

January 2016

The Effects of Diversity Training on Faculty and Students' Classroom Experiences

Keonya C. Booker

College of Charleston, bookerkc@cofc.edu

Lisa Merriweather

University of North Carolina at Charlotte, lmerriwe@uncc.edu

Gloria Campbell-Whatley

University of North Carolina at Charlotte, gcampbe1@uncc.edu

Recommended Citation

Booker, Keonya C.; Merriweather, Lisa; and Campbell-Whatley, Gloria (2016) "The Effects of Diversity Training on Faculty and Students' Classroom Experiences," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 10: No. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2016.100103>

The Effects of Diversity Training on Faculty and Students' Classroom Experiences

Abstract

In response to the changing face of postsecondary education, efforts have been made to provide faculty and staff with training in multicultural and diverse perspectives. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of faculty participation in a Summer Diversity Training Institute. Focus group interviews were conducted with both faculty participants and the students of faculty attendees to determine the impact of the Institute on classroom dynamics, instruction, and assessment. Findings revealed that faculty participation in the Institute was beneficial in the sense that instructors' personal growth was most frequently evidenced through attitudinal and curricular changes. Students experienced a greater sense of community, personal growth, and conflict resolution skills by being in the classes taught by faculty trained in multicultural course development. As the demographics of higher education change to include more diverse populations, research must determine the effects of multicultural programming and training on both faculty and student participants.

Keywords

Multicultural Education, Diversity Training, College Faculty, College Students

The Effects of Diversity Training on Faculty and Students' Classroom Experiences

Keonya C. Booker,¹ Lisa Merriweather,² and Gloria Campbell-Whatley²

¹Department of Teacher Education, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC 29424, USA

²College of Education, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223, USA

(Received 10 April 2015; accepted 19 January 2016)

In response to the changing face of postsecondary education, efforts have been made to provide faculty and staff with training in multicultural and diverse perspectives. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of faculty participation in a Summer Diversity Training Institute. Focus group interviews were conducted with both faculty participants and the students of faculty attendees to determine the impact of the Institute on classroom dynamics, instruction, and assessment. Findings revealed that faculty participation in the Institute was beneficial in the sense that instructors' personal growth was most frequently evidenced through attitudinal and curricular changes. Students experienced a greater sense of community, personal growth, and conflict resolution skills by being in the classes taught by faculty trained in multicultural course development. As the demographics of higher education change to include more diverse populations, research must determine the effects of multicultural programming and training on both faculty and student participants.

INTRODUCTION

The face of a "traditional" college student is changing. Data reports highlight these trends across the spectrum. Nationally, college enrollment rates for students of color are increasing (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). Women continue to eclipse men in the attainment of bachelor's degrees (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014). The number of college students participating in English Language Learning (ELL) programs has grown by 12% in recent years (Choudaha & Chang, 2012). Nontraditional student populations are growing as adults affected by the 2008 recession look to higher education as a way to increase social mobility and income. Those who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Questioning (LGBTQ) students are actively choosing universities that provide a sense of community and acceptance (Sanlo, 2004).

All of these groups of students bring to bear on the college experience various backgrounds, unique histories, linguistic variants, political and religious affiliations, and sexual orientations. In response to this multitude of cultural changes, colleges and universities have had to readjust traditional approaches to instruction, assessment, and collaboration. In response to the academic and social needs of diverse groups, faculty are expected to demonstrate evidence of inclusion, empowerment, and content integration within their courses. An outgrowth of these expectations is the need for diversity training that supports faculty in selecting content, assessment measures, and instructional strategies that use students' various backgrounds as assets in the classroom setting (Gay, 2010).

There is evidence to suggest that a significant number of faculty feel ill-prepared to address some multicultural concepts such as power, dominance, access, and privilege (Mayo & Larke, 2010; Sue, Torino, Capodilupo, Rivera & Lin, 2009). In light of these concerns, college and university administration have answered the call by providing professional development opportunities to assist faculty with initiatives focused on instructional diversity.

There is no shortage of multicultural initiatives at the collegiate level; however, there is a dearth of qualitative information about the experiences of students who take courses with instructors who participate in such training programs (Clarke & Antonio, 2012; Morrier, Irving, Dandy, Dmitriyev, & Ukeye, 2007). The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the curricular and attitudinal experiences of both faculty who attended a week-long

diversity training institute and the students in their classes. In this study, multicultural/diversity training is defined as preparing faculty to use culturally diverse instructional strategies and language from multiple groups, cultures, and societies in the development of course content, teaching techniques, and assessments (Banks & Banks, 2013). This study is notable because the experiences of the college student are being examined, not just what faculty say they are doing in the classroom setting (Sciame-Giesecke, Roden, & Parkison, 2009). This study offers a glimpse into how students are affected by the curricular and instructional choices of a faculty member who has participated in a training program dedicated to a greater understanding of diverse populations.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The work of Grant and Sleeter (2011) typifies a model that is useful when examining how diversity training programs are developed and the goals that are established as related to student learning outcomes. The model consists of five approaches for addressing human diversity: (1) teaching the exceptional and culturally different (focus on assimilation); (2) human relations (focus on color blindness); (3) single-group studies (focus on one group); (4) multicultural education (focus on how societal institutions maintain power, dominance, and inequality) and (5) multicultural and reconstructionist education (focus on social action and resistance).

In the first level of Grant and Sleeter's theory, teaching the exceptional and culturally different, the focus is on assimilating diverse populations to "adjust and achieve to a dominant norm" (Gorski, 2009, p. 310). In the second approach, human relations, the goal is to increase interpersonal agreement between members of the classroom setting. An instructor focused on this second level will likely highlight the similarities amongst students and not attend to differences on a more conscious level. Oftentimes called teaching to the "color blind" level, instructors who choose not to embrace differences as assets to the learning process can inadvertently create spaces where diverse populations may feel restricted or relegated to a marginal status. The third component of multicultural programming, single-group studies, can be utilized when instruction is designed to go beyond surface-level discussions about differences with an evaluation of oppressive policies, programs and institutions.

Of particular interest to the present study are the fourth and

fifth stages of addressing human diversity and inclusive programming. In the fourth stage, multicultural education, faculty demonstrate a willingness to address how power, opportunity, access, and discrimination affect student experiences. An instructor who reaches the fifth level of Grant and Sleeter's typology, multicultural and reconstructionist education, will bring to bear a heightened sense of consciousness to the teaching and learning experience. With a focus on agency and social action, the subject matter is regarded as a vehicle for the expression of these higher ideals. At both the fourth and fifth levels, instruction is student-centered and a variety of methods are used to integrate knowledge and increase critical thinking skills.

During the workshop sessions, faculty participants of the Summer Diversity Institute were asked to reflect on how they would use the cultural experiences of their students to relate subject matter in a more holistic way. They were prompted to be reflexive in their own biases and preconceived notions about the role of teaching and learning as relevant to diverse cultures. Faculty were provided with examples and templates of how to challenge students' critical thinking about issues such as marginalization, discrimination, and sociopolitical perspectives. An interpretive qualitative research methodology was employed to address the following research questions:

1. How do faculty institute participants and students of the attendees define diversity?
2. In what ways are faculty participants addressing cultural diversity within the classroom setting?
3. In what ways does participation in a diversity training institute help faculty attendees reflect on their content instruction in substantive and actionable ways?
4. How are personal growth, responsibility, and empathy realized by both faculty and student participants?

METHODS

Context

The study took place at a large, urban, research university in the Southeast. The university employs more than 900 full-time faculty members, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Eighty percent of the faculty are Caucasian. The student body consists of 22,000 full-time undergraduate and graduate students, 27% of which are culturally and ethnically diverse. The gender rate at the undergraduate level is fairly evenly split (52% female and 47% male). The campus has seven colleges (Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Health and Human Services, Architecture, and Computing and Information) and 140 graduate programs.

The Summer Diversity Institute (SDI) provides faculty and full-time instructional staff across the university's colleges and departments with diversity training based on research-based best practices. Participating faculty receive a monetary stipend and resources to support culturally responsive teaching and assessment. Each year 25 to 40 faculty and instructional staff from all seven colleges attend the Institute.

The aim of the SDI is to help faculty integrate diversity into their syllabi and curricula. The five-day Institute consists of over a dozen 60- to 90- minute sessions that explore awareness of and sensitization to diversity, as well as providing information about campus and community resources related to diversity and multicultural

education. Each year the Institute features different speakers and topics such as: Diversity at Work: Moving from the Ivory Tower; Multicultural Education: A Research Perspective; Internationalization: A Focus on Research; Diversity: Realizing the Necessity; and Higher Education: Achieving Curriculum Diversity. There are, however, several staple topics that are included every year such as cultural awareness, infusing syllabi with diverse activities, gender identity, classroom climate, international students, students with disabilities, religion, sexual orientation, and campus multicultural resources among others. Faculty also participate in group sessions where they incorporate what they learned into their syllabi and curriculum. An important component of the SDI consists of Institute graduates presenting creative ideas, various activities, and examples of ways they have diversified their syllabi and curricula. In addition, a number of off-campus guest speakers are invited.

Participants

All faculty and staff who had completed the SDI within the past two years (approximately 58 persons) were invited to participate in a focus group interview. Sixteen faculty agreed to be interviewed, for a response rate of 28%. The faculty represented all of the seven colleges previously reported. Nine of the faculty members were men and seven were women. Eight faculty identified as non-majority people of color.

Invitations to participate in a focus group interview were extended to students who were currently enrolled in a class with a faculty member who had completed the SDI's training within the past two years. Thirty-seven students participated in the focus groups, with a majority of female students in attendance (58%). Seven percent of the participants were non-majority students and all classifications from freshman to senior year were represented.

Data Collection and Analysis

Two faculty focus groups consisting of eight participants each were conducted. The average faculty focus group interview length was 46 minutes. Five focus groups were held with students of former SDI attendees. Three focus groups had seven participants each and two focus groups had eight participants each. The average student focus group interview took 34 minutes to complete. All focus groups were led by a member of the research team, with two other team members present to record the interview data both electronically and via field notes.

Focus group interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview format. While the interview was guided by certain standard questions for all participants, the interview protocol still allowed for the conversation to shift if necessary, as is the case typically in focus groups (Hollander, 2004; Maxwell, 2005). The interview questions were developed by the research team and covered areas from the literature, curriculum of the SDI, and feedback from previous classes of participants. Some of the interview questions for faculty included: "What type of challenges (if any) have you experienced with addressing multicultural education/diversity within your classroom?" and "Regarding course dynamics, what are some things you do to acknowledge students' cultural, personal, and/or community experiences within the classroom?" Focus group questions for students included: "In your own words, how would you define or describe cultural awareness?" and "How (if at all) does your professor incorporate diverse topics and perspectives into

your class sessions?”

All data were transcribed and initially reviewed by the team of researchers. A key word coding approach was used based on the frequency and intensity of certain descriptors and participant statements. To reduce the data further, descriptive categories were developed from the codes (Krueger, 2009; Tufford & Newman, 2010). These categories described the various ways that the Institute impacted student participants and whether the Institute facilitated active learning in matters of diversity. Interrater agreement was achieved at 84%.

Ethical Considerations and Trustworthiness

The research project was approved by the Institutional Review Board. All participants were apprised of their rights and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. To ensure the qualitative data were accurate and credible a process of verifying the trustworthiness of the study was employed (Creswell, 2013). The research team analyzed the data individually and then conducted an iterative process of reflection and synthesis of the various coding categories. Having multiple perspectives analyze the data increased the agreement on certain themes and classifications. All faculty and student participants were offered the chance to review the interview transcripts to ensure accuracy and credibility of the data prior to analysis.

FINDINGS

The Institute had a significant impact on the campus community which included both faculty and students. The SDI facilitated this through a variety of instructional techniques that were favorably received. Faculty participants were impacted in three key areas: ideologically, individually through knowledge and skill development, and in terms of classroom practice. Student participants were influenced in three main domains: professional development, classroom environment and personal growth. Faculty findings are presented first.

Impact on Ideology

The SDI was effective in broadening the ideology of diversity of the faculty participants. All had some understanding of diversity prior to enrolling in the Institute ranging from concrete and simple to abstract and complex. Most participants fell somewhere in between. Diversity was consistently framed around descriptive characteristics of the population. Race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual preference were most frequently mentioned. Among others, additional characteristics included age, differentially abled persons both physical and mental, religion, socioeconomics, political views, and being overweight (e.g., “fat shaming”). This view highlights the similarities and differences among groups of people. For some, the Institute helped them to recognize the uniqueness of people.

Recognition of difference was one outcome but the SDI also helped participants to understand why differences matter. It cemented the idea that diversity was a dimension of identity. It helped them to value how people identify themselves. One Communications professor noted, “You get a surprising number of students who don’t view culture in ‘that’ way or who don’t see diversity in ‘that’ way. [There are] different ways they can view it. It is not just a color thing. It is not just... a gender thing. There are a lot of ways we can discuss it.” These markers of identity ranged from being

culturally bound in terms of communication styles, customs, rituals, and practices to being expressions of self, such as clothing, piercings and associations. For instance, students might identify with a group like the “Scene Kids” by wearing certain types of clothing or being associated with a campus sports team. Both the characteristics and the awareness of identity merged to create a more robust conceptual understanding of diversity. Diversity became multimodal in the sense that it mimicked the qualities of a noun, adjective and verb. As a noun it represented ideas, as an adjective it described those ideas and as a verb it was a catalyst for new ideas and behaviors. Some of the ideas included defining diversity as every aspect of what a person is: one’s outlook, orientations, and perspectives, a representation of a plurality of voices, inclusion, and hegemonic filtered power. The ideas were described by words such as different, complexity, and broadness which in turn resulted in actions such as meaningful appreciation, efforts to build community, embracing human experience, redefining difference and inclusion, and respecting individuality.

This impact on ideology resulted in a plethora of outcomes that speaks to the influence of the SDI on participants. These outcomes were varied in terms of the primary recipient of the outcome’s benefit: the institutions, the students, and the faculty. The institutional benefits included affirmation of a University culture that supports diversity and is open to diversity in all its forms as well as an organizational atmosphere that is structurally supportive of faculty who honor and engage diversity at all levels. The SDI was seen as an effective means of assisting the University in meeting its diversity strategic plan goals such as recruitment and retention of a diverse student body. A History professor shared: “*We’re all different, but there are certain differences that have made more of an impact than others when it comes to education. So with the Institute... that sense of the cultural awareness to me was functioning on two levels. One, an awareness that culture matters in the classroom and, two, a commitment to doing something about the fact that culture doesn’t get checked at the door... your own [culture] and other people’s.*” Students benefited from improved classrooms in which instructors, who are more sensitive and aware, equally valued the life experiences of students from all backgrounds because they see the students as people first. That is, faculty see students holistically and not unidimensionally and they create space for the richness of diversity in their classrooms.

The faculty participants as a whole believed that the SDI supported their instructional methods. One participant stated that she felt like diversity was already in her curriculum but the workshop clarified what she was doing in the classroom. This Mathematics professor exclaimed: “*I just go back to the idea of what does diversity really mean and what do we do with cultural awareness in our classroom... it is not just celebrating someone from a different place. It’s also to identify the real issues [that come with] the recognition of difference... you know, we are coming from different places and we are not seeing eye to eye on this... so what we should do afterwards...*”

For others, the Institute not only expanded their notions of inclusion and diversity and how to truly honor both, but it also helped them to recognize that a continuum exists with regard to the incorporation of diversity and where they fall on that continuum. Faculty recognized that, in spite of the differences among academic disciplines, they shared a common goal and purpose when it comes to respecting diversity in their courses. The most powerful

idea imparted by some faculty was that the SDI helped them to develop a new lens for seeing and evaluating the world. The impact was described as breaking out of a mindset that narrowly defined diversity. Often diversity was constructed in terms of “the other” but the new mindset recognized diversity as being part and parcel to the makeup of everyone. In essence, we all become “the other” under this new construction of diversity.

Impact on the Individual

On a more personal level, instructors were impacted in three ways: pedagogically, in skill and knowledge enhancement, and via personal development.

Intentional pedagogy. Pedagogy is defined as the process of teaching. It encompasses a wide range of attributes that influence the teaching and learning transaction. The attributes shape how the educator approaches the act of teaching. What was clearly evidenced was a pedagogical approach that was purposeful and deliberate with regard to the key ideas about diversity promoted in the Institute. The participants described being more intentional with course development by using innovative teaching practices, and modifying classroom management practices (Morey & Kitano, 1997). The most frequently shared idea focused on being inclusive. These educators expressed a hyper vigilance about not excluding learners in their classrooms. This was a salient point in two ways: (1) the SDI created an awareness that they previously had excluded students, albeit unconsciously in most instances and (2) it resulted in a commitment to recognizing, in a substantive way, the diverse learners in their classrooms. An English professor asserted: “*One of the things I’ve been running into this week is even the differences in students who are the first generation coming to college versus students who have had parents and grandparents going to college. There are a lot of differences in how expectations play on these kids. [In] how they actually behave in a classroom and what they are expecting from us. I was having a very interesting discussion of regional differences this past week as well.*” Instructors made specific changes to their classes to ensure that inclusion would occur and now have a conscientiousness surrounding their pedagogy that results in increased efforts to create inclusive learning spaces.

The participants became more thoughtful about how to incorporate innovative teaching practices that honored diversity. A precursor for some was a shift in thinking of diversity in the classroom as an add-on to or distraction from the “real” course material to thinking of diversity as an integral part of the course material that ultimately enhanced the course. Diversity was now being thought of as “best practice” and the instructors were actively thinking about how to adapt their classes. This required engaging in different teaching practices. A professor of Dance and Theater explained: “*We were talking about the history of ballet and I showed a short documentary on, the day in the life of a dancer...the dancer happened to be a Korean woman who dances for a ballet company in London. One of my students said in conversation that she was ‘obviously not British,’ and it was one of those moments so you would say ‘ok, now I have to go away from the [original] lesson plan to unpack that....’ ‘What made you say that, what are the assumptions here, why are you assuming that...did you hear her British accent? We don’t know how she identifies...’*” As a result of attending SDI, the instructors were more conscious about what they were doing in their classrooms relative to diversity and multiculturalism. Sometimes this meant having to pause with a pre-

planned lesson to dig into issues and concerns that students would bring into the discussion.

This intentional pedagogy was also described in more personal terms. On a personal level, instructors discussed adopting a more informal, less detached, and more overt pedagogical approach to teaching. There was a sense of needing to be more transparent and vulnerable with students. Several faculty participants mentioned being more explicit in sharing their own personal views during class sessions. They also expressed how, at a metacognitive level, they were engaged in this process of thinking about diversity. One participant referred to this as “getting the conversation going in my head” and “stepping back and absorbing everything” as part of the intentional pedagogy employed following participation in the SDI.

Skill and knowledge enhancement. In addition to changing how the professors approached instruction – altering their pedagogy – the SDI enhanced the skills and increased the knowledge of the participants. These skills and knowledge ranged from the concrete to the abstract. Several participants discussed becoming aware of campus resources such as the Multicultural Center and University policy initiatives that could help support their efforts to honor diversity and multicultural strategies for learning in the classroom. A Writing instructor noted: “*I know sometimes I feel challenged in my teaching where a particular issue comes up and I know it has to do with the issue of difference. A student is struggling with their English, because English is their second language or there are some support services they need. I can’t do all of that, but knowing there were people on campus who could...knowing where to access the right kind of support to make appropriate referrals was critical for me.*” Besides expanding their previous knowledge and introducing new concepts and teaching strategies relative to diversity, the Institute was credited with helping instructors to develop a framework or structure for infusing diversity into their instruction. For some faculty, this altered their course preparation in that they engaged in more research to demonstrate the relevance of diversity to their students.

For others, it resulted in expanding their idea of what inclusivity meant in the context of classroom instruction. A popular refrain from the interviews with the faculty was becoming more aware of their own vocabulary. A consciousness around language as a strategy for inclusivity was developed. A general awareness of other factors, like the type of examples used as illustrations, that influenced the creation and maintenance of diverse and inclusive learning environments was evidenced in the conversations with the instructors. The skills and knowledge presented during the week long training were immediately implemented in the courses of several of the participants. Additionally, the participants described how the Institute impacted their personal development relative to diversity and multiculturalism.

Personal development. Like all workshop trainings, the program planners set goals and objectives to be achieved during the learning event and like most workshop trainings unintended but beneficial by-products resulted. Several of the study’s participants discussed how they became more aware of self in relation to the material and how that awareness contributed to their personal development. Faculty articulated an awareness that acceptance and incorporation of diversity existed on a continuum not only when planning and implementing instruction but also within individual persons. They developed an acute awareness of where they were as persons on that continuum (i.e., how sensitive they were) and a

recognition that others also struggled with their continuum location.

Impact on Practice

There was a general consensus that the classroom atmosphere was more beneficial to the students as a result of the SDI workshop. Faculty began to think more carefully about the heterogeneity of individuals, their unique view points, and their societal positionality within the classrooms and this impacted their planning. For some participants, prior to attending the Institute, attention to diversity was viewed as a burden and additional thing to do. Subsequent to participation, faculty were more thoughtful about how to accommodate differences particularly with regard to disability, race, and gender. Diversity was now seen as a tool for learning (Hurtado, 2007). It was a means to an end as well as an end goal for the course.

Classroom practices. To facilitate this, faculty inspired by the Institute modified syllabi, course materials, approaches, activities, and assignments. Common changes to the syllabi included adding a diversity statement, moving the diversity statement so that it appeared earlier in the syllabus, and including a list of resources relative to diversity. Two faculty specifically discussed the significance of reordering course topics so that the diversity as subject matter for the course was integrated into the introduction of the course. These faculty felt strongly that this repositioning changed the way subsequent material was viewed because diversity became one of the lenses through students would filter the other course subjects.

Concerted efforts were made to include course material that spoke to the expanse of human experience. This required faculty to include material reflective of their broadened ideological conception of diversity. For some faculty this ideology was operationalized through adding specific content about women and other marginalized cultures, research that highlighted diversity, and material that problematized the universality of the discipline's canons. Others did this through the inclusion of visual indicators that diversity mattered in the classroom such as the creation of PowerPoints that included images of different races, ethnicities, genders, and clothing styles, the incorporation of videos, websites, and publications about life around the world. A Communications professor shared, "Because I teach a media class, I actually try to get my students to use Twitter...so that they know there's a large world and many more conversations happening. They also need to know, at least from my perspective, how to communicate and to [respect] the boundaries of public and private." Faculty also embraced diversity in terms of learning styles and included content that was affective not just cognitive, that was visual not just auditory, and that simplified course texts to help students grasp the material better. There was a deliberate effort to infuse into the classroom material that reflected multiple viewpoints and material they felt would speak to the individual students' experiences.

Course activities and assignments were developed similarly to the content. Activities were designed such that students could discuss opinions, share personal experiences, and reflect on the information. For some, activities were purposively designed to be student centered with limited didactic interaction such as that generated from lecturing. Emphasis was on dialogue with others to promote cultural pluralism based on the hearing and privileging of diverse experiences. Lectures were used as a means to directly introduce cultural diversity and were supplemented with carefully selected examples which centered on student experiences. Assignments were created which reinforced the centrality of diversity as a lens for understanding the

course topics. Students were required to read about diversity, experience diversity through visiting the Multicultural Center, and by working with various materials and people. Assignments were opportunities for further exploration of what diversity means and opportunities to apply those concepts in ways meaningful for professional development.

The incorporation of different course materials, activities, and assignments were reflective of a broader dimension of practice that was modified. Faculty spoke of how they changed their approach to the classroom relative to diversity. Faculty became more observant following the SDI. They had a greater awareness of their language which heightened their sensitivity to using inclusive language and being cognizant of how they explained diversity as well as other course topics (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Participants actively monitored their speech to avoid using racist, sexist, and heteronormative language. This approach involved modeling through example. One participant simply indicated that this modeling helped her to practice what she preaches to the student. In addition to monitoring language, theirs as well as their students, faculty monitored their behavior which included being conscious of who was called on, being aware of personal biases to reduce the chance that those biases might inadvertently influence curricular choices, classroom facilitation, and student evaluations. In their approach to instruction, faculty explained efforts to create a safe environment imbued with trust. This environment encouraged the type of interactions faculty felt were necessary to attend effectively to issues of diversity. These efforts included personalizing the students' learning experiences, allowing everyone to have input in the class discussion, and gauging the comfort level of the students throughout the learning experience. The final aspect regarding a modification of approach included explicitly connecting diversity to the experiences of the students. Faculty illustrated how diversity would impact their effectiveness as professionals and highlighted how effectiveness was limited in the absence of thoughtful consideration to diversity issues. Faculty intentionally forced students to interact with different people and be fully immersed in a variety of ideas as part of the effort to get students to think differently about the world and their place in it.

Impact on Students and Their Benefits as Learners

Learners accrued benefits across three domains: professional development, classroom environment, and personal growth.

Professional development. Because faculty were actively connecting diversity to professional practice, learners were able to further develop professionally. Students were able to see how diversity would be an integral part of their vocations because faculty made the course and specifically the content around diversity relevant to the students and the communities in which they would work. A female Education major commented, "In one of our projects, we're encouraged to reach out to a family or to a student of a different background than us to give us more experience working with people of other cultures." This student made diversity part of her professional identity and expressed the importance of respect, consideration, and sensitivity when dealing with families of her future students. The Education professor, a former SDI attendee, was cognizant of facilitating discussions about cultural awareness and privilege and how those ideas would impact a career in public education.

Classroom environment. Students within the classrooms of these participating faculty experienced having a voice in their learning

spaces. They felt included, visible, and valued in the class (Gurin et al., 2002). Faculty actively constructed opportunities that afforded every student the chance to contribute to the class. Inclusion was also promoted from a perspective change in which diversity was the frame of reference relied upon when students responded in class. This made faculty more open to the range of potential responses received by students. This foundation of inclusivity was set by faculty using a variety of strategies which included being more cognizant of the course materials, course activities, and personal behaviors employed in the classroom setting. A senior Communications major shared: *"With all the examples that she [professor] used... the importance is that you don't want to offend anybody and it's wrong to offend people, especially if you're writing for a public newspaper or things like that because when you're writing for a public newspaper or an article or journal or whatever, it's not necessarily your opinion. You use facts and you try your hardest not to put your opinion in it at all because that's not why you're writing..."* Each course was purposefully designed to allow students to see and hear their own experiences in learning environment. Students claimed license to be themselves and felt safe and comfortable in doing so. The atmosphere of inclusion created a portal for deeper engagement with the course material which resulted in better understanding of the material and its application to practice.

Personal growth. The analysis suggests that personal growth was most frequently evidenced through attitudinal changes. Faculty were purposeful in trying to teach students how to change their attitude and response toward diversity. Through course activities and classroom facilitation, faculty focused on changing students' ideas of acceptance, and of "otherness" by enabling a paradigm shift wherein students recognized that difference is a quality inherent in all people. A female Psychology major relayed: *"I find that I have an easier time communicating with others now that I know how to do so respectfully when someone is of a different culture... when I perceive myself as being respectful, I'm not going to come across as something else to someone else. I feel like I can communicate more confidently with people of other cultures both in my schoolwork and things related to that and also just in daily life."* Students became more sensitive to issues of diversity and more aware of their own frames of reference for judging others. The knowledge and skills gained resulted in students being more comfortable talking about diversity and being around people who were different than they were.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of faculty who engaged in a Summer Diversity Institute and how that participation influenced the students who took courses with them. Findings from the faculty participants included an emphasis on three major areas: impact on ideology, impact on the individual, and impact in the classroom on students. Participants, without reservation, indicated that the work was important, and necessary. It was beneficial and satisfying but most importantly it helped and was a worthwhile experience.

An interesting impact from the Institute was a sense of validation for faculty to be themselves. The Institute was a resounding affirmation that it was acceptable to struggle, it was okay to be in the process of developing, and it was fine to "push the envelope" with both students and faculty concerning issues of diversity. Those faculty who arrived with a strong understanding of diversity felt the Institute reinforced they were on the right track while those who did not have

much knowledge prior to the Institute left with a greater sense of confidence, strength, and comfort in raising and confronting such issues in their classrooms. Some developed their "voice" as a result of attending the Institute, a voice that permitted him or her to speak out against indifference and to claim privilege often afforded to those from the majority culture – White, male, heterosexual, Christian, etc. This personal development formed the foundation from which they advanced a more intentional pedagogy as well as their skills and knowledge (Gay, 2010). Personal growth was categorized by an increase in knowledge and skills and changes in attitude. The faculty who attended the SDI recognized this and actively constructed instructional plans that would produce these types of outcomes. The concept and practice of diversity as a learning tool was evident in this category.

In terms of knowledge and skills, students were able to see issues more broadly and develop a global understanding of society. The knowledge expanded their awareness through the presentation of multiple perspectives. In some instances they gained specific knowledge relative to diversity and multiculturalism and their application to their respective fields of study. This information helped the students to appreciate the differences as well as the commonalities among humankind. With this knowledge, the students developed critical thinking skills which taught them to question the course material, what they know about the "other", and their surrounding environment. Students also became more aware of and questioned their language, attitudes, and behaviors relative to diversity. In doing so, they became more effective communicators and more cognizant of the need to be more socially responsible in their speech and behavior. This resulted in attitudinal changes.

The Institute was not without drawbacks, however. Comments made during the interviews also suggested that the SDI needs to develop strategies that address what the analysis revealed as barriers to implementation of the practices promoted during the week-long training. Three barriers surfaced: time, competency, and priority. In spite of the strategies and knowledge being considered as interesting and potentially useful, some participants indicated that there was not enough time to infuse diversity in the course of a semester. The amount of material mandated by their academic discipline was overwhelming which limited the time or space available for material related to multiculturalism (Mayhew & Grumwald, 2006; Sue et al., 2009). Even with good intentions to include it, some reported that they were too busy or would forget. The Institute was ineffective in convincing these participants that diversity should be an equal priority, particularly in disciplines or with individuals who saw diversity as an atypical component of their academic subject matter.

While time and priority were important barriers highlighted by participants, the one in which the Institute has the greatest opportunity of influencing is competency. Some felt that it was a challenge to incorporate diversity because of student perceptions and resistance, and subject matter incongruence. One participant's comments upon analysis suggest that resistance is also a factor within the faculty. It was noted that the SDI, by virtue of its focus on marginalized populations, may inadvertently alienate those from majority cultures. This particular participant felt blamed for the problems wrought by the lack of widespread incorporation of diversity in program and course planning.

Limitations and Future Research

This research study was carried out at a predominantly white institution, so the findings may not generalize to other college environments and different populations of students. Also, interview data are self-report in nature, so future studies could implement an observational component to see if what faculty and students claim is happening in the classroom setting is, in fact, occurring. Asking SDI faculty to allow for observations of course sessions could provide an additional layer of information from which administrators can plan for future diversity programming (Sciame-Giesecke, Roden, & Parkison, 2009).

Admittedly, there is the possibility for a self-selection bias in our results. Specifically, the Summer Diversity Institute may attract faculty already sensitive to the issue of culturally responsive instruction and therefore some of the positive outcomes we found may be due to this bias. While our response rate was respectable, future studies can examine the experiences of faculty who participated in the Institute, but perhaps did not follow up with requests for interviewing and observation. Finally, with a need to continue the conversations on diversity and multiculturalism across the country, it would be useful for institutions to partner with other colleges and universities to establish a network of support services for faculty as they work with diverse student populations to ensure equitable and just postsecondary experiences for all.

References

- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. (2013). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (8th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Choudaha, R., & Chang, L. (2012, February). *Trends in international student mobility*. World Education Services, New York. Retrieved from www.wes.org/RAS
- Clarke, C., & Antonio, A. (2012). Rethinking research on the impact of racial diversity in higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 36*(1), 25-50.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gorski, P.C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 309-318.
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (2011). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*, 330-366.
- Hollander, J.A. (2004). The social contexts of focus groups. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 33*(5), 602-637.
- Hurtado, S. (2007). ASHE presidential address: Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 185-196.
- Krueger, R.A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lopez, M. H., & Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2014, March 6). Women's college enrollment gains leave men behind. *Fact-Tank: News in the Numbers - Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/06/womens-college-enrollment-gains-leave-men-behind/>
- Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Grumwald, H. E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*, 148-168.
- Mayo, S., & Larke, P.J. (2010). Multicultural education transformation in higher education: getting faculty to "buy in". *Journal of Case Studies in Education, 1*, 1-9.
- Morey, A. I., & Kitano, M. (1997). *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Morrier, M. J., Irving, M.A., Dandy, E., Dmitriyev, G. & Ukeje, I. C. (2007). Teaching and learning within and across cultures: Educator requirements across the United States. *Multicultural Education, 14*(3)32-40.
- Sanlo, R. (2004). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: Risk, resiliency, and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 6*(1), 97-110.
- Sciame-Giesecke, S., Roden, D., & Parkison, K. (2009). Infusing diversity into the curriculum: What are faculty members actually doing? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*, 156-165.
- Sue, D., Torino, G., Capodilupo, C., Rivera, D., & Lin, A. (2009). How white faculty perceive and react to difficult dialogues on race: Implications for education and training. *Counseling Psychologist, 37*(8), 1090-1115.
- Tufford, L. & Newman, P. (2010). Bracketing in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work, 11*(1), 80-96.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2012* (NCES 2014-015), Chapter 3.