

EXAMINING CAMPUS MULTICULTURAL CENTERS AT PREDOMINANTLY
WHITE INSTITUTIONS

BY

SHALON MALONE

KARRI HOLLEY, COMMITTEE CHAIR
JASON GARVEY
NATHANIEL BRAY
ARLEENE BREAUX
CLAIRE MAJOR

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies in the
Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2020

COPYRIGHT BY SHALON MALONE 2020
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Campus based multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions have the surmountable task of both supporting marginalized identities and educating the majority White community on diversity and social justice issues. As a unit often placed under student affairs, multicultural centers are the only unit that is tasked with a dual position of support and education for the entire campus community. While there is an abundance of research on Black cultural centers, diversity education, and on certain populations within historically marginalized identities, there is little to no research on the departments and units that are charged with all of the components listed. This study examined multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions, including their programs, services, missions, and structures to gain an understanding of what made these centers successful and how multicultural centers function within this unique dual position.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank all the members of my committee who took the time to help me refine my research, and also those who took the time to cheer me on and instilled in me my value of my own voice, as a black woman and a professional in higher education. Your words of encouragement will stay with me forever.

For those individuals that are working in multicultural centers, who took the time to listen to me and answer my questions, I want to thank you and know that I understand how difficult this work is on your full self, but know that you are making our colleges and universities better for those from historically marginalized identities. These students are our legacies. They will go on to pay it forward for those that come behind them.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
PURPOSE STATEMENT.....	4
RESEARCH QUESTION.....	5
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY.....	5
RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY.....	7
KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS.....	11
DEFINING MULTICULTURAL CENTERS.....	13
OUTLINE OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY.....	14
CONCLUSION.....	14
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW.....	16
HISTORY OF MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLEMENT.....	17
HISTORY OF BLACK CULTURAL CENTERS.....	22

HISTORY OF AFFINITY CENTERS AND MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMS.....	27
EMERGENCE OF MULTICULTURAL CENTERS AND MULTICULTURAL INITIATIVES.....	30
PRESENT-DAY MULTICULTURAL CENTERS.....	32
MULTICULTURAL CENTERS STRUCTURE AND DESIGN.....	33
IMPORTANCE OF CULTURAL CENTERS.....	34
IMPORTANCE FOR AFFINITY GROUPS.....	35
BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES.....	38
MULTICULTURAL CENTERS VALIDITY AND RELEVANCE.....	38
PERCEPTION OF RESPONSIBIITY.....	40
MISCONCEPTIONS.....	41
SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES FOR MULTICULTURAL CENTERS.....	43
MULTICULTURAL VISIBILTY.....	43
MISSION, OBJECTIVES, INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE.....	45
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATION.....	47
CRITICAL RACE THEORY.....	48
STRUCTURATION THEORY.....	50
CAS STANDARDS.....	51

UTILIZING CAS STANDARDS.....	52
MULTICULTURAL STUDENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	
SELF-ASSESSMENT GUIDE.....	53
SUMMARY OF CHAPTER.....	54
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	56
RESTATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTION.....	56
RESEARCH PURPOSE AND SETTING OF RESEARCH.....	57
RESTATEMENT OF RESEARCH POSITIONALITY.....	58
METHODOLOGY SECTION.....	58
METHOD SECTION.....	60
DATA COLLECTION.....	61
INTERVIEWS.....	61
DOCUMENTATION.....	62
DATA ANALYSIS.....	63
PARTICIPATION SELECTION.....	65
CRITERION SELECTION.....	65
SAMPLE.....	66
DATA ANALYSIS SUMMARY.....	69
LIMITATIONS OF STUDY.....	70

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS.....	71
CAS STANDARDS.....	71
EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS.....	72
STRUCTURATION THEORY.....	73
CRITICAL RACE THEORY.....	75
METHODOLOGY SUMMARY.....	76
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	78
ANALYSIS.....	79
MISSION.....	80
PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.....	83
CULTURAL PROGRAMMING.....	83
DIVERSITY EDUCATION.....	86
SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION.....	88
STUDENT SUCCESS AND ACADEMIC ADVISING.....	90
ACCESS, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION.....	92
HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	94
FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.....	101
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS.....	103
COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES.....	104

TARGET AUDIENCE.....	106
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL	
FOUNDATIONS SUMMARY.....	107
ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY.....	107
CRITICAL RACE THEORY.....	111
CONCLUSION.....	114
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	116
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	118
MISSION AND PURPOSE.....	119
TARGET AUDIENCES.....	120
ATTITUDES TOWARDS MISSION.....	121
PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.....	123
SOCIAL JUSTICE V. DIVERSITY EDUCATION.....	125
DIVERSITY AND ACCESS.....	128
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	129
PROFESSIONAL STAFF.....	131
IMPLICATION OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS.....	133
STRUCTURATION THEORY.....	133

CRITICAL RACE THEORY.....	134
LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH.....	136
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	137
EXPAND VISIBILITY.....	137
ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.....	139
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.....	140
CHALLENGING STRUCTURATION THEORY.....	141
RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	142
CONCLUSION.....	144
REFERENCES.....	146
APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANTS INSTITUTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS.....	163
APPENDIX B: CAS STANDARDS SELF ASSESSMENT GUIDE	
MULTICULTURAL STUDENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.....	164
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	168
APPENDIX D: IRB CONSENT FORM.....	169
APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL DOCUMENT.....	173

LIST OF TABLES

1. NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS BY TYPE, SIZE, AND PERCENTAGE OF
RACIAL MINORITIES.....68

2. PARTICIPANTS INSTITUTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHICS.....163

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Initially created in the late 1960s, cultural centers were established at predominantly White institutions to support the academic and social development of Black students (Jones et. al, 2004). Patton (2006b) described multicultural centers as “all-encompassing facilities that are often established to cater to the needs of historically marginalized groups” (p. 642). First established as Black cultural centers, these entities were created to provide safe and welcoming counterspaces for Black students to grow and develop while attending predominantly White institutions. At their inception, these cultural centers provided counseling services, writing labs, and campus resources; they also developed programs that celebrated racial and ethnic identities and tackled the social issues of the time (Patton, 2006a). With the assistance of these centers, the graduation rates of Black students increased, and with better recruitment and support services, retention at predominantly White institutions also increased (Hefner, 2002; Patton, 2006b).

As universities began to recognize the benefits and success of Black cultural centers, other cultural centers that supported the needs of other ethnic or cultural groups began to emerge including Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian or Pacific Islander (Welch, 2009; Stennis-Williams, Terrell, & Hayes, 1988). As visibility and awareness of the gender gap and various sexual identities began to appear in the national conversation, a need to provide support for groups such as women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer (LGBTQ) groups as well as other religious centers to support the growing diversity of those entering predominantly White institution (Harper, S. et. al, 2009). During the 1990s, a rising trend of diversity and multicultural education sparked an emergence of some Black cultural centers to transition to

multifaceted, multicultural centers that supported more than Black students such as other marginalized communities including other minorities. Today, a vast majority of multicultural centers served students from multiple identities across racial and ethnic backgrounds, across marginalized communities. Many colleges and universities have added multicultural centers that serve as countspaces (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000, p. 70) for students of marginalized groups. As student representation shifted and enrollment of historically marginalized students increased, some Black cultural centers adjusted their missions to support other marginalized identities such as Chicana/Latinx, Asian, Native American, women, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans (LGBT) students. This shift served as the impetus to contemporary multicultural campus centers. This multicultural approach to education exposes students to cultural diversity so that all students from diverse populations can have a positive and an equitable educational experience (Banks, 2003; Hu & Kuh, 2003).

Multicultural centers exist to provide support services to historically marginalized groups and provide multicultural education programming to the entire campus community. Although colleges and universities have become more diverse, students still require educational opportunities to gain a cultural understanding of the world in which they live. Hefner (2002) noted that although multicultural centers were created to provide support services to students from marginalized communities, these centers also provide multicultural and diversity education opportunities for the majority community. In other words, the center staff was responsible for educating the rest of the campus community through programming and research while serving historically marginalized students (McClusky-Titus & Sutton, 2010). These programs by the multicultural center staff and students include activities in diversity awareness activities, cultural events, and celebrations.

Young (1991) believed that affinity cultural centers operated in two distinct approaches: the fortress and the oasis philosophy. The fortress philosophy contends that historically marginalized students utilized the facilities as safe havens of any outside presence (Young, 1991; Patton, L. & Hannon M.D., 2008). The oasis philosophy welcomes anyone who desires to participate in the programs and services that focus on diversity and cultural awareness operated by the center. Multicultural centers operate utilizing both methods, providing both the oasis or a space to celebrate historically marginalized students in addition to learning opportunities for the majority campus. However, some administrators still perceive these centers as promoting a notion of separatism with a limited number of students that engage in the office's programs based on race or identity (Stewart & Bridges, 2011).

Multicultural centers were also symbols of institutional commitment to diversity. Multicultural centers' programs and services were utilized as recruitment tools in admissions of historically marginalized students and demonstrate the variety of cultural programming, activities, and experiences to the majority community. However, on its face, institutional commitment to the multicultural centers is diluted with misconceptions and preconceived notions about the programs, services, and function of these centers and their staff. Although cultural centers have a history of creating supportive environments in which students may learn about each other and themselves, the challenges that the centers may face were significant enough to threaten their future existence in higher education. Since multicultural centers and their professionals serve a unique population, they were also perceived as the sole advocates for and authorities on the needs of the students they serve. This expectation relieves other administrators from focusing on the recruitment and retention goals of diverse populations and providing

programs, mentoring, leadership development, and cultural experiences needed for underrepresented population (McClusky-Titus & Sutton, 2010).

Multicultural centers had the dual responsibility to support a student population that faces many challenges and obstacles in persistence to graduation while providing education to the entire university community. While doing so, multicultural centers and the professionals within them may ask the precarious question of, can we be all to everybody? This question is asked because multicultural centers were given the responsibility not only to be advocates, but also educators while other institutional units were only responsible for their programs and students which they serve. Although there were more students from diverse student populations attending colleges, less staff, resources, and institutional support exist to maintain a growing population.

Although there is an abundance of research on Black cultural centers and today's multicultural support services such as academic and student success programs, there is little to no research on how programs and services of multicultural centers target the needs of historically marginalized students while facilitating multicultural and diversity education to the majority community. While the extant research provides evidence for the need for these centers, it lacks evidence of how multicultural centers affect change in the students they serve and the campus environment. This study examined multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions, including their programs, services, missions, and structures to gain an understanding of what made these centers successful.

PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of this study was to provide an understanding of how multicultural centers operate, including programs and activities for both historically marginalized students and the majority community. While an abundance of research on Black cultural centers and other

minority services exists (Hord, 2005; Patton, 2006a; Patton & Hannon, 2008), there was limited research that examines the role of multicultural centers on college campuses that serve a myriad of underrepresented social communities. This study examined multicultural centers, including their purpose, mission, structure, program activities, and how professional staff perceive their success within the larger institution.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The central research question was intended to explore multicultural centers and their roles within the larger institutional structure: How do multicultural centers provide support to marginalized communities and facilitate multicultural education within the institution? The four questions that supported the central question of this study were as follows:

1. What is the mission, purpose, and structure of the multicultural center (i.e., space, professional staff, and reporting lines)?
2. What are the programs that provide multicultural education offered by the center?
3. How does the multicultural center support the academic, social, and cultural experiences of all students?
4. How do multicultural center staff define success for the center and how are they achieving that success?

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The significance of this study extends into both research and practice-based applications. By examining multicultural centers, I fill the void in the research by providing a better understanding of these centers and exploring how Multicultural center staff balance serving in a dual position of supporting historically marginalized identities and the majority social communities at their institutions. Multicultural centers were established through a history of

student unrest that led to the creation of Black cultural centers, as well as other affinity centers at colleges and universities across the United States. During the 1990s, colleges and universities began to collapse these centers to form all-encompassing multicultural centers that support all historically marginalized student populations. However, there was limited research on how the transformation of these centers had resulted in structural changes, program design, and activities that would provide support for these populations.

The current study would also shed light on the practices that might aid or impede the success of these centers. Educators and professionals can gain valuable expertise from the successes and failures of peer programs and services at other institutions. By examining the programs and services of multicultural centers, professionals may gain a better understanding of their personal multicultural centers within their colleges and universities.

The goal of this study was not to argue for the existence of multicultural centers or validate their existence, though this may be done throughout the literature and findings of the study. The goal of this study was to fully examine the role of multicultural centers within higher education. There was a lack of research of the programs, services, and practices of multicultural centers. Although diversity and minority programs have been studied, the emphasis has not been as a function of multicultural centers. It was imperative to highlight these practices in order to demonstrate to other institutions that they are creating meaningful change in the students and university in which they served.

Furthermore, this study would also inform administrators and practitioners of the services and programs that are facilitating success for historically marginalized student populations and the majority population. As student affairs professionals, we must use the knowledge we gain from studies to direct our practice and to ensure our programs are responsive to the changing

demographic that we serve. It is important to this study to give multicultural centers a narrative, providing a critical assessment of programs, services, and activities and an example of successful practices that will assist them to continue into the future.

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

Two influences encouraged me to study multicultural centers. As a student affairs practitioner, I chose to study multicultural centers because I understand the need for an analysis in this area. For the past 10 years, I have had the opportunity to work in multicultural centers at various institutions. Immersed in this work, I have been up close and personal with the challenges and misconceptions surrounding multicultural centers. I have also observed the student experiences that happen within these centers and the opportunities for all social identities that take part in the programs and services including personal development, mentoring, social responsibility, and career exploration. Personally, as an undergraduate student, I was one of many who benefited from the services and support offered by the multicultural center at my institution. The multicultural center was my home, and the professionals there became my family and mentors. It is because of these professionals that I chose to go into student affairs and, specifically, work with historically marginalized student populations in higher education.

As an undergraduate student, I attended a predominantly White institution in the Midwest part of the country. A dance major from the South, I chose to attend a small liberal arts college away from home because I wanted the college life experience that I read about in books and saw on television. I also wanted to pursue my dance career. I attended performing arts schools most of my life. From elementary school to high school, I focused on pliés and pirouettes with some of the academic fundamentals. Although I received admission to the most prestigious conservatory in the United States, I knew that I was not academically prepared to face the rigors

of the institution. However, I felt confident in my choice and thought I would be successful both academically and professionally at my institution.

My first few weeks of college entailed one realization after another. I was the only Black woman in my conservatory class. The faculty told me that my body type would make it difficult to be a professional ballet dancer and I was given a strict diet and exercise plan from the beginning of the semester until the end of the academic year if I expected to stay in the program. My classes were harder than expected and the amount of coursework, in addition to my dance classes, was more than I could handle. In addition, I found that I had to get a work-study position to pay for my expenses.

I had anxiety for the first time in my life. Because of my major, it was so hard to make friends outside of the conservatory. Being away from home scared me. By fall break, I considered going back home to attend college or dancing for the local dance company that I left behind. It was then that I learned of a work-study position in the multicultural center. The job consisted of light office work, planning and the implementation of university programs. I had heard of the multicultural center and had even walked by it a few times but did not consider it for me. However, I needed a job and thought the hours would work well with my schedule, so I applied.

The decision to work for the multicultural center changed my college experience and the rest of my life. The professionals within the center became my family, teachers, mentors, and my friends. They helped me find tutors, introduced me to services that I did not know existed, and helped me develop as a person. They helped me connect with others like me and gain the positive outlook and self-awareness I was lacking. The director fed me when I was not eating and helped me gain back a positive body image through a support group for women of color. By

my junior year, I served on student government, worked as an orientation leader, and joined a historically Black sorority through a sister school in the area. The college I attended did not have many programs or events that interested me. Outside of the multicultural center, the programs and events did not support or celebrate my culture. My director instilled in me that the multicultural center was a “safe space, not a hiding place.” I was to use the support and services the multicultural center provided to spread diversity and understanding throughout the campus community.

By my senior year, I focused more on helping others than the struggles I faced in the conservatory. My dance career took a back seat to planning programs and being part of student services as an assistant to the dean. When it was time to begin the job search, finding a job with a dance company gave me anxiety and insecurities that did not feel right. I was worried that my college degree was worthless and that I had spent my entire college career playing around when I should have chosen something different for myself. It was then that the director of the multicultural center asked me, “What do you think about working in higher education?” I never thought about it as a career, but here was a professional in the field making life better for me. I could do this for a living and do this for someone else. This began my journey in student affairs, but this was also when I began to see the struggles that she and many other professionals have in the field.

In my first job, I served as a coordinator in multicultural services. I was an advisor for international students where I assisted them in their entry and helped them with the culture shock transitioning to the U.S. I managed the first-year mentoring program for historically marginalized students and was in charge of planning programs for all cultural history months, international week, and both women and LGBT students. In addition, I was also the advisor of

several cultural groups and diverse student organizations where I assisted in their programs and events. The amount of work was challenging; the staff was small and the budget was smaller. Not only did we answer to student services and our students, admissions and academic departments called on us to talk about the diversity of the institution. Nevertheless, I knew that students were thriving because of the sweat and many tears I poured into them through my work to serve them.

I also thought it was important to learn more about student affairs as a new professional. I immersed myself in cultural guides, and went to several conferences and workshops to understand how to serve historically marginalized student identities. I wanted to learn more about higher education, how similar centers accomplished the seemingly insurmountable task of supporting all students. In my quest for knowledge, I gained a new perspective on my place in higher education and my dedication to helping students from all social identities.

Many of my colleagues were not asked to represent the university in the capacity in which multicultural center staff were asked. Everyone requested the practitioners to represent the student historically marginalized population from admissions to academic departments and university-wide committees. Other areas utilize their expertise and knowledge in diversity and social identities. Multicultural services consistently had smaller budgets than other service areas within both public and private institutions and are asked to produce more with limited resources. Pigeonholed into their roles, professional staff were only called upon to assist in diversity issues when they can add knowledge and expertise in other areas of the university. Although diversity initiatives were part of university efforts, too often the responsibility solely falls on multicultural center staff to ensure that these programs continue and that students have a positive college experience despite any difficulty that multicultural centers faced.

When I decided to study multicultural centers for my dissertation, my experiences and knowledge of the field were at the forefront of my mind. The history of multicultural centers began within the need to create a space for historically marginalized groups, but merged into multicultural centers to fit the growing demographic of higher education. However, there is a lack of evidence as to whether these changes were more beneficial to the student and to the university community. Although I have learned about the history and focus of these centers, it is difficult to ascertain if these centers were successful despite the issues and challenges they faced. Additionally, there is a lack of research in the field of multicultural services. It was my desire to fill the gap in the research so that multicultural affairs could move forward in present times. With this knowledge, it was also my hope to remove the stigma surrounding multicultural affairs and the professionals within them. Without constant survey and analysis, multicultural centers cannot establish the best methods by which the field can improve and serve the population.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

To provide a foundation for this study, the following terms and their associated definitions are listed below.

Campus Climate/Environment. Campus climate refers to the general attitude, beliefs, and actions related to the makeup (students, faculty, and staff) of the campus community as it relates to the understanding and accommodations of the individual needs of others. This includes respect of the individual needs of diverse students including their abilities and potential spaces for cultural norms and celebrations. Sometimes this is referred to as campus environment (Rankin, 2003).

Culture. Culture refers to the norms, celebrations, attitudes, and beliefs of individual marginalized groups that include, but are not limited to ethnic/racial identities, religions, sexual identities, and regional groups.

Cultural Awareness. This is the exposure to various cultural differences and experiences of various groups including racial and ethnic identities to promote understanding and acceptance of people of difference (Ferguson & Thomas-Rashid, 2011).

Cultural centers. An institutional department or office within an area of student affairs that is staffed and funded by the college or university to meet the needs of historically marginalized students and those of other social identities (women, gay, lesbian, trans, and bisexual students). Services may include providing academic, social, cultural and interpersonal development support programs (Hord, 2005; Patton, 2010). This study focused on cultural centers at 4-year public and private higher education institutions.

Diversity. A broadly defined term, diversity focuses on cultural and social differences and institutional efforts to support marginalized social identities (i.e. race, gender, international, indigenous groups, and sexual orientations; Hurtado, 2012).

LGBT. The acronym that represents lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans (transsexual/transman/transwomen) identities.

Marginalized Identities. A group of social identities that are forced into a new system of rules while facing social stigma and stereotypes from the dominant group in society, further marginalizing and excluding individuals (Young, 2000).

Multicultural centers. Evolved from the Black cultural centers in the 1960s and a social justice framework, these centers are support centers for all marginalized communities

with programmatic initiatives and services to promote cross-cultural engagement throughout the campus community (Benitez, 2010; Patton, 2010).

Racial microaggressions. “Subtle forms of bias and discrimination that harms people of color” (Sue, 2010 p. 5).

Social identities. A term related to a group or category in which a person identifies related to the race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation (Reynolds, 2001). For the purpose of this study, social identities refer to historically marginalized social identities (students of color, women, and sexuality identities).

Students of color. A term that broadly defines student of marginalized racial identities. This includes Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Asian, and Native American students.

Defining Multicultural centers for Study

In (Bridges, Cubarubbia, & Stewart, (2008) “Survey of Multicultural Student Services” attempted to collect data from professionals associated with various professional organizations in higher education that identified themselves as working in multicultural student services. Among the individuals that participated in this study, the populations in which they provided support services varied in racial/ethnic groups, gender, sexual identities, and religious diversity. From this information, it was easy to ascertain that no two multicultural center is the same and the individual identities that they support can vary from institution to institution. However, all participants surveyed shared the same model of support and education. It is important to note that the findings in this analysis refer to those multicultural centers who served the dual role of support of marginalized students and education to campus community.

OUTLINE OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 began by outlining the purpose and significance of study for multicultural centers. Research positionality demonstrated my understanding of multicultural centers and how my experiences as a student, and now a professional, have led me to research and study multicultural centers. The research question for the study provided helpful insight to professionals of multicultural centers and to the leaders of the institution who make decisions that affect these centers.

Chapter 2 provided an overview of the literature including the history of multicultural centers and the evolution of what these centers have become today. This chapter would also discuss success strategies for multicultural centers as well as challenges and obstacles facing centers. Although the research in this area was limited, I will provide information of both the cultural centers and multicultural centers to provide a framework for the argument.

Chapter 3 describe the methods used in this dissertation for analyzing and understanding multicultural centers and their staff. The methodology includes an overview of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Standards that will be utilized in the study. CAS standards are used to assess programs and services in higher education institutions for improvement and development and the epistemological foundations that demonstrate the grounded theories in which Multicultural centers are structured. Finally, chapters 4 and 5 will examine my findings and summarize the results and recommendations following the study.

CONCLUSION

Multicultural centers were institutional units that exist to support and provide services to historically marginalized groups as well as provide programming for multicultural education to the entire campus community. This chapter served as an introduction to multicultural centers

and my intent in studying their structure, programs, and professionals to provide evidence of best practices and models of success. Once established as Black cultural centers, multicultural centers were to provide safe and welcoming places and facilitate diversity education opportunities for the majority campus. While universities moved to a multicultural and social justice framework, campus cultural centers are given the dual responsibility to serve the student population while addressing the precarious question of, can we be all to everybody? This purpose of this study was to provide an understanding of how multicultural centers operate, including programs and activities for both historically marginalized students and the majority community.

Additionally, this chapter also provides evidence of my knowledge of the work of the multicultural center on college campuses. Finally, I provided a list of key terms and definitions that were used throughout the study. The research question for the study was “How does the multicultural center provide support to marginalized communities and facilitate multicultural education within the institution?” This study was designed to assist professionals in practice and the university administrators who support them. I examined multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions, including their programs, services, missions, and structures to gain an understanding of what makes these centers successful.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE OVERVIEW

The purpose of chapter 2 is to provide an overview of the literature that supports the study of multicultural centers. First, the chapter provides an overview of cultural centers and multicultural centers. This includes an historical overview and the purpose of multicultural centers, student services, and multicultural education on college campuses. Secondly, it will also discuss the challenges facing multicultural centers as many multicultural centers face opposition to their existence. In addition, I examined the organizational structure of multicultural centers today. Thirdly, an overview of the conceptual framework and epistemological foundations that supported the validity of the study and finally, this chapter provided an overview of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), how they are used in professional practice to access programs and services for improvement, and development of multicultural that were in the study.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

An overview of multicultural centers and their services must begin with an understanding of their people and their history that shaped the foundation and multicultural centers' current framework today. Various minority groups have had a contentious history with higher education. Their fight for equality and acceptance within higher education was the motivation behind the creation of such a service at colleges and universities. Understanding the history, people, and attitudes that formed multicultural centers will give an insight on the challenges and successes of these centers today.

The first section serves as an overview of that history of the people, briefly describing minority student enrollment in higher education. Secondly, the section will then describe the history of the emergence of cultural centers including societal climate, systemic racism, and barriers that minority students faced in higher education. Finally, this section will describe the emergence of multicultural centers, the programs, and structure that have informed our current practices today.

History of Minority Student Enrollment

To examine multicultural centers and the student populations they serve, one must have an understanding of the intended purpose of higher education, the privilege population it once served, and the history of minority student enrollment in higher education (Kupo, 2011).

Founded by Christian puritans, higher education in the United States was committed to educating Christian, White men who were to carry on family businesses and continue the strong, religious traditions of the colonies. Higher education was not intended for the general population or public access; in addition, lower class working people and minority groups did not aspire to postsecondary education (Thelin, 2004). Higher education was privately owned and exclusive to those that could afford to educate those in the upper socioeconomic class. Albeit public access was not plausible until the early 1900s, higher education was not for the general population until the Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890 (Thelin, 2004).

The minority group to first benefit from education opportunities was American Indians. For American Indians the inequity in education began with U.S. government's forced assimilations and regulations on territories. The federal government forced American Indians, or indigenous people, to learn English, Christian values, and European customs that the United States was founded (Kupo, 2011). Grammar and Indian schools were founded by missionaries to

assist in Christian conversion, but also were used as tools to increase donors from the English colonies for early colleges (Thelin, 2004). Primarily, the goal for educating American Indians was centered on assimilation and teaching them the Eurocentric values of the colonies (Shotton, et. al, 2010).

Some of the first colleges to enroll American Indians included Harvard, The College of William and Mary, and Dartmouth. Educating American Indians was part of their initial missions and many thrived in this postsecondary education (Shotton, et. al, 2010). Although some American Indians enrolled in higher education with high attrition rates, many colonists frowned upon educating a group of people considered as savages, or lower class individuals, and ultimately, the experiment began to fail with high dropout rates and ailments such as measles, and depression (Kupo, 2011). Tribes did not see the value in postsecondary education and perceived it to challenge the tribal traditions and skills that they thought were critical to their society (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 2000). The cultural conflict that existed led to the majority of American Indians disassociating from higher education and the isolation of the tribal communities.

Similar to American Indians, Mexican Americans were treated in the same manner, with them being placed in separate schools to learn English and American customs in order to assist in assimilation. Following the Mexican Revolution, during the 1920s and 1930s, the number of Mexican immigrants increased. Mexican Americans were placed in schools to help them learn English and the American culture; however, the assumptions of inferiority and racism toward this group were maintained (Kupo, 2011; Valencia et. al., 2004). Similar to Blacks, racism and other prejudices kept Mexicans in segregated schools with inadequate education. In the 1930s the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) urged the courts to make education a

right for all Mexican Americans in California (Valencia et al., 2004). The 1946 case *Mendez v. Westminster School District of Orange County* was the precursor to the historic 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* Supreme Court case that ended segregation of the public school systems.

For African Americans, education was not only a struggle for equality, but was also necessary for survival in an oppressive society. For many African Americans education brought economic freedom and a way to live (Boyer, 1997; Fleming, 1981). Prior to 1850, education was nonexistent for African Americans due to slavery and laws that prohibited them from learning how to read and write. However, Northern missionaries began providing financial support to schools for African Americans who wanted to learn (Boyer, 1996). Missionaries believed African Americans were “hapless victims of a corrupt and immoral system that instilled values antithetical to ‘civilization’ and viewed as their God-given task to both ‘civilize and educate’ the freedman” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 243). In 1854, Lincoln University, then Ashum Institute, was the first historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU) to offer baccalaureate degrees to African Americans. Wilberforce University was founded 2 years later (Boyer, 1996; Fleming, 1984; Harper & Quaye, 2009; Patton, 2006b; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Preceding the Reconstruction of the Civil War higher education institutions such as Morehouse, Howard University, and Fisk were also established (Fleming, 1984). White Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian missionary groups provided financial support to establish over 200 private Southern HBCUs (J. Anderson, 1988; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Gasman, 2007; Perma, 2007).

The first land grant act, known as the Morrill Act of 1862, gave states public land to establish the first public or state universities for the general population. These universities generally focused on agricultural, engineering, or mechanical arts. Although the Morrill Act of

1862 was the largest influences on public higher education, it failed to consider Southern states and the large number of African Americans, or Blacks, that aspired to higher education (Harper et al., 2009). The second Morrill Act of 1890 extended opportunities to 17 states that provided public education for African Americans (Brazzell, 1996). After the second Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1890 passed, the majority of HBCUs were founded. These HBCUs only offered degrees in mechanical, agricultural, or technical fields. It was not until 1916 that liberal arts education was realized (Fleming, 1984).

The Morrill Act of 1890 also began the segregation of public schools. Roebuck and Murty (1993) posited that the establishment of public HBCUs limited access to public White institutions and, in addition, limited African Americans to vocational training. However, a few African Americans did attend and matriculate at schools that offered a liberal arts education. Following the *Plessey v. Ferguson* ruling in 1896, the phrase “separate but equal” was coined to describe the law that called for separate public facilities for African Americans and Whites, including educational facilities (Fleming, 1984; Wilson, 1994). Despite their continued committed to education, African Americans felt that in a “*separate but equal*” society, they received less funding, subpar facilities, and resources for education (Roebuck and Murty, 1993).

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) believed that the “separate but equal” legislation was unfair and worked to eradicate the law. Despite the African American student enrollments that rose to approximately 19,000 by 1930, many felt that they were not given the same benefits and opportunities as their contemporaries because of the legislation (Fleming, 1984; Wilson, 1994; Fairclough, 2001). Although there were a few African Americans that matriculated at public White institutions, fewer than 1% of the nation’s population enrolled were racial minority students (Davis, 1989). In 1954, *Brown v. the Board of*

Education of Topeka called for desegregation and the redistribution of funds for public education (Wilson, 1994, Fairclough, 2001; Baumgartner et. al, 2011). Although the law did not lead to the immediate desegregation of schools, this led to the subsequent changes in education during the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Student Movements of the 1960s (Fairclough, 2001).

Although the struggle for equality initiated with the right to education, the Civil Rights movement became a fight for equality in all aspects of American life. When considering education, many viewed the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision as advancing certain aspects of desegregation, but not integration as a whole. However, the goal of subsequent legislative action were to advance integration in all facets of society (Young, 1995).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 made the most significant changes to the landscape of colleges and universities (Thelin, 2004). Due to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, schools were banned from receiving federal funds if segregated. The Higher Education Act of 1965 also allowed historically underserved populations to receive financial aid to attend institutions of higher education (Ferguson & Thomas-Rashid, 2011). These legislations significantly changed the demographics of predominantly White institutions. The Civil Rights Act of 1965 resulted in an influx of Black students at predominantly White institutions (Williamson, 1999). Mingle (1981) explained that during the late 1960s, the Black student population increased from 3,000 to 98,000 students at universities across the country. By 1969, the Black student population increased to 8.4 % of the total undergraduate student enrollment (Mingle, 1981). However, this did not change the climate of American education, only the structural diversity of higher education institutions. Minority students at predominantly White institutions faced a great deal of opposition from students, administrators, and outside agitators that impaired their academic experience.

Although racial minority students' enrollment increased, students felt alienated from their educational settings and were treated with overt hostility from their White peers attending the same universities (Williamson, 1999; Shufford, 2011). Minority students began to show frustration with their treatment and expressed doubts about universities' commitments to Black student retention. Students faced unreceptive classroom environments and worried that they were not as successful due to their lack of academic preparation relative to their White peers (Exum, 1985; Walker, 1976; Williamson, 1998). Black students were to assimilate and accept the hostile environment of the Predominantly White Institution (PWI) culture that was filled with racism, discrimination, and oppression (Hannon & Patton, 2008). They also had concerns with microaggressions, isolation, and lack of connection with the college campus (Ponce, 1988; Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000). Black students faced a deep sense of oppression and prejudice from faculty and administrators in addition to their White peers (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000). Walker (1976) also hypothesized that racially polarized teacher-pupil relationships and classroom discomfort, compounded by racial tension among students, were negative factors in the Black students' college experiences. These factors led to the student protests and demands for supportive and academic spaces for Black students at their colleges and universities.

History of Black Cultural Centers

The history of multicultural centers began with the struggle for equality in higher education. Before the 1960s, college and universities were still campuses of predominantly White, Christian males of a certain privilege (Thelin, 2004). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 made the most significant changes to the landscape of colleges and universities (Thelin, 2004). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned schools from receiving federal funds if segregated. The Higher Education Act of 1965 also allowed historically

underserved populations to receive financial aid to attend institutions of higher education (Ferguson, & Thomas-Rashid, 2011). These legislations significantly changed the demographics of predominantly White institutions however, it did not change the prejudiced attitudes and systems of privilege on campuses, only the structural diversity of the institutions (Kupo, 2011). The lack of resources and support prompted students to create opportunities that would enhance their experiences and combat the discrimination and racism that permeated the climate (Patton, 2006b). Black students wanted to eradicate their feelings of invisibility and believed that having their cultural heritage integrated into the academic and social functions of their universities would alleviate some of the issues (Patton, 2004).

The Black Student Movement of the late 1960s and 1970s ushered in a new wave of resistance to the status quo at predominantly White institutions. The ideals and philosophies of the Black Power Movement led students to protest and demonstrate at predominantly White institutions (Patton, 2006a). Black students demanded universities to provide adequate support for academic and social endeavors, as well as a safe spaces to celebrate their unique social and cultural differences (Allen, 1992; Williamson, 1999; Patton, 2006a). Rhoads (1998) posits:

Armed with the tools of civil disobedience and a spirit of radicalized by witnessing the American dream betrayed, thousands of college students committed themselves to transforming campuses into sites of social and political change. For the remainder of the decade, the American college campus would become the central stage for the drama of democracy's ebb and flow, as the struggle of Blacks became a movement of Blacks characterized by Stokely Carmichael as the rising tide of Black Power (p.2).

Between 1968 and 1971, several significant occurrences altered the position of Black students in higher education (Baumgartner et al., 2011). In September of 1968, students at Northwestern occupied the offices of the bursar and the vice president to protest the university's policies on admissions, housing, and student facilities that furthered the practice of segregation. Organized by the students of For Members Only (FMO) and the Black Student Union, students from Northwestern demonstrated for several days, garnering media attention from several outlets. White students from the Students for a Democratic Society joined in to support changes in the curriculum, student advising, and financial aid policies that put Black students at a disadvantage (Baumgartner et al, 2011).

Concurrently, students at San Francisco State College, now University, endured several months of violent protest and demonstrations led by the Black Panther Party and its founder, Bobby Seale. The protests led to several arrests, riots, and demonstrations that forced the school to temporarily close and administrators to step down from their posts (Rooks, 2006). In the wake of increased violence and racial incidents, predominantly White colleges struggled to understand the specific factors that affected student success among Black students (Allen, 1992, Rooks, 2006).

Guided by the "Black Power" message of Stokely Carmichael and Bobby Seale, Black students demanded space in which they could assemble, receive personal support, and validation (Patton, 2006a). It was essential that Black students have a separate space where students can be supported and celebrate a common ethnic identity in a welcoming environment (Patton, 2006a). Student demands also included Black studies courses, increased recruitment efforts, financial assistance for Black students, and support for cultural activities through the establishment of Black culture centers (Patton, 2006). By the end of the 1960s, several institutions including

Harvard and San Francisco State University introduced Black Studies into the university curriculum to meet academic needs. Advocacy programs and support services such as Black cultural centers were established to meet the cultural and social demands. The first Black cultural center was established at San Francisco University in 1969 (T. Anderson, 1990).

In the *Handbook of Minority Student Services*, Young (1986) stated, “The first Black cultural centers were viewed by students and staff as safe havens in an alien environment . . . minority centers were viewed as a necessary and just alternative to this environment (p. 18)”. The majority of these centers were formed at predominantly White institutions, with only a few created at HBCUs (Young, 1991). Heffner (2002) suggested the Black Cultural Centers (BCCs) were once viewed as mechanisms of support to Black students at predominantly White institutions. Support included dedicated academic centers, programming activities, and safe spaces where students could gather to celebrate their identity and shared experiences (Allen, 1992; Hefner, 2002). In the beginning, Black cultural centers also housed academic programs such as ethnic studies and were equipped with dedicated staff and faculty members. They also provided counseling services, academic writing labs, campus resources, and activities celebrating racial and cultural differences (Princes, 1994; Patton, 2010). Stewart (2011) described the spaces and usages of the Black cultural centers:

The center was not just a dance hall, nor some space to be avoided so that non-Black friends wouldn't think you were militant. The physical spaces were far from plush, and the resources were minimal. But through collaborations with nascent Black Studies academic units and progressive Black student organizations, Black cultural centers were able to play a vital role as a support base for Black students, staff, and faculty (p. 26.)

Along with Stewart (2005) and Princes (1994), who explained the characteristics and services of Black student centers, Pittman (1994) contended that Black cultural centers facilitated a positive identity development process and enhanced the campus climate for Black students and led to higher retention rates, as well as offering academic and social opportunities. Young (1986) stated, “The cultural center was to be a place where attitudes, values, knowledge, and skills could be debated and shared”. Princes (1994) added that once Black cultural centers were established, they became a marketing tool used in admissions packages to recruit more students.

Decades later, Black cultural centers remained the heart of Black students’ social and academic life at predominantly White institutions. In many cases, Black cultural centers were structured after the federal TRIO programs that provided similar services for first-generation, low socioeconomic students (Shufford, 2011). Students felt the centers remained a “home away home,” utilized the centers as a place to engage in local community and national activism, and meet with other Black students without the hostility from their White contemporaries (Stewart, 2005). Despite these centers efforts, Black students faced the same challenges with college adjustment (Faegen, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Hefner, 2002; Patton, 2010), retention, negative campus racial climates, and social integration (Pascarella & Tetrazzini, 1999; Hefner, 2002; Patton, 2010). However, Black students persisted at predominantly White institutions due, in large part, to the social networks, and the educational support provided by Black cultural centers (Patton, 2006a). During the mid-1970s, other ethnic cultural centers for Latinos and Asians were established stemming from similar protests and needs of other historically oppressed groups (Stewart, 2005). It was the creation of Black cultural centers coupled with the multicultural movement that served as the impetus of today’s multicultural, minority, and other affinity

centers. The following section will discuss the creation of other affinity centers and multicultural centers, today's multicultural student services, and multicultural education.

History of Affinity Centers and Multicultural Centers

Black cultural centers were established as academic and social spaces devoted to an identity culture. Student demands for dedicated spaces also led to the establishment of academic programs that provided intellectual and cognitive spaces to delve into the history and tradition of the culture (Wei, 1993). During the Black Power movements, other students of color were also empowered by their racial identity to demand resources. The majority of underrepresented students of color attending predominantly White institutions also encountered similar issues and concerns as Black students. At San Francisco State, for example, the Philippian and Latino communities joined Black students asking for academic programs based on their racial and ethnic identities (Shufford, 2011). During the 1970s to early 1980s other affinity centers such as tribal, Hispanic and Chicano, and Asian American centers grew out of the same necessity, providing students with a safe space to mature academically and personally, as well as assisting with retention efforts at the institutions. The affinity centers were crafted, similar to Black cultural centers, to provide a level of nurture and support vital to student development at predominantly White Institutions.

As predominantly White universities shifted to reflect a more diverse campus environment, faculty began to realize the relationship to research on racial ethnic identity groups to the impact of self-efficacy and academic success in racial minority students. Administrators began to realize concomitance of ethnic/cultural celebrations to the impact of students' relationships, understanding, and campus racial environment (Howard-Hamilton, Cuyjet, & Cooper 2011). It was at this time, multicultural centers began to emerge. The structural

diversity of higher education institutions changed to demonstrate an increasingly global society and in the early 1990s, campus-based centers' focus specifically on diversity and multicultural education emerged to reflect the change of the institutions. This move was to streamline processes and resources, as well as establish a central department that would focus on diversity and cultural awareness within the institutions (Patton, 2006a).

Various cultural centers renewed their emphasis to support students of racial or ethnic minority groups, while others collapsed to create multicultural and minority affairs offices to support a diverse community within the university (Patton & Hannon, 2008). For example, the Jim Thorpe Multicultural center at the University of Oklahoma that once housed the American Indian Center is now the hub for all minority ethnic, racial, and sexual identities on campus (Sutton et. al, 2010). Multicultural centers were able to offer a wide range of services and support for a number of underrepresented populations and, in addition, support the intersection of identities of minority students. This includes lesbian, gay, and bisexual students of color, minority women, and the religious diversity of all underrepresented groups (Shufford, 2011). Universities also began to incorporate a diversity paradigm in which all students were expected to understand individual and group difference and value and appreciate all differences (Palmer, 1989). Multicultural centers began to offer multicultural programming for all students while continuing to support the needs of underrepresented students (Palmer, 1989; Shufford, 2011).

Multicultural centers provided facilities for academic, social, and recreational events for all students across various social identities. These spaces are utilized to promote intergroup interactions in an informal environment. They provided equitable educational support, as well as offer space to tackle issues and social concerns unique to their communities (Jones, 2004). Most multicultural centers have mission statements that include a directive to provide opportunities for

experiencing and learning about the value of racial and ethnic diversity (Patton & Hannon, 2008). These centers continue to play a critical role in acclimating first-year students to college by creating a sense of community and programs aimed at the needs of historically marginalized identities students. Research shows that students who utilize the centers had a heightened sense of their racial or minority identity (Patton, 2006b, 2010). In addition, students who utilize the centers have better persistence rates, are more acclimated to their campus environment, and a holistic perspective of others of difference (Harper & Quaye, 2009).

Young (1991) has discussed how the multicultural centers should contribute to the larger school community. At this time of the current study, there is not one model for multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions. To date, there is also little to no research on the similarities on the structure, framing, or mission of multicultural similarities (Shufford, 2011). However, some researchers believe that due to their structural and operating philosophy, they should be located in a freestanding, highly visible facility close to the center of campus (Young, 1991; Patton, 2006; 2010; Harper, Museus, & Nichols 2010). Administrators were becoming increasingly aware that it is not enough to have the centers and students of all ethnicities in the classroom. Universities must also provide programs and events that focus on various social identities in which students can interact and learn from one another. By universities allowing students opportunities to learn and celebrate differences, students are more engaged in interactional diversity outside the classroom (Patton & Haddon, 2008). White students may benefit from the programs and activities of multicultural centers, due to many of whom have had little cross-cultural interaction and are unaware of White privilege or the dominant discourse that permeate the culture (Gewirtz, 1998; Freire, 2000; & Hooks, 2003).

As critical as cultivating safe and open spaces is for historically oppressed groups, multicultural centers must also address the need for academic and social development of White students. The literature does not account for multicultural centers and the experiences of White students with multicultural education. However, research does posit that by fostering cross-cultural interactions and providing education on oppression and privilege, White students were more accepting of an inclusive and diverse campus environment (Patton, 2006b; Gewirtz, 1998; Freire, 2000). Multicultural centers position themselves within the university community to create spaces in which these interactions can occur. In addition, these centers also fostered programs and activities that are for all students within the community to promote cross-cultural communication and teach the majority white students about the cultural and social differences of their fellow students.

By understanding others, students would develop sensitivity and awareness of people that are different from them to create an equitable and positive working environment for various groups. This thinking is what practitioners and scholars considered cultural competence. Described as a process, cultural competence happens when a person goes from being unknowledgeable to having a growing knowledge, understanding, and acceptance (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004).

Emergence of Multicultural Centers and Multicultural Program Initiatives

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, federal governments made a commitment to increase enrollment, matriculation, and graduation rates of racial minorities. The change was what some considered the beginning of the multicultural movement in higher education (Patton & Hatton, 2008). The Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life's (1988) publication of *One Third of the Nation* delineated that institutions must at least mirror the

structural racial minority population of that in the United States. It also outlined the federal government's concern that without fair academic and financial support, minorities would not be able to contribute to American life (Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life, 1988). It was believed that the more minorities have an equitable education, the more productive they would be in society. As a result, the desire was that colleges and universities would aspire to increase diversity, support the needs of, and welcome all students of difference.

This report forced educators to look to their institutions to strengthen efforts to recruit, retain, and graduate more minority students. Universities were to create a campus culture that would encourage minority students, while embracing the cultural difference they brought to campus life. In response to the multicultural movement, PWIs expanded Black Studies academic programs to later add other ethnic and gender studies programs (Patton & Haddon, 2008). Curriculum reflected a more interdisciplinary perspective in course offerings, research on ethnic and other minority groups, and scholarships. Some colleges even added diversity, or multicultural courses, to their graduation requirements (Patton & Haddon, 2008).

Universities also began to add other affinity cultural centers for other ethnic and gender minorities. Black cultural centers still remain dedicated facilities and support for minority students. In the South, campus-based cultural centers that once served Black students only, now served Hispanic and Native American Indian students (Young, 1991; Shufford, 2011). During the late 1980s and 1990s, a number of Black cultural centers began to evolve and became stand-alone multicultural or minority affairs offices (Patton & Haddon, 2008; Shufford, 2011). The scope was broadened to meet the demands of other underrepresented minorities and a greater awareness of these groups in society. Following this trend, after the death of an openly gay

student in Wyoming in 1998, college campuses began to look at the unique needs of LGBT students. Like much of the violence of the 1960s, the resource centers for LGBT students on college campuses were a direct response to this hate crime (Fine, 2012).

By expanding the academic programs and centers, colleges and universities assumed that the creation of these centers demonstrated their desire to support these groups and connect the underrepresented groups to the larger campus community. Multicultural centers supported a broad range of marginalized identities that included race, gender, religions, and sexual identities. Support services still included academic assistance but also included mentoring programs and programs to enhance personal and professional development (Shufford, 2011). Multicultural centers were also to teach others to value group and individual differences. In addition, their concentration was also to promote multiculturalism and educate the majority population on issues of race and culture (Palmer, 1989; Shufford, 2011; Fine, 2012).

PRESENT-DAY MULTICULTURAL CENTERS

In this section, I will present an overview of current or present-day multicultural centers. While multicultural centers can trace their historical roots to the emergence of Black cultural centers, their structure had to shift to accommodate the growing population of students entering higher education. However, these centers still serve the same purpose, to support and advocate for marginalized social identities. While multicultural centers still served a unique function, these centers face a number of barriers and obstacles that threaten their existence. This included funding and loss of administrative support, and questions of validity and structure. Yet, students and professional staff continue to grow and mature within multicultural centers.

The previous section demonstrated the history and changing demographics that led to the current multicultural center focus. This chapter will give an overview of the current multicultural

centers. This section will also provide an outline of the barriers and obstacles that multicultural centers face.

Multicultural Centers' Structure and Design

The structural diversity of higher education institutions changed to demonstrate an increasingly global society and in the early 1990s, the emergence of new campus-based centers that focus specifically on diversity and multicultural education. This move was to streamline processes and resources, as well as establish a central department that would focus on diversity and cultural awareness within the institutions (Patton, 2006a).

Various Black cultural centers renewed their emphasis to include students of racial groups, while others collapsed to create multicultural and minority affairs offices to support a diverse community within the university (Patton & Hannon, 2008). Universities also have affinity centers for all diverse students' - Asian, Hispanic, Islamic, Jewish centers, as well as centers that are for students with respect to sexual or gender identities (Patton & Hannon, 2008). Multicultural centers provide facilities for academic, social, and recreational events that are for all students. They provide equitable educational support, as well as offer space to tackle issues and social concerns unique to their communities (Jones, 2004). Most multicultural centers have mission statements that include a directive to provide opportunities for experiencing and learning about the value of racial and ethnic diversity (Patton & Hannon, 2008).

These centers continue to play a critical role in acclimating first-year students to college by creating a sense of community and programs aimed at the needs of students. Research shows that students who utilize the centers have a heightened sense of their racial or minority identity (Patton, 2006b; 2010).

As critical as cultivating safe and open spaces for historically oppressed groups, multicultural centers must also address the need for academic and social development of White students. Literature researched does not account for multicultural centers and the experiences of White students with multicultural education. However, research proposed that by fostering cross-cultural interactions, White students are more accepting of an inclusive and diverse campus environment (Patton, 2006a; Gewirtz, 1998; Freire, 2000). Multicultural centers position themselves within the university community to create spaces in which these interactions could occur. In addition, these centers also fostered programs and activities that are for all students within the community to promote cross-cultural communication and teach the majority White students about the cultural and social difference of their fellow students.

Importance of Multicultural centers

Multicultural centers developed to serve a unique purpose on university campuses, and that was to both provide support to a number of underrepresented groups and provide multicultural programming for all within the university community. While other affinity cultural centers, such as Black cultural centers, can trace their histories through the violent protest of the 60s and the emergence of academic departments and programs geared toward a specific identity, the development of multicultural centers was less evident (Shufford, 2011). Mena (2010) described the emergence of campus-based cultural centers as being established through “histories and contemporary contexts of their respective campuses” (p.178). Multicultural centers could only find their histories and purpose amongst the campus-based affinity centers that began during the 1960s Black Power and La Raza movements. However, today’s multicultural centers were still thriving, supportive spaces that extended their intended purpose adding services and programs to support the entire campus and remain relevant in today’s global community.

Thelin (2004) posits that universities, “may suffer from amnesia or may have selective recall, but ultimately heritage is the lifeblood of our campus” (p. xiii). Thelin indicated that while colleges and universities are embedded with tradition and historical relevance, they often forget why certain services and institutional departments are established.

Importance of Centers for Affinity Groups

The Native American history population has a contentious history with postsecondary education. As one of the most underrepresented student populations in higher education, the matriculation rates had fluctuated in recent decades making up only 1% of the total population of higher education (Woodcock & Alawiye, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Due to feelings of isolation and other factors such as lack of academic preparedness, motivation, and insufficient family and cultural support, research suggests that the structural support centers can provide is critical to transition to the university setting and matriculation of Native American students (Jackson, Smith, & Hill, 2003).

In addition, Native Americans students share strong communal values that were unique to this subpopulation of students. In many instances, tribes placed more emphasis on the welfare of the group rather than the individual. Their core responsibility was to care for the needs of others and the cooperation of the community was important for the health of the tribe (LaFromboise, Trimble, & Mohatt, 1990). Providing cultural centers assistance, addressing a sense of belonging, and community was critical to the success of these students (Dell, 2000).

The Hispanic, or Latino/x, population is the fastest growing minority population in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004b). However, education attainment in this population is lower than Whites, Asians, and Blacks. Only 57 % of Latinos over the age of 25 have high school diplomas and only 11% have bachelor’s degrees. Although Latinos are enrolling in 2 and

4-year institutions in high rates, their rate of degree attainment is disproportionately lower than other minorities. Similar to other minority groups, Latinos encounter issues with academic preparedness, isolation, and environmental fit (Gonzalez, 2003). However, Latinos also face issues with immigration, familial concerns, and racism on college campuses including stereotyping and racial-themed parties that further marginalized this population in the predominantly White community (Lozano, 2010).

Gonzalez (2003) posited that establishing a sense of pride and cultural familiarity is important for Latino students that are feeling marginalized and isolated within the larger majority college community such as cultural celebrations, language, music, dance, and art. Cultural centers provide this sense of community and a holistic learning experience that is important for this population. Latino or Chicano cultural centers also provide community outreach and academic and financial support for undocumented students.

During the late 1980s and 1990s, a number of cultural centers began to evolve and became stand-alone multicultural or minority affairs offices (Patton & Haddon, 2008; Shuford, 2011). It was also commonplace to offer standalone facilities supporting the intersection of other identities such as women or LGBT students. Created in the 1970s, women centers supported a growing population of women returning to college and reentering the workforce. These centers also raised consciousness on women's social issues and offered opportunities for leadership and academic development (Devi, 2015).

Following the murder of an openly gay student in 1998, college campuses began to look at the unique needs of LGBT students. Like much of the violence of the 1960s, the resource centers for LGBT students on college campuses were a direct response to this hate crime (Fine, 2012). The climate for this population of students has consistently been hostile. It was

commonplace during the 1960s for students to be expelled for homosexual relations (Allyn, 2000). The experiences of these students were silenced or all together ignored. Although LGBT students are acknowledged and accepted in higher education, universities were still oppressive and unwelcoming (Kupo, 2010). LGBT centers provide a safe space for individuals to explore their own identity development as well as discover resources and support within the community (Negrate & Purcell, 2011).

However, as multicultural centers began to join most affinity centers into one all-encompassing multicultural centers, there is still critical evidence that the importance of affinity centers still exist. During the mid-2010s, many racial incidents on college campuses and in the community began to mirror incidents of bias and discrimination that happened during the 1960s. Also, many students posited that the campus environment is hostile and face the same level of issues with academic preparedness and support through these centers (Patton, 2006a). In 2015, The University of Missouri was the first to lead many predominantly White institutions in student protests to address the needs of historically marginalized identities, specifically Black students. In total, 61 protests out of 160 incidents where students engaged in various forms of activism and engagement (Eligon & Perez-Pena, 2015). Similar the Black Power Movement, the #BlackLivesMatter movement galvanized students to look into the issues of systematic racism and police brutality, but the institutional and systematic policies that still encouraged race-neutral ideology, racism, and inequities of power and privilege that overwhelmingly affected Black students (Hamer & Lang, 2015). Many of the students' demands called for the emergence and support of the Black Cultural Centers because these centers were the place of support for these students.

Barriers and Challenges of Multicultural Centers

Multicultural centers began with a tumultuous history and a need to support groups of minority students entering higher education. Over the years, multicultural centers have evolved to fit the changing culture of the institution and student population they serve. Although many who visit and utilize these centers have been vocal about the benefits and positive experiences centers create, multicultural centers face many barriers and challenges that may threaten their future. Multicultural centers' perceptions of relevance, misconceptions, and lack of institutional support have an adverse impact on their existence.

Multicultural Centers' Validity and Relevance

Many researchers believe that in a post-racial America, the reasons to have multicultural centers no longer exist (Muesus & Quaye, 2009). Multicultural centers were established to support marginalized student populations and provide multicultural education to the majority campus community. However, Hardy-Fanta (1993) estimated that one third of the student population in higher education would be non-White 25 years ago. It was also estimated that by the year 2020, the majority of college students enrolling in higher education would be Black and Latin/a students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Although this has not come to fruition at this time, there is the notion that with an increasing number of minorities attending predominantly White institutions, the issues with microaggressions and isolation would dissipate over time.

It is also believed that in a growing global community, students no longer seeked to have identified safe spaces and programs to celebrate identity. These programs are already part of the culture. Although multicultural centers have long since emerged as a model of inclusivity and providing multicultural program for the campus community (Stage & Manning, 1992), the goal

of inclusiveness and diversity has not materialized (McCoy, 2011). Research has shown that minority students' persistence rates are still proportionately lower than White students and feelings of isolation have not only increased but rates of discrimination and bias have increased in the last decade (Museus & Quaye, 2009). Most recently, student activism at predominantly White institutions demonstrate a resistance to the way historically marginalized students are supported and a strong resistance to the hostile environment that still persisted (Jones & Reddick, 2017).

Another point to consider is although multicultural centers continued on college campuses, these centers have done little to no renovation of space or to programs and services for which they are responsible (Hannon & Patton, 2008). Often it was due to the lack of financial support needed to increase programs and expand services to a growing minority population. Budget cuts and the decline of legislative funding have affected most colleges and universities (McCoy, 2011). Competition for funds and resources prevent multicultural centers from expanding and limits the scope of programs offered (McCoy, 2011). Lack of funding also resulted in less professional staff and the necessary training to develop the skills to support a growing minority population. Participation in support programs and services are capped to fit the funding structure (Renn, 2011, Strayhorn, 2009;).

Unlike other campus entities, multicultural centers were consistently asked to justify their existence and, often, do not receive the same respect and attention for the programs and experiences these centers create (Bankole, 2005). Although multicultural centers have an inclusive focus, they are perceived to be singular in focus and only support a small portion of the campus population. In addition, in these difficult economic times, diversity education was the first to lose funding when considering student learning and academics. Cocurricular activities

that were not academically supported are prioritized in the order of the number of students served and institutional commitment to the experience and activities these activities provide. Therefore, without institutional commitment, multicultural centers programming needs were not prioritized.

Perceptions of Responsibility

Shufford and Palmer (2004) posited that diversity and cross-cultural interactions should not be the sole responsibility of multicultural centers, but the responsibility of the various campus entities that supports students such as housing, Greek life, student life, and academic affairs. Multicultural center professionals were to facilitate these collaborations and create meaningful partnerships to forge diversity in the fabric of the institutions (Shufford and Palmer, 2004), including policies, programming, and curricula that guide the institution. The rationale for this was that diversity and multicultural education cannot happen in a vacuum. If there was to be real institutional change, it must permeate all facets of the institution. However, there were several concerns with this idea that impede partnerships amongst university entities. For example, many credible campus partners believe that diversity was the responsibility of multicultural centers and their professionals. The responsibility to create opportunities for cross-cultural interaction was solely multicultural centers and to ask other partners to do this takes away from the function of the centers (Hannon & Patton, 2008). In addition, professional staff from other university entities may not have had the knowledge or understand how to create programs and services for cross-cultural interactions. Their programming might have an adverse reaction that may impede on the diverse spaces they are attempting to create (Shufford and Palmer, 2004; Hannon & Patton, 2008).

Policies and procedures could also be a hindrance to collaborations (Hannon & Patton, 2008). Programs and services that may cater to one specific group may have particular policies and guidelines that may hinder collaboration with other departments within the institution. It was also largely the perception of various entities within the institution that programs and services cannot be successful unless one particular entity takes sole possession of the program. Sharing programming budgets also was prohibited and without upper administrative support, cross-collaborations are highly unlikely (Hannon & Patton, 2008). Therefore, while collaborations are idealistic, budget constraints could hinder collaborative programming.

Likewise, within the institutional culture, various campus entities can be perceived as catering to White students. The larger traditional programs of the institutions such as homecoming and Greek week did not consider the needs and interests of minority populations. Therefore, they have less participation from underrepresented students because they feel unwelcoming to the students. The perception of these major programs has a greater impression of the administrative areas that can prevent minority student's involvement (Hannon & Patton, 2008). In addition, the practices, policies, and spaces of the university could also cater to the majority campus. Renn (2008) suggested taking an audit of the most visible and visited place on campus, the student union. The artwork, photographs, programs, and flow of the traffic can communicate that the spaces are not for minority students. Minority students may feel that multicultural centers were not advocating their needs and interest within the majority community by collaborating with the organizations that discriminate against them.

Misconceptions

Finally, one of the biggest challenges facing multicultural centers was their perception and misconceptions individuals have of them. A considerable misconception is that campus

cultural centers promote separatism amongst students (Patton, 2010). Some administrators see multicultural centers as hindering minorities' integration into the university culture and do little to facilitate cross-cultural interaction within the campus community. Despite the work multicultural centers do to open their programs and activities to everyone, the university culture determines what spaces belong to what group on campus (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). This means the campus culture dictates whether one group belongs to the center, and students that are not part of a particular group do not feel comfortable in the space.

Young (1991) believed that multicultural centers operated in two distinct approaches - the fortress and oasis philosophies. The fortress philosophy contends that minority students utilized the facilities as safe havens and any outside presence, or majority White students, will decrease the legitimacy and capacity of the facility (Hannon & Patton, 2010, Young, 1991). The oasis philosophy welcomes anyone who wants to learn and participate in the programs and services operated by the center. Most multicultural centers function under the oasis approach. However, with the ever-changing campus climate, multicultural centers could be utilizing both methods which leads to administrators' perceive notion of separatism.

The philosophy behind increasing diversity in higher education is majority White students would benefit from cross-cultural interaction and integrated classroom settings by learning to work and live in a culturally diverse world (Patton, 2010). Renn (2008) posited, "A common criticism of identity centers is that they deprive majority students of opportunity to meet the others (p. 22)". The problem with this is that minority students were charged with creating the opportunities and initiating the interaction. Furthermore, this notion did not also consider that majority students did not engage in cross-cultural interactions because they did not feel it is necessary, or feel uncomfortable around what was familiar (Patton, 2010).

Multicultural centers were symbols of the institutional commitment to diversity. However, on its face, institutions' commitment to the multicultural centers is diluted with misconceptions and preconceived notions of the programs, services, and function of these centers and their staff. While multicultural centers had a history of creating supportive environments in which students may learn about each other and themselves, the challenges that the centers may face were large enough to impede their future existence in these difficult financial times and uncertainty in higher education.

SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES FOR MULTICULTURAL CENTERS

There is little research on the success of multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions. However, several recommendations have been made in response to the many challenges that multicultural centers face in today's multicultural centers. Many of these recommendations have come in response to the challenges and obstacles faced by multicultural centers in higher education. The following are some of the successful strategies multicultural centers have put in place to remain relevant at their institutions.

Multicultural Center's Visibility

Multicultural centers face invisibility in the greater institutional community. Stewart and Bridges (2011) posited that one of the greatest hindrances to the visibility of multicultural centers was the limited number of students that engage in the office programs based on race. By natural design, the majority of individuals who frequent programs, events, and services of multicultural centers were students from historically marginalized identities (Patton, 2006a; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Funding allocations also rely on the visibility of the programs. Programs that were perceived as successful are those with the greatest attendance. However, the percentage of underrepresented populations are far less than the majority community. Therefore, these centers

appear less successful than other programs and departments (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). To increase the number of individuals in which centers contact multicultural centers have an evident need for an increase on professional staff and multicultural programming that reach the majority community (Stewart and Bridges, 2011).

Many who visit and participate in the programs benefit from their experiences, but they do not appeal to the larger community of students, faculty, and staff. If an audit of program participants is conducted, the number of students that attend multicultural centers' programs are significantly lower than those participating in the traditional institutional programs because the numbers of those of historically marginalized community are significantly lower than the larger community (Renn, 2008; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). These data coincides with the institutional perception that multicultural center's programs were unsuccessful, not well attended, and no longer valid in today's society. However, with the majority of the minority community attending multicultural centers' events, the data do not show an accurate picture of the success of these programs (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). These perceptions were largely due to the institutional culture, though more students from the majority culture would participate if multicultural centers were more visible in the larger community.

Ferguson and Thomas-Rashid (2011) proposed that multicultural centers must focus on the institutional culture and not just the students that frequently attend their programs. If multicultural centers do not change the institutional culture, they cannot create the cross-cultural interactions that they seek within the majority community. Institutional culture is permeated with longstanding, traditional programs and policies that are geared toward the majority community. However, if multicultural centers find ways to integrate the traditional programming they can expand their audience and, subsequently, find ways to integrate minority

students in the university traditions and programs. The visibility of multicultural centers can increase by expanding the racial groups and university stakeholders in centers' programs and activities (Stewart and Bridges, 2011).

The University of Michigan dealt with a myriad of racial incidents and social concerns following the affirmative action case in 2006. The institution's policies and racial interactions became front and center. Society began to question how students related to one another, the institution's commitment to diversity education, and the racial isolation of their students at the university. The university changed many of its programs and policies to create a more diverse campus culture. The University of Michigan created programs in orientation, homecoming, and university education courses to discuss diversity (Chronicle for Higher education, 2009). The multiethnic student affairs, a unit inside the division of Student Affairs, offers programs and services for all ethnic groups and trains student allies within the community.

Evidence has shown that multicultural centers had a positive impact on first-year students (Patton & Hannon, 2008; Muesus & Quaye, 2009). Students that participated in their programs had a positive attitude about ethnic identity and more accepting of people of difference (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). These programs were facilitated by the multicultural center staff and students and include activities in diversity awareness activities, cultural events, and celebrations. By forging a place within the traditional and most prominent programs of the university, multicultural centers guarantee their visibility within the campus culture.

Mission, Objectives, and Institutional Structure

It is also important that multicultural centers align their missions with the broader mission and vision of the university. Multicultural centers are symbols of the institutional commitment to diversity. Aligning the mission and vision of the center to that of the university,

multicultural centers become evidentiary proof of that commitment. It also demonstrates that the centers were not only connected to the university, but are intricately linked to the goals and objectives of the institution. Multicultural centers can also anchor their programs to the institutional history and culture. For example, Texas A&M University was entrenched in its traditions and institutional culture. Its philosophy, "The Aggie Family" was an important part of their campus tradition. The multicultural center programs focus on the value of the family traditions and how all students can be involved in the aggie experience.

The placement of multicultural centers in the university structure can also negate the negative perceptions of multicultural centers and maximize their impact on the institutional culture (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Multicultural centers can be placed in either academic affairs or student affairs. If multicultural centers are positioned under academic affairs, the centers are provided with access to faculty and senior administrators that have a greater influence on the strategic plan for the university. If placed under student affairs, multicultural centers have more access to the students, campus services, and professional staff and have more influence on the campus climate and co-curricular activities. The facilities are centrally located and may receive more community support for programs and services. Multicultural centers must be placed within the department that makes a larger impact on the overall institutional culture. Depending on the college or university's placement of multicultural centers, students may believe that the campus-based centers have a lower priority to the university's administrators (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Multicultural centers must be placed within the entity that has a greater impact on the institutional culture and demonstrates the institutional commitment to the programs, services, and needs of the students.

In summary, multicultural centers emerged from a history of unrest when various marginalized social identities felt discriminated against or unsupported in higher education. In the late 1960s, the Civil Rights Movement led to a series of protest and struggles for equality for black students that led to an emergence of cultural center at institutions of higher education. These centers provided academic, social, and cultural support for students. They were also a safe haven for students that felt isolated and unwelcomed within their respective institution. Other affinity centers including centers for women, Hispanic and Native American students were also established.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, cultural centers began to collapse into all-encompassing multicultural centers to support all marginalized social identities. Multicultural centers began to play a dual role at colleges and universities, supporting marginalized communities and facilitating a space where multicultural and diversity education could thrive for the larger institutional community. Though the multicultural centers remained a focus for diversity and multicultural education, many misconceptions and barriers surrounded multicultural centers and their validity within higher education. However, multicultural centers continue to serve their institutions, providing a wealth of programs and support to marginalized communities. The following section will provide an overview of the theoretical framework used in the study.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPESTIMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

Various models and theories were utilized to explain the behaviors, attitudes, and best practices of services and departments within higher education. Practitioners used these models to access their programs for success and to improve upon their programs based on higher education standards. Practitioners also utilized theories to predict how students succeed and to maximize

their effectiveness with college students (Torres, et. al, 2009). This section will give an overview of the epistemological foundations Critical Race Theory or CRT (Bell, 1980) to provide the concept by which multicultural centers were created and structuration theory (Giddens, 1984), a specific organizational theory that will describe the organizational structure that can be identified in a multicultural centers organizational framework. I will the give an overview of the CAS standards of higher education that are utilized in program development. This section will also discuss how these standards are applied to multicultural centers. The models emphasized in this study will provide a theoretical framework for research design for the study.

Critical Race Theory

A collective of minority legal scholars led by Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman created the critical race theory (CRT) in the 1970s. CRT sheds light on how racism and race relate to societal issues and the legal system (Howard-Hamilton, McEwen, Patton & Rednon, 2007). Scholars revealed that individuals in power implement policies supposedly race neutral, but continue to perpetuate racial oppression and ideals such as color-blindness, and meritocracy of disadvantage people of color and further the placement of Whites (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). Therefore, a strong effort to raise racial consciousness reduces racism in society (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). Later, critical race theory was applied to other areas including higher education research and practice (Landson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, and Thomas (1995) proposed, "The task of Critical Race Theory is to remind its readers how deeply issues of racial ideology and power to continue to matter in American Life" (p. xxxiii).

There are five tenants central to critical race theory: (a) inherent race and racism, (b) dominant group culture ideology, (c) privilege and oppression, (d) counter-storytelling, and (e)

the critique of liberalism (Decuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladsons-Billings, 1998; McCoy, 2011). CRT examines the role race and racism play in society. At its core, CRT contends that race and racism are so ingrained in society that it is hard to pinpoint and dismantle (D.A.Bell, 1992; Russell 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Landsons-Billings, 1999; Howard-Hamilton et. al, 2007). Therefore, race is a determining factor in how individuals relate to one another, succeed, or function in society. Social groups were labeled as either dominant or subordinate based on their race but it also includes gender, class, immigration status, and sexuality (Valdes, 2002). CRT was used to expose the patterns race and privilege have on situations in society (Landson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

When applying critical race theory to an educational setting, there was a slight difference from the legal application. Critical race theorists attempt to show that racism is part of institutional practices and crosses epistemological boundaries. Critical race theorists believe that these social constructs have impeded the experiences and communities of color (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). The origins of racial oppression were shared in interdisciplinary studies and explored to eliminate the traditional paradigms or racism. Other methods to raise cultural consciousness of disadvantage groups, are exposure to microaggression, counter stories of disadvantage groups and counterspaces (Landsons-Billings, 1999; Howard-Hamilton et. al, 2007). Counter-storytelling, an important tenant of CRT, gives voice to the experiences of the subordinate culture. The goal of counter-storytelling is to erase the race-neutral argument by sharing experiences of those that are oppressed and have opposite experiences. It can also assist practitioners in understanding and analyzing the current campus racial climate for many students. By providing the narratives, practitioners also can offer programs and services that may counteract the negative experience of the dominant culture and race neutral ideology

(Mergervin, 2010). Established academic and social spaces for disadvantaged groups allows them to find other people that look like them and a place that is hospitable and gives a sense of belonging.

Structuration Theory

When considering the structure of an institution, various organizational theories outline the organizational structure of student affairs and the entities within them. Organizational theories are a practical framework used by scholars to understand an organism, or in this case an organization including businesses, nonprofits, or higher education institutions (Bess & Dee, 2008). The student affairs area is a complex organization within a larger organization that has a direct correlation to overall educational experience and a student's success (Kuk & Banning, 2009). Although within the student affairs unit were made up of separate entities that work independently, but they all work together to provide the student with a holistic educational experience. This model would suggest that student affairs operates within a loosely coupled organizational theory (Weik, 1976).

Loosely coupled theory (Weick, 1976) describes a system that has several separate entities loosely connected to one another. For some systems, the reason for these connections are unspecified or happen due to limited constraints placed on the systems. However, these systems are linked together for a specific goal or these systems serve the same unique purpose much like the service unit of student affairs. The organization's behaviors determine how these organizations are structured and how well they succeed while intrinsically linked (Bess & Dee, 2009). Student affairs systems often comprise the organizational units that serve the student community and create opportunities for experiences beyond the classroom. These areas can include leadership, service, student activities, Greek life, and diversity programs. Although these

areas work separately, they serve a common purpose, providing student experiences.

Organizational theory suggests that organizational framework must be designed to effectively meet their mission and strategic purpose (Galbraith, 2002). Student affairs is designed to meet the unique purpose of delivering the student experiences.

Similar to loosely coupled theory, structuration theory (Giddens, 1984) suggests that an organization's behaviors determine the organizational structure. However, in structuration theory those that are part of the structure are the groups that are actively engaged in the structure of the organization. Structuration theory also describes a phenomenon called *duality of structure* in which the people who are activity engaged in the creation of the structure are also constrained by the previous construction of the structure (Bess & Dee, 2009). I chose structuration theory to describe multicultural centers organizational structure because of the phenomenon of the duality of structure.

In addition, structuration is the development of social systems that were created, continually changed through people to fit its intended purpose (Bess & Dee, 2009). While multicultural centers might be constrained by their history, these centers are constantly evolving to fit the need of the students served. Multicultural centers modified their programs to fit the current population of the students. For some, these centers use the CAS standards to analyze their programs for its intended purpose and to maximize their effectiveness. The next section will give an overview of the CAS standards and how they would be used in this study.

CAS Standard of Higher Education

As student affairs became a burgeoning profession, the need to create a set of standards by which to obtain a sense of validity and accreditation as an established field (Patterson & Carpenter, 1989). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)

set out to accomplish this when it released its first set of standards in 1986. Founded in 1979 as the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs, the council was comprised of several professional associations representing student affairs practitioners (CAS Standards, 2015).

The purpose of the CAS standards was to offer a set of principles for services and programs for student affairs regardless of structure, institutional size, or location (Armino & Gochenaur, 2004; CAS, 1980). Patterson and Carpenter (1989) stated that CAS standards was a “major step forward in the efforts toward becoming a profession” (p.125). As higher education succumbs to more scrutiny, calling for more assessment and intended outcomes, the CAS standards also demonstrates student affairs’ attempt to set its own standards rather than have outside constituents who do not understand their intended purpose (Bryan and Mulendore, 1991).

The first set of standards originated with a grant from the American College Testing (ACT) and covered 16 functional area standards including housing, campus activities, and student leadership development. In 1988, CAS developed an assessment, the Self-Assessment Guide (SAG), for each functional area to assist program assessment and evaluation. CAS standard have general standard that covers 45 functional areas including off-campus housing, academic advising, multicultural programs, and LGBT programs and services. The CAS standards were utilize in this study to analyze multicultural centers. The CAS standard for multicultural programs was used to analyze the different multicultural centers in this study.

Utilizing CAS Standards

CAS standards can be used for various purposes. For some the CAS standards can be used to regulate practice. Programs and services follow the standards to set the roles and programs of the unit. Another way CAS standards can be used is to evaluate and assess the

programs and services provided. The CAS standards of higher education have offered program reviews and self-assessment guides (SAGs) of individual units of student affairs to conduct evaluations of the programs.

The CAS standards were developed by a group of experienced practitioners from a wide range of service areas of student affairs. These practitioners created the standards and SAGs based on various theories, practices, and experiences. SAGs all have similar framework with 12 components, or sections, which are to be reflective of the practices and services of each individual area or unit that can be evaluated. The 12 components are mission, program, organizational leadership, human resources, ethics, law and governance, diversity and access, internal and external relations, financial resources, technology, facilities and equipment, and lastly, assessment. Each section was reflective of the service area being evaluated through the self-assessment guide. The self-assessment guide offers a set of instructions and recommendations on how to conduct the evaluation and how to produce an action plan following the assessment. Those who utilize the SAGs can begin to grasp an informed perspective of the programs and services, but also understand the strengths, weaknesses, and institutional commitment of the programs assessed. The SAGs can also provide university and department leaders a tool to justify the validity of their programs through current standards of practice.

Multicultural Student Programs and Services Self-Assessment Guide

Within the 34 various programs that are assessed using CAS standards, multicultural centers fall under the unit of multicultural programs and services. For multicultural centers, history was an integral component in the assessment of multicultural student programs and services (Kupo, 2011). “Systems of power and privilege, and oppression have created a need for multicultural student services on college campuses as a remedy for communities that have

historically been barred from receiving formal primary, secondary, and higher education” (Kupo, 2011, p. 14). American higher education’s narratives surrounding issues such as racism, discrimination, and segregation have influenced the inequalities in enrollment and retention of historically marginalized groups. The historical narratives have also shaped the institutional structure, which in turn has impacted historically marginalized groups’ access to higher education and their attitudes and experiences within higher education. How historically marginalized groups’ engage in higher education influences the programs and services offered by multicultural programs and services. Therefore, it is important to understand the universities’ historic narrative to begin assessment of these programs.

Each institution of higher education is different and their historical narrative surrounding historically marginalized communities is also unique. In assessing multicultural programs and services, the first component is the mission. Within this component, the historical narrative sets the tone of the structure of not only the multicultural centers but how the history has influenced the programs and services provided by the multicultural center. This also includes the goals, values, and institutional commitment to the unit being assessed. In this section of the assessment, the clarity of the mission and how often it is reviewed is also evaluated. Throughout the SAG, the documentation of the mission becomes the most important element of the programs and services. An overview of the other components of the assessment guide will be covered in chapter 3.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The chapter began with an historical overview of multicultural centers. Multicultural centers emerged during the late 1960s and early 1970s when Black students demanded their institutions to provide an equitable and supportive environment that reflected their cultural and

student experiences (Patton, 2010). It was during this time that Black cultural centers and Black Studies courses were established within higher education. These centers provided academic, social, and cultural experiences for students where there were not any offered within the hostile and isolating campus environment. As student populations evolved and the institutions became focused on a more multicultural curriculum, Black cultural centers changed to multicultural centers to support all historically marginalized identities including other racial identities, women, and LGBT students.

This chapter also described multicultural centers today including the challenges, obstacles, and some barriers they have to success. While there is no one single model to cultural centers, multicultural centers face the unique challenge of supporting all historically marginalized identities and facilitating multicultural education to the majority community. While these can be difficult for the practitioners working in multicultural centers, they have been successful in supporting the communities they serve as well as providing programs that facilitate multiculturalism and cultural understanding. This was demonstrated in the chapter with several successful programs offered by other multicultural centers.

Finally, this chapter gives a brief overview of the theoretical framework that was used in the study including the structuration theory, an organizational theory given to the structure of multicultural centers, and the CAS standards, the standards that were used to assess the programs and services within the study. The next chapter will provide the method and the organizations that were assessed for the purpose of the study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I summarize the research methodology utilized in examining multicultural centers by providing an overview of the purpose, research question, and research design. The research design was a qualitative approach based on the ideals outlined in the CAS standards of higher education along with documentation, questionnaire, and interviews with the multicultural center professional personnel examined in the research. The chapter concludes with the limitations of the design and summary of the methodology.

RESTATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The intended study was to answer the following research question: How do multicultural centers provide support to marginalized communities and facilitate multicultural education within the institution? The four questions that supported the central question of this study were as follows:

1. What is the mission, purpose, and structure of the multicultural center (i.e., space, professional staff, and reporting lines)?
2. What are the programs that provide multicultural education offered by the center?
3. How does the multicultural center support the academic, social, and cultural experiences of all students?
4. How do multicultural center staff define success for the center and how are they achieving that success?

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND SETTING OF THE RESEARCH

A multicultural center is a complex organization within a larger institutional structure whose objective was to simultaneously educate and bring awareness to a majority community while serving and advocating for historically marginalized identities (Patton, 2010). The purpose of this study is to provide an understanding of how multicultural centers operate, including mission, organizational structure, audience, and programs and activities for both historically marginalized students and the majority community. By having focused this research on these characteristics, this study can present an accurate representation of how multicultural centers support the needs of historically marginalized students while providing diversity education to a majority campus community.

The interview questions were designed to garner a better understanding of the professional's perspectives of multicultural centers. The professionals who work firsthand with the centers have a better understanding of the mission, goals, and the audience in which the centers serve. The professionals also have an acute awareness and assessment of the multicultural centers and the barriers and limitations that may impede their effectiveness to serve the university community. Multicultural centers have a unique position as a unit within the university structure that serves a dual mission to support and educate two different stakeholders. Practitioners are better equipped to understand how these centers effectively serve this dual mission.

The examination of multicultural centers not only establish a greater understanding of these centers, but also ascertained whether there are those who have strong evidence of being successful in their dual positions. I applied qualitative methods such as interview protocol and

design (Merriam, 2009) based on the CAS standards multicultural programs and SAGs (CAS, 2015).

RESTATEMENT OF RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

Two influences encouraged me to study multicultural centers. As a student affairs practitioner, I chose to study multicultural centers because I understand the need for an analysis in this area. For the past 10 years, I have had the opportunity to work in multicultural centers at various institutions. Immersed in this work, I have been up close and personal with the challenges and misconceptions surrounding multicultural centers. In addition, I identify as a Black woman who have not only worked in multicultural centers but also, benefited from programs and services offered by these centers. I have firsthand account of the problems, misconceptions as well as the benefits multicultural centers have at predominantly White institutions. However, I understand that the research and examination of these centers is limited. This study was intended to offer an analysis of these type of centers to shed light on how they affects their college campus communities.

METHODOLOGY SELECTION

The commonality in all research projects is the idea that the researcher is “inquiring into, or investigating something in a systematic manner” (Merriam, 2009, p. 4). Research seeks to understand a phenomenon and extend the knowledge of a thing (Merriam, 2009). No matter the research method, whether quantitative or qualitative, research aids in progressing knowledge to assist in making decisions and informing practices. However, qualitative research also seeks to understand, or explain the complexity in what is being researched (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Qualitative research investigates and observes things in their natural settings to understand how individuals make sense of them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 2009).

Specifically, qualitative research seeks to explain how people understand a thing, and then finds ways to interpret their experiences and interactions within it (Patton, 1985). Understanding comes from analyzing the various parts of the research and the context in which others perceive them. Merriam (2009) categorized qualitative research in four elements: a) meaning and understanding, b) researcher as the primary instrument, c) inductive process, and d) rich descriptions. Although qualitative research is ideally flexible and adaptable by nature, these factors are identified as common to all qualitative research (Merriam, 2009).

The qualitative researcher is concerned with social phenomena and understands the participants' perspective to them (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). The researcher is defined as a human instrument that is responsible for explaining the data and making the interpretation easy to understand and useful for others. Merriam (2009) explained that qualitative researchers are interested in, "(1) how people interpret their experiences, (2) how they construct their worlds, and (3) what meaning they attribute to their experiences" (p .23). Creswell (1998) posited that the qualitative researcher " builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting" (p.15).

The goal of the researcher is to shape their understanding of the verbal and nonverbal communication of their subjects and explain it to others (Merriam, 2009). After data were collected and categorized from general to specifics, the study will begin to build towards themes. Merriam (2009) posited utilizing larger themes, categories, and pictures to describe, "What the researcher has learned about a phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009, p.16). Although there were various methods research that could be used to conduct the study, qualitative research is best used to illustrate one's interpretation of the phenomenon and their experiences. Because this study will inform others on multicultural centers, qualitative research was the best suited for the

current study. Its methods were utilized to make sense out of the purpose, goals, and experiences one has with multicultural centers to understand their effectiveness in the larger institutional structure.

METHOD SECTION

In order to examine multicultural centers, a qualitative descriptive study design was chosen as the most appropriate design for this research (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006). I analyzed various multicultural centers through their primary institutions in which were located, their organizational structures, missions, programs, and professional staff. Yin (2008) defined case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident” (p.18).

A qualitative descriptive study involves examining and analyzing data to arrive at a comprehensive summary of a phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). A method that came about in the 1970s and 1980s, descriptive-interpretation as define by some scholars, is used when researchers our exploring a phenomenon to uncover emerging themes or an holistic approach to summarize a phenomenon (Elliot & Timulak, 2005). In this study, I examined various multicultural centers as descriptive case then offer a cross analysis looking for generalizations, commonalities, and differences using the selective codes. By doing this, it was anticipated that as the researcher, I would discern a better, holistic understanding of multicultural centers and how they operate at predominantly higher education. Barker et al. (2002) suggested “exploratory questions, suitable as the base for qualitative inquiry are typically used when: (a) there is little known in a particular research area; (b) existing research is confusing,contradictory,or not moving forward; or (c) the topic is highly complex” (Elliot & Timulak, 2005. P. 149).

In this qualitative descriptive analysis, the multicultural centers were bound by their institutional dual function in which these organizations operate. This study compared and analyzed how multicultural centers carried out their functions.

DATA COLLECTION

The information utilized for the current qualitative descriptive study was gathered using documentation, interviews, and CAS standards SAGs for multicultural student programs and services and follow-up interviews with the professionals within the multicultural centers chosen for the study. These are tools commonly found in a primary qualitative research study (Merriam, 1989; Patton, 2002). Merriam (2009) suggested, “Qualitative researchers build toward theory through observation and intuitive understanding gleaned from being in the field” (p. 15). Since the objective was aimed at gathering information, these methods will assisted the researcher in gaining access and an in-depth perspective of multicultural centers studied.

Interviews

Interviews are “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in a conversation focused on questions related to a research study” (Demarrias, 2004 p. 55). An interview is necessary when direct observation is not feasible. It was also deemed necessary when attempting to gain an understanding from individuals that cannot be identified through observation (Bowman, 2009). Due to the nature of this study, an interview was the most effective method to gain perspectives from the individuals that worked within multicultural centers.

There are different types of interviews: structured, semi-structured, and unstructured (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative structured interviews have predetermined questions with a definite order and often with a specific demographic group. The most common form of a structured

interview is a written survey given orally, such as a marketing survey (Merriam, 2009). A semi-structured survey is less restrictive and is guided by a list of questions. An unstructured or informal interview typically has open-ended questions and is guided by the responses given by the participants (Merriam, 2009).

In this study, the questions were administered through email to give participants time to expand on their answers with follow-up phone interviews. This method was chosen for straightforward, easy access for both the professionals and the participants. To understand professional staff perception of the effectiveness of centers in which they work, there were 15 questions asked in this interview. Questions were formulated using the CAS standards criteria for multicultural programs and services. The interview questions included questions on the mission, organizational structure, programs and services, diversity and access and facilities and equipment. The questions also approximated if they felt they met the needs of their mission and are successful in their dual purpose as a unit. In addition, I asked them to expound on how the goals and mission of the multicultural center is met and the challenges and limitations. Other questions identified how their multicultural centers intended on serving the majority student community. The interview offered in-depth knowledge that can be used in the self-assessment guide instrument formulized by the CAS standards SAG. Included in the appendices is the interview questions and the profile for each person interviewed (See Appendix B).

Documentation

In addition to the interviews, the document analysis also assisted in the study analysis. LeCompte et al (1993) described documents as artifacts, “symbolic materials such as writings and signs and nonsymbolic symbolic materials such as tools and furnishings” (p. 216). Documents assist in describing a thing, as well as give insight into the representation of it. For

the purpose of this study, document analysis included public materials such as brochures, flyers, annual reports, and websites. Website analysis is a relatively new method of gathering documentation in research. Institutional websites can be the most valuable tool to a critical insight to the institution as well as the most current information shared to those consumers including potential and current students, faculty, and staff. Although there is a wealth of information on the internet on the various websites, choosing the type of information and how it will be analyzed is integral to eliminated misinformation or information not useful to the study. Ramono, Donovan, Chen, & Nunamaker (2003) persisted that “Awareness of which data to collect and how to analyze it to create meaningful information, knowledge, and wisdom are key challenges firms must address to derive significant value-added from these new QD sources” (p. 214). Website information was limited to the multicultural centers themselves, but also the institution. Institutional data supplied information on the demographics of students, size, cost, region, organizational structure, and university missions’ goals and commitments. This better assisted gaining an understanding of how the multicultural center is situated within the institution and resources provided to the center. The document analysis was supplementary to the interviews.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data collection in this study involved 15 qualitative interviews with current professionals as the primary source of research data. Interviews were semi-structured, open-ended questions with additional follow-up questions to add or clarify participants’ responses. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes to an hour. Websites of the individual multicultural centers and their respective institutions served as supportive data to the research. Additionally, documents obtained such as brochures, annual reports, university strategic plans, and university research

data from advisory groups or a panel of outside reviewers were also used as supportive research data.

To conduct the analysis, following each interview, the recorded interviews was transcribed and manually coded using the selective codes of the CAS Standards and the epistemological foundations for the research. The supportive data was also manually coded and reviewed for emerging themes and clarifying information related to the interview questions. Utilizing a phenomenological approach, each transcription, notes, and supportive documentation was bracketed into themes related to the selective coding based on the SAG components. The brackets were selected to ensure personal bias and experiences did not come into the interviews of each participant. Analyzing each bracket, I searched for quotes, statements, and documentation that aligned with the research questions used in this study. Themes, generalizations, differences and similarities began to emerge from the brackets and used to provide a holistic overview of multicultural centers based on the professionals that work within them.

The interviews were coded manually during open coding in order to conduct the analysis. Open coding is a process used in qualitative research to identify themes and categories based on the participant's responses during the interview (Merriam, 2009). Open coding was conducted after each interview to identify themes and statements in analysis to further the research. Selective coding is the process of choosing a core category to tell the story of the research (Merriam, 2009).

The selective codes used were adaptive from CAS Standards list of ethics and standards for multicultural programs and services. The SAGs have similar framework with 12 components, or sections that are to be reflective of the practices and services of each individual area or unit

that can be evaluated. The 12 components are mission, program, organizational leadership, human resources, ethics, law and governance, diversity and access, internal and external relations, financial resources, technology, facilities and equipment, and lastly assessment. For the purpose of the study, not all twelve components were used for selective coding; the selective codes used were mission, program, diversity and access, organizational structure and human resources, and facilities and equipment. As the researcher, I chose these specific components due to the general research question. The full list of the 12 components and their general descriptions can be found in Appendix B.

PARTICIPATION SELECTION

In this descriptive design approach, a criterion-based selection process identified the participants chosen in this study (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). LeCompte and Preissle (1993) defines a criterion as a list of participants created based on specific characteristics based what is essential to the study. Once the researcher establishes the criteria, then they will seek out those that purposefully match the attributes related to the study. By employing this method not only does the researcher identify the participants that best fit within the study, but as the researcher I can specifically explain why the criteria are important and the participants are essential to the study.

Criterion Selection

In my criteria, I have chosen to research multicultural centers situated at predominantly White institutions. These institutions' multicultural centers have been found to be those who not only serve historically marginalized communities, but the majority campus. Their mission statement should have reflected the dual purpose to support a specific or multiple historically marginalized identities and provide educational programs and services to the majority

community. This mission is most reflected through either pamphlets or web pages that explain the history of the center or the mission, vision, and goals of the multicultural centers. These centers also, at predominantly White institutions, also share a history of inception related to serving the specific needs of racial minority students and evolved to multifaceted multicultural centers. The professionals chosen to participate in the study was chosen after it was determined that the centers fit the study. As a professional, I have worked and visited various multicultural centers and have a firsthand account of some of the centers that were used in this study. From my personal relationships and work with multicultural centers, I began with five multicultural centers professionals and snowball to various other centers that fit the specific criterion. The multicultural centers were from both 4-year private and public institutions with multicultural centers with varying structures, personnel, and programs.

The institutions in which these centers were situated all share in the commonality that they were predominantly White institutions. However, these institutions were both private and public institutions with varied size, minority student enrollment, region, and location. Tuition rates and number of students on financial assistance also which will also give an important contrast to the socioeconomic status of students as well as resources to the multicultural center.

SAMPLE

Fifteen participants interviewed in this study. The participants all met the minimum requirement of working in or overseeing the unit described as a multicultural center with a dual purpose of providing support programs for historically marginalized identities and provide education for majority White racial identities on campus. Self-identified demographics were given and those who participated in the study identified as 60 % women, 39% men, and one percent identified as gender non-binary. Seven of the participants shared a racial identity of

Black, 4 participants share Latin or Hispanic racial identity, 2 identified as Asian or Asian Pacific Islander, one participant self-identified as Southeast Asian or Indian, and one person identified as White.

The total number of years in higher education represents over 80 years of experience with those participants stating the majority of their career has served multicultural or international identities. The participants' title or role in Multicultural centers range from director (7 participants), assistant or associate director (3 participants), and higher administrators identified as vice presidents of diversity, dean or assistant dean (5 Participants). Of the five participants, three also served the role of director or senior director of the multicultural center.

It is also important to note the demographics of the institutions in which there participants work. As indicated in Table 1, the fifteen institutions are four-year public or private institutions that varied in size, location, student population and percentages of historically marginalized identities within that population. Predominantly White institutions are institutions with the majority of students racially identify as White. Two public institutions were designated Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HIS), an institution designated by the federal government that has a Hispanic student population with 25% or more, however they are still identified as predominantly White Institutions as the Majority racial identity is White. Private institutions in this study makeup 31% of the study and have a racial minority percentage ranging from 21 to 39%. The largest public institution, with over 30,000 students had a 54% racial minority, however 18% of those were considered international students.

Table 4.1 Number of Institution by type, size, and percentage of racial minorities

Size of Institution						
Control	Less than 5000	5000-10000	10000-15,000	15,000-20,000	20,000+	30,000+
Public		1	3	3	5	1
Private	1		2			
Percentage of Racial Diversity	19%	35%	21-39%	12%-27%	21%-36%	54% (18% international)

Due to the purpose of the study, the breakdown of the sample used is vital to the analysis of the multicultural center including the institutional type, size, and percentage of racial minorities within the student population. Racial minorities in this study refer to students that identify as Black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander, Native American or American Indian, or students who identify with two or more racial identities. This study examines multicultural centers and the role they play in supporting historically marginalized communities as well as how they are educating the majority campus on issues concerning diversity and multiculturalism. The size of the student population is vital to understanding the populations in which multicultural centers serve as well as the target audience for their programs and services. A full list of the sample, including the participants' position, institutional type, center, and demographics can be found in appendix A.

DATA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Data analysis is the process of summarizing and interpreting the data collected. Merriam (2009) defined data analysis as “consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher has seen and read. . . the process of making meaning” (p. 176). A qualitative descriptive method was used to determine the data analyzed (McMillan & Schumacher, 2002). To answer the research question, I focused on the mission, organizational

structure, programs and services, and institutional commitment to multicultural centers including funding, resources, and professional staff.

The CAS Standards for Higher Education Multicultural Programs and Services (2015) was used as the main conceptual framework for this study. The CAS standards were established to give practitioners a set of components or principles that are used to guide and evaluate practices for higher education units. How institutions utilize the CAS standards is to either evaluate various units of student affairs to enhance or develop functional areas to achieve maximum educational excellence or to ensure that professionals understand their purpose and the skills, knowledge, and expertise needed to operate their units. This framework was used to inform this study because of its relevance to Multicultural centers. If the centers meet the current standards set forth by CAS, those institutions were considered as exceeding the purpose and achieving excellence in their units. Secondary to the CAS Standards there are two theories that are used as epistemological foundations the structuration theory and Critical Race Theory is utilized in this study to demonstrate how Multicultural centers operate with a dual structure and develop programs and service that dismantle the dominant culture.

To begin data analysis I utilized the phenomenological method to examine the individual case studies of the multicultural centers to find the commonalities and differences in mission, organizational structure, programs and services, and strategies to provide services and education to all students (Charmaz, 2006). By discovering the commonalities, I identified a foundation for the mission of multicultural centers and common themes of how these centers address their purpose and serve their student populations. Identifying the differences assisted in discovering the range of programs, missions, and strategies that multicultural centers utilize to provide

services. The information gained through interviews identified is used to better describe multicultural centers and how well these centers lived up to the mission of the organizations.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

No study is without its own set of limitations. By acknowledging the study had limitations, the researcher acknowledges that the researcher understands their personal limitations and the weaknesses in the study provided (Marshall & Rossman, 2010). For this study, the limitations were location and resources. It was not plausible to visit many of the multicultural centers and institutions that were in the study. Therefore, I could not be immersed in the programs and structure of the institutions. In addition, because of the locations, many resources may not have been available such as newspapers, additional program materials, and interviewing subjects (students and staff), which may have caused the researcher to make certain assumptions about the success of the centers.

In addition, there may have been limitations in the type of multicultural centers that were analyzed in the study. While all multicultural centers identified in this study had a share mission of dual purpose within their institutions, the identity populations served may have differed. For example, the underserved population that these centers may supported may have been solely racial or ethnic minorities while others may also support gender, religious, and LGBTQ identities. Some institutions may have had both affinity centers and multicultural centers at their respective institutions. Because there is not one sole model for multicultural centers, the audience and types of programs of support offered differed from institution, a limitation that I wish to explore in the case study analysis and interviews.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

The conceptual framework in this study was used demonstrate expectations found in the research. Practitioners use theories to inform practice and develop programs, policies, and procedures. In this research study, I explored how multicultural centers operate with a dual purpose to serve the university community. The conceptual framework in this study was designed to illustrate how theory and selected variables inform the practice of multicultural centers. The CAS Standards of Higher Education will also be explained as it is used to frame the research in this study. The epistemological foundations were two theories that are used demonstrate the grounded theories in which multicultural centers are structured were the structuration theory and critical race theory.

CAS Standards in Higher Education

In 1986, the CAS standards in Higher Education published its first set of standards for 16 functional areas within student services. Created by practitioners from various higher education associations, the standards provide a foundation for practices within each functional area (CAS, 2015). CAS currently has standards for 45 functional areas including multicultural programs and services. The SAGs that followed in 1988 for the professionals to conduct a self-study of each of their programs and services (CAS, 2015).

Developed by a group of experienced practitioners, the CAS standards created the standards based on various theories, practices and experiences. CAS standards covers 45 functional areas including off campus housing, academic advising, multicultural programs, and LGBT programs and services. Multicultural Programs and Services is not very different from other unit's standards offered. However, CAS place a distinct value on the mission, programming, services, and the professionals that operate the unit. The CAS standards states,

“multicultural student programs and services must create and nurture environments that are welcoming to and bring persons of diverse backgrounds” (CAS Standards Assessment Guide, 2015). The diversity standards also stress multicultural programs and services should serve the campus community by educating students, faculty, and staff on diversity issues. Multicultural programs and services should also offer support and advocacy programs for oppressed or historically marginalized identities such as academic support, celebration programs, and campus climate programming to encourage belonging and identity development.

The SAG for multicultural programs and services is a 45-page workbook that includes the standards of practice and guidelines for assessment (See Appendix). Twelve components were measured within the workbook. The 12 components are mission, program, organizational leadership, human resources, ethics, law and governance, diversity and access, internal and external relations, financial resources, technology, facilities and equipment, and lastly assessment. Each component measured offers statements that help guide the level of compliance with each standard (CAS, 2015).

The multicultural centers were indirectly and directly examined using this criterion in the CAS standards. In addition, the CAS standards were also utilized to design key questions used in the interview including mission, organizational structure, facilities and equipment, and program resources and programmatic implementation. The CAS standards were not used in all the interview questions, but those pertaining to those components listed.

Epistemological Foundations

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge. It refers to how we understand the phenomenon and the relationship between what we know and what we are trying to understand (Marriam, 2009). When used in qualitative research, an epistemological perspective assist the

researcher increase knowledge of a phenomenon by providing a framework to be able describe, predict, or interpret a specific perspective being researched (Marriam, 2009). In this research study, I chose two theories to assist in the deconstruction and analysis of multicultural centers, the structuration theory and critical race theory because they support the understanding of multicultural centers organizational structure and design of program and services.

Structuration Theory

When considering the structure of an institution, various organizational theories outline the organizational structure of student affairs and the entities within them. Institutional units in higher education are complex, but they have a direct correlation to overall educational experience and a student's success (Kuk & Banning, 2009). Although student affairs units are made up of separate entities that work independently, they all work together to provide the student with a holistic educational experience in and outside of the classroom. This model suggests that student affairs operates within a loosely coupled organizational theory (Weik, 1976).

Loosely coupled theory (Weik, 1976) describes a system that has several separate entities loosely connected to one another. For some systems, the reason for these connections are unspecified or is due to limited constraints placed on the systems. However, these systems were linked together for a specific goal or they serve the same unique purpose much like the service unit of student affairs. The organization's behaviors determine how these organizations were structured and how well they succeeded while intrinsically linked (Bess & Dee, 2009). Organizational theory suggests that an organizational framework is designed to effectively meet the organization's mission and strategic purpose (Galbraith, 2002).

The organizational structure and the position within the larger organization can demonstrate how multicultural centers manage their dual position within the organization. Multicultural centers are unique units within higher education because they have a dual operating mission and audience and their organizational structure demonstrates how this unit operates within the larger organization.

Multicultural centers have a long history of supporting and advocating for marginalized students, specifically racial minorities identities because others were not equipped to do so. However, as universities evolved, multicultural centers served a broader range of other marginalized social identities as well as provide education for the university community, not only students but also faculty and staff. Those involved in multicultural centers are actively engaged in establishing a structure that fits the difference in purpose and the populations in which they serve. However, multicultural centers are constrained by the previous structure in which they were established and not the people, behaviors and attitudes in which these centers have evolved. This is known as the *Structuration Theory* which organizations are bound by their previous structure (Giddens, 1984). Professionals in this theory, actively engage in redefining the organization to fit with the duality of structure, the one previously established and the structure in which they operate (Bess & Dee, 2009).

Behaviors, misconceptions, and institutional memory are the rules that sustained the structure or social systems in which multicultural centers are bound - centers that are the sole support for racial minority identities. Poole, Seibold, and McPhee (1996) posits that individuals often appropriate systems and structures from larger society and imitate a form of them within their own structuration. This study will show how the structuration theory is applied to multicultural centers studied and how they operate in the duality of the structure.

Critical Race Theory

A collective of minority legal scholars led by Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman created CRT in the 1970s. CRT sheds light on how racism and race relate to societal issues and the legal system (Howard-Hamilton et al., 2007). Scholars revealed that individuals in power implement policies supposedly race neutral, but continue to perpetuate racial oppression and ideals such as color-blindness and meritocracy that disadvantage people of color and further the placement of whites (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). Therefore, there is strong effort to raise racial consciousness reduce racism in society (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). Later, critical race theory was applied to other areas including higher education research and practice (Landsons-Billings & Tate, 1995). Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas (1995) posited, "The task of Critical Race Theory is to remind its readers how deeply issues of racial ideology and power to continue to matter in American Life" (p. xxxii).

At its core, CRT contends that race and racism is so ingrained in society that it is hard to pinpoint and dismantle (D.A.Bell, 1992; Russell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Landsons-Billings, 1999; Howard-Hamilton et. al, 2007). Therefore, race is a determining factor in how individuals relate to one another, succeed, or function in society. When applying critical race theory to an educational setting, there is a slight difference from the legal application. Critical race theorists attempt to show that racism is part of institutional practices and crosses epistemological and methodical boundaries. Critical race theorists believe that these social constructs have impeded on the experiences and communities of color (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). Other methods to raise cultural consciousness of disadvantage groups are exposure to microaggression, counter stories of disadvantage groups and counter space (Landson-Billings, 1999; Hamilton et. al, 2007).

Racism is especially rampant in places and people that produces knowledge rampant in places and people that produce knowledge...By bringing in our own approaches and methodologies, we transform that theorizing space (Anzaldúa, 1990 pp. xix, xxv).

Racism, privilege and oppression is why Multicultural centers were established at predominantly White Institutions. Predominantly White institutions were founded on policies and practices that centered on the interest and privileges of White male students and for the reason that marginalized identities often endured negative interactions, experiences, and were faced with a hostile campus environment (Caldwell, 1995). Using the framework of CRT, counterspaces were created to assist these identities persist in a hostile environment; such were the case of many of the first multicultural centers established in the late 1960's and early 1970's at predominantly White institutions (Yozo and Lopez, 2010). CRT was used in this structuration to dismantle the systems, behaviors and attitudes that permeate through the educational structure. Counter-stories tells the lived experiences of those that the system is inherently oppressing and challenge the dominant ideology of the system (Yozo and Lopez, 2010). Researching the multicultural centers will demonstrate how these centers utilized the methods of counterspaces and storytelling to dismantle systems of privilege and oppression in educational structures.

SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

This chapter summarized the processes used to examine and describe the best practices of multicultural centers. In order to address the study's main research question and examine multicultural centers, I utilized a qualitative approach conducting in-depth interviews as the primary method and comparative case study analysis as the secondary approach. As the researcher, I conducted a qualitative case study approach of multicultural centers at various institutions. I looked at documents and immersed myself in the culture of the specific

multicultural centers to discern whether these centers operate with the dual purpose and best practices that can be shared and utilized by other multicultural centers. There were themes that can emerge from the analysis of the research. Chapter 4 will outline the data analysis of the open and selective coding of the interviews with the practitioners and the selective documentation of the multicultural centers.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to provide an understanding of how multicultural centers operate, including programs and activities for both historically marginalized students and the majority community. This chapter covers the results of the data collected grounded in the CAS standards of higher education and the theories that ground the framework of the multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions. The central research question explored multicultural centers and their roles within the larger institutional structure; How do multicultural centers provide support to marginalized communities and facilitate multicultural education within the institution? The four questions that supported the central question of this study were as follows:

1. What is the mission, purpose, and structure of the multicultural center (i.e., space, professional staff, and reporting lines)?
2. What are the programs that provide multicultural education offered by the center?
3. How does the multicultural center support the academic, social, and cultural experiences of all students?
4. How do multicultural center staff define success for the center and how are they achieving that success?

Few published studies on multicultural centers provide insight on the mission, structure, and programs and services provided by these centers (Shufford, 2011; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). This study distinguishes itself by examining the dual purpose of these centers, to support marginalized communities while educating the majority campus community on issues of

diversity and multiculturalism. By offering an examination into multicultural centers' mission and purpose, organizational structure, and assessment methods, we gained an enhanced understanding of how these centers will reach their intended goals. In addition, conducting qualitative descriptive analysis this study looked to determine a baseline of how these centers accomplish their purpose.

This chapter will discuss the analysis conducted using the interviews, the CAS Professional Standards for Multicultural Programs and Services (CAS, 2015), and epistemological foundations of structuration theory and critical race theory and how these theories connect to the research questions. There are three categories of coding used in this analysis: (a) Open coding to describe the interviews, (b) Selective coding using the CAS standards, and (c) theoretical coding to determine the theories found in the organizational structures of each multicultural center analyzed. The chapter will conclude with the analysis of the results including themes, similarities and differences, and assumptions made in the overall analysis.

ANALYSIS

The analysis of the research data is organized by the general selective coding used in the interviews. The subsequent section headers that follow indicate the selective codes that was used – mission, program, diversity and access, organizational structure and human resources, and facilities and equipment. Participants (Appendix A) interviewed were given pseudonyms in order to protect their anonymity in this study.

Mission

The mission of an organization describe its values, goals, and vision of its organization. A mission statement guides the work of an organization. For multicultural centers, the mission demonstrate how the organization intend to serve the community. The CAS standards stated the mission of multicultural programs and services (MSPS) should include a guiding statement that includes the support of historically marginalized identities and facilitate education of diverse issues.

Found to share similar mission statements, the participants and subsequently, the centers were chosen because the duality of purpose at their respective institutions. Their mission statements met the requirement set by the CAS standards as providing a mission statement that outlined the dual role of the unit. When participants were asked if they carried out the mission of the organization, they described the difficulty of the dual role of the center. Issa, who is an associate dean, as well as the director of the multicultural center shared that there were claims that these multicultural centers did not serve the campus community in the manner as stated in their current missions and in fact, created exclusionary spaces instead of the inclusive space that multicultural centers set out to establish. These statements seemed to align with findings from other studies of cultural centers and multicultural services (Patton, 2010; Stewart & Bridges, 2011).

There is no universal model for student affairs units within the organizational structure in higher education (Manning, Kinzie, & Schur, 2013). However, there is less structure or universal model for multicultural centers. Though organizational structure will be explored more in the chapter, it is important to outline various models that were researched as they relate to the mission statement. Of the 15 participants, eight participants identified their multicultural center

as a central unit at their institutions and their mission statement solely described their unit - values, goals, programs, and services. Sanai described their mission as a “*holistic approach to supporting the entire campus community*”. A central multicultural center model is equally responsible for supporting historically marginalized identities and educating the majority community of diversity and social justice issues.

Seven of the participants identified their organizational model as the “affinity model” (Ambler, 2000), a cluster of affinity centers or racial/ethnic centers that provide services to historically marginalized identities that report to either a senior-level administrator or a director of a multicultural center. This multicultural center also supports historically marginalized identities but also provides educational programs and services for the majority community. Six of these participants worked in large public institutions where affinity centers predates the multicultural centers by decades. Ambler (2000) suggested some of the challenges with this model are due to the bureaucracy amongst the units. The seven participants discussed the politics of this model and that it was difficult to assess how the organization as a whole is fulfilling its mission. Joe is an assistant director at a Midwest, public institution. He stated:

Everyone is doing their own thing and there is no way you can assess how well they are all living out the mission. I can't tell you that we all try to coordinate, but sometimes there are too many hands in the cookie jar to all be on the same page.

When the participants described the difficulties of carrying out their mission, themes emerged including organizational structure and the audience served. Seven of the participants' centers the affinity cultural center remained and still have a prominent place on campus. For many of these multicultural centers with this model, the cultural centers and identity center focus solely on the advocating and supporting those historically marginalized communities while the

multicultural center focused on educating the broader campus community. The mission statements and the programming can further explain this in the next section about how these centers carry out this work.

Additionally, multicultural centers' mission states that their purpose is intended to serve three different audiences – (a) historically marginalized identities, (b) the majority White identities of the community, and (c) a culturally diverse audience to facilitate “an interaction across differences in a global society” (CAS Standards, 2015). Participants were asked to indicate if they were reaching the audience or stakeholders identifying in the mission. Thirteen out of 15 participants identified the population the centers served had not changed much over time. Historically marginalized identities are those that mostly utilize the facilities and utilize the programs and services offered by the office.

We may reach 10 percent of the majority population. Students that seek us out may have an oppressed identity such as sexual identity or gender that make them seek out other ways to understand or learn about others. But the majority has to have a reason to utilize our services or they will not come by. (Ty, Director)

Chris is an associate dean for diversity and equity at a large, public institution in the southwest. He expressed that although their mission to facilitate education opportunities was at the core of what they did, only those that often hold those identities discussed attend those programs. For example, a person who may identified racially as White, but also identified as an international student, or within the LGBTQ population. Another example is one that identified their gender as female but also held other marginalized identities such as sexual identity, ability, or racial identities. This meant that although these centers were to have a multicultural audience,

the majority of those that utilized the center were those hold one or more historically marginalized identities.

Issa, Bryan, and Kelly also expressed similar difficulties reaching the majority audience, but described partnerships from academic departments assisted them in fulfilling their mission including mandatory for credit courses in diversity, cultural awareness, and social justice that were taught through the centers. These programs will be explored more in the next section.

We have programs for orientation programs, courses [academic], and training seminars that are for the campus that help us reach a broader audience (Bailey, associate dean/director).

Programs and Services

Multicultural programs and services must serve the majority community and advocate for students of historically marginalized identities. Under section 2 of the CAS standards for Multicultural Programs and Services, multicultural centers met standard requirements when they increase a student's knowledge of their own cultural and racial heritage. Additionally, programs that support historically marginalized identities should assist in student success and students' educational progression, retention, and of graduation goals including programs in academic advising, student development in and outside the classroom, and skills that would assist in students' learning.

Cultural Programming

Cultural programming was a shared commonality of all multicultural centers. The purpose of cultural programs is two-fold – to celebrate and affirm the diversity of cultures and ethnicities shared by students on campus, and to raise awareness of different cultures, identities,

and ethnicities with which people may not be familiar. Examples of cultural programming include cultural heritage month celebrations, dance and art performances, drag shows, and inviting speakers and lecturers to campus. All the multicultural centers in this study provided some form of cultural programming. For those multicultural centers with racial affinity centers or identity centers structured under them, cultural programming was pivotal to the work of those centers as they served as methods to celebrate identities and share cultural traditions with the majority community. For central multicultural centers, cultural programming worked collaboratively with diversity education programs for the entire campus.

The heritage month programs such as Black history month or Hispanic Heritage month are some of our biggest and most attended programs. If we did not have our Black History Month kick-off, there would be an uproar. . The cultural programs we have, have become university traditions. (Brittney, assistant dean at a Midwest university)

Cultural heritage and awareness programming followed along the lines of cultural heritage months including but not limited to Hispanic Heritage, LGBT, Black History, and Women's History months. Programming that represent those these identities are solely facilitated on the related months and rarely happen outside these months.

Brittney is a senior-level administrator and director of the multicultural center that oversees several racial affinity centers. She stated:

Cultural Awareness Programming is the majority of the work that these centers put on. They (the programs) serve as both teaching tools but social programs that provides cross-cultural interactions for the campus (Brittney).

Participants also described programs that celebrate all identities, but around specific topics or festivals of culture.

Our biggest program for our office is a world music festival. Music is the greatest equalizer and brings everyone together. We try to ensure that all identities are represented and the campus is all together for one purpose (Issa, associate dean/director).

Participant's Jerry, Bailey, and Kelly also discussed similar programs in world festivals and cultural awareness days. However, the cultural did based programs do not cover all identities on campus but those of the majority of the historically marginalized identities. For example, Sanai represented a large public institution located on the West coast. The individual expressed that the majority of the cultural programming is to celebrate the Hispanic or Latinx identities because Hispanic/Latin heritage makes up 21 % of their historically marginalized community. Cultural programming that celebrated other historically marginalized communities were much smaller and did not receive the audience or the programming funds through their office.

It is difficult to plan programs about or for other historically marginalized communities without being challenged by students about the programs we are doing. I know some students feel that we do not enough for their communities, but we do not have the funding to do more. We rely on student organizations to provide cultural programming when we are not able to (Issa, associate dean/director).

Gurin et. al (2002) posited that it is not enough to have structural diversity at an institution, but you must add several positive interactions with diverse people to change and understand differing perspectives. Cultural programming offers a method in which diverse students can interact and share cultural differences in supportive environments. However, through interviews of participants, the majority expressed that those who attend these programs

were those that hold those cultural identities. There are some successes with an amalgamation of several cultures on a topic or issue however; those that hold historically marginalized identities attend the major of programs.

Diversity Education

Diversity education programs are also vital to the mission of multicultural centers as their intended purpose is to facilitate learning and understanding. Adams (1997) posited that diversity education programs can be traced to the 1940s and were created to increase individuals' exposure to people of difference and to create a culture of understanding, respect, and improve the communication of people from different identity groups. By establishing these relationships and exposure to other cultures, there is a reduction in discrimination and prejudice in society (Watson & Reason, 2011). Grounded in critical race theory, diversity education programs facilitated learning on topics such as power and privilege as well as cultural identity knowledge, awareness, and development.

Diversity education programs included, but were not limited to the following; training programs and workshops that gives faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to acquire the skills and knowledge of cultural competence, diversity awareness, and cross-cultural communication; and safe zone programs that create a culture of allies to the LGBTQ community. In addition, multicultural centers offered conferences and weekend-long retreats focused on issues diversity and social justice; and, facilitate intergroup dialogues that allow students from all backgrounds to discuss of issues and concerns related to diversity and cultural competence. Jerry is an assistant dean and director of his multicultural center. He was the first senior level professional that oversees diversity efforts at his institution. He discussed that they have a strong social justice framework,

We use our student ambassadors to facilitate discussions to student organizations, Greeks, and in residence halls. Our (diversity training) program that for faculty is what really brings more people to our office (Jerry, assistant dean and director at a large, public Southern institution)

Of the multicultural centers in analyzed in this study, two or more of these types of programs were through the multicultural centers. Of all the programs and services provided by the central multicultural centers models, diversity education programs made up over half of their primary responsibilities. Participants from multicultural centers with racial affinity and identity centers that report to multicultural centers stated that cultural programming and diversity education programs were equally provided through their centers, but with significant focus on cultural programming. The diversity education programs offered through the affinity centers were to promote cross-cultural interaction. However, participants expressed that those that attended the programs at the affinity centers were typically those students that they supported.

During the interviews, the professional staff responsible for these centers stated that diversity education programs were vital to the programming for majority campus. Designed to increase the knowledge, skills, and consciousness of diversity and multiculturalism, these programs were targeted to the majority campus community. Diversity education programs were vital to their mission and were singularly responsible for providing an opportunity for the majority community of the campus community to interface with their centers. When asked about these programs, participants stated that these programs have less attendance than the cultural or social programs. For those that were successful in educational programming, the success of these programs is due to the collaboration of campus partners. Community building and outreach assisted with reaching out to other faculty and units to build connections to carry out the

mission of facilitating education on diversity topics. Bailey talked about the program for training student, faculty and staff on bias and how “knowledge about bias, its effect on the campus community, how to address bias and how to best support those experiencing bias.” This program engages the entire campus on cultural, understanding and bias. According to participant Bailey, because of this program and collaboration with other units, 40% of the campus community were engaged in some form of educational programming on diverse issues. Jerry, Sanai, and Chris also discussed programs that engaged the community that were mandatory for the campus community. These programs, mandatory, increased the awareness and engagement of these programs and in turn, the participation. Participants stated that with these mandatory engagements, people would not attend these programs.

It is very hard to get people to care about issues that they do not know about or want to learn. Unfortunately, only making diversity education mandatory is the only way we can get them in the door, but once they are in they are all the better for it (Alex is an associate director at a private, Midwest institution).

Social Justice Education

A contemporary notion that many multicultural centers have begun to adopt was social justice education. Social justice refers to the full participation of all individuals to create a fair, just, and equitable society for all (L.A. Bell & Adams, 2016). In social justice education, individuals learn how to be allies, advocates, and activists for issues related to social justice and those who receive unfair treatment in society. Social justice education teaches individuals to speak for those who cannot. A critical component of social justice is understanding the relationship to others and how certain privileges within identities (i.e., race, gender, class, sexual identities) may oppress others who hold specific social identities that may be inferior (Bell,

1997). Issues related to power, oppression, and privilege are taught in social justice education, and students of social justice began to think critically about how we are treated in society and how we can treat others more justly.

Mayhew and Fernandez (2007) stated that, “increasingly, institutions are being charged with cultivating students’ commitment to issues related to social justice” (p. 55). As institutions adopt the idea of social change and social justice, multicultural centers were at the center of the conversation and are charged with facilitating social justice education to the campus community. Similar to diversity education, examples of social justice education programs are dialogues, workshops, and advocacy training. Safe zone programs that teach individuals to be allies and advocates for LGBT individuals have a social justice focus as well as other ally training for international students and veterans. Social justice education has a direct correlation to the goal of CRT, utilizing the counterstories of historically marginalized communities to educate those of privilege of the systems of racism and disfranchisement.

All the participants in this study discussed implementing social justice education into their programs, few discussed combining cultural awareness with social justice. This is a preferred approach to developing competencies in areas of diversity before teaching social justice (Patton, 2006a). Some educators believe that this is the best approach as these two elements, diversity and social justice, cannot be exclusive of the other (Pope et al., 2004). By forming an understanding of others, individuals could better advocate for their needs in society. The participants in this study also discussed that social justice education was a better method for reaching the majority campus. Rather than focusing on specific identities, like many diversity and multicultural education programs, the focus was on various issues in society. Social justice education also seemed to eliminate some barriers that some within the majority community have

in attended multicultural centers' programs. People were more likely to attend events and were more comfortable discussing various topics of concern, than diversity programs that pointed to race or privilege.

Although all participants suggested that a social justice framework is implemented through their programs, few offered insights as to how it is integrated. Of those that did offer examples, most were from central multicultural centers that stated various components and values that aligned with a social justice framework. In addition, general brochures and website information of central multicultural centers demonstrated a social justice framework.

Student Success and Academic Advising.

One of the foundational services of cultural centers were academic programs (Patton, 2010). When cultural centers were first created, their main objectives were to provide the academic and social support needed to African American students that were not acclimated to the rigors of higher education and the academic and social isolation that comes from attending predominantly White institutions (Patton, 2010). Academic services provided by cultural centers included academic advising; tutoring programs in math, science, or English writing courses; study skills workshops; and credit-bearing courses taught by faculty specifically for historically marginalized students (Stewart & Bridges, 2011).

Participants indicated that student success programs were still a component to the work to support historically marginalized communities, but not at the same level at their inception. The CAS standards suggested that multicultural programs that supported historically marginalized identities should assist increasing a students' educational goals, students' progression, and timely graduation rates. Four multicultural centers in this study offered summer bridge programs or pre-enrollment programs, 4 to 6-week programs that offer residential

housing, placement testing, and preparatory classroom instruction, study skills and college writing. Other programs offered included peer mentoring or tutoring programs that paired students with upperclassmen by major to assist first-year students in their introductory courses. Twelve out of the 15 participants indicated that they offered peer-mentoring program that also assisted students in developing the cultural and social support needed to ensure students are not isolated and create a sense of belonging for students. Three participants indicated that they offered programs that introduced faculty mentors to students that share the same racial or gender identities.

When retention is down in a specific demographic, they look to us to increase the number of student success programs we offer. . . Three years ago, we added our Black Male Engagement program because the matriculation rates of Black males were extremely low. However, we did not get any more resources or additional staff to run the program. Although the program is supposed to be about student success, we have focused on providing a space for Black Men to engage with one another and build a sense of community. I don't believe it has increased graduation rates overall, but it has increased retention of those involved. (Joe, associate director at a public Midwest institution)

Traditional academic advising or student success programs were not offered through the centers analyzed in the study. Although these centers did not offer it, often times they are asked or required to provide this service by other faculty and or upper administrators. Participants indicated that faculty collaboration or building relationships with academic advising centers assist in providing this service. The majority of the first-year peer mentoring programs in this study offered some form of academic prep, supplemental instructions, or tutoring programs.

However, they do not go beyond first-year programming and very seldom assisted students once they were in major courses.

We are asked by our students to assist with academic advising all the time. Beyond their first year, they often have trouble with academic advising and they have built a rapport with our professional staff and the faculty that assist us. However, we do not have the resources to go beyond the first year. (Michelle, director at a Southern, public institution)

Access, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Advocating for resources and addressing issues of access and equity is one component. Coded as diversity and access, this component suggested that multicultural centers should engage in assessing the campus climate and maintained educational and work environments that are welcoming, accessible, inclusive, equitable, and free from bias or harassment. Although all participants agreed they had some place in advocating for resourcing and assisting the campus climate, it was difficult because of their placement and position in the university.

It is important to assess the climate of the university to understand the pulse of the campus environment and the needs of the students. A campus climate survey assesses the pulse of the racial and diverse environment, identifies what resources were needed for historically marginalized identities, and determines how effective the information is on bias, discrimination, and harassment. Of the 15 participants, only five of those interviewed indicated that they took part in administering or analyzing the campus climate surveys. Three participants Brian, Chris, and Paula indicated that their campuses had not administered a campus climate survey in several years.

The interview questions did not offer a response or lead to information regarding their ability to respond or create policies and procedures that assisted in increasing equity and access. However, throughout the interview, participants discussed frustrations with their placement in creating policies and responding to bias, discrimination, and harassment on campus. Of those centers that housed in the division of student affairs, 12 of participants reported to a senior-level official including a dean of students, associate dean of students, or vice president of student affairs including the five interviewed for this study. Those with senior-level administrators that oversaw multicultural centers discussed being part of the conversation and could propose policies that affect marginalized students but recognize that their expertise is rarely sought in these matters. The other participants in this study, three reported to a senior-level position that oversees diversity efforts within the university such as a vice president, vice chancellor, or associate provost of diversity were housed in either academic affairs or diversity affairs within student affairs at their institutions. However, all of this participants expressed that they rarely are consulted in programs and policies that increased or impacted equity, accessed, and inclusion programs at their institutions.

They only seek us out when there are campus issues of bias or a hate crime. This past year we had a major racial incident and it was the first time that we were asked to facilitate programs for the campus community (Alex, an associate director at a private, Midwest institution)

Of the participants who reported to a senior-level person in charge of diversity at the university, reported that they felt that they had a higher placement within the hierarchy of the university and a greater emphasis in the overall campus climate for historically marginalized communities. Multicultural centers had the opportunity to have a physical space for the

multicultural centers, an increase of resources including discretionary budgets for programming, and additional professional staff. These participants felt that by reporting to a senior-level position for diversity gave them significant influence in the campus environment and that the institution had a greater sense of commitment to diversity.

Human Resources and Organizational Structure

Participants described their institutional placement, reporting lines, and professional staff. Institutional placement referred to the division in which centers are housed and reporting lines refer to the professional staff that is responsible for the center within that division. Of the 15 participants, eight participants identified their multicultural center as a central unit at their institutions responsible for diversity and inclusion programs. A central multicultural center model is equally responsible for supporting historically marginalized identities and educating the majority community of diversity and social justice issues. Of these centers, six of these began as multicultural centers between 1992 and 2000. Two of these began as either Black Cultural Center and were altered to meet the growing diverse population of the campus between 1993 and 2003 due to limited resources or the need to serve a broader demographic of marginalized students within the university.

Of the centers analyzed in this study, four participants reported their central multicultural centers supported all historically marginalized identities including race, gender, and sexual identities. Although they were responsible for all, they generally focused on the racial or ethnic identities on campus. “The only programs we have that focus on other identities is National Coming Out day, Safe Zone Training for staff, and International Women’s Day. We also supported the LGBTQ student organization and a few women’s organizations (Joe, associate

director.)” All participants expressed that a large part of this is due to “lack of staff” and “financial resources.” In addition, participants also expressed lack of interest.

We have tried to promote events that solely focus on these issues, but unless they only ones that are successful are those that focus on the intersection of race and gender or race and sexuality. Either way, people feel that they are not represented through some of the programs and services that we offer (Issa, associate dean and director)

Seven of the participants identified their organizational model as the affinity model, with multiple affinity centers or racial/ethnic centers that provided services to historically marginalized identities that reported to either a senior-level administrator or a director of a multicultural center. Overwhelming, all of these affinity centers included Black cultural centers, but also centers for Hispanic/Chicana centers, Asian American, International and woman and LGBTQ+ centers. This multicultural center also supported historically marginalized identities but also provided educational programs and services for the majority community. Six of these participants worked in large public institutions where affinity centers predated the multicultural centers by decades from 1968 to 1984.

The multicultural centers that are structured with affinity centers were either one or multiple racial or identity-based centers that report up to or work collaboratively with the multicultural center and all had varying reasons for doing so, including student resistance, historical prevalence, or the needs of the campus community. Jerry stated that at their public institution, they had a Black Cultural center that has a university endowment and separate government structures and university resources that allowed the cultural center to function. This affinity center is a stand-alone cultural center reported to the director of the multicultural center.

Those participants who stated student resistances or historical occurrences as reasons that these cultural centers remain, also stated the importance of the keeping the affinity center to the history of the campus or the students that they serve. Due to the history of the centers' inception, students supported by these centers still felt that there were issues surrounding isolation and support within the university. Jerry discussed an incident when it was announced that the race-based cultural center would be eliminated and professional staff would fall under the multicultural center. Student protests and petitions ensued. The participants described that students felt frustrated with university administrators and that an all-encompassing multicultural center could not assist in their needs as students of specific racial identities. The racial-based affinity center remained and still had a prominent place on campus. For many of these multicultural centers with this model, the cultural centers and identity center focus solely on the advocating and supporting those historically marginalized communities while the multicultural center focuses on educating the broader campus community. Chris described some issues with territorial and competition concerns.

The cultural centers fight for visibility and resources through the multicultural center. Even though, the cultural centers are all funded equally they all feel as if they deserve more than the other (Chris, associate dean for diversity).

Mostly demonstrated in this model were the epistemological foundation of structuration theory as the duality of structure of these models is constrained by the preexisting model of these centers. The difficulties were explored in conceptual framework analysis, but those who have this model find it difficult balancing the old organizational structure with the demands of the new structure of the centers. Participants described misconceptions of the center in which majority White communities see the multicultural center as solely for marginalized identities.

We try to dispel some of the negative remarks about our office because it is complete opposite of what we are trying to accomplish. The scope of most of our programs are geared toward intercultural dialogue, changing the campus climate, and social change of our community. But, because we have a visible and active Black community through the Black Cultural Center, we have an identity crisis within in the institution no matter how many times we speak to our other programs and services (Alex, associate director)

Participants indicated the composition of professional staff including how many full-time professional staff, graduate assistants or paraprofessionals, and student workers. Of the 15 participants, the only commonality was that all had a full-time director. Eight of the participants indicated having two to eight assistant directors and coordinators as full-time staff. Five participants indicated having only one other professional staff and an administrative office assistant; two participants indicated being the only full-time professional with two or more graduate assistants and student works. All 15 participants also identified students as either staff that were either paid or a volunteer role. The number of student leaders that work in these centers ranged from two to 20. Brian, a multicultural center director at a northeast, public institution said, because there were only two professional staff, they relied on student assistants to plan and implement programs for the historically marginalized community including the cultural heritage celebrations, dialogue engagement, and socials programming.

Students are vital to our office because they serve as ambassadors to our office and help us connect to students that we cannot reach. They are responsible for facilitating and implementing various aspects of cultural programs, educational workshops, and leadership development opportunities throughout the school year (Joe, associate director).

Additionally, multicultural centers' professional staff are sought as experts in the area of diversity and social justice. Under *Human Resources*, the CAS standard suggest that all staff members be committed to diversity and social justice and knowledgeable about cultural identities and identity development. As multicultural centers support multiple historically marginalized identities, the professional staff is presumed experts on the lived experiences of historically marginalized identities. The professional staff is often self-taught and left on their own to stay current with new research, language, identity development, best practices, and additional tools and programs to facilitate training for skill development surrounding diversity and social justice (Almandez & Lee, 2011). There are cultural and ethnic studies academic programs, however professionals that work in multicultural centers hold advanced degrees in higher education or educational leadership.

There are not many learning opportunities about racial and gender identities. Many of the opportunities out there are not supported by our professional development budgets and there are few conferences that speak to our experiences. We have to lean on each other and ask for help from other multicultural centers on resources and training opportunities (Sanai, multicultural center director)

Multicultural professional staff are often sought to advocate and support historically marginalized identities. Although professional staff might be seen as experts, often their issues come from the students they serve.

I'm a Latino male and I oversee the Black male initiative. I do okay, but it took a very long time for them to trust me and believe that I hear and understand their experiences. But there are still times when it is hard to discuss certain topics without feeling like I am the outsider and cannot understand what they are feeling. After the police shootings, we

had a discussion about the police and issues with the Black community. I was listening to the conversation and wanted to share my empathy and tell them that I understand, but some of them left feeling so disgusted with me for even being part of the conversation. I wish we had more Black males in our department to better assist me because sometimes the caucus space and sharing experiences with others that look like you is more important than someone who empathizes with the situation (Joe, multicultural center associate director.)

Participants indicated they felt that they cannot speak for all marginalized identities that they support. In addition, some felt they could not be an expert or reach the students they support because they did not share common identities.

Of all the participants interviewed, only one identified as a White. Participants also described their professional staff as the intersection of multiple historically marginalized identities such a Black female, Latinx non-gender binary, or White gay male. The concern is that because staff do not possess an identity of a specific identity, the students that they are to serve felt that they cannot assist because they do not understand their lived experiences within the institution. For example, a White person cannot tell a Black and Hispanic student how to feel about racism when they encounter those experiences. A heterosexual, cisgender female cannot understand the lived experiences of a Trans male or female. Professional staff can only empathize, research, and listen for understanding. For some students, empathy is not enough to provide support. Additionally, because professional staff within multicultural centers do not represent the diversity of the college community, it is often difficult to reach those students that do not share in those identities. Combined, these issues hinder the staff from reaching their intended audiences for programming.

I do not identify with the LGBT community; however, I provided safe zone trainings and programs as an ally. I also advise Spectrum, which is our LGBT student organization. I know we have a relatively thriving LGBT community and we offer many programs students ask for or I think are interesting, we have very low attendance at these events. At the end of last year, I went around and did focus groups to see why students were not coming; many of the students said that there were not enough people in our office of the community and they were scared of being outed or discriminated against at these events. I started doing all of our student programs this year through the student organization and I have seen an increase in attendance (Michelle, multicultural center director at a Southeast, public institution).

Professional staff must also hold an earned graduate or professional degree in a field relevant to their position (CAS Standards, 2015). Of the 15 participants in the students, seven participants held terminal degrees in higher education administration or organizational leadership, one held a terminal degree in cultural studies, and two participants were in doctorate programs for educational leadership. The rest of the participants held master's degrees in higher education. The interview questions did not offer a response or lead to information regarding reporting lines. However, throughout the interview reporting lines became an emerging theme. Of the participants who reported to a senior-level person in charge of diversity at the university, reported that they felt that they had a higher placement within the hierarchy of the university and a greater emphasis in the overall campus climate for historically marginalized communities. Multicultural centers have the opportunity to have a physical space for the multicultural centers, an increase of resources including discretionary budgets for programming, and additional professional staff. These participants felt that reporting to a senior-level administrator for

diversity gave them significant influence in the campus environment and that the institution have a greater sense of commitment to diversity.

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities for multicultural centers should be appropriate spaces that are equipped to carry out the mission of the unit (CAS Standards, 2015). Participants were asked about their physical spaces and where they were located. Seven participants that were earlier identified as multicultural centers with affinity centers reporting to them, described their facilities as being centrally located in campus student union buildings and their affinity centers located on another side of campus in stand-alone buildings or houses. Two of these participants described their affinity center facilities being located in residence halls. Three of the participants described their affinity centers in stand-alone facilities predated preceding the physical space or inception of the multicultural center office with plans to refurbish or build upon the centers.

Our multicultural center space is really just a suite in our student union -my office, the communications director, and the office assistant and we have a small conference room. Most of our programs and services our carried out in the union or in the cultural centers. Our cultural centers are different in size, but they are all located on a street on the south side of campus. They have study spaces, multi-purpose programming spaces, meetings rooms and some have classroom space (Jerry, associate dean/multicultural center director.)

Participants indicated that the centers' facilities were sincerely a home away from home for historically marginalized students. The facilities are outfitted with classroom spaces, study spaces, lounges with media televisions and computers, multi-purpose programming spaces, and some have libraries and cultural art centers housed in their units.

Students do not leave. Our lounge spaces have student organization meetings until the building closes at midnight. Our building is important to the students because they often times have no place else to go on campus. The multicultural Greek organizations do not have spaces on campus so they use our space to meet and hold programs (Bryan, director).

Participants that indicated that they have central multicultural centers locations, the facilities and utilization varied. Three participants indicated that their space was centrally located in the campus student union. However, two of these centers were located in either a basement or top floor of the student union out of the way of foot traffic of students and prospective students. The other centers were located in other buildings on campus such as residence halls and academic buildings. Their spaces also had varied spaces inside their facilities but all were determined to hold office space and either lounge or study space. These participants discuss the location of their space impeded on the success of their center. They did not have enough or adequate space to hold programs and services that were critical to the mission. Kelly is a director at a Midwest, public institution described the challenges that they had in their space.

We don't have enough space to hold our programs. We have to reserve rooms in other parts of campus and are charged for using them because we do not have space in our own facilities. . . And because spaces are limited on campus, they are never in the same place. Although we have a space, we don't have a central location for programs and services, which hurts us when people were trying to find us.

Participants discussed the visibility of their spaces and facilities. Those that are centrally located in student unions or centrally located buildings and houses discussed how readily

accessible they were to the campus community and because they were open and centrally located, students would stop in to explore what the offices or centers had to offer.

Currently they are building a new, multimillion-dollar multicultural center in the center of campus. After an external review, it was found that the placement of the center's physical space obstructed student's access and ability to visit the center between classes (Jerry, assistant dean and director.)

For those that were not centrally located, participants indicated that impeded on participation and knowledge about the center and services offered. Participants also indicated they often heard many people did not know of their existence and attributed this to their location on campus.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

Multicultural centers across the entire sample, over time, have derived from the similar circumstances or need to serve the campus community. All the multicultural centers were found to share similar mission statement, programs, and services provided and opposition from campus communities. In addition, participants also shared that these multicultural centers do not serve the campus community in the manner as stated in their current missions and in fact, created exclusionary spaces instead of the inclusive space that multicultural centers set out to establish. These statements seem to align with findings from other studies of cultural centers and multicultural services (Patton, 2010; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Through the analysis of multicultural centers, there were other findings worth noting including commonalities through center programs and services, challenges in reaching target audiences stated in the mission statement, and organizational resources and facilities. These findings are directly related to the research question posed in the study.

Commonalities and Differences across Center Types

The multicultural centers analyzed in this study varied by type of institution (public or private), size, location, and model. For this study, two different models emerged – the central multicultural center and affinity model in which the multicultural center with various racial or identity affinity centers aligned report to or collaborate with the multicultural centers. This research was to examine how multicultural centers served the marginalized communities while also educating the majority campus community. The findings across the sample of multicultural centers stated similar missions to serve both communities; however, the important distinction presented in the findings was how center types served this purpose.

Central multicultural centers offered a comprehensive list of programs and services that clearly stated how these programs supported their mission and purpose. Of the multicultural centers analyzed with this model, these multicultural centers supported multiple marginalized identity groups including race, gender, and sexual identities and had more social justice focus advocating for marginalized communities beyond the campus, but also in their surrounding communities. With a social justice focus, these centers developed programs that advocate and create a culture of support for students, utilizing other departments and academic units within the university. They also developed programs, separate from the support services that facilitate education on cross-cultural engagement, facilitate training on advocacy and activism, and facilitated discussions on issues of social justice rather than cultural awareness. Stewart and Bridges (2011) posited that this is customary for multicultural centers to reinvent themselves and moved beyond the initial intended purpose of these centers to demonstrate that these centers are for the campus community rather than singular marginalized communities that they first supported. Although social justice was a focus at these multicultural centers at both, public and

private institutions, public institutions seem to have more training and opportunities to develop skills on cross-communications, ally programs, and workshops related to social justice including privilege and oppression.

Multicultural centers that have affinity centers aligned or reporting to them, share in the work of supporting marginalized identities and providing educational opportunities on diverse issues. However, the affinity centers, specifically one with long-standing histories and traditions in the community, work to support those racial identities and provide a safe place to gather and explore identity development. The multicultural centers focus on engaging diversity education, civic engagement, and fostering the leadership skills that assist in intercultural interaction and cultural engagement. Centers that have this model are less focused on social justice education, but more on creating unique opportunities to engage in diversity and cultural interactions. These centers are also found to focus more on the racial historically marginalized identities rather than other identities such as gender and sexual identities. Although this model shares in the work, the affinity centers are indicted to provide exclusionary spaces on campus. The affinity centers also struggle with communication and funding resources on campus. Participants interviewed stated the cultural centers play a vital role in creating a culture of support for marginalized student communities. While the multicultural centers support historically marginalized students, participants stated that students often credit the cultural centers in playing a role in their college experience separate from the cultural centers. Therefore, with multiple arms of the center, these participants felt that they were more successful in carrying out the work stated in their mission. While the multicultural centers may not support the student identities, it does serve the campus community with education and academic programs. Professional staff under the multicultural centers have the opportunity to focus on the specific audience and target programs that will reach

a larger population of students on campus. Participants also noted similarly that target audience reached is a success and a challenge.

Target Audiences

The study found that multicultural centers utilize various methods of reaching the target audiences and have varying degrees of success in reaching their mission, goals, and purpose within their institutional structure. Although the centers found success in creating spacing and programs for historically marginalized communities, the centers all expressed difficulties reaching the majority White community. One quote that stuck with me came from Issa, who discussed her professional career in higher education is mostly in diversity and advocating for diversity and social justice education. Issa said, “You cannot make people care about diversity,” meaning while we offer diversity and want the community to understand why learning about issues of social justice, individuals will not just attend if it is not important to them or something of interest. Although most participants expressed some success in reaching the majority audience with diversity education programs, overall participants did not believe they reached more than 30 % of this audience. Those who have had some success attribute it to the collaboration of faculty and staff as well as mandatory programs offered to students. Practitioners call this the community building and outreach model, a model that focuses on creating unique relationships to increase a center’s audience, visibility, and outreach (Jenkins, 2012). Without these programs, multicultural centers do not reach their mission in educating the majority community. However, multicultural centers felt that they are successful because they do provide these opportunities even if students do not attend.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS SUMMARY

The variables of the CAS standards were chosen to illustrate the various components of multicultural centers that established their work in their dual purpose, which directly correlates with the research question. I chose the CAS standards as the conceptual framework for this study because, as a practitioner, I am continuously pointed to these standards as a measure of success and practice. I wanted to not only demonstrated the strength of these centers through this framework, but also some limitations and possible archaic notions that might exist in these standards as it relates to multicultural programs and services. For example, the study of the analysis showed that programs and services still had services that are part of multicultural centers such as academic advising but the professionals in this study explained that services such as these have long been moved to other departments such as academic advising, career centers, and student success units. The two theories that were used as epistemological foundations were predetermined to demonstrate how the units' position is situated and how the programs are developed and implemented. This section will show the results of the two theories utilized in multicultural centers – organizational theory and critical race theory.

Organizational Theory

Structuration theory also describes a phenomenon called *duality of structure* in which the people who are activity engaged in the creation of the structure are also constrained by the previous construction of the structure (Bess & Dee, 2009). Multicultural centers have a long history of supporting and advocating for marginalized students, specifically racial minorities. However, as universities evolved, multicultural cultural centers served a broader range of other marginalized social identities as well as providing education for the university community. Those involved in multicultural centers are actively engaged in establishing a structure that fits

the difference in purpose and student populations. However, multicultural centers are constrained by the previous structure in which centers only supported racial minority students rather than the dual function of also educating the majority community. Their current structure was constrained by the behaviors, misconceptions, and institutional memory. Organizational behaviors contributed to the concept in which programs and services that are supported by the institution heavily involved one social identity rather than all that these centers encompass. While identifying the organizational structure of the multicultural centers, the duality of the structure emerged from research and the advantages and disadvantages of the social systems.

There is not a universal model for multicultural centers, however two models emerged from the research – (a) a central multicultural center model where all programs, support, and services are situated in one unit, and (b) an affinity model in which a multicultural center operates in collaboration with or aligned with various racial and identity cultural centers. Institutional placement refers to the strategic placement in which the multicultural center reports, the physical space and the visual representation of the multicultural center within the university structure.

Of the 15 participants' interviews, 12 indicated that they were housed under a student affairs unit with other units that had direct interactions with students on a regular basis.

I see being a part of student affairs as a benefit, because we are able to collaborate with other departments that work with students. If I were to give any concerns about it, there are times we are the low in priority in student affairs because we are seen as “the black office” and we don't have anything to offer with the rest of the students. We are also funded less than other departments with a larger audience. We have to really demonstrate

a need and be visible in the community to get more funding and advocate for our space in student affairs (Brittney, associate dean for diversity).

Some participants indicated it was a benefit and a challenge to be a member of student affairs.

We are housed within student affairs and report to the associate dean that works with other auxiliary services that supports other student-centered offices. I think it helps us to collaborate with other offices with similar challenges as ours communicating with students and finding sponsorship for programs. However, housing in student affairs, does not help us with faculty in academic affairs. We have three diversity courses that we teach in the fall and spring semester and we cannot get faculty to see us as legitimate courses to get students to sign up. . . we have in charge of various diversity and training for faculty and cannot reach them and I think it is because we are in student affairs (Chris, associate dean).

There were three multicultural centers that indicated they were housed in both the divisions of academic affairs and student affairs, reporting to senior-level positions including the vice president of diversity or senior vice-provost/dean of diversity and inclusions within academic affairs. The institutional placement of the multicultural center is a visual representation of the commitment to the diversity and social justice efforts of the multicultural center. The implication of the multicultural center's placement demonstrates the importance of the initiatives and programs these centers provide.

The physical location of the space is integral to how the unit is situated within the institution. If the physical location of the office or center is not centrally located, it reinforces that the office is further marginalizing and is not vital to the university's mission. Paula is at a

small, Southern public institution and has been the director of her multicultural center for five years. She discussed the frustration of the location of her center and issues with the space:

We are in the basement. There is no lighting, the lounge leaks all the time and it takes days, sometimes weeks for them to come in and fix it. Our students do not complain and they still call this place home, but I am embarrassed. And, we are not part of any campus tour, located on any map, and we are very hard to find. If we do not go out and invite people to our space, no one will know that we exist.

A central campus location connected to the students, faculty, and staff signifies the multicultural center's importance and access; the visibility of the location increases the multicultural centers. The placement within the reporting structures and the division are also of importance. Situating the multicultural center in an office in which it can maximize its reach to the campus community is integral to its success. Consider the implications of one participant's account of the placement of their center. There is no mention of the center during orientation, in campus tours, or in faculty classrooms. There is limited collaboration with offices or other departments; therefore, the support of the center's initiatives to the campus community is limited. Multicultural centers should be situated within the division that maximizes their reach on colleges. Because university structures differ from institution to institution, this could be academic affairs or student affairs. However, greater access to faculty and senior-level administrators will allow further collaboration and maximize the reach of multicultural centers on campus.

Structuration not only involves the organizational structure but the rules of the group members that design and sustain a social system. The rules in this case are the preconceived assumptions, dominant group behavior, and attitudes that contributed to the conception of

multicultural centers. The elimination of the centers, its programming, and services throughout institutional programs and communication are in part because those centers were traditionally absent from the conversation. Those who have found methods to establish themselves within the larger community have not changed the structure, but have worked with the constraints to be visible.

Critical Race Theory

There are five tenants to central to critical race theory – (a) inherent race and racism, (b) dominant group culture ideology, (c) privilege and oppression (d) counter-storytelling; and (e) the critique of liberalism (Decuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1998; McCoy, 2006). CRT examines the role race and racism play in society. At its core, CRT contend that race and racism is so ingrained in society that it is hard to pinpoint and dismantle (Bell, 1992; Russell 1993; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Landsons-Billings, 1999; Howard-Hamilton et. al, 2007).

When applying critical race theory, the social justice framework emerged as the consistent theme. Methods to raise cultural consciousness of disadvantage groups, are exposure to microaggression, counter stories of disadvantage groups and counterspaces (Landsons-Billings, 1999; Hamilton et. al, 2007). The idea of a social justice framework is to raise awareness of historically marginalized communities and those that have been disenfranchised to create social change, including dismantling systems of oppression and racism. Historically, programs that focus on multiculturalism and diversity were intended to counter the dominant programming of Whiteness in higher education (Delgado, 2000). There is a high representation of White students disproportionately to Black students at predominantly White institutions. College traditions, social networks, and values and interests follow the old paridigm in which colleges and universities were founded, for the education and social upheaval for the dominant

White, male culture (Brown et. al, 2003). Traditional multicultural and diversity programs were developed to combat the dominant culture. However, a social justice framework is concerned with societal issues and concerns, not a Black-White binary that is in many of the multicultural programs.

CRT is concerned with the “interest convergence” (Bell, 1987) which is the process of exposing the systems of privilege and the White dominant structure and works toward dismantling racism, sexism, and poverty, systems that overwhelmingly impact people of color. Although, CRT is primarily a theory that involves race, the intersectionality of other marginalized identities paired with race impacts people of color more as it doubles the systems of oppressions these individuals encounter. By providing a social justice framework, to programming you are educating the dominant White culture on the societal issues that affect these identities and not the racial, gender, and other identities to dismantle the system and not the people (Landsing-Billing, 2000; Patton, 2006a).

Counterstorytelling, an important tenant of CRT, gives voice to the experiences of the subordinate culture that are impacted by these systems. It can also help practitioners understand and analyze the current campus racial climate for many students. By providing the narratives, practitioners also can offer programs and service that may counteract the negative experience of the dominant culture (Mergervin, 2010). Established academic and social spaces for disadvantaged groups allow them to find other people that look like them and a place that is hospitable and gives a sense of belonging.

Multicultural centers indicated that they used critical race theory to guide many of their cultural awareness and social justice programming. Although none of the participants cited or referenced the CRT in their interview, the method of counter-stories and conscious raising

programs that leads to the use of CRT in this research is intricately tied to programs that discuss ally ship, dismantling racism, and privilege. Nine participants indicated that they utilize students and student ambassadors to tell the story of their office. These students use their own narrative to share their experiences within the marginalized community and get others to be involved in the unit. In addition, social justice programs that raise awareness of power and privilege, racism, and prejudice are all tenants of CRT.

CONCLUSION

Interviews were conducted of those who either worked in or oversaw multicultural centers to answer the research question presented in this research study on how multicultural centers support marginalized communities while providing educational services to the majority campus. In addition, an analysis of mission, programs, and services was also conducted utilizing the multicultural center websites and by using the CAS standards of multicultural programs and services. The study found that multicultural centers utilize various methods of reaching the target audiences and have varying degrees of success in reaching their mission, goals, and purpose within their institutional structure. Though many of the multicultural centers in this study were first established to serve specific identity groups, it is evident that all these centers studied have transformed into the contemporary multicultural centers that we have today. These multicultural centers support a number of historically marginalized communities and broaden their reach to include a broader audience to include students, faculty, and staff that identify with the majority community. However, history of these centers' creation and the issues that made that made the inception of these centers necessary have, in some part, impeded that their success and their effectiveness at their respective colleges and universities.

Kupo (2011) posited, "Systems of power, privilege, and oppression have created a need for multicultural student services on college campuses as a remedy for communities that have historically been barred from receiving primary, secondary, and higher education" (p.14). For marginalized communities, these centers are a home away from home and vital for their success in higher education, providing the academic, cultural, or social support needed. The notion of broadening the mission of the centers comes from university strategies to combat the issues that caused marginalized students to become relevant, transforming the campus community to an inclusive campus community. Researchers have argued when diversity and inclusion are embedded in the campus culture, marginalized students have an improved learning environment (Hurtado et al., 2012; D.G. Smith, 2009). Majority communities were added to the mission of contemporary multicultural centers only to ensure the campuses are creating a culture of inclusivity and equity. This can be demonstrated through the structure of the multicultural centers, programs and services, and assessments.

In this study, multicultural centers were found to have similar missions but various structures, programs and services, and target audiences. Many of the multicultural centers were added to an already established affinity cultural center or multiple identity center that was formed before the establishment of the multicultural centers. Because the same issues that drove the centers' inception were still prevalent, the centers remained, and differences in how these organizations are structured are so significant that there is no one model or structure found in multicultural centers.

Along with the multicultural center models, programs and services also were found to be significantly different from center to center. Multicultural centers were typically at the center of all cultural programming on campus and in charge of all the diversity education and building the

skills and knowledge surrounding diversity issues (Patton, 2010). Although there were some similarities in the programs and services offered, the programs and services mostly populated and had more interest were those that were for historically marginalized communities. Because these programs are generally populated with the those from historically marginalized communities, students from the broader community makes it difficult for multicultural centers to reach the target audience of the majority community. Some programs that multicultural centers offer also have a long-standing history of support for marginalized communities that are still part of the campus culture. For the majority community, this still may be a reason that some are still apprehensive of taking advantage of the programs and services offered. This may also explain why many on the campus do not know of the multicultural center's existence.

In conclusion, the analysis of the multicultural centers in this study has demonstrated how these centers support the historically marginalized communities and educate the majority community. While multicultural centers share similarities in mission and purpose, there were significant differences in multicultural center models and effectiveness of the reach of the target audience. The next section will explore the discussions, implications, and recommendation of multicultural centers.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will provide a summary of the study. The chapter will continue with a discussion of the results presented in Chapter 4 and its connection to chapter 2's literature review. The implications and recommendations will follow as well as future research suggested by the study. The central research question in this study was this: How do multicultural centers provide support to historically marginalized communities and facilitate multicultural education within the institution? When I began this study, I desired to examine the dual purpose and positionality of multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions because, as a practitioner, I have seen the effects of the dual structure and its impact on the communities we serve and the professionals that worked within them. There was an abundance of research on student affairs and student affairs practitioners. Additionally, one can find studies of diversity in higher education, social justice, and of various historically marginalized identities including discrimination, retention, college readiness, and student success. However, the research on the systems or the centers that do all of the above is minimum and some scholars may see the research as outdated as most of it is ten years or older.

An interesting fact about the time of this study, the research study happened during a time that there was an emergence of racism and racist acts in our country. Following a string of racially motivated hate crimes, the murders of Black men and women by the hands of the police, and a national health crisis that was overwhelmingly affecting people of color, there is a national movement happening. #BlackLivesMatter was a movement that galvanized people around the

country to demand systematic change, to address racism and the racist history of our country, and to demand better treatment for those Black and Brown in our society (Wilson, 2015).

On college campuses, students were beginning to protest and demand university systems to acknowledge the racial past of their institutions, support an increasingly diverse student body, and demand the elimination of systems of Whiteness and privilege that still effected students of color that attended predominantly White institution. In addition, asking the university to improve support of the offices and departments that support them such as multicultural centers. In 2015, out of 161 student protests on college campuses, 66 of them ask for better funding and support of multicultural centers and affinity centers at their universities or asked for the creation of one if they did not have one including the University of Alabama (Eligon & Pèrez-Peña, 2015). Following the #BlackLivesMatter movement, Black and Brown student activism called on universities to reconsider ideologies and the predominant Whiteness that overlooked their representation and existence at their respective universities.

As a Black woman and professional staff, I recognize student voices are what is changing the lives and experiences of our collective community. Black professional staff were often overlooked, paid unreasonably less than our White peers, and the systems that affect our students affects us all as a community. As director of a multicultural center, I could draw parallels of the Black Power Movement to the #BlackLivesMatter movement. The systems, environments, and student activism that led to our creation is identical to those of the Black Power movement and now leading to the resurgence of the importance of these centers. Although the current literature found on multicultural centers is very limited and most of all, out-of-date, the literature holds up during these current times. However, there is still very limited information on the spaces that were charged with supporting marginalized identities and educating the majority community and

now, work to dismantle systems of White privilege, policies and procedures that do not support historically marginalized identities.

In chapter 1, I asked the question, “Can we be all to everybody?” This study is important for adding the limited knowledge of how multicultural centers operate in this dual function, supporting historically marginalized communities and facilitating multicultural education within the institution.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Multicultural centers have evolved from being the historical singular focus of supporting historically marginalized identities to being the hub of all diversity initiatives within a campus community. Charged with shifting the campus climate, multicultural centers employ various methods to transform colleges and universities to a welcoming, inclusive environment for all. By transforming the campus environment, all within higher education institutions could feel supported, included, understood, and able to succeed. Albeit a somewhat utopian notion, this is what is being asked of multicultural centers when requesting that they empower, support, and educate the campus community on all things concerning diversity and ensure that those from historically marginalized identities succeed at their respective institutions. After analyzing the data, bracketing the findings in themes based on the selected codes, it was found that multicultural centers do fulfill their dual purpose of supporting marginalized communities and facilitating multicultural and diversity education to the majority community. However, they may differ in how they choose to carry out this mission and dual purpose based on their institutional structure, environment, and overall organizational structure. The limitations and struggles they had comes from a longstanding history of misrepresentation and archaic notions of support and diversity that cannot be changed in its current structure. Therefore, I have determined that the

rules, or in this case, the institutional memory, assumptions, and misconceptions, that constrained the duality of the structure determined the functionality and success of multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions.

I collected data from interviews, websites, and other documentation using the CAS Standards for Multicultural Programs and Services (CAS, 2015). I limited my examination to the following selective codes – mission, program, diversity and access, organizational structure and human resources, and facilities and equipment. From the analysis of the data, various themes emerged. The following section discusses those themes.

Mission and Purpose

The study of the multicultural centers developed some shared themes that multicultural centers have that demonstrated how they support historically marginalized identities and educated others on elements of diversity. In general, mission statements of individual multicultural centers answered the research question for this study. Although the verbiage differed, the mission statements of the multicultural centers demonstrated how they intended to reach every person on campus. For historically marginalized identities, multicultural centers intend to provide support services and programs to assist in students' success, sense of belonging and community, and identity development. The majority community programs to educate on diverse and cultural issues and promote cross-cultural interactions and engagement. What surfaces as integral to this mission was the target audiences that the centers attempted to reach. Multicultural centers may attempted to reach a broader target audience, however campus attitudes, misconceptions, and interest may have impeded their success.

Target Audience

The need for multicultural centers to broaden their target audiences stems from the need to diversify the campus population that utilized the services of the multicultural centers (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). When multicultural centers began to alter their mission and intended purpose, the only students that utilized their services were students from historically marginalized communities, predominantly students from racial minority identity groups. However, when multicultural centers expanded their mission to be an all-encompassing vehicle for diversity, they needed to reach the other members of the campus community and demonstrate that they were welcoming to all who want to take part in their programs. However, this did not change the perception of the center to the community. The majority community saw multicultural centers as exclusive spaces that were not welcoming for those that were from the majority community (Patton, 2010). Majority White students were uncomfortable in multicultural spaces and felt that the programs and services were not inclusive of their identity. Multicultural centers were first created to ensure students of color felt supported and welcomed on campus due to the racial tension and discrimination, and now multicultural centers are accused of the same reasons for their inceptions (Patton, 2010). When participants in this study were asked about weaknesses of the multicultural centers, some of the participants described attitudes and how those attitudes affected participation in the programs.

Participants in the study expressed that they did not reach as many people in their target audiences as they hoped. One participant expressed they believed that they only reached as little as 20% to 30% of the campus population. Others expressed concerns with the parts of the campus community that do not know of their existence. Kelly's anecdotal explanation of this

discusses campus tours and orientation programs. During students' introduction to campus life, they are inundated with information on the specific opportunities and programs that they, as students, could take part in, including emerging leaders programs, fraternity/sorority life, intramural sports, the arts, and academic research. There was little to no information given about the programs and services offered by the multicultural center. Therefore, it was a passive communication that these programs were not as important or not needed for the majority community. A student would have to seek them out to be involved and those that do often hold one or more historically marginalized identities or come from a very diverse demographic.

Alternatively, multicultural centers offered pre-orientation and orientation programs for, separate admissions events for prospective students, bridge programs, and peer-mentoring programs for first-year students, and graduation ceremonies specifically for historically marginalized identities. These programs had a long-standing history within the institutions as they support a sense of community and belonging, and assisted in the matriculation of students. Therefore, it is difficult to spread the word about the multicultural center to a broader campus community and demonstrate that multicultural centers were inclusive places for all when they are some exclusionary spaces that persist because of the structure.

Attitudes towards Mission

The campus attitudes toward multicultural centers have not changed. There were still those who believed that not only multicultural centers were only for students of color, but also they were no longer needed. Racism and oppression were still common issues that permeate society, however since the structural diversity of the university has changed, university diversity statements, no longer have overtly anti-black, discriminatory policies we no longer need to have a designated space for students. It was evident that this premise was wrong with the police

brutality and the surge in bias and hate incidents happening all over the country. As colleges and universities emulated the broader society, these attitudes continue to show up on campus (Patton a, 2010). In principle, as long as these issues persist there was a need for multicultural centers on college campuses. The contemporary multicultural center was expected to advocate for historically marginalized communities and develop programs that combat the racism on the college campus. It was also expected of multicultural centers reinforce the notions of anti-racism; facilitate learning on discrimination and harassment, and understanding of historically marginalized identities to White students. However, the reasons these centers were in existence were the same reasons that few individuals did not believe that these centers should continue on campus. Power and privilege are directly related to the ideas of internalized racism and racial subordination (Harvey, 1998). If individuals could eliminate racism and work for an equitable society, those that hold perceived power and privilege would feel as if some power is lost. Therefore, these individuals would fight to keep social systems unchanged and eliminate anything that is considered a threat to the status quo. Therefore, students who were unaware of and hold these privileges would not engage in or reject programs that will essentially dismantle their privilege.

Additionally, although multicultural centers have broadened their target audiences and missions, other historically marginalized communities and social identity groups they serve, the Black-White binary still exist. The Black-White binary referred to the notion that people of color were racially inferior to the majority White community, specific individuals who racially identify as Black (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The Black-White binary drives communities to fragment and divide campuses to separate spaces. It also serve to delegitimize the lived experiences of other historically marginalized communities as vital to the campus community,

drive student populations to competition and prevents historically marginalized communities from forming alliances and working collaboratively among diverse populations (Patton, L. D., Ranero, & Everett, 2011). Therefore, it was difficult to reach a broader, diverse audience when communities of identity groups will not come together. Students continue to work separately and in silos rather than together to fight the notions of anti-racism and discrimination on campus. Therefore, inclusivity of programs and people was challenging to pull together. However, as the universities looked to address the internal social conflicts between identity groups, multicultural centers continue their efforts by relying on cross-cultural interactions and programs. For those in the multicultural centers, the effort to eliminate social conflicts was essential to the work and without attempting to combat them, the conflicts will continue. However, the limitations that were discussed impeded on the effectiveness to bring a diverse audience to begin combating and dismantling these systems.

Programs and Services

For multicultural centers, the majority of the work was in their programming and services. Through this study, the number of programs that are developed and implemented through multicultural centers outnumber other units in their areas of student affairs 5 to 1. Brittney, indicated that through the multicultural center and the various affinity centers such as the Black, Asian, and Native American centers on her campus, there were one to three programs/events are on the calendar of events every day in the academic semester, which adds to approximately 240-400 events an academic year. This was in spite of the lack of visibility of programs and services, the center, and its students to the overall community. However, she approximated that only 30 % of the student populations attended their programs and this always made their programming and services appear unsuccessful. The lack of participation to upper

level administrators demonstrated that these program and services plays into the notion that multicultural centers are no longer needed or do not do enough to reach a target audience. Therefore leads to less funding and allocation of resources. However, administrators should look at this alternatively to see the success and limitations that constrain these centers in this argument. If an institution had a 28 to 30% racial minority demographic and the majority of students that attended multicultural centers' programs identified with a historically marginalized identity, then if 30% of the student population engaged with multicultural centers then, subjectively, you would have approximately 100 % of the population in which multicultural centers that were first intended to serve.

Programs for marginalized identities include mentoring programs, academic preparedness, leadership skills and identity development, cultural heritage celebration, socials, and cultural student support programs. In addition, the diversity programs and social justice education included workshops, trainings, dialogues, cross-cultural interactions, social and civic engagement events, and more. The CAS standards for multicultural student and services provided a detailed account of all the various types of programs and services that should be offered by multicultural centers including student outcomes, learning, and assessment. However, CAS did not take into account the number of programs, students, and allocated resources that it will take to implement these programs, and that multicultural centers were not equipped the same. For areas with a singular focus, the needs and components were straightforward and did not have two focus areas to carry out. In addition, due to the changes in the organizational structure, other departments that could support historically marginalized students. The number of resources and professional staff were general to a unit within student affairs, but the number of resources for the number of programs was not equitable.

Resources refer to professional staff, physical space, finances or budget. Participants did not share the same limitations of resources, however all named one or all of them as resource restrictions. The majority of the participants did discuss that while they were able to produce amazing results with limited resources, they were being underfunded for programs and services that they were required to provide. Financial budgeting models differ from institutional type and how funds were disseminated within an institution. Additional funding, in general, goes to those units that were of most importance to the strategic initiatives of the university or deemed by the participation and the amount of students served. At public institutions, where state legislative budgets are declining, and less money goes into higher education, universities consistently were asked to do more with less. This includes less professional staff, administrative resources, and programming (McCoy, 2011). At private institutions, some institutions had significantly larger budgets for programming, but the limited professional staff was an issue. However, multicultural centers at both public and private institutions explained that they received less funding than those within their unit, specifically those that were situated within student affairs (Ferguson & Thomas-Rashid, 2011).

Social Justice v. Diversity Education

When multicultural centers were first established, the goal of the cultural programming aspect was to celebrate and embrace the cultural identities of historically marginalized identities, specifically of Black students. This includes the heritage and traditions of the African American and African Diaspora. When the student representation of other historically marginalized identities increased such as Asian or Asian American, Native American Indian, or Hispanic or Latin/x, the cultural paradigm shifted and the university began to establish multiple initiatives that sought to offer a multicultural focus and share in the celebration of other racial historically

marginalized identities (Chang, 2005). This introduced the heritage month celebrations (i.e., Hispanic heritage month, Native American, Black history month) so that all cultural minorities in the current model were affirmed and celebrated.

Diversity education involves learning about different identities and cultures, and teaching others to foster an environment where all identities were affirmed, valued, and part of an inclusive community (Patton, 2006). This includes cultural awareness programs, but also cross-cultural dialogues, engagements, and workshops on cross-cultural communication, and understanding and acceptance. The idea of inclusion comes from “including” everyone of diverse backgrounds and the role of diversity education is to learn from peers of different cultures and different societal perspectives to change others’ ideas of the social landscape in which they live. White students that have had little to no cross-cultural engagement are encouraged to cross-cultural interactions, immersion and discourse. However, the struggle with diversity education is that it is rooted in the Black-White binary that once dominated the social discourse and the cultural dynamics of higher education. White students, currently enrolled in colleges, were bringing with them both new and old perspectives of how they conceptualize diversity (DiMaria, 2007). “Diversity awareness training is a popular type of diversity training initiative. It is often met with confusion, disorder, approval, reverence, bewilderment and even hostility” (Cavaleros, Van Vuuren, & Viser, 2002, p.51). Often times these programs were to address the Black-White binary and the racism that was left behind by previous generations and old societal norms. This was not to minimize the notion of racism still persists in our society, but it did not address the cultural shift of other cultures and oppression of other marginalized identities.

There is a shift in multicultural centers to situate diversity education into social justice framework to eliminate the Black-White binary. This addresses the societal issues and concerns that touch on all marginalized identities including gender, LGBTQ, socioeconomic, and ability. A critical component of social justice was understanding the relationship to others and how certain privileges within identities (i.e., race, gender, class, sexual identities) may oppress others who hold specific social identities that may be inferior (Bell, 1997). Issues related to power, oppression, and privilege are taught in social justice education, and students of social justice began to think critically about how we are treated in society and how we can treat others more justly. A social justice framework was grounded by CRT as the contexts was shaped by dismantling the social, structural, and institutional policies that may oppress those and give privileges to others. Situating Whiteness or the majority college community in this framework was not to specifically address race, but equity and the systems that are established based on the dominant culture in which society was established. Therefore, it appeals to all students that have an interest in understanding and creating social change in the community.

The struggle that multicultural centers had with diversity education versus social justice lies with the conversation of inclusion vs. equity and the duality of structure and purpose these centers. Multicultural centers were to assist in growing and maintaining a structurally diverse community, in which everyone was included, but the ideals of equity that were part of the social justice framework is not part of the conversation of the institution. Higher education institutions were more concerned with structural diversity and the notion of an inclusive environment, which was a great asset to the university. Therefore, the ideas of diversity education and cultural awareness takes precedent over a social justice framework that dismantles the systems of privilege and oppression. Therefore, it was harder for some multicultural centers to include a

social justice framework in their educational curriculum that still count on multicultural centers to support and maintain an inclusive environment.

Diversity and Access

Advocating for resources and addressing issues of access and equity was one component of the CAS standards that also deals with the notion of social justice framework. Diversity and Access, suggest that because multicultural centers advocates and supports historically marginalized identities, professionals within the center should be at the forefront of creating policies and addressing systems of inequity within the college. However, the ability to make change as a center and their professionals are less defined for some Multicultural Centers because of the place in the organizational structure and the institutional rules defined by the structure. While multicultural centers were intended to ensure that are all students of marginalized identities were given adequate support and treated fairly and equitably within the institutional environment, there were limitations in the scope they can accomplish if they were solely looked upon to provide services to these groups. Moreover, they were the only unit that is looked upon to provide services to these identities and not the institution as a whole. Also, for those that were exclusively directors of multicultural centers they rarely have a seat at the table to provide expertise on policies and systems that might discriminate or oppress marginalized identities.

Bryan is a director at a multicultural center that discussed an incident in which they were thrust into the university spotlight the summer of many of the police shooting of unarmed black men, one specifically in the city in which they were located in the northeast. He was asked to provide council to administrators and university faculty on how to discuss the issues in the classroom and shed some light on the student experiences with local and university police

officers. However, when it was time to discuss how they were to address these issues within the institution, create policies and training with university police, his voice was completely absent from the conversation. As a director of a multicultural center, I also have dealt with this issue. The CAS standards call for multicultural centers to be forefront in the conversation of diversity, equity and access but often times they were not in a position to do so. Those that either report to a vice president of diversity or chief diversity officers or were have dual role as also a director were positioned better to address equity at an institutional level. The data analyzed painted a picture of multicultural centers professionals and their range of responsibilities within the institution. Participants felt the organization of the structure does not give them the level of agency to use their voice and expertise in areas of diversity and access. While they were deemed experts they rarely have a *seat at the table* to make a positive impact on the policies and procedures that deal with diversity and equity at the institution. However the CAS standards suggest that is an integral component to these centers.

Organizational Structure

From the analysis of multicultural centers, when describing the placement of multicultural centers within the university structure, hierarchal placement became a key component to those who felt their centers reached their intended goals and purpose. When a multicultural center was situated with academic affairs, it may have access to various cultural studies programs, faculty, and academic resources for historically marginalized identities, but not to the student population. Placement within an institutional unit could maximize reach to the campus community, additional staff and budgetary resources, and access to senior-level administrators. Multicultural centers also benefit from reporting to a top, senior-level

administrator. A senior-level administrator can advocate on behalf of the multicultural center in avenues that were not readily available for a director within a department.

Hierarchical placement within the university could also reinforce an institution's commitment to diversity initiatives (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). In the research, the role of the chief diversity officer or senior-level administrator indicated beneficial visibility in the success of the multicultural center. A senior-level administrator for diversity that worked collaboratively with a multicultural center could place the needs of historically marginalized identities at the forefront, but also signal the importance of diversity to the university's goals and initiatives. Strategic placement of the physical space and the advertisements for the multicultural center could also demonstrate the institutional commitment to inclusivity.

Participants discussed the visibility of their spaces and programs within the university structure. Those that were centrally located in student unions or centrally located buildings and houses discussed how readily accessible they were to the campus community and because they were open and centrally located, students would stop in to explore what the offices or centers had to offer. Jerry shared that, currently they were building a new, multimillion-dollar multicultural center in the center of campus. After an external review, it was found that the placement of the center's physical space obstructed students' access and ability to visit the center between classes. It also demonstrated to students that the center was a lower priority to the university and senior-level administrators because other offices and centers were centrally located or connected at the center of the campus. When the university developed a new strategic plan, an initiative was added to, "Increase diversity efforts and improve the quality of the student experiences for minority identity groups." Therefore, a newly, constructed multicultural was realized. It is apparent that the strategic placement of a multicultural center is essential to the students'

perception of the center and demonstrates the university's commitment to those students it serves. However, very few multicultural centers conduct these types of reviews, some participants even expressed that they did not even have campus climate surveys administered on their campuses.

Professional Staff Expectations and Expertise

Professional staff played a significant role in the success of multicultural centers. For the students that describe multicultural centers as their "home away from home" (Patton, 2010), the staff is often the vehicles of support and encouragement that students need for them to succeed. Not only did the professional staff advocate for students within the institutions, but the professional staff plan and implement the social, cultural, and academic programs as part of their primary responsibilities (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). However, as stated in the preceding section, the limitations on professional staff and resources were a source of contention for most multicultural centers. With the dual function of multicultural centers, there was not enough staff to both create programs of support for marginalized students and provide cultural awareness programs, training, and dialogues on issues concerning diversity and social justice.

McCoy (2011) proposed, "Multicultural educators are often hyper-visible on their campus, working varied and demanding hours while serving as role models and mentors for students in less than welcoming environments" (pp. 144-445). The dual function of multicultural centers was an issue for professional staff that is not often considered. Few units within an institution were asked to play a two-fold role within their units or departments. For example, if one would examine the mission and purpose of other departments with the division of student affairs, these departments provide a single service to the campus community. Leadership programs and services are to provide students with the necessary learning to develop leadership

skills that will assist them as student leaders and in the workforce. Campus activities provided social programming to the campus community and, often, oversaw the broader university-wide campus programming including homecoming. These two departments might work collaboratively to develop programs to serve the campus community, but they were rarely singularly responsible for both. The expectations of multicultural center professional staff often exceeded the expectations of other units, providing both education, programs, and support. In this study, participants described that staff often felt undervalued and unsupported within the overall university environment.

Additionally, along with a surplus of primary responsibilities, multicultural centers' professional staff often were looked upon as experts in the area of diversity and social justice. As multicultural centers that support multiple historically marginalized identities, the professional staff were presumed experts on the lived experiences of multiple identities. Participants expressed difficulty with this task as many within multicultural affairs may hold an intersection of various identities, but cannot speak to all historically marginalized experiences. Additionally, professional staff that works in multicultural centers have advanced degrees in student personnel or higher education, not cultural studies. The professional staff was often self-taught and left on their own to stay current with research, language, identity development, best practices, and additional tools and programs to facilitate training for skill development surrounding diversity and social justice (Almadrez & Lee, 2011). Multicultural professional staff was often seen as an expert to campus administrator and fail when they cannot speak to everyone's experiences. Although professional staff might be seen as experts, often their issues come from the students in which they serve.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge. How we know, what we know is the foundation of the epistemological perspective and how we understand and describe a phenomenon is research (Marriam, 2009). The two foundational theories I used to describe and analyze multicultural centers is structuration theory and critical race theory. How these theories were revealed in multicultural centers will be discussed in this section.

Structuration Theory

Structuration theory explains how an organization's behaviors determine the organizational structure (Giddens, 1984). Structures, rules and resources in this theory were created and adapted by a group of members within the formal organization and are sustained by the social system that originated the organization. Structuration theory also describes a phenomenon called *duality of structure* in which the people who were actively engaged in the creation of the structure are also constrained by the previous construction of the structure (Bess & Dee, 2009). Organizations have formal and informal structures that were both actively engaged in the organization. The informal structure is often created when there are limitations and unmet needs in the formal structure. The informal structure worked within the constrained social system to meet the needs that are unmet and attempts to change the social system over time (Bess & Dee, 2009). Structuration Theory describes the organizational structure of a multicultural center.

Multicultural centers were constrained by their history and the history of the larger, formal organization. The social system and group that created multicultural centers were, essentially sustaining the culture environment and the rate of change within the organizations. Initially, multicultural centers supported historically racial marginalized identities but the

structure these centers are constantly evolving to fit the need of the students served. Multicultural centers modified their programs to fit the current population of the students. However, the formal structure of the organization had not changed. Although, the structural diversity of predominantly white institutions had altered, the colleges and universities still had a predominantly White structure with rules that give those of the majority a privilege over those from oppressed groups. It was evident in how multicultural centers were introduced to first-year students through orientations, institutional brochures and university's acknowledgement of them.

Additionally, affinity models are multicultural centers that have various affinity centers that either align with them or report up to the multicultural center. In most cases, the multicultural centers were supplementary to the affinity centers, more specifically the Black Cultural centers as most of them were the first to be created at the institution. Because these centers are either newly created or do not have the traditional institutional history of the Black Cultural centers, they did not receive the same level of attention from the community as the affinity centers. Those who have this model find it difficult balancing the old organizational structure with the demands of the new structure of the centers. Participants described misconceptions of the center in which majority White communities see the multicultural center as solely for marginalized identities.

Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory is a body of work that has many implications and used to breakdown power structures of dominant groups, but more importantly address racism and the racial power structures in society (Landson-Billing & Tate, 1997). The tenants of CRT has served as a framework, acknowledging the lived of experiences, called counter-storytelling, of people of color who have been victimized and discriminated against due to racism and brings attention to

the permanence of racism, White privilege, and interest conversion (DeCuir & Dixon, 2004; Hiraldo, 2010; Landson- Billings Tate, 1998). At its core, CRT is about race, anti-racism, and dismantling racial systematic structure that were present in society and critical of the dominant beliefs and systems that promoted race neutrality and colorblindness that socially support the privilege and power structure that exist.

Practitioners and scholars used CRT to inform their approach to ongoing realities people of color experiences with discrimination and systems that marginalize their existence. At predominantly White Institutions, CRT was used to demonstrate the lived of Black students that was faced with discrimination and hostile, racist attitudes towards their existence. Cho and Wesley (2002) contended that the Black student activism of the Black Power movement led to rise of CRT as a movement due to their resistance to the inequities in higher education. The planned activities, protests, and demonstrations brought light to the issues and concerns of students of color at predominantly White institutions and the race neutral, discriminatory systems that affected their success as students. Students demanded systematic change and CRT gave a framework of how to dismantle systems of Whiteness and privilege which predominant White colleges and universities were founded.

Critical Race Theory is critical to understanding the work of multicultural centers at predominantly white institutions, but also some of the limitations multicultural centers faced that was found in the study. The framework CRT as practitioners and scholars utilizes CRT to inform methods that challenged the dominant White cultures, systems, and traditions of PWIs. The use of counterstories, provides a narrative for historically marginalized identities, and counterspaces provide a safe space and support of these identities to resist the or retreat from the hostile environments that students may have found in and outside of the classrooms. While it is not

widely supported, although the tenants of CRT is rooted in race and racism, it can be used to address other systems of dominance and privilege. For example, gender, religious and LGBTQ students were faced with systems of sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, and transphobia. Multicultural Centers used counter stories and counterspaces for these identities to help support and resist the systems that marginalize their identities.

It was critical that multicultural centers inform White students of the systems of privilege and systems which they may or may not know they benefit. By providing this information, multicultural centers could begin the work to dismantle racism and create systematic change that would lead to an equitable society or at the least an equitable, welcoming college environment. However, the positionality of multicultural centers at predominantly White institutions limits the full cooperation in implementing CRT and the methods that will lead to dismantling structures. The predominantly White, male social systems that created the higher education still are those in power and overwhelmingly benefit from it. Although affinity and multicultural centers were created, the dominant culture still sustain and persist the culture environment and the rate of change within the organizations. The positionality, allocated resources, and audience reach demonstrates the limitations multicultural centers have on imploring the full tenants of the Critical Race theory and, in theory, minimize multicultural centers mission to address and dismantle systems of discrimination and racism at predominantly White institutions. The recommendations offered in this study assist multicultural centers advance these tenants through the centers.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

To conduct this research study, interviews were conducted by phone. I chose to use this method for a myriad of reasons, but two of the most important were time and location. The

interviews were conducted over a 5-week period. The questions asked were given prior to the interviews in an effort to give the participants time to reflect on the answers and write down any questions or additional information that they wanted to share about their position, institution, and their multicultural center. Phone interviews were chosen because of the ease to record and transcribe the interviews. Also, because of some of the varying times these interviews were conducted phone calls were identified as an easier method to ensure that all participants were equitable and had equal time and similar method of interview. While visiting these centers may have given further insight to the research, the participants were in varying locations as far as the west coast. In-person interviews were not possible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To recap, the intended goal of this research was to determine how multicultural centers performed with a dual purpose, supporting multiple historically marginalized communities and educating the campus. In chapter 1, the question was asked, "Can we be all to everybody?" What is being asked of multicultural centers is to serve the whole campus community, but with two goals- to educate and support. While there is no "one" model of success, data gathered in this study demonstrates that there are various recommendations that can be addressed that can influence the success of these centers' intended goal to serve everyone.

Expand Visibility

The need to expand the visibility of multicultural centers stems from the need to reach a broader population who did not participate in the programs and services the multicultural center have to offer. Multicultural centers still were perceived to serve a singular audience. The effectiveness of multicultural centers was obstructed by the number of those in the majority community who participate in their programs. The multicultural center provide education on

issues of diversity and social justice without a diversified audience. A university commitment to issues of diversity and social justice heightens the awareness of those within the community to engage in the discussion and become more involved in the programs and services that the university has stated as essential to the university's mission.

The institutional commitment to diversity was a crucial component to expanding the visibility of multicultural centers. In general, universities' goals and objectives were integral parts of the strategic planning process. They show where a university is currently and where it is headed. Adding diversity to this part of the planning process signifies a university's commitment to improving the quality of life of marginalized students and that diversity education was a vital component of a student's learning experience. By adding diversity to a university's goals, one can begin to discuss what is needed to expand units of campus in charge of diversity efforts. Adding a senior-level administrator for diversity would demonstrate that diversity matters at the highest level of the universities and the needs of the multicultural center could begin to be advocated for at the highest level. Conversations with those that seem to provide opposition to the broadening of the scope of the audience could be had, and the implication can be addressed.

Additional resources including professional staff, physical space, and budgetary resources are also necessary to broaden the audience. The additional professional staff consists of not only the number of professional staff within the office, but also the diversity of identities, disciplines, and expertise. By adding additional staff to the office, the burden of providing numerous programs of support and educational programs with less staff will be alleviated. Also, the professional staff in the office needs to be a better representation of society and the identities in which the office serves. Multicultural centers serve multiple identities and by diversifying the

identities served as a visual representation to the community. Additionally, having the diversity of expertise in the office could also be beneficial in reaching the intended goals of the office.

The multicultural centers that had multiple racial affinity and identity centers reporting to them were not only successful because of the number of professional staff but the diversification of identities and expertise within the office including academic advising and training specialists.

Allocation of Resources

An adequate amount of budgetary resources is often concerned with the cost of services, comprehensive programs, and initiatives. The implication of less or inadequate funding is the quality and quantity of programs and services can be impacted. Often time, multicultural centers were asked to do more with less and receive less funding than other offices that do not have the same and even fewer demands to produce a number of programs and initiatives to serve the campus community. As multicultural centers broaden the scope of the audience, the demand for additional services and an increased number of programs to engage many students, faculty, and staff can be hindered if adequate funding was not received. An assessment of programs and initiatives effectiveness and a realistic assessment of the cost and return on investment could ensure adequate funding for the programs and services needed to diversify the audience.

Although additional budget resources were often related to the cost of programming, it also include the allocation for additional professional staff, administrative resources, and physical space. If the additional professional staff was added to the multicultural centers, an increase of the allotment of budgetary funds is necessary. The administrative cost for operation of the multicultural center was also needed if there is an increase in services and additional space provided.

Community Engagement

The tri-sector cultural practitioner model (Jenkins & Walton, 2006) was an approach for universities to adopt when they were exploring multiple facets of diversity and how it impact the personal and professional of each person's character. The components of this model ensure that cultural and diversity inclusion are intentionally merged into the infrastructure of the university. This model can assist multicultural centers' approach to dual purpose and how to maximize reach to the target audience. The three areas of the model include- community building and outreach, administrative practices, and cultural programming. But for multicultural centers, you must focus on community building and outreach.

Community building and outreach involve increasing the community knowledge and relationship with cultural programming or diversity awareness. This also includes outreach to the various stakeholders that could benefit from cultural awareness. One of the biggest components of this is a comprehensive marketing campaign. Multicultural centers had brochures, annual reports, calendar of events and program, and updated websites. However, often times these were shared in silos. Comprehensive marketing includes sharing the message with the entire computer including mission. If you were to transform a community and change a campus culture, it should be the work of everybody. The mission of a multicultural center was the work of everybody and shared throughout the university as part of the institution mission to created a safe, welcoming and nurturing environment for all students and educate all to work and live within a cultural society. This mission was of multicultural student affairs as well as an institution that is committed to creating change and cultural competent and diverse individuals. A comprehensive campaign was to share the mission of the multicultural affairs and bring others on board to work with the multicultural center's mission.

Community engagement brings everyone together under one mission. Multicultural Centers uses this as agency building, to engage other faculty and staff in issues of diversity and social justice. Building a community that was engaged with diversity, helps increase people who want to acquire and experience the history, practices and infrastructure of various cultures. This gives increases the majority audience that the multicultural center was trying to reach. Many multicultural centers adapts this model by bringing in faculty to volunteer within the office and teach courses within the center.

CHALLENGING STRUCTURATION THEORY

The purpose of this research was to examine multicultural centers to better understand how they operate in the dual function. What I found is that dual purpose in which multicultural centers operate is because of the dual structure that constrains them. Multicultural Centers were first created to support historically marginalized identities and as colleges evolved, the multicultural centers also transformed. However, was taking away responsibilities, responsibilities were added keeping the same ideas and notions in place. As colleges and university began to have a more diverse community and add more of a commitment to diversity, the ideas and structure must change to be more of diverse community. Multicultural centers were said to be exclusionary spaces because it was under those condition in which they were founded. The notion would still remain if they continue to operate within a dual function. Therefore, should not have a dual purpose, but one purpose of creating an inclusive community and educating the campus through a social justice framework.

Multicultural centers became safe spaces for racial minority students because they found the campus community unsafe. In addition, there were no support systems for these students as campus were not equipped to handle these students within its social system. However,

universities now have other units that can support historically marginalized identities such as tutoring or student success centers, living learning communities, and academic departments that educate and support marginalized identities. Creating a sense of belonging and community was also important for historically marginalized identities and orientation, pre-college, and student activities can create spaces for these students to be engaged in the full campus culture. As university become more committed to diversity, it should be the work of the entire community to support all marginalized identities

Today's universities still struggle with meeting the needs of historically marginalized communities because they turn to multicultural centers to do the work for them. As members of this society, we all understand that the ideas that first created the centers persists. However, in this new structure the multicultural centers intended purpose is to challenge and dismantle those ideas throughout the institution. If multicultural centers singular focus was to provide educational programs, then they can begin to do the work throughout the university to ensure that all are able to support students. It will also challenge the notion that multicultural centers were only for those communities.

By challenging, the duality of structure and the rules that constrain them multicultural centers can begin to move forward and challenge the systems in which created them. Asking how multicultural centers operate in this dual purpose, but the question to ask is should they remain to operate with dual purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As stated earlier in chapter 1, there is minimum research on multicultural centers at predominantly White Institutions and less research on how these centers operate within a dual purpose. A large multi-institutional assessment of multicultural centers would ascertain the

number, various models, and programs and services there are at predominantly White Institutions. In addition, research can ascertain how these centers have operated within their dual structure and possible best practices for other multicultural centers can utilize. In addition, a question that emerged from the research was “should multicultural centers operate in a dual purpose?” By asking this question, the researcher can identify the rules, barriers, and misconceptions that constrain multicultural centers to dismantle them.

A recommendation a large multi-institutional study of students that utilize and are supported by multicultural centers would collect the student perception of the centers through marginalized communities. There have been studies of students’ perspectives of Black cultural centers at specific institutions, but not of multicultural centers and no studies have been found that are multi-institutional. A research study that collect students’ voices and perspectives can garner information on how students view these centers at their respective institution as well as the centers impact on the institutions that the centers serve.

Additionally, the CAS standards for higher education only look at multicultural centers through the dual purpose. With the understanding that the CAS standards were written by a number of experts in the field of student affairs, the CAS standards for Multicultural programs and services attempts to ask of their multicultural centers to provide programs and services that are part of other units of student affairs such as student success. The CAS standards only address multicultural centers in its dual function and perhaps by examining if this is effective for them to operate we can gain a better understanding of how to transform these centers through a singular lens. Also, if multicultural centers support other historically marginalized identities such as interfaith, gender, and LGBTQ programs they also have a set of standards written that considerably different from multicultural programs and services. A research study of how to

merge many of the CAS Standards will help develop a set of CAS standards that encompasses all historically marginalized identities.

CONCLUSION

The history of multicultural centers can be traced back to the cultural spaces that provided support to students of color at a time of unrest at colleges and universities. When students of color were granted admission to predominantly white institutions, institutions were not prepared for the influx of students. Adequate academic, cultural, and social support were needed to ensure that these students persist and were successful at their respective institutions. Cultural centers provided the support needed to assist combats the negative experiences they encountered and, over the years, added other marginalized communities from multiple identities that also needed the support needed to succeed. Also, cultural centers were then asked to facilitate diversity education to the campus community to combat issues of racism and discrimination on a college campus. Today, contemporary multicultural centers are hubs of diversity and social justice for the campus community.

Multicultural centers are complex organizations that operate under a dual focus – to provide supportive networks to marginalized communities and provide education to the campus community on issues of diversity, multiculturalism and social justice. The issues that made the centers vital to marginalized communities persist. Historically marginalized students look to multicultural centers to provide the academic, social, and cultural support needed to combat the daily negative experiences with racism, microaggressions, and discrimination. Diversity and social justice education assists students find a deeper understanding of these issues and provide cross-cultural interactions that will enable multicultural centers to create a welcomed, inclusive environment.

The purpose of this study was to examine multicultural centers to understand how multicultural centers provided support to marginalized communities while also providing educational programs and initiatives on issues of diversity and social justice education to the majority campus community. By examining multicultural centers, one may understand how these centers operate in this dual focus and create benchmark data for other multicultural centers can utilize to maximize their effectiveness. The data revealed that there is no one model of success and multicultural centers and the programs and service provided varied by institutional type, location and populations these centered served. However, the commonalities in themes and implications provide others with a roadmap to address the concerns that impact multicultural centers success.

Statements made the participants in the study demonstrate a commitment and dedication to address these issues and maximize the influence these centers have on the campus community. Multicultural centers will continue to exist in the dual purpose of their organization and alter their existence to ensure that they are moving the university community to an inclusive campus community and continue to ensure that all students feel supported.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (2007). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education.
- Alford, S.M. (2000). A qualitative study of the college social adjustment of Black students from lower socioeconomic communities. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28*, (1), 2-15.
- Allen, W.R. (1992). The color of success: African American college student outcomes at predominately White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 2*(62) 26-44.
- Allen, W. & Jewell, J. (2002) A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically Black colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*, 241-261.
- Allen, W., Jayakmer, U.M., & Frank, R. (2009) Till victory is won: The African American struggle for higher education n California. Choices. *Los Angeles, University of California.*
- Allen, W., & Solorzano, D. (2001). Affirmative action, educational equity, and campus racial climate: A case study of the University of Michigan Law School. *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal, 12*, 237-363.
- American Indian Higher Education Consortium. (2000). Tribal college contributions to local economic development. Retrieved June, 8, 2007.
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*(2), 180-185.
- Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the south, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, T. (1990). Black studies: Overview and theoretical perspectives. In T. Anderson (Ed.), *Black studies: Black studies: Theory, method, and cultural perspectives*. Pullman: Washington State University Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1990). Making faces, making soul= haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives of feminists of color (pp. xv-xxviii). *San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books*.
- Atkinson, D., Morten, G. & Sue, D (1979) *Counseling American Minorities*. 1st edition. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Allyn, D. (2016). *Make love, not war: the sexual revolution: an unfettered history*. routledge.

- Almadrez, M. G. A., & Lee, F. J. (2011). Bridging integrated identities to integrated services. Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community, 107-121.
- Ambler, D. A. (2000). Organizational and administrative models. *The handbook of student affairs administration*, 2, 121-134.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1990) Haciendo Caras/making face, making soul: creative and critical perspectives by women of color. *San Francisco, CA, Aunt Lute Press*.
- Arminio, J., & Gochenauer, P. (2004). After 16 Years of Publishing Standards, Do CAS Standards Make a Difference?. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 24(1), 51-65.
- Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of college student development*, 37(2), 123-34.
- Banks, J. (1993) Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 19 (1993), pp. 3-49.
- Banks, J. A. (2000). The social construction of difference and the quest for educational equality. In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), *Education in a new era* (pp. 21-45). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Banks, J. A. (2003). Teaching strategies for ethnic studies (7th ed.). *Boston: Allyn and Bacon*.
- Barker, C., Pistrang, N. & Elliott, R. (2002). Research methods in clinical psychology: An introduction for students and practitioners, 2nd ed. *Chichester, England: John Wiley and Sons*.
- Baumgartner, K., Fenderson, J., Stewart, J. (2011) Expanding the history of the Black studies movement: some prefatory notes. *Journal of African American Studies* March 2012, Volume 16, Issue 1, pp 1-20.
- Bell, Derrick A., Jr., (1980) Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma, 93 Harv. L. Rev. 518.
- Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. Teaching for diversity and social justice, In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A source book* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge
- Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 25-38). Routledge.
- Bell, L. A., & Adams, M. (2016). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 21-44). Routledge.

- Bennett, C. I. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4), 259-265.
- Benitez Jr, M. (2010). Resituating culture centers within a social justice framework. *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*, 119-134.
- Berkner, L., He, S., & Cataldi, E.F. (2002). Descriptive summary of 1995–96 Beginning Postsecondary Students: Six years later (NCES 2003–151). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics.
- Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Dynamics of the system* (Vol. 1). Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Biasco, F., Goodwin, E. A., & Vitale, K. L. (2001). College students' attitudes toward racial discrimination. *College Student Journal*.
- Bankole, K. (2005). An overview of black culture centers in higher education. 2005). *Black culture centers*, 164-182.
- Bourke, B. (2010) Experiences of black students in multiple cultural spaces at a predominantly white institution. *Journal of Diversity Education*. (3) 2: 126-155.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20.
- Boysen, G. A., Vogel, D. L., Cope, M. A., & Hubbard, A. (2009). Incidents of bias in college classrooms: Instructor and student perceptions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(4), 219.
- Boysen, G. A., & Vogel, D. L. (2009). Bias in the classroom: Types, frequencies, and responses. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36(1), 12-17.
- Boysen, G. A. (2012). Teacher and student perceptions of microaggressions in college classrooms. *College Teaching*, 60(3), 122-129.
- Brazzell, J. C. (1996). Diversification of postsecondary institutions. In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodard (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 43–63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bridges, B.K., Cubarubbia, A., & Stewart, D. (2008) *Survey of Multicultural Student Services*.
- Bryan, W. A., & Mullendore, R. H. (1991). Operationalizing CAS standards for program evaluation and planning. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1991(53), 29-44.
- Bureau of the Census, US Census Bureau, & Hoover's Business Press. (2004). *Statistical abstract of the United States: The national data book*. National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce.

- Cabrera, A. & Nora, A (1994) College student perceptions of prejudice and discrimination and their feelings of alienation. A construct validation approach. *Review of education/ pedagogy*. 16, 380-409.
- Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E., & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(2), 134-160.
- Caldwell, P. M. (1995). A hair piece: Perspectives n he intersection of race and gender. *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*, 267-277.
- Carroll, G. (1998). *Environmental stress and African Americans: The other side of the moon*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cavaleros, C., & Van Vuuren, L. J. (2002). The effectiveness of a diversity awareness training programme. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(3), 50-61.
- Chang, M. J. (2005) Reconsidering the diversity rationale. *Liberal Education*, 91(1). P. 6–13.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, & Wells, J. B. (2015). *CAS professional standards for higher education*. Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. sage.
- Chickering, A.W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A.W. & Reisser, L. (1993) *Education and Identity* (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cokley, K. O. (2001). Gender differences among African American students in the impact of racial identity on academic psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 480-487.
- Cole, Lisa (2010) "Campus Climate Survey," Many Voices - One Community: Vol. 1: Iss. 4, Article 11.
- Commission on minority participation in education and American life. (1988). One-third of a nation. Washington, DC: *American Council on Education & Education Commission on the States*.
- Crenshaw, K.W., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (1995) *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New York Press.
- Creswell, J. (1998). W.(1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*, 2.
- Cross, W. E.. Vandiver, B. J., Worrell, F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 49(1), 71.

- D'Augelli, A. R., and Hershberger, S. L. (1993) African American undergraduates on a predominantly White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education*, 62(1), 67–81.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001) *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York Press, New York.
- Davis, P. (1989) Law as microaggression. *Yale Law Journal*, 98(8), 1559-1577.
- Decuir, J., & Dixson, A. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 26-31.
- Dell, C. A. (2000). *The first semester experiences of American Indian transfer students* (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University-Bozeman, College of Education, Health & Human Development).
- DeMarrais, K. (2004). *Qualitative research: Learning through experience. Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). 2005. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 3.
- DeSousa, D., & Kuh, G. (1996). Does institutional racial composition make a difference in what Black students gain from college? *Journal of College Student Development*. 37, 257–267.
- Donovan, R. (1984). Path analysis of a theoretical model of persistence in higher education among low-income Black youth. *Research in Higher Education*, 21, 243-252.
- Drewry, H. N., & Doermann, H. (2001). *Stand and prosper: Private Black colleges and their students*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Eimers, M. T., & Pike, G. R. (1997). Minority and nonminority adjustment to college: Differences or similarities. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(1), 77-97
- Elliott, R., & Timulak, L. (2005). Descriptive and interpretive approaches to qualitative research. *A handbook of research methods for clinical and health psychology*, 1(7), 147-159.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. *Psychological issues*.
- Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Insight and responsibility*. WW Norton & Company.
- Exum, W. (1985). *Paradoxes of protest: Black student activism in a White university*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fairclough, A. (2001). *Better day coming: Black and equality 1890-2000*. New York: Penguin.
- Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.

- Fege, A. F. (2006). Getting Ruby a quality public education: Forty-two years of building the demand for quality public schools through parental and public involvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76, 570-586.
- Ferguson, K. M., & Thomas-Rashid, T. L. (2011). Multicultural student services at private, liberal arts colleges. *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*, 125-139.
- Fine, L. (2012) The Context of Creating Space: Assessing the likelihood of college LGBT center presence. *Journal of College Student Development*. 53 (2) 285-299.
- Fischer, M. (2007). Settling into campus life differences by race/ethnicity in college involvement and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*. 78 (2). 125-156.
- Fisher, B. J., & Hartman, D. J. (1995). The impact of race on the social experience of college students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Black Studies*, 26, 117–133.
- Fine, L. (2012). The context of creating space: assessing the likelihood of college LGBT center presence. *Journal of College Student Development*. 53 (2) 285-299.
- Fleming, J. (1984) Blacks in College: A Comparative study of students' success in Black and White institutions. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*
- Flowers, L. A. (2004). Examining the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 633-654.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum.
- Furr, S. R., & Elling, T. W. (2002). African-American students in a predominantly-White university: Factors associated with retention. *College Student Journal*, 36(2), 188.
- Galbraith, J. R. (2002). Organizing to deliver solutions. *Organizational dynamics*, 31(2), 194.
- Garcia, P. (1991). Summer bridge: Improving retention rates for underprepared students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 3(2), 91-105.
- Gasman, M. (2007). *Envisioning Black colleges: A history of the United Negro College Fund*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Education Policy*, 13(4) 469-484.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Univ of California Press.
- Gonzalez, K. P. (2003). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education*, 37(2), 193-218.
- Guiffrida, D. A. (2003). African American student organizations as agents of social integration. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 304-319.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E.L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity in higher education:

- Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.
- Hamer, J. F., & Lang, C. (2015). Race, structural violence, and the neoliberal university: The challenges of inhabitation. *Critical Sociology*, 41(6), 897-912.
- Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. W. (1997). Conceptual foundations for social justice courses. In M. Adams, L. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice: A Sourcebook* (pp. 16-29). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hardy-Fanta PhD, C., & Stewartson, D. (2007). A Seat at the Table? Racial/Ethnic & Gender Diversity on Corporate, Hospital, Education, Cultural & State Boards.
- Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, 7-24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black identity expression and development among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 127-144.
- Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and equity for African American students in higher education: A critical race historical analysis of policy efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 389-414.
- Harper, S. & Quaye, S. (2009) Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations. *New York: Routledge*.
- Harper, S, Museus, S.& Nichols, A. (2010). Racial differences in the formation of postsecondary educational expectations: A structural model. *The Teachers College Record*, 112(3).
- Hefner, D (2002) Black cultural centers: standing on shaky ground? *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 18(26), 22-29.
- Hannon, M.D., Patton, L.D. (2008) Collaboration for cultural programming: engaging culture centers, multicultural affairs, and student activities offices as partners. *Creating Inclusive Campus Environments. Selected Works by Lori Patton*. 8, 139-153.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Hinderlie, H. H., & Kenny, M. (2002). Attachment, social support, and college adjustment among Black students at predominantly White universities. *Journal of College Student Development*.
- Hooks, B. (2003) *Teaching community: a pedagogy of hope*. *New York: Routledge*.
- Hord, F. (ed) (2005) *Black Cultural Centers: Politics of Survival and Identity*. *Chicago: Third World Press*.

- Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (Ed.). (2004). *Meeting the Needs of African American Women: New Directions for Student Services, Number 104* (Vol. 19). Jossey-Bass.
- Howard-Hamilton, M.F., McEwen, M., Patton, L.D, Rednon, L. (2007) Critical Race Perspectives on Theory in Student Affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*. DOI:10.1002/ss.256.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F., Cuyjet, M. J., & Cooper, D. L. (2011). Understanding multiculturalism and multicultural competence among college students. *Multiculturalism on campus: Theory, models, and practices for understanding diversity and creating inclusion*, 11-18.
- Hurtado, S., Carter, D., & Spuler, A. (1996). Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 135–157.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: contexts of conflicts. *Journal of Higher Education*. 63 (5). 540-569.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 26, No. 8*. Washington, DC: George Washington University
- Hu S. & Kuh,G. (2003) Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development*. 44(3), 320-334. DOI; 10.1353/csd.2003.0026
- Inkelas, K. K. (2004). Does participation in ethnic cocurricular activities facilitate a sense of ethnic awareness and understanding? A study of Asian Pacific American undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 285-302.
- Jenkins, T., & Walton, C. (2006). Setting the stage for character development through culturally specific advising practices. *Journal of College and Character*, 7(2).
- Jackson, A. P., Smith, S. A., & Hill, C. L. (2003). Academic persistence among Native American college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(4), 548-565.
- Jones, L., Castellanos, J., & Cole, D (2002). Examining the ethnic minority student experience at a Predominantly White Institutions: A Case Study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*. 1(19) p 19-38.
- Jones, L. (2004). The development of multicultural student services office and retention strategy of minority students: Still Miles to Go! In F. W. Hale (Ed.), *What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies*. (p. 125-145). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Jones, L., Castellanos, J., & Cole, D (2002) Examining the ethnic minority student experience at a Predominantly White Institutions: A Case Study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*. 1(19) p 19-38.

- Jones, V. A., & Reddick, R. J. (2017). The heterogeneity of resistance: How Black students utilize engagement and activism to challenge PWI inequalities. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 86(3), 204-219.
- Juneau, Stan, W. Fleming, and L. Foster. "History and foundation of American Indian education." *Montana Office of Public Instruction* (2001).
- Kroger, J. (2004). Identity in adolescence: The balance between self and other. *Psychology Press*.
- Kuh, G. D., & Love, P. G. (2000). A cultural perspective on student departure. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp. 196-212). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Kuh, G. D. (2001/2002). Organizational culture and student persistence: Prospects and puzzles. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, theory & practice*, 3(1), 23-39.
- Kuk, L., & Banning, J. H. (2009). Designing student affairs organizational structures: Perceptions of senior student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, 46(1), 94-117.
- Kupo, V. (2011). Remembering our past to shape our future. 2011). *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*, 13-28.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education?. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- LaFromboise, T. D., Trimble, J. E., & Mohatt, G. V. (1990). Counseling intervention and American Indian tradition: An integrative approach. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 18(4), 628-654.
- LeCompte, M. D., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.
- Lozano, A. (2010). Latina/o culture centers: Providing a sense of belonging and promoting student success. *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*, 3-25.
- Lewis, A. E., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. A. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 74-91.
- Marcus, A., Mullins, L. C., Brackett, K. P., Tang, Z., Allen, A. M., & Pruett, D. W. (2003). Perceptions of racism on campus. *College Student Journal*, 37, 611-626.

- Manning, K., Kinzie, J., & Schuh, J. H. (2013). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice*. Routledge.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage publications.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Fernández, S. D. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(1), 55-80.
- Mayo, J. R., Murguia, E., & Padilla, R.V. (1995). Social integration and academic performance among minority university students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 542–552.
- McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. 2001. *Research in Education a Conceptual Introduction*. New York: Longman.
- McCoy, D. L. (2011). Multicultural student services at public institutions. Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community, 140-153.
- Mena, S. (2010) Promoting student engagement: Administrative consideration for current and future planning of cultural center planning and outreach, In Patton, L (ed) (2010) *Cultural centers in higher education: perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*. Stylus Publishing; Virginia.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative Research: a guide to design and interpretation*. San Francisco.
- Merriam, S. B. (2014). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Miller, M. H., Anderson, R., Cannon, J. G., Perez, E., Moore, H. A. (1998). Campus racial climate polices: The view from the bottom up. *Race, Gender & Class*, 5, 139-157.
- Mingle, J. R. (1981). The opening of White colleges and universities to Black students. In G. E. Thomas (Ed.), *Black students in higher education: Conditions and experiences in the 1970s* (pp. 1829). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Muesues, S. Jayakaumor, U. eds. (2012) *Creating campus cultures: fostering success among racially diverse student populations New York and London*, Routledge.
- Museum, S. D. (2008). Focusing on institutional fabric: Assessing campus cultures to enhance cross-cultural engagement. In S. R. Harper (Ed.), *Creating inclusive campus environments for cross-cultural learning and engagement* (pp. 205-234). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
- Museum, S. D., & Quaye, S. J. (2009). Toward an intercultural perspective of racial and ethnic minority college student persistence. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(1), 67-94.

- McClusky-Titus, P. & Sutton, E. M. (2010) Campus culture center directors' perspectives on advancement, current issues, and future directions. Patton, L (ed) (2010) *Cultural Centers in Higher Education: Perspectives on Identity, Theory, and Practice*. Stylus Publishing; Virginia.
- McEwen, M. K. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, 4, 203-233.
- Museum, S. D. (2007). Using qualitative methods to assess diverse institutional cultures. In S. R. Harper, & S. D. Museum (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in institutional assessment: New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 136, pp. 29-40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Museum, S. D. (2008). Focusing on institutional fabric: assessing campus cultures to enhance cross-cultural engagement. In S. R. Harper (Ed.), *Creating inclusive campus environments for cross-cultural learning and engagement* (pp. 205-234). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002). *Digest of educational statistics*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Negrete, N. A., & Purcell, C. (2011). Engaging sexual orientation and gender diversity in multicultural student services. *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*, 81-93.
- Nora, A., Cabrera, A. F., & Pascarella, E. T. (1996). Different impacts of academic and social experiences. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(4), 427-451.
- Office of Minority Concerns. (1985). Fourth annual status report on minorities in higher education. *Washington, DC: American Council on Education*.
- Palmer, J. (1989). Diversity: Three paradigms for change leaders. *Journal of the OD*.
- Parker, L. (1998). Race is . . . race ain't: An exploration of the utility of critical race theory in qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 43-55.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terezini, P. (1991). How college affects students. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*.
- Paterson, B. G., & Carpenter, D. S. (1989). The emerging student affairs profession: What still needs to be done. *NASPA Journal*, 27(2), 123-127.
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). Qualitative research. *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*.
- Patton, L. (2004). From protest to progress? An examination of the relevance, relationships and roles of Black Culture Centers in the undergraduate experiences of Black students at predominantly White institutions (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65, 292.
- Patton, L.D. (2005) Power to the people! A literature review of the impact of Black student protest on the emergence of Black cultural centers. In F. Hoed (Ed.), *Black Cultural Centers and political identities* (pp. 151-163). Chicago: Third World Press.

- Patton, L.D. (2006a.) Black culture centers: still central to student learning. *About Campus*, 11(2) 2-8.
- Patton, L.D. (2006b.) The voice of reason: A qualitative examination of Black student's perceptions of Black cultural centers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 628-646.
- Patton, L. D., & Hannon, M. D. (2008). Collaboration for cultural programming: Engaging culture centers, multicultural affairs, and student activities offices as partners. Creating inclusive campus environments for cross-cultural learning and student engagement, 139-154.
- Patton, L. D., Ranero, J., & Everett, K. (2011). Engaging race in multicultural student services. *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*, 63-80.
- Perna, L. W., Gerald, D., Baum, E., & Milem, J. (2007). The status of equity for black faculty and administrators in public higher education in the south. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 193-228.
- Patton, L (ed) (2010) Cultural centers in higher education: perspectives on identity, theory, and practice. *Stylus Publishing*; Virginia.
- Peterson, M. (1978) Black students on white campuses. The impacts on black enrollments. *Institute for Social Research*.
- Ponce, F.Q. (1988). Minority student retention: a moral and imperative. In M.C. Terrell & D.J. Wright (Eds.), *From survival to success: Promoting Minority Student Retention (pp.1-23)*. NASPA Monograph Series, no. 9. Washington, D.C.
- Poole, M. S., Seibold, D. R., & McPhee, R. D. (1996). The structuration of group decisions. *Communication and group decision making*, 2, 114-146.
- Pope, R., Reynolds, A., & Mueller, J. (2004). Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs. *San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass*.
- Pittman, E. (1994). Cultural centers on predominantly White campuses: Campus, cultural and social comfort equals retention, Last Word. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 11,(October 6), 104.
- Pope, R., Reynolds, A., & Mueller, J. (2004). Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*
- Princes, C.D. (1994/2008) The precarious question of Black cultural centers versus multicultural centers. F. Hord (Ed.) *Black culture centers: Politics of survival and identity*. (pp 136-146). Chicago: Third World Press.
- Radloff, T. & Evans, N. (2003) The social construction of prejudice among Black and White college students. *Naspa Journal*. 40 (2) p. 1-16.

- Rankin, S. (2003). Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people: A national perspective. *Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.*
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational Tapestry Model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262.
- Rhoads, R.A. (1998). Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69(6).
- Renn, K. A. (2011). Identity centers: An idea whose time has come . . . and gone? In P. M. Magolda & M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.) *Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue.* (pp. 244-254). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the National Study of New Professionals in Student Affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49 (4), 319-335.
- Reynolds, A. L. (2001). Multidimensional Cultural Competence Providing Tools for Transforming Psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29(6), 833-841.
- Romano Jr, N. C., Donovan, C., Chen, H., & Nunamaker Jr, J. F. (2003). A methodology for analyzing web-based qualitative data. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(4), 213-246.
- Roebuck, J. B., & Murty, K. S. (1993). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education.* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rooks, N. M. (2006). *White money/black power: The surprising history of African American studies and the crisis of race in higher education.* Beacon Press.
- Russell, M. (1992). Entering great America: Reflections on race and the convergence of progressive legal theory and practice. *Hastings Law Journal*, 43, 749-767.
- Sampson, W. A. (1986). Desegregation and racial tolerance in academia. *Journal of Negro Education*, 55, 171-184.
- Sedlacek, W. (1999). Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research. *Journal of College Student Development* 40 (5).p. 538-550.
- Sanlo, R. (2004). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues on campus. In L. A. Flowers (Ed.), *Diversity Issues in American Colleges and Universities: Case Studies for Higher Education and Student Affairs Professionals.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.
- Schwitzer, A. M., Griffen, O. T., Ancis, J. R., & Thomas, C. R. (1999). Social adjustment experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77, 189-197.
- Sedlacek, W. (1999). Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research. *Journal of College Student Development* 40 (5).p. 538-550.

- Shade, B. J. (1989). *Culture, style, and the educative process*. Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Shotton, H. J., Yellowfish, S., & Cintrón, R. (2010). Island of sanctuary: The role of an American Indian culture center. *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*, 105-116.
- Shufford, B.C. (2011) Historical and Philosophical Development of Multicultural Student Services in D.L. Stewart (Eds.) *Multicultural Student Services on Campus*. Sterling, Virginia. Stylus.
- Smedley, B. D., Myers, H. F., & Harrell, S. P. (1994) Minority-Status Stresses and the College Adjustment of Ethnic Minority Freshmen. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1993, 64(4), 434-452.
- Solorzano, D., Allen, W., & Carroll, G. (2002). A case study of racial microaggressions and campus racial climate at the University of California-Berkeley. *UCLA Chicano/Latino Law Review*, 23, 15-111.
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., and Yosso, T. J. (2000) Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate: The Experiences of African American College Students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1), 60-73.
- Stage, F., & Manning, K. (1992). Enhancing the multicultural campus environment: A cultural brokering approach.
- Stake, R. E., & Schwandt, T. A. (2006). On discerning quality in evaluation. *The Sage handbook of evaluation*, 404-418.
- Stennis-Williams, S., Terrell, M. C., & Haynes, A. W. (1998). The emergent role of multicultural education centers on predominately White campuses. In M. C. Terrell (Series Ed.), & D. J. Wright (Vol. Ed.). *From survival to success: Promoting minority student retention* [Monograph Series Vol. 9] (ED334999). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Stewart, D.L. & Bridges B. (2011) A demographic profile of multicultural student services, in D.L. Stewart (Eds.) *Multicultural Student Services on Campus*. Sterling, Virginia. Stylus.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2009). Fittin' In: Do Diverse Interactions with Peers Affect Sense of Belonging for Black Men at Predominantly White Institutions? *NASPA Journal* 45(4), pp. 501-527.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sutton, E. M., & Kimbrough, W. M. (2001). Trends in Black student involvement. *NASPA Journal*, 39(1), 30-40
- Sue, D. W. (2005). *Multicultural social work practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions as instigators of difficult dialogues on race: Implications for student affairs educators and students. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 26(2), 136-143.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.), (1978). Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. *London: Academic Press*.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). (Ed.). Social identity and intergroup relations. *Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press*.
- Taylor, C. M., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (1995). Student involvement and racial identity attitudes among African American males. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 330-336.
- Thayer, P. B. (2000). Retention of students from first generation and low income backgrounds.
- Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: a theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89 – 125.
- Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. *Chicago: The University of Chicago Press*.
- Tinto, V. (1993). Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.). *Chicago: University of Chicago Press*.
- Torres, V., Howard-Hamilton, M., & Cooper, D. L. (2003). Identity development of diverse populations: Implications for teaching and administration in higher education. *San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass*.
- Torres, V., Jones, S. R., & Renn, K. A. (2009). Identity development theories in student affairs: Origins, current status, and new approaches. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 577-596.
- Torres, V. (2011). Using student development theories to explain student outcomes. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 425-448). Springer Netherlands.
- Torres, V., Howard-Hamilton, M. F., & Cooper, D. L. (2011). *Identity Development of Diverse Populations: Implications for Teaching and Administration in Higher Education: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* (Vol. 12). John Wiley & Sons.
- Turner, J. C. (1984) Social identification and psychological group formation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *The social dimension: European developments in social psychology*. 2, 518-538. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Turner, J. C. (1985) Social categorization and the selfconcept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes*, 2, 77-122.
- Turner, C. (1994) Guests in someone else's house: Students of color *The Review of Higher Education*, 17 (4), p. 355-370.
- American Indians & public higher education. *Education*, 121(4), 810.
- Valdes, F., McCristal Culp, J., & Harris, A. P. (2002). Battles waged, won and lost: Critical race theory at the turn of the millennium. In F. Valdes, J. McCristal Culp, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Crossroads, directions and new critical race theory* (pp. 1–6). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Valencia, R. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Mexican Americans & the Law: El Pueblo Unido Jamas Sera Vencido!*. University of Arizona Press.
- Walker, S.V. (1976) Transitional experiences of Black students at a predominantly White university, *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, Washington University.
- Reason, R. D., & Watson, K. T. (2011). Multicultural competence and social justice advocacy. 2011). *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*, 267-281.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-19.
- Welch, E. F. (2009). Campus based community centers: Havens, harbors, and hope for underrepresented and marginalized student success (Doctoral dissertation, UC San Diego).
- White, L. S. (1998). "Am I Black enuf fo ya?" Black student diversity, issues of identity and community. In K. Freeman (Ed.), *African American culture and heritage in higher education research and practice* (pp. 91-119). Westport, CT: Praeger
- Williams, D., & Wade-Golden, K. (2007). The chief diversity officer. *CUPA HR JOURNAL*, 58(1), 38.
- Williamson J.A. (1999) In defense of themselves: the black struggle for success and recognition at predominately white colleges and universities. *The Journal of Negro Education*. 68 (1) 92-105.
- Wilson, J. (2015). How black lives matter saved higher education. *Al Jazeera America*.
- Woodcock, D. B., & Alawiye, O. (2001). The antecedents of failure and emerging hope:
- Wilson, R. (1994). The participation of African Americans in American higher education. *Minorities in higher education*, 195-209.
- Yosso, T., & Lopez, C. B. (2010). Counterspaces in a hostile place. *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*, 83-104.

- Young, L. W. (1991). The minority cultural center on a predominantly white campus. In H. E. Cheatham (Ed.), *Cultural pluralism on campus*. Alexandria, VA: *American College Personnel Association*.
- Young, L. W. (1986) The role minority student Centers play on predominantly White campuses, in C.A. Taylor (ed.), *Handbook of Minority Student Services*. *Madison, Wis.: NMCC*.
- Young, L. W. (1991). The minority cultural center on a predominantly white campus. In H. E. Cheatham (Ed.), *Cultural pluralism on campus*. Alexandria, VA: *American College Personnel Association*.
- Zea, M. C., Jarama, L., & Bianchi, F. T. (1995). Social support and psychosocial competence: Explaining the adaptation to college of ethnically diverse students. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 509 –531.

APPENDIX A: PARTICIPATION INSTITUTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Participant Number #	Position	Location	Institutional Type	Student Population	Racial diversity by percentage
Jerry	assistant dean/director	South	Public	20,000+	18%
Ty	director	North East	Public	20000+	20%
Sanai	director	West Coast	Public	20000+	36%
Bailey	associate vice president/director	Midwest	Public	15000-20,000	17%
Issa	associate dean/director	Midwest	Public	30000+	54%
Joe	associate director	Midwest	Public	20,000+	31%
Bryan	director	Northwest	Public	20,000+	41%
Kelly	director	Midwest	Public	15,000+	21%
Chris	associate dean	Southwest	Public	1000-5000	89%
Mary	director	Southeast	Private	5000+	19%
Alex	associate director	Midwest	Private	15,000	44%
Brittney	assistant dean	Midwest	Private	20,000+	46%
Paula	director	South	Public	10000- 15,000	50%
Michelle	director	South	Public	10,000 – 15,000	39%
Andre	assistant director	South	Public	15000-20000	21%

APPENDIX B: MULTICULTURAL STUDENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
CAS STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

1. Mission

- Must be to facilitate the learning and development of traditionally underserved students;
- Offer programs that educate the campus about diversity, multiculturalism, and interaction across differences in a global society;
- Convene departments across campus to facilitate intercultural dialogue

2. Programs

- Must contribute to students' formal education, which includes both the curriculum and the co-curriculum
- Student progression and timely completion of educational goals
- Preparation of students for their careers, citizenship, and lives
- Student learning and development
- Identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes

3. Organization and Leadership

Must have:

- clearly stated and current goals and outcomes
- policies and procedures
- responsibilities and performance expectations for personnel
- organizational charts demonstrating clear channels of authority

4. Human Resources

Multicultural Student Programs and Services must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish mission and goals.

5. Ethics

Multicultural Student Programs and Services (MSPS) must:

- review applicable professional ethical standards and must adopt or develop and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice
- publish and adhere to statements of ethical practice and ensure their periodic review
- orient new personnel to relevant ethical standards and statements of ethical practice and related institutional policies

6. Law, Policy and Governance

Multicultural Student Programs and Services (MSPS) must be in compliance with laws, regulations, and policies that relate to their respective responsibilities and that pose legal obligations, limitations, risks, and liabilities for the institution as a whole. Examples include constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and case law; relevant law and orders emanating from codes and laws; and the institution's policies.

7. Diversity, Equity, and Access

MSPS must

- advocate for sensitivity to multicultural and social justice concerns by the institution and its personnel
- ensure physical, program, and resource access for all constituents
- modify or remove policies, practices, systems, technologies, facilities, and structures that create barriers or produce inequities
- ensure that when facilities and structures cannot be modified, they do not impede access to programs, services, and resources
- establish goals for diversity, equity, and access
- foster communication and practices that enhance understanding of identity, culture, self-expression, and heritage
- promote respect for commonalities and differences among people within their historical and cultural contexts
- address the characteristics and needs of diverse constituents when establishing and implementing culturally relevant and inclusive programs, services, policies, procedures, and practices

8. Internal and External Relations

Multicultural Student Programs and Services (MSPS) must reach out to individuals, groups, communities, and organizations internal and external to the institution to:

- establish, maintain, and promote understanding and effective relations with those that have a significant interest in or potential effect on the students or other constituents served by the programs and services
- garner support and resources for programs and services as defined by the mission
- collaborate in offering or improving programs and services to meet the needs of students and other constituents and to achieve program and student outcomes
- engage diverse individuals, groups, communities, and organizations to enrich the educational environment and experiences of students and other constituents
- disseminate information about the programs and services

9. Financial Resources

In establishing and prioritizing funding resources, MSPS must conduct comprehensive analyses to determine

- Adequate funding
- Financial Planning and Implementation
- Policy and Procedures and Protocol

10. Technology

Multicultural Student Programs and Services (MSPS) must have technology to support the achievement of their mission and goals. The technology and its use must comply with institutional policies and procedures and with relevant codes and laws.

11. Facilities and Equipment

Multicultural Student Programs and Services' (MSPS) facilities must be intentionally designed, located in suitable, accessible, and provide safe spaces that demonstrate universal design and support the program's mission and goals.

12. Assessment

Specify programmatic goals and intended outcomes

- Identify student learning and development outcomes
- Employ multiple measures and methods
- Develop manageable processes for gathering, interpreting, and evaluating data
- Document progress toward achievement of goals and outcomes
- Interpret and use assessment results to demonstrate accountability
- Report aggregated results to respondent groups and stakeholders
- Use assessment results to inform planning and decision-making

From the CAS standards for Multicultural Programs and Services (2015)

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What long have you been at your institution? How long have you worked within your multicultural center?
2. What do you know of the history and mission of your multicultural center?
3. Describe how your programs and services fit the mission of the center.
4. What are the roles and responsibilities of each professional staff member within your multicultural center? How does these responsibilities fit the mission of the center?
5. Who mostly utilizes the services or participates in the programs of your center?
 - How do you suppose this group perceives the function of the center?
 - How do you suppose other groups that do not perceive the function of the center?
6. Describe the strengths and limitations of your multicultural center.
7. What multicultural, or diversity programs targets the majority student populations? How successful are these programs?
8. What programs or services that targets the historically marginalized student population?
9. How do you feel these programs and services are being successful? How do they fit within the mission of the institution?
10. What assessment methods are used to weigh the effectiveness of your programs?

APPENDIX D: IRB CONSENT FORM

AAHRPP DOCUMENT #192

**UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM**

Informed Consent for a Non-Medical Study

Study title: The Examination of Multicultural centers

Investigator's Name: Shalon Malone, Doctoral Candidate for Higher Education Administration

Institution: University of Alabama

You are being asked to take part in a research study.

This study is called "The Examination of Multicultural centers."

This study will be done by Shalon Malone, candidate for Doctorate in Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama.

Is the researcher being paid for this study?

The researcher will not be paid for this study.

Is this research developing a product that will be sold, and if so, will the investigator profit from it?

The research in this study will not be sold and the researcher will not gain any profit from this study.

Does the investigator have any conflict of interest in this study?

As the researcher or principal investigator, I have no conflict of interest in this study.

What is this study about? What is the investigator trying to learn?

Multicultural centers are given the dual responsibility of to continue the support of minority communities while providing educational programs focusing on diversity and

multiculturalism. Support programs and services that support the success of minority communities such as TRIO and identity centers such as black cultural center have been studied. However, less attention has been given to stand alone multicultural centers and their dual responsibility to their institutions and the institution's commitment to diversity. This study will attempt to fill the void in the research by analyzing their purpose, mission, and programs of these centers.

Why is this study important or useful?

By focusing this research on these characteristics, this study can present an accurate representation of how multicultural centers support the needs of historically marginalized students while providing diversity education to majority campus community.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?

You have been asked to be in this study because you either 1) work within the multicultural center and responsible for the educational and cultural programs, support services that are developed and carried out by the center or 2) responsible for overseeing the programs and support services carried out by the multicultural center within their institution of higher education.

How many people will be in this study?

About 20 other people will be in this study.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

If you meet the criteria and agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete an interview by phone or video conference.

How much time will I spend being this study?

Participants will complete a one-time interview that will take approximately forty-five minutes to an hour.

Will being in this study cost me anything?

There will be not only cost to this study other than my time to complete the study.

Will I be compensated for being in this study?

You will not be compensated for being in this study.

Can the investigator take me out of this study?

The investigator can take a participant out of the study if you no longer fulfill the requirements of the study.

What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?

There is no risk to be a part of this study. Your identity will be confidential and you can discontinue this study at any time.

What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?

There is no direct benefits to participation in this study. Results of this study will be used to understand the function of multicultural centers within higher education.

What are the benefits to science or society?

This study will help those who work in higher education understand the dual purpose of these center and how these multicultural centers can be successful within higher education.

How will my privacy be protected?

As principal investigator, I will not tell anyone of you are involved in this study. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

As the principal investigator, I will only know the names of the participants and their corresponding multicultural centers. Information gained from this study will only be used for the purpose of this study and will be kept on private computer and not on any university or public property.

What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?

If you do not want to be part of this study the alternative, choice is to refuse.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study later on, please

call Shalon Malone at (615) 491-2597 or shmalone@gmail.com. You may also ask contact my faculty advisor Dr. Kerri Holley at (205) 348-7825.

If you have questions about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in it. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA[®] | Office of the Vice President for
Research & Economic Development
Office for Research Compliance

May 2, 2018

Shalon Malone
Department of ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama
Box 870302

Re: IRB # 18-OR-167 "Examining Multicultural Centers"

Dear Ms. Malone:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research. Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on May 1, 2019. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved informed stamped consent form to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance

358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066

AAHRPP DOCUMENT #192
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM
Informed Consent for a Non-Medical Study

Study title: The Examination of Multicultural Centers

Investigator's Name: Shalon Malone, Doctoral Candidate for Higher Education Administration

Institution: University of Alabama

You are being asked to take part in a research study.

This study is called "The Examination of Multicultural Centers."

This study will be done by Shalon Malone, candidate for Doctorate in Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama.

Is the researcher being paid for this study?

The researcher will not be paid for this study.

Is this research developing a product that will be sold, and if so, will the investigator profit from it?

The research in this study will not be sold and the researcher will not gain any profit from this study.

Does the investigator have any conflict of interest in this study?

As the researcher or principal investigator, I have no conflict of interest in this study.

What is this study about? What is the investigator trying to learn?

Multicultural centers are given the dual responsibility of to continue the support of minority communities while providing educational programs focusing on diversity and multiculturalism. Support programs and services that support the success of minority communities such as TRIO and identity centers such as black cultural center have been studied. However, less attention has been given to stand alone multicultural centers and their dual responsibility to their institutions and the institution's commitment to diversity. This study will attempt to fill the void in the research by analyzing their purpose, mission, and programs of these centers.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 5-2-18
EXPIRATION DATE: 5-1-19

Why is this study important or useful?

By focusing this research on these characteristics, this study can present an accurate representation of how multicultural centers support the needs of historically marginalized students while providing diversity education to majority campus community.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?

You have been asked to be in this study because you either 1) work within the multicultural center and responsible for the educational and cultural programs, support services that are developed and carried out by the center or 2) responsible for overseeing the programs and support services carried out by the multicultural center within their institution of higher education.

How many people will be in this study?

About 20 other people will be in this study.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

If you meet the criteria and agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete an interview by phone or video conference.

How much time will I spend being this study?

Participants will complete a one-time interview that will take approximately forty-five minutes to an hour.

Will being in this study cost me anything?

There will be not only cost to this study other than my time to complete the study.

Will I be compensated for being in this study?

You will not be compensated for being in this study.

Can the investigator take me out of this study?

The investigator can take a participant out of the study if you no longer fulfill the requirements of the study.

What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?

There is no risk to be a part of this study. Your identity will be confidential and you can discontinue this study at any time.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 5-2-18
EXPIRATION DATE: 5-1-19

What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?

There is no direct benefits to participation in this study. Results is this study will be used to understand the function of multicultural centers within higher education.

What are the benefits to science or society?

This study will help those who work in higher education understand the dual purpose of these center and how these multicultural centers can be successful within higher education.

How will my privacy be protected?

As principal investigator, I will not tell anyone of you are involved in this study. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

As the principal investigator, I will only know the names of the participants and their corresponding multicultural centers. Information gained from this study will only be used for the purpose of this study and will be kept on private computer and not on any university or public property.

What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?

If you do not want to be part of this study the alternative, choice is to refuse.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study later on, please call Shalon Malone at (615) 491-2597 or shmalone@gmail.com. You may also ask contact my faculty advisor Dr. Kerri Holley at (205) 348-7825.

If you have questions about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
 CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 5-2-18
 EXPIRATION DATE: 5-1-19

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in it. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 5-2-18
EXPIRATION DATE: 5-1-19