BELONGING THROUGH DISSENT: A NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT ACTIVIST

SENSE OF BELONGING AND INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION

by

JOSEPH EDWARD PIERCE

(Under the Direction of Georgianna L. Martin)

ABSTRACT

Student activists have a long history of causing disruption on American college campuses. They have fought against numerous racial, sexual, and economic injustices in order to provide a more welcoming environment. Research supports that students who have a stronger sense of belonging and connection to their institution are more likely to persist to graduation than those who do not. This research, using two instruments to measure Sense of Belonging (Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, & Salomone, 2002) and Institutional Integration (French & Oakes, 2004), shows that student activists, in spite of organizing against their institutions, actually achieve statistically significant higher scores on measures of belonging and connection than do their non-activist peers. The only exception is the subscale measuring a student's desire to stay and graduate from their institution, which had a higher, but not statistically significant, score for non-activists over student activists. When looking at experiences of student activists by race/ethnicity only a few items achieved statistically significant levels. White students in comparison to Hispanic students experienced a statistically significant positive difference in their overall Sense of Belonging Scale, the connection between peer groups, and the overall Revised Institutional Integration Scale. The differences between students based upon their sexual

orientations did not rise to statistical significance through any of the subscales or overall scales. In order to create an environment in which student activists want to stay enrolled, the researcher suggests that institutions have a more positive view of student activism, develop clear and supportive policies governing student activism, and equip and embolden cultural centers to assist in the support of student activism.

INDEX WORDS: Colleges, College Students, Higher Education, Institutional Integration, Student Activism, Students of Color, LGBTQ Students, Sense of Belonging, Universities

BELONGING THROUGH DISSENT: A NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT ACTIVIST

SENSE OF BELONGING AND INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION

by

JOSEPH EDWARD PIERCE

B.S., University of Tennessee at Martin, 2005

MBA, Kennesaw State University, 2009

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2021

BELONGING THROUGH DISSENT: A NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT ACTIVIST

SENSE OF BELONGING AND INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION

by

JOSEPH EDWARD PIERCE

Major Professor:	Georgianna L. Martin
Committee:	Laura A. Dean
	Jason W. Umfress

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2021

DEDICATION

"Belonging through Dissent: A National Study of Student Activist Sense of Belonging and Institutional Integration" is dedicated to the prior and upcoming student activists to whom we owe gratitude and thanks. Throughout my research I have been amazed to see the creative and impactful ways that student activists have organized to create change on campus. A dedication of distinction goes to the student activists who organized and disrupted campus to call attention to institutional failures that marginalized their mere existence on campus. My hope is that institutions will begin to appreciate the developmental experiences of activism and the positive changes that come with students demanding that their voices be heard.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though I walk across the graduation stage alone I could not have made it here without the substantial love, care, support, and challenge from the village of people I call family, friends, and colleagues. I wish to call special attention to a few of them knowing that an entire dissertation's worth of pages could be used to explain how many people have helped this first-generation college student become Joseph E. Pierce, Ed.D.

My Parents. Edward and Susan Pierce are dreamers at heart. They have always been "in my corner" and supportive of every wish and dream I have ever had, even the most far-fetched. They have cheered me on through education and life, always dropping moments of support and encouragement along the way. I am forever grateful to have them as parents and thankful for the bits and pieces of them that I am.

Rebecca, Grayson, Gabriel, and Wesley. To my incredible family that put up with me missing-in-action or multi-tasking school and home life. Each of you, in your own special and unique way, made this achievement a little bit easier. As I walk through the completion of this journey, I recognize I could not have made it without the everlasting support of my little family. To Rebecca I am extremely grateful for the moments you allowed me to steal away to write and read or to even decompress from all the challenges in life. To Grayson, Gabriel, and Wesley I hope that watching me on this path has taught you one thing: you, too, can do hard things.

The Chipmunk Cohort. My amazing classmates that quickly became friends and then over time framily – thank you for being authentically you. Our cohort is made up of so many different experiences, perspectives, and personalities. However, our appreciation for each other

and our singular goal of being a cohort that goes through this journey together never faded. I appreciate all of our shared experiences, especially those that involved genuine laughter. Our UGA Transit ride with *Boobie the Chipmunk* set off our journey as one marked by laughter and once-in-a-lifetime occurrences. Through it all, as a collective and as individuals you all made this journey educational, fun, and one that I would do all over again – but only if we did it together.

Mary Frances Early College of Education. Before this program I never experienced faculty relationships that mirrored friendship and equals. The amazing faculty of the college and department have been instrumental in growing my knowledge and capabilities as a student affairs professional, leader, and scholarly practitioner. I have learned so much about myself, those around me, and the systems of higher education because of the thoughtful and intentional ways that you brought content to life. Whether it was through presentations, papers, annotated bibliographies, campus walks, role playing a focus group, or the always nearly forgotten discussion posts I appreciate and acknowledge how you all made the study of our field enjoyable. I especially want to acknowledge and thank my dissertation committee: Drs. Martin, Dean, and Umfress. I was so lucky to have all of you guiding my dissertation and scholarly pursuits along the way. Each iteration of my dissertation was sharper and more impactful because of the unique perspectives and strengths you each brought to our discussions. To Drs. Dunn, Cooper, Higgins, Means, Brannon, and Barham I am indebted to each of you for the large and small things you did to welcome me to your scholarly space and to make sure that I left knowing enough to have an educated thought, and humble enough to know that life is more often about "yes, and" than "yes, but".

Colleagues. I work with some of the most thoughtful and caring people in higher education. I owe the start of this journey to my colleagues that encouraged me to apply, wrote

me letters of recommendation, and those who showed me how to live the dual life as a full time professional and doctoral student. To each of my supervisors, Dr. Scott Wallace and Dr. Patrice Jackson I am thankful for your professional moments of support and your friendly cheers of encouragement through coursework and the dissertation process. I always felt like I could have real talk about my doctoral journey with each of you. Your confidence in my abilities to be a great professional and student breathed confidence into my daily work. To my Student Life & Engagement team, past and present, I acknowledge and appreciate every word of encouragement and moment of stress as you saw first-hand how I imperfectly balanced school, work, and life. You are the heroes of the office and it is a joy and privilege to work alongside such brilliant and capable higher education professionals.

#FirstGenDocs. As a first-generation doctoral student at a research institution there were days and times that I didn't know what words to use or even what questions to ask. The entire #FirstGenDocs community, led by three brilliant Black scholars, was like home on the internet. This group helped me figure out some of the most difficult unwritten, never-in-an-orientation parts of being a doctoral student. Every tweet, direct message, and passing conversation came with care, support, and a passion for advancing the first-generation doctoral student movement. I am confident that this community kept me grounded and focused throughout the journey.

Lastly, I want to thank everyone in between. My life and journey have been filled with folks who have given me more than I could give back. From my childhood to now I am incredibly thankful that others invested time and energy into my development. With so much love and adoration, thank you everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

BELONGING THROUGH DISSENT: A NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT ACTIVIST

SENSE OF BELONGING AND INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Student dissent is not a new phenomenon; it has been an essential part of campus life for many centuries. In the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries students protested the strict rules of college campuses (Boren, 2019; Moore, 1976). Students were frustrated at the "extremely rigid behavioral policies" (Boren, 2019, p. 30) that universities had in place. In the 18th century, heightened by the surge of American liberty and personal independence, they fought against drinking rules, poor university food, and little student participant in governance. During the 20th and 21st centuries, substandard conditions and divisive environments drew and continue to draw the attention of concerned students. In a three-month period of 2020, Syracuse University students endured 26 incidents of campus racism or anti-Semitism (Hicks, 2020). Frustrated at the lack of action and transparency of Syracuse administration, several students participated in a sit-in at the main administration building. The sit-in lasted 31 days. Students were subjected to academic suspension, the withholding of food and medicine, and an eventual move to a virtual protest because of the Coronavirus pandemic (Hicks, 2020). Similar incidents and feelings of mistrust also occurred at The University of Iowa. In February of 2019 students took to social media to share incidents of racism and divisiveness while asking #DoesUIowaLoveMe? Students of color, sexual minorities, and students of indigenous descent shared online and at public rallies various experiences that made them feel unwelcome at The University of Iowa (Peckman, 2019). In October of 2019 first year students at Georgia Southern University protested a first-year

common-read author's campus appearance. The common-read and accompanying author's campus visit were designed to assist students in an unpacking of oppression, marginality, and privilege. During and after a public speech from the author, assumedly racially privileged students protested. They verbally challenged the author during her speech by shouting, and several students went to their residence hall to burn their common-read textbook. Students were frustrated with Georgia Southern's support of the author who some characterized as "dissing white people" (Smith & Baxley, 2019).

Generation Z Students and Campus Activism

Syracuse University, University of Iowa, and Georgia Southern are three examples of campus activism that represent students using their voice and behaviors to disrupt the campus environment in hopes of being heard and effecting change. These students are all part of what has come to be known as Generation Z. Generation Z students have several characteristics that align with activist behaviors. Seemiller and Grace (2016) found that Generation Z students are:

- Troubled with education, employment, and racial disparities;

- Conscious of issues impacting their local, national, and international environment;

- Willing to participate in service opportunities that have real and identifiable impact on foundational structural challenges;

- Cause-oriented through motivation to advocate and work for issues that are important to them.

Generation Z students also have an action-oriented nature that many Millennials lacked. With their consciousness of issues and propensity to act, we are experiencing a resurgence of campus activism (Rue, 2018). Many institutions have proactively recruited high school students who are well versed in student activism. Students around the nation who participated in protests after the

2018 school shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School have been welcomed to college campuses without a consequence for their protest participation (Rue, 2018). Additionally, Broadhurst and Martin (2014) believed universities ought to "welcome student activism on campus not only through the institution's mission, values, and culture but also through verbal encouragement" (p. 90). With experience in activism and a generational push to action, students are likely to participate in activism when they appreciate the cause (Seemiller & Grace, 2016).

Campus Activism as a Tool of Institutional Connection

Participation in student activism can also be seen as a means to academic and social achievement. Literature indicates student activism may yield student learning and positive outcomes (Biddix, Somers, & Poman, 2009; Quaye, 2007). Biddix et al. (2009) found that student activism provides opportunities for students to learn to engage across a broad range of perspectives, develop a sense of community, examine and develop personal values, contribute to social change, and commit to global citizenship. Participation in activism also has positive outcomes for student development (Biddix, 2014). Students are likely to engage in complex skill building they would not otherwise have the opportunity to explore. Biddix (2014) also found that mere participation in student activism is likely to influence a student's future endeavors. Student activists are likely to have a greater commitment to change and social involvement, as well as self-confidence related to advocacy for change.

Student activism support can also be a tool of retention. For students that have been historically marginalized or underrepresented on college campuses, student activism may contribute to connection, community, and a sense of belonging (Linder & Rodriguez, 2012). A student's sense of belonging portrays how students may or may not feel connected to the institution (Strayhorn, 2019). The change in approach from mere tolerance to celebration of

campus activism signals a safe space for student activists on campus. Reger (2018) suggested institutions that support student activism are able to be more proactive than reactive to student activism. Supportive universities should also provide resources to support an activist subculture on campus. When universities view campus demonstrations as an "educational opportunity or a step toward engaged citizenship" (Martin, 2014, p. 88), they can become an integral part of campus life leading to an increased sense of belonging and integration for students.

Student Activism and Marginalized Populations

How students interact with and name activist behaviors can vary dramatically and often relies on the student's own privileged or marginalized identities (Andaluz Ruiz, et al., 2017; Linder, et al., 2019). Research focused on identity-based activism has shown that students participate in activism to disrupt their environments to address inequities. Student activism flares when institutions fail to create an environment where everyone can learn and live in a safe and supportive environment. In response, students with marginalized identities are often motivated to organize activism opportunities (Linder, et. al., 2019). Some believe that activism is their duty or their obligation to themselves, each other, and to the institution. Through activism marginalized students are formalizing concerns that their access to higher education is not enough; they want and deserve support, resources, and a welcoming environment to be successful (Bragg et al., 2016).

<div align="center">

Research Problem

</div>

A student's sense of belonging and institutional integration are well regarded indicators of student persistence (Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, & Salomone, 2002; Strayhorn, 2019). Students who participate in demonstrations may experience vitriolic disdain from campus administrators (Harrison & Mather, 2017), potentially damaging a student's affective attitude

and behaviors that could lead to connection. Although research shows that participation in activism is positively associated with the creation of a civically minded college student (Biddix, 2014), the relationships between student activism and sense of belonging and institutional integration are largely unknown. Students who hold marginalized identities, such as minoritized race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, are often pushed to activism because of their oppression (Linder, et al., 2019). Furthermore, Wheatle and Commodore (2019) noted that recent student activist movements have been centered around identities, such as LGBT and minorities, that are oppressed by institutions. Therefore, the research of belonging and integration of students with marginalized identities is important to understand when we consider student activism as a whole.

Theoretical Framework

In this study I will use Tinto's Longitudinal Theory of Departure (1975) as a way to understand the experiences and relationships between the institution, faculty/staff, and peers of student activists. Tinto postulated that a student's academic and social needs must be met for them to persist and be retained (1975). The Sense of Belonging (Hoffman, et. al., 2002) and Revised Institutional Integration instruments (French & Oakes, 2004) have used Tinto's Theory of Departure as a guiding framework. These two constructs together capture both affective and behavioral dimensions of students' college experiences. Sense of belonging and institutional integration theories posit that a student's connection to campus can be determined by measuring their feelings (sense of belonging) and behaviors (institutional integration). Both instruments center the student's perception of peers, faculty, and the institution as the lens that students use to determine how they do or do not feel connected to the institution or if they belong. Both instruments also use Tinto's Longitudinal Theory of Departure (1975) as a foundation to ascertain what feelings and behaviors are likely to lead to student persistence.

Purpose of the Study & Research Questions

The purpose of this quantitative study is to describe the direction and degree of relationship between student activists and their sense of belonging and institutional integration. The study will also explore the relationships between race/ethnicity and sexual orientation with student activism. The study will attempt to answer the following questions:

Research Question 1

RQ1: What, if any, are the differences in sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists and non-activists as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Research Question 2

RQ2: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their race/ethnicity as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Research Question 3

RQ3: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their sexual orientation as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

To determine the sense of belonging and institutional integration of undergraduate and graduate student campus activists, this study will utilize a quantitative methodology. The relationship between a student's activist identity and that of their sense of belonging and

institutional integration is key to understanding how institutions can not only retain, but also support student activists on their campus. The study of student activists' demographics will not only add to race/ethnicity and sexual orientation research but also to literature regarding student activism.

Participants in the study will self-identify as campus activists. Researchers have observed that students identify with an activist identity in multiple ways. Some students think of it in traditional forms of activism such as sit-ins, marches, or meetings with officials (Barnhardt, 2014; Metzger, Erete, Barton, Desler, & Lewis, 2015). Several minoritized identities saw their mere existence in dominate normative spaces as activism (Stewart, 2019). Stewart (2019) believed that most of the activism he observed as a student affairs educator was beyond the traditional methods of public discourse into a more private resistance. Participants in Stewart's (2019) study used #BlackGirlMagic to disrupt social media with proclamations and celebrations of existence in spite of lack of institutional support and resources for Black women. Including public and private forms of activism allows the study to include the sense of belonging and integration of those who practice activism in non-traditional means (Stewart, 2019).

Significance of the Study

Across the nation, student activism has captured the attention of many universities. Failure to address concerns of students may result in protests and activism that disrupts the campus environment. Many of these protests are the result of institutions failing to listen and change their culture in response to students' needs (Linder et. al, 2019). Students who participate in these activist behaviors, large and small, do not feel supported by their institutions (Ruiz, Cheng, Terrell, Lewis, Mattern, & Wright, 2017). Students who feel unsupported or who feel that their institution lacks concern for their care and safety are likely to drop out (Strayhorn,

2019). A meaningful connection to their institution encourages students to persist to graduation.

When students feel like they are cared about, their connection, both academically and socially, is

much stronger. Because of their increased institutional connection, they are able to endure and

cope through typical college challenges and pressures to persist towards graduation (Hoffman, et.

al, 2002).

Using information from this study, practitioners and scholars will be better equipped to

identify practical ways to make better connections with students who are engaging in activism.

Increasing their connection to their institution is likely to create more of an affective belonging

and integration into campus driven by student behaviors. That connection to the university has

been associated with increased persistence (Strayhorn, 2019) as well as with students remaining

active with time and money after graduation (Drezner, 2010).

Discussion of Key Concepts

Activism

For the purpose of this study, I will define activism in the broadest sense possible.

Jordan's (2002) definition of activism as "violent or peaceful, noisy or quiet actions taken by

groups of people, some small and some huge, [in] attempts to alter society according to the

desires of those taking action" (p. 8) is foundational. Recently Stewart (2019) identified

additional ways that students identify as activists where minoritized students can see their

existence in a dominant space as activism, as a way to alter society. Martin, Linder, and Williams

(2019) defined student activism "as any efforts by students to bring about and create social

change on their campuses and beyond" (p. 5). Student activism, as defined by Martin, Linder,

and Williams (2019), reflects public and private activism that Jordan (2002) and Stewart (2019)

reflected in their definitions while allowing students to self-define their activist behaviors for a

broader, more inclusive perspective. For this reason, I define student activism using Martin, Linder, and Williams' (2019) focus on student activist behaviors that bring about social change on their campus. Only looking at activism aimed at social change on campus will allow me to concentrate on how student activism may influence a student's connection to their institution.

Sense of Belonging

As higher education professionals, one of the most pertinent questions we attempt to understand and answer is "Why do students leave college and how can we get them to stay?" (Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, & Salomone, 2002, p. 228). Many researchers posit that the initial understanding of this question is within a sense of belonging that students feel. For the purpose of this study, I define "sense of belonging" as "the experience of personal involvement in a system or environment so that persons feel themselves to be an integral part of that system or environment" (Hagerty, Lynch-Sauer, Patusky, Bouwseman, & Collier, 1992, p. 173). Belongingness is a basic human need and essential for students to learn and grow at our institutions. Strayhorn (2019) underlined the importance of belonging as a matter of academic and social success. Students who do not feel as if they belong are likely to drop out of our institutions at a higher rate than those who feel a connection with the institution (Strayhorn, 2019).

Institutional Integration

The student's interactions with the university, both academic and social, can assist practitioners and researchers in understanding what keeps students enrolled and why they may choose to drop out. Institutional integration is a multidimensional approach to measuring the academic and social integration of students (French & Oakes, 2004). Tinto posited that levels of social and academic integration are measured through a series of dimensions, such as interactions

with faculty and peers, as well as their growth in intellectual matters (Tinto, 1975; French &

Oakes, 2004). Understanding how student activists are connected to the institution as influenced

relationships with faculty, peers, and institutional commitments could provide guidance as to

what dimensions could be improved to support student activists.

Conclusion

Generation Z students are likely to participate in structural change demonstrations

because of their increased diverse and global perspective (Seemiller & Grace, 2016).

Understanding how campus activists are or are not connected to their institution will assist

practitioners in a higher level of support and appreciation for campus activists. Throughout the

next chapter I will review current literature regarding sense of belonging and institutional

integration, as well as experiences of students of color and LGBT students within these

constructs. By first understanding these topics in a broad stroke, educators will better be able to

identify how campus activism participation, and holding marginalized identities, may change

students' connection to their institution.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Students have long been involved in activism. Activism has occurred throughout the centuries both on and off of college campuses (Brax, 1981; Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). This study will specifically look at students who participate in activism that occurs to disrupt campus policies and practices, whether motivated by internal or external pressures, and their perceived institutional integration and sense of belonging.

Rueben, a professor at Harvard University, contends that "activism is most successful when college students make an off-campus issue also a campus issue" (Jason, 2018, para. 8). According to Wheatle and Commodore (2019), "American higher education has responded to and wrestled with politics and policies from external stakeholders" (p. 10). For example, Black Lives Matter is a national movement that when on college campuses often focuses on campus issues relating to race, gender, and sociopolitical inequities (Altman, 2015). College campuses are a ripe ground for student activism as their existence manifests space for dissent, police actions are mostly limited, and media coverage exists (Boren, 2019).

In this chapter I will review literature pertaining to student activism, sense of belonging, and institutional integration. Initially I will cover the history of student activism on United States' campuses, the emergence of identity-based student activism, highlights of student activism over the last five years, and lastly how student activism has changed and shifted campus cultures. Then I will review literature on sense of belonging and institutional integration broadly and specifically to students of color and those who identify as LGBT. Understanding the experiences of students whose identities are marginalized by institutional policies and campus

environments is important context to the overall study of student activism. Minoritized students are frequently compelled to activism because their identities are often the root of sociopolitical institutional policies that do not meet their needs (Linder, Quaye, Stewart, Okello, & Roberts, 2019). I hope to understand how their belonging and integration may differ from students who do not possess identities marginalized by systemic oppression.

History of Campus Activism

Riots, student protests, and demonstrations have beleaguered institutional administrators for centuries (Braungart & Braungart, 1990). "Behold our butter stinketh" (Brax, 1981, p. 3) was the first recorded activist rally cry at Harvard University in 1776. Students were immensely dissatisfied with poor quality dining hall food and protested for better conditions. During the 1920s institutions were strongly criticized for educational issues pushing against campus newspaper censorship and the right for radical speakers to come to campus. The activists hoped to establish and protect free speech on campus (Altbach & Peterson, 1971), which continues to be a challenge. Student activists continued to rail against restrictions on free speech in the 1930s. Students at the City College of New York protested against their president who banned a campus pro-Communist radical journal. The president lambasted and dismissed the editorial staff of the journal. Following the student protests the students were reinstated and the school's governing board affirmed that students had the right to publish their views (Boren, 2019). Broadhurst (2014) noted that after World War I students had grown weary of war and created a peace movement. During the movement students ridiculed and protested against college campuses hosting Reserve Officers' Training Corp's (ROTC) commissioned officer training. Following the war, higher education enrollment increased by from 3.6 million to 8.5 million and universities responded with a more standardized approach to curriculum (Lucas, 2006; Thelin, 2004).

Students protested against colleges and universities for becoming educational factories and losing the personal connection students were accustomed to (Boren, 2019; Broadhurst, 2014). Students described their institutions as lacking intellectual challenge and foregoing any recognition of student individuality (Horowitz, 1986). Students also demanded courses designed to aid them in meeting the changing circumstances and environments around them.

Identity-Based Student Activism (1940s-Present)

The history of students protesting issues related to their identities is rich. Identity-based student activism is "organizing resisting and engaging with issues directly tied to oppression and identity" (Linder, et. al., 2020, p. 4). African American students in the 1940s and 1950s protested against the "separate but equal" doctrine highlighting that Black student facilities did not equal those of white students. In 1945 white and Black students fought to desegregate universities throughout the United States (Boren, 2019; Broadhurst, 2014). Washington University students partnered with civil rights groups to successfully integrate the medical school and school of social work in 1946. The entire Washington University was desegregated in 1952 (Boren, 2019). However, upon entry Black students became the center of a chilly, hostile environment. They were put into separate dorm rooms and segregated lunch tables and were limited to class sections noted for "colored" students (Wallenstein, 2008). Though they were admitted, they were still being treated differently their peers.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s Black students demanded education that was relevant and inclusive of their history and culture (Boren, 2019; McDowell, Lowe, & Dockette, 1970). Proponents of Black studies believed that curriculum changes could be a part of a "larger pursuit of social justice and a broader, more inclusive democracy" (Joseph, 2003, p. 182). After witnessing the uprising and police brutality of the 1968 Orangeburg Massacre in Orangeburg,

SC, students at Howard University pressed forward with university reform after many unsuccessful attempts. Their agenda included race-centered curriculum, better student representation, and greater political freedoms. Boren (2019) noted that after the Orangeburg Massacre Howard University students increasingly pressed for their president to resign. At the peak of the protest, they occupied the administration building. In response Howard University administration unsuccessfully attempted to send all students home. Thousands of students returned in protest each morning until successful changes were made. Through compromise the students were able to gain a commitment to better student representation and that formal charges would not be pursued against protestors. The physical occupation of administrative spaces at Howard University inspired campuses across the nation (Boren, 2019).

Later in 1968, four days after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., at a public address of Stanford University's Provost, members of the Black Student Union were moved to action. The chair of the Black Student Union, Kenny Washington, proclaimed "put your money and your action where your mouth is" as other students revealed their list of demands (Armbruster-Sandoval, 2017, p. 163). The marginalized students wanted to see more hiring of minority faculty, recruitment of minority students, and subsequent curriculum changes that reflected a more diverse course of study (Armbruster-Sandoval, 2017). Also, in 1968 African American students at Columbia University protested against the gentrification of adjacent land to build a new gym for the school. Student described the act as blatantly racist because it purposefully excluded Black city residents from using its facilities. The feud between students and Columbia University continued for several months. As students occupied university buildings in protest, they were often forcefully removed by New York City Police. Students also walked out of the university commencement address to attend a counter-commencement that

featured Sarah Lawrence College President Harold Taylor. As this continued on students were disciplined for their participation. Ultimately in response to protests the Columbia University president resigned (Boren, 2019).

Many campus protests in the 1970s, centered on ending the Vietnam War and on achieving greater Black student presence on campus, turned violent. Kent University students had been active protesters when the Ohio governor forbade protests to continue after a campus ROTC building was burned down. The National Guard had a heavy presence on campus to squash student uprisings (Boren, 2019). On May 4, a thousand students overwhelmed the National Guard and protested on the Commons. Students threw cans and rocks at the officers. Officers responded with gunfire killing four students and wounding eight others (Kifner, 1970). Two weeks later at Jackson State College (now Jackson State University) in Mississippi, police killed protesting Black students. The students were accused of throwing rocks at cars driven by white men. President Nixon instituted a review of these police attacks by the Federal Bureau of Investigations (Boren, 2019).

The 1970s also brought out a fury of gendered protests. Female students started to unravel the patriarchy of campus environments and demanded changes. Similar to Black students, women across the nation protested for more inclusive curriculum, identity centers, and respect on campus. (Boren, 2019).

During the 1980s, anti-apartheid movement college students were largely concerned with university relationships and involvement abroad (Boren, 2019; Broadhurst, 2014). Through the campus newspaper, Spelman College students brought voice to the opposition of the racist and violent government of South Africa. Editors published interviews of men and women who were victims of abuse and discrimination. Students also brought South African students to publicly

speak on their experiences (Jackson, 2009). Many universities erected shantytowns to visually show the plight of South Africans (Boren, 2019). Martin (2007) noted that divestment activism was largely successful: 60% of universities that had activist students divested while only 3% of other universities divested. The University of California withdrew over $3 billion from companies tied to South Africa because of student protests gaining national attention (Boren, 2019).

In 1988, Stanford's Rainbow Coalition students also participated in identity-based student activism. The group protested against politically motivated curriculum changes that minimized diversity initiatives. Students demanded Stanford undergo a study of campus racism and divestment from South Africa (Sandoval, 2012). Also, in 1988 students at Gallaudet University protested the hiring of their new president. As a school for deaf students the university had never had a deaf president. During the protest of a newly appointed non-deaf president, students demanded a deaf president, changes to the university's governing board, and amnesty for the demonstrators. With the support of faculty, the students were successful in gaining the resignation of the president and chairman of the board. Soon after the new board appointed one of the deaf candidates as president. For the first time since the university was founded, students at Gallaudet University, a school for deaf students, had representation at the highest level – a deaf president (Boren, 2019).

In the 1990s diversity continued to be a centerpiece focus for student activism. During the National Day of Action in 1996 students across the nation joined together to protest: immigrant rights, affirmative action, increased access to education, and better campus climates for students of color and for the LGBT community (Broadhurst, 2014). The Day of Action consisted of walkouts, sit-ins, rallies, and teach ins all focused on campus issues that would

benefit the most marginalized. Hunger strikes gained in popularity on college campuses in the 1990s. Hunger strikes were held at Columbia University, Sarah Lawrence College, Stanford, University of California Los Angeles, University of California Santa Barbara, the University of Colorado, and at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. These strikes were held for the establishment of multicultural curriculum, ethnic studies programs, or for ethical university financial investments (Boren, 2019).

Contemporary Student Activism

Though many issues have taken center stage within contemporary student activism (Wheatle & Commodore, 2019) I will focus my review of contemporary student activism as it relates to free speech, LGBT student support, and racially hostile campus climates. LGBT student support and racially hostile campus climates are important to this study as research questions are focused on the experiences of students who identify as LGBT and students of color. The free speech movement is included because it is often used as a shield by those working to further oppress marginalized identities (Healy, 2019).

Free Speech

In 2017 students across the nation lambasted their institutions for hosting conservative, right wing speakers (Boren, 2019). Milo Yiannopoulos was invited to speak at the University of California Berkeley by the Berkeley Patriot campus publication. As covered by the UC Berkeley campus newspaper, *The Daily Californian,* students, faculty, and staff were joined by the community to protest Yiannopoulos' speech. Faculty wrote open letters, students collected signatures and protested around campus against Yiannopoulos' alt-right extremist views. While the activism worked, and the Berkeley Patriot canceled the speech, Yiannopoulos still came to

campus. He spoke to a small crowd of students on campus as hundreds of protesters gathered to disrupt the event (The Daily Californian, 2017).

Tensions rose at other institutions for similar high profile, right wing extremist campus appearances. At the University of Florida white nationalist Richard Spencer was scheduled to deliver a speech on campus one month after his appearance at the Unite the Rite Rally in Charlottesville, Virginia which left three people dead, many others injured, and some arrested (Martin & Tecklenburg, 2020). Before the event, students unsuccessfully protested Spencer's appearance through a petition to put pressure on the University of Florida President and Board of Trustees (Ellenbogen, Morales, & Respess, 2017). The No Nazis at UF student organization, along with 2,500 other students, faculty, and staff, marched towards the auditorium hosting Spencer. Once inside the auditorium the crowd chanted, yelled, and drowned out Spencer (Kornfield, 2017). A year after the event a student shared that the day University of Florida hosted Spencer was the "day that she didn't feel like a gator anymore" and that the university hosted someone that wanted to take her life away (Curbelo, 2018, n.p.).

Chemerinsky (2018) discussed the tension between institutional free speech and the student body's desire that the administration quell offensive speech. Many students expressed the desire that the administration take an active role in determining offensive speech and to ban it from campus – a far cry from the 1920s protests opposing censorship as noted by Altbach and Peterson (1971). The battle of free speech on campus has shifted (Chemerinsky, 2018). The concern is now largely less about administrators squashing student free speech than it is about university campuses becoming the battleground for "outside speakers and outside disruptors" (p. 589).

At both UC Berkeley and University of Florida students felt betrayed and confused that their institution would allow student organizations to host speakers that denigrated populations of students' mere existence (Curbelo, 2018; The Daily Californian, 2017).

LGBT/Gender

Over the past few years students have also rallied around representation and rights of LGBT and gender non-conforming students (Boren, 2019). In 2018 students at Tufts University celebrated the installation of gender-neutral restrooms in several central campus buildings. Students had been increasing in activist behaviors since 2002 using the Student Government's tools for activism. They created legislative resolutions, held campus wide forums, and gained allies within administration to push the campus community forward in support of and to financially provide for gender inclusive restrooms (Minster, 2018).

LGBTQ students at Baylor University, a private religious institution steeped in Christian Baptist beliefs, have felt like "second class citizens" because the institution has refused to recognize their LGBTQ student organization (Retta, 2019). Up until 2015, same sex displays of affection were in violation of the student code of conduct. However, even after that was changed, LGBT students continued to feel as if they do not belong (Retta, 2019). In 2019 students from the unofficial student organization petitioned assistance from the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The request alleges that the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students at Baylor have faced discrimination for years (Bauer-Wolf, 2019). Students allege that Baylor approved an anti-LGBT flyer to be distributed and posted that amplified the harassment and feelings of exclusion of LGBT students on campus. Baylor students also circulated a petition that received over 3,200 signatures in support of recognition for the LGBTQ student group (Bauer-Wolf, 2019).

Black Lives Matter

The Black Lives Matter Movement started in 2013, when the not guilty verdict was announced for George Zimmerman who killed 17-year-old, unarmed, Black teen Trayvon Martin. Alicia Garza, a Black female and one of the Black Lives Matter founders, believed that the verdict said loud and clear that Black people are not safe in America (Day, 2015). The killings of numerous Black people across the country initially inspired the movement; however, the everyday and consistent racism reminds Black people that they are not welcome in America (Altman, 2015).

The Black Lives Matter Movement was named on the Time Magazine Person of the Year Short List in 2015 after garnering national recognition including calling attention to the gender, identity, and social inequities on college campuses (Altman, 2015). At the University of Missouri, Columbia (Mizzou) three Black female students sparked interest for an organizing group, Concerned Students 1950. Named for the first year Mizzou admitted Black students, the women were initially motivated to protest by the 2014 fatal shooting of unarmed Michael Brown, a Black 18-year-old man, by police in Ferguson, Missouri. Upset that the administration had not publicly addressed police brutality so close to campus the students organized massive die-ins and other demonstrations on campus (Little, 2019). During the Concerned Students 1950 movement, students disrupted campus through many means, attempting to gain a meeting with the president. Despite their many attempts the president would not meet with them. After emailing a list of demands and continued presidential silence Jonathan Butler, a founder of the organizing group, embarked on a hunger strike. Butler promised not to eat until the president resigned or was terminated (Little, 2019). A tent city was created in the center of campus that included "nonviolent, disruptive campus demonstrations; a boycott of the student union and any

purchase of auxiliary services; mass walkouts, teach-ins, meetings with alumni and state legislators; and an all-out strike by our predominately Black football team" (Little, 2019, p. 27).

In October of 2019 American University student Gianna Wheeler was forcibly removed from her campus dorm room after campus police were called to do a wellness check. The incident sparked an outrage online and on campus. Students tagged #HandsOffGianna and #BLM to show solidarity with Wheeler. A Black Lives Matter protest was held on campus to highlight the inequities and experiences of many Black students at American University. Wheeler left the institution citing a hostile environment and systemic racism as her motivation despite having a full scholarship (Johnson, 2019). A few months later a similar incident happened to another American University student. Zach Mills, a graduate student, was threatened and received aggressive questioning from campus police after his academic department requested a wellness care check. Mills believed that the care check was retaliation against him for lodging various discrimination complaints against his department. Fellow students in his department acknowledged that professors held Mills to a double standard. Students continued to protest racial inequities on campus, believing that American University had serious race problems (Johnson, 2019).

After the string of police violence against Black Americans in 2020, Black Lives Matter protests resurged on college campuses across the nation. Georgetown University Student Association (GUSA) voiced solidarity with the Black Lives Matter movement through legislation that calls upon administration to show how the campus police will enhance its commitment to providing a safe space for Georgetown's Black students. They also urged the campus community to elevate the Black Lives Matter movement through donations by listening to Black voices and donating to affiliated bail funds and organizations. A Georgetown student

criticized the GUSA response. One student called it reactionary and argued that GUSA should do more to uplift and cultivate relationships with the Black community every day, not just when something big happens. A member of GUSA cited racial barriers causing her to feel unwelcome or that her voice was less important at GUSA meetings (Hardy, 2020).

In 2020 students and alumni at Augusta University also pushed back against tone deaf campus messaging concerning support for Black Lives Matter. Specifically, the Black Student Union student organization decried that administrators would describe Augusta University as an anti-racist community (Student, personal communication, June 4, 2020). Seizing the opportunity to highlight local racial inequities as it relates to the Black Lives Matter movement, the Black Student Union released a list of demands via personal communication to campus leaders and via Instagram. Their demands included more and better representation of Black faculty and staff, a zero-tolerance policy on acts of discrimination, inclusion of Black history, removal of racially historic symbols on campus, and the creation of a Black Student Affairs department among other things. Students across campus reposted the content tagging several campus departments as a means of disrupting social media presences and calling departmental attention to their demands (Black Student Union, 2020).

Garza, a founder of Black Lives Matters, believes that their movement is a call to action and that everyone plays a role in creating a world where Black lives actually do matter (Day, 2015). Whatever the forum, student activists are rallying around the support and uplifting of voices whose identities are marginalized by campus administration policies and unwelcome environments (Linder, et al., 2019).

Throughout the history of higher education, students have used their voice to dissent for a variety of reasons. The connectedness of these students to their peers, faculty, and institution is

an important dynamic to understand. When higher education professionals understand how student activists do and do not experience belonging and connection, we can engage them more meaningfully in areas of support. Sense of belonging research shows the positive outcomes that students are likely to achieve when they feel belongingness and the magnified importance of sense of belonging for students who have a marginalized identity (Strayhorn, 2019).

Activism and Campus Change

Activism has encouraged and demanded institutional change for centuries (Braungart & Braungart, 1990; Broadhurst, 2014). The encouragement for institutions to change is underscored by changing demographics and the worldview of current students (Kezar, 2018; Seemiller & Grace, 2016; Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). Generation Z students are increasingly diverse and action-oriented towards systemic level issues (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Institutional stakeholders often know what needs to happen to create a welcoming environment for various populations of students, but often fail to enact meaningful change through structural and cultural enhancements (Kezar, 2018). Student activism can spur institutions to act on what they know should be done. Activism can also be the result of an unethical act of change on campus that minimizes or pushes out student voices (Kezar, 2018). The student organization protest at Baylor University has not resulted in an approved student organization charter but has highlighted Baylor's lack of support on a national level (Retta, 2019). After the collective action of Concerned Students of 1950 at Mizzou, the president resigned after two months of racial unrest and a failure of the administration to listen to and respond to Black Lives Matter protests (Little, 2019). The Black Student Union at Augusta University was able to gain an ally in the president to provide more funding that supports cultural competence, increase multicultural programming

within student affairs, and name a student committee to address historical racial symbolism on campus (Personal Communication).

College students are motivated to make change on their campus for many different reasons, but often feel the weight and carry the burden for initiating those changes (Linder, Quaye, Stewart, Okello, & Roberts, 2019). Many institution leaders abdicate their duty to ensure a welcoming environment to the actual students who often feel the most unwelcome. While the sense of belonging and institutional integration for all students is a concern, educators and practitioners must equally be concerned about how our students at the epicenter of activist change do or do not connect and feel a sense of belonging to their institution.

Tinto's Longitudinal Theory of Student Departure

According to Wheatle and Commodore (2019), "today's higher education scholars, leaders, practitioners, and policymakers strive to understand and address campus issues to strengthen institutions and institutional effectiveness and to improve their ability to serve students and communities" (p. 10). According to Tinto (1993), retention should not be the goal of the institution, rather retention should be the outcome. Tinto's (1975, 1987) research contributed to models and predictors of social and educational integration that led to student departure persistence. Tinto's model (1993) describes ways that students experience and interact with the campus environment and measures the academic and social integration of students. The measurement of integration is largely based on how the student feels they are or are not a part of the institution. The model (1993) takes into account stages of integration as defined as separation, transition, and incorporation. A student's ability to separate with their past community norms leads students into a transition marked by negotiating an in-between phase of not fully adopting their new environment and habits but also having transitioned out of previous

norms. Students achieve incorporation when they adapt and adopt the behavior and cultural norms of their institutional community (Milem & Berger, 1997). The hope of Tinto's (1993) model is to determine what "processes allow students to navigate the stage of transition and to enter the stage of incorporation" (Milem & Berger, 1997, p. 389). The following review of sense of belonging and institutional integration research will show how Tinto's work has been used to understand different methods and levers of student retention and persistence.

Sense of Belonging

Insight into the affective connection between a student and their institution can be viewed through the sense of belonging lens. One of the greatest questions every institution must answer is why students leave and how institutions can get them to stay (Hoffman, et. al., 2002). Research has shown that students select and stay at institutions because they feel like they belong (Ribera, Miller, & Dumford, 2017; Strayhorn, 2012). Strayhorn has written extensively on the topic of sense of belonging (Strayhorn, 2012; Strayhorn, 2019). His research explores sense of belonging as a foundational level of need fulfillment, often calling sense of belonging a basic human need that is sufficient enough to drive human behavior. Sense of belonging is about an individual's psychological experiences and how they do or do not integrate into environments (Strayhorn, 2019). To achieve a sense of belonging on campus students must feel that they play an important role, that colleges depend on them, and that their presence, or lack thereof, is noticed. Students that feel that sense of belonging function at higher levels than students who succumb to feelings of loneliness and intimidation (Strayhorn, 2019). When sense of belonging is put into a context of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, students are not able to address higher order needs, such as self-actualization and esteem, until the need to belong is satisfied. For places like college campuses, the need for belonging is high because they are different and unfamiliar to

most (Strayhorn, 2019). Students that struggle with a sense of belonging on campus are likely to struggle academically and socially because they spend their energy negotiating spaces and places where they feel like they are outsiders (Strayhorn, 2012). In the next few sections I will review sense of belonging in a broad context as well as studies that have focused on sense of belonging for students of color and those who identify as LGBT.

Hoffman et. al. (2002) used freshman seminar classes and learning communities to identify measures and attributes of a student's sense of belonging. Throughout the process Hoffman focused on the academic and social integration from Tinto's (1993) research. Student perception of these attributes tended to drive their opinions of their academic and social support systems. They determined the faculty characteristics of being humane and compassionate, as well as feeling important and supported, lead to a more positive feeling of belonging. Through a deductive process Hoffman identified perceived peer support, perceived faculty support/comfort, perceived classroom comfort, perceived isolation, and empathetic faculty understanding as the dimensions most associated with sense of belonging (Hoffman, et. al., 2002).

At the heart of sense of belonging is a mutual responsibility of the institution and of the student for a culture that makes complex environments more supportive socially and academically (Johnson, Soldner, Brown Leonard, Alvarez, Kurotsuchi Inkelas, & Rowan-Kenyon, 2007). Other researchers have found that a sense of belonging is associated with academic motivation, success, and persistence (Freeman, Anderman, & Jensen, 2007; Hausman, Schofield, & Woods, 2007; Hoffman, et. al., 2002). Student-faculty relationships are a key driver of sense of belonging. Positive faculty interactions consistently lead to positive outcomes such as increased retention, improved grade point average, and an increased sense of belonging (Fechheimer, Webber, & Kleiber, 2011; Freeman, et. al., 2007; Haave & Audet, 2013; Kim &

Sax, 2009; Quaye & Harper, 2014). Educators have used their knowledge of sense of belonging to increase rates of college graduation and persistence for generations (Silver Wolf, Perkins, Butler-Barnes, & Walker, 2017). Many of these practices have informed high impact education practices ranging from first-year seminars, learning communities, collaborative assignments, undergraduate research, and diversity/global learning (Kilgo, Sheets, & Pascarealla, 2015). Employment of high impact practices has led to greater engagement and retention among undergraduate students (Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Kuh 2008).

Sense of Belonging for Students of Color

Many researchers have also agreed that the intersection of sense of belonging and race are important considerations and deserve additional attention (Ribera et. al., 2017). Studies have shown that students of color experience sense of belonging in different capacities than white students (Hurtado et. al., 1998; Vacarro, Daly-Cano, & Newman, 2015). Read, Archer, and Leathwood (2003) found that students with marginalized identities are likely to feel alienated by academic culture; these same students experience social and academic challenges that white students do not, such as isolation, difficulty making friends, and alienation (Zepke & Leach, 2005). The answer to a sense of belonging for marginalized students is beyond representation and structural diversity. Hurtado et. al. (1998) and Read (2003) argued that institutional support must align with structural diversity so that marginalized populations no longer feel "eternally out of place" (p. 263).

Researchers have reviewed methods of student involvement as a tool to create sense of belonging for students of color. Strayhorn (2012) noticed involvement specifically helped Black males fit in and acclimate to campus. Johnson et. al. (2007) found contradicting results where extracurricular involvement increased belonging for Asian American and white students but not

for non-Asian students of color. For Latinx students, extracurricular organizations can be helpful with creating community (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). These students look for organizations where they can find a similar and authentic connection often supporting identity-specific challenges. This is not surprising as students with a marginalized identity stated that their belonging was highly linked to their ability to be authentically true to themselves (Vacarro, Daly-Cano, Newman, 2015).

Native American students stated that they experienced a lack of sense of belonging as they experienced a disconnect between their new environment, their language, cultural traditions, and loss of close proximity to family (Holm, Pearson, & Chavis, 2003). Native American students also shared their experiences with harassment and microaggressions leading to a hostile, unwelcoming environment. Other identities, such as students who identify as LGBT, may also experience marginalization and a lower sense of belonging than their peers who do not identify as LGBT (Vacarro, Daly-Cano, and Newman, 2016).

Sense of Belonging for LGBT Students

Research specifically focused on sense of belonging and students that identify as LGBT is scarce. Vacarro, Daly-Cano, and Newman (2016) noted that other minoritized identities outside of race are also likely to lead to feelings of marginalization and otherness because of the oppressive campus systems and environments they must navigate. LGBT students are often left to wonder if they matter or even if their campus knows that they exist (Vacarro, et. al, 2016). A large influence on LGBT students' sense of belonging is linked to meaningful relationships on campus. In a study of gay men of color, Strayhorn (2019) identified that "fictive kin" relationships created a supportive family-like structure that satisfied parts of a student's sense of belonging. Fictive kin, primarily used in sociological literature, are those around us who are not

related by blood, but by imaginary familial ties that accept us for who we are (Karner, 1998).

Participants felt social, financial, and psychological support from their fictive kin despite the

hostile educational environment. Strayhorn (2013) also found that a lack of sense of belonging

within the LGBT population often led to an association with negative behaviors such as

loneliness, sadness, depression, suicidal ideation, and social isolation.

Institutional Integration

Institutional integration, similar to sense of belonging, is steeped in Tinto's Theory of

Student Departure (1993). Where sense of belonging measures student feelings, institutional

integration considers many student behaviors that lead to connection. Tinto's belief that a

student's connection to the university is predicated on multiple factors and reflected in much of

the research focused on student integration. The creation of the Institutional Integration Scale

(IIS; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980), built upon Tinto's (1975) study of retention and departure,

allowed scholars to further their research on student retention and practitioners to design

evidence-backed academic and social retention strategies.

Much of the research using the IIS has been on understanding the academic and social

integration of specific populations of students such as community college students, first-year

engineering students, students of color, and students that identify as LGBT. Research into social

integration of community college students has been inconclusive. Maxwell (2000) found that

community college student experiences were different than four-year institutions. Community

college student social integration was more closely associated with studying together, discussing

coursework, or even informally talking. Mertes (2015) went on to underscore that social

integration was closely aligned to academic activities. Specifically, community college students

experienced social integration less through purely social activities and more through peer groups centered on academic activities, such as study groups.

The findings of the IIS tell a mixed story concerning the relevance of institutional integration upon persistence for different populations. French, Immekus, and Oakes (2005) used the IIS to study predictive attributes for first-year engineering student GPA and persistence. The study found that institutional integration was not a statistically significant predictor of GPA, continued enrollment at the university, or persistence in the engineering program. Woosely and Shepler (2011) studied the early integration experiences of first-generation college students. Much of the research on first-generation students reveal that they have challenges with family separation, goals and commitments, academic preparation, social adjustment, and campus involvement (Covarrrubias & Fryberg, 2015; DeFreitas & Rinn, 2013; Jury, Smeding, & Darnon, 2015; Woosley & Shepler, 2011). Woosley and Shepler's findings indicated that though first-generation students navigate college differently than their peers, their integration was not significantly different. The study underlined the importance of the campus environment for first-generation students to feel accepted and to ensure that it promotes academic performance (Woosley & Shepler, 2011).

Institutional Integration of Students of Color

There is evidence to suggest that students' institutional integration may differ based on racial identity. Reid (2013) found that African American students at large public research universities have a higher self-efficacy when they feel academically integrated. Regular and impactful faculty interactions and experiences bolster and support African American students' self-efficacy towards their coursework. Reid (2013) also relayed that the more holistic experience students had with faculty, the higher the integration. Students of color whose faculty

took interest through advisement and co-curricular wellbeing showed a much stronger connection to the university and higher levels of self-efficacy.

Social integration has also been researched through racial and ethnic lenses. Bowen and Bok (1998) found that Black students who had multicultural friendships obtained higher levels of social integration into their institutional environments. A significant relationship between multiracial identity and social integration was also found perpetuating the importance of institutional integration for students of color (Spicer-Runnels, 2013). Spicer-Runnels (2013) went on to say that social programs that promote integration should continue to be evaluated for effectiveness because they have been found to increase the social integration of students that have a multiracial identity.

Institutional Integration of LGBT Students

Scholars have noted that students who identify within the queer spectrum can be academically negatively affected by a less than welcoming and supportive campus environment (Hequembourg & Dearing, 2013; Vaccaro, 2012). The same studies also found that students who ranked their environment as supportive had higher levels of academic integration possibly due to feelings of inclusion and increased positive visibility (Garvey, Squire, Stachler, & Rankin, 2018). Garvey et. al. (2018) also found that students achieved higher academic integration when they perceived their campus leadership as taking actions to improve the campus climate. Robinson (2019) completed a qualitative study looking at the experiences of LGBT students at community colleges. Tinto's Theory of Student Departure (1995) was used as the theoretical framework that helped define his interview protocol. Participants identified their involvement in the LGBTQ club as a method of social connection with several students iterating that the club played a significant role in their decision to continue schooling. The participants also spoke of an

academic classroom environment where they felt safe to speak up, debate, and to introduce new ideas. The participants in Robinson's (2019) study revealed the ways and mechanisms they experienced integration into their campus community.

Woodford and Kulick (2015) examined academic and social integration of lesbian, gay, and bisexual students through a campus climate lens. Using the General Campus Climate Scale (Cortina, et. al., 1998) the researchers looked at instructor relationships and institutional satisfaction. Results showed that instructor relations were positively associated with academic and social integration. To further determine academic integration, they employed Ramos's (2000) 9-item scale. Personal heterosexist harassment was significantly associated with the academic disengagement and grade point average of lesbian, gay, and bisexual students (Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Students that experience harassment are forced to spend time attempting to satisfy and negotiate their need for safety on campus distracting them from studying and finding belonging elsewhere. This necessary distraction can lead to poor academic performance and social belonging on campus for LGBT students (Strayhorn, 2019).

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed important research related to activism, sense of belonging, and institutional integration. Educators must start to address the gap in research that connects the experiences of student activists with their sense of belonging and institutional integration. As higher education works to provide an environment that supports student voices of dissent, we must also educate ourselves on how their participation in activism relates to their own belongingness on campus.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this study, I examined the relationships that exist between sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists currently enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program in the United States. More specifically, what differences existed between sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists based on their race or ethnicity and their sexual orientation? These demographic intersections were identified because LGBT rights and racial inequities have been recent popular topics for student activism (Wheatle & Commodore, 2019). Understanding how student activists may or may not feel connected to the institution adds to the overarching student activist research as well as further exploration of students of color and LGBT student experiences.

I used three research questions to guide my study: 1) What are the differences, if any, between sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists and non-activists? 2) Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their race/ethnicity? 3) Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their sexual orientation? Findings from these analyses are presented in Chapter 4.

The participants in this study completed a questionnaire that included demographic information and the combination of two instruments. The questionnaire included the *Sense of Belonging Scale* (Hoffman, et. al, 2002) and the *Revised Institutional Integration Scale* (French & Oakes, 2004) instruments. This chapter outlines my research process, methods, and procedures used to collect and analyze data.

Research Design

Site

Through this study, I worked to understand sense of belonging and institutional integration of student activists on college and university campuses across the United States. In order to compare experiences of student activists and non-activists my sample included students who identify with both identities. I used Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram to attract participants from across the United States. All participants were recruited and surveyed using online social media platforms and through professional channels such as NASPA forums. Demographic information, in addition to participants' race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, was included in the survey instrument. Participants were also asked descriptive questions about their institution so that environmental context can be included in my findings. (see Appendix A)

Sample/Participants

The participants in this study were undergraduate and graduate students of any age at colleges and universities in the United States. The participants included students who have and have not participated in student activism. The study used social media to recruit participants from all areas of the United States.

Data Collection

For the purpose of this study, I recruited current undergraduate and graduate students whether they have participated in student activism or not through Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and professional networks. Convenience sampling provides a low-cost, far-reaching option to solicit numerous participants without geographical barriers (Johnson & Christensen, 2017). Participant recruitment occurred through professional and social media networks with access to

college students. I asked for my colleagues' assistance in recruiting students through my professional membership in NASPA.

Students have long used social media to participate in activist behaviors (Nakagawa & Arzubiaga, 2014; Senft & Noble, 2013). Recruiting participants in a digital space many student activists already inhabit likely increased my sample participation. In order to increase student activist participants, I reached out to social media accounts dedicated to these movements (for example @NotAgainSU and @DoesUIowaLoveMe on Twitter) directly asking for their participation and for them to share my study's information with other student activists. Using snowball sampling will helped me reach participants outside of my professional and personal reach, hopefully growing the sample larger and larger based on peer recommendations (Johnson & Christensen, 2017). I also used paid promotions in Instagram across a two-week period in October to reach nearly 20,000 users that had interest in activism, colleges or universities, social change and other relevant tags. During the two-week period of Instagram Promotion, I received multiple questionnaire responses each day. Ten participants were drawn at random and given a $50 Amazon gift card for their participation.

According to Johnson and Christensen (2017) when using convenience sampling it is important to describe participant characteristics. In my study I included aggregate participant demographic and campus characteristic data so that readers can identify limitations within the sampling process as well as gain a more complete picture of who was included in the study.

Participant recruitment occurred immediately after gaining IRB approval in early September of 2020. See Appendix B for my recruitment material. Recruitment of participants ran for eight weeks. The social media posts recruiting participants included the necessary information in an easy to read and accessible format. Participants were asked to click the link, fill

out the survey, and share the study with those who may be interested. The first page of the survey included the informed consent page for participants to read and accept if they wanted to take part in the study. Participants were encouraged to email me if they had questions or concerns. I received one email asking for clarity around the provided gender options and their implications for transgender students. I posted two reminders in the Facebook groups and on Twitter after the call for participants was open for two weeks and again issued a final call for participants two weeks later. Participants were then entered into a raffle for one of ten $50 Amazon gift cards. Participation was not necessary to enter, and winners were notified within 48 hours after recruitment closed.

I used a questionnaire that included researcher selected demographic data alongside two instruments. A questionnaire was optimal because of the ease of distribution and the ability to make generalizations about the student activist and non-activist population (Johnson & Christensen, 2017). The University of Georgia Qualtrics software was used to collect data. The first page included the consent form to participate. If a participant did not consent, they were taken to the end of the survey that displayed a thank you message. When participants did consent, by clicking the begin survey button, they were taken to the first question of the survey. If at any point during the survey the participant closed out the survey, a Qualtrics box appeared asking them if they wanted to leave the survey, and the survey would end when they clicked the 'x' again. When participants completed the survey, they reached a thank you message. A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Appendix A.

To ensure confidentiality and protection of the participants, protections were taken. The survey within Qualtrics and the downloaded file were password protected. The files were only

downloaded to my personal laptop, which was also password protected. The numerous password barriers provided many safeguards against others gaining access to data files.

Instrumentation

I learned more about the institutional connective experiences of student activists by using a combined survey instrument that included the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002) and Refined Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004) along with demographic questions. Both of these scales included subscales that identified affective and behavioral connections with peers, faculty, and the overall institution. Permission to use these scales has been provided by the authors and is attached in Appendix C and Appendix D.

Sense of Belonging Scale

The Sense of Belonging Scale created by Hoffman's (2002) research team was designed to empirically measure belongingness as a way to determine and predict student retention. They predicted that the greater the perceived student belonging at the institution, the greater the chance of persistence. The researchers conducted numerous focus groups from students participating in living learning communities and first-year seminar classes to create a list of possible belonging measurements. Originally the scale had five subscales; however, a published revised scale merged the two subscales regarding faculty into one subscale (Hoffman, et. al., 2002). The updated version of the scale includes the following four subscales: Perceived Peer Support, Perceived Classroom Comfort, Perceived Isolation, and Perceived Faculty Support, which had Cronbach alphas ranging from 0.89 to 0.92 (Morrow & Ackermann, 2002). The final instrument has 26 questions on a five-point scale. Holloway-Friesen (2019) used the Sense of Belonging Scale to study the influence of mentoring on Hispanic American students. The researcher

obtained reliability coefficients of α = .82 for Perceived Peer Support, α = .89 for Perceived

Classroom Comfort, and α = .88 for Perceived Faculty.

Institutional Integration Scale

The focus of the Institutional Integration Scale is the academic and social integration of

students as predictors of persistence (French & Oakes, 2004). The original scale as constructed

by Pascarella and Terenzini (1980) consisted of five scales totaling 30 items measuring peer

group interactions, interactions with faculty, faculty concern for student development and

teaching, academic and intellectual development, and institutional and goal commitment.

French and Oakes (2004), in an effort to increase the instrument validity and reliability, rewrote

negatively worded questions, added four sub-scale items removed by the original authors, and

reworded questions for readability. The coefficient alpha increased from 0.83 to 0.92 for the

updated 34-item scale. French and Oakes (2004) noted that the increase in reliability resulted

from aforementioned item revisions and the larger sample size. In this study, I used French and

Oakes' revised version of the Institutional Integration Scale

Data Analysis

In this section I describe how the data was analyzed to answer the three research

questions. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software platform was used to

analyze the data. Inferential statistics was used to make inferences and draw conclusions about

the population from the sample (Johnson & Christensen, 2017). A regression analysis using the

one-way analysis of variance test (ANOVA) or Welch ANOVA was performed to determine

what personal or campus attributes, if any, significantly contributed to sense of belonging and

institutional integration.

Research Question One: What are the differences, if any, between sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists and non-activists as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Question one was analyzed through an independent t-test or a Welch t-test based on the homogeneity of the samples. The independent student population samples Sense of Belonging and Institutional Integration Scale scores were compared to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between student activists and non-activists.

Research Question Two: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their race/ethnicity as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Data for question two underwent an analysis of variance (ANOVA) or a Welch ANOVA test based on the homogeneity of the samples. The ANOVA test is designed to compare means of different samples (Christopher, 2017). The use of an ANOVA test allowed me to compare sense of belonging and institutional integration scale scores by race/ethnicity. There were two race/ethnicity options, Native American and Native Hawaiian, that did not garner enough participants to allow for meaningful statistical analysis. They were not included in any of my analysis.

Research Question Three: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their sexual orientation as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Similar to question two, an ANOVA or Welch ANOVA test was used to compare sense of belonging and institutional integration scale scores by sexual orientation for question three. For sexual orientations that did not garner enough sample participation to be included in my analysis I created combined categories. For example, I created a combined category of gay, lesbian, queer, and same-gender-loving because of their similarities. I acknowledge that these are distinct sexual orientations that mean different things; however without a combined category of similar sexual orientations I would not have been able to include them in my study.

Role of the Researcher

I grew up not knowing the power of my own voice. Both of my parents worked hard and long hours, but still needed government assistance to help make ends meet. There was not time nor was it a priority for us to engage in activist work or to make an environment where we would advocate for our needs. In many ways, as a child, I just felt lucky to survive – why would I ever push or question others so that I could thrive? In a few words, whether consciously or unconsciously, I believed that life was something that just happened. I accepted the judgements of others as fact, never pushing back.

As a first-year college student I was selected by upperclassmen to represent all first-year non-academic concerns to not only our first-year governing body, but also the entire student government. We tackled large and small issues around dining, safety, parking, and student involvement. This advocacy work continued as I stayed involved in student government for many of my years at The University of Tennessee at Martin. While I cannot recall any student activist gatherings during college, I believe that the privilege of my cisgender, white, and Christian identities were unchallenged and therefore provided quite the insulation from how my

peers were feeling oppressed and unsupported. In hindsight my acquaintance group was diverse, but not deep enough for me to see or understand the differences in their experiences and mine.

As a student affairs professional my role now requires that I understand and uplift the experiences of a broadly diverse student body. My motivation to engage in research pertaining to the sense of belonging and institutional integration for campus activists is motivated through my past experiences of feeling like I had no voice, to finding and using my voice for me and then others, and through being in a professional role that has a charge to create an optimal environment for student success. The importance of how students feel is informed by my early childhood aspirations of wanting to be accepted and needed by those around me. When we understand how students that are participating in campus activism feel and are or are not connected to the university, we can begin to understand how our culture has failed them.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the quantitative methodology used to answer my research questions. Through the use of social media and snowball sampling I recruited participants at colleges and universities across the United States. Using Hoffman et. al.'s (2002) Sense of Belonging Scale and French and Oakes (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale along with researcher selected demographic and campus characteristic questions I am able to provide context for the retention and support of students who participate in student activism.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the sense of belonging and institutional integration experiences of student activists and non-activists across the United States. A broad social media strategy was used to recruit participants. This chapter will provide various descriptive statistics of participant demographic attributes as well as answer my research questions. Statistical analysis was used throughout the study to explore the (1) differences in sense of belonging and institutional integration of activists and non-activists, (2) differences in sense of belonging and institutional integration of student activists based on their race or ethnicity, and (3) differences in sense of belonging and institutional integration of student activists based on their sexual orientation.

Participant Demographics

Recruitment occurred between mid-September and mid-October of 2020 primarily using Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram. Through Twitter I identified accounts that were tied to student activism. I publicly tagged them to ask that they share my study with their followers. If accounts allowed direct messaging, I would direct message them with a similar request. Of note, my study received several retweets from several academic scholars whose research interests intersect with student activism.

Facebook was used to reach out to professional network Facebook Groups, some were associated with professional associations, such as the NASPA Fraternity and Sorority Knowledge Community, and stand-alone groups organized around a passion, such as the Millennials in Student Affairs group. These requests were always posted in accordance with

group membership rules. Through Facebook I also reached out directly to several student government associations asking for them to share with their membership.

Through Instagram, I shared my study with my followers and asked for them to participate, if they qualified, and to share it with their friends and colleagues. I also used Instagram Promotions to place my study in the feeds of Instagram users aged 18-25 in the United States, and with interest in social equity, activism, student activism, social change, colleges, or universities. Of the 19,000,000 potential users, my post reached 17,750 unique users that viewed it 26,704 times (personal communication).

Throughout September and October, I also reached out to colleagues informally asking them to share my study with undergraduate and graduate students directly within their oversight. Several colleagues that oversaw students working in orientation, conduct, and multicultural affairs shared the study on my behalf.

Of the 395 participants that began 93 completed only the demographic questions. Of the participants, 76% completed the demographics questions and the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, & Salomone, 2002), while only 62% of participants completed the demographic questions, the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman, et. al., 2002) and the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). Between 300 and 302 participants answered each of the demographic questions. The variance in sample size because participants were not required to answer each question. The questionnaire included two instruments, each with multiple subscales, and demographic questions requiring a fifteen-to-twenty-minute time commitment for participants to answer all questions.

Demographics

The average age of respondents was 21.61 (SD = 4.21) and ranged from 18 to 50.

Students 18-20 years old made up 49.7% of participants as seen in Table 1. A little over 35% of

the participants ranged in age from 21 to 23 while 16% were over 24 or older. In Table 2

undergraduate students as a whole made up 77.4% of participants and graduate and professional

students a little over 22%. Graduate and professional students made up 22.6% of participants

with second year undergraduate students next at 19.6% and fifth year or higher students least

reported at 6.3%.

Table 1

Participant age

	n	*Percent*	*Cumulative Percent*
18	45	15.0	15.0
19	58	19.3	34.3
20	46	15.3	49.7
21	40	13.3	63.0
22	33	11.0	74.0
23	30	10.0	84.0
24 and above	48	16.0	100.0

N = 300

Table 2

Year in school

	n	*Percent*	*Cumulative Percent*
Undergraduate First Year	55	18.3	18.3
Undergraduate Second Year	59	19.6	37.9
Undergraduate Third Year	51	16.9	54.8
Undergraduate Fourth Year	49	16.3	71.1
Undergraduate Fifth Year or Higher	19	6.3	77.4
Graduate or Professional School	68	22.6	100

N = 301.

Table 3 shows that participants attended a mixture of private and public education as well as two-year and four-year institutions. Of the 300 student participants, 217 were enrolled in public institutions and 83 in private institutions. Twenty participants were enrolled in a two-year institution while 280 enrolled in four-year institutions. According to Table 3 80 of the 280 four-year institution enrolled participants reported experiences from a private school.

Table 3

Public, Private and Two-Year and Four-Year Crosstabulation

	What type of institution do you attend?		
Public or Private	Two-year institution	Four-year institution (includes Graduate and Professional programs)	Total
Public institution	17	200	217
Private institution	3	80	83

Total	20	280	300

While participants identified with numerous race and ethnicities, genders, and sexual orientations much of the data lacked a sample size large enough to perform thorough analysis by variable. It was important to me and my research topic to allow participants to choose the identities they closely aligned with. Through my research design, I believe that most participants were able to do so. However, with the necessity of performing rigorous statistical analysis, combining of sexual orientations that were similar and underrepresented in the sample was required. While the combining of sexual orientation is problematic, the loose similarities between the combined options can provide context into their experiences.

To honor the numerous race and ethnicities that participants identified, as outlined in Table 4, I ran analysis using all of the individual race and ethnicity options except for American Indian (n = 13) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific American (n = 3). Because of the low sample size these participants were not included in Research Question 2 as it questioned differences in experiences based on race or ethnicity. The majority of participants identified as white (62.1%); Asian American and Black or African American tied for second highest at 10.9% each. Nearly 9% (8.8%) of participants chose combinations of up to 6 individual races and are labeled as multiracial. Minoritized racial and ethnic identities made up 41.2% of participants and the remaining were white.

Table 4

Race and/or Ethnicity

	n	*Percent*
Hispanic	21	7.0

American Indian	13	4.3
Asian or Asian American	31	10.3
Black or African American	31	10.9
Multiracial	25	8.8
Native Hawaiian or Pacific American	3	1.0
White	177	62.1

N = 301.

Participants chose a wide variety of ways to showcase their gender identity, as shown in Table 5. Participants were largely cisgender female (66.7%) while the next most popular gender, cisgender male, accounted for 13.9%. Other genders included participants that chose more than one gender (4%), genderqueer (3.7%), and androgyne, demi gender, and trans man all accounting for 2% each. Trans woman and agender were also represented with 1.3% of participants each.

Table 5

Gender

	n	*Percent*
Agender	4	1.3
Androgyne	6	2.0
Cisgender female	200	66.7
Cisgender male	42	13.9
Demi gender	6	2.0
Genderqueer	11	3.7
Multigender	12	4.0
Questioning or unsure	2	.7

Trans man	6	2.0
Trans woman	4	1.3
Not Listed	2	.7
Prefer not to disclose	5	1.7

N = 300.

In terms of sexual orientation, participants were approximately divided evenly between heterosexual (51.8%) and a marginalized orientation identity (48.2%). Table 6 shows the breadth of sexual identities represented in this study. Bisexual (15.9%) and participants that chose more than one sexual orientation (multi-sexual = 10.6%) were the only two that reached above 10% of participants.

Table 6

Sexual Orientation

	n	*Percent*
Asexual	7	2.3
Bisexual	48	15.9
Gay	20	6.6
Heterosexual	156	51.8
Lesbian	11	3.7
Multi-sexual	32	10.6
Pansexual	8	2.7
Queer	3	1.0
Questioning or unsure	8	2.6
Same-gender loving	1	.3
Not Listed	2	.7
Prefer not to disclose	5	1.7

N = 301.

The study also looked at population density of, and United States regions of, represented institutions. As shown in Table 7, 154 (51%) of the 301 participants were from the Southern region of the United States. Forty-nine of those in the Southern region were from Georgia, the state within which I live, practice, and have the most connection to colleagues and students. The Northeast (17.3%), West (15.9%), and Midwest (15.6%) had similar numbers of participants. In terms of the population density around the institution, Table 8 shows that most participants'

institutions were located within a city (46.5%), in a suburb (26.3%), or in a town (18.5%). Less

than 10% reported attending school in a rural setting (6.4%) or attending school online (2.4%).

Table 7

Campus Location by Region

	n	Percent
Northeast	52	17.2
Midwest	47	15.6
South	154	51.2
West	48	15.9

N = 301. Regions were aligned with the United States Census Bureau designated regions.

Table 8

Institutional Setting

	n	Percent
100% online	7	2.4
City	138	46.5
Suburban	78	26.3
Town	55	18.5
Rural	19	6.4

N = 297.

The study also asked questions pertaining to the respondents' activist identity and their activist behaviors. Of the 302 participants, 188 (62.3%) of them had engaged in student activism as defined by Martin, Linder, and Williams (2019) and adapted for this study to focus on any effort to bring about and create social change on their campus.

Participants were then asked to rank their activist behaviors where 1 = not engaged in any activist activity; 2 = passive (most only engage through social media/signing petitions); 3 = active (engage in social media posts/signing petitions & attended a rally or a protest); 4 = very active (engage in social media posts/singing petitions& attended multiple rallies or protests); and 5 = organizer (engage through social media, attend multiple rallies/protests, and have organized other activists). Most participants (M = 2.94, SD = 1.16) as shown in Table 9 are likely to have engaged in social media activism as well as attended at least one rally or protest. A large majority of participants also identified that they had only participated in campus activism 1-5 times (26.8%) or 6-10 times (23%) as shown in Table 10. Interestingly, the next highest percentage (16%) of participants indicated that they participated in 30 or more activist behaviors. The most popular forms of activism as outlined in Table 11 were largely passive to include social media post(s) (57% of participants) and organizing or signing petitions (52% of participants). Other popular forms of activism included lobbying/meeting with campus administration (37.7%) and protesting or marching (33.1%). Participating in sit-ins or die-ins (9.9%) or hunger strikes (2.3%) were least popular activist behaviors.

Table 9

Levels of Student Activism

	n	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 = Not Engaged	27	9.0	9.0
2 = Passive	97	32.3	41.3
3 = Active	77	25.7	67.0
4 = Very Active	65	21.7	88.7
5 = Organizer	34	11.3	100

M = 2.94, SD = 1.17

Table 10

Participation in Student Activism

	n	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5 times	81	26.8	43.3
6-10 times	43	23.0	66.3
11-15 times	23	12.3	78.6
16-20 times	10	5.3	84.0
More than 20 times	30	16.0	100

N = 187, M = 2.28, SD = 1.47

Table 11

Forms of Activism

	n	*Percent*
Hunger strike(s)	7	2.3
Lobbying/meeting/emailing with campus administration	114	37.7
Organized/signed petitions	157	52.0
Protest(s)/March(es)	100	33.1
Social media post(s)	172	57.0
Sit-ins/Die-ins	30	9.9

After the demographic section, the questionnaire contained two instruments: the Sense of Belonging Instrument (Hoffman, et. al., 2002) and the Revised Institutional Integration Instrument (French & Oakes, 2004). See the entire instrument in Appendix A. The Sense of Belonging Scale contains 26 statements pertaining to how students feel or perceive their college experience. They were asked to select the response that best described them from "completely untrue" to "completely true". The Sense of Belonging instrument is captured in four subscales: perceived peer support, perceived classroom comfort, perceived isolation, and perceived faculty support. Each of the subscales contributes to the feeling and perception of belonging. Perceived Peer Support gauges the student's interaction with their peers. Perceived Classroom Comfort measures the student's comfortability participating in classroom activities. Perceived Isolation looks at how students may experience loneliness inside and out of the classroom. Perceived Faculty Support measures the perception of approachability and connection that students have

with their faculty. For example, a student's sense of belonging is measured by rating such questions as "I feel comfortable talking about a problem with faculty" and "I have developed personal relationships with other students in class" (Hoffman, et. al., 2002). The combined subscales make up the Sense of Belonging Scale which captures the feeling of belongingness through multiple lenses.

The Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004) contains 30 statements pertaining to how students feel and their enacted behaviors at their institution. The 30 statements are divided between five subscales: academic and intellectual development, peer group interactions, interaction with faculty, faculty concern with student development, and institution and goal commitment. Students are asked to choose the degree to which each statement is true for them on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Each of the subscales measures a different aspect of integration into the campus culture. Academic and Intellectual Development encompasses how the student has sought opportunities to expand their intellect inside and out of the classroom. The Peer Group Interactions subscale measures how students behave and interact with their peers. Interaction with Faculty pertains to how a student engages with their faculty members. Faculty Concern with Student Development supports how faculty might show an interest in the academic and social wellbeing of students. The Institution and Goal Commitment subscale measures how committed the student is to the institution as well as their goals of persistence and graduation from their institution. For example, institutional integration is measured by students rating such questions as "It has been easy for me to meet and make friends with other students" and "I am satisfied with the extent of my intellectual development since enrolling in this university" (French & Oakes, 2004). The overall Institutional

Integration Scale measures how comfortable students are and what steps they have taken to integrate into the academic and social parts of campus.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

RQ1: What, if any, are the differences in sense of belonging and institutional integration for student activists and non-activists as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging Scale and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Sense of Belonging Scale

Perceived Peer Support. Student activists (n = 183) and non-activist participants (n = 113) completed the Perceived Peer Support subscale of the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002). A Welch t-test was run to determine if there were differences in experiences of student activists and non-activists due to the assumption of homogeneity of variances being violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .007). There were four total outliers, all four identified as non-activists, by inspection of the box plot. The outliers were kept in the data as there were only a few of them among the many participants. The activist and non-activist scores were negatively skewed by inspection of the boxplot. Student activists (M = 30.95, SD = 26.46) perceived more support at a statistically significant levelfrom their peers (M = 4.49, 95% CI [2.64, 6.33]), t(197.86) = 4.786, p = .000), than non-activists (M = 26.46, SD = 8.45).

Perceived Classroom Comfort. Student activists (n = 188) and non-activist participants (n = 113) completed the Perceived Peer Support subscale of the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002). A Welch t-test was run to determine if there were differences in

experiences of student activists and non-activists due to the assumption of homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) being violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .001). There were no outliers by inspection of the box plot. The activist and non-activist scores were negatively skewed by inspection of the boxplot. Student activists (M = 15.55, SD = 3.71) perceived more comfort in the classroom than non-activists (M = 13.70, SD = 4.59) and this difference was statistically significant, M = 1.85, 95% CI [.85, 2.86], t(198.95) = 3.641, p = .000.

Perceived Isolation. Student activists (n = 187) and non-activist participants (n = 113) completed the Perceived Isolation subscale of the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were statistical differences in perceived isolation between student activists and non-activists. There were no outliers by inspection of the box plot. The activist scores skewed positively while the non-activist scores were normally distributed by inspection of the boxplot. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .245). Student activists (M = 10.25, SD = 4.10) reported feeling less isolated than non-activists (M = 12.67, SD = 4.45) at a statistically significant difference, M = -2.42, 95% CI [-3.41, -1.43], t(298) = -4.799, p = .000.

Perceived Faculty Support. Student activists (n = 183) and non-activist participants (n = 112) completed the Perceived Faculty Support subscale of the Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were statistical differences in perceived faculty support between student activists and non-activists. There was one outlier for student activists by inspection of the box plot. The outlier data was kept due to the minimal impact the outlier has on the totality of the data. The activist and non-

activist scores also skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .151). Student activists (M = 37.09, SD = 7.61) reported feeling more supported by faculty than non-activists (M = 34.90, SD = 8.58) at a statistically significant difference, M = 2.19, 95% CI [.30, 4.08], t(293) = 2.285, p = .023.

Sense of Belonging. Student activists (n = 178) and non-activist participants (n =110) completed the entire Sense of Belonging Scale (Hoffman et. al., 2002). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were statistical differences in the sense of belonging between student activists and non-activists. There were two outliers for non-activists by inspection of the box plot. The outlier data was kept due to the minimal impact the outliers have on the totality of the data. The activist and non-activist scores also skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. Table 12 summarizes t-test results for the Sense of Belonging subscales and the overall Sense of Belonging Scale. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .600). Student activists (M = 37.09, SD = 7.61) reported feeling a stronger sense of belonging than non-activists (M = 93.90, SD = 12.60) at a statistically significant difference, M = 6.09, 95% CI [2.93, 9.24], t(286) = 3.795, p = .000.

Table 12

Sense of Belonging Scale Comparison

	N	*Mean*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Perceived Peer Support				4.79	.000*
Student Activists	183	30.95	6.72		
Non activists	113	26.46	8.45		
Perceived Classroom Comfort				3.64	.000*
Student Activists	188	15.55	3.71		
Non activists	113	13.70	4.59		
Perceived Isolation				-4.80	.000*
Student Activists	187	10.25	4.10		
Non activists	113	12.67	4.45		
Perceived Faculty Support				2.29	.023*
Student Activists	183	37.09	7.61		
Non activists	112	34.90	8.58		
Sense of Belonging Scale				3.80	.000*
Student Activists	178	93.90	12.60		
Non activists	110	87.82	14.17		

*$p < .05$

Institutional Integration Scale

Academic and Intellectual Development. Student activists (n = 172) and non-activist participants (n = 93) completed the Academic and Intellectual Development subscale of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in experiences of student activists and non-activists. There were eight total outliers, two were non-activists and six were activists, by

inspection of the box plot. Overall, the activist and non-activist scores skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. The outliers were kept in the data as they represented a few of the many participants. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .344). Student activists (M = 30.51, SD = 5.49) reported more academic and intellectual development than non-activists (M = 28.47, SD = 5.85) at a statistically significant difference, M = 2.10, 95% CI [.68, 3.53], t(263) = 2.907, p = .004.

Peer Group Interactions. Student activists (n = 173) and non-activist participants (n = 94) completed the Peer Group Interactions subscale of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). A Welch t-test was run to determine if there were differences between student activist and non-activist behaviors due to the assumption of homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) being violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .029). There were four total outliers, three were activists and one identified as a non-activist, by inspection of the boxplot. The scores also skewed negatively for activists and non-activists by inspection of the boxplot. Student activists (M = 39.06, SD = 6.68) reported higher peer group interactions than non-activists (M = 35.23, SD = 8.45) at a statistically significant difference, M = 3.82, 95% CI [1.97, 5.68], t(265) = 4.059, p = .000.

Interaction with Faculty. Student activists (n = 170) and non-activist participants (n = 94) completed the Interaction with Faculty subscale of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in experiences of student activists and non-activists. There was one outlier that identified as a student activist by inspection of the box plot. The activist and non-activist scores also skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. The outlier was kept in the data as it represented a small portion of the participants. There was homogeneity of variances (similar

sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .171). Student activists (M = 18.74, SD = 4.74) reported better or more interactions with their faculty than non-activists (M = 16.32, SD = 5.29) at a statistically significant difference, M = 2.42, 95% CI [1.17, 3.67], t(262) = 3.815, p = .000.

Faculty Concern for Student Development. Student activists (n = 171) and non-activist participants (n = 94) completed the Faculty Concern with Student Development subscale of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in experiences of student activists and non-activists. There were four total outliers, one identified as a non-activist and three were activists, by inspection of the box plot. The activist and non-activist scores skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. The outliers were kept in the data as they represented a few of the many participants. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .286). Student activists (M = 20.49, SD = 3.74) reported more behaviors that support faculty concern for student development than non-activists (M = 19.40, SD = 4.50) at a statistically significant difference, M = 1.08, 95% CI [.63, 2.10], t(263) = 2.091, p = .037.

Institution and Goal Commitment. Student activists (n = 169) and non-activist participants (n = 93) completed the Institution and Goal Commitment subscale of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). A Welch t-test was run to determine if there were differences in experiences of student activists and non-activists due to the assumption of homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) being violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .023). There were ten total outliers, eight were activists and two identified as non-activists, by inspection of the boxplot. The scores skewed negatively for

activists and non-activists by inspection of the boxplot. While student activists (M = 26.95, SD = 3.50) reported lower commitment to the institution and personal achievement goals than non-activists (M = 27.38, SD = 2.76), they did not reach a statistically significant difference, p = .282.

Institutional Integration. Student activists (n = 160) and non-activist participants (n = 87) completed the entire Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004). An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were statistical differences in French and Oakes (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale between student activists and non-activists. There were eight total outliers, three identified as activists and five were non-activists, by inspection of the box plot. One of the non-activist outliers was an extreme outlier defined as being 2.5 boxes away from the mean. The activist and non-activist scores also skewed negatively by inspection of the boxplot. The outliers were kept in the data as they represented a few of the many participants. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .945). As seen in Table 13 student activists (M = 135.82, SD = 18.89) reported more behaviors that lead to integration into their institutions than non-activists (M = 126.26, SD = 20.85) at a statistically significant difference, M = 9.55, 95% CI [4.42, 14.69], t(245) = 3.662, p = .000.

Table 13

Revised Institutional Integration Scale Comparison

	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Academic and Intellectual Development				2.91	.004*
Student Activists	172	30.58	5.49		
Non activists	93	28.47	5.85		
Peer Group Interactions				3.79	.000*
Student Activists	173	39.06	6.68		
Non activists	94	35.23	8.45		
Interactions with Faculty				3.82	.000*
Student Activists	170	18.74	4.74		
Non activists	94	16.32	5.29		
Faculty Concern with Student Development				2.09	.037*
Student Activists	171	20.49	3.74		
Non activists	94	19.40	4.50		
Institution and Goal Commitment				-1.08	.282
Student Activists	169	26.95	3.50		
Non activists	93	27.38	2.76		
Revised Institutional Integration Scale				3.66	.000*
Student Activists	160	135.82	18.87		
Non activists	87	126.26	20.85		

*p < .05

Research Question 2

RQ2: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their race/ethnicity as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Sense of Belonging

Perceived Peer Support. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if peer support experiences were different for groups that identify with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven groups: Hispanic (n = 13), Asian or Asian American (n = 15), Black or African American (n = 21), white (n = 104), multiracial (n = 20), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. There was one outlier for white as visually inspected via boxplots; data was normally distributed for each category except for white (p > .05). Participant scores for white were skewed negatively. Homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) was met as assessed by Levine's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .800). Sense of Belonging Peer Support score increased from Hispanic (M = 27.00, SD = 5.58), to multiracial (M = 28.90, SD = 6.53), to Black or African American (M = 30.33, SD = 7.36), to Asian or Asian American (M = 30.80, SD = 6.21), to white (M = 32.10, SD = 6.71) in that order. Perceived Peer Support was not statistically significantly different between races or ethnicities, $F(4, 168) = 2.43$, $p = .050$.

Perceived Classroom Comfort. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if the perceived classroom comfort was different for different races or ethnicities. Participants

classified themselves into four groups: Hispanic (n = 13), Asian or Asian American (n = 15), Black or African American (n = 21), white (n = 108), or multiracial (n = 20). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Four outliers were identified and kept as visually inspected by boxplot. Two outliers were identified within Asian or Asian American and two within white. Each of the categories were negatively skewed except for Black or African American skewed positively. There was heterogeneity of variances (unequal sample sizes) as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .024). Perceived Classroom Comfort increased from Hispanic (M = 12.77, SD = 4.60), to multiracial (M = 14.30, SD = 4.60), to Asian or Asian American (M = 15.33, SD = 2.06), to Black or African American (M = 15.67, SD = 3.32), to white (M = 16.12, SD = 3.66). Perceived Classroom Comfort was not statistically significantly different between races or ethnicities, F(4, 39.04) = 2.13, p = .096.

Perceived Isolation. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the perceived isolation was different for student activists with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven categories: Hispanic (n = 13), Asian or Asian American (n = 15), Black or African American (n = 21), white (n = 107), multiracial (n = 20), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. No outliers were visually identified by inspection of boxplots. Hispanic and Black or African American scores were negatively skewed; Asian or Asian American, white, and multiracial were positively skewed. Data was normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05), except for white. There was homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .777). Sense

of Belonging Perceived Isolation scores increased from white (M = 9.97, SD = 4.14), to Asian or

Asian American (M = 10.07, SD = 4.00), to Black or African American (M = 11.14, SD = 4.30),

to multiracial (M = 11.40, SD = 3.39), to Hispanic (M = 11.62, SD = 4.11) in that order, but the

differences between these groups were not statistically significant $F(4, 171) = 1.09$, $p = .364$.

Perceived Faculty Support. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the

perceived faculty support was different for student activists with different races or ethnicities.

Participants classified themselves into seven categories: Hispanic (n = 13), Asian or Asian

American (n = 14), Black or African American (n = 21), white (n = 105), multiracial (n = 19),

Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian

were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large

enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. No other categories contained outliers. Data was

normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except for white.

Homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) was met, as assessed by Levene's test of

homogeneity of variances (p = .189). Sense of Belonging Perceived Faculty Support score

increased from Asian or Asian American (M = 33.57, SD = 7.12), to Hispanic (M = 33.85, SD =

7.70), to multiracial (M = 36.05, SD = 8.68), to Black or African American (M = 36.81, SD =

4.83), to white (M = 38.07, SD = 7.87) in that order, but the differences between races or

ethnicities were not statistically significant, $F(4, 167) = 1.87$, $p = .118$.

Sense of Belonging Scale. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if sense of

belonging experiences were different for groups that identify with different races or ethnicities.

Participants classified themselves into seven groups: Hispanic (n = 13), Asian or Asian American

(n = 14), Black or African American (n = 21), White (n = 101), multiracial (19), Native

American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were

excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. No outliers were visually identified by inspection of boxplots. Data were normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except for white. Homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) was met as assessed by Levine's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .449). Sense of Belonging Peer Support score increased from Hispanic (M = 85.23, SD = 14.94), to Asian or Asian American (M = 89.64, SD = 9.79), to multiracial (M = 90.68, SD = 13.86), to Black or African American (M = 93.95, SD = 10.14), to white (M = 96.42, SD = 12.44) in that order. The F(4, 163) = 3.38, p = .011 test was significant for intergroup differences. A Tukey post hoc test revealed that the increase from Hispanic to white (11.19, 95% [1.13, 21.23] was statistically significant (p = .021), but no other group differences were statistically significant as seen in Table 14. In other words, white students tended to score higher than Hispanic students on their perception of belonging with their university peers, faculty/staff, and the overall institution.

Table 14

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Sense of Belonging Scale Scores Based Upon

Racial/Ethnic Identity

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Perceived Peer Support					
Between Groups	4	431.04	107.76	2.43	.050
Within Groups	168	7447.91	44.33		
Total	172	7878.95			
Perceived Isolation					
Between Groups	4	72.06	18.02	1.09	.364
Within Groups	171	2832.30	16.56		
Total	175	2904.36			
Faculty Support					
Between Groups	4	431.16	107.79	1.87	.118
Within Groups	167	9639.84	57.72		
Total	171	10071.00			

Sense of Belonging Scale

Between Groups	4	2063.74	515.93	3.38	.011*
Within Groups	163	24913.11	152.84		
Total	167	26976.85			

Table 15

Significant Welch Analyses of Variance of Sense of Belonging Scale

Scores Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

	Statistic	df1	df2	p
Perceived Classroom Comfort	2.13	4	39.04	.096

Table 16

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Sense of Belonging Scale Scores Based Upon

Racial/Ethnic Identity

			95% CI	
Comparison	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Sense of Belonging				
White & Hispanic	11.19*	3.64	1.14	21.23

*p = .021

Institutional Integration

Academic and Intellectual Development. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the academic and intellectual development behaviors were different for student activists with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven categories: Hispanic (n = 12), Asian or Asian American (n = 14), Black or African American (n = 16), white (n = 103), multiracial (n = 16), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Six outliers were identified via visual inspection of boxplots and kept. One outlier was found that identified with Hispanic, Asian or Asian American, and multiracial respectively. Three outlier scores were from participants that identified as white. Data were normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except for Asian or Asian American and white. Homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) was met, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .196). Sense of Belonging Perceived Faculty Support score increased from Asian or Asian American (M = 27.57, SD = 5.18), to multiracial (M = 29.13, SD = 4.24), to Hispanic (M = 29.33, SD = 7.95), to Black or African American (M = 31.18, SD = 4.72), to white (M = 31.30, SD = 5.48) in that order, but the differences between races or ethnicities were not statistically significant, Welch's $F(4, 156) = 1.97$, p = .101.

Peer Group Interactions. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if peer group interactions were different for groups that identify with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven groups: Hispanic (n = 11), Asian or Asian American (n = 14), Black or African American (n = 18), White (n = 102), multiracial (17), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were

excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Three outliers were identified via visual inspection of boxplots and kept. One outlier was found that identified with white and two with multiracial participant scores. Data were normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$) except for white and multiracial. Homogeneity of variances (similar sample sizes) was met as assessed by Levine's test of homogeneity of variances ($p = .512$). Institutional Integration Peer Group Interaction score increased from Hispanic ($M = 34.82$, $SD = 7.95$), to multiracial ($M = 36.00$, $SD = 7.29$), to Asian or Asian American ($M = 36.07$, $SD = 7.70$), to Black or African American ($M = 39.28$, $SD = 5.50$), to white ($M = 40.50$, $SD = 6.12$) in that order. The ANOVA test was significant, $F(4, 157) = 4.16$, $p = .003$, for intergroup differences. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that the increase from Hispanic to white (5.68, 95% [.03, 11.34] was statistically significant ($p = .048$), but no other group differences were statistically significant.

Interaction with Faculty. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if faculty interactions were different for student activists with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven categories: Hispanic ($n = 12$), Asian or Asian American ($n = 13$), Black or African American ($n = 18$), white ($n = 100$), multiracial ($n = 17$), Native American ($n = 2$), and Native Hawaiian ($n = 8$). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Three outliers were identified via visual inspection of boxplots and kept. One outlier was found that identified with Asian or Asian American and two within white identified scores. Data were normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$) except for Asian or Asian American and white. Homogeneity of variances (similar

sample sizes) was met, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .438).

Institutional Integration Interaction with Faculty score increased from Hispanic (M = 16.42, SD

= 5.87), Asian or Asian American (M = 17.62, SD = 4.03), multiracial (M = 17.82, SD = 4.39),

Black or African American (M = 18.50, SD = 5.20), to white (M = 19.25, SD = 4.74) in that

order, but the differences between races or ethnicities were not statistically significant, F(4, 155)

= 1.32, p = .264.

Faculty Concern with Student Development. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to

determine if faculty concerns for student development were different for student activists with

different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into six categories: Hispanic (n =

11), Asian or Asian American (n = 14), Black or African American (n = 18), white (n = 100),

multiracial (n = 17), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American

and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10

and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Three outliers were identified

and kept via visual inspection of boxplots. One outlier was found that identified with multiracial

and two within white identified scores. Data were normally distributed for each group, as

assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except for multiracial and white. Homogeneity of

variances (similar sample sizes) was met, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of

variances (p = .230). Institutional Integration Faculty Concerned with Student Development

score increased from Hispanic (M = 18.45, SD = 4.48), to Asian or Asian American (M = 20.21,

SD = 2.42), to multiracial (M = 20.29, SD = 4.48), to Black or African American (M = 20.61, SD

= 3.22), to white (M= 20.76, SD = 3.70) in that order, but the differences between races or

ethnicities were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4, 155) = .999, p = .410.

Institution and Goal Commitment. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if institution and goal commitment differed for student activists with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven categories: Hispanic (n = 12), Asian or Asian American (n = 14), Black of African American (n = 18), white (n = 99), multiracial (n = 15), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Ten outliers were identified via visual inspection of boxplots and kept. Five outlier scores were identified with participants that identified as white, three for multiracial, and two for Black or African American. Data were only normally distributed for Hispanic, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05). All other categories skewed negative. There was also heterogeneity of variances (unequal sample sizes) as assessed by Levine's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .029). Institutional Integration Institution and Goal Commitment score increased from Asian or Asian American (M = 25.57, SD = 4.26), to Hispanic (M = 25.92, SD = 3.90), to multiracial (M = 26.73, SD = 4.33), Black or African American (M = 27.11, SD = 3.84), to white (M = 27.60, SD = 2.84) in that order, but the differences between these races or ethnicities were not statistically significant, Welch F(4, 29.98) = 1.22, p = .325.

Institutional Integration Scale. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if institutional integration scores were different for groups that identify with different races or ethnicities. Participants classified themselves into seven groups: Hispanic (n = 10), Asian or Asian American (n = 13), Black or African American (n = 16), White (n = 99), multiracial (n = 15), Native American (n = 2), and Native Hawaiian (n = 8). Native American and Native Hawaiian were excluded from analysis because their sample size was less than 10 and thus not

large enough for a meaningful statistical comparison. Three outliers were identified and kept via visual inspection of boxplots. One outlier was found that identified with white and two with Asian or Asian American participant scores. Data were only normally distributed for Hispanic and Black or African American, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05). Asian or Asian American, white, and multiracial skewed negatively. Homogeneity of variances was met as assessed by Levine's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .714). Institutional Integration Scale score increased from Hispanic (M = 119.80, SD = 25.98), to Asian or Asian American (M = 128.85, SD = 18.10), to multiracial (M = 129.40, SD = 19.66), to Black or African American (M = 136.50, SD = 17.37), to white (M = 139.68, SD = 16.94) in that order. The $F(4, 145) = 4.03$, p = .004 test revealed that there was a significant difference between groups. A Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that the increase from the Hispanic to white group (19.88, 95% CI [3.31, 36.44]) was statistically significant (p = .010), but no other group differences were statistically significant as seen in Table 17. In other words, white students tended to score higher than Hispanic students on their connection with their university peers, faculty/staff, and the overall institution.

Table 17

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Revised Institutional Integration Scale Scores

Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Academic and Intellectual Development					
Between Groups	4	238.61	59.65	1.97	.101
Within Groups	156	4715.95	30.23		
Total	160	4954.56			
Peer Group Interactions					
Between Groups	4	693.86	173.46	4.16	.003*
Within Groups	157	6745.68	41.69		
Total	161	7239.53			
Interactions with Faculty					
Between Groups	4	121.73	30.43	1.32	.264
Within Groups	155	3563.71	22.99		

Total	159	3685.44			

Faculty Concern for Student

Development

Between Groups	4	54.84	13.71	1.00	.410
Within Groups	155	2127.13	13.72		
Total	159	2181.98			

Revised Institutional Integration

Scale

Between Groups	4	5244.79	1311.20	4.03	.004*
Within Groups	145	47207.88	11.14		
Total	149	52452.67			

Table 18

Significant Welch Analyses of Variance of Revised Institutional

Integration Scale Scores Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

	Statistic	df1	df2	p
Institution and Goal Commitment	1.22	4	29.98	.325

Table 19

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Revised Institutional Integration Scale Scores

Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Comparison	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	95% CI	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Peer Group Interactions				
White & Hispanic	5.68*	2.05	.03	11.34
Revised Institutional Integration				
White & Hispanic	19.88*	6.00	3.31	36.44

*p < .050

Research Question 3

RQ3: Do campus activists experience a difference in sense of belonging and institutional integration based on their sexual orientation as measured by Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging Scale and French and Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale?

Sense of Belonging

Perceived Peer Support. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the peer support experiences were different for student activists with different sexual orientations. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 32), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 22), heterosexual (n = 89), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 24). There was one outlier (heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. The outlier was included in analysis as

there was only one among the many scores. Data were normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05), except for heterosexual and multi-sexual scores which skewed negatively. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .079). Sense of Belonging Perceived Peer Support increased from multi-sexual (M = 29.63, SD = 7.76), to GLQS (M=30.36, SD = 6.28), to asexual or questioning (M = 31.00, SD = 6.98), to heterosexual (M = 31.22, SD = 7.09), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 31.44, SD = 5.47) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual orientation groups were not statistically significant, $F(4, 172) = .344$, p = .848.

Perceived Classroom Comfort. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the comfortability within the classroom was different for student activists with different sexual orientations. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 33), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 23), heterosexual (n = 91), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 25). There were two outliers (GLQS and heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. The outliers were included in analysis as there was only a couple among the many scores. Data were normally distributed for asexual or questioning and multi-sexual groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05). All other groups skewed negatively. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .219). Sense of Belonging Perceived Classroom Comfort increased from bisexual or pansexual (M = 14.48, SD = 3.78), to multi-sexual (M = 14.84, SD = 4.43), to GLQS (M = 15.17, SD = 3.28), to asexual or questioning (M = 15.70, SD = 4.30), to heterosexual (M = 16.13, SD = 3.52) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual orientation groups were not statistically significant, $F(4, 177) = 1.52$, p = .198.

Perceived Isolation. A one-way Welch was conducted to determine if student activists felt isolated differently by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 32), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 23), heterosexual (n = 91), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 25). There were three outliers (GLQS), as assessed by boxplot. Data were normally distributed for asexual or questioning, GLQS, and multi-sexual as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05); all other groups skewed positively. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .429). Sense of Belonging Perceived Isolation increased from heterosexual (M = 9.86, SD = 4.17), to asexual or questioning (M = 9.90, 4.86), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 9.91, SD = 4.16), to GLQS (M = 10.91, SD = 3.79), to multi-sexual (M = 11.60, SD = 4.11) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual orientation groups were not statistically significant, $F(4, 176) = 1.08$, p = .367.

Perceived Faculty Support. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if how student activists perceived faculty interactions differed by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 32), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 23), heterosexual (n = 91), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 25). There was one outlier (heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. Data were normally distributed for all groups as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05); but there was heterogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .004). Sense of Belonging Perceived Faculty Support score increased from GLQS (M = 34.91, SD = 8.46), to multi-sexual (M = 35.64, SD = 10.32), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 36.28, SD = 7.80), to heterosexual (M = 37.82, SD =

6.55), to asexual or questioning (M = 40.60, SD = 6.77) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these groups were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4, 39.82) = 1.40, p = .251).

Sense of Belonging Scale. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if how student activists felt a sense of belonging differed by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 30), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 22), heterosexual (n = 88), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 22). There were no outliers, as assessed by boxplot. Data were normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05), except for multi-sexual skewed negatively. There was heterogeneity of variances (unequal sample sizes), as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .000). Sense of Belonging Scale score increased from multi-sexual (M = 90.73, SD = 18.58), to GLQS (M = 91.55, SD = 13.40), to bisexual or questioning (M = 92.70, SD = 11.47), to heterosexual (M = 95.10, SD = 11.22), to asexual or questioning (M = 97.20, SD = 9.59) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these groups were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4, 40.31) = .879, p = .485), as seen in Table 20.

Table 20

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Sense of Belonging Scale Scores Based Upon

Sexual Orientation

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Perceived Peer Support					
Between Groups	4	63.95	15.99	.344	.848
Within Groups	172	7996.10	46.49		
Total	176	8060.05			
Perceived Classroom Comfort					
Between Groups	4	84.05	21.01	1.52	.198
Within Groups	177	2447.42	13.83		
Total	181	2531.48			
Perceived Isolation					
Between Groups	4	74.72	18.68	1.08	.367
Within Groups	176	3038.59	17.27		
Total	180	3113.31			

Faculty Support

Between Groups	4	431.16	107.79	1.87	.118
Within Groups	167	9639.84	57.72		
Total	171	10071.00			

Table 21

Significant Welch Analyses of Variance of Sense of Belonging Scale

Scores Based Upon Sexual Orientation

	Statistic	df1	df2	p
Perceived Faculty Support	1.40	4	39.82	.251
Sense of Belonging Scale	.879	4	40.31	.485

Institutional Integration

Academic and Intellectual Development. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the academic and intellectual development experiences were different for student activists with different sexual orientations. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 31), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 20), heterosexual (n = 82), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 24). There were four outliers (two each for bisexual or pansexual and heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. The outliers were included in analysis as there was only a couple among the many scores. Data were normally distributed for all groups,

as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except heterosexual skewed negative. There was

homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .279).

Institutional Integration Academic and Intellectual Development score increased from GLQS (M

= 29.20, SD = 6.81), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 29.84, SD = 5.24), to multi-sexual (M =

30.21, SD = 5.88), to heterosexual (M = 30.93, SD = 5.40), to asexual or questioning (SD =

32.30, SD = 3.23) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual

orientation groups were not statistically significant, F(4, 162) = .790, p = .533.

Peer Group Interactions. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if the

interactions with peers differed by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five

categories: asexual or questioning (n = 10), bisexual or pansexual (n = 31), gay, lesbian, queer,

or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 20), heterosexual (n = 84), and those that picked more than

one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 23). There were four outliers (heterosexual), as

assessed by boxplot. Data was normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk

test (p > .05), except for heterosexual skewed negatively. There was heterogeneity of variances,

as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .007). Institutional Integration

Peer Group Interactions score increased from GLQS (M = 38.05, SD = 6.39), to multi-sexual (M

= 38.09, SD = 8.68), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 39.03, SD = 5.65), to heterosexual (M =

39.38, SD = 7.00), to asexual or questioning (M = 39.80, SD = 2.74) sexual orientations in that

order, but the differences between these groups were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4,

47.98) = .381, p = .821).

Interaction with Faculty. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if

interactions with faculty were different for student activists with different sexual orientations.

Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 9), bisexual or

pansexual (n = 31), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 20), heterosexual (n = 84), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 23). There were six outliers (one GLQS and five heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. The outliers were included in analysis as there was only a couple among the many scores. Data were normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05) except heterosexual and multi-sexual skewed negatively. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .525). Institutional Integration Interaction with Faculty score increased from bisexual or pansexual (M = 17.77, SD = 5.31), to multi-sexual (M = 18.55, SD = 5.35), to GLQS (M = 18.70, SD = 4.54), to asexual or questioning (M = 18.78, SD = 4.52), to heterosexual (M = 19.22, SD = 4.55) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual orientation groups were not statistically significant, F(4, 160) = .525, p = .717.

Faculty Concern for Student Development. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if the perceptions of faculty concern for student development differed by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 9), bisexual or pansexual (n = 31), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 19), heterosexual (n = 83), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 24). There were no outliers, as assessed by boxplot. Data were normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05), except for heterosexual and multi-sexual skewed negatively. There was heterogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .045). Institutional Integration Faculty Concern for Student Development score increased from bisexual or pansexual (M = 19.55, SD = 3.92), to multi-sexual (M = 19.83, SD = 5.31), to heterosexual (M = 20.70, SD = 3.43), to GLQS (M = 20.95,

SD = 3.10), asexual or questioning (M = 22.11, SD = 2.52) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these groups were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4, 39.04) = 1.48, p = .227).

Institution and Goal Commitment. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if commitment to the institution and personal goals were different for student activists with different sexual orientations. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 9), bisexual or pansexual (n = 30), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 19), heterosexual (n = 82), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 24). There were nine outliers, as assessed by boxplot. One asexual or questioning, three GLQS, four heterosexual, and one multi-sexual outlier. The outliers were included in analysis as there was only a few among the many scores. Data were not normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05). All groups skewed negatively. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .107). Institutional Integration Institution and Goal Commitment score increased from multi-sexual (M = 26.38, SD = 4.68), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 26.57, SD = 2.66), to GLQS (M = 26.95, SD = 3.21), to heterosexual (M = 27.13, SD = 4.68), to asexual or questioning (M = 27.33, SD = 3.24) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these sexual orientation groups were not statistically significant, F(4, 159) = .321, p = .864.

Institutional Integration Scale. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to determine if the institutional experiences of student activists differed by sexual orientation. Participants were classified into five categories: asexual or questioning (n = 9), bisexual or pansexual (n = 30), gay, lesbian, queer, or same-gender loving (GLQS) (n = 18), heterosexual (n = 76), and those that picked more than one option categorized as multi-sexual (n = 22). There was one

outlier (heterosexual), as assessed by boxplot. Data was normally distributed for all groups, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test (p > .05), except for heterosexual skewed negatively. There was heterogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances (p = .037). Institutional Integration Scale score increased from GLQS (M = 133.06, SD = 20.00), to bisexual or pansexual (M = 133.70, SD = 14.54), to multi-sexual (M = 133.82, SD = 25.49), heterosexual (M = 137.05, SD = 19.26), to asexual or questioning (M = 139.78, SD = 9.98) sexual orientations in that order, but the differences between these groups were not statistically significant, Welch's F(4, 40.28) = .671, p = .616), as seen in Table 22.

Table 22

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Revised Institutional Integration Scale Scores

Based Upon Sexual Orientation

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Academic and Intellectual Development					
Between Groups	4	96.74	24.18	.790	.533
Within Groups	162	4957.01	30.60		
Total	166	5053.75			
Peer Group Interactions					
Between Groups	4	693.86	173.46	4.16	.003*
Within Groups	157	6745.68	41.69		
Total	161	7239.53			
Interactions with Faculty					
Between Groups	4	48.52	12.13	.525	.717
Within Groups	160	3696.73	23.11		

Total	164	3745.25			

Faculty Concern for Student

Development

Between Groups	4	54.84	13.71	1.00	.410
Within Groups	155	2127.13	13.72		
Total	159	2181.98			

Institution and Goal Commitment

Between Groups	4	68.97	17.24	1.21	.310
Within Groups	159	2003.46	12.60		
Total	163	2019.63			

Table 23

Significant Welch Analyses of Variance of Revised Institutional

Integration Scale Scores Based Upon Sexual Orientation

	Statistic	df1	df2	p
IIS Peer Group Interactions	.381	4	47.98	.821
IIS Faculty Concern with Student Development	1.480	4	39.04	.227
Institutional Integration	.671	4	40.277	.616

Conclusion

The results of my study have indicated that activists mostly experience a greater sense of belonging and institutional integration than their non-activist counterparts at a statistically significant difference. Student activists show they have a stronger belief in and connection to their peers through both academic and social experiences, and with faculty relationships concerned with intellectual development and personal wellbeing. When looking into how activists may experience college differently by race or ethnicity very few significant differences were found. White activists showed a significantly higher holistic academic and social connection than did their Hispanic counterparts as measured by both instruments. White activists also had significantly better peer group interactions than did their Hispanic peers as measured by the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2014). When looking specifically into differences of experiences based on sexual orientation this study also revealed that there were no significant differences based on how activists identified their sexual orientations. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the limitations of the study, implications for current practice in student affairs, and present ideas on further research pertaining to student activists' belonging and integration.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a brief overview and discussion of the results presented in Chapter 4. The chapter includes a summary of the study, an explanation of the research questions, discussion of the findings, why the findings matter, how the findings can inform a scholarly practice, and concludes with ideas for future research.

Summary of Study

The purpose of the study was to understand the belonging and integration of student activists. The researcher compared experiences of activists and non-activists and sought to determine if there were significant differences in belonging and integration experiences based on activists' race/ethnicity or sexual orientation. The questionnaire used two instruments and a series of demographic questions to answer the researcher's questions: the Hoffman, et. al, (2002) Sense of Belonging Scale to understand how participants felt about their experiences and the French and Oakes (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale to measure participant interactions and behaviors. The demographic questions created context around age, level of education, institutional setting, and environment. Specifically race/ethnicity and sexual orientation were asked to determine if significant differences were found based on these identity-based demographics.

The sample for this study was found using social media and snowball sampling. The researcher posted on several Facebook groups dedicated to higher education professionals. The researcher encouraged group members to share the study and flyer with their students. Reminder posts were made twice biweekly. Instagram Promotion was also used to reach college students

directly. After identifying interests that would align with the study (college/university, activism, etc.) the researcher placed advertisements that encouraged eligible participants to complete the study. The researcher also attempted to recruit participants by directly engaging with student activist Twitter accounts. Several accounts dedicated to student activism were tweeted and/or direct messaged asking the account to reshare the study with their followers. The researcher also attempted to reach participants directly through Facebook. After identifying accounts dedicated to student governments, the researcher messaged each to share the flyer and study with their members. The researcher also contacted colleagues directly asking them to share the flyer and study with their students inside and out of the classroom.

An accurate sample size of student activists could not be ascertained, because of the varied definition of student activism and because population information on student activists is not tracked locally or nationally at higher education institutions. Through the multiple methods of recruiting participants, the researcher closed recruitment with 395 participants beginning the survey, 300 completing demographic questions and one instrument, and 245 completing the demographic questions and both instruments.

The researcher analyzed the data and conducted statistical analysis to answer the three research questions that guided this study. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were run to bring demographic context to the participants and their institutions. An independent samples t-test was run to determine differences between student activists and non-activists. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) or a Welch Analysis of Variance was used to determine differences among race/ethnicity and sexual orientation. Overall, student activists showed a greater sense of belonging and institutional integration than their non-activist peers; differences based upon race/ethnicity were not statistically significant except between white and Hispanic activists in the

peer group interactions subscale and the overall Sense of Belonging and Revised Institutional Integration scale; and there were not any significant differences found between activists identifying with differing sexual orientations.

Limitations

Scholars and scholar practitioners looking to use these research findings should consider the study's limitations. The study's sample size was limited in quantity as well as variance of demographics. A few demographics identities represented more than half of the survey respondents: white (62.1%), cisgender female (66.7%), and heterosexual (51.8%). The high representation of these demographics compared to others could have skewed the results. When comparing student activists to non-activists the study garnered 300 responses for one scale, and 245 for both scales. When further diving into the student activist experiences through the lens of race/ethnicity and sexual orientation the sample was also largely aligned with privileged identities, lacking a sufficient number of minoritized identity responses for meaningful statistical comparisons. For example, 60% of participants were white and the remaining 40% identified with various minoritized racial/ethnic identities. Scholars should be cautious generalizing these results across the population. Subsequently, to create a sample large enough for statistical analysis, several minoritized sexual orientation identities, such as bisexual and pansexual, had to be merged together. Though there is similarity between the merged options, the study did not yield enough responses to share the distinct experiences of these minoritized identities, and it is likely that the results have been skewed because of the need to combine identity categories.

During the questionnaire distribution many students were learning in a remote or hybrid experience due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The National Study of Student Engagement deployed a special Fall 2020 survey option to 190 institutions in the United States and Canada

that received 137,000 responses. The results showed that students were weary of learning through technology and felt very disconnected from their institution (NSSE, n.d.). Measuring a student's belonging and integration during a pandemic that has physically removed them from campus is difficult. This study was not designed to determine how much of their response is due to their physical isolation from campus versus feelings and behaviors of belonging and integration that occur during a non-pandemic semester. Students also shared that they did not enjoy being in front of technology most of the day (Anderson, 2020). Therefore, it is also possible that participation was limited because students were spending so much time online that they opted out of another piece of online engagement.

Another limitation of the study was in participant recruitment. Recruitment primarily occurred via social media and relied on higher education professionals sharing information about the study with students. Outside of the Instagram Promotion only students who received the information from higher education professionals or other students would have been aware of the study. The Instagram Promotion was limited because of the financial costs of advertising the study to users of Instagram that were not followers of the researcher.

Discussion of Findings

The study sought to determine the differences in experiences for student activists compared to non-activists. Within the student activist population, the researcher also wanted to understand the differences among different races/ethnicities and sexual orientations.

Student Activists versus Non-Activists Experiences

For one of the research questions, I ran independent samples t-test to determine if significant belonging and connection differences occurred between student activists and non-activists. Each the Sense of Belonging subscales showed a statistically significant difference in

experiences between student activists and non-activists. Each of the scales showed that student activists experience a significantly greater sense of belonging than do non-activists. Simply put, this finding found that students who participated in campus activism reported a significantly higher connection to their faculty, peer students, and institution as a whole than did their non-activist peers.

The results from the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004) showed that student activists experienced a deeper connection than non-activists in all but one subscale. Student activist experiences pertaining to the acquisition of knowledge, interactions with peers, faculty interactions, and faculty relationships were significantly higher than their non-activist peers. However, the subscale that measures the student's personal and institutional commitment revealed that non-activists scored higher, but not at a level of significance. Non-activists revealed that they were more likely to graduate from their institution and more felt like they had made right decision to attend their institution. However, when reviewing all of the measures of connection, student activists showed a significantly higher connection to the institution than did their non-activist peers.

Generation Z students, the majority of my study's participants, are drawn to and motivated by creating sustainable and systematic change (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Forms of student activism can be motivated by creating sustainable and systematic change. Exercising their activist identities may have highlighted an intrinsic motivation and created a stronger connection between the student and the institution. The findings might also indicate that student activism should be considered as a form of student involvement. Also, Strayhorn's (2012) work on sense of belonging supports that Black students found a higher sense of belonging when they were involved. Latinx students also found that when they were involved in extracurricular

activities, they had a higher connection to the institution (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). If student activism can be viewed as involvement on campus, the research might also support that student activists had a higher belonging and connection to their institution based on these past findings.

All subscales showed a significantly higher difference between student activists and non-activists belonging and connection except for the subscale measuring the student's commitment to the institution. In fact, Institution and Goal Commitment of the Revised Institutional Integration Scale (French & Oakes, 2004) is the only subscale where non-activists showed more belonging and connection. Despite the other favorable indicators of belonging and connection the finding does align with Cheng, Terrell, Lewis, Mattern, and Wright's (2017) conclusion that student activists do not feel supported by their institution. Without feelings of support student activists may also have less commitment to persistence and graduation from the institution.

Student Activists by Race/Ethnicity

Another aspect of this study was to determine if significant differences occurred between the student activist population based on race or ethnicity. White students had the greatest sense of belonging and integration when compared to other races and ethnicities throughout each instrument's subscales and overall instrument. White students had a significantly higher sense of belonging than did their Hispanic peers when combining the multiple subscales of the Sense of Belonging Instrument (Hoffman et. al., 2002). Additionally, white students had a significantly higher connection with their peer groups than did Hispanic students. White students also had a significantly higher connection than Hispanic students when all of the Revised Institutional Integration (French & Oakes, 2004) subscales were combined.

These findings did not find significant differences that mirror multiple studies that showed differences in social and academic experiences based on race/ethnicity. Participants in

Spicer-Runnels (2013) inclusive social programming research showed that participants that listed

more than one racial identity (multiracial) had significantly higher social connections than those

of the various other race/ethnicity options. Read, Archer, and Leathwood (2003) found that

students with minoritized identities experienced difficulty making friends, isolation, and

alienation. This research supports my finding that white students experienced the least amount of

perceived isolation when compared to students with minoritized racial/ethnic identities. Overall,

these prior research findings are supported; however, they did not arise to statistical significance

in comparison between groups of activists with different race or ethnicities. Non-significant

findings between groups of activists by race and ethnicity could be explained by how minoritized

students create their own spaces of belonging on campus (Ladson-Billings, 2012). Further,

Linder and Rodriguez's (2012) research on women of color student activists showed that their

organizing behavior did so by creating their own safe space where they felt like they belonged

and integrated into campus. It is quite possible that student activists of color are burdened with

creating their own spaces of belonging where white students, who exhibited a non-significant

difference in belonging and connection, are likely to find belonging easier on campus simply

because they are in an environment reflective of them. Simply put, despite the additional energy

and resources that students of color put towards creating their sense of belonging, their belonging

and connection is still lower than white students.

Student Activists by Sexual Orientation

The study was also designed to understand if student activists had differing experiences

based on their sexual orientation. Much of the results were mixed, with heterosexual and asexual

or questioning student activists scoring the highest on the majority of the subscales and scales.

Bisexual or pansexual student activists noted the most support from their peers. Heterosexual

students exhibited the most comfort in their classrooms, comfortability with their faculty, and the lowest feelings of isolation. Asexual or questioning student activists experienced high support from their faculty, support for academic development, interactions with their peers and faculty, and had the highest sense of belonging and institutional integration as measured by the instruments. Though there are differences in experiences, none of the results showed a significant difference based on the sexual orientation of student activists.

It is not surprising that LGBTQ students felt less connected to their institution. Vacarro Daly-Cano, and Newman (2006) explained that sexually minoritized students wondered if they had a place at their institution. Strayhorn (2013) went on to reveal that LGBTQ identifying students experienced isolation and loneliness due to their lack of belonging. It is also possible that the LGBTQ students in this study faced chilly and hostile environments that threatened their belonging and connection similar to those found in Woodford and Kulick's (2015) study of campus environments for LGBTQ students.

Implications for Scholarly Practice

The findings of this study reveal positive feeling and behavior outcomes for student activists when compared to non-activists and that in certain aspects (overall sense of belonging, interactions with their peers, and overall integration) white student activists had a significantly greater connection to their institutions than their Hispanic peers. With non-activists scoring higher on their retention and graduation commitment, institutions are at risk of student activists not returning or graduating. Based on these findings, scholar practitioners should continue to consider how their work supports the development and persistence of student activists. Practitioners and institutions must first realign their thinking and beliefs in support of allowing student activism and dissent to occur on campus. Further encouragement of student activist

involvement in official campus governance, increased support for student advocacy work, and a more defined support system for activism embedded into cultural centers at our institutions could make great strides in the continued support and welcoming environment for student activists.

Why is a Culture Shift Needed?

According to the findings, student activists achieve a higher sense of belonging and institutional integration than non-activists. After Biddix (2014) found that participation in campus activism increased a student's civic mindedness and appreciation for citizenship he joined many other researchers in calling for an acceptance of opposing views and actions (Goldfinger, 2009; Misa, Anderson, & Yamamura, 2005; Sax, 2000; Strayhorn, 2005). The study reveals additional benefits of student activism that further implores higher education administrators to challenge their current beliefs about student activists. Strange and Banning (2015) revealed that institutions that have a developmental environment have an "appreciation for the unique and creative" and "encourage opportunities for risk taking to maximize educational effectiveness" (p. 103). The support of student activism can also be seen as a way of protecting the institution. Institutional response and appropriate enacting of change can serve the If institutions become adept at responding and enacting change, they can likely minimize the disruption and tremendously bad press when student activism escalates. Many of the previous examples of activism were only made famous after institutional responses (or non-responses) were inadequate. Imagine if the President of the University of Missouri had met with students about their concerns of race and hostility, would it have escalated to a food strike movement covered by the national news? How would the outcome had been different at Spelman College if the administration had supported student activism against institutional financial alignment with the apartheid? Would shanty towns been erected on the lawn and a complete disruption to

campus? When presented with the dichotomy of supporting student development and increased retention through student activist support or having a full-on campus disruption having an institutional culture that appreciates student activism protects the institution at great lengths. Further, to fully realize an appreciation for student activism, institutions must accept and encourage the student development and belonging that comes with student activism. Encouragement of student activism can involve proactive and educational campaigns of student activism best practices and acknowledgement that activism can bring about needed change on campus. As far back as Tinto's (1975) initial research on student departure, institutions have been attempting to identify systematic methods to increase persistence and graduation. Keeping in mind that student activists have an increased belonging and connection to their institution, a culture shift around student activism can be accomplished through encouragement to be involved in official campus governance, increased student advocacy work, and recognition of the intersection of activism and identity through cultural centers.

Official Campus Governance and Other Involvement

The only non-significant finding between student activists and non-activists measured the student's intentions and commitment to their institution. This finding may lend validity to Harrison and Mather's (2017) point that institutional administrators are likely to see student activists as unruly or as hostile while looking at student leaders as "good" and "quiet" (p. 119) . The majority of student activists from this study were involved in passive forms of activism. Their behaviors, such as posting on social media, sending emails, and organizing or signing petitions, are more akin to established forms of campus involvement and governance. To transition from a hostile environment of us versus them, professionals who interact with student activists should encourage these student activists to participate in official campus governance.

Nationally most institutions use a shared governance model where students play a role in the administration of campus operations. Student activist participation in established methods of gathering and reacting to student feedback may allow them to create the changes they desire without having to gain the attention of administrators through disruption of campus operations. Perhaps if student activists became involved in shared governance the institution may have a healthier relationship with student activists that grows their positive opinion of and long-term connection to the institution. However, student activists that are participating in more active forms of activism, such as protesting, sit-ins or die-ins, are likely beyond using established channels of change and are more focused on creating disruption to gain the attention of the institution.

A secondary way of connecting student activists to campus involvement would be to encourage their membership in relevant and meaningful student organization experiences. While student organizations' mission statements and purposes are wide and variable, many of them are founded for the advancement of a cause or to support student identities. When possible, aligning student activists with student organizations of similar interests can reinforce to the students that the university is creating connection between the institution and the student activist. Student organizations and their campus advisors already play an important role in the retention and persistence of students (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Student activists could also then gain the support and assistance of the student organization advisor whose role of expanding student leaders' knowledge of institutional systems and processes could be key. Student advisors often are aware of official and unofficial campus policies alongside potential collaborative partners to sharpen or further maximize the activist foundation of the organization (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Further, student organizations often have dedicated campus resources (funding,

advisement, space reservations, leadership development, etc.) that might be unavailable to unregistered activist groups. Encouragement of activism within student organizations would not only show that the administration cares for and wants to hear their activist message, and devotes university resources to support their short-term cause, but also the student's long-term leadership and social development student organizations are known for (Kane, 2017).

Student Advocacy Work

An integral step of creating any culture requires that administrators are consistent in formal policies and programs as well as informal communication and support (Strange & Banning, 2015). While student activism can draw the utmost discomfort amongst institutional administration there are many positive outcomes related to participation in student activism. Beyond what this study found (student activists have a higher sense of belonging and connection to their institution) student activists can also experience a deep developmental lesson in the use of power (Biddix, Somers, & Polman, 2009); an appreciation of differences, cultivation of values, a connection to global society (Quaye, 2007); and an increased awareness and involvement in civic engagement (Biddix, 2014). I join Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, and Whitt, (2005) calling for policies that guide effective and safe activism on campus, not attempt to squelch it. These should be reviewed and written with the input of students and with a guiding principle of being student centered. This would allow students to practice activism in a way that has the aforementioned learning benefits for students, but also broader lessons of free speech and civic engagement for the entire campus community (Keeling & Associates, 2004). All policies that could be applied to student activism should be revisited for clarity and to determine if the policy appropriately supports student activism or could lead to a silencing of student dissent. Free speech policies should include provisions that allow for student activism to be effective while

also appropriately minimizing the disturbance to campus. Such provisions should include as broad as possible regulations on where and when students can demonstrate; definitions and distinctions between protected and unprotected free speech; a strategy guide for how student organizations can host external guests on campus for the purpose of campus activism; and useful support for organizing counter protests. Counter protests can be extremely important for students who want to push back against speaker and demonstrations they are at odds with. An additional guiding document of how student activism can occur without breaking student conduct codes or policies could assist in the planning and execution of campus demonstrations that dually supports the cause and a less disruptive assembly on campus.

Lastly, institutions can better support student activists and their assemblies on campus through consistent support. A clear, well communicated, frequently practiced, and widely known action plan for whenever student activism occurs should be in place. The plan should streamline communication to and from student activists through a knowledgeable central point of contact that also has positional authority and access to high levels of the administration. For most institutions the contact could be within the Office of the Dean of Students as they have existing systems and processes to care and support students in tough situations, such as behavioral intervention and crisis management. Included in the plan should be frameworks and philosophies of support of student activism so to remind administrator participants that the goal of supporting student activists supersedes silencing the disturbance.

It is likely difficult for administrators to acknowledge the developmental growth or potentially positive influence on retention when they are the subject of activism. While the sting and dissonance cannot be fully resolved the codified process of supporting student activists may help. Using an established process, guideline, and philosophy of student activist support

decenters the administrator's feelings and centers the developmental experience of students and purported positive outcomes for the institution.

The entire campus has a role in the belonging and connection of students. The instruments used to measure belonging and connection in this study reveal the importance of interactions with peers, faculty and staff, and the overall environment. Student affairs professional development and student organization advisor training should include a refresher of the above policies and guidelines. Literature on the positive outcomes associated with student activism could also be shared. Highlighting the higher belonging and connection to the institution found in this study as well as the appreciation for and awareness of civic engagement of Biddix's (2014) research and various other positive outcomes (Biddix, et. al., 2009; Quaye, 2007) may help campus partners shift away from a negative view of student activism.

Activist participants in this study had lower levels of commitment to their institution than non-activists. Perhaps if student activists felt and actually were better supported by easy-to-use institutional guides and clearly written policies, they may display a higher commitment to staying at and graduating from their institution, therefore increasing the retention and graduation of students. By making it easier to appropriately organize on campus, administrators may also see more students participating in activism. With the aforementioned benefits of greater belonging and connection in mind, having more student activists may be a successful retention and graduation strategy.

Activism and Identity Centers

Repeatedly through research scholars have found that holders of institutionally marginalized identities have a harder time feeling as if they belong or a connection to their institution (Ladson-Billings, 2012; Stewart, 2019; Strayhorn, 2019). In fact, many of them are

burdened with creating their own spaces that promote belonging and connection (Linder & Rodriguez, 2012).While the findings of this study did not show a significant difference in sexual orientation or race/ethnicity outside of a few subscales between white and Hispanic students, it is important to further identify ways that institutions can support student activists who hold institutionally marginalized identities. These activists are even more vulnerable because they already experience lower levels of belonging than their peers due to institutional marginalization (Strayhorn, 2012) as well as lower rates of degree attainment (Museus, Yi, & Saelua, 2017). Cultural centers are already the place where "meaningful cultural interaction and growth happens" (p. 25) and are designed to be a venue where cultural learning and engagement occurs (Jenkins, 2008). With a vision of supporting cultural and leadership growth many students find cultural spaces to be their "spot" on campus (Patton, 2006). Students with minoritized identities are able to find professional staff that are often reflective of their skin color, sexual orientation, or religion and build mutual trust because of shared experiences (Jenkins, 2008). With many cultural centers focused on student identities and with the critical role of identity in student activism, it is possible that cultural centers play a critical role in student activism. Cultural centers as the hub of cultural exploration and empowerment should be well equipped to advise students of institutional beliefs and policies concerning campus demonstrations. Institutional cultural centers should be equipped with resources to assist students to take action when their peer, faculty, or staff relationships are strained because of racist, sexist, elitist, or other problematic occurrences on campus. Cultural centers can provide all students, activists and non-activists, that increased connection and belonging to campus despite others on campus repeating and reminding students of how their identities are marginalized. Lastly, cultural centers can show institutional support, with the aim of increasing belonging and connection, through the

recommendation and sharing of external organizations and resources aligned with the ideas that students are organizing around. While this would have to be handled with care, so as to carefully balance care for the institution and care for student issues, a proactive series of engagements centered on community organizations that are known for their support of student causes could, at minimum, raise awareness without the cultural center directly involving external partners in campus disputes.

In this study we know that student activists already rate high their interactions with faculty and staff; however, the impetus for higher support for activism through cultural centers is to further support those with minoritized identities already marginalized by their mere existence on campus. With the consistently lower rates of belonging and connection experienced by non-white students, student activist support through cultural centers should be one of many systemic support initiatives for students of color and LGBTQ aligned students.

Areas of Future Research

While I have attempted to answer this study's intended questions, additional questions for further research have arisen. This study expressed the feelings and behaviors of student activists in a quantitative manner and provides indicators that students who participate in activism against their institution experience a greater level of attachment than their non-activist peers. However, we are not able to glean why. Previous qualitative studies (Ruiz, at. al., 2017; Bragg, et. al., 2016; Linder & Rodriguez, 2012; Linder, et. al., 2019; Stewart, 2019) of activism have pulled together patterns of feelings and behaviors, but they have lacked the sole perspective of students participating in activism aimed at creating change within their institution rather than change more broadly. A narrative study of student activists and their experiences that relate to why they

choose to persist and graduate from an institution they have organized against could bring meaningful stories to this research.

The small sample size of activists with minoritized identities in this study limits the broad application of the findings. However, a study solely focused on the student activist belonging and integration experiences through a minoritized identity lens could complement my findings and existing research. The abovementioned study could offer more meaningful implications of practice that support students whose identities intersect with their activism.

Another area where future research is needed surrounds the impact that a supportive student activist culture has on persistence and graduation of all students. Based on the initial findings it would suggest that students who participate in student activism have a stronger connection to the university – could that connection become stronger if the institution implements a culture of student activist care instilled by transparent policies?

Conclusion

This study was designed to look at the belonging and integration experiences of student activists and to determine how student activist experiences differ from non-activists and if differences exist between race/ethnicity or sexual orientation. The analysis has shown a deeper connection for those who participate in student activism. The results by race/ethnicity and sexual orientation were interesting and informative but failed to show significant findings outside of comparisons between white and Hispanic activists. With the onslaught of Generation Z students and their focus on righting systemic level issues, institutions of higher education should realize the benefit of participation in student activism as an involvement and retention tool (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Shifting our lens towards a positive view of student activism and followed up with clear and transparent supportive policies, institutions are likely to engage student activists at a

much higher level than their non-activist peers. This study has given scholar practitioners a glimpse into the data they need to know that student activists are creating a stronger culture of belonging and connection to the institution while organizing against it to create change on campus. When practitioners look at student activism through that lens, I hope they acknowledge and appreciate that student activists experience a higher connection to the institution in spite of whatever institutional injustice they are organizing against.

REFERENCES

Altaian, A. (2015). Black lives matter: A new civil rights movements is turning a protest cry into

    a political force. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from http://time.com/ time-person-of-the-

    year-2015-runner-up-black-lives-matter

Altbach, P. G., & Peterson, P. (1971). Before Berkeley: Historical perspectives on American

    student activism. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science,*

    395(1), 1-14.

Anderson, N. (2020, October 26). College students are weary of 'Zoom U.' But they're also

    trying to make the best of it.. *The Washington Post.*

    https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/umbc-pandemic-remote-

    learning/2020/10/23/24add5f2-0e24-11eb-b1e8-16b59b92b36d_story.html

Armbruster-Sandoval, R. (2017). *Starving for justice: Hunger strikes, spectacular speech, and*

    the struggle for dignity. University of Arizona Press.

Barnhardt, C. L. (2014). Campus-based organizing: Tactical repertoires of contemporary student

    movements. In C. J. Broadhurst & G. L. Martin (Eds.), *"Racial academia"?*

    Understanding the climates for campus activists (pp. 43-58). New Directions for Higher

    Education, No. 167. San Francisco, CA. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20104

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2019, August 7). Baylor student activists appeal to NCAA. *Inside Higher Ed*.

    https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/08/07/gay-rights-activists-ask-ncaa-

    intervene-baylors-lgbtq-policies

Biddix, J. P. (2014). Development through dissent: Campus activism as civic learning. In C. J.

    Broadhurst & G. L. Martin (Eds.), *"Racial academia"? Understanding the climates for*

campus activists (pp. 73-85). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 167. San

Francisco, CA. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20106

Biddix, J. P., Somers, P. A., & Polman, J. L. (2009). Protest reconsidered: Identifying democratic

and civic engagement learning outcomes. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(3), 133-147.

Black Student Union [@aug_bsu]. (2020, June 15). We demand ACTION. BSU has sent a letter

of demands to multiple leaders of Augusta University. [Images]. Instagram.

https://www.instagram.com/p/CBel3N5gkWA/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link

Boren, M. E. (2019). *Student resistance: A history of the unruly subject.* Routledge.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of*

considering race in college and university admissions. Princeton University Press.

Broadhurst, C. J. (2014). Campus activism in the 21st century: A historic framing. In C. J.

Broadhurst & G. L. Martin (Eds.), *"Racial academia"? Understanding the climates for*

campus activists (pp. 3-15). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 167. San

Francisco, CA. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20101

Brownell, J. E., & Swaner, L. E. (2010). *Five high-impact practices: Research on learning*

outcomes, completion, and quality. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Bragg, D., McCambly, H., & Durham, B. (2016). Catching the spark: Student activism and

student data as a catalyst for systemic transformation. *Change: The Magazine of Higher*

Learning, 48(3), 36-47.

Braungart, M. M., & Braungart, R. G. (1990). Studying youth politics: A reply to Flacks.

Political Psychology, 11(2), 293-307.

Brax, R. S. (1981). *The first student movement: Student activism in the United States during the*

1930s. Kennikat Press.

Chemerinsky, E. (2018). The challenge of free speech on campus. *Howard Law Journal, 61*(3), 585-600.

Christopher, A. N. (2017). *Interpreting and using statistics in psychological research*. SAGE Publications.

Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology*, *23*(4), 703-729. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00304

Cortina, L. M., Swan, S., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Waldo, C. (1998). Sexual harassment and assault: Chilling the climate for women in academia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *22*(3), 419–441. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00166.x

Covarrubias, R., & Fryberg, S. A. (2015). Movin' on up (to college): First-generation college students' experiences with family achievement guilt. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *21*(3), 420. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0037844

Curbello, J. (2018, October 18). 'I don't feel like a Gator:' A year after Spencer, students still wrestle with university actions. *The Independent Florida Alligator*. https://www.alligator.org/article/2018/10/i-don-t-feel-like-a-gator-a-year-after-spencer-students-still-wrestle-with-university-actions

Day, E. (2015, July 19). #BlackLivesMatter: The birth of a new civil rights movement. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/19/blacklivesmatter-birth-civil-rights-movement

DeFreitas, S. C., & Rinn, A. (2013). Academic achievement in first generation college students: The role of academic self-concept. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 57-67.

Drezner, N. D. (2010). Private Black colleges' encouragement of student giving and

    volunteerism: An examination of prosocial behavior development. *International Journal*

    of Educational Advancement, 10(3), 126-147. https://doi.org/10.1057/ijea.2010.14

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacity for socially

    responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*, 525– 549.

Ellenbogen, R. (2017, October 9). UF, Gainesville react to Richard Spencer confirmation. *The*

    Independent Florida Alligator. https://www.alligator.org/news/uf-gainesville-react-to-

    richard-spencer-confirmation/article_1fbb5f96-ac71-11e7-af15-c3e08c252a99.html

Fechheimer, M., Webber, K., & Kleiber, P. B. (2011). How well do undergraduate research

    programs promote engagement and success of students? *CBE Life Sciences Education*,

    10(2), 156–163. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.10-10-0130

Freeman, T. M., Anderman, L. H., & Jensen, J. M. (2007). Sense of belonging in college

    freshmen at the classroom and campus levels. *The Journal of Experimental Education*,

    75(3), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.75.3.203-220

French, B. F., Immekus, J. C., & Oakes, W. C. (2005). An examination of indicators of

    engineering students' success and persistence. *The Research Journal for Engineering*

    Education, 94(4), 419-425. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00869.x

French, B. F., & Oakes, W. (2004). Reliability and validity evidence for the institutional

    integration scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 88-98.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258458

Garvey, J. C., Squire, D. D., Stachler, B., & Rankin, S. (2018). The impact of campus climate on

    queer-spectrum student academic success. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *15*(2), 89–105.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2018.1429978

Goldfinger, J. (2009). Democratic plaza: A campus space for civic engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(2), 69–77.

Haave, N., & Audet, D. (2013). Evidence in support of removing boundaries to undergraduate research experience. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, *6*, 105–110. https://doi.org/10.22329/celt.v6i0.3737

Hagerty, B. M., Lynch-Sauer, J., Patusky, K., Bouwsema, M., & Collier, P. (1992). Sense of belonging: A vital mental health concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 6*, 172–177.

Hardy, L. (2020, June 4). GUSA voices solidarity with Black Lives Matter protest. *The Hoya*. https://thehoya.com/gusa-voices-solidarity-with-black-lives-matter-protests/

Harrison, L. M., & Mather, P. C. (2017). Making meaning of student activism: Student activist and administrator perspectives. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *29*(2), 117-135.

Hausmann, L. R., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and white first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(7), 803–839. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-9052-9

Hayford, A. (2020, May 31). Hundreds gather for State College's Black Lives Matter protest sparked by death of George Floyd. *Daily Collegian.* https://www.collegian.psu.edu/news/borough/article_cd4537fe-a390-11ea-aeb5-bbefc2ca8909.html

Healy, T. (2019). Return of the campus speech wars. *Michigan Law Review, 117*(6), 1063-1084.

Hicks, M. (2020, March 18). #NotAgainSU ends occupation after 31 days. *The Daily Orange*. http://dailyorange.com/2020/03/notagainsu-ends-occupation-31-days/

Hequembourg, A. L., & Dearing, R. L. (2013). Exploring shame, guilt, and risky substance use among sexual minority men and women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(4), 615–638. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.760365

Hoffman, M., Richmond, J., Morrow, J., & Salomone, K. (2002). Investigating "sense of belonging" in first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, *4*(3), 227-256. https://doi.org/10.2190/DRYC-CXQ9-JQ8V-HT4V

Holloway-Friesen, H. (2019). The role of mentoring on Hispanic graduate students' sense of belonging and academic self-efficacy. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 0*(0), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192718823716

Holm, T., Pearson, D., & Chavis, B. (2003). Peoplehood: A model for the extension of sovereignty in American Indian studies. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *18*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.2003.0004

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*, 324-345. http://doi.org/10.2307/2673270

Jackson, N. M. (2009). *Remembering Soweto: American Students and International Social Justice, 1976-1988* (Publication No. osu1238010978) [Thesis, The Ohio State University]. OhioLink.

Jason, Z. (2018). Student Activism 2.0. *Ed.* https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/ed/18/08/student-activism-20

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Brown Leonard, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan-Kenyon, H., & Longerbeam, S. D. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first year undergraduates from different racial/ ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525–542. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0054

Johnson, E. (2019, October 31). *Forced removal of student prompts protest*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/10/31/american-university-students-protest-mistreatment-black-student

Jordan, T. (2002). *Activism!: Direct action, hacktivism and the future of society*. Reaktion Books.

Jury, M., Smeding, A., & Darnon, C. (2015). When first-generation students succeed at university: On the link between social class, academic performance, and performance-avoidance goals. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *41*, 25-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.11.001

Kane, C. (2017). Advancing student leader development through student organization advising and institutional support. In D. M. Rosch (Ed.), *The role of student organizations in developing leadership* (pp. 59-70). New Directions for Student Leadership, No. 155. San Francisco, CA.

Keeling, R. P., & Associates. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience.* Washington, DC: The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, The American College Personnel Association.

Kezar, A. (2018). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change.* Routledge.

Kifner, J. (1970, May 5). 4 Kent State students killed by troops. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/1970/05/05/archives/4-kent-state-students-killed-by-troops-8-hurt-as-shooting-follows.html

Kilgo, C. A., Sheets, J. K. E., & Pascarella, E. T. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: Some longitudinal evidence. *Higher Education*, *69*(4), 509-525. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9788-z

Kim, Y. K., & Sax, L. J. (2009). Student-faculty interaction in research universities: Differences by student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(5), 437–459. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9127-x

Kornfield, M. (2017, October 23). Spencer speech derailed, drowned out by booing crowd. *The Independent Florida Alligator.* https://www.alligator.org/news/spencer-speech-derailed-drowned-out-by-booing-crowd/article_38dcd6f6-b560-11e7-9b08-6720392909ae.html

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). Never let it rest: Lessons about student success from high-performing colleges and universities. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 37*(4), 44-51.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2012). Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research & scholarship. *Educational Researcher, 41*(4), 115-120.

Linder, C., Quaye, S. J., Lange, A. C., Evans, M. E., & Stewart, T. J. (2019). *Identity-based Student Activism: Power and Oppression on College Campuses*. Routledge.

Linder, C., Quaye, S. J., Stewart, T. J., Okello, W. K., & Roberts, R. E. (2019). "The whole weight of the world on my shoulders": Power, identity, and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, *60*(5), 527-542. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0048

Linder, C., & Rodriguez, K. L. (2012). Learning from the experiences of self-identified women of color activists. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(3), 383– 398. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0048

Little, M. C. (2019). Resistance matters. In A. Dache, S. J. Quaye, C. Linder, & K. M. McGuire (Eds.), *Rise up! Activism as education* (pp. 9-32). Michigan State University Press.

Lucas, C. (2006). *American higher education: A history*. Springer.

Martin, B. (2007). "Unsightly huts": Shanties and the divestment movement of the 1980s. *Peace and Change*, *32*(3), 329–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0130.2007.00444.x

Martin, G. L. (2014). Understanding and improving campus climates for activists. In C. J. Broadhurst & G. L. Martin (Eds.), *"Racial academia"? Understanding the climates for campus activists* (pp. 87-92). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 167. San Francisco, CA. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20107

Martin, G. L., Linder, C., & Williams, B. M. (2019). Editors' Notes. In G. L. Martin, C. Linder, & B. M. Williams (Eds.), *Leadership learning through activism* (pp. 5-8). New Directions for Student Leadership, No. 161. San Francisco, CA. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20316

Martin, K., & Tecklenburg, H. C. (2020). The White nationalist on campus: Re-examining university free speech and leading through crisis. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 23*(1), 111-123.

Maxwell, W. E. (2000). Student peer relations at a community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *24*(3), 207–217. https://doi.org./10.1080/106689200264169

McDowell, S. F., Lowe, G. A., & Dockette, D. A. (1970). Howard University's student protest movement. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *34*(3), 383–388. https://doi.org/10.1086/267814

Mertes, S. J. (2015) Social integration in a community college environment. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 39*(11), 1052-1064. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.934973

Metzger, M. W., Erete, S. L., Barton, D. L., Desler, D. K., & Lewis, D. A. (2015). The new political voice of young Americans: Online engagement and civic development among first-year college students. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 10*(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197914558398

Misa, K., Anderson, J., & Yamamura, E. (2005, November). *The lasting impact of college on young adults' civic and political engagement*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Moore, K. (1976). Freedom and constraint in eighteenth century Harvard. *Journal of Higher Education*, *47*(6), 649–659. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1976.11774087

Morrow, J. A., & Ackermann, M. E. (2012). Intention to Persist and Retention of First-Year Students: The Importance of Motivation and Sense of Belonging. *College Student Journal*, *46*(3), 483–491.

Milem, J. F., & Berger, J. B. (1997). A modified model of college student persistence: Exploring

    the relationship between Astin's theory of involvement and Tinto's theory of student

    departure. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*(4), 387-400.

Minster, S. (2018) Student activism leads the push for gender-neutral bathrooms. *The Tufts*

    Daily. https://tuftsdaily.com/news/2018/02/12/student-activism-leads-push-gender-

    neutral-bathrooms/

Museus, S. D., Yi, V., & Saelua, N. (2017). The impact of culturally engaging campus

    environments on sense of belonging. *The Review of Higher Education, 40*(2), 187-215.

Nakagawa, K., & Arzubiaga, A. E. (2014). The use of social media in teaching race. *Adult*

    Learning, *25*(3), 103-110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159514534190

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary

    dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *The Journal of Higher Education, 51*(1), 60-

    75. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1980.11780030

Peckman, C. (2019, February 28). Students share #DoesUIowaLoveMe Stories at rally. *The*

    Daily Iowan. https://dailyiowan.com/2019/02/28/students-share-doesuiowaloveme-

    stories-at-rally/

Quaye, S. (2007). Hope and learning: The outcomes of contemporary student activism. *About*

    Campus, 12(2), 2–9.

Quaye, S. J., & Harper, S. R. (2014). *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical*

    perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Ramos, A. (2000). *Sexual harassment at the University of Puerto Rico*. [Unpublished doctoral

    dissertation]. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Read, B., Archer, L., & Leathwood, C. (2003). Challenging cultures? Student conceptions of 'belonging' and 'isolation' at a post-1992 university. *Studies in Higher Education, 28*(3), 261–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070309290

Reger, J. (2018). Academic opportunity structures and the creation of campus activism. *Social Movement Studies, 17*, 558-573. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1495073

Reid, K. W. (2013). Understanding the Relationships among Racial Identity, Self-Efficacy, Institutional Integration and Academic Achievement of Black Males Attending Research Universities. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(1), 75-93. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.82.1.0075

Retta, M. (2019, December 2) These LGBTQ students say their school treats them like second-class citizens. *The Nation*. https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/christian-university/

Ribera, A.K., Miller, A.L., & Dumford, A.D. (2017). Sense of peer belonging and institutional acceptance in the first year: The role of high-impact practices. *Journal of College Student Development 58*(4), 545-563. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0042

Robinson, G. D. (2019). *Promoting Persistence Among LGBTQ Community College Students*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois State University]. ISU Research and eData. https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/1041

Ropers-Huilman, B., Carwile, L., Lee, C., & Barnett, K. (2003, April). *Student activists in higher education: Exploring the relationships between perceptions of culture and change strategies*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Rue, P. (2018). Make way, Millennials, here comes Gen Z. *About Campus*, *23*(3), 5-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086482218804251

Ruiz, B. A., Cheng, K. W., Copeland Terrell, B. C., Lewis, K. A., Mattern, M. C., & Wright, A. M. (2017). For us, by us: Exploring constructions of student activism and university support. *Higher Education Politics & Economics*, *3*(2), 239-260. https://doi.org/10.32674/hepe.v3i2.11

Sax, L. (2000). Citizenship development and the American college student. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 3–18). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Seemiller, C., and M. Grace. 2016. Generation Z Goes to College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senft, T., & Noble, S. U. (2013). Race and social media. *The Routledge handbook of social media*, 107-125.

Silver Wolf, D.A.P., Perkins, J., Butler-Barnes, S.T., & Walker, T.A., Jr. (2017). Social belonging and college retention: Results from a quasi-experimental pilot study. *Journal of College Student Development 58*(5), 777-782. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0060.

Smith, S. & Baxley, M. (2019, October 10). Students burn author's book outside of Eagle Village. *The George-Anne*. http://www.thegeorgeanne.com/news/article_27bf3288-eb78-11e9-b386-47de5677b8c7.html

Spicer-Runnels, A. D. (2013). *An examination of the influence of social and academic integration on multiracial college student persistence* (ERIC No. ED553671) [Doctoral Dissertation, Lamar University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Stewart, T. J. (2019). "Where we are, resistance lives": Black women, social media, and everyday resistance in higher education. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity*, *5*(2), 1-31.

Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by Design: Creating Campus Learning Environments That Work*. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Josey-Bass.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. Routledge.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2013). And their own received them not: Black gay male undergraduates' experiences with white racism, black homophobia. *Counterpoints, 383*, 105-119.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2019). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. Routledge.

Thelin, J. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. 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.* University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1993). Building community. *Liberal Education, 79*(4), 16-21.

The Daily Californian News Staff (2017, September 25). Milo Yiannopoulos makes brief speech at UC Berkeley as hundreds protest outside barriers. *The Daily Californian*. https://www.dailycal.org/2017/09/24/milo-yiannopoulos-speaks-uc-berkeley-hundreds-protest-outside-barriers/

Wheatle, K. I., & Commodore, F. (2019). Reaching back to move forward: The historic and contemporary role of student activism in the development and implementation of higher education policy. *The Review of Higher Education*, *42*(5), 5-35. http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0043

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 49*(4), 429–446. https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6473

Vaccaro, A., & Newman, B.M. (2016). Development of a Sense of Belonging for Privileged and Minoritized Students: An Emergent Model. *Journal of College Student Development, 57*(8), 925-942. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0091

Vaccaro, A., Daly-Cano, M., & Newman, B. M. (2015). A sense of belonging among college students with disabilities: An emergent theoretical model. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(7), 670-686.

Wallenstein, P. (2008). Black southerners and nonblack universities: The process of desegregating southern higher education. In P. Wallenstein (Ed.), *Higher education and the Civil Rights Movement: White supremacy, Black southerners, and college campuses* (pp. 17–59). University Press of Florida.

Woodford, M. R., Kulick, A., Sinco, B. R., & Hong, J. S. (2014). Contemporary heterosexism on campus and psychological distress among LGBQ students: The mediating role of self-acceptance. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 84*(5), 519.

Woosley, S. A., & Shepler, D. K. (2011). Understanding the early integration experiences of first-generation college students. *College Student Journal*, *45*(4), 700-715.

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2005). Integration and adaptation: Approaches to the student retention and achievement puzzle. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 6*(1), 46–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787405049946

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

CONSENT LETTER

Sense of Belonging and Institutional Integration of Student Activists and Non-Activists

Dear Participant,

My name is Joe Pierce and I am a student in the Counseling and Human Development Services Department at the University of Georgia under the supervision of Georgianna Martin, PhD. I am inviting you to take part in a research study.

I am conducting research on the perceived sense of belonging and institutional integration of college students and am interested in comparing students who participate in student activism to students who do not participate in activism.

I am looking for currently enrolled undergraduate, graduate or professional students in the United States who have or have not participated in student activism. For the purpose of this study we define student activism as "any efforts by students to bring about and create social change on their campus" (Martin, Linder, & Williams, 2019, p. 5).

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire that will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Each participant will be entered into a drawing to receive one of ten $50 Amazon gift cards.

Participation is voluntary. You can refuse to take part or stop at any time without penalty.

There are questions that may make you uncomfortable. You can skip these questions if you do not wish to answer them.

Your responses may help us understand how students feel they belong and their level of connectedness to their institution. Gaining this understanding will allow higher education practitioners to have a more informed strategy for supporting students.

Participants will remain anonymous. No identifying information is asked as a part of this study. Questionnaire results will be stored in The University of Georgia Qualtrics software and will be password-protected once downloaded.

There is a possibility that the data will be used for future studies without additional consent.

If you have questions about this research, please feel free to contact me at 706-504-1494, jp1@uga.edu or Dr. Georgianna Martin at glmartin@uga.edu. If you have any complaints or questions about your rights as a research volunteer, contact the IRB at 706-542-3199 or by email at IRB@uga.edu.

Please keep this letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Joe Pierce

Doctoral Candidate

Student Affairs Leadership

Department of Counseling and Human Development

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. This study is using a combination of the

Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone's (2002) Sense of Belonging and French and

Oakes' (2004) Revised Institutional Integration Scale to understand the experiences of student

activists and non-activists.

1. Are you currently enrolled at a college or university within the United States?
       Yes
       No

2. What was your age on your last birthday?
       Input your age _____

3. What is your year in school?
       Undergraduate First Year
       Undergraduate Second Year
       Undergraduate Third Year
       Undergraduate Fourth Year
       Undergraduate Fifth Year or Higher
       Graduate/Professional School

4. If Graduate and Professional School, please list the degree you hope to obtain: _____

5. What type of institution do you attend?
       Public institution
       Private institution

6. What type of institution do you attend?
       Two year institution
       Four year institution (includes Graduate and Professional programs)

7. Where in the United States is your campus located?

100% online
Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont)
Midwest (Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin)
South (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia)
West (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming)

8. What is the setting of your institution?
   100% online
   City
   Suburban
   Town
   Rural

9. Are you Hispanic or Latino or Spanish origin (Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race)?
   Yes
   No

10. What is your race and/or ethnicity? Choose as many as you identify with.
    Hispanic or Latino or Spanish Origin of any race
    American Indian or Alaskan Native
    Asian or Asian American
    Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    Black or African American
    White
    Race and Ethnicity unknown
    An identity not listed: please specify _____

11. What is your sexual orientation (choose all that apply):
    Asexual
    Bisexual
    Gay
    Straight (heterosexual)
    Lesbian
    Pansexual
    Queer
    Questioning or unsure
    Same-gender loving
    An identity not listed: please specify _____
    Prefer not to disclose

12. Gender identity (choose all that apply):
   Agender
   Androgyne
   Demigender
   Genderqueer or gender fluid
   Man
   Questioning or unsure
   Trans man
   Trans woman
   Woman
   Additional gender category/identity: please specify _____ __
   Prefer not to disclose

13. What experiences have you participated in at your current institution? Check all that apply.
   Living learning community
   On campus employment
   Undergraduate research
   ePortfolios
   Internship
   Service learning
   Capstone course or project
   First year seminar
   Orientation Leader
   Fraternity or sorority member
   Student Government
   Tour Guide/Ambassador
   Resident Assistant
   Student Organization(s)
   Other:_____

14. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you best describe your activist identity? 1=Not an activist,
   2=Passive (social media posts/sign petitions), 3=Active (attended a rally or a protest),
   4=Hyper Active (attended multiple rallies or protests), 5=Organizer (organized other activists
   for a cause)

15. Have you participated in student activism during your time in college? Student activism is
   any effort to bring about and create social change on your campus.
   Yes
   No

16. If yes, how many times have you participated in any form of student activism while in
   college?
   1-5 times
   6-10 times

11-15 times
16-20 times
More than 20 times

17. If yes, please choose the methods of student activism that you have participated in. Check all that apply.
Social media post(s)
Sit-ins/Die-ins
Protest(s)/March(es)
Hunger strike(s)
Organized/signed petition(s)
Lobbying/meeting/emailing with campus administration
Other: please specify_____

Please select the option that best describes you:

Completely Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Equally True and Untrue	Mostly True	Completely True
1	2	3	4	5

18. I have met with classmates outside of class to study for an exam
19. If I miss class, I know students who I could get notes from
20. I discuss events which happened outside of class with my classmates
21. I have discussed personal matters with students who I met in class
22. I could contact another student from class if I had a question
23. Other students are helpful in reminding me when assignments are due or when tests are approaching
24. I have developed personal relationships with other students in class
25. I invite people I know from class to do things socially
26. I feel comfortable contributing to class discussions
27. I feel comfortable asking a question in class
28. I feel comfortable volunteering ideas or opinions in class
29. Speaking in class is easy because I feel comfortable
30. It is difficult to meet other students in class
31. No one in my classes knows anything personal about me
32. I rarely talk to other students in my class
33. I know very few people in my class
34. I feel comfortable talking about a problem with faculty
35. I feel comfortable asking a teacher for help if I do not understand course-related material
36. I feel that a faculty member would be sensitive to my difficulties if I shared them
37. I feel comfortable socializing with a faculty member outside of class

38. I feel that a faculty member would be sympathetic if I was upset
39. I feel that a faculty member would take the time to talk to me if I needed help
40. If I had a reason, I would feel comfortable seeking help from a faculty member outside of class time (office hours etc.)
41. I feel comfortable seeking help from a teacher before or after class
42. I feel that a faculty member really tried to understand my problem when I talked about it
43. I feel comfortable asking a teacher for help with a personal problem

Choose the degree that the statement is true for you

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

44. Most of my courses at my university have been intellectually stimulating.
45. I am satisfied with my academic experience at my university.
46. I am more likely to attend a cultural event (for example, a concert, a lecture, or art show) now than I was before coming to this university.
47. I am satisfied with the extent of my intellectual development since enrolling in this university.
48. In addition to required reading assignments, I read many of the recommended books in my courses.
49. My interest in ideas and intellectual matters increased because of this university.
50. I have an idea at all what I want to major in.
51. This year my academic experience has positively influenced my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.
52. Getting good grades is important to me.
53. I have performed academically as well as I anticipated I would.
54. My interpersonal relationships with other students have positively influenced my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.
55. The student friendships I developed have been personally satisfying.
56. My personal relationships with other students have positively influenced my personal growth, attitudes and values.
57. It has been easy for me to meet and make friends with other students.
58. I am satisfied with my dating relationships.
59. Many students I know would be willing to listen and help me if I had a personal problem.
60. Most students at my university have values and attitudes similar to mine.
61. I am satisfied with the opportunities to participate in organized extra-curricular activities at my university.
62. I am happy with my living/residence arrangement.

63. I am satisfied with my opportunities to meet and interact informally with faculty members.
64. Many faculty members I have had contact with are willing to spend time outside of class to discuss issues of interest and importance to students.
65. I have developed a close, personal relationship with at least one faculty member.
66. My non-classroom interactions with faculty members have positively influenced my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.
67. My non-classroom interactions with faculty members have positively influenced my personal growth, values, and attitudes.
68. My non-classroom interactions with faculty members have positively influenced my career goals and aspirations.
69. Many faculty members I have had contact with are genuinely outstanding or superior teachers.
70. Many faculty members I have had contact with are genuinely interested in students.
71. Many faculty members I have had contact with are genuinely interested in teaching.
72. Many faculty members I have had contact with are interested in helping students grow in more than just academic areas.
73. It is important to me to graduate from college.
74. It is important to me to graduate from my university.
75. I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to attend my university.
76. I will most likely register at my university for the next semester.

Appendix B

Appendix C

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Sense of Belonging Scale

Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 at 6:45:58 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: Morrow, Jennifer Ann

To: Pierce, Joseph

Attachments: SENSE OF BELONGING SCALE - REVISED.pdf, Hoffman_et_al_2002-2003.pdf

CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER

This email originated from an external source. Please exercise caution before opening attachments, clicking links, replying, or providing information to the sender. If you believe it to be fraudulent, contact the AU Cybersecurity Hotline at 72-CYBER (2-9237 / 706-722-9237) or 72CYBER@augusta.edu

Joseph,

You are free to use the scale in your research as long as you properly cite it. I've also attached the revised coding for the scale. Good luck with your project!

Be well,

JM

Jennifer Ann Morrow, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Evaluation, Statistics, and Measurement
University of Tennessee
Educational Psychology & Counseling Department
503 Jane and David Bailey Education Complex
Knoxville, TN 37996-3452
Email: jamorrow@utk.edu
Phone: (865) 974-6117
https://epc.utk.edu/people/jennifer-ann-morrow-phd/
https://epc.utk.edu/evaluation-statistics-measurement/
Twitter: https://twitter.com/evaluationdiva

From: Pierce, Joseph <JOPIERCE@augusta.edu>

Appendix D

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Institutional Integration Scale

Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 at 4:38:34 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: French, Brian F

To: Pierce, Joseph

Attachments: ISS_revised.pdf

Dear Joe,

Thank you for your message. It is good to see that people remain interested in this work. I have attached a version of the scale(Purdue was inserted into the language). The scoring must people use is a summed score. But there are other options of course. I am working with folks now who are using the scale in South America. Neat to see the use spreading.

I wish you success with your work and your dissertation. I would be interested in seeing your results when finished.

Take care,

Brian

_____

Brian F. French
Berry Family Professor
Associate Dean for Research
Director, LPRC & Psychometric Laboratory
College of Education | Washington State University
509-335-8584

_____

From: Pierce, Joseph <JOPIERCE@augusta.edu>