Nicholas Fiore (1996), there are two main ways institutions benefit from tax exemption on products sold in college bookstores. The first is through selling substantially related products, such as any course material that either explicitly supports the "institution's education purpose [or] furthers the intellectual life of the campus community" (Fiore, 1996, para. 4). The second is through the "convenience exception… items low in cost and recurring in demand may be considered to be for the convenience of a school's students, officers and employees" (Fiore, 1996, para. 5-6). This allows for tax exemption on the sale of branded merchandise and other noneducational products, a benefit that privately-owned college bookstores cannot have. In order to prevent institutions from abusing this advantage, they can funnel funds from noneducational products to students (Kim, 2014; Editor, 2017). These tax loopholes help institutions stay afloat and continue serving their students when they receive decreasing amounts of state and government allocations (Mitchell et al., 2019).

The increasing digitization means students can purchase cheaper course materials online, especially as more college bookstores partnering with Amazon only sell noneducational merchandise (Dollinger, 2016). Electronic course materials can be incredibly beneficial—they increase accessibility and convenience and are often cheaper (Douglas-Gabriel, 2018). But digitization also allows for unscrupulous practices from businesses attempting to eliminate competitors through their overwhelming resources. Textbook retailers Follet Corporation and Barnes & Nobles Education, along with other textbook publishers that control roughly 80% of the college course material market, were issued an antitrust lawsuit for their monopoly of online course materials (Leonard, 2020). By using their "Inclusive Access" program (para. 7), students are automatically billed for access to temporary online course materials that cannot be resold (McKenzie, 2020). Their tactics seem to be a way to compete with Amazon to sell the same materials at discounted rates (Leonard, 2020), but it all contributes to the commercialization of course materials. This impacts the bottom line of physical college bookstores as they rely on the sale of physical course materials, ultimately impacting students who have less control over their purchases. The profit-first approach of corporate America deviates from the educational mission and student-first method of the college bookstores, but digitization is not the enemy.

Electronic course materials are beneficial and can be separated from the for-profit agenda of private businesses. The Open Educational Resources Commons (OER) is an organization that gathers and shares a variety of free electronic course materials (such as curriculum and textbooks) without many of the ownership rights that limit availability (OER Commons, n.d). This drastically increases accessibility, both in acquiring the necessary materials and financially for lower-income students. Though the variety is limited, they are not contractually bound to what learning materials they could offer and the price point in the same way private college bookstores are (Becker, 2011). This limitation can extend to faculty who must base entire courses around limited educational materials, potentially stifling academic freedom and creativity (Seybold, 2008). OER can also pose these same limitations, but it can prevent all students—especially low-income students— from participating in the bookstore monopoly by not purchasing marked-up course materials (LaFaive, 2000). However, the reliability of OERs cuts into potential revenue for college bookstores and forces them to find other income-generating alternatives. While not a silver bullet for struggling college bookstores, the use of OERs and partnerships with college libraries for discounted textbooks or trade with other libraries can benefit both the college bookstore and the students they serve (Westervelt, 2014).

Empowering the College Bookstore and Recommendations

The college bookstore has democratized the ability for students to access and purchase the necessary course materials to succeed. But that often results through compromising its educational mission and student-first approach when private businesses incentivize institutions with greater profit margins. These two factors are not inherently detrimental to the college

bookstore's values—as mentioned throughout the text, their ability to generate income and stay competitive is what helps them exist. The issue is that the discretionary money institutions gain is difficult to track or mostly funneled back into those private businesses (Kleinman, 2019). Either option results in profiting from college bookstores without considering their educational mission. Some significant disadvantages of independent college bookstores is their lack of sense of community, autonomy, financial stability, and involvement of institutional shareholders. These recommendations work to ameliorate these shortcomings rather than guarantee a financially successful independent college bookstore—much less one that breaks even. These recommendations are realistic and work to strengthen the foundations of the college bookstore by cooperating with institutional stakeholders to exercise its educational mission and student -first approach. These should contribute to a more stable college bookstore that could convince institutions not to hand over their operations to private businesses with their own agenda.

One major reason athletic apparel companies continue to have a significant presence in college bookstores is that their branded merchandise symbolizes community. College bookstores have difficulty eliciting a sense of community in students, especially when they can feel excluded due to expensive course materials or are wary of its similarities to for-profit retailers (Chan, 2020). Taking inspiration from Claire Ommen (2015) and the University Book Store (n.d), college bookstores should partner with students to include their input in what should be sold. According to Courtney Peters (2016), themed sales, open houses, rental programs, and anything that makes the college bookstore memorable can increase student traffic. That relationship might lead to greater financial stability and loyalty from students and help establish a community that supports their college bookstore to prevent the need for help from private businesses. The goal is not to net any revenue, but that money could be put into scholarships and other institutional programs that directly benefit students (Kim, 2014; Editor, 2017).

The increasing monopolization of college bookstores through private businesses means similarly binding contracts where only certain course materials can be sold at a predetermined price. Students are forced to pay, find alternatives, or risk their grades by not purchasing anything (McKenzie, 2018); faculty must structure courses to these predetermined materials as contracts might prevent other materials.

This fragmentation hurts the institution and the college bookstore, so compromising on OER and other low-cost alternatives (used textbooks, rentals, and digital products) can unite stakeholders. While the college bookstore would lose revenue from sold course material (Westervelt, 2014), partnerships with other institutions or sharing libraries can help build social capital. By giving faculty members autonomy over selected course materials and students multiple ways to access them, more faculty members and students of all income levels can be empowered and contribute to the collective social capital. This financial sacrifice would reward the college bookstore with a partnership between various institutional stakeholders, allowing for a better bargaining tool when institutions consider outsourcing.

If outsourcing the college bookstore to a private business or athletic apparel company is inevitable, partnerships with institutional stakeholders can be a powerful bargaining tool. Constituent loyalty could translate to protests on behalf of the college bookstore, forcing the institution to consider contracts more carefully. Students and faculty gathered in protest of the privatization of the University of North Carolina (UNC) Chapel Hill college bookstore in November 2015 ("Protestors Object", 2015). Protestors worried for the fate of student workers while UNC leadership realized declining sales meant decreased allocations for scholarships (University of North Carolina [UNC], n.d). Outsourcing to Barnes and Noble Education would provide revenue to fund the college bookstore's educational mission (UNC, n.d), but UNC leadership needed to consider their community's pleas. The deal came to pass, but with a contract requiring the hiring of student workers and an advisory board "consisting of students, faculty and staff,[sic] to provide input on store programs, merchandise, and services" (UNC, n.d). The involvement of institutional stakeholders contributed to a contract that benefits the community and a private college bookstore under constant monitoring.

Conclusion

Corporate America has contributed to the commercialization of higher education through the privatization of college bookstores by athletic apparel companies and private businesses. The decreasing number of independent college bookstores is a direct result of it, and it puts their educational mission and student-first approach in jeopardy. But independent college bookstores should not have to be outsourced

and prioritize profit in order to succeed. Branded merchandise and marketplace competition have their place in the college bookstore—they financially benefit institutions and help prevent a bookstore monopolization. Even a greater reliance on electronic services can benefit students rather than alienate them. It all depends on how institutions implement these initiatives. Higher education institutions must have the courage to stand against corporate America so college bookstores can continue to prioritize students.

References

Anderson, N. (2016, November 10). Here's a college bookstore that doesn't stock any textbooks. *The Washington Post*. https://tinyurl.com/4j5y6e7m

Angelo, D. (2021, September/October). *Driving traffic*. The College Store Magazine, (September/October 2021), 18-28. https://tinyurl.com/yckwt4w5

Becker, B. W. (2011, September 14). The e-book apocalypse: A survivor's guide. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, 30(3), 181-184. DOI:10.1080/01639269.2011.591278

Bok, D. (2004, December 5). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton University Press. ISBN:9780691120126

Brown, M. (2020, September 29). *Hey, what's in a small school apparel contract anyway?* Extra Points. https://extrapoints.substack.com/p/hey-whats-in-a-small-school-apparel

Dollinger, A. (2016, September 16). As Amazon arrives, the campus bookstore is a books store no more. *The New York Times*. https://tinyurl.com/bdfn5crb

Dorpat, P. (2001, February 26). *Now & then—University Book Store*. History Link. https://www.historylink.org/File/3000

Dosh, K. (2017, June 12). The biggest misconceptions about the finances of college sports. *Forbes*. https://tinyurl.com/2p84rr22

Edelman, M. (2020, May 27). Chartering the Future of Intercollegiate Athletics at the City University of New York – A Legal, Ethical, and Financial Case Study. *Virginia Sports & Entertainment Law Journal, Forthcoming*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3612357

Editor, W. (2017, January 30). Keeping college bookstore prices down and revenues up. *University Business*. https://tinyurl.com/yckrsfb5

Fiore, N. (1996, September 1). From the tax adviser: College and university bookstores. *Journal of Accountancy*. https://tinyurl.com/5n8sw7e8

Highland, K. D. (2016). In the bookstore: The houses of Appleton and book cultures in antebellum New York City. *Book History* 19, 214-255.doi:10.1353/bh.2016.0006

Independent College Bookstore Association. (n.da). *About ICBA*. https://icbainc.com/about-icba/

Independent College Bookstore Association. (n.db). *ICBA Member Stores*. https://icbainc.com/about-icba/icba-member-stores/

Kim, J. (2014, June 12). A college bookstore Q&A. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://tinyurl.com/y7fes8rz

Kish, M. (2014, November 29). Big brands on campus: Money flows to some unlikely places. *Portland Business Journal*. https://tinyurl.com/2e78r98m

Kleinman, D. (2019, September 13). The most valuable college apparel deals: UCLA leads as gear companies' new mindset thwarts rivals. *Forbes*. https://tinyurl.com/2p8w3bj2

LaFaive, M. D. (2000, Spring). *Privatization by the book: Competition for campus bookstores (Michigan Privatization Report No. 2000-01)*. Mackinac Center for Public Policy. https://www.mackinac.org/2725

Lederman, D. (2017, March 6). Leveling the playing field for independent bookstores. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://tinyurl.com/44m86d9f

Leonard, M. (2020, January 23). McGraw-Hill, Barnes & Noble accused of online monopoly (2). *Bloomberg Law*. https://tinyurl.com/mredshxk

Macdonald, M. (2020, January 16). Happy 120th birthday, University Book Store! Here are some things you might not have known about it. *The Seattle Times*. https://tinyurl.com/2p9eex3h

McDonough, R. (2017, February 17). Secret to small bookstore success is building community of readers, neighbors. *WHYY*. https://tinyurl.com/5n7un7f5

McKenzie, L. (2018, August 16). Students spending on course material plumments. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://tinyurl.com/3btb7v2r

McKenzie, L. (2020, January 27). A legal challenge for inclusive access. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://tinyurl.com/yc6ndnx5

Merriam-Webster. (n.d). Retail. *In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved January 06, 2022, from https://

www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/retail

Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., Saena, M. (2019, October 24). *State higher education funding cuts have pushed costs to students, worsening inequality.* Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/10-24-19sfp.pdf

Moravian University. (n.d). *Moravian Bookshop.* https://www.moravian.edu/bookshop

National Association of College Stores. (2020). *Higher Education Retail Market Facts & Figures.* https://www.nacs.org/newpage

National Association of College Stores. (n.d) *About us.* https://www.nacs.org/services

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2020, September). *NCAA financial database: Finances of intercollegiate athletics database.* https://tinyurl.com/2p9eadsx

OER Commons. (n.d). *About OER Commons.* https://www.oercommons.org/about

Ommen, C. (2015, September 24). *The paradox of private bookstores.* Whitman Wire. https://whitmanwire.com/feature/2015/09/24/the-paradox-of-private-bookstores/

Pac-12 Conference. (n.d). *About the Pac-12 Conference.* https://tinyurl.com/5n8zr2vh

Peters, C. (2016, February 18). *5 ways to attract more students to the campus bookstore.* XanEdu. https://tinyurl.com/2p8uppsw

Protesters object to plan to take UNC Book Store private. (2015, December 1). *Citizen Times.* https://tinyurl.com/3uuc5zpw

Rosen, J. (2016, November 25). The college bookstore, disrupted. *Publishers Weekly.* https://tinyurl.com/ycknjxbw

Rosen, J. (2017, March 10). National College Store Association gears up to fight for independent college bookstores. *Publishers Weekly.* https://tinyurl.com/4nd2p7ed

Rubin, B. F. (2016, May 13). Only Amazon can open a college bookstore with no books. *CNET.* https://tinyurl.com/288zxvzz

Seybold, P. J. (2008, June 12). *The Struggle against Corporate Takeover of the University.* Socialism and Democracy, 22(1), 115-125. https://tinyurl.com/uavw7s5u

Sugiura, K. (2017, July 7). What do companies pay for in an apparel contract? *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution.* https://tinyurl.com/2p85b392

University Book Store. (n.d). *About us.* https://www.ubookstore.com/about

University of North Carolina. (2016, April 21). *UNC-Chapel Hill selects Barnes & Noble College to manage UNC Student Stores.* https://tinyurl.com/wu2nt85x

University of Washington. (n.d). *Associated Students of the University of Washington.* http://www.asuw.org/

Veneziano, J. (n.d). America's oldest intercollegiate athletic event. Harvard University. http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~harvcrew/Website/History/HY

Westervelt, E. (2014, October 10). Digital natives, except when it comes to textbooks. National Public Radio. https://tinyurl.com/2nznf4u9

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Special Education Legislation: An Overview of the Stride Toward Inclusion

Joanna Pisacone

Special Education Legislation: The Impact on Students with Disabilities in Higher Education

Special education is a relatively new concept despite schooling in the United States having centuries of foundation. For most of education history, students with disabilities have been excluded from the narrative (Yell et al., 1998). The emergence of disability advocacy brought forth a plethora of litigation that resulted in the creation of laws and policies that addressed this negligence in schools. This influx of advocacy is the result of almost half of the students with disabilities in the United States receiving an inadequate education or no education at all (Rogers et al., 1997). The endeavor of ensuring the educational rights of students with disabilities has been a long haul. Overtime, the conversation around educating students with disabilities has shifted from access to quality. An understanding of the litigation and legislation that contributed to the development of special education as we see it today is essential for the prosperity of students with disabilities.

There is an ongoing cycle of litigation that results in legislation followed by further litigation to clarify legislation which is already in place; when considering this cycle, it is a two-step process that continuously repeats itself. This process is grueling, yet it is the foundation of continued developments in special education, therefore, it is proven necessary to address issues faced by students with special needs (Rogers et al., 1997). Bringing inequalities that a student faces in their schooling to a litigious setting or pushing for further clarification of a policy will benefit all students. Moreover, understanding the way litigation and legislation are intertwined contributes to our advocacy for students with disabilities to ensure their prosperity. Developments in education policy and legislation pertaining to individuals with disabilities is essential to prohibit discrimination based on a disability not only in schooling K-12 but in higher education as well.

Ongoing attention brought to the rights of individuals with disabilities is needed, especially in the realm of higher education. As policy and legislation continues to evolve, it is essential to place focus on all stages of a student's education, not solely the early developmental years. The National Center for Learning Disabilities (2022) reports that students with disabilities attend college at half the rate of their nondisabled peers. This jarring statistic brings attention to the need to address the barriers preventing individuals with disabilities from entering higher education.

Legal Developments in Special Education

Developments in special education to provide better education to students with disabilities are the result of the ongoing cycle of litigation and legislation. The unequal treatment of students with disabilities in education was unattested until litigation brought attention to the matter (Yell et al., 1998). Advocates who sought better treatment and educational outcomes brought the unfathomable inequality children with disabilities were facing to the courts to spur change. With the establishment of legal precedent that allowed the exclusion of students from school based on their disability, litigation began to emerge in hopes of mitigating this discrimination (Yell et al., 1998). Over time the cycle of litigation and legislation pertaining to special education evolved to no longer support the intentional exclusion of individuals with disabilities. The implementation of legislation regarding the treatment, access, and quality of education received by students with disabilities in turn changed the way schools needed to operate. However, interpretation of the laws varies. Although legislation regarding special education has been implemented at a federal level, education is mainly a responsibility of state and local governments. As a result, different interpretations

of the law at the state level led to more litigation to determine what is truly required by schools to provide to their students with disabilities (Martin et al., 1996). This in turn leads to a continuing cycle of litigation that is initiated to clarify the law which results in refined legislation. This cycle, although grueling, results in the establishment of essential rights and procedures protecting students with disabilities.

Key Terms Pertaining to Special Education

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

When defining what a free appropriate public education is, the U.S. Department of Education (2010) states: "An appropriate education includes: education services designed to meet the individual education needs of students with disabilities as adequately as the needs of nondisabled students are met, the education of each student with a disability with nondisabled students, to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of the student with a disability, evaluation and placement procedures established to guard against misclassification or inappropriate placement of students, and a periodic reevaluation of students who have been provided special education or related services, and establishment of due process procedures."

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

A student's Individualized Education Program also known as their IEP is a legal document that is crucial to their education. Specifically, the IEP documents a child's need for special education and creates a plan to provide programs and services that adhere to the student's needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

A student is placed in what is considered the least restrictive environment for their learning. The least restrictive environment is different for each student given every child has unique needs. According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997), when placed in the least restrictive environment your child will be educated alongside his or her non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. As a result, removal from the general education classroom only occurs when services or supplementary aids do not prove to be useful given the nature of the disability (IDEA, 1997).

Related Services

As described by the U.S. Department of Education (2010), related services are services that assist a student in receiving a meaningful education. These services are provided to enhance and aid the learning experience. Among these services are counseling, speech-language therapy, and occupational therapy.

Litigation

A series of cases brought attention to the inequity and inequality that students with disabilities were facing in the realm of schooling. As these cases were brought to the courts, the rights of students with disabilities began to be solidified. Consequently, the courts have found that schools are not permitted to deny equal protection under the law on the basis on a student's disability.

Brown v. Board (1954)

Brown v. Board is a landmark case known for the advances it made for civil rights in the United States 1950s. Brown addressed the segregation in public schools that was occurring under the standard of "separate but equal." The Supreme Court held that educating students separately solely based on race was a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Brown v. Board, 1954). Ultimately, the Court found that the segregation implemented in public schools caused detrimental effects on the educational and personal growth of African American students (Brown v. Board, 1954). Although this case has a foundation addressing racial inequality in schools, Brown served as a legal precedent in the future during the Disability Rights Movement.

Disability advocates joined forces with the civil rights movement to gain momentum in their fight for equality (Anti-Defamation League, 2018). Those who fought for the rights of students with disabilities in the classroom used the findings from Brown as a legal foundation for their cases. When delivering the opinion of the unanimous Court decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren stated "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (Brown v. Board, 1954). Despite the findings of Brown being grounded in racial inequality, the case was adapted to adhere to the needs of students with disabilities.

PARC v. Pennsylvania (1972)

PARC v. Pennsylvania, is a critical case to gain momentum in the efforts for access to education for students with disabilities, was the first case to address the right to an education in the country (The Public Interest Law Firm, n.d.). This lawsuit sought to

overturn Pennsylvania law that excluded students with disabilities from receiving an education in the public school system. The plaintiffs of this case argued that the law violated students with disabilities' right to due process and the equal protection clause. PARC's ruling was a monumental step in the right direction; the court found that the state must provide a free appropriate public education to students with disabilities.

PARC is a case that formed the foundation for special education. It established the standard of appropriateness for Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) (PARC v. Pennsylvania, 1972). Establishing the standard of a free appropriate public education required not only providing a free public education to students with disabilities, but also ensuring that the education provided was appropriate to the child's learning abilities and needs (Martin et al., 1996).

Mills v. Board of Education (1972)

Occurring not long after PARC, Mills brought a suit against public schools in the District of Columbia due to their expelling or denying the enrollment of students with disabilities (Mills v. Board of Education, 1972). The exclusion of students with disabilities was attributed to budget constraints. When considering how many students this would affect, the decision would exclude approximately 12,340 students with disabilities (Martin et al., 1996). Mills raised the question of whether a school can deny education services to a student with disabilities due to funding issues.

This is an important topic to discuss given that educating a student with disabilities costs more than educating an abled peer. For context, when comparing the expenditures per pupil for general versus special education for the 2017-18 school year, New York State spends $13,367 per pupil in general education and $32,359 per pupil in special education (New York State Education Department, 2019). However, despite the extra funding needed to educate students with disabilities, the court held that the burden of insufficient funding is not placed on the child but the school (Martin et al., 1996). Therefore, schools cannot claim they do not have the funds to support the education of a student with disabilities as a reason for not providing them an equitable education.

Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley (1982)

Rowley addressed the question of what a school needs to provide to meet the requirement of a free appropriate public education. This is a critical turning point in special education given the conversation has shifted from access to quality. Prior to Rowley, the majority of legislation regarding special education was focused on ensuring that students with disabilities had access to the classroom. Gaining access to the classroom was only half the battle in the enduring fight for recognition for students with disabilities; advocates had to now work on ensuring that adequate resources and services are provided to guarantee an equal education to nondisabled peers.

This case is essential in determining how legislation should be interpreted regarding what resources schools are required to provide. As schools permitted access to students with disabilities into the classroom, schools and parents were conflicted on who should provide the necessary assistance. The Court held that the school is only responsible for services and resources that will ensure the student has an equal education to their non-disabled peers (Board of Education v. Rowley, 1982). Therefore, the school is required to provide all necessary aids that level the playing field in the classroom among disabled and nondisabled students.

Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education (1989)

This case was central to establishing the importance of the least restrictive environment. Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education (1989) is a case that was brought on due to a school denying a student with disabilities placement in a classroom with nondisabled peers. Daniel R.R. was influential in the movement to favor mainstreaming students with disabilities rather than excluding them. The Court found that schools must place the student in a learning environment where they interact with their nondisabled peers to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, removal from the general education classroom must be justified and documented.

This case came because of the law not explicitly stating what constitutes a least restrictive environment. However, the general explanation of the least restrictive environment is due to the varying, unique needs of each student. The least restrictive environment that works for one student is not necessarily applicable to all students with the same disability.

Oberti v. Board of Education (1992)

Oberti established that the use of related services, accommodations, and supplementary aids to ensure inclusion in general education classrooms is the standard (The Public Interest Law Center, n.d.). This

case determined that if a student can succeed in the general education classroom with needed extra support, that is where they should be placed. Furthermore, the school must provide the supports needed to ensure the student's success. As a result of Oberti a two-prong test was developed to determine if schools were following the requirement to mainstream students if they are eligible.

Ultimately, consideration must be given to whether the student will better succeed in the general classroom with supplemental aids and services or within a segregated special education class. When weighing these two options it is necessary to address the benefits a student receives when integrated with their nondisabled peers. Thinking of this in a higher education context is necessary given at this level there are no longer IEPs; however, under Section 504 and Title II students with disabilities in higher education are still protected from discrimination. The U.S. Department of Education (2020) states: "colleges and universities are required by Section 504 and Title II to provide students with disabilities with appropriate academic adjustments and auxiliary aids and services that are necessary to afford an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to participate in the school's program." The requirement of higher education institutions to accommodate students with the necessary supports or aids to alleviate inequities resulting from their disability is embedded in the outcome of Oberti.

Legislation

Advocacy for the rights of students with disabilities through litigation led to legislation. Starting with the parents and loved ones of students with disabilities, the push for change eventually made its way to the federal level. Legislation pertaining to the needs of students with disabilities is relatively new and continues to be redefined and altered to fit the everchanging needs of students as inequities arise.

Much of the existing legislation pertaining to individuals with disabilities applies to K-12 education, however, there are elements in place that adhere to the higher education sector. When transitioning from grade school to higher education, the ways in which the rights of students with disabilities are addressed can change (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Although legislation such as Section 504 and Title II apply to higher education as well, responsibilities at this level of education differs. For example, according to the U.S. Department of Education (2011), post-secondary schools are not required to provide FAPE in the way that grade schools are. This disparity is significant given the assurance of FAPE is an integral part of ensuring an equitable education for all students despite their abilities. Differences in execution among varying levels of education have led to the introduction of new components to existing legislation as well as the emergence of completely new policies and legislation.

Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act (1973)

The passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act was the first federal effort to protect people with disabilities. Originally proposed in 1972, the legislation was not put into effect until 1977 due to political delay. Amending Section 504 extended civil rights protection including all remedies, procedures, and rights under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to people with disabilities (Yell et al., 1998). The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006) states that Section 504 is a national law that protects individuals from discrimination based on their disability. This law prohibits denying an individual the opportunity to participate in or benefit from federally funded programs, services, or benefits due to their disability.

Subsequently, the Department of Education has established the Office for Civil Rights. Among many other things, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has the responsibility of protecting students with disabilities from discrimination in their education. According to the Office for Civil Rights (2020), most concerns are regarding the identification of students who are protected by Section 504 and obtaining an appropriate education for said students. Therefore, OCR is in place to ensure Section 504 is enforced and students with disabilities are receiving the free appropriate public education they are legally entitled to and deserve. This is done by examining school procedures used to identify, evaluate, and place students with disabilities.

The rights afforded to individuals with disabilities continues from their K-12 education on to the higher education sector. Enforced by the Office for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education, Section 504's goal to dismantle discrimination based on disability is applied to postsecondary school to protect students (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). An example of this being, a higher education institution may not deny acceptance to a qualified candidate solely because they have a disability. Moreover, once accepted the institution will need to provide the student with all

necessary supports or aids needed.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975)

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) recognized the need to help provide a quality education for students with disabilities. This act provided federal funding to states to assist them in educating students with disabilities in accordance with the requirements presented in the Act (Rogers et al., 1997). Consequently, states had to submit a plan to ensure they are enacting the requirements in their schools to receive the funds.

The EAHCA included many protections and rights for students with disabilities. This included the right to nondiscriminatory testing, evaluation, and placement procedures. Therefore, a student with disabilities must be tested, evaluated, and placed in a way that does not make use of their disability as cause for hindering their educational success. Additionally, this Act mandated that students be educated in the least restrictive environment. As addressed in Oberti and Daniel R.R., ensuring a student is placed in a learning environment that is integrated with their peers to the extent most possible is an important aspect of educational equity. In relation to least restrictive environment, EAHCA also requires that a free appropriate public education be provided to students with disabilities. Mandating at the federal level that students with disabilities have the right to a free, public education that adequately fits their unique needs is an integral step in the development of special education (Yell et al., 1998). The EAHCA explicitly laid out expectations for the education of students with disabilities at a national level, representing a dramatic shift in the view of educating students with disabilities.

In terms of higher education, EACHA provides great foundation for providing rights to students throughout their education journey. EACHA has set precedent that aims to dismantle discrimination based on disabilities in education and was renamed to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990. The goals and objectives of EACHA are further developed and modernized with the implementation of IDEA.

Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was put into place in 1990 to prohibit the discrimination against individuals with disabilities. Moreover, through the passage of ADA, individuals with disabilities are afforded civil rights protections like rights based on gender, race, and religion. ADA protects against discrimination of individuals with disabilities in all areas of public life including jobs, transportation, and schooling (ADA National Network, 2022).

There are multiple facets of ADA that contribute to the protection of individuals with disabilities from discrimination. Title I of ADA ensures equal employment access and opportunities for individuals with disabilities (ADA National Network, 2022). This component is designed to ensure employers provide necessary accommodations or modifications that are needed to adhere with an individual's needs. Title II of ADA enforces nondiscrimination based on disability in state and local government services (ADA National Network, 2022). This section of ADA is in place to ban discrimination of individuals with disabilities in programs, activities, and services of public entities. Furthermore, according to the ADA (2022), Title II clarifies section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by expanding its coverage to all entities. Title III of ADA focuses on prohibiting the discrimination of individuals with disabilities regarding public accommodations. Public accommodations refer to private places that provide public accommodations, for example, a private school. Consequently, Title III requires businesses to make accommodations or modifications to their typical practice when serving individuals with disabilities (ADA National Network, 2022).

Access to higher education is among the most vital goals of ADA promoting equal access to individuals with disabilities. Through Title II of ADA higher education institutions are not legally allowed to decline a student's enrollment based on their disability (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Moreover, the passage of ADA has ensured that despite students not having an IEP at the post-secondary level, schools will be accountable to provide the resources and supports necessary to alleviate barriers that may stem from having a disability; difficulties that may arise include possible programmatic, physical, and social barriers (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The implementation of ADA in higher education can be seen through accommodations and modifications put into place by disability service offices. These offices found at colleges and universities across the nation are in place to alleviate difficulties and disparities that may occur because of differences in expectations from the high school to the post-secondary level (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Moreover, disability service

offices are a way to ensure that an institution is abiding by the legal and ethical obligations set forth by ADA (ADA National Network, 2022). The implementation of ADA provides a foundation of ground rules which provide access to students with disabilities to the higher education environment.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was developed on the foundation set by EAHCA; the 1990 amendments renamed EAHCA to IDEA. The passage of IDEA has subsequently made it the guidebook for all to follow regarding special education rights and procedures. Overall, there are six main components that shape IDEA:

1. Every child is entitled to a free appropriate education.
2. Every student is entitled to an evaluation of all areas relating to the suspected disability.
3. Creation of an IEP to dictate what services and programs will be provided to the child in their education.
4. Education programs and services must be provided in the least restrictive environment.
5. The child and parents' input must be taken into consideration during the education process.
6. When a parent feels the IEP is inappropriate for their child, they are entitled to challenge the treatment with due process rights.

The act continued the establishment of rights already set forth by EAHCA but added additional major changes. Among these changes included emphasis on person first language; this altered language that would be used within legislation and other educational documents from "handicapped student" to "student with a disability." This change has been extremely influential in the way people with disabilities are acknowledged. The implementation of person first language recognizes the person before the disability; this switch in terminology provides the opportunity to separate the person from their diagnosis (National Aging and Disability Transportation Center, 2020). Much of this change has stemmed from exposure to disability representation at the higher education level; this conversation is necessary as more students with disabilities continue onto enrolling in higher education institutions. In fact, a study done on perception of first-person language in higher education reports that 43% of students were first exposed to person-first language in their university classrooms (Hoffman et. al, 2020).

Support of the use of person-first language is essential to create a more inclusive and positive environment in the context of higher education such as on college campuses.

In addition to this, IDEA established distinct categories for students diagnosed with autism or traumatic brain injuries (Rogers et al., 1998). This addition allowed for students with these disabilities to be entitled to all that is covered under the law. Lastly, among major changes is the requirement that a transition plan be developed in the IEP for every student by the age of 16. The development of a transition plan is useful for students with disabilities in the shift from schooling to life after school. Transition plans consider the student's interests, hobbies, goals, and needs (Advocates for Children, 2018). The inclusion of a transition plan within the IEP process is fundamental to planning for a student with disability to transition to post-secondary life including the workforce and living skills.

In 1997 amendments were made to IDEA. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 amended and reauthorized IDEA given the successes the act had in improving the access students with disabilities had to an education (Rogers et al., 1998). The new goal of the federal government was improving the performance and achievement of students with disabilities. As a result, there were several mandated changes to the IEP that focused on improving educational results. One of many of these changes is the requirement of a statement of measurable goals to be included in the IEP. This was added to ensure accurate measurement and reporting of a student's progress in achieving their goals dictated in the IEP. Additionally, the amendment added a section regarding the discipline of students with disabilities. IDEA requires that if a student with disabilities presents behavioral issues, then the IEP team is supposed to implement behavioral interventions, supports, and strategies (Rogers et al., 1998). Beyond this if the student's behavior requires them to be expelled the expulsion exceeds ten days.

By 2004, IDEA was amended once again to address current issues in special education. The most recent reauthorization called for early intervention, greater accountability, improved outcomes, and raised standards for instructors (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2020). These additions are focused on bettering the quality of education received by students with disabilities. There is great importance behind early intervention: The earlier it is provided the more likely it is to be effective (Center for Disease

Control and Intervention, 2021). Intervention services can affect a child's developmental path, therefore, the addition of policy regarding early intervention for students with disabilities is a significant step in contributing to educational skills and outcomes. Regarding accountability and outcomes, IDEA mandates that children with disabilities be included in system accountability measures. The inclusion of students with disabilities in the system accountability measures requires recognition that students with disabilities are given the opportunity to succeed and have access to general education standards (National Center on Educational Outcomes, n.d.). In addition, IDEA enforces specific requirements that must be met by special education teachers that categorizes them as "highly qualified." According to IDEA Regulations: Highly Qualified Teachers this includes individuals' minimum degree requirements and certifications.

A major component of the IEP is the inclusion of a transition plan for students by the age of 16. The transition plan is designed to facilitate a student with disabilities' movement from school to post-school activity (Wrights Law, 2020). Post-school activities include post-secondary education, vocational schooling, and community involvement. The transition plan is individualized, incorporating how a student will partake in post-school activities based on their needs and interests. Grounding the transition plan in the student's specific needs and interests aims to ensure the plans will appropriately set the individual up for future success. However, despite the initial steps of incorporating a transition plan into a student's IEP, there continues to be barriers in the transition process that prevent students from going further in their academic careers to higher education. There is a clear and consistent need for more explicit transition planning between high school and higher education institutions.

Moreover, not all aspects of IDEA carry on beyond the K-12 education. An example of this is IDEA's requirement of FAPE; although this is a requirement at the primary levels, higher education institutions are not required to provide FAPE to their students (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). Another example is the shift in responsibility for identifying a disability. While IDEA mandates that school districts are responsible for identifying students' disabilities and assessing their needs, at the higher education level that responsibility falls on the individual (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). This transition of ownness to the individual requires them to initiate the conversation regarding need for support or accommodations.

Higher Education Act

The Higher Education Act (HEA) focuses directly on college and post-secondary plans for students with disabilities. According to the National Center for Learning Disabilities, HEA has two main goals to improve outcomes for students with disabilities – increasing access to college and preparing teachers. Given students with disabilities attend college at half the rate of their nondisabled peers, the measures provided in HEA are necessary to address this inequity in access and outcomes (National Center for Learning Disabilities, n.d.). Although this act serves as a foundation for future legislation that aims to increase opportunity, there is much more that needs to be done to produce results that change the current trajectory.

Conclusion

The process of providing students with disabilities access to an education that is of appropriate quality is still a relatively new endeavor. Students with disabilities benefit from the support of family, educators, and many other professionals addressing the inequality that is faced in school. Ultimately, progress has been achieved from persistent advocacy. Bringing the issues faced by students with disabilities in their education to court has evidently led to legislative outcomes that aim to overcome the obstacles faced by these students.

It is evident that although advocacy and representation of students with disabilities has led to meaningful change yet there is still a substantial way to go. Specifically in the context of higher education, legislation needs to better address issues that arise in post-secondary schooling and beyond the K-12 experience. Current legislation provides a variety of safeguards and a foundation that can be used as precedent in the higher education sector but does not directly address the problems that may be occurring at the higher education level that are not apparent in K-12.

References

ADA National Network (2022). *What is the Americans with Disabilities Act?* Retrieved from https://adata.org/learn-about-ada.

Advocates for Children. (2018, September). *Transition Services & College Planning.* Retrieved from http://www.advocatesforchildren.org/sites/default/files/library/missed_communications_2007.pdf.

Anti-Defamation League. (n.d.). *A brief history of the disability rights movement.* Retrieved from https://www.adl.org/education/resources/backgrounders/disability-rights-movement.

Brown v. Board of Education. 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Why act early if you're concerned about development?.* (2021, April 19). Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/actearly/whyActEarly.html.

Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education, et al. 874 F.2d 1036 (5th Cir. 1989)

data.nysed.gov. (2019). *Fiscal Accountability Summary* (2018-19). Retrieved from https://data.nysed.gov/fiscal.php?year=2019&instid=800000048663.

Hoffman H., Hengesbach M., & Trotter S. (2020) Perspectives on Person-First Language: A Focus on College
Students. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 33(1), 39-48. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1273634.pdf

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, 105th Congress.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2020, November 24). *A history of the individuals with disabilities education act.* Retrieved from https://sites.ed.gov/idea/IDEA-History.

Martin, E. W., Martin, R., & Terman, D. L. (1996). The legislative and Litigation History of Special Education. *The Future of Children*, 6(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.2307/1602492

Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972).

Pennsylvania Association for the Retarded Citizens (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972).

National Aging and Disability Transportation Center. (2020, September 1). *Person-first and identity-first language choices.* Retrieved from https://www.nadtc.org/news/blog/person-first-and-identity-first-language choices/#:~:text=Person%2Dfirst%20language%20(e.g.%2C,someone's%20diagnosis%20from%20their%20personhood.

National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO). (n.d.). Accountability for Students with Disabilities. Retrieved from https://nceo.info/Resources/publications/TopicAreas/Accountability/AccountFAQ.htm.

National Center for Learning Disabilities. (2022). *Rewriting the Higher Education Act to Serve Students with Disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www.ncld.org/news/policy-and-advocacy/rewriting-the-higher-education-act-to-serve-students-with-disabilities/

Public Interest Law Center. (n.d.). *Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon.* Retrieved from https://www.pubintlaw.org/cases-and-projects/oberti-v-board-of-education-of-the-borough-of-clementon/.

Public Interest Law Center. (n.d.). *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (parc) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: The Public Interest Law Center*. Retrieved from https://www.pubintlaw.org/cases-and-projects/pennsylvania-association-for-retarded-citizens-parc-v-commonwealth-of-pennsylvania/.

Yell, M. L., Rogers, D., & Rogers, E. L. (1998). The Legal History of Special Education. *Remedial and Special Education,* 19(4), 219–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259801900405

U.S. Department of Education (2020, April 20). *Disability Discrimination.* Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/frontpage/faq/disability.html#:~:text=Colleges%20and%20universities%20are%20required,participate%20in%20the%20school's%20program.

U.S. Department of Education (2010, August). *Free Appropriate Public Education for Students with Disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/edlite-FAPE504.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2019, August 30). *Guide to the individualized education program.* Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/parents/needs/speced/iepguide/index.html#process.

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *IDEA–Reauthorized Statute Highly Qualified Teachers*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/tb-qual-teachers.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education. (2020, January 10). *Protecting students with disabilities.* Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/504faq.html. .

U.S. Department of Education. (2011, September). *Students with Disabilities Preparing for Postsecondary Education.* Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/transition.html

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006, June). *Your rights under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.* Retrieved from https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ocr/civilrights/resources/factsheets/504.pdf.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Theme IV: Identity Development

The Myth of the Black Monolith: Reconstructing the Black Identity on College Campuses

Sean J. Richardson

The Myth of the Black Monolith: Reconstructing the Black Identity on College Campuses

There are three main groups within the Black community and the African Diaspora: Africans, Caribbean, and African Americans. However, there are other groups; within this paper, these groups will be mentioned regarding universities within the United States. Black immigrants make up a significant portion of our society in the United States. In 2016, 4.2 million Black immigrants were living in the United States. Approximately 1 out of every 10 Black people are foreign-born (Anderson & López, 2020). In student affairs practice, there is a constant push for racial and ethnic diversity among the college population (Martin, 2020), especially in the wake of racial unrest. How does this push apply to Black students? Is there a particular type of Black student this messaging refers to? There is a typical image of what a Black person looks like and their perceived ethnicity. There are multiple ethnicities within the Black community aside from African Americans, yet in the U.S., Black ethnic groups are told they are Black and African American. The umbrella term "Black" obscures Black immigrants' ethnicity and erases their background when these same Black immigrants present themselves in the United States.

When race and ethnicity are used interchangeably, it can skew our understanding of what it means to be Black and have an ethnicity other than African American. Even though Black immigrants may distinguish themselves from African Americans, is there a shared racial experience? Within this body of text, it is argued that there is a shared racial experience among the Black community regardless of ethnicity. As it relates to higher education, colleges and universities need to support Black students in searching for their racial and cultural identity beyond society's perception of their identity.

There is a search for racial and cultural identity beyond society's perception. Colleges and universities are meant to serve as microcosms of society and inform the development of students regarding their identities. As it pertains to racial identity and Black students in higher education, there are layers informed by racial identity theories, assimilation theories, and relationships formed within the Black diaspora. Ultimately, this paper will identify student development theories, apply those to the related literature on the subject matter, and eventually develop conclusions that disprove the monolithic nature of Black student support.

When referring to populations in this text, African Americans will refer to those born within the United States who are Black. Caribbean Immigrants will refer to those born in the Caribbean and emigrated to the United States who are Black. Lastly, African Immigrants will refer to those born in Africa and who emigrated to the United States and are Black. "First generation-immigrant" will refer to those who emigrated to the United States. "Second generation-immigrant" will refer to the children of first generation-immigrants.

Theoretical Framework
Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory can provide much-needed context. Social identities refer to socially defined groups in which a person's characters indicate membership. Social identity development refers to how people come to understand their social identities and how these identities affect the different parts of their lives (McEwen, 2003). Social identity theory relies heavily on social structures as well as psychology. When Black individuals come to the United States, they enter an established racial context that is typically different from their country of origin. In this case, Americans place meaning on Black identity and act based on

assumptions and stereotypes for both Black immigrants and African Americans. There is a history of American enslavement and systemic racism projected upon Black immigrants that do not apply to them. With other groups within the United States, there is a malleability of racial identity that Black people do not have, just based on phenotypic features that Black people have. This proves that race is a perceived social identity with multiple inputs from different parts of society and is grounded in social construction, stratification, and creates a caste system based on skin color (Patton et al., 2016). There are four levels of social identity development: Individual, relational, collective, and material (Patton et al., 2016). To a degree, each level influences another. Collective identity mainly focuses on ethnicity, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, etc. (Patton et al., 2016). Collective identities imply community, and in this matter, the African American identity can be placed upon individuals whether they wish to be a part of this community.

Along with the African American identity, stereotypes are also placed upon Black immigrants. The individual does not solely establish social identity; it is set by those in proximity as well. "Aspects of self that other people, not just the individual, evaluate, and make judgments about '' (Patton et al., 2016). The process mentioned previously describes the way in which identify formation takes place. This confirms the concept of social identity place not being an exclusively intrinsic process but one that involves those within proximity.

Racial Identity Theory

Racial and Cultural Identity Development (Sue & Sue, 2003) provides a framework for different racial identity theories applied in the context of the United States. These theories were developed on Black people who primarily identified as African American and is used in levels.

The first level is Conformity. At this level, individuals are actively engaged in white culture and have negative internalizations of their racial and ethnic identity. The next level is Dissonance. At this level, racialized experiences begin to not align with the White dominant culture nor the expected outcomes. The third level, characterized by exploration of one's racial and ethnic identity, is Resistance & Immersion. Some individuals will begin rejecting alignment with the dominant culture and, instead, start identifying further with their racial and ethnic culture. These individuals will continue to reject the dominant culture

because they do not fit within it, and their experiences do not correspond. In the fourth level, Introspection, people begin trying to balance the dominant culture and their own racial or ethnic culture within themselves. Those who continue this intensive reflection enter the final level of Synergistic & Awareness. At this level, people begin to bridge the gap between the dominant culture and their heritage. They accept themselves and appreciate other groups' contributions and recognize that their racial identity is one aspect of their identity as Black immigrants live in the United States and discover that they are not immune to racial violence. In turn, this identity theory model may not account for all the experiences of immigrants. This model was developed from the experience of African Americans and can only be applied to that one individual community within the larger community of Black people. Immigrants' racial identity development does not occur in the same context as American-born Black people.

Immigration Context and Identity Theories

Within the conversation of Black immigration, it is crucial to explain why people immigrate to the United States. Political rhetoric on immigration is concerned with the willingness to migrate, and not necessarily the amount of distress, instability, and exploitation that leads to immigration (Rice, 2012). Images of perceived American living are projected in these countries of origin, and indirectly, these populations are encouraged to emigrate to the United States. These images fed to these populations are representations of White Americans and their attainment of this perceived American dream. The discussion of who can achieve the American dream based on racialized inequality is an image not given or a conversation in the portrayal of the American zeitgeist. Black immigrants come to the United States for an opportunity, but they confront racial realities.

Assimilation Theory

Assimilation is how immigrants are absorbed into the dominant culture around them. When discussing the role immigrants play in their socialization into racial groups within the United States, the Segmented Assimilation Theory (Xie & Greenman, 2011) can provide the necessary context for understanding immigrants' challenges when assimilating into communities within the United States. Segmented Assimilation Theory argues that social contexts matter. Portes & Zhou (1993) propose assimilation is an unequal process since inequalities exist within our society based upon race, gender, and socioeconomic status.

There are three paths in which immigrants can assimilate. Path one, straight-line assimilation, refers to immigrants being integrated into mainstream American society and included within White, middle-class America. Path 2 is classified as Downward Assimilation. This is when immigrants are socialized within the urban underclass. The final level of assimilation is Selective Acculturation. Selective Acculturation is the "deliberate preservation of the immigrant community's culture and values, accompanied by economic integration" (Xie & Greenman, 2011, p. 967). At its core, Segmented Assimilation is the ideology that there are multiple ways to become American. In many cases, immigrants are not socialized within the same contexts. These pathways are not strictly accounted for in immigrant communities; however, these theories and patterns help us make sense of the realities immigrants can face when coming to the United States.

Literature

The way social identity is placed upon Black immigrants, the intergroup tension of the Black community, and how and why Black immigrants will distance themselves from African Americans theory plays a role in our understanding of the complex nature of racial identity development in immigrants. Literature has gone from focusing on the development of racial consciousness in Black people to centering on what makes Black people develop racial lenses differently (Mangum & Rodriguez, 2018). With this came the research on Black ethnicities and how these experiences align in the United States. A central theme within the study was that the experiences of African Americans, Black Caribbean people, and Black Africans could be different. Research indicates that when immigrants do not think of themselves as Black Americans, they begin to distance themselves from African Americans to avoid dangerous stereotypes and ultimately downward mobility (Waters, 2001). This distancing can result in anti-African American sentiments. Intergroup dynamics form and reinforce biased ideas that African Americans are inferior. Literature has begun to pursue this group dynamic and how African Americans, Black Caribbean, and Africans operate in the United States under intense racial stratification.

Social Identity Formation

The social identity of African Americans, and their history, is projected onto Black immigrants based on phenotypic features; Black immigrants are then given the title of "Black Americans." Even though this population is told they are Black Americans, they cannot relate and often have different experiences than African Americans. Black immigrants will use distancing techniques to avoid racial stereotypes and discrimination associated with being Black in the United States (Benson, 2006). Depending on where a particular Black immigrant is from, race can hold different meanings and operate differently in the United States (Benson, 2006). Immigrants carry the native country's racial context in addition to the U.S. context.

Even though Black immigrants might not align themselves with African Americans, they still experience the racial stratification African Americans face. Other populations with racially ambiguous phenotypes have options about how they identify themselves. This seems to be how other groups distance themselves from Blackness, such as Puerto Ricans and Dominicans who do not appear dark-skinned (Itzigsohn et al., 2006). Skin color alone dictates how someone is perceived, and thus, racialized in the United States, confirming race is based upon perception. Eventually, after years of racial stratification and racial discrimination, Black immigrants began to align themselves with the interests of African Americans. However, they might still carry their ethnic identity with themselves as well (Benson, 2006).

Social identities are formed by how people are perceived and how people see themselves. When it comes to racial identity within the United States, many Black immigrants identify themselves with their ethnicity before their race to distinguish themselves from African Americans (Jones & Erving, 2015). This stems from fear of stigmatization from White people and Downward Assimilation. Black immigrants are indirectly instructed to differentiate themselves from their African American counterparts by using cultural clothes or distinct accents and avoiding Black Americans altogether (Carter & Hall, 2006). As social identities form and push and pull our societies further, Black immigrants are pressured to establish themselves as American and even further as Black Americans. There is also a pressure to abandon their culture and take on an African American identity (Mangum & Rodriguez, 2018). It is the expectation that when immigrants come to the United States, they must conform to the identity of the majority. Conformity is expected, but there is resistance since Black immigrants do not want to be perceived as African American. Adopting a Black American identity would mean limiting their chances at an opportunity in the United States.

Implications for Second Generation Immigrants

The children of Black immigrants navigate complex structures as they begin to define themselves within a society of racial stratification and rigidly defined labels. Authentic identity is questioned as students explore their racial and ethnic identities. Are children too African American? Or are they too Caribbean/African for their immediate communities?

A central theme within the development of second-generation immigrants is this idea of living in limbo between cultures. Within, Identity Constructions and Negotiations Among 1.5- and Second-Generation Nigerians: The Impact of Family, School, and Peer Contexts (Awokoya, 2012), the Nigerian experience is described. This study took college-aged participants, 1.5 generation and second-generation immigrants from Nigeria, and interviewed them on their experiences navigating what it means to be African, Nigerian, and to some extent, African American. In the discussion of identity development, it is mentioned that first-generation immigrant parents constructed both the African identity and the African American identity and presented both to their children (Awokoya, 2012). There were concerns about the loss of their Nigerian culture. The African American identity is considered wrong and detrimental to their child. While the African identity is being praised at home, in their other immediate environments, such as school, the African identity is associated with primitivism (Awokoya, 2012). At the same time, these African children cannot fully relate to their African American peers on any basis beyond their skin color. Students attempting to navigate both identities run into roadblocks where their social identity is questioned within themselves and within constituencies around them (Awokoya, 2012). Parents held a considerable amount of weight when enforcing their cultural agenda, and their African children were not allowed to be African American.

African parents expressed the need for cultural integrity, but unfortunately, this came with its problems of promoting anti-African American rhetoric (Awokoya, 2012). Earlier in this paper, it was mentioned that media consumption plays a role in how Black ethnicities see African Americans. It is described that African parents would emphasize the cultural differences by calling African Americans lazy based on their media consumption (Awokoya, 2012). Would these second-generation African immigrants have to sever their ties to Africa and become African American? Or would they pick the other side that maintained their African identity but isolated them in different settings that were not mainly African?

The central theme of identity confusion was highlighted within, In Search of an Authentic African American and/or Black Identity: Perspectives of First-Generation U.S.-born Africans attending a Predominantly White Institution. This case study explored the concept of the Black identity with U.S.-born Africans attending a predominantly white institution. In an interview, one of the participants mentioned, "You look like them, but you're not part of their actual tribe" when describing the tension between Africans and African Americans (de Walt, 2011). The Africans that stand at this middle ground have feelings of confusion regarding their identity. Africans born in Africa were considered "real" Africans while their African peers would tell those born in the U.S., "You're Black. You're not really Ethiopian. That's a culture that you just try to be in" (de Walt, 2011, p. 490). Being perceived as Black American while being African has its implications of identity confusion. When it comes to the U.S.-born Africans attempting to claim the African American identity, they are conflicted because one of the primary perceived markers of the African American identity is the legacy of American slavery (de Walt, 2011).

Within Challenging American Conceptions of Race and Ethnicity: Second Generation West Indian Immigrants (Butterfield, 2004), the experience of Caribbean immigrants' identity development is described and characterized as "contextual fluid." Like the one prior, this study took college-aged, second-generation Caribbean immigrants and posed racial and ethnic identity development questions. Whether or not these immigrants identified as African American or as Caribbean-American depended upon whom they referred to in conversation (Butterfield, 2004). Second-generation young adults catered their responses to the audience. When dealing with strangers, research suggests that these second-generation immigrants identified as African American to protect their culture from ridicule and other forms of racism from those who were non-West Indian (Butterfield, 2004). When identifying themselves as African American, they encounter many cultural differences that they must navigate that ultimately, they did not understand. When considering who was African American, second-generation Caribbean immigrants noted a context they were missing regarding the knowledge of African

American culture and influence in the United States, such as the Civil Rights movement (Butterfield, 2004). Second-generation Caribbean Americans feel guilty for not knowing much about the fight for equality in the United States, thus furthering the cultural divide between African Americans and Caribbean Americans. Caribbean Americans reconcile their identity differences by labeling themselves as racially Black and Caribbean as their ethnic identity. (Butterfield, 2004).

The findings confirm the dissonance second-generation Black immigrants feel when navigating multiple identities and different contexts. Being African or Caribbean at home would mean something different when identifying as such outside of the home and in the eye of the public. Second-generation immigrants would be labeled as not African or Caribbean enough while not fitting in with their African American peers. Multiple factors tug and pull at second-generation immigrants trying to navigate the cultural differences between African American culture and their native culture. The research findings understand that these identities do not have to exist opposing one another but can exist simultaneously (Butterfield, 2004). Conversations surrounding ethnic and racial identity topics imply a fixed, dichotomous nature to how someone identifies when identity is contextually fluid and never fixed or constrained. Through social identity theory, the understanding of race and ethnicity, and the experiences these second-generation immigrants have had, it's clear that identifying with African American culture in some capacities does not negate someone's African-ness or Caribbean-ness. Instead, these identities can coexist.

Implications for Higher Education:

When it comes to understanding the populations of students who are currently being encouraged to go to college, higher education professionals must treat disadvantaged populations as priorities for their diversity, equity, and inclusion plans. Every Black student is not African American, and assuming such can result in tensions between students. With every Black student being different, they will interpret their surroundings differently and thus need equitable resources.

Identity Exploration & Affirmation

College retention researchers identified three factors that play a role in the retention of Black students: faculty support, family support, and, finally, Black student affinity spaces (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010). With specific attention to the student affinity groups, students of color will gravitate towards communities that validate their experiences while attending a predominantly white institution (Griffin et al., 2016). Student-organized affinity spaces exist as a way for students to find their community on their campus, whether in their ethnic group or racial group and serve as a service to combat the lack of racial community that can appear on majority-white campuses. With spaces like this existing, there are barriers to the full actualization of these ethnicity-based organizations. Allowing the students full autonomy over these organizations and how they are governed can dramatically improve the willingness to participate and cultivate a student space that these groups may need. Racial and ethnic affinity spaces allow for student identity exploration to exist and allow students to feel affirmed in their identity and experiences.

Second-generation students may identify with African Americans while having Caribbean or African parents. This gives students the agency to pick their affiliation with the Black community and find a community within the greater Black population. As mentioned above, students identify with being Black but cannot relate to one another in an authentic way (de Walt, 2011). Doing so allows students to recognize diversity within the Black community and creates a more well-rounded peer education for non-Black students. Having only one Black student organization can be detrimental as students explore their identities. A "one size fits all" approach to this racial and ethnic work is not only more damaging but can lead to identity confusion. There should be multiple organizations that provide service and community to all Black students that intermingle and work together for solidarity and to reconcile intergroup tension. Race and ethnicity do not oppose each other, but they are two different things. Race and ethnicity can coexist, and students do not have to pick one or the other, but students should know and recognize the differences between the two and be assured they do not have to choose one or the other. As student affairs practitioners, systems should be in place to promote different ways of identifying oneself regarding race and ethnicity.

Clear Commitment to Black Students & Reconciling Oppressive Structures

Given the structures in place at colleges and what serves as barriers to Black students, there should be a clear commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion and

the protection and validation of Black and Indigenous populations at their college or university. Higher education has been traditionally made up of White students, and a lot of the resources are catered to serve this population. Taking a critical look at the resources offered to students can expose different perspectives in which Black students may not feel comfortable utilizing essential resources that they could benefit from.

Being transparent about the racial climate on the campus can serve Black students as well. In describing their college, Black and Brown students noted that their schools were not structurally diverse (Griffin et al., 2016). Understanding the institutional barriers that prevent structural racial and ethnic diversity supports students. It breaks those same barriers down so colleges can provide students with a more well-rounded faculty, staff, and administration who can help students further. Coming to terms with the historical context of every college can be a challenge. Still, it also provides students with much-needed security in their experience and allows students to recognize that the college or university does indeed take their history of exclusion seriously. Colleges and universities should continue to identify populations that have been historically discriminated against and disenfranchised and then provide them with opportunities to succeed in college and thrive within their experience.

While addressing the social inequalities and actively dismantling racist systems that operate on campuses, higher education professionals should provide multiple outlets for students to relieve their race-related stress. Whether that is having additional counselors for students to report to that specialize in minority stress or having support systems for these students. This would ensure that Black students would receive the support needed to finish a degree and increase retention rates among Black students. Students mentioned in Challenging American Conceptions of Race and Ethnicity: Second Generation West Indian Immigrants (Butterfield, 2004) that they would limit the scope of describing who they were ethnically to protect their culture from unnecessary scrutiny. This scrutiny exists because racism and xenophobia are still present on college campuses. The threat of racism prevents students from fully actualizing their cultural identities in their college years.

Future Research
Racial Consciousness in Immigrant Populations

Future research should ask questions of racial consciousness in these communities. When do immigrants begin to perceive themselves as Black and a part of the Black community in the United States? Current research mentions time as a factor in the development of racial consciousness. However, there should be additional variables that contribute to immigrants understanding the racial context of the United States. Immigrants begin to accept that they cannot exist outside of the racial conditions and are affected by them.

To further this idea of racial consciousness development, research should look at Black immigrants' socialization into their communities. It could be helpful to do comparative research with Black immigrants from various backgrounds, other immigrants of color, international students, and white immigrants. Researchers might ask if and how these groups understand the racial context of the United States before and after their arrival. It is told that Black immigrants begin to understand it over time and as they encounter racism in the country. However, white immigrants are not facing the same racial stratification as the community of Black immigrants. Is it possible for white immigrants to assimilate into white communities fully? Do they begin to fit this traditional model of whiteness? Is interpersonal xenophobia reserved for immigrants of color? Is there a racial consciousness formed in white immigrants?

Intersectionality and Identity Exploration
Future research should focus on the intersectionality of identities as they amplify or mitigate identity exploration within race and ethnicity. Socioeconomic status can decide where an immigrant family lives within the United States. That influence can determine how immigrant students perceive themselves within a racial and ethnic lens. Religion, sexuality, gender, and other identifying factors can influence how one sees their racial and ethnic status.

Limitations
Upon reflecting on the current research and the literature offered, there was a lack of research specializing specifically in the development of racial consciousness in immigrants, as it relates to educational settings and situations. As this research relates to specific immigrant groups, the generalization of Africans erases the cultural differences in each specific country. This also points to the lack of research on Africans regions as it relates to their experience in the United States. This logic can also apply to those within the Caribbean. There may

be cultural similarities, however, they are not the same grouping of people. Generalizing can cause more harm than good as it relates to these populations.

Conclusion

The current push for more diverse populations to attend predominantly white institutions frequently overlooks the political nuances of racial and ethnic identity in higher education. When there is a push for Black students, who are they talking about? Do they want African American students, Black Caribbean students, or Black African students? Grouping students together in their diasporic group can result in identity confusion. Not every Black student is African American, and assuming such displays the invisibility of other Black ethnicities and encourages the disillusion of the Black community.

Social identity theory mentions that identity is placed upon an individual by the society around and within oneself. Going into the racialized context of the United States, immigrants are automatically placed within the racial categories and immediately socialized as Black Americans. Non-Black people will begin the process of assuming an immigrant's race. While the immigrant may not know it, they are being associated within the racial categories of the United States. Eventually, immigrants identify with their ethnicity to distinguish themselves from African Americans, separating themselves from the negative stereotypes associated with Black Americans. They internalize these negative stereotypes and project them into the world. Since Non-Black populations perceive Black people, Black Caribbean and Africans in a similar manner. Thus, these populations face the same racial discrimination that African Americans face. Even though these immigrants are not African American, these damaging stereotypes exist for Black people overall, not just exclusively U.S.-born Black Americans who are descendants of enslaved people. Thus, racial consciousness is formed, and immigrants perceive themselves as Black and Caribbean or Black and African.

This research shows a racialized experience of Black people in the United States. Under white supremacy, every Black body within the United States is subjected to racist realities. Black immigrants can attempt to distinguish themselves from Black Americans. However, this reality exists for every Black person in the United States. With the provided understanding of racial identity theory, assimilation theory, and the literature, we understand how damaging assumptions of the Black community can be. It can expose tensions within the community and lead to identity confusion among students and children. With the number of Black immigrants coming into the United States, we must continue to break down this idea of the Black monolith and continue to encourage diversity within the Black community.

The shared racial experience also exists within the realm of higher education. Practitioners should provide spaces where students can safely participate in identity exploration and identity affirmation while breaking down the barriers that keep these spaces hidden or nonexistent. Continuing to fight for the placement of African American students in higher education establishments and fighting the xenophobic rhetoric that plagues communities of Black immigrants should be central in welcoming these populations at colleges and universities. Abolishing the Black monolith should be centered in conversations on the enrollment of Black students and the retention of these students. Understanding the different ethnic identities and their group relations within the Black community can improve policies, procedures, and overall campus climate regarding equity, diversity, and inclusion.

References

Anderson, M., & López, G. (2018, January 24). *Key facts about black immigrants in the U.S.* Pew Research Center; Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/24/key-facts-about-black-immigrants-in-the-u-s/

Awokoya, J. (2012). Identity constructions and negotiations among 1.5- and second-generation Nigerians: The impact of family, school, and peer contexts. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(2), 255–281. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.2.9v77p329367116vj

Bryce-Laporte, R. S. (1972). Black Immigrants. *Journal of Black Studies,* 3(1), 29–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/002193477200300103

Butterfield, S. P. (2004). Challenging American conceptions of race and ethnicity: Second generation west Indian immigrants. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 24(7/8), 75–102. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330410791028

De Walt, P. S. (2011). In search of an authentic African American and/or black identity: Perspectives of first generation u.s.-born Africans attending a predominantly white institution. *Journal of Black Studies,* 42(3), 479–503. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934710378748

Deaux, K. (2000). Surveying the landscape of immigration: Social psychological perspectives. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology,* 10(5), 421–431. https://doi.org/3.0.co;2-y">10.1002/1099-1298(200009/10)10:5<421::aid-casp598>3.0.co;2-y

Foner, N., Deaux, K., & Donato, K. (2018). Introduction: Immigration and Changing Identities. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences,* 4(5), 1. https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2018.4.5.01

Griffin, K. A., Cunningham, E. L., & George Mwangi, C. A. (2016). Defining diversity: Ethnic differences in Black students' perceptions of racial climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039255

Hall, S. P., & Carter, R. T. (2006). The relationship between racial identity, ethnic identity, and perceptions of racial discrimination in an Afro-Caribbean descent sample. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 32(2), 155–175. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798406287071

Hasa. (2021, January 20). *What is the Difference Between Dependency Theory and Modernization Theory?* Pediaa.com. https://pediaa.com/what-is-the-difference-between-dependency-theory-and-modernization-theory/

Howard-Hamilton, M., Richardson, B. J., & Shuford, B. (1998). Promoting multicultural

education: A holistic approach. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 18(1), 5-17. https://go.openathens.net/redirector/bc.edu?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/promoting-multicultural-education-holistic/docview/224822787/se-2?accountid=9673

Itzigsohn, J., Giorguli, S., & Vazquez, O. (2005). Immigrant incorporation and racial identity: Racial self-identification among Dominican immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 50–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/0141984042000280012

Jones, C., & Erving, C. L. (2015). Structural Constraints and Lived Realities. *Journal of Black Studies,* 46(5), 521–546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934715586506

Kenneth Bancroft Clark, & Philogène G. (2004). *Racial identity in context: the legacy of Kenneth B. Clark* (pp. 197–209). American Psychological Association.

Komives, S. R., Woodard, D., & McEwen, M. K. (2003). New Perspectives on Identity Development. *In Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 203–233). essay, Jossey-Bass.

Mangum, M., & Rodriguez, M. (2018). *Assimilation and Black Immigrants: Comparing the Racial Identity and Racial Consciousness of Caribbeans and African Americans.* Texas Southern University.

Martin, A. (2020, September 24). *The Push to Increase Diversity in Higher Ed Advancement.* Volt. https://voltedu.com/education-administration/no-more-waiting-the-push-to-increase-diversity-in-higher-ed-advancement/.

Patton, L. D., Renn, K. A., Guido-Dibrito, F., & Stephen John Quaye. (2016). *Student development in college: theory, research, and practice* (pp. 95–100). Jossey-Bass, a Wiley Brand.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The ANNALS*

of the *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530(1), 74–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271
6293530001006

Rice , M. J. (2012, November 30). *Formative essay..."compare and contrast modernization theory and dependency theory. what, if anything do they have in common?"*. mjrice. Retrieved April 15, 2022, from https://mjrice.
tumblr.com/post/36845460530/formative-essaycompare-and-contrast

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). J. Wiley.

Thornton, M. C., Taylor, R. J., Chatters, L. M., & Forsythe-Brown, I. (2016). African American and Black Caribbean feelings of closeness to Africans. *Identities*, 24(4), 493–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/107028
9x.2016.1208096

Winant, H., & Waters, M. C. (2001). Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities. *Contemporary Sociology,* 30(4), 376. https://doi.org/10.2307/3089769

Xie, Y., & Greenman, E. (2011). The social context of assimilation: Testing implications of segmented assimilation theory. *Social Science Research*, 40(3), 965–984. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.01.004

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Mixed Meaning Making: A Third Wave Investigation of Multiracial Student Development

Lisa Delacruz Combs

Two pieces that never truly make a whole
It's like being a person moving around earth without a soul
I see her shine as she banishes the other
Both knowing they are disappointing her mother
She navigates the world and feels the need to compartmentalize
Because both can't live, it's like the whole thing dies
She spends hours wondering if it is the system or maybe just her
The thoughts fill up her mind until everything becomes a blur
It's like trying to contort your body into jeans that don't fit
Her lost soul wandering the earth but feeling ready to quit
She can tell the story until her lungs run out of air
But she wonders if anyone is even listening out there
Both of her cling to critical hope
Wondering how they ended up in this contrived trope
Grasping the memories where they coexist together
These are what help her believe things will get better
The worst part is that no one believes her
They try to box her in and guess what side she prefer
The story she tells is so loud
But they press mute because messages tend to create a crowd

I start this third wave student development theory investigation literature review from my positionality and lived experiences as a multiracial woman of color. This paper gives voice to my story because it adds to the multiracial literature. It paints a picture on an empty canvas. It makes a sound in the void. This poem and paper write my narrative into existence. The scholars who created these multiracial identity development theories centered my being in the literature in invisible ways before they took their pen to paper and their fingers to the keyboard. I analyze their work through the three waves in student development to push this story forward and utilize theory to transform the messages that create a crowd into one rooted in liberation and solidarity. I begin with my own story and positionality because of my worldview. To know me is to see the significance of this work. My own multiracial identity informs my poststructural worldview. I used to see my identity as a fragmented puzzle. It felt like I did not belong anywhere. I now see my identity as a liminal asset to move beyond white supremacy's rigidity. My multiracial identity also pushes me to engage in coalition-building across and between identity experiences as points of empathy, solidarity, and aspiring allyship. I bring this poststructural worldview to this scholarship and analysis.

Introduction

In their text, Evolution of Student Development Theory, Jones and Stewart (2016) coin the term "waves" and organize student development theory within them. The first wave is characterized as rigid stage models informed by positivist paradigms. The second wave brings attention to students with minoritized identities and moves away from linear models towards fluidity and flexibility (beyond stage based). The third wave calls attention to systems of oppression and societal structures informed by power. It also demands expansive thinking, thus prompting social transformation and change. Abes et al. (2019) build upon this scholarship by focusing on critical perspectives to rethink development utilizing critical and poststructural frameworks by unsettling the rigidity of linear-based models and introducing constructs within student development theory. They assert the power of theory to transform societal structures and inequities, naming theory as a powerful tool for "liberatory praxis" (Friere, p.79, 1968).

This paper traces the trajectories of multiracial college student development theories through the three waves conceptualized by Jones and Stewart (2016) to inform future directions in critical mixed- race

scholarship and praxis. Within each wave, I examine the utility and limitations of each paradigmatic perspective to construct my argument. I focus on Critical Multiracial Theory or MultiCrit (Harris, 2016) and utilize it as a frame in my analysis. This literature review demonstrates that theories of multiracial identity development are uniquely positioned to inform college student development theory; but while multiracial identity development theory is currently situated in the third wave from critical perspectives, more research is needed to capture multiracial students' lived experiences from a poststructural worldview to inform liberatory praxis.

Who are Multiracial Students?

Johnston-Guerrero and Wijeysinghe (2021) recently dedicated an entire volume to multiracial experiences in higher education, signaling the importance of mixed race scholarship, experiences, and voices in post-secondary education. Johnston-Guerrero and Wijeysinghe (2021) define multiracial people as "those who claim membership in more than one (mono) racial group/and or identify with a multiracial identity term" (p.xxi). Many terms may be utilized interchangeably to describe multiracial people, including biracial, multiracial, mixed-race, and more. Terminology depends on how multiracial students choose to identify in higher education and more broadly. However, throughout the paper, mixed-race and multiracial are used interchangeably. Moreover, Johnston-Guerrero et al. (2021) call for imaginative thinking when situating multiracial experience in higher education. This paper begins to answer this call by analyzing multiracial student development through three waves to inform innovative recommendations for praxis and research.

Framing the Paper: Critical Multiracial Theory

Harris (2016) developed Critical Multiracial Theory or MultiCrit as an extension of Critical Race Theory (Ladson Billings and Tate, 1995) to center the experiences of multiracial people. While Critical Race Theory (CRT) asserts the existence of racism and centers the lived experience of people of color, MultiCrit expands upon this by naming monoracism as a lived experience for multiracial people. In 2010, Johnston & Nadal coined monoracism, a unique system of oppression that operates under the assumption that

most people identify with one racial group. An example of monoracism is having to choose one race on a demographic form. MultiCrit (Harris, 2016) has seven tenets, however, for the purpose of this paper I focus on four. The first one asserts that the world operates within a monoracial paradigm, meaning that the world assumes that most people identify with one racial identity, and the Western systems of power and structures that are in place reflect this belief. The second tenet focuses on the existence of monoracism as a system of oppression and the relationship between monoracism, racism, and colorism. While all three of these systems are inextricably connected, they manifest differently. The third tenet examines micro-racialization and posits that multiracial students are racialized differently based on context, environment, and time. Many components shape the ways that multiracial students are racialized. For example, a Black and white multiracial woman of color may be racialized differently in a predominantly white institution than at a historically Black institution because of context and environment. The fourth and last principle of MultiCrit calls attention to how intersectionality and different racial makeups shape how muiltiracial people move through the world (Harris, 2016).

Literature Review

This review is an overview of select multiracial student theories situated within the three waves. Within them, I trace identity development as a construct and utilize MultiCrit (Harris, 2016) as a theoretical frame to examine what is gained and missing from each paradigmatic perspective on identity development. Abes et al. (2019) build upon the wave metaphor that Stewart and Jones (2016) coin to illuminate how student development theories may fall across and between different waves. I place theories in the first, second, and third waves based on how Abes et al. (2019) conceptualize them and on the contributions that the theory provided for student development as a field. However, the metaphor of waves signifies theories may fall across and between them. I have placed them here for this specific analysis in alignment with a MultiCrit lens.

First Wave

Abes et al. (2019) describe first wave theories as "broadly addressing earlier psychological theories" (p.4). Positivist worldviews often inform theories in this wave and scholars categorize them as stage models with rigid distinct destinations (Abes et al., 2019). In the first wave, identity development is linear

and moving in a direction over time. Poston (1990) introduced a model with five stages toward healthy biracial identity development. He created it in response to multiracial voices not being captured within earlier racial development models (Renn, 2008), such as the Black racial identity development model (Cross, 1971). Even though this model centers multiracial voices, it remains in the first wave because of the rigidity of the stages.

The five levels of Poston's (1990) model include: personal identity, group categorization, enmeshment/denial, appreciation, and integration. While this closely mirrors the work of Cross (1971), Poston differentiates his model by focusing on the lived experiences of multiracial students. Poston defines personal identity as the first level as identifying with personal characteristics rather than racial identities. As a person moves to the second level (group categorization), they choose one of their racial identities based on their cultural knowledge, perceptions, and appearance. The third level is categorized as denial or anger, where a multiracial person experiences guilt and shame around not identifying holistically with two or more racial identities. The fourth level is developing an appreciation for all backgrounds, and the fifth level is integration or a multicultural existence. In this model, Poston builds upon monoracial identity development models to fully capture the multiracial lived experience.

Utility and Limitations in First Wave

The first wave's utility and contributions in the field are to honor the lived experiences of multiracial people as distinct from those that identify as monoracial, though still through a linear lens. Furthermore, Poston (1990) strengthens student development literature by contributing nuance and centering multiracial and biracial individuals. Nevertheless, there are still limitations about identity development as a construct and through the lens of MultiCrit. First, Poston's model regards identity development as linear, with integration as the final destination. Multiracial students' lived experiences may not fit neatly into Poston's levels. Moreover, they may not view integration or a multicultural existence as a goal of their identity development and college experience. Second, the first wave does not address monoracism or any systems of oppression.

Second Wave

One major critique of the first wave was failing to include minoritized populations as participants in grounded theory student development studies (Abes et al., 2019).

Examples of minoritized students in higher education are people of color, the LGBTQIA+ community, and students with disabilities. The second wave begins to center non-dominant social identities, moving away from linear models and setting destinations concerning development. When focusing on multiracial students, the second wave, concentrates on microaggressions, prejudice, and discrimination rather than the systems of oppression at large (Root, 1990; Renn, 2000; Renn, 2004; Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Harris, 2017; Museus et al., 2015; Museues et al., 2016).

Beyond the Linear

In the second wave, Maria Root (1990) developed a model focused on the tensions within biracial identity experiences and negotiations. She proposes four resolutions: acceptance of the identity society assigns, identification with both racial groups, identification with a single racial group, and identification with a new racial group. In the first resolution, biracial teens accept their own biracial racial identity because of family ties and support. In the second one, Root describes identifying with both racial groups because of societal support. The third resolution is categorized by identifying with a single racial group because of external social pressures. The final resolution is when biracial individuals move beyond rigid categories and exude fluidity within their identity to build strong communities with other biracial individuals. Root's resolution model moved beyond linear stages to recognize the fluidity in multiraciality identity development because she emphasizes that students may move between resolutions at different times in one's life. Additionally, Root (1990) names oppressive experiences that multiracial people navigate, i.e., external social pressure.

Rockquermore and Brunsma (2002) build upon Root's work within the psychology field and racial identity development models. Like Root, they argue that racial identity development is complex and fluid. Their Multidimensional Model of Biracial Identity focuses choice and ecological perspectives. The four choices they outline are singular identity (choosing to identify with one race), Border identity (choosing to identify with both races), Protean identity (which means to identify both singularly and with both racial identities), and Transcendent identity (which is moving beyond assigned racial categories). Rockquemore and Brunsma's model allows for more fluidity, agency, and choice in multiracial identity development. However, like Root's proposed solutions, this model fails to capture how racism and monoracism influence

multiracial identity development.

Rejecting linear and rigid models happened outside of psychology as well. In 1992, Wijeyesinghe introduced a Factor Model of Multiracial Identity Development (FMMI) within the student affairs discipline. Wijeyesinghe argues that multiple factors may shape how multiracial people identify, these include racial ancestry, physical appearance, social and historical context, other social identities, spirituality, political awareness and orientation, early experience and socialization, and cultural attachment. Factors work together to inform a multiracial person's choice of racial identity.

In addition to psychology-based theories and Wijeyesinghe's (2001) FMMI, Renn (2000,2004) establishes patterns among multiracial college students. The patterns move beyond rigid stages and toward fluid patterns within multiracial identity development. Renn (2000,2004) defines these patterns as students holding a monoracial identity, identifying with multiple monoracial identities and shifting between contexts and environments, claiming a multiracial identity, identifying with an extraracial identity beyond rigid racial categories, and a claiming a situational identity that depends on context. Renn's patterns continue into the second wave by moving beyond stages and setting destinations associated with college student development. While Renn (2000, 2004) acknowledges context, ecological impact, environment, peer influence, and phenotype, she fails to address the systems of oppression that shape multiracial identity development.

Addressing Prejudice, Discrimination, and Microaggressions

The second wave begins to "acknowledge the existence of larger structures of inequality" (Abes et al., 2018, p.11). These experiences interact with identity development as a construct. Museus et al. (2015) conducted a qualitative study that illustrates that and created coping methods by educating others about what it means to be multiracial, engaging support networks, embracing the fluidity of their identity, and avoiding conflict associated with their multiraciality. Mueseus et al. (2016) continues this examination and introduces eight types of prejudice that multiracial people face: essentializing, invalidation, external focus, exclusion and marginalization, questioning racial authenticity, suspicions, exoticization, and pathologizing. Harris (2017) contributes to this work by illustrating the lived realities that multiracial students face in higher education by describing a typology of multiracial

microaggressions (Johnston & Nadal, 2010), including denial of multiraciality, assuming a monoracial identity, and not feeling monoracial enough. However, beyond Harris' (2017) work, it falls short in its analysis with the failure to speak to critical frameworks and monoracism and racism as systems of oppression.

Utility and Limitations in Second Wave

Multiraciality inherently exists beyond borders and between liminal spaces (Turner, 1969) because multiracial people identify beyond the fixed monoracial categories that society has constructed. Second-wave multiracial identity development scholarship has influenced it more broadly. For example, Jones and Abes (2013) discuss Reynold and Pope's (1991) Multidimensional Identity Model (MIM), which illustrates the multiple oppressions that individuals experience. Jones and Abes describe that Reynolds and Pope drew upon Maria Root's (1990) work on multiracial resolutions to provide more complex options in investigating multiple identities. The MIM's aimed to capture more fluidity when looking at the development of various identities. The second wave provided a lens where theorists, researchers, and scholars moved beyond development as a fixed point and allowed for more flexibility within student development theory.

Additionally, the second wave called much-needed attention to the unique forms of discrimination and microaggressions multiracial students experience in college (Museus et al., 2015, Museus et al. 2016, Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Harris, 2017). It exposes very lived realities and informed critical praxis and recommendations for supporting multiracial college students. However, where there is strength lies limitations. The second wave fails to address systems of oppression with nuance. It also has an absence of critical theories that have the power to transform systems of inequity within higher education. MultiCrit (2016) centers on the assertion that monoracism exists and is a critical theory that calls for transformation in praxis.

The most illustrative way to summarize the limitations of the second wave is to return to Abes et al.'s (2019) conceptualization. They argue that "second-wave theories acknowledge the existence of larger structures of inequality, but do not necessarily interrogate these relative to student development" (p.11). This scholarship fails to frame and investigate critical perspectives (MultiCrit), racism, and monoracism in multiracial identity development. While the second wave does acknowledge the systems, it does

not examine the inextricably connected interactions between them and identity development as a construct.

Third Wave

It is characterized by the utilization of critical theory, the goal of social transformation, and "the explicit attention to larger structures of inequality as the context in which development takes place" (Abes et al., 2019). When situating multiracial identity development in the third wave, I must define the unique structure of inequality that multiracial students navigate in their collegiate experience because of the third wave's focus on systemic oppression. To be situated in this wave, student development theory must acknowledge and interrogate monoracism as the larger system that multiracial students may navigate.

MultiCrit (Harris, 2016) is a critical theory and/or framework that can be centered when focusing on the third wave because it is an offshoot of Critical Race Theory, with emancipatory aims and the purpose of centering multiracial voices. Moreover, it is grounded in the assertion that monoracism is a real system of oppression inextricably linked to colorism and racism. the following studies focus on monoracism and MultiCrit in framing and methodological executions to highlight these necessary and critical contributions. They may not be developmental in nature, but they center experiences of multiracial identity which is fundamental to racial identity development.

Jessica Harris (2016, 2017) utilized MultiCrit as her theoretical framework when examining lived experiences of multiracial women on college campuses. Harris (2017) revealed that multiracial women navigate stereotypes associated with their multiracial identities and perceived monoracial identities. She also utilized intersectional whiteness as property from CRT (Harris, 1993) to explore how whiteness shapes multiracial student experiences in academic and social settings.

Wijeyesinghe (2012) also takes up critical perspectives by utilizing intersectionality as a frame in her Intersectionality Model of Multiracial Identity, which she depicts as a galaxy model. In this model, context, environment, and experiences are consistently changing, which shapes how multiracial students make choices about their identity. The galaxy model is meant to capture how intersectionality and interlocking systems of oppression all move in orbit to shape the choice of racial identity

Johnston-Guerrero and Tran (2018) also explore power, privilege, and oppression systems with multiracial college students. Specifically, they examine how they view their privilege by temporarily accessing multiple cultures. They problematize the tensions between whether the source of privilege is the mixture with whiteness or multiraciality. They continue this nuanced examination by focusing on how multiracial students experience oppression in higher education. Johnston-Guerrero, Tran, and Combs (2020) find that students did not name monoracism as a system of oppression they navigate because of a lack of awareness that it exists. These studies center on monoracism and critical paradigmatic approaches to explore multiracial identity development and more nuanced experiences.

Utility and Limitations of the Third Wave

The third wave names monoracism as a real system of oppression multiracial students navigate on college campuses. It centers on critical theory, MultiCrit, CRT, intersectionality, and whiteness as property to push towards social transformation and liberation for and with multiracial students of color (Harris, 2016; Crenshaw, 1989, Harris, 1993). Critical theories and worldviews inform crucial recommendations for praxis in higher education that call for more awareness around monoracism as a system of oppression and a more nuanced differentiation between colorism, racism, and monoracism itself. While these systems are inextricably connected, more work is needed to honor how they operate differently. These critical perspectives allow scholars and practitioners to think more expansively about the multiracial student population.

While the work in college student development focused on multiracial students is growing and beginning to incorporate critical perspectives, more third wave scholarship is needed to develop an understanding of monoracism and multiracial identity development in higher education - specifically research concerning multiracial student development situated in this third wave.

Notably, multiracial student development theory must also take on poststructural perspectives; they are a "yes-and" to critical approaches (Ashlee and Combs, forthcoming). The poststructural paradigm calls for more expansive thinking and opens possibilities for deconstruction and reconstruction. While critical paradigms expose and interrogate structures of power, privilege, and oppression, poststructuralism moves beyond the rigidity of structures to create more expansive ways of knowing as the field of student affairs moves towards liberatory praxis. Student affairs and higher education scholars often see poststructural theory as lofty and difficult to implement in practice.

Multiracial identity development is uniquely positioned as inherently liminal and occupying an in-between space. More poststructural perspectives are needed to capture identity development as a construct. These calls for more expansive ways of knowing may shape not only multiracial students but also student development more broadly. This claim is not meant to tokenize multiracial students or assert racial hierarchies across and between multiracial and monoracial students of color. Instead, I argue that there is utility in examining multiracial development because exploring how multiracial students wrestle with identity and monoracism can inform third wave thinking.

Lessons Learned

This analysis emphasizes utility in looking at the holistic body of literature about multiracial college student development. The limitations of each wave do not negate their contributions to the scholarship. The first wave also distinguishes multiracial and monoracial experiences of identity development. However, it falls short because it relies on rigid stage-based models to an inherently liminal existence and occupies the in-between. This rigidity boxes students into progressive developmental stages. The first wave also fails to recognize systems of oppression that interact with multiracial college student development. The second wave responds to the limitations of the first one by beginning to illustrate privilege, discrimination, microaggressions, and systems of oppression. While the second wave names these systems, it does not utilize critical perspectives or interrogates these systems with intentionality.

The third wave of multiracial student development theory contributes theoretical perspectives to the scholarship by explicitly naming monoracism and developing MultiCrit (Harris, 2016), an extension of Critical Race Theory. Within student development, there is a need for a poststructural perspective situated in this wave. My analysis demonstrates that multiracial identity development can inform college student development. Pope (1991) drew upon Maria Root's (1990) work on multiracial resolutions to inspire the Multidimensional Identity Model. Multiracial identity development models shaped and influenced this work and pushed scholars to look beyond the linear and rigid. Moreover, Wijeyesinghe (2012) expanded upon her Factor Model of Multiracial Identity Development (FMMI) to capture the complexities of intersectionality in an Intersectional Model of Multiracial Identity (IMMI). Wijeysinghe (2012) names explicitly that "the contribution of the IMMI is less about the inclusion of additional factors that affect choice of identity in Multiracial people, and more about how to advance the discussion of who represent and interpret intersectional identity models" (p.102). This work on multiracial identity, concerning choice, is more expansive in its reach by not only capturing multiracial experiences but by illustrating the complexities of intersectionality.

The analysis of the third wave denotes the importance of acknowledging systems of oppression, specifically monoracism, colorism, racism, and intersectionality. It also reveals how multiracial identity development has more broadly shaped and influenced student development theory. Only, within the third wave, more poststructural perspectives are needed to capture the liminal and in-between space that multiracial students may occupy. The poststructural paradigm does not negate that systems of oppression exist. Instead, it provides a lens to continue this examining power while acknowledging that it exists. Abes (2016) states that "unlike critical theorists who have an agenda for change, poststructuralists deconstruct normality without assuming one way in which society should be structured" (p.13). Critical perspectives sit in hopelessness, attempting to make change within the rigid systems that white supremacy has built. But poststructuralism shifts the lens from hopelessness to critical hope and propels higher education to deconstruct, expand, and reimagine these realities. Like Audre Lorde (1984) once said, it allows minoritized people to know and own tools that dismantle this house of white supremacy. Multiracial identity development is innately positioned as an existence beyond the inflexible categories that the system of white supremacy has built. This multiracial positionality and lived experience have the potential to inform expansive solutions in the path towards liberation.

Implications for Practice and Future Research

This section outlines three recommendations for praxis and two for future research in the realm of multiracial student development theory. When working with students, student affairs professionals must honor and validate their lived experiences with monoracism, racism, colorism, microaggressions, and discrimination. However, praxis cannot stop there. To critically interrogate this application in practice means to engage asset-based approaches (Yosso, 2005). Multiracial

students may share experiences with monoracism, and they may share components of their multiracial identity that they are proud of, such as access to multiple cultures or navigational capital (Yosso, 2005). Student affairs professionals must understand that both of these may be true.

In alignment with MultiCrit, student affairs practitioners and scholars must name monoracism as a real-life experience for college students. The literature reveals that multiracial students often navigate a denial of their multiracial reality (Harris, 2017). Affirming and validating monoracism is crucial Moreover, there needs to be more intentionality in diversity, equity, and inclusion curriculum by incorporating multiracial voices and perspectives. As multiracial people of color, it may be challenging to carve out space in the larger activism realm in fear of taking up too much space or diverting from other movements. it is also essential to include this experience as valid and real within the larger discourse about social identities.

The third recommendation for praxis is rooted in poststructural perspectives. There is difficulty in applying the poststructural lens to student affairs practice because it seems lofty and unattainable to imagine something new. However, this does not mean it's not worth trying. What would it look like to understand identity development as an ongoing existence rather than a process with a fixed endpoint? What would it look like to reimagine student development through the lens of constructs such as authenticity, resiliency, or dissonance (Abes et al., 2019) rather than through segmented identity populations? How can construct-based development build solidarity across and between different identities? As student affairs professionals engage these questions, we must do so with compassionate caution (Ashlee and Combs, forthcoming), by still acknowledging the very real systems of oppression and not asserting sameness across and between communities. In alignment with (Ashlee and Combs, forthcoming) I recommend leaning into expansive thinking by accessing poststructural praxis with intentionality and care.

In future research, higher education scholars should employ grounded theory approaches to explore multiracial student development theory utilizing poststructural perspectives and Adele Clarke's (2007) situational analysis from a postmodern paradigm. This methodology aligns with third wave thinking and developing theories. More attention is needed to examine student development theory from an expansive lens in empirical research to understand better how the lofty, expansive, and imaginative can become a reality in praxis. A second recommendation is to examine student development theory across and between minoritized populations with poststructural perspectives that acknowledge unique forms of oppression that students navigate and finds points of solidarity through constructs. Finally, future research should tie together the utility of the first, second, and third waves to push scholarship forward in imaginative ways.

Conclusion

This analysis highlights the utility and the limitations of three waves of student development theory pertaining to multiracial students in higher education. The three waves can interweave to push the third wave to poststructural praxis and imaginative ways to deconstruct and reconstruct the rigidity of systems that white supremacy has created. The first wave provides foundational knowledge and gives voice to the multiracial experience in higher education. The second wave begins to acknowledge microaggressions and discrimination associated with multiraciality. The third wave extends upon this further by emphasizing systems of power, privilege, and oppression. All three waves provide significant insights about the future of critical mixed-race studies in postsecondary research and praxis.

However, more attention is needed to illustrate poststructural perspectives on multiracial college student identity development., multiracial college student research is also innately positioned encourage scholars to reimagine and deconstruct rigid ways of knowing related to racial categories and hierarchies within higher education structures. This paper also emphasizes the importance of pushing linear boundaries related to student development theory and racial identity. Scholars should continue to think critically about the third wave and engage poststructural, critical, and construct-centered approaches.

References

Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & Stewart, D. L. (Eds.). (2019). *Rethinking college student development theory using critical frameworks*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Abes, E. S. (2016). Situating paradigms in student development theory. *New Directions for Student Services,* 154(2016), 9-16.

Ashlee, A. A., Combs, L.C., (Eds.) (forthcoming). Identity interconnections: *An expansive approach to identity development and social justice action in student affairs and higher education*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Clarke, A. E. (2007). Grounded theory: Critiques, debates, and situational analysis. In Outhwaite, W., & Turner, S. (Eds.). (2007). *The SAGE handbook of social science methodology*. Sage.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. *Black World*, 20 (9), 13–27.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised)*. Continuum.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard law review,* 106 (8), 1707-1791.

Harris, J. C. (2016). Toward a critical multiracial theory in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 29(6), 795-813.

Harris, J. C. (2017). Multiracial college students' experiences with multiracial microaggressions. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 20(4), 429-445.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2013). Identity development of college students: *Advancing frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Jones, S. R., & Stewart, D. L. (2016). Evolution of student development theory. *New Directions for Student Services*, 154(2016), 17-28.

Johnston-Guerrero, M. P., Wijeyesinghe, C. L. (2021). *Multiracial experiences in higher education: Contesting knowledge, honoring voice, and innovating practice*. Stylus.

Johnston-Guerrero, M. P., Tran, V. T., & Combs, L. (2020). Multiracial identities and monoracism: Examining the influence of oppression. *Journal of College Student Development,* 61(1), 18-33.

Johnston-Guerrero, M. P., & Tran, V. T. (2018). Is it really the best of both worlds? Exploring notions of privilege associated with multiraciality. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege*, 7(1), 17-37.

Johnston, M., & Nadal, K. (2010). Multiracial microaggressions: Exposing monoracism in everyday life and clinical practice. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact (pp. 123–144).Wiley & Sons.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers college record,* 97(1), 47-68.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister/outsider*. Crossing Press.

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

Museus, S. D., Sariñana, S. A. L., & Ryan, T. K. (2015). A qualitative examination of multiracial students' coping responses to experiences with prejudice and discrimination in college. *Journal of College Student Development,* 56(4), 331-348.

Poston, W. C. (1990). The biracial identity development model: A needed addition. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69(2), 152-155.

Renn, K. A. (2000). Patterns of situational identity among biracial and multiracial college students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 399-420.

Renn, K. A. (2004). *Mixed race students in college: The ecology of race, identity, and community on campus*. SUNY Press.

Renn, K. A. (2008). Research on biracial and multiracial identity development: Overview and synthesis. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2008(123), 13.

Reynolds, A. L., & Pope, R. L. (1991). The complexities of diversity: Exploring multiple oppressions. *Journal of Counseling & Development,* 70(1), 174–180. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01580.x

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2002). Socially embedded identities: Theories, typologies, and processes of racial identity among Black/White biracials. Sociological Quarterly, 43(3), 335-356.

Root, M. P. (1990). Resolving" other" status: Identity development of biracial individuals. *Women & Therapy,* 9(1-2), 185-205.

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Cornell University Press.

Wijeyesinghe, C., & Jackson, B. W. (Eds.). (2012). *New perspectives on racial identity development: Integrating emerging frameworks.* NYU Press.

Wijeyesinghe, C. L. (2001). Racial identity in multiracial people: An alternative paradigm. In Wijeyesinghe, C. L., & Jackson III, B. W. (2001). *New Perspectives on Racial Identity Development: A Theoretical and Practical Anthology*. (pp.129-152). New York University Press.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education,* 8(1), 69-91.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

It Is What It Is: The Impact of Practitioner-Student Relationships on the Success of Black Collegians

Alexis McLean

Higher education research indicates that Black students have lower graduation rates than their White counterparts and are much less likely to become academically and socially integrated into the campus community. Townsend (1994) attributed racial differences in completion rates to "universities… coming up short on their end with a shortfall of financial aid, inadequate mentoring, lack of cultural and social support, a dependence on Eurocentric curricula, faculty indifference, racial hostility, and an absence of institutional commitment to pursue Black student retention efforts" (pg. 85). Harper (2009; 2015) also pointed to weak or absent support systems, little to no sources of information that can foster academic and psychosocial success, and a lack of "intentionally designed" practices that could improve academic outcomes. Arroyo and Gasman (2014) cited inequitable access to higher education but noted that very little research adequately addresses the role of the institution in retaining Black students once they enroll. Indeed, Witham and Bensimon (2012) asserted that, all too often, institutions attempt to remedy racial achievement gaps through a process by which they "diagnose-and-react" (p. 54). Instead of thoroughly examining what may be wrong with the institution and implementing appropriate reform, problems are attributed to Black students who need fixing.

While the causes of racial disparities vary, extant literature underscores the significance of practitioners in students' collegiate experience and ove-rall success. These institutional agents consist of faculty, staff, or administrators, who provide students with a wide range of academic and psychosocial support. This includes assisting students with navigating sociocultural, socioeconomic, and linguistic barriers and serving as a buffer to the racism and classism they frequently experience (Stanton-Salazar, 2010). As a result, practitioners play a crucial role in college students' academic and social integration.

Disparities in Rates of Degree Attainment

According to Pena, Bensimon and Colyar (2006), "not only do African Americans…have lower graduation rates than Whites…they also experience inequalities in just about every indicator of academic success – from earned grade point average to placement on the dean's list to graduation rates in competitive majors" (p. 48). In 2016, the National Center for Education Statistics indicated that Black students, who comprised 15% of students enrolled at two-year institutions, obtained 14% of the associate degrees conferred between 2014 and 2015. In comparison, White students, who comprised 50% of students enrolled at two-year institutions, acquired 60% of the associate degrees conferred during the same time period (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016a; 2016c). Enrollment data regarding four-year institutions also highlighted racial disparities. Black students represented 14% of students enrolled at four-year colleges or universities, and White students comprised 61% of students enrolled at these institutions, but baccalaureate degree attainment for each group was 11% and 67%, respectively (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016b; 2016c). This data is not indicative of a recent trend. In fact, during every year for which it exists, racial disparities in persistence and rates of degree attainment have been evident (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016a; 2016b; 2016c).

Barriers to Black College Student Success

Literature regarding barriers to Black college students' success suggests that they are overwhelmingly subjected to feelings of isolation and alienation due to a lack of academic, cultural and social support (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagedorn, 1999; Harper, 2009; Nora & Cabrera, 1996; Palmer & Gasman, 2008; Smith, Allen, Danley, 2007; Solorzano, Allen, & Carroll, 2002; Solorzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000; Townsend, 1994). This is often found to be the result of collegiate experiences

marked by racially hostile campuses climates. Like other college students of color, Black undergraduates are frequently on the receiving end of indirect racial attacks or microaggressions. The term, coined by Harvard University psychiatrist Chester Pierce, refers to "…subtle, innocuous, preconscious, or unconscious degradations and putdowns…" that Blacks endure on a regular basis (Pierce, 1995, p. 281). According to Pierce (1969, p. 303), "the incessant lesson the Black must hear is that he is insignificant and irrelevant." Because microaggressions can lead to feelings of humiliation and erode self-confidence as well as self-image, they have long-lasting and detrimental effects on Black students' academic and psychosocial success. When Solorzano et al. (2000) investigated how racial microaggressions impact campus racial climate and the experiences of Black college students, participants reported being exposed to microaggressions while interacting with both faculty and peers. As a result, students felt increased discouragement, self-doubt, frustration, isolation, and helplessness. Incessant verbal and nonverbal racial affronts also reduced their interaction with practitioners and decreased the likelihood that they would utilize student services on campus.

When Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis and Thomas (1999) researched the experiences of Black students at a predominantly White university, participants reported that they found it difficult to initiate contact with faculty. This was attributed to their belief that asking for help would confirm negative racial stereotypes and knowledge that certain faculty members were unfamiliar with Blacks. Harper (2015) found that even Black students who were high achievers and actively engaged were subjected to, and had witnessed, either covert or overt acts of racism being committed by faculty and administrators on campus. Unfortunately, some efforts to combat these experiences may cause further harm, and lead to the development of racial battle fatigue—the result of an overwhelming amount of mental, emotional, and physical strain, and of having to constantly contend with a racially hostile campus climate (Smith et al., 2007). Indeed, there is evidence in the literature that Black collegians' racial/ethnic identity and minority status negatively impacts their psychological functioning, and can lead to the development of trauma-related symptoms (McClain, et al., 2016; Pieterse, Carter, Evans, & Walter, 2010).

The impact of a hostile campus climate on the academic and psychosocial adjustment of Black students has been well documented. Participants in a study by Sc-

Schwitzer et al. (1999) reported a general feeling of underrepresentation and stated that they often felt overlooked, frustrated and misunderstood. In addition, direct perceptions of racism at the institution resulted in a sense of hurt, aloneness, and isolation from faculty and peers. Cabrera, et al. (1999) researched the effects of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of Black students and found that, unlike White students, their academic and social experiences were significantly shaped by perceptions of prejudice and discrimination. Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr (2000), who studied student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race, found that compared to both White students and other student groups of color, Black students experienced greater racial/ethnic hostility, greater pressure to conform to stereotypes, less equitable treatment by faculty, staff and teaching assistants, and more faculty racism. Pieterse et al. (2010) described similar findings when they examined the association between Black, White and Asian students' perceptions of racial and ethnic discrimination, racial climate, and trauma-related symptoms. Black students reported higher levels of discrimination, and perceived the racial climate as more negative than White and Asian students. Thus, there is evidence in the literature that Black students have unique perceptions of campus racial climates and undergraduate experiences but may also be exposed to a much more hostile environment than other students of color and their White counterparts.

According to Ancis et al. (2000), "continual exposure to a hostile educational climate, marked by racial tension and stereotyping, may adversely influence the academic achievement and psychological health of students of color" (p. 183). Indeed, Cabrera et al. (1999), who surveyed over 300 Black students across 18 institutions, found that a racially hostile campus climate hindered Black students' academic and intellectual development, and impacted their commitment to the institution, as well as the likelihood that they would persist. This indicates a link between unsupportive and hostile campus climates, unsuccessful academic and social integration, and a lack of persistence amongst Black students.

College Student Success and the Role of Practitioners

Challenges of the Prevailing Definition of Success in Higher Education

A cursory review of mission statements or strategic plans from colleges and universities across the country reveals that while these institutions have prioritized success, they fail to provide an explicit definition of the concept (Chattanooga State Community College, 2015; City University of New York, 2018; Community College of Rhode Island, 2015; Iowa Central Community College, 2010; Prairie View A&M, 2017; San Diego City College, 2010; University of Colorado Boulder, 2018). It is clear, however, that success—for both students and institutions—is largely tied to the attainment of high and timely retention (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006; Astin, 2004; Rockstroh, 2011). Acquiring or conferring a college degree is the prevailing definition of success in higher education.

The challenge regarding the prevailing definition of success is that it may not be consistent with how practitioners and students ascribe meaning to the concept. Schneider (2013), asserts that there is a "widening disconnect between a data-driven obsession with 'student success' and the values and experiences that graduates themselves report as transforming." When McLean-McKessey (2015) examined Black collegians' notions of success, participants explained that being the first person in their family to attend college made them successful. This was irrespective of whether they actually acquired the degree, as students had never considered pursuing higher education or had life circumstances that made embarking upon the journey seem impossible. Participants also expressed that they felt successful at several points in their academic journey that came prior to degree completion. This included instances when they exited remediation, mastered course content in an area where Black students are underrepresented, and made strides toward becoming academically and socially integrated into the campus community. Jennings, et al. (2013) had similar findings when they explored students' perceptions of success throughout their time in college. Almost half of the participants wanted to attain a "life management" goal by the end of their first year, and over 70% indicated that they wanted to reach a "social" milestone within the same time frame.

The aforementioned literature suggests that both practitioners and students may be guided by ideas and b-eliefs that are not taken into consideration when success is defined and/or assessed at an institutional or national level. While noteworthy, few sources in the literature study success as a fluid and subjective concept that encompasses students' individual goals. Nevertheless, it illustrates the importance of reevaluating the predominant approach to studying college student success and suggests it may be useful to do so holistically.

Practitioner-Student Relationships and Student Success

Several scholars have linked relationships with practitioners to students' academic and personal development, and a wide range of psychosocial and professional support (Astin, 1993; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, and Gonyea, 2008; McLean-McKessey, 2015; Wood & Turner, 2011). Practitioners belong to multiple networks, and have intellectual and social resources that can be used on behalf of students (Stanton-Salazar, 2010). Some practitioners serve as mentors who develop an ongoing and personal relationship with students, where there is consistent academic, emotional, social, financial and/or professional support and guidance. When Crisp and Cruz (2009) reviewed the literature on mentorship between 1990 and 2007, they noted a general consensus regarding three essential (and beneficial) facets of these relationships. The first is that mentorship is focused on the growth and accomplishment of an individual. The second is that the mentoring experience may encompass broad forms of support including assistance with professional and career development. The third is that mentoring relationships are personal and reciprocal. Campbell and Campbell (1997) investigated the effects of student participation in a mentoring program with practitioners as mentors and noted several gains in student achievement. Students who were mentored had higher GPAs, completed more credits per semester, and had lower dropout rates than students in a control group. When Rhodes (2008) investigated whether mentoring would improve students' performance and increase graduation rates, mentored students had higher GPAs and retention and completion rates than those who were not mentored. In further research by Campbell and Campbell (2000), students who participated in mentoring programs cited in their earlier findings (Campbell & Campbell, 1997) reported that mentoring relationships helped them reach academic goals, and assisted them with graduating from the university.

Blackwell (1981; 1983; 1989) asserted that mentoring increases retention and graduation rates, as mentors provide training; stimulate the acquisition of knowledge; provide emotional support, encouragement and coping strategies for mentees; socialize protégés regarding expectations or demands of the profession; and help protégés perform at their greatest potential. In fact, Edlind and Haensly (1985) referred to the benefits of mentoring as "gifts", which consist of improved self-confidence and esteem, increased knowledge and skills, advancement of one's career, the development of known as well as undiscovered talents and a personal ethic, the establishment of a friendship, and the enhancement of creativity. Noteworthy, is what they described as the symbiotic nature of mentor-mentee relationships. "Gifts" to mentors include completion of work, stimulation of ideas, establishment of a long-term friendship, and personal satisfaction.

Kuh et al. (2008) noted that faculty interaction within and outside the classroom is a form of "educationally purposeful engagement," and that involvement with faculty is positively correlated with student persistence. Pascarella and Terenzini (1977) also cited the importance of practitioner-student relationships when they investigated how faculty-student interaction impacted college persistence versus attrition. Students who persisted had significantly more interaction with faculty than students who left the institution. In 1999, when Terenzini, Pascarella and Blimling reviewed literature regarding the influence of students' out-of-class experiences on learning and cognitive development, they stated, "most researchers have reported positive associations between the nature and frequency of students' out-of-class contacts with faculty members and gains on one or another measure of academic or cognitive development" and "faculty-student contact and student learning are positively related, and it would seem… finding ways to promote such contact is in the best educational interests of…students and institutions" (p. 616).

In his seminal work, What Matters in College? Astin (1993) detailed findings from a longitudinal study involving more than 200 four-year colleges and universities, and approximately 25,000 students who attended these institutions between 1985 and 1989. Faculty-student interaction, whether frequent or minimal, contributed to students' academic and personal development, and satisfaction with the undergraduate experience. These students were significantly more likely to be racially understanding, promote social change, attend or participate in campus events, be elected to student offices, obtain a degree, and enroll in graduate or professional school. Astin's findings illustrated a link between faculty-student relationships and student development and illuminated the importance of these relationships.

Driven by the assertion that a lack of integration into an institution decreases the likelihood that students will persist, Tinto's (1993) Theory of Student Departure also illustrated the importance of forging relationships within the campus community, particularly as it relates to persistence and success. According to Tinto, dropout behavior could be determined by external factors (such as familial background and pre-college schooling), and a student's interaction with the college environment. Successful interaction refers to both academic integration, which is indicated by a student's grade performance and intellectual development, and social integration, characterized by relationships with peers, as well as practitioners such as faculty and administrative personnel. Tinto stated that within the college environment, academic and social systems are "invariably interwoven" and "events in one may directly or indirectly influence, over time, events in the other" (p. 109). Academic and social integration presents many avenues towards institutional commitment, with the former allowing students to meet explicit standards and identify with the academic system, and the latter providing students with social communication, friendship support, faculty support, and collective affiliation. Once again, the role of practitioners in students' integration is evident.

The Transformative Role of Practitioners and Black Student Success

Forging relationships with practitioners can transform a Black student's collegiate experience. The benefits of these relationships include direct access to support and guidance, and someone with academic and professional insight who can prepare students to succeed while in and beyond college (McLean-McKessey, 2015). The notion that practitioner-student relationships can reduce and eliminate barriers to Black college student success is supported by the literature, which highlights a range of benefits that result from having access to a faculty member, staff person, or administrator with whom they can develop a relationship. Griffin, Perez, Holmes and Mayo (2010), who interviewed over twenty Black faculty members in STEM, found that every participant spoke about the importance of mentoring and advising in their

long-term success:

> Although many participants spoke of the importance of familial support, it seems that relatives were not among those who most significantly shaped their academic experiences and careers. Undergraduate professors, graduate advisors, and occasionally older colleagues were primary mentors (p. 98).

When Wood and Turner (2011) studied factors affecting the academic success of Black men enrolled in community college, they found that faculty who were friendly and caring proactively addressed students' academic progress, listened to students' concerns, and encouraged students to succeed were associated with such success. And while some research has noted the insignificance of shared race/ethnicity (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997; Griffin et al. 2010), Palmer and Gasman (2008) asserted that, for Black students, there are added benefits when practitioners share these attributes. This included access to someone who can assist them with navigating various environments as a racial/ethnic minority, serve as a realistic role model, and prove that becoming a Black professional is feasible. In other words, Black practitioners provided Black students with an opportunity to "see themselves" in someone with whom they have forged a committed relationship.

Harper (2009; 2015) suggested that institutions make a conscious effort to diversify and educate their faculty, and increase the number of mentors available to students of color, as practitioners who engage students within and outside of the classroom can help address racial disparities. In fact, Townsend (1994) contended that, for Black students, having access to faculty who serve as advocates, mentors, and/or counselors is positively correlated with persistence. Yet, several scholars have noted the dearth of faculty, and thus, mentors of color in academe (Allen, Jacobson and Lomotey, 1995; Blackwell, 1989; Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997; Johnson, 1998). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2017), only 6% of the faculty at our nation's institutions of higher education are Black. Since most mentors select mentees who have similar socio-cultural attributes (Blackwell, 1989), the limited presence of faculty of color at colleges and universities decreases the number of mentors available. Blackwell (1989) stated that, within the realm of higher education, little attention has been paid to ethnic minorities and mentoring, which is "a process that can increase the retention of minority students in colleges and universities…through which larger numbers may be graduated from colleges, enter and comp-lete graduate training, be hired for faculty positions, and be retained as contributing members of the professoriate" (p. 8). Indeed, What Matters in College? (Astin, 1993) revealed that faculty-student interaction was positively correlated with students choosing a career in college teaching. This finding is promising as it relates to the numbers of Black faculty who may enter academe; however, it is important to consider the underrepresentation of other practitioners of color throughout higher education. In the year 2011, less than 9% of the people who held professional administrative jobs at colleges nationwide were Black (Patton, 2013). Yet research regarding practitioners who are not faculty has indicated that administrators, counselors, and advisors can be instrumental in Black students' sense of adjustment, comfort, belonging, and competence as college students (Deil-Amen, 2011; McLean-McKessey, 2015; Orozco, Alvarez & Gutkin, 2010). Nevertheless, this research is sparse, as the literature regarding practitioners and Black collegians primarily focuses on the role of faculty.

Amaury Nora's Student/Institution Engagement Model

Amaury Nora's Student/Institution Engagement Model (Nora, 2002; 2003) accounts for the ways in which Black collegians' racial/ethnic and socioeconomic identities often intersect while highlighting the role of practitioner-student relationships in the Black college student experience. An examination of these relationships should be situated within this theoretical framework, as it captures several distinct features of such an experience, and provides a lens through which we can gain a better understanding of how to best serve this population.

The Student/Institution Engagement Model (Nora, 2002; 2003) emphasizes the interaction between a student and institution and addresses precollege, college, and environmental factors or "pulls" that influence student retention/persistence and graduation. Precollege factors consist of parental education, academic resources, educational plans, leadership and involvement in extracurricular activities, and academic self-concept. College or institutional factors include educational goal commitment, academic performance, and academic and social integration. Finally, environmental factors or "pulls" consist of financial circumstances, work or familial responsibilities, and support for college enrollment from family and friends (Arbona & Nora, 2004). Nora's theoretical framework is appropriate for studying the role of relationships with practitioners in the

success of Black college students, as key elements of the model capture several unique facets of their experiences, such as parental education and encouragement, academic performance and social experiences, campus climate, and work or familial obligations, all of which have been found to influence Black students' decision or ability to remain in college (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). In fact, Rendon, Jalomo, and Nora (2000), asserted that students live in, and interact with, "multiple worlds" composed of various persons (parents, peer networks, children, community mentors) that often help shape their aspirations and motivation. Rendon (2006) further contended that "college faculty and staff should take the initiative in reaching out to students to assist them to learn more about college, believe in themselves as learners, and have a positive college experience."

The value of practitioner-student relationships to the success of Black college students is highlighted in the academic and social integration piece of the Student/ Institution Engagement Model. Formal and informal interaction with faculty leads to increased educational goal commitment. Validating experiences, which include encouragement and support from faculty or staff increase self-esteem, self-efficacy and acceptance of others, and the knowledge that one is part of a global society. Mentoring experiences with faculty and counseling/advising staff lead to institutional commitment or a sense of belonging and belief that attending college is a worthwhile experience. Although beneficial in and of themselves, all of these relationships, interactions and experiences can impact students' persistence, and ultimately increase the likelihood that they will graduate.

In his research on how mentoring increases persistence and graduation, Nora noted that literature on students' interaction with faculty suggests these relationships largely contribute to undergraduate success. A wide range of faculty-student interaction, including career or personal counseling, advising, intellectual discussions, and informal socializing contribute to the social integration and satisfaction of students. According to Nora and Crisp (2008):

The more likely students view interactions as positive and feel they are integrated into the campus environment as valued members, the more likely students will persist… While the argument is not that career counseling or informal socializing is the same as mentoring, it is highly probable that during such activities and interactions similar aspects of mentoring can be experienced. (p. 339)

Considering the role of counseling staff in the *ac-* *demic and social integration* piece of the Student/ Institution Engagement Model, this also has several implications for the significance of these practitioners in student success.

Nora's Student/Institution Engagement Model underscores the importance of precollege, college and environmental factors, and how interaction with and between these "worlds" can impact Black college students. The model also illustrates how practitioners and the institution at large function as integral parts of a student's experience. This includes interactions with practitioners and the institution that produce a wide range of psychosocial benefits, which may be defined by practitioners and Black students as isolated, or collective indicators of success. Thus, Nora's Student/Institution Engagement Model is a suitable theoretical framework for understanding the role of practitioner-student relationships in the Black college student experience, and how these relationships foster Black college student success.

Limitations and Recommendations for Further Study

This literature review has limitations that could be important to future research, and implications that may not be generalizable. Although there has been a great deal of research regarding the role of practitioner-student relationships in student success, several scholars have noted that there are still gaps in the literature regarding how they function as an integral part of the success of Black students in particular (Allen et al., 1995; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Griffin et al., 2010; Strayhorn & Terrell, 2007). Furthermore, research regarding practitioners and Black collegians primarily focused on the role of faculty and does not substantially highlight the ways in which other practitioners impact Black collegians. The literature also provided limited solutions concerning the implementation of institutional programs and practices that provide access to practitioners who have experience working with, are able to understand, and are willing to develop relationships with Black students, and fails to clearly explain why such programs and practices may be especially beneficial for Black collegians.

Another major drawback of the literature is that, with few exceptions (Bush & Bush, 2010; Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997; Pope, 2002; Wood & Turner, 2011), relationships between practitioners and Black students at community colleges have been given little attention. Research regarding the experiences of Bl-

ack college students is generally based upon those enrolled full-time at selective residential four-year colleges or universities. This fails to highlight many aspects of the Black community college student experience, including their first-generation, socioeconomic, financial aid, and enrollment statuses. Over 40% of Black undergraduates are enrolled at community colleges. A substantial proportion of first-generation college students and students receiving financial aid also attend community colleges, representing 36% and 58% of the population, respectively. In addition, over 60% of community college students are attending part-time (American Association of Community Colleges, 2017). Further examinations of practitioner-student relationships should account for the distinct characteristics of students enrolled at community colleges, and how race/ethnicity intersects with these factors.

Lastly, a wide range of scholarship has been dedicated to student success, but as previously noted, it is largely based upon assumptions and beliefs that may not be consistent with how practitioners and Black students in particular define success. It would be both practical and beneficial for future research to focus on a more holistic approach when conceptualizing notions of success. This would entail challenging the prevailing definition of success and examining cumulative achievements (e.g., exiting remediation, mastering of course contents, increases to academic and social integration), as well as the fluidity of the concept itself. Higher education research addressing all of the aforementioned would make the literature regarding the success of Black collegians more robust.

Conclusion

Relationships with practitioners can produce a number of academic and psychosocial benefits that are particularly important for Black students who, because of historical and existing inequities within higher education, do not have the same collegiate experiences or access to practitioners as their White counterparts. Research has shown that the impact of these relationships could lead to the transformation of institutional programs and practices that are racially/ethnically exclusionary, and/or the creation of those that are inclusionary (Blackwell, 1989; Harper, 2009; Harper, 2015; Rhodes, 2008). Given recent, current, and continued demographic shifts in the U.S. population, colleges and universities cannot meet institutional goals without: a) providing practitioners who are culturally competent and indiscriminately invested in student success, and b) implementing programs and practices which take the unique experiences of Black students into account. Creating and sustaining practitioner-student relationships can directly impact the success of Black students, and institutions of higher education.

References

Allen, K., Jacobson, S., & Lomotey, K. (1995). African American women in educational administration: The importance of mentors and sponsors. *Journal of Negro Education, 64*(4), 409-422.

American Association of Community Colleges (2017). *American Association of Community Colleges fast facts 2017*. Retrieved from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/fast-facts/

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2006). *Graduation rates and student success: Squaring means and ends*. Retrieved from http://www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/06b_perspectives(1).pdf

Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JNP, 78*(2), 180-185.

Arbona, C., & Nora, A. (2004). Predicting college attainment of Hispanic students: Individual, institutional, and environmental factors. *Association for Institutional Research*. Retrieved from http://www.airweb.org/GrantsAndScholarships/Documents/Grants2004/ArbonaNoraRG2004Proposal.pdf

Arroyo, A., & Gasman, M. (2014). An HBCU-based educational approach for Black college student success: Toward a framework with implications for all institutions. *American Journal of Education, 121*(1), 57-85.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education, 79*(4), 4.

Astin, A. W. (2004). To use graduation rates to measure excellence, you have to do your homework. *Chronicle Of Higher Education, 51*(9), B20.

Blackwell, J.E. (1981). *Mainstreaming outsiders: The production of black professionals*. Bayside, NY: General Hall.

Blackwell, J.E. (1983). *Networking and mentoring: A study of cross-generational experiences of blacks in graduate and professional schools*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Educational Foundation.

Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe, 75*(5), 8-14.

Bush E. C., & Bush L. (2010). Calling out the elephant: An examination of African American male achievement in community colleges. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 1*(1), 40–62.

Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E., & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(2), 134-160.

Campbell, D. E., & Campbell, T. A. (2000). The mentoring relationship: Differing perceptions of benefits. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 516.

Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (1997). Faculty/student mentor program: Effects on academic performance and retention. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(6), 727-742.

Chattanooga State Community College (2015). *Mission statement*. Retrieved from http://catalog.chattanoogastate.edu/content.php?catoid=15&navoid=1685

City University of New York (2018). *Connected CUNY strategic framework*. Retrieved from http://www1.cuny.edu/sites/connected/

Community College of Rhode Island (2015). *Mission of the college*. Retrieved from
http://www.ccri.edu/about/mission.html

Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature
between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(6), 525-545.

Deil-Amen, R. (2011). Socio-academic integrative moments: Rethinking
academic and social integration among two-year college students in career-related
programs. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(1), 54-91.

Edlind, E. P., & Haensly, P. A. (1985). Gifts of mentorships. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 29*(2), 55-
60.S

Grant-Thompson, S., & Atkinson, D. R. (1997). Cross-cultural mentor effectiveness and African-
American male students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 23*(2), 120-34.

Griffin, K. A., Perez II, D., Holmes, A. P. E., & Mayo, C. E. P. (2010). Investing in the future:
The importance of faculty mentoring in the development of students of color in STEM.
New Directions for Institutional Research, 148, 95-103.

Harper, S. R. (2009). Race-conscious student engagement practices and the equitable distribution
of enriching educational experiences. *Liberal Education, 95*(4), 38-45.

Harper, S. R. (2015). Black male college achievers and resistant responses to racist stereotypes at
predominantly white colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*, 646-
674.

Iowa Central Community College (2010). *About Iowa Central*. Retrieved from
http://www.iowacentral.edu/about.asp

Jennings, N., Lovett, S., Cuba, L., Swingle, J., & Lindkvist, H. (2013). "What would make this a
successful year for you?" How students define success in college. *Liberal Education,
99*(2), 40-47.

Johnson, G. G. (1998). African American women administrators as mentors: Significance and
strategies. *Initiatives (Washington, D.C.), 58*(3), 49-56.

Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects
of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of
Higher Education, 79*(5), 540-563.

McClain, S., Beasley, S. T., Jones, B., Awosogba, O., Jackson, S. & Cokley, K. (2016). An
examination of the impact of racial and ethnic identity, impostor feelings, and minority
status stress on the mental health of black college students. *Journal of Multicultural
Counseling and Development, 44*(2), 101-117.

McLean-McKessey, A. (2015). *A recipe for success: Examining the relationships between
practitioners and Black students in community college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved
from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3729799).

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016a). *Associate's degrees conferred by
postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student: Selected years, 1976-77
through 2014-15* [Data file]. Retrieved from
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_321.20.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016b). *Bachelor's degrees conferred by
postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student: Selected years, 1976-77
through 2014-15* [Data file]. Retrieved from
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_322.20.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016c). *Total fall enrollment in degree-granting
postsecondary institutions, by level and control of institution and race/ethnicity of*

student: Selected years, 1976 through 2015 [Data file]. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_306.20.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Percentage distribution of full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by academic rank, race/ethnicity, and sex: Fall 2015* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61

Nora, A. (2002). A theoretical and practical view of student adjustment and academic achievement. In W. G. Tierney & L. S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing access to college: Extending possibilities for all students* (pp. 65-77). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Nora, A. (2003). Access to higher education for Hispanic students: Real or illusory? In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds./), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (pp. 47-68). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 119.

Nora, A., & Crisp, G. (2008). Mentoring students: Conceptualizing and validating the multi-dimensions of a support system. *Journal of College Student Retention, 9*(3), 337-356.

Orozco, G. L., Alvarez, A. N., & Gutkin, T. (2010). Effective advising of diverse students in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(9), 717.

Palmer, R., & Gasman, M. (2008). "It takes a village to raise a child": The role of social capital in promoting academic success for African-American men at a Black college. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(1), 52-70.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1977). Patterns of faculty-student informal interaction beyond the classroom and voluntary freshman attrition. *The Journal of Higher Education, 48*(5), 540-552.

Patton, S. (2013). At the Ivies, it's still white at the top. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(39), A4-A12.

Pena, E. V., Bensimon, E. M., & Colyar, J. (2006). Contextual problem defining: Learning to think and act from the standpoint of equity. *Liberal Education, 92*(2), 48-55.

Pierce, C. M. (1969). Is bigotry the basis of the medical problems of the ghetto? In J. C. Norman (Ed.), *Medicine in the ghetto* (pp. 301-312). New York: Meredith.

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

Pieterse, A. L., Carter, R. T., Evans, S. A., & Walter, R. A. (2010). An exploratory examination of the associations among racial and ethnic discrimination, racial climate, and trauma-related symptoms in a college student population. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(3), 255-263.

Pope, M. L. (2002). Community college mentoring: Minority student perception. *Community College Review, 30*(3), 31-45.

Prairie View A&M (2017). *Strategic Plan 2016-2021*. Retrieved from http://www.pvamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/StrategicPlan_Web.pdf

Rendon, L. I. (2006). Reconceptualizing student success for underserved students. *National Postsecondary Education* Cooperative. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/resp_Rendon.pdf

Rendon, L. I., Jalomo, R. E., & Nora, A. (2000). Theoretical considerations in the study of

minority retention. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Reworking the Student Departure Puzzle* (pp. 127-56). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Rhodes, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring really work for college students? *Allied Academies International Conference. Academy of Educational Leadership Proceedings, 13*(2), 62-66.

Rockstroh, E. C. (2011). *Examining student success: Student definitions and perceptions of success at the California community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3474465).

San Diego City College (2010). *Master plan 2010-2011*. Retrieved from http://www.sdcity.edu/Portals/0/About/StrategicPlanning/MasterPlan/2361_MasterPlan.2010-2011.update.web.pdf

Schneider, C. G. (2013). Losing our way on the meanings of student success. *Liberal Education, 99*(2), 2-3.

Schwitzer, A. M., Griffin, O. T., Ancis, J. R., & Thomas, C. R. (1999). Social adjustment experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*(2), 189-197.

Smith, W.A., Allen, W.R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the position...you fit the description": Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American males college students. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51*(4), 551-578.

Solorzano, D., Allen, W., & Carroll, G. (2002). Keeping race in place: Racial microaggressions and campus racial climate at the University of California, Berkeley. *The Chicano-Latino Law Review, 23*(15), 15-112.

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

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2010). A social capital framework for the study of institutional agents & their role in the empowerment of low-status students & youth. *USC Center for Urban Education*. Retrieved from http://cue.usc.edu/tools/Social_Capital%2C_Institutional_Agents_%2526_the_Empowerment_of_Low-status_Youth%2C_by_RD_Stanton-Salazar.pdf

Strayhorn, T. L. & Terrell, M. C. (2007). Mentoring and satisfaction with college for Black students. *Negro Educational Review, 58*(1/2), 69-83,132.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1999). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 610.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition* (2nd ed.). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Townsend, L. (1994). How universities successfully retain and graduate Black students. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education,* 85-89.

University of Colorado Boulder (2018). *About*. Retrieved from https://www.colorado.edu/about

Witham, K., & Bensimon, E.M. (2012). Creating a culture of inquiry around equity and student success. In S.D. Museus & U.M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating Campus Cultures: Fostering Success among Racially Diverse Student Populations* (pp. 46-67). New York: Routledge.

Wood, J. L., & Turner, C. S. (2011). Black males and the community college: Student perspectives on faculty and academic success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35*(1-2), 135-151.

This page has been intentionally left blank.