UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

RACIAL DIVERSITY IN UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS: THE CASE FOR INCREASING INFORMAL INTERACTIONAL DIVERSITY WITHIN SILOED INSTITUTIONS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF HUMAN RELATIONS

By

KAYLEY MARY GILLESPIE
Norman, Oklahoma
2015

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Literature suggests racial diversity is a common good for in groups and out groups and further suggests a particular type of diversity, informal interactional diversity, has the greatest benefits. This research explores the demographics of student organizations at the University of Oklahoma and determines if student organizations engage in meaningful informal interactional diversity. Research suggests student organizations do not engage in informal interactional diversity. Data suggests any diversity encounters or partnerships between student organizations are artificial and student organizations are largely siloed

Chapter 1: Introduction

As the United States grows increasingly diverse, universities must generate plans to accommodate a varied population. Universities have a unique responsibility to prepare their students for a global marketplace by having diversity at various levels – within the student population, faculty and staff, course offerings, and student organizations. Even so, the student population of many universities do not reflect the racial diversity in the general population. Projected trends in student enrollment by race and ethnicity do not indicate significant growth in institutional racial diversity over the past decade. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, non-White children are projected to become the majority by 2018 and non-White adults are projected to become the majority by 2038 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). It is vital not only for universities to ensure structural diversity by recruiting and enrolling a diverse student population, but to also create informal interactional diversity – conditions that encourage frequent and meaningful interactions within and between diverse student organizations. Diverse environments not only encourage inclusion but, as research studies suggest, both minority and majority populations benefit from such interactions.

Numerous researchers conclude that informal interactional diversity activities in student organizations may increase students' cognitive development (Bowman, 2010a), improve interpersonal interactions (Bowman, 2010b), expand students' world views (Denson & Chang, 2009; Jayakumar, 2008), increase academic achievement (Denson & Chang, 2009; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund & Parente, 2001), better prepare students for the job market (Jayakumar, 2008; Riveira, 2011), improve students' psychological well-being (Bowman, 2013), and create overall positive university

experiences (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). I propose an increase in informal interactional diversity within student organizations to create socially-literate students who understand the nuances, challenges, and privileges within such experiences and intersecting identities. These students are also prepared to be leaders at their respective institutions.

Chapter 2: Diversity: What it is and why it is important

Student body racial diversity is the composition of various races of students enrolled in a university at any given time; inclusion, the aim of diversity, is "actively valuing differences and using them constructively in all aspects of organized [campus] life" (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011, p. 36). Diversity is positively correlated to the amount of interaction among diverse students, which ultimately contributes to students' openness to and understanding of people of different races and ethnic groups (Pike, Kuh & Gonyea, 2007). Although diversity encompass socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, and age, among other identifiers, it primarily refers to race for the purpose of this thesis.

Types of Diversity

Racial diversity on college campuses can be described in three ways. First, structural diversity refers to the representation of diverse students in the total student body. A university's racial minority student population in relation to the overall student population is an example of structural diversity. Second, classroom diversity refers to the learning with and about diverse people within a classroom context. This may include a university's general curriculum and mandated diversity or multicultural courses required for graduation. Finally, informal interactional diversity – conceivably

the most valuable component of diversity – refers to the frequency and quality of interactions between racially and ethnically diverse students that occur outside of the classroom. This includes interactions in student organizations, campus events, and university housing programming (Bowman, 2010a). In this thesis, I analyze the informal interactional diversity in student organizations, specifically, to determine the demographics of University of Oklahoma student organizations, the frequency and quality of meaningful diversity experiences, and the implications. Structural diversity is a necessary condition to achieve diversity, but structural diversity alone does not necessarily provide adequate conditions for inclusion, engagement, and education (Bowman, 2010a; Denson, 2009; Pike & Kuh, 2006). Informal interactional diversity experiences are more likely to occur as the heterogeneity of the student population increases, thus the need for structural diversity (Pike & Kuh, 2006; Smith & Jones, 2011).

Diversity Benefits

Recent literature suggest that carefully devised diversity initiatives improve cognitive and leadership skills, spur civic engagement, create positive self-concepts and sense of belonging, and improve one's cultural awareness, intergroup attitudes, and constructive critical thinking abilities (Bowman, 2013). Bowman (2013) suggests higher levels of diversity may strengthen the link between diversity interactions and student outcomes. These interactions are important for student intellectual growth when they help students to rethink inaccurate worldviews of race. Chang (2003) documented significant differences in viewpoints between college freshman racial groups. Milem,

Chang, and Antonio (2005) concluded that different racial viewpoints and experiences often create discontinuity that can facilitate positive cognitive identity development.

There are several caveats when discussing a socially-constructed identifier like race and referring to its use in university admissions and survey materials because race is a social construction and different individuals may perceive a particular person to belong to different races. Additionally, most people may claim or identify with multiple races in different ways. For example, a bi-racial or multi-racial individual may identify with one particular race, some races, all personally relevant races, or no races. Unfortunately, survey items that force respondents to simply "choose one," item do not allow the respondents to fully describe their racial identities, or surveys that do not have a comprehensive list of racial choices, may not accurately capture an individual's profile.

Many college and university surveys have traditionally excluded particular social and ethnic groups from being respondent identifiers. For example, the University of Oklahoma student enrollment surveys only recently added "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander," "two or more races," and "not reported." (University of Oklahoma, 2010). Also prior to 2010, the University of Oklahoma referred to "international" students as "Non-Resident Aliens." The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) documented the demographics of coaches by only "White," "Black," or "other" during the 1995-1996 academic year. Further, it was not until 1999 that the NCAA added "American Indian/Alaskan Native," "Asian/Pacific Islander," "Hispanic/Latino," and "other" categories to its student atheletes demographic survey data. "Native Hawaiians" and "two or more races" were added to the student athletes

demographic survey in 2007 (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2013). Other college and university demographic surveys share a similar history.

The way in which universities refer to racial groups of students can be problematic and misleading. For example, the University of Oklahoma refers to international students, or students who attend the university but are not U.S. citizens, as a racial or ethnic group in its Fact Book data that details the race and ethnicity of Norman campus students. This categorizes an international student from England and an international student from Taiwan as members of the same racial or ethnic group, according to university data (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). Further, it invalidates the cultural diversity of enrolled international students. Additionally, Oklahoma State University's Diversity Ledger, which includes demographic information for students, faculty, and staff, considers White females and international individuals as members of the university's minority community (Oklahoma State University Institutional Research and Information Management, 2014a). It is important to understand the ways in which universities collect and report demographic data to understand the inconsistencies between institutions and compare universities year-by-year.

Each year's higher education demographic data show a gradual progression of awareness of diverse races and cultures on campus. But one must consider the semantics and evolution of survey items when reviewing data and comparing them across a specified timeframe. To be sure, the low numbers represented by each minority are a testament to how much work must still be done by universities that want to be culturally diverse and inclusive.

Chapter 3: Informal Interactional Diversity in Student Organizations

While the author focuses on the racial diversity of student organizations, a holistic approach to racial diversity in terms of recruiting, admissions, hiring, curriculum, and administrative structures are the best barometers of an institution's diversity and inclusion. A holistic approach also allows institutions to measure de facto systems of inequality (Maramba & Velasquez, 2010; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

Additionally, the author acknowledges that university diversity and inclusion cannot be successfully realized by one individual or academic unit. Many factors that are within and outside of a university's control can prevent diversity from occuring the same way on each campus. By the same token, students' conceptualization of diversity and their willingness to engage in diversity encounters do not guarantee success. For these reasons, a sustained and collaborative effort is vital if any institution is to have and sustain racial diversity within its student organizations (Chang, Denson, Saenz & Misa, 2006; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

Further, racial diversity cannot be adequately addressed without also recognizing intersecting variables that contribute to or influence equal educational opportunities (Acker, 2006). These regimes include historically interrelated practices and processes that maintain inequality in terms of class or socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, age, ability, sexual orientation, and gender identity (Acker, 2006). The following topics focus on the need for diversity in student organizations.

Changing Demographics

Just as universities try to determine the best ways to educate students in a global marketplace of evolving technology and a rapidly changing economic conditions,

research findings suggest it is important for American universities to also prioritize the changing national demographics of secondary school-aged children who may become future university students, job seekers, and leaders. Non-White children are projected to become the majority of Americans by 2018; non-White adults are projected to become the majority by 2038 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). While the demographics of non-White children will vary by states, state school goals for racial and cultural diversity within their colleges and universities are also likely to vary. Research universities, which by definition are committed to graduate education, give higher priority than other schools to research and awarding doctoral degrees (Carnegie Foundation, 2010). American universities that attract a disproportionate number of accomplished professors and that educate some of the most successful students in the world have a social responsibility to achieve diversity. It should be noted that while racial integration may foster critical thinking and a wealth of personal experiences in higher education, universities should not merely mirror population demographics. A reflective representation does not guarantee the valuable components of diverse interactions. Ensuring that all minorities are not just represented but prioritized, valued, and provided opportunity is the most prudent way to produce racially and culturally diverse graduates who are globally adept (Tienda, 2013).

The changing demographics at the University of Oklahoma during the last decade show a gradual decrease in Oklahoma resident student enrollment, suggesting the institution has the ability to diversify beyond state demographics. Oklahoma residents comprised 74.52% of total on-campus enrollment in fall 2002 and Oklahoma resident enrollment decreased by almost one percent each subsequent year. By fall

2013, more than a third of on-campus students were from other states, with almost 70% of out-of-state students coming from Texas and California. With an increase of minority group students coming from Texas and California, the University of Oklahoma has opportunities to crease more structural diversity and to have more informal interactional diversity (State & County QuickFacts: California; State & County QuickFacts: Oklahoma; State & County QuickFacts: Texas).

Table 1: University of Oklahoma Students by Residency

State	Fall 2013	Fall 2012	Fall 2011	Fall 2010	Fall 2009	Fall 2008	Fall 2007	Fall 2006	Fall 2005	Fall 2004	Fall 2003
Oklahoma	16940	16073	14879	15010	15574	15576	15994	16316	17070	17638	17835
Texas	**4481**	**4568**	**4416**	**4225**	**3998**	**3848**	**3801**	**3557**	**3526**	**3439**	**3088**
California	**300**	**317**	**264**	**236**	**191**	**163**	**164**	**153**	**140**	**130**	**125**
Alabama	24	28	22	13	17	15	17	15	18	15	9
Alaska	18	20	16	13	10	12	13	17	20	20	15
Arizona	56	53	50	51	51	43	42	42	39	33	26
Arkansas	92	97	101	106	92	90	80	76	71	80	90
Colorado	181	172	148	124	102	89	90	101	89	79	80
Connecticut	19	25	30	23	19	18	12	11	12	16	13
Delaware	2	6	6	7	3	3	1	1	1	2	1
District of Columbia	18	26	22	20	16	12	12	11	10	5	1
Florida	72	74	77	74	62	61	54	41	37	44	45
Georgia	57	71	73	68	63	53	50	47	58	64	48
Hawaii	12	15	11	9	7	7	7	3	5	7	6
Idaho	17	18	18	16	18	21	17	16	17	18	17
Illinois	149	166	138	120	101	95	80	87	90	95	96
Indiana	39	44	42	38	31	29	25	22	28	35	34
Iowa	37	43	41	38	33	26	29	32	36	34	30
Kansas	213	235	235	196	161	143	145	132	152	150	149
Kentucky	14	19	17	21	15	15	12	15	14	17	12

Louisiana	43	41	54	48	41	50	54	44	45	34	37
Maine	11	12	9	11	10	7	6	3	3	3	2
Maryland	42	49	44	42	34	36	34	31	32	33	28
Massachusetts	14	17	25	20	19	14	14	12	14	15	17
Michigan	64	75	71	56	61	54	49	44	39	34	41
Minnesota	47	50	46	48	45	47	36	37	34	37	35
Mississippi	13	14	14	11	9	13	14	12	10	11	7
Missouri	139	157	155	138	137	124	115	115	102	107	105
Montana	15	16	14	11	10	18	21	22	22	19	16
Nebraska	34	35	36	41	39	35	39	33	32	35	36
Nevada	47	39	32	25	25	27	30	25	26	16	13
New Hampshire	8	6	11	9	12	16	14	9	6	7	5
New Jersey	52	42	35	32	39	30	27	21	24	26	23
New Mexico	42	57	51	45	45	56	62	68	62	67	72
New York	55	53	46	53	47	36	31	31	34	36	42
North Carolina	30	37	40	39	34	29	37	34	37	29	23
North Dakota	7	9	10	12	12	7	5	8	7	6	4
Ohio	66	70	69	73	79	73	67	60	63	72	61
Oregon	19	23	23	23	18	17	21	17	15	12	16
Pennsylvania	77	77	70	65	54	44	40	36	39	32	40
Rhode Island	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	3	6
South Carolina	23	22	19	15	11	11	15	14	14	12	13
South Dakota	21	19	17	16	18	18	18	18	18	17	14
Tennessee	45	43	40	36	39	36	34	33	37	40	40
Utah	29	29	24	23	22	19	15	12	9	10	15
Vermont	2	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	3
Virginia	56	64	59	72	64	56	54	58	49	56	55
Washington	53	52	46	45	42	28	37	39	40	34	35
West Virginia	8	7	9	6	6	6	5	9	14	15	13
Wisconsin	53	64	63	64	59	44	39	33	31	28	31
Wyoming	11	11	9	6	6	7	9	10	7	11	10

Puerto Rico	3	5	4	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	--
American Samoa	--	--	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	--
Northern Mariana Islands	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	--
Guam	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	1	1	1	--
Virgin Islands	--	--	--	--	0	0	1	1	1	2	--
State Not Available	74	438	456	213	148	134	145	118	175	166	151
International	1751	1680	1641	1567	1502	1429	1384	1351	1431	1620	1773
Out of State Total	7004	7633	7330	6704	6182	5841	5748	5390	5409	5311	4892

Public School Systems

Universities that prioritize structural, classroom, and informal interactional diversity may set the stage for change in public schools that are experiencing racial divides similar to those before the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954) decision (Jayakumar, 2008). Segregation in public schools reached an all-time low in the late 1980s; it has steadily increased since then. In fact, by the mid-1990s, the racial diversity gains of *Brown* were nearly reversed. Stroub and Richards (2013) found that segregation in metropolitan areas has generally declined since 1998, it should be noted that Blacks are still far more segregated from Whites than Asians or Hispanics and Hispanics more segregated from Whites than Asians. Though segregation declined in 65.1% of all metropolitan areas between 1998 and 2009, it worsened in over a third of metropolitan areas when 23.1% of metropolitan areas were re-segregated during the period of 1998 to 2009 (Stroub & Richards, 2013). Further, White students are currently overrepresented at many of the most elite universities and they are less likely than non-

White students to engage in cross-racial relations in college (Jayakumar, 2008). This may be a self-perpetuating trend, as White individuals live in the most racially segregated neighborhoods and attend the most racially segregated secondary schools (Jayakumar, 2008). Universities that diversify their student bodies may encourage public schools to also diversify.

The Workplace

Diverse membership in university student organizations tend to result in graduates who are better able to advocate on their own behalf and become influential leaders in the workplace. In organizations in which females and racial minorities are disproportionately in few in numbers or employed in subordinate positions, they are not likely to assert themselves, feel entitled, or pursue leadership roles (DiTomaso, Post & Parks-Yancy, 2007). In racially fair and balanced student organizations, minority group students have power and leadership roles. Consequently, these students learn to be autonomous and assertive.

It is important for student organizations to be egalitarian, thereby preparing more minority group students for leadership positions in public and private organizations. Rivera (2011) interviewed a hiring manager at an elite law firm who described how challenging it was to find qualified racially and ethnically diverse job candidates. An untold number of minority group applicants lack the academic qualifications or campus involvement experience that characterizes attractive candidates. Rivera (2011) noted that the partner in charge of recruitment for a consulting firm recognized the fact that many job applicants of color who apply have less adequate leadership experience than White college graduates (Rivera, 2011). The

demographics of most elite firms are still not racially diverse. Clearly, leadership opportunities buttressed by other kinds of campus involvement are important for getting jobs after graduating from a college.

Racial diversity in student organizations helps minority students to gain leadership skills and organizational experiences that can better prepare them for the workplace. In truth, most universities must do a better job preparing *all* students for the workplace and an increasingly global society. Compared with non-diverse student organizations, organizations with diverse memberships tend to prepare more students of all races for interacting and collaborating with a diversity of other races (Jayakumar, 2008). If workplace diversity is a public good because the public invests in educating and preparing students for workforce, then society benefits from a skilled workforce. If equal opportunities in employment exist (Johnsen, Tatli, Ozbilgin & Bell, 2013), its antecedent – student organization diversity – is also a public good. That is, members of racially diverse student organizations generally are more cross-culturally competent workers.

Implementing cross-cultural workplace competencies in universities before students enter the workforce may eliminate discriminatory practices students of color when they encounter the workplace Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) concluded that applicants with "White-sounding" names received 50 percent more callbacks for job interviews than applicants with "Black-sounding" names, despite similar qualifications and accomplishments, occupation, industry, and employer size (p. 991). If students were better exposed to diversity at various levels (structural, classroom, and informal interactional diversity) before they entered the labor market, workplace discrimination

may be mitigated in the future when some of the graduates become human resource managers.

Academic Achievement

Informal interactional diversity may increase students' intellectual self-confidence and raise their degree aspirations. Antonio (2004) noted that minority group students with a high degree of diversity in their friendship groups tend to have enhanced self-confidence and high educational aspirations. Because persons involved in student organizations are likely to meet new people in those organizations, campus involvement may be an avenue to forging interracial friendships. Additionally, Antonio (2004) cites Weidman's (1989) model of socialization as the foundational theory for his study. A basic assumption of Weidman's model includes the importance of interpersonal processes that prescribes "long-term academic impacts of college are not the result of classroom experiences, but of informal forms of social interactions with students and faculty" (Antonio, 2004, p. 452). That is, college students who have frequent racially diverse interactions often experience better academic outcomes.

Cognitive Development and Psychological Well-Being

A growing body of research explores the positive correlation between racial diversity experiences and cognitive gains in terms of students' self-comparison of gains made since entering college, (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Bowman, 2009; Bowman, 2010b, p. 192; Lorenzo-Hernandez, 1998), enhanced self-confidence (Antonio, 2004), motivation (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005), educational aspirations (Antonio, 2004), and the ability to practice deep, active, and critical thinking (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Bowman, 2010a; Hurtado, 2001; Nelson-Laird, 2005; Tsui,

1999). The disequilibrium some students encounter during racially diverse interactions is an aspect of their cognitive and psychological development. Simply put, experiences with racially diverse individuals which produce ideas that do not fit into a student's existing worldview prompt the student to either reconcile the discrepancy with existing beliefs or change his or her views to fit with the new information (Bowman, 2010a). This interracial influence spurs individuals to exert greater cognitive effort, access issue-relevant and in-depth information processing, and engage in more divergent thinking (Crisp & Turner, 2010). Also, Bowman (2010a) concluded that face-to-face interactions that produce disequilibrium and further promote critical thinking and evaluation may produce more cognitive development than diversity courses or workshops mandated by universities. That is, students may reap more benefits from engaging with diverse others in student organizations than they may completing coursework that focuses on diverse others.

Informal interaction diversity may also provide a cognitive benefit to bicultural students, specifically. Lorenzo-Hernandez (1998) suggests bicultural individuals reap cognitive benefits from continuous interaction with dominant group members by developing the ability to display less stereotyping and confirmatory biases and more tolerant attitudes. While informal interactional diversity is productive for individuals who may be hesitant to integrate, it is certainly beneficial for bicultural individuals who choose to integrate to the host society, too.

Literature suggests institutionalized advantages position White students above minority students in intellectual self-confidence under normal conditions before one experiences diverse interactions. It is important to become inclusive and foster a

heterogeneous environment of different ideas and experiences. Specifically, White students are more likely than minority students to self-report high intellectual self-confidence (Antonio, 2004). Universities must increase structural diversity to increase the possibility for informal interactional diversity within student organizations.

Developmentally, traditional college students who are in their late adolescence are better prepared than most non-college students to begin thinking for themselves and claiming ownership of their ideas (Denson & Chang, 2009; Jayakumar, 2008). Whereas older members of the population may be set in their ways and resistant to change, the university culture encourages and supports free-thinking and personal development. Properly created diverse environments allow for informal interactional diversity and allow students to better understand themselves and how they fit in the world. This is a primary component of the learning experience that students should extract from a university.

One's experience in a diverse university community can be transformative and worthwhile not only because college-age students are cognitively primed to make the connections, but because positive intergroup contact experiences are so influential. These experiences influence attitudes not only toward the encountered primary outgroups, but also toward other outgroups not involved in the encounters (Bowman, 2013). Additionally, positive attitudes about outgroups creates a culture in which cross-racial interaction and student learning experiences are expanded beyond social and cultural lines (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Expanding one's perceptions of outgroups and expanding learning experiences beyond traditional parameters may broaden one's take on topics entrenched in diversity and difference, like political and

social views, racism and discrimination, women's rights, and national politics (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Informal interactional diversity may craft individuals who are more socially and politically aware and who are able to interact with a diverse group of individuals and a globalized society.

Chapter 4: Maintaining Diversity at the Institutional Level

Institutions that commit to enhancing structural racial diversity – a necessary condition to facilitate the productive and enriching interactions that stem from informal interactional diversity in student organizations – may also commit to broader diversity measures. Because individuals from different racial backgrounds practice different religions, come from various socioeconomic classes, identity with different political ideologies, and ensure many other different diverse qualities, structural racial diversity may ensure a campus community with varied opinions and perspectives and who are best prepared to succeed (Pike & Kuh, 2006; Pike, Kuh & Gonya, 2007). A diverse community sponsors learning both inside and outside of the classroom in both traditional and non-traditional ways.

Additionally, recent literature suggests a diverse university that has numerous instances of informal interactional diversity benefits all students – even those not engaging in diverse interactions. Students with very little cross-racial interaction who are part of a diverse university that has high average levels of cross-racial interaction tend to report greater individual gains in openness to diversity than do similar students who attend a university with low average levels (Chang, Denson, Saenz & Misa, 2006). A university cannot require its students to engage in cross-racial interactions, but creating an environment that facilitates informal interactional diversity tends to produce

students who do indeed become more open to diversity. Further, all students may benefit from the "network of values, policies, practices, traditions, resources, and sentiments" that support such a university's institutional quality (Hale, 2004, p. 11).

Further, Bowman (2010b) suggests research universities provide first-year students with greater gains in positive relations with other students, purpose of life, and self-acceptance than do students who attend smaller colleges with less opportunity and a more homogeneous student population. The University of Oklahoma is in a unique position to capitalize on its ability to provide students with gains in personal well-being by encouraging diversity, especially within student organizations. Creating structural diversity will allow more disadvantaged students to become involved in the school community and reap benefits in the personal well-being of more students.

University Experience

An individual's overall university experience varies from student to student depending on many factors, and students of different races are likely to view the university differently. Who people are and where they are positioned in an institution affect the ways in which they experience and view the institution, its mission, and its social climate (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Students in diverse student organizations may view the university differently than those not in an organization at all. To be sure, one's perception of his or her university – including one's perceived level of institutional commitment to diversity – affects the university experience.

Universities can reap benefits not only from diversity in practice but also from students' perceived levels of university commitment to diversity. For example, high perceived levels of institutional commitment to diversity are associated with higher

reported college grade point averages and increases in students' ability to advocate for racial understanding (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Conversely, low perceived levels of institutional commitment to diversity are associated with higher levels of student alienation. Literature suggests African American students perceive higher levels of hostility and discrimination and lower grades, Latino students experience a difficult time adjusting to college and finding a sense of belonging, and Native American students feel isolated on a campus with low perceived levels of institutional commitment to diversity (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

A 2007 study commissioned by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) surveyed 23,000 undergraduate students and 9,000 campus professionals, including faculty, academic administrators, and student affairs staff, to determine perception about personal and social responsibility across 23 institutions (Dey, 2008). First-year students were more likely to "strongly agree" their institution prioritized the five dimensions of personal and social responsibility – striving for excellence, cultivating personal and academic integrity, contributing to a larger community, taking seriously the perspectives of others, and refining ethical and moral reasoning (Dey, 2008). Notably, student satisfaction with personal and social responsibility waned as class year increased (Dey, 2008), suggesting as students became more acquainted with their university, they found instances and areas of inadequacies to legitimize their opinions. Additionally, more than 40% of students perceive having developed over the course of college in all five dimensions except contributing to a larger community (Dey, 2008). Perhaps a structurally diverse student body that prioritizes informal interactional diversity in student organizations would increase

students' satisfaction with personal and social responsibility and encourage engagement with a larger community.

Student satisfaction data like the AAC&U's survey may best represent an institution's perceived commitment to diversity and inclusion. Recognizing that in-college experiences have been shown to have a greater effect on students' adjustment to and persistence in college more than their own backgrounds (Hurtado, Carter & Spuller, 1996), the University of Oklahoma's student opinions on cross-racial interactions and diversity suggest OU students do not prioritize the institution's commitment to diversity or engaging in diversity themselves. Only 48% of new freshman surveyed by a 2010 University of Oklahoma Assessment Report reported they agreed strongly or agreed somewhat with the statement "I would be interested in interaction with people whose ethnic background is different from mine." Additionally, 38% of freshman believed that becoming more open-minded is an extremely important benefit of higher education, 30% of freshman believed understanding social issues more fully is an extremely important benefit of higher education, 17% of freshman believed becoming more tolerant of others is an extremely important benefit of higher education, and 16% of freshman believed becoming more aware of other cultures is an extremely beneficial aspect of higher education (University of Oklahoma Office of Academic Assessment, 2010). Perhaps a sign of the social issues during the time, there was a 10% decrease in the number of freshman from 1977 to 2005 who believed that it was extremely important that higher education would lead to more fully understanding social problems and issues, from 32% to 22%, respectively (University of Oklahoma Office of Academic Assessment, 2005). From 2005 to 2010, the number of freshman who

indicated it was extremely important that higher education would lead to more fully understanding social problems and issues increased from 22% to 30%. Because an institution's environment has an impressive power on student satisfaction data (Carter, 2006), one may determine the University of Oklahoma's environment is not as conducive to cultural diversity programs and facilitating informal diversity interactions as it could be. Additionally, considering the AAC&U's data that suggests students become less confident in their university's commitment to personal and social responsibility as their class year increased, it is possible freshman who participated in the 2010 New Student Survey might change their answers to the above questions later in their academic career.

Case Law Influencing Diversity at the Collegiate Level

There is a wealth of case law spanning the last 65 years that confirms diversity is an important tenant to the education experience. Many of the following cases are cited in recent literature on diversity at the collegiate level and legitimize the surge of interest in such studies. It is also important to note case law and legislative support is an appropriate tenant to a successful social movement that seeks change (Acker, 2006). Creating a historical context and understanding where institutions fit today can mobilize a social movement to seek current legislative support.

The Supreme Court has been careful to legislate racial quotas in admissions cannot be justified, as decided in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), and a formulaic approach that awards bonus points to minority students is unconstitutional, as decided *in Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003) (Pike & Kuh, 2006), but the Regents of the University of California v. *Bakke* (1978), *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003),

and *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2013) made the distinction that race and ethnicity considerations do not violate the 14th Amendment and such qualifiers can be a considering factor in admissions if race and ethnicity can be shown to improve the quality of one's educational experience (Fisher v. University of Texas; Pike & Kuh, 2006; Pike, Kuh & Gonya, 2007). Specifically, *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) confirmed Michigan Law School's race-conscious admissions program did not create a disadvantage to nonminority applicants because the university's review of each applicant was thorough and individualized so as to not base a decision on race alone (Grutter v. Bollinger). Research has suggested that safeguarding racial diversity at the institutional level is vital because the increasingly diverse nation will soon rely on graduates of these institutions to shape the nation's economy and its moral and civic engagement (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

Other cases have proved the importance of racial diversity on college campuses in pursuit of an academic experience. *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950) ruled the University of Texas Law School could not restrict admission to White students exclusively because, according to Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, a law school cannot be successful by alienating "individuals and institutions with which the law interacts" (Moses & Chang, 2006, p. 6). Additionally, Chief Justice Vinson recommended students should not study in "an academic vacuum, removed from the interplay of ideas and the exchange of views with which the law is concerned" (Moses & Chang, 2006, p. 6). White students are still the majority of college students, both nationally and specifically at the University of Oklahoma, leaving many universities in the aforementioned academic

vacuum, despite the impending demographics that suggest non-White students will be the majority of college-aged students within a few decades.

Further, Chief Justice Vinson invalidated the University of Oklahoma's practice of restricting Black graduate students from accessing the library, classrooms, and the cafeteria in *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education* (1950) (Moses & Chang, 2005). Restricting one population's access contributed to educational inequality by preventing "the intellectual commingling of students" and restricted Black students' ability "to engage in discussion and exchange views with other students," according to Chief Justice Vinson (Moses & Chang, 2005, p. 6-7). One may argue that a majority student population of White students and a lack of informal interactional diversity within student organizations in the 21st century fails to foster a "intellectual commingling" and limits students' opportunities "to engage in discussion and exchange views with other students" – ideas that were recognized over 50 years ago (Moses & Chang, 2005, p. 6-7).

Chapter 5: Minority Disadvantages and Underrepresentation

Cumulative Disadvantages

The underrepresentation minorities experience on college campuses may be the result of many small disadvantages experienced at an early stage that accumulate to create large between-group differences (Milkman, Akinola & Chugh, 2014). One's race, socioeconomic status, and experiences may determine if he or she has the funding, encouragement, ambition, support, knowledge of the process, and resources to apply to college, be successful, and become involved in student organizations. College students from a disadvantaged high school may require remedial classes, more study time, and

help navigating courses and the college process, leaving less time to pursue involvement in student organizations.

Additionally, college students from low-income families may have to work part- or full-time to pay their school expenses. That leaves less time for them to participate in student organizations (Callender & Jackson, 2008; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak & Terenzini, 2004). Research has shown the decision to work while in college is positively associated with living at home (Finch et al., 2006; Callendar & Wilson, 2003). The culmination of working and living at home may limit students' opportunities to become engaged in student activities on campus. Milem, Chang and Antonio (2005) recommend integrating commuter students into activities that promote informal interactional diversity to experience frequent and sustained interaction with a wide range of students.

According to the University of Oklahoma's *The New Student Survey: Trends in Backgrounds and Attitudes of New Freshman at the University of Oklahoma* (2013), a survey administered to freshman annually, about 59% of 2012 freshman expected to work while attending the university, with 19% of freshman expecting to work one to ten hours each week, 29% of freshman expecting to work 11 to 20 hours each week, eight percent of freshman expecting to work 21-30 hours each week, and two percent of freshman expecting to work 31 to 40 hours each week. More than a third of freshman reported they either "agreed strongly" or "agreed somewhat" with the statement, "I needed to work to go to school." Additionally, 22 percent of freshman reported they "disagreed somewhat" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement, "At this present time, I have enough resources to complete my first year at OU" (University of Oklahoma

University College, 2013). *The New Student Survey* illustrates a significant segment of the University of Oklahoma population faces major stressors that may discourage student organization involvement and create barriers for academic achievement.

Additionally, Callendar and Jackson (2008) found students from lower socioeconomic statuses relied on unofficial and informal sources of information, like friends, family, and word of mouth, rather than formal networks like state and university departments. This may result in misinformation or a lack of a complete understanding of processes throughout one's university experience, hindering a potential student from achieving success inside and outside of the classroom.

Institutional History

The University of Oklahoma's history of racial tension and exclusionary practices should be acknowledged and understood by students, faculty, staff, and the administration to create a current understanding of diversity that benefits from historical context (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). The University of Oklahoma community should become familiar with the policies that once prevented non-White students from attending the university, the de jure desegregation that followed landmark rulings like *Sipuel v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma* (1948) and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education* (1950) (Moses & Chang, 2005), the local impact of the Civil Rights Movement, and the lack of racial diversity that exists nearly 60 years later. With the University of Oklahoma's segregation claiming the first 60 years of its institution and de jure desegregation claiming the last 60 years, the university is at a pivotal point in its history to create real change in terms of racial diversity.

National Racial Demographics

While the U.S. population is growing increasingly diverse, university student populations are not growing at the same rate. While the number of non-Hispanic Whites increased nationally by only 1.2% during 2000 and 2010, populations among non-Whites grew at a much significant rate (Bowman, 2013). In this ten-year period, the national Hispanic population grew by 43%, the national Asian population grew by 43%, the national Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander population grew by 35%, and those who identify with two or more races grew nationally by 32% (Humes, Jones & Ramirez, 2011). An increasing non-White demographic constitutes a stringent look at minority-specific challenges in universities.

Big 12 Racial Demographics

To generate a perspective and formulate recommendations for structural and racial diversity at the institutional level, it is important to assess the existing structural diversity in the Big 12 region. Further, recognizing an institution's geographical location, religious affiliation, and many others factors influence its student demographics, a snapshot of the following schools is instructive to contextualize data analysis. The following racial demographic section considers the Fall 2013 student population at each of the Big 12 institutions.

The University of Texas is the most structurally diverse institution in the Big 12, with 48.44% of its Fall 2013 student population identifying as White. While the institution's Fall 2013 student population of Hispanic, Asian, and foreign students (including international students) is 19.06%, 15.38%, and 9.19%, respectfully, the remaining federally-recognized minority categories – Black, American Indian,

Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, two or more races, and unknown – are represented by a combined 7.93% of the student population (University of Texas at Austin Office of Information Management and Analysis, 2014). These remaining minority groups are statistically underrepresented among the Big 12 schools.

Black students represent about 2.49% to 4.74% of each of the Big 12 institutions, save for Texas Tech University and Baylor University reporting Black students represent 5.53% and 7.28% of their student population, respectively. American Indian students represent an even smaller student population, representing less than one percent of student populations at all but two institutions – the University of Oklahoma (4.03% of the student population) and Oklahoma State University (5.37% of the student population). Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students represent three-tenths of a percent or less of each Big 12 institution's student population. While Asian students are more represented at the University of Texas than they are at any other Big 12 institution with 15.38% of students identifying as Asian, and while Baylor University's student population is 8.61% Asian, the rest of the Big 12 institutions report Asian students represent 1.48% to 5.22% of the population. Finally, while Hispanic students represent 19.06% and 19.04% of the University of Texas and Texas Tech University, respectively, they represent 3.16% to 13.13% of the rest of the Big 12 schools.

Table 2: Big 12 Student Racial Demographics, Fall 2013

	White	African American/ Black	African American Multiracial	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	International	Not Reported	Total
Baylor University	10,156	1,137	--	56	1,344	2,051	5	702	--	165	15,616
	65.03%	7.28%	--	0.36%	8.61%	13.13%	0.03%	4.50%	--	1.06 %	
Iowa State University	25,469	819	--	67	875	1,334	29	565	3,797	--	32,955
	77.28%	2.49%	--	0.20%	2.66%	4.05%	0.09%	1.71%	11.52%	--	
University of Kansas	17,576	935	--	157	920	1355	21	908	2246	317	24,435
	71.93	3.83%	--	0.64%	3.77%	5.55%	0.09%	3.72%	9.19%	1.30 %	
Kansas State University	18,597	967	--	104	364	1,341	32	650	--	420	24,581
	75.60%	3.93%	--	0.42%	1.48	5.46%	0.13%	2.64%	--	1.80 %	
University of Oklahoma	14,441	1,135	--	964	1,249	1,912	34	1,409	1,751	1,04 9	23,944
	60.31%	4.74%	--	4.03%	5.22%	7.99%	0.15%	5.88%	7.31%	4.38 %	
Oklahoma State University	18,015	1,157	--	1,394	424	1,151	9	1,638	1,941	210	25,939
	69.45%	4.46%	--	5.37	1.63%	4.44%	0.03%	6.31%	7.48%	0.81 %	
Texas Christian University	7,213	490	--	92	229	1,007	25	82	508	279	9,925
	72.68%	4.94%	--	0.93%	2.31%	10.1%	0.25%	0.83%	5.12%	2.81 %	
University of Texas	25,219	2,061	276	111	8007	9920	49	1165	4782	469	52,059
	48.44%	3.96%	0.53%	0.21%	15.38 %	19.06%	0.09%	2.24%	9.19%	0.90 %	
Texas Tech	20,582	1,830	214	108	863	6,303	30	665	2291	225	33,111

University	62.16%	5.53%	0.65%	0.33%	2.61%	19.04%	0.09%	2.01%	6.92%	0.68 %	
University of West Virginia	23,956	1,204	--	53	526	931	26	810	1,820	140	29,466
	81.30%	4.09%	--	0.18%	1.79%	3.16%	0.09%	2.75%	6.18%	0.48 %	

While a snapshot of each of the Big 12 institutions' fall 2013 student racial demographics allows individuals to consider each institution at a fixed time, a discussion which highlights each school's racial demographics over the past decade creates an individualized historical context that may predict trends in enrollment. The following section will consider each Big 12 institution's racial demographics by percent of total enrollment from fall 2003 to fall 2013. This presentation will illustrate specific gains or decreases, hold each school accountable for its enrollment numbers respective of the fall 2003 starting point and the fall 2013 end point, and consider possible trends in enrollment.

Despite the productive discussion that can ensue when comparing data, it is important to recognize that many institutions do not have the same data intake process, and the way in which they organize data can differ. For example, students who are not U.S. citizens are referred to as "Non-Resident Aliens" at the University of Kansas, "Foreign" at the University of Texas at Austin, and "international" at many Big 12 schools, including the University of Oklahoma. Native Americans have been referred to as American Indians. Additionally, new federal race and ethnicity categories were implemented by all Big 12 schools between 2009 and 2010, with some schools expanding their race and ethnicity categories in 1996 and 2004. While also respecting that this data is self-reported, it is difficult to compare an individual institution's type of

data across a continuum, let alone data from multiple Big 12 schools. While keeping these caveats in mind, the racial categories "White" and "total minority population" did not change over the continuum. For this reason, the author is able to discuss the decrease in White students and the increase of minority students at each Big 12 school relative to the overall percent of enrollment. For the purpose of this thesis, the author considers the "total minority population" to be all enrolled students who are not White and who are not "international," "Foreign," or "Non-Resident Alien" students.

All Big 12 institutions' data showed an increase in percent of minority students relative to the overall student population from about 20% to almost 80%, but those with the largest increases were the least diverse (See Appdendix A). For example, West Virginia University's total minority student population as a percentage of the overall enrollment increased from 6.98% in fall 2003 to 12.54 percent in fall 2013 – an increase of nearly 80%. On the other hand, the most diverse institution in the Big 12, the University of Texas at Austin, expressed a total minority student population at about 34% in Fall 2003 to about 43% in fall 2013. Though this increase in percent of minority students was about a 25% increase, its gains are expressed by its ability to diversify earlier than many other Big 12 institutions.

One may also determine an institution's ability to diversify based on the decrease of the White student population. Texas Tech University has made the greatest gains from fall 2003 to fall 2013 in decreasing its White student population, with total enrolled White students as a function of the overall student population decreasing from about 79% to about 63% -- about a 21% decrease. Conversely, Texas Christian University has made the fewest gains from fall 2003 to fall 2013 in decreasing its White

student population, with total enrolled White students as a function of the overall student population decreasing from about 77% to about 73% -- about a five percent decrease. The University of Oklahoma's gains to diversify and thereby decreasing the percent of White students as a function of the overall student population is second to Texas Tech University, decreasing from about 72% to about 60% -- about a 16% decrease. An institution's ability to increase structural diversity and the trends which predict growth in minority enrollment may ensure that institution's ability to harness productive informal interactional diversity and the proposed benefits.

Chapter 6: Contextualizing the University of Oklahoma

University of Oklahoma Student Racial Demographics

The need for structural and informal interactional racial diversity is contextualized by the current racial demographics and trends within the student population. On-campus enrollment from 1993 to 2013 shows a White student population ranging from 73.86% in 1993 to 60.31% in 2013 (University of Oklahoma, 2014). Institutional data that goes as far back as 1976 illustrates an 87.5% White student population that leveled off to 80.7% by 1990 (University of Oklahoma, 1997). While White students have reigned as the majority student population, minority populations identified as American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Black and African American, and Hispanic have represented about 2 to 7% of the student population during the last twenty years, and less than 1 to 3% from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s (University of Oklahoma, 2014; University of Oklahoma, 1997). And while the White population looks to have diversified slightly over the last 20 years, the new federal race and ethnicity categories implemented in 2010 suggest those who identified with the newly

added categories – Native Hawaiian, two or more races, and not reported – may have previously identified with the White category in their absence since the White student population dropped by almost 10% from 2009 to 2010 (University of Oklahoma, 2014). Research findings suggest that all universities have much to gain by being racially diverse and providing opportunities for students to have formal and informal interactional diversity interactions. This improves the educational experiences for both White and non-White students.

Table 3: University of Oklahoma On-Campus Enrollment, Fall 1993-2012

	White	International	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Not Reported	Total
1993	14,537	1,711	992	766	1,189	485	--	--	--	19,680
	73.86%	8.70%	5.04%	3.89%	6.04%	2.46%	--	--	--	
1994	14,197	1,750	1,150	836	1,240	510	--	--	--	19,683
	72.13%	8.89%	5.84%	4.25%	6.30%	2.59%	--	--	--	
1995	14,272	1,718	1,292	867	1,245	570	--	--	--	19,964
	71.49%	8.61%	6.47%	4.34%	6.24%	2.86%	--	--	--	
1996	14,226	1,702	1,345	929	1,229	595	--	--	--	20,026
	71.04%	8.50%	6.72%	4.64%	6.14%	2.97%	--	--	--	
1997	14,612	1,589	1,370	988	1,303	647	--	--	--	20,509
	71.25%	7.75%	6.68%	4.82%	6.35%	3.15%	--	--	--	
1998	14,911	1,600	1,400	1,040	1,398	719	--	--	--	21,068
	70.78%	7.59%	6.65%	4.94%	6.64%	3.41%	--	--	--	
1999	15,041	1,594	1,478	1,065	1,.401	760	--	--	--	21,339
	70.49%	7.47%	6.93%	4.99%	6.57%	3.56%	--	--	--	
2000	15,284	1,577	1,495	1,085	1,421	760	--	--	--	21,622

	70.67%	7.29%	6.91%	5.02%	6.57%	3.51%	--	--	--	
2001	16,164	1,601	1,621	1,105	1,383	787	--	--	--	22.661
	71.33%	7.07%	7.15%	4.88%	6.10%	3.47%	--	--	--	
2002	17,067	1,730	1,666	1,138	1,381	831	--	--	--	22,813
	71.67%	7.26%	7.00%	4.78%	5.80%	3.49%	--	--	--	
2003	17,659	1,773	1,699	1,164	1,340	865	--	--	--	24,500
	72.0%	7.24%	6.93%	4.75%	5.47%	3.53%	--	--	--	
2004	17,923	1,620	1,717	1,170	1,272	867	--	--	--	24,569
	72.95%	6.59%	6.99%	4.76%	5.18%	3.53%	--	--	--	
2005	17,547	1,431	1,646	1,166	1,231	889	--	--	--	23,910
	73.39%	5.98%	6.88%	4.88%	5.15%	3.72%	--	--	--	
2006	16,872	1,351	1,599	1,159	1,199	877	--	--	--	23,057
	73.18%	5.86%	6.93%	5.03%	5.20%	3.80%	--	--	--	
2007	16,740	1,384	1,633	1,205	1,250	914	--	--	--	23,126
	72.39%	5.98%	7.06%	5.21%	5.40%	3.95%	--	--	--	
2008	16,762	1,429	1,519	1,202	1,223	900	--	--	--	23,035
	72.77%	6.20%	6.59%	5.22%	5.31%	3.91%	--	--	--	
2009	16,687	1,502	1,552	1,246	1,248	1,023	--	--	--	23,258
	71.75%	6.46%	6.67%	5.36%	5.37%	4.40%	--	--	--	
2010	14,507	1,567	1,269	1,222	1,176	906	30	458	2,146	23,281
	62.31%	6.73%	5.45%	5.25%	5.05%	3.89%	0.13%	1.97%	9.21%	
2011	14,894	1,641	1,171	1,215	1,194	1,246	41	823	1,625	23,850
	62.44%	6.88%	4.91%	5.09%	5.01%	5.22%	0.17%	3.45%	6.81%	
2012	14,890	1,680	1,068	1,227	1,206	1,607	39	1,167	1,260	24,144
	61.67%	6.96%	4.42%	5.08%	5.00%	6.66%	0.16%	4.83%	5.22%	
2013	14,441	1,751	964	1,249	1,135	1,912	34	1,409	1,049	23,944
	60.31%	7.31%	4.03%	5.22%	4.74%	7.99%	0.15%	5.88%	4.38%	

Though the next discussion is not exhaustive in terms of detailing the privileges of White students and the struggles of non-White students, it does touch on the direct and indirect results of institutionalized racism, or lack of equal educational

opportunities. The author chronicles numerous findings of scholars who have researched racial and ethnic issues of diversity.

African American and Black Students

These students are 4.74% of the University of Oklahoma's Norman campus fall 2013 enrollment (University of Oklahoma, 2014). Literature suggests that African American students enrolled in predominately White institutions report lower academic achievement, less positive relationships with professors, lower levels of social involvement, and more academic stressors than African American students enrolled in historically Black colleges (Boyraz, Owens, Home & Armstrong, 2013). Many intrinsic and extrinsic factors may influence African American students to make them less likely to join student organizations. However, Boyraz, Ownes, Home and Armstrong (2013) theorized that those from a lower socioeconomic class who are more likely to live in at-risk areas and less likely to have access to financial and social resources – and who, therefore report higher rates of trauma exposure and PTSD – may be more vulnerable and less likely to succeed in a collegiate arena. Though not all Black individuals come from disadvantaged backgrounds, data suggests income inequality is divided across the color line, with the median White family holding nearly 20 times more assets than the median Black family and 74 times more assets than the median Hispanic family (Wolff, 2012).

Academic and social integration, which may be sponsored by informal interactional diversity, influences African American students' achievement and persistence. Defined by Boyaz, Owens, Home and Armstrong (2013), academic integration is the degree to which a student is integrated into the intellectual climate of

the university, while social integration is the degree of congruence between the student and the university. Because social involvement and engagement is positively related to perceived intellectual development and persistence among African American students (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagerdon, 1999), campus involvement that founds an institutional commitment to a university may also yield African American students who are more likely to remain enrolled during their second year of college (Boyaz, Owens, Home & Armstrong, 2013).

Cultivating social integration through informal peer group interactions and participation in extracurricular activities may be difficult, though, since Smith and Jones (2011) suggest Black student participation in predominately White campus organizations produces feelings of interracial harassment. Various researchers suggest tokenism may also be a derivative of minority student participation in student organizations where the minority student population is less than 15 to 20%, leaving minority students with little voice or access to resources (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Smedley, Myers & Harrell, 1993). Additionally, Bowman (2010b) found African American students report lower levels of positive relations with others than do White students. Since the University of Oklahoma is a predominantly White institution, it is important that the university takes steps to not only increase its structural racial diversity, but to encourage informal interactional diversity.

Latino and Hispanic Students

These students were just 7.99% of the University of Oklahoma's 2013 Norman campus enrollment (University of Oklahoma, 2014). Smith and Jones (2011) found

Latino/Hispanic college students were two and a half times more likely to encounter intraracial harassment than White college students. Like other represented minority groups, Latinos may engage in borderism – sanctions experienced by individuals who cross the color line, disassociate from their race, or claim an additional racial membership – to preserve a collective identity and community in the face of discrimination or perceived discrimination by the majority population (Smith & Jones, 2011). This preservation is especially important given Latino's "in between status" in the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Lee & Bean, 2004). Creating structural racial diversity and encouraging informal interactional diversity may dissolve tensions perceived by minority members and encourage more productive engagements with both minority and majority members of the student body.

In conjunction with the influential force Smith and Jones (2011) found borderism has on minority students, Latino students are almost three times more likely to socialize with fellow Hispanic students than White students (Espenshade & Radford, 2009). To dissolve borderism and create more meaningful cross-group interactions, institutions must increase informal interactional diversity to encourage interaction that challenges preexisting stereotypes (Crisp & Turner, 2011; Tienda, 2013). Stereotype inconsistencies that present alternative perspectives and trigger flexible thinking are vital to adaptation in judgment and behavior (Crisp & Turner, 2011).

Asian Students

These students were 5.22% of the University of Oklahoma's 2013 Norman campus enrollment (University of Oklahoma, 2014). Smith and Jones (2011) found Asian college students were 2.9 times more likely to encounter intraracial harassment

than White college students. Like Latino students who are positioned within an "in between status" in the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Lee & Bean, 2004), Asian students engage in borderism to preserve a similar collective identity and community in the face of discrimination or perceived discrimination by the majority population (Smith & Jones, 2011).

Like Latino students, Asian students are also more likely to socialize with other Asian students than with other minority students (Espenshade & Radford, 2009). Though Asian students are almost two times as likely to engage with other Asian students as they are White students, they are almost four time as likely to engage with other Asians students as they are Black students (Espenshade & Radford, 2009). Cross-racial interaction data suggests students who are unlikely to socialize with other races may also be unlikely to become active members in heterogeneous student organizations.

American Indian and Alaska Native Students

These students were 4.03% of the University of Oklahoma's 2013 Norman campus enrollment (University of Oklahoma, 2014). American Indian and Alaska Native students report dramatically low levels of personal growth and positive relations than non-Hispanic White students during their first year of college (Bowman, 2010b). Bowman (2010b) suggests students who encounter difficulty making friends on campus are likely to rate themselves low on positive relations with others. His study suggested the quality of one's interpersonal relationships influenced his or her psychological well-being (Bowman, 2010b). Further, becoming involved in co-curricular activities had a positive effect on one's psychological well-being (Bowman, 2010b).

Though the University of Oklahoma ranks top five in the nation in the number of undergraduate degrees conferred to Native Americans (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, n.d.), it is important to contextualize this distinction by noting the severe underrepresentation Native American students experience on college campuses. According to Norman campus enrollment by race and ethnicity in fall 2013, American Indian and Alaska Natives are the smallest minority present on campus at 4.03%, save for Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders who represented 0.15% of students (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). Additionally, though OU teaches five Native American languages – more than any university in the world – the university enrolled almost twice as many Native American students in 2003 as it did in 2013 (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, n.d.; University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). There is an alarming disconnect between the university spreading American Indian culture and language and increasing American Indian enrollment. Providing a community with the skills to succeed and lead may equip a community to thrive socially and economically. People who are unequipped to succeed in a globalized society may encounter difficulty sustaining themselves and their culture.

White Students

These students were 60.31% of the University of Oklahoma's 2013 Norman campus enrollment (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). Literature suggests White students are most likely to grow up in the most racially segregated neighborhoods and attend the most racially segregated secondary schools, least likely to engage in cross-racial interaction during college, and least likely to be

exposed to people of other races by the time they enter the job market (Jayakumar, 2008). Despite U. S. Census data that suggests White college-aged individuals will no longer be the majority by 2038 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012), Tienda (2013) reported data that suggests White students are least likely to engage in cross-group socializing on campus. Data on cross-racial relations and diversity suggests structural and informal interactional racial diversity are vital to ensuring a productive and dynamic educational environment, yet the White majority in the position of power that has traditionally dominated college enrollment and many job sectors is situated in a homogeneous environment.

Chapter 7: Structures Affecting Informal Interactional Diversity

University Oversight

Informal interactional diversity is important to students' university experiences and development, but the majority in positions of power may fail to see the issues that necessitate diversity as current issues. For example, 5,326 students who attended one of 93 four-year institutions across the nation took a survey which gauged students' opinions on social, political, and economic issues by race (Chang, 2003). While African American, Asian American, Latino, and White students were in least disagreement concerning the statement, "The death penalty should be abolished," opinions varied concerning the following racialized statements: "Racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America" and "Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus" (Chang, 2003, p. 61). White students were most likely to agree that racial discrimination is no longer a problem and were most likely to disagree that colleges should prohibit racist and sexist speech on campus (Chang, 2003). Though race does not prescribe

opinions and ideas, that Chang (2003) found that White and Asian American students were more than twice as likely as African American students to agree racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America suggests race may influence one's life experiences and viewpoints. This difference in opinion across racial lines about the issue of race in the U.S. suggests authority figures within colleges and universities – the majority of whom are White – may be disconnected from issues and share a difference in opinions, too.

The mirror-argument for diversity explains that organizations are likely to benefit from creating a demographic that mirrors its stakeholders (Johnsen, Tatli, Ozbilgin & Bell, 2013) and individuals in a dominant group are unlikely to recognize both their privilege and others' disadvantage (Acker, 2006). Student organizations, then, are likely to enlist a majority of White membership, as its stakeholders – other students and the university faculty, staff, and administration – are a majority White demographic. According to the mirror-argument, diversity at the structural level that would prescribe a more racially diverse student, faculty, staff, and administrative population may increase diversity in student organizations. Perhaps one way to support structural diversity is to ensure diversity at the top-level – in the administration, faculty, and staff.

Faculty and Staff Racial Demographics

Recent literature suggests a holistic approach to diversity, including a diverse faculty, staff, and administrative population – the aforementioned stakeholders to student organizations – may encourage the development and sustainability of diverse student organizations (Maramba & Velasquez, 2010; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005).

The racial demographics of the University of Oklahoma's full-time faculty during Fall 2013 is less diverse that the student population, with White faculty representing 68.4% of full-time faculty, international faculty representing 14.35% of full-time faculty, and Asian faculty representing 7.9% of full-time faculty (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). All other minority categories are each represented by less than two and a half percent of full-time faculty (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). Full-time staff positions during Fall 2013 are similarly distributed, with White staff representing 78.4% of the population, Black/African American staff representing 6% of the population, and American Indian/Alaskan Native staff representing 5.80% of the population (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). All other minority categories are each represented by less than three and a half percent of full-time staff. Finally, all but two of the administrators representing the deans, associate deans, and assistant deans population in Fall 2013 are White, save for one administrator identifying as Asian and one identifying as "two or more races" (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2014). The homogeneous demographics of the university's faculty, staff, and administration suggests hegemonic conditions that may impede progress in developing and sustaining diversity at all levels and within all departments.

Table 4: Racial Demographics of Full-Time Faculty and Staff, Fall 2013

	White	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Two or more races	International	Not reported	Total
Full-Time Faculty	1,039	31	120	33	36	1	11	218	30	1,519
	68.4%	2.04%	7.90%	2.17%	2.37%	0.07%	0.72%	14.35%	1.97%	
Full-Time Staff	3,125	231	76	239	131	1	82	42	59	3,986
	80.21%	5.80%	1.90%	6.00%	3.29%	0.03%	2.06%	1.05%	1.48%	
Deans	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	35
	94.29%	0%	2.86%	0%	0%	0%	2.86%	0%	0%	

Institutions founded on exclusion are unlikely to suddenly become inclusive, despite policies and statutes (Grasgreen, 2013; Hughey, 2010). Additionally, Acker (2006) contends change in institutions that are entrenched with inequity is difficult because of rooted class interests, the legitimacy of class interests as opposed to racial and gender inequalities, and allegiances to gendered and racialized identities and advantages. While Hughey's (2010) scholarship focuses on White Greek letter organizations, his ideas can be applied to structural racial diversity at universities and informal interactional diversity within student organizations – institutions that have also traditionally catered to the White majority. Hughey (2010) contends an administration's laissez-faire approach to diversity is not conducive to change, explaining that if administrators don't take a proactive stance on diversity and inclusion, the same racial

demographics are likely to be reproduced annually (Grasgreen, 2013). According to Bowman (2013), ignoring race in recruiting, admissions, and campus programming may decrease student growth. Creating a more structurally diverse campus in which each minority group is represented by more than four to eight percent is more likely to increase productive informal interactional diversity engagements.

First-Time, First Year Freshman Admission

Despite the need for structural racial diversity and the contention that diversity will not ensue on its own (and it is unable to do so without sufficient structural diversity), the University of Oklahoma does not consider one's racial or ethnic status or first-generation status in first-time, first-year freshman admission decisions (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013a). Even so, Pike, Kuh and Gonya (2007) found proactively recruiting diverse students from diverse backgrounds was more effective than relying on them to become naturally diverse, especially since some minority students experience cumulative disadvantages that may discourage them from joining student organizations on their own. Data suggests minority students are likely also first-generation students who are navigating the collegiate world on their own. According to the September 2010 National Center for Education Statistics report, while only 28.2% White students were first-generation college students during the 2007-2008 academic year, 45% of Black students, 48.5% of Hispanic students, 32.2% of Asian students, 35.6% of Native Americans or Alaska Native students, and 31.3% of Pacific Islander students were first-generation college students during the 2007-2008 academic year (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This data does not only suggest that a significant proportion of the University of Oklahoma's minority student

population are first-generation college students, but also suggests the University of Oklahoma could create structural racial diversity by considering first-generation status.

Literature suggests that though first-generation students are less likely to be involved in extra-curricular activities and noncourse-related interactions with peers, first-generation students tended to extract significantly stronger positive benefits from such involvements than students whose parents have a college degree (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak & Terenzini, 2004). Creating a diverse culture that encourages informal interactional diversity by the way of student organizations may ensure all students have a chance to succeed in ways that are unique to their circumstances. Alternatively, institutions may offer admission to students not based on first-generation status, but based on the high school, neighborhood, and socioeconomic status.

Four Israeli universities – Tel-Aviv University, The Hebrew University, Ben-Gurion University, and The Technion – began a need-blind, color-blind, class-based affirmative action plan in 2000 to provide institutionally disadvantaged students leverage in admissions (Alon, 2011). Administrators recognized the overlap between systems of inequality in Israel and the national and ethnic stratification, and selecting for high school, neighborhood, and socioeconomic status for academically-borderline applicants (as opposed to race exclusively) diversified the universities (Alon, 2011). This is an attractive strategy for the United States, considering how influential one's socioeconomic status is to college enrollment, attendance, and achievement. Since the 1960s, students from low socioeconomic classes are more likely to attend two-year institutions, while students from affluence are more likely to attend four-year universities (Alon, 2009). Additionally, in 1992, students from families representing the

bottom quartile of the socioeconomic status distribution represented just seven percent of students at four-year institutions and percent of students at elite schools (Alon, 2009). Since the University of Oklahoma does not consider one's racial, ethnic, or first-generation status in first-time, first year freshman decisions (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013a), perhaps considering attributes like one's high school, neighborhood, and socioeconomic status – indicators of underprivileged populations – would produce racial diversity (and diversity in other areas) without selecting for race.

Graduation Rates

Recent literature has identified challenges minorities face throughout their collegiate career that legitimizes the need to prioritize efforts to attract and retain non-White students and to create informal interaction diversity. Minority students are more likely to drop out of college before graduation than students in the racial majority (Carter, 2006). This is true at both the national and institutional level.

Nationally, public four-year institutions in a National Center for Education Statistics 2006 cohort had an overall 39% graduation rate, with Asian, White, students identifying as two or more races, and non-resident aliens (46.3%, 42.6%, 46.5%, and 44.1%, respectfully) more likely to graduate in four years than Hispanic, Pacific Islanders, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Black students (29.2%, 24.2%, 21.9%, and 20.5%, respectfully) (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Oklahoma public four-year institutions' 2010 graduation rates show an overall 21.5% four-year graduation rate, with Asian and White students (30.1% and 23.6%, respectively) more likely

Hispanic, American Indian, or Black students (17.9%, 15.4%, and 9.8%, respectively) to graduate in four years (The Chronicle of Higher Education, n.d.)

The University of Oklahoma's four-year graduation rate from 2009 to 2013 is significantly lower for non-White students, excluding international and Asian students (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013d). While 40% of White students graduated in four years, the Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Black/African American four-year graduation rate was 29%, 27.5%, and 25.3%, respectively (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013d). Additionally, the University of Oklahoma Pell Grant recipients' four-year graduation rate is comparable to that of the minority student population at 24.7% from 2009 to2013 (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013d), suggesting income level and prescribed disadvantage may hinder low-income students from graduating on time. While students with a Subsidized Stafford loan – students with a higher earned family income that qualified for a need-loan to finance education – experienced a slightly higher four-year graduation rate from 2009 to 2013, 34.3%, students who did not receive a Pell Grant or a Subsidized Stafford Loan experienced a four-year graduation rate at 43.4% (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013d).

Table 5: University of Oklahoma Full-Time Student Graduation Rates by Race, 2009 Cohort

	Head Count of Cohort	Within Three Years		Within Four Years
		Grad.	Cont.	Graduation Rate
Full-Time Students	3,703	1.3%	71.1%	38.1%
White	2,697	1.2%	71.6%	40%
Black	194	1.0%	62.9%	25.3%

Hispanic	224	1.8%	70.5%	29.0%
Asian	228	4.0%	78.9%	41.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	284	0.4%	62.3%	27.5%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races	--	--	--	--
Not Reported	--	--	--	--
International	76	1.3%	85.5%	63.2%
Pell Grant Recipients	809	0.6%	60.7%	24.7%
Subsidized Stafford Loan Recipients	494	1.2%	68.6%	34.5%
Did Not Receive Either Pell Grant or Subsidized Stafford Loan	2,400	1.6%	75.1%	43.4%

Remedial Courses

According to the University of Oklahoma's *Remediation Study of First-Time Students Academic Year 2012-2013*, 447 of fall 2012 first-time students enrolled in at least one remediation course (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013c). Though this accounts for just 10.80% of first-time students, it accounts for 28.64% of Black first-time students, 16.03% of Hispanic first-time students, 18.99% of American Indian and Alaska Native first-time students, 20% of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander first-time students, 20.13% of international first-time students, and 11.82% of first-time students who identify as two or more races. Additionally, 15.39% of students enrolled in at least one remediation course did not report their race (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013b; University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013c). White and Asian first-time students fell below the mean, with 8.13% and 3.07% in at least one remedial

course, respectively (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013b; University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013c). Additionally, four out of ten freshmen who began college in 2010 directly upon graduating from an Oklahoma high school enrolled in at least one remedial course (Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 2011). Because literature suggests informal interactional diversity has the potential to increase academic achievement for both White and non-White students (Denson & Chang, 2009; Terenzini, et al 2001), increasing the university's structural racial diversity to create greater instances of informal interactional diversity in student organizations may benefit students academically – minority students, especially – decrease remedial courses enrollment, and create a space that encourages academic success.

Diversity Courses

There is conflicting literature on whether diversity courses benefit students during their collegiate careers. Some research studies conclude that ethnic studies courses, women's studies courses, and generally categorized "diversity courses" increase students' critical thinking (Hurtado, 2001; Nelson-Laird, 2005; Tsui, 1999). Other researcher studies conclude that diversity courses do not affect significant student gains in terms of analytic problem-solving skills (Hurtado, 2004) or critical thinking (Mayhew & Engberg, 2003).

The University of Oklahoma Program Outcomes 2010-2011 Assessment Report for General-Education Students Taking Courses in African and African-American Studies revealed a majority of students from varied disciplines reported an enhanced sense of cultural competence, an increased knowledge about African-Americans past

and present, and an understanding of cultural strivings made by African Americans in their quest to achieve inclusion into the American social fabric (Davidson, 2011). While the racial demographics of respondents were not recorded, the students who reported these gains were in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, the College of Engineering, and the College of Journalism (Davidson, 2011). Additionally, the majority of students reported they felt comfortable discussing matters of race within a racially diverse setting (Davidson, 2011). Students who identified challenges that hindered such discussion felt "fear of division in the classroom, tension between races, and fear of offending others" were contributing factors to lack of engagement (Davidson, 2011, p. 2). This survey was prepared by the director of the University of Oklahoma's African American Studies department, as are many course assessment materials. The author acknowledges the inherent conflict of interest within such assessment materials, but still values the diversity of colleges and disciplines represented.

Clearly, diversity courses require a safe space and culture of trust within the classroom to achieve growth and understanding. Though scholars disagree about whether diversity courses provide positive cognitive development, some research studies suggests diversity experiences are related to positive cognitive development (Bowman, 2009). Perhaps some students would feel more comfortable and less alienated if their institutions were more structurally diverse and encouraged more informal interaction between students of different racial groups.

Despite the increase in scholarship for racial and ethnic minorities in American colleges and universities since the *Grutter v. Bollinger* decision, Jonsen, Maznevski,

and Schneider (2011) lamented the paucity of literature focusing on racial diversity. Though the scholars review workplace and management diversity literature and its research findings, not diversity in higher education-specific literature, it is important to note that workplace diversity has informed scholarship for higher education diversity and findings in higher education diversity can often be carried over to workplace diversity. Jonsen, Maznevski, and Schneider (2011) argue that inclusiveness has only been recently discussed, non-American subjects constituted only nine percent of diversity articles reviewed by Wise and Teschirhart (2000), almost 90% of authors of diversity literature are American, Canadian, Australian, and British (many of whom work for North American universities), and very little diversity research is interdisciplinary. Additionally, meta-analyses have suggested findings in many diversity management studies are inconsistent, suggesting scholars should reconsider theories that rely on psychological principles to be universal, for example, when they may apply only to North Americans living in specific sets of cultural meanings and practices (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011).

Diversity Management and Student Organizations

The lack of diversity at the collegiate level often necessitates the need for diversity management in the workforce. Since recent literature discusses effective diversity management techniques in the workplace, can diversity management principles be applied to university admissions and student organizations? How would diversity recruitment look different for student organizations (with the mission to encourage informal interaction diversity)? Would the student organization president or

student leadership head diversity management, or would OU as an institution oversee diversity in student organizations? Perhaps there would be multiple players.

In-reach events fall underneath the diversity management umbrella in the workplace (Rivera, 2013). Is this similar to recruiting and the University of Oklahoma's "Howdy Week" fairs? Would student organizations have the time, money, or membership numbers to institute in-reach events? Would university groups that require a faculty nomination for an official application, like Crimson Club, rely exclusively on structural racial diversity to create diversity and inclusion?

Discrimination: Pathways and Gateways

While pathways represent a fluid process that influences one's ability to access entry points within an organization and achieve success, gateways are the formal entry points within an organization (Milkman, Akinola & Chugh, 2014). How is discrimination via pathways and gateways experienced at the University of Oklahoma? If discrimination occurs at pathways, perhaps events occur that cause students not to perceive potential friendships, academic advancement, professional growth or the opportunity for connections in student organizations or perhaps student organization recruitment was not geared toward a particular sect of the university community. If discrimination occurs at gateways, perhaps students experienced discrimination during interviews or during the application process. Is the campus not structurally diverse enough to have a significant number of minority students achieve membership in student organizations? Are minority students applying for membership in student organizations and at what point are they experiencing discrimination?

Tokenism

Because tokenism is defined as a demographic minority that has less than 15 to 20% representation (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011), each category of non-White University of Oklahoma students are tokens. According to token status theory, individuals who hold token positions are adversely affected in the amount of attention they receive and how they are perceived by others (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011). Minority stressors exacerbate group differences, hinder integration, and affect overall student achievement (Smedley, Myers & Harrell, 1993; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). Are all non-White University of Oklahoma students at risk of experiencing the adverse effects of tokenism? Does the risks associated with tokenism discourage non-White students from joining student organizations? Would structural and informal interaction racial diversity decrease or correct adverse effects? I seek to answer these questions by analyzing which students have access to student organization leadership positions and by determining how many non-White students hold student organization membership according to an organization's demographic data that is self-reported by the organization leader.

Borderism, Campus Balkanization, or Maintaining Group Identity

Various scholars have discussed the advantages and disadvantages inherent within multicultural student organizations. Some suggest multicultural organizations may engage in and encourage borderism, perpetuate the maintenance of group boundaries, create a severely homogeneous organization that lacks cross-racial relations, and contribute to a culture of "campus balkanization" (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Smith & Jones, 2011; Tienda, 2013). On the other hand, Maramba and

Velasquez (2010) found underrepresented students of color who attended predominately non-White universities reported further development of their ethnic identity was associated with a considerable positive impact on their sense of competence, sense of belonging, interpersonal relationships, and commitments. Additionally, Harper & Quaye's (2007) qualitative study regarding high-achieving African-American undergraduate men who were active in student organizations and leadership positions found the students had a deep commitment to uplifting the African-American community, serving as a liaisons between large student organizations and Black student organizations, and addressing issues that plague non-White students. Minority students may also first consider multicultural group membership before branching out to mainstream and majority White groups (Harper & Quaye, 2007).

How are multicultural groups at the University of Oklahoma productive and unproductive, considering recent literature? Do the University of Oklahoma's multicultural groups engage in borderism or prevent cross-racial relations? Are these groups vital to maintaining a collective racial identity that would otherwise be lost at a majority White university? Do non-White students represent a significant portion of student organization membership or do they primarily represent membership in multicultural organizations?

Chapter 8: The Study

Literature suggests increasing a university's informal interaction diversity through student organizations may increase students' cognitive development (Bowman, 2010a), improve interpersonal interactions (Bowman, 2010b), expand one's world view (Denson & Chang, 2009; Jayakumar, 2008), increase academic achievement (Denson &

Chang, 2009; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund & Parente, 2001), better prepare students for the job market (Jayakumar, 2008; Riveira, 2011), improve one's psychological well-being (Bowman, 2013), and create an overall positive university experience (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005). The purpose of this study was to determine the racial diversity within University of Oklahoma student organizations – to determine if the institution's structural diversity predicts the demographics of student participation in student organizations. Determining student organizations' structural diversity may determine the likelihood of beneficial informal interactional diversity engagements, the frequency and quality of intergroup interaction as necessary ways to experience meaningful diversity experiences.

Method

The research design is descriptive-exploratory and provides quantitative and qualitative data on racial demographics of student membership in University of Oklahoma student organizations. The author administered a three-pronged survey to University of Oklahoma student organization leaders to determine the racial demographics of student organization membership, the student leaders' demographics, and the student leaders' ideas about racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma. Because it was infeasible to distribute the survey to every student member within all 391 student organizations, a representative from each organization – the organization's president, vice president, secretary, or treasurer, hereafter referred to the student organization leader – took the survey on behalf of his or her organization. Focus groups were conducted to gain greater insight into perceptions of and feelings about racial diversity at both the University of Oklahoma and within University of Oklahoma

student organizations. The survey results provide information about opportunity and access – about who holds leadership positions at the University of Oklahoma and whether University of Oklahoma student organizations are capable of hosting diversity benefits. The study also determined the following characteristics of student leaders on campus to understand who holds and may garnish possible academic or professional benefits from holding leadership positions at the University of Oklahoma: one's classification, race and ethnicity, gender, resident status, family income, racial composition of one's high school, employment status, employment location on or off campus, and residency on or off campus. Finally, the study captures student leaders' perceptions about racial diversity on campus to better determine the opportunity to diversity given the structural diversity on campus.

The survey consists of 32 multiple choice and open-ended questions designed by the author, as well as 15 Likert scale questions which make up the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale Short Form (Fuertes, Miville, Sedlacek & Gretchen, 2000). The 32 questions of the author's design determine the racial composition of University of Oklahoma student organizations and determine who holds leadership positions at the University of Oklahoma. The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale Short Form is also applied (M-GUDS – Short Form). M-GUDS – Short Form is composed of a Likert scale of 15 questions in which the respondent chooses "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" to create an informed perspective of the respondents' interest in participating in diverse social and cultural activities, the extent to which the respondent values the impact of diversity on self-understanding and personal growth, and to

determine the respondents' degree of comfort with diverse individuals (Fuertes, Miville, Sedlacek & Gretchen, 2000).

The descriptive element of the design describes the demographics of student organization leaders and their self-reported racial demographics of the student organization they lead, as well as student organization leaders' perceptions of racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma. The exploratory component examines responses in order to explore the possibility of informal interactional diversity occurring within or between student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. Using a Likert scale, the potential responses in the M-GUDS – Short Form range from degree to which one agrees with the statement (strongly disagree, disagree, disagree a little bit, agree a little bit, agree, and strongly agree). The survey also contains "yes" or "no" questions and open-ended questions. The units of analysis are both individual student leaders and individual groups of student organizations at the University of Oklahoma and the data is cross-sectional.

Research Questions

The existing literature on diversity within university environments prompted questions about the demographics of student leadership, student organization membership, and informal interactional diversity. What are the factors that support or hinder structural diversity and informal interactional diversity at the University of Oklahoma? Could the benefits of informal interactional diversity during one's university experience correct the institutional disadvantages non-White students often experience before, during, and after enrollment? That is, could increasing students' cognitive development (Bowman, 2010a), improving interpersonal interactions

(Bowman, 2010b), expanding one's world view (Denson & Chang, 2009; Jayakumar, 2008), increasing academic achievement (Denson & Chang, 2009; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund & Parente, 2001), better preparing students for the job market (Jayakumar, 2008; Riveira, 2011), improving one's psychological well-being (Bowman, 2013), and creating an overall positive university experience (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005) correct disadvantages like one's socioeconomic status, lack of encouragement, ambition, and support during the college application process, lack of preparedness for college courses, and financial strains that necessitate work requirements and living at home? Further, do student leaders within University of Oklahoma student organizations fit the same demographics? Additionally, will admitting a more structurally racially diverse student population increase diversity within student organizations?

Hypotheses

1. Structural diversity at the institutional level will be positively related to structural diversity within student organizations.
2. A homogeneous student organization will be negatively related to informal interactional diversity and cross-racial interactions.
3. Black students are less likely to be involved in student organizations than other non-White students, based on four-year graduation rates and remedial course enrollment at the University of Oklahoma, as well as data that suggests Black students are more likely to be harassed by members of their own ethnic group after they associate with members of another racial group (University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013c; University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, 2013d; Smith & Jones, 2011).

Independent Variables

1. Student body structural diversity: this characteristic refers to the university's minority student population in relation to the overall student population. This variable is determined via University of Oklahoma Fact Book data.
2. Socioeconomic and sociodemographic characteristics of student leadership: These characteristics include a student leader's classification, race, gender, resident status, family income level, the racial composition of his or her high school, employment status, employment location on or off campus, and residency on or off campus.
3. Prerequisites or qualifications for student organization membership: These factors are determined by asking the respondent to check all statements that best describe the qualifications applicants must have to attain membership, as well as determining if there are any applicants who are turned away from membership.
4. Student organizations' involvement with other organizations to determine possible cross-racial relations: This involvement and possible relationships are determined via nominal yes or no questions and multiple choice questions, as well as open-ended questions.

Dependent Variables

1. Structural diversity within student organizations: this characteristic refers to university student organizations' minority student membership in relation to the overall student membership.
2. Structural diversity within student leadership: this characteristic refers to the demographics of university student organization leadership

3. Informal interactional diversity within student organizations: this characteristic refers to the cross-racial interactions hosted by student organizations

Sample

The study used a non-probability, purposive sample frame by querying one student leader of each active student organization at the University of Oklahoma to participate in the survey and inviting various student organizations – including student organization leaders and student organization members – to participate in focus groups. An October 8, 2014 query produced a list of 391 registered student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. Ten student organizations did not have accurate contact information for their student leader, decreasing the sample size to 381 student organization leaders. The criteria for inclusion in this study was the participant must have been a student leader or a member in a University of Oklahoma registered student organization.

The sample size target for this study was N=381 usable surveys from all of the registered active student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. A list of prospective study participants was generated by accessing the list of registered active student organizations at the University of Oklahoma Student Life website, which includes the contact information for the student organization leader and the organization's faculty advisor. Each student expressing interest in the survey was provided with a survey consent form approved by the University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board that included a detailed explanation of the study (See Appendix A). Participants were asked to electronically sign the consent form, signifying voluntary participation and informed consent. Participants were assured their responses

would be kept strictly confidential and individual identifiers will not be published. Participants were assured all quantitative data would be reported in aggregate form and qualitative data would be reported only after names and other identifiers were removed or changed. The study participants were not harmed in any way by taking part in this research, and their withdrawal from the study at any time before completion did not result in penalty or retaliation in any manner.

Data Collection

Data collection took place via online surveys emailed to all 381 student leaders of University of Oklahoma student organizations (See Appendix B). An exhaustive list of all University of Oklahoma student organizations, including the student organization president's and faculty advisor's contact information, can be located at the Student Life website. Each representative from a student organization that responded was noted by group type (academic group, art group, culture group, faith and religion group, graduate student-oriented group, ideology and politics group, pre-professional group, recreational group, service and philanthropy group, special interest group, student governance group) to determine if possible oversampling was achieved.

Instrumentation

A 47-item survey was employed to obtain information about racial diversity within University of Oklahoma student organizations. A 32-question survey was employed with items influenced by Smith & Jones (2011). A list of questions detailing the student leader's university classification, race, gender, resident status, family income level, racial composition of his or her high school, employment status, employment location on or off campus, and residency on or off campus were included

in the 32-item survey, as well as a self-reported demographic assessment of student membership. The short form of the 15-item M-GUDS– Short Form was employed (Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek & Gretchen, 2000). The complete 47-item survey is included in Appendix B.

Each organization that participated in a focus groups engaged in a 30 minute to one hour discussion about racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma and within University of Oklahoma student organizations. Focus groups were asked ten guide questions, which are included in Appendix C. These guide questions were merely guides to facilitate discussion. Other questions and discussion that deviated from the ten guide questions naturally flowed in conversation. A separate consent form was administered to focus group participants (see Appendix A). The focus group sessions did not begin until the researcher explained the consent form to the participants and received consent from each participant to audio record the session for accuracy and analysis to identify themes. Each focus group participant received a separate copy of the consent form for his or her records. While most focus group sessions were conducted before or after an organization's general membership meeting, one was conducted outside of the group's general meeting time.

Measures

Survey

The 32-item survey included an exhaustive questionnaire to determine the racial demographics of student organization membership and student leaders' experiences with diversity, the student leaders' demographics, and the student leaders' ideas about

racial diversity at OU (See Appendix C). The study sought to determine the following of University of Oklahoma student organizations:

1. The type of student organization: academic group, art group, culture group, faith and religion group, graduate student-oriented group, ideology and politics group, pre-professional group, recreational group, service and philanthopy group, special interest group, student governance group, or Another voluntary organization (with the option to further specify)
    a. To contextualize the demographics with the type of organization and to organize responses by type of student organization to ensure one type of organization was not oversampled
2. The best estimate of the demographics of student organization membership: the number of members, the majority racial composition, the percentage of the members who are non-White, the percentage of each racial category federally recognized by the U.S. Department of Education
    a. To create an understanding of the racial demographics of student organization membership
3. Prerequisites or requirements for membership: application, interview, selection committee, qualification such as major, classification, or accolade, or other (with the option to further specify)
    a. To determine how students gain entrance into the student organization.
4. Whether applicants are turned away from membership and why
    a. To determine exclusivity by determining if membership is open to all students or if a selection committee grants access into group

5. Previous partnerships with other student organizations
    a. To determine if student organizations create opportunities for cross-racial relations with other groups
6. Guest speakers' invitations and the purpose for the guest speakers' presence: Motivational, Educational/instructional, Career development advice or consultation, Diversity development, Other (with option to specify further)
    a. To determine to whom student organizations expose the student members and why
7. Whether diversity programming is mandatory for the student organization and, if so, how the organization encourages, promotes, and supports diversity programming
    a. To determine diversity efforts within the student organizations

The study sought to determine the following of University of Oklahoma student organization leaders:

1. Affiliation with the student group: President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Member, Other
    a. These items ensured the contact information listed on the Student Life website accurately lists current student leaders' information
2. Demographics such as race, gender, university classification, residency status, family's income level, racial composition of the student leaders' high school, residency on- or off-campus, employment status and employed on- or off-campus, and length of involvement with the student organization

a. These items painted a comprehensive picture of student leaders within University of Oklahoma organizations. Literature suggests socioeconomic and sociodemographic characteristics may suggest whether a student is more or less likely to join a student organization

3. A nominal yes or no question that sought to determine whether the student leader knows where to find information describing the racial demographics of the University of Oklahoma student population. A follow-up question provided a field for respondents to supply the source he or she would use to access this data
    a. To determine the student leaders' literacy with the University of Oklahoma's racial demographics and how the institution reports data, as well as to gauge the student leaders' ability to find this data at a later date to remain informed and hold the university accountable.
4. A Likert scale item that asked respondents to determine the University of Oklahoma's racial diversity on a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse.
    a. To determine the student leaders' perception of racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma, irrespective of whether he or she knows where to find the data that describes the racial demographics of the student population
5. Two questions that sought to determine the student leaders' best estimate of the student population that is White and that is non-White.

a. To best qualify student leaders' understanding of "diversity," especially respective of the previous Likert scale question

6. One open-ended question that provided the student leader with the opportunity to explain whether and how the University of Oklahoma has cultivated understandings or experiences with diversity

Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale – Short Form

The 15-item Likert scale questionnaire sought to determine the student organization leaders' interest in participating in diverse social and cultural activities, the extent to which student organization leaders value the impact of diversity in self-understanding and personal growth, and the student organization leaders' degree of comfort with diverse individuals (Fuertes, Miville, Sedlacek & Gretchen, 2000). Responses range from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Disagree a Little Bit, Agree a Little Bit, Agree, and Strongly Agree.

Focus Groups

Focus group participants were recruited in two ways. The first way focus groups participants were recruited was through the online survey. The student leaders who took the online survey were provided with an opportunity to participate in a focus group by providing his or her contact information at the end of the survey. The student leader was assured his or her contact information will in no way be identifiable with his or her survey answers. Additionally, the author's email address was listed at the end of the survey in case student leaders preferred to contact the author at another time about focus group participation. The second way focus group participants were recruited was by sending email reminders to student organization leaders to both thank the student

organization leaders who have completed the survey and to encourage those who had not done so to complete the survey and participate in a focus group.

Process

A statement of purpose was sent to the University Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Clarke Stroud, in mid-September to remain transparent about the research study concerning racial diversity within student organizations. Student organization leaders and the faculty advisers of each registered active student organization at the University of Oklahoma were contacted about the study via the listed contact information provided on the University of Oklahoma Student Life website. Each E-mail described a brief abstract of the research study, as well as any risks and benefits of participating in the survey. Prospective participants took the survey via a survey development cloud. The quantitative data was analyzed with SPSS and the qualitative data was analyzed manually by the author.

Time Frame

The data for this cross-sectional study was gathered from October 15, 2014 to March 31, 2015. The survey was available during the entirety of this time frame, allowing participants ample time to take the survey. The principal investigator began analyzing survey data and recruiting for focus groups January 12, 2015. Qualitative data collection, transcription, and analysis ensued from January 2015 to March 2015. Data analysis was be available to the public on May 8, 2015.

Chapter 9: Phase One Results

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses were conducted to describe student organization leaders' demographics, student leaders' feelings of and understanding of racial diversity within their organization and within the university, and student leaders' self-reported membership demographics of their organization. The standard deviation was used to determine the variability within self-reported racial demographics of student organizations, and crosstabulations, including chi square analyses, are included to determine relationships, variability, and the statistical significance of results. Specifically, descriptive statistics were used to calculate correlations between the student organization leaders' self-reported racial demographics of his or her organization and the opportunity student organizations have to engage in informal interactional diversity to answer hypotheses one and three. Descriptive statistics were also employed to determine the variability of Black student involvement to answer hypothesis two. The sample size, n=73, is consistent throughout my analyses, save for a few data points that access a sample size of n=71. This is because two respondents did not answer the survey questions to confirm the majority of the racial composition of their respective student organization.

Phase One: Descriptive Findings

Student Leaders

Characteristics of the sample of presidents demographics (n=73) are provided in Table 6. The majority of the student organization leaders are upperclassman or graduate students. More specifically, student leaders in this study were sophomores (4.11%),

juniors (19.18%), seniors (46.56%), and graduate students (23.29%). A small sample of respondents (6.85%) identified as "other." The majority of student leaders identified as White (61.64%). The minority of student leaders identified as two or more races (10.96%), international (6.85%), American Indian/Alaska Native (6.85%), African American/Black (6.85%), Asian (4.11%), and Hispanic (2.74%).

In Table 6, slightly more leaders in the study were females (53.42%). While 46.58% of the respondents identified as male, it should be noted there was an option to select "trans woman," "trans man," "genderqueer/nonconforming," and an option to provide a fill-in-the-blank answer. All student leaders who responded to this survey identified within the male/female binary. While there are slightly more females represented in this study, an even larger majority of student leaders in this study graduated from a high school with a majority White student demographic. Table 6 shows most student leaders who participated in this survey graduated from a high school with a majority White student demographic (68.49%). Significantly fewer student leaders graduated from a high school with an equal White/non-White student demographic (16.44%) and even fewer student leaders graduated from a high school with a majority non-White student demographic (15.07%).

Student leaders were also prompted to describe the non-White membership of their organization members by percent and to rate the racial diversity of the University of Oklahoma on a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse. The average self-reported non-White membership in student organizations is 35.59% (SD=28.50). Additionally, the average diversity rating for the University of Oklahoma is 5.04 (SD=2.14).

Table 6: Registered Student Organization Leaders' Characteristics

Characteristic of Student Leader	Number (%)
Classification	
Sophomore	3 (4.11%)
Junior	14 (19.18%)
Senior	34 (46.58%)
Graduate Student	17 (23.29%)
Other	5 (6.85%)
Total	73
Race/Ethnicity	
African American/Black	5 (6.85%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	5 (6.85%)
Asian	3 (4.11%)
Hispanic	2 (2.74%)
International	5 (6.85%)
White	45 (61.64%)
Two or More Races	8 (10.96%)
Total	73
Gender	
Female	39 (53.42%)
Male	34 (46.58%)
Total	73
High School Demographic	
Mostly White	50 (68.49%)
Mostly non-White	11 (15.07%)
Equally White/non-White	12 (16.44%)
Total	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73

The gender and race of student leaders in terms of the White and non-White binary is described in Table 7. While women represent 53.42% of student leaders, White women represent 36.99% of all student leaders and non-White women represent 16.44% of all student leaders. Likewise, while men represent 46.58% of student leaders, White men represent 24.66% of all student leaders and non-White men represent 21.92% of all student leaders. White student leaders represent 61.64% of all student leaders and non-White student leaders represent 38.36% of all student leaders.

Table 7: Gender and Racial Binary Identification of Student Leaders

	Female	**Male**	**Total**
	Number (% of total)	**Number (% of total)**	**Number (% of total)**
White	27 (36.99%)	18 (24.66%)	45 (61.64%)
Non-White	12 (16.44%)	16 (21.92%)	28 (38.36%)
Total	39 (53.42%)	34 (46.58%)	73 (100%)

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73

The gender and racial category of each student leader is described in Table 8. Notably, there are fewer non-White female students represented in student leadership. Specifically, there were no Hispanic females represented in this study, one Asian female represented in this study, and one female who identified as American Indian/Alaska Native. Minority groups with little to no female leaders have at least twice as many male leaders. There are twice as many Asian males represented in this study and four

times as many male students who identified as American Indian/Alaska Native. In the absence of Hispanic females, there were two Hispanic males represented in this study. International students are not identified as a minority group in this study and international female students have four times more representation in this study than international male students.

Table 8: Gender and Race of Student Leaders

	Female (% Total)	Male (% Total)	Total (% Total)
African American/Black	2 (2.74%)	3 (4.11%)	5 (6.85%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	1 (1.37%)	4 (5.48%)	5 (6.85%)
Asian	1 (1.37%)	2 (2.74%)	3 (4.11%)
Hispanic	0	2 (2.74%)	2 (2.74%)
International	4 (5.48%)	1 (1.37%)	5 (6.85%)
White	27 (36.99%)	18 (34.66%)	45 (61.64%)
Two or More Races	4 (5.48%)	4 (5.48%)	8 (10.96%)
Total	39 (53.42%)	34 (46.58%)	73 (100%)

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73

Table 9 describes characteristics of student leaders by race, family income, and majority high school demographic. Notably, the majority of student leaders are White students who graduated from a high school with a majority White student demographic and who's family income level is middle class. While most student leaders are from a middle class background (43.84%), the second most common student leader comes from an upper-middle class background (28.77%). Lower-middle income student leaders represent 20.55% of student leaders surveyed. Both lower class and upper class

categories are outliers, with 4.11% of student leaders representing a lower class background and 2.74% of student leaders representing an upper class background.

Notably, all American Indian/Alaska Native leaders graduated from a high school with a majority White student demographic, while all Hispanic student leaders graduated from a high school with a majority non-White demographic. While there is variation in the other student leaders' high school demographics, all student leaders were just as likely or more likely to graduate from a majority White high school than they were to graduate from a majority non-White or equally White and non-White high school. There is no instance in which a racial group of student leaders is more likely to graduate from a high school with a majority non-White demographic.

Table 9: Student Leaders by Race, Family Income, and High School Demographic

	High School Racial Demographic	Lower Class	Lower Middle Class	Middle Class	Upper Middle Class	Upper Class	Total
African American/Black							
	Mostly White	0	1	0	1	0	2
	Mostly non-White	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Equally White/non-White	0	0	1	0	0	1
American Indian/Alaska Native							
	Mostly White	1	0	3	1		5
Asian							
	Mostly White	0	0	1	0	1	2
	Mostly non-	0	0	0	1	0	1

	White						
Hispanic							
	Mostly non-White	1	0	1	0	0	2
International							
	Mostly White	1	0	0	1	0	2
	Mostly non-White	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Equally White/non-White	0	0	0	1	0	1
White							
	Mostly White	0	9	16	9	0	34
	Mostly non-White	0	0	1	1	1	3
	Equally White/non-White	0	1	2	5	0	8
Two or more races							
	Mostly White	0	3	2	0	0	5
	Mostly non-White	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Equally White/non-White	0	0	2	0	0	2
Total		3	15	32	21	2	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. High school demographic categories not represented underneath the student leaders' racial category were not reported for this survey. N=73

Student Organizations

Characteristics of the student organization each student leader represents are described in Table 10. Student leaders who represent organizations with a majority of White student membership are most represented, with 64.38% of student leaders claiming the majority of the student membership of their organization is composed of White students. Additionally, 10.96% of student leaders responded no racial group dominates membership of the student organization they lead. The remaining racial categories are represented by less than six percent. In this study, student organization membership is about eleven to thirty times more likely to be dominated by White students than by African American/Black students, American Indian/Alaska Native students, Asian students, or Hispanic students, according to the percent of membership by race. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students were not represented in this study.

Culture groups are the most represented type of group, with 19.18% of student leaders responding the group they represented was a culture group. Pre-professional groups (16.44%), special interest groups (12.33%), service and philanthropy groups (12.33%), academic groups (12.33%), student governance groups (9.59%) and graduate student-oriented groups (8.22%) were the next best represented. Recreational groups (4.11%), faith and religion groups (4.11%) and art groups (1.37%) were the least represented in this study and ideology or politics groups were not represented in this study.

Table 10: Majority of Self-Reported Student Membership by Racial Composition and Group Type

Characteristic	Number (%)
Majority Membership	
African American/Black	4 (5.48%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	2 (2.74%)
Asian	3 (4.11%)
Hispanic	3 (4.11%)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
White	47 (64.38%)
International student	4 (5.38%)
No racial group dominates membership	8 (10.96%)
Total	73
Group Type	
Academic	9 (12.33%)
Art	1 (1.37%)
Culture	14 (19.18%)
Faith/religion	3 (4.11%)
Graduate student-oriented	6 (8.22%)
Ideology or politics	0
Pre-professional	12 (16.44%)
Recreational	3 (4.11%)
Service or philanthropy	9 (12.33%)
Special interest	9 (12.33%)
Student governance	7 (9.59%)
Total	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73

Table 11 describes the majority of student membership by racial group in each type of student organization. There is a significant difference in the type of groups represented and the majority of membership by racial group, $\chi^2_{(54, 71)} = 79.32$, p= .014. It should be noted the sample size in this data point is n=71. Groups with a majority of White student membership represent 66.20% of the total sample, n=71. Pre-professional groups, academic and service groups are the groups with the highest representation of majority White student membership. Culture groups are the only groups in this study in which a racial group whose membership is of a non-White majority has just as much representation, or slightly more representation, as the White majority racial group.

More specifically, in this study, only 15.38% of culture groups are dominated by membership of a White majority, an African American majority, an American Indian/Alaska Native majority, a Hispanic majority, and a heterogeneous group in which no race dominates. Additionally, 23.08% of culture groups are dominated by membership of an international student majority. White majority membership is significantly higher for all other group types. Academic, recreational and faith or religion groups only have a majority White student representation, whereas 83.33% of pre-professional groups and graduate student oriented groups and 100% of academic groups are represented by groups with majority White student membership.

Table 11: Types of Registered Student Organizations by Majority of Racial Category

	Majority of Membership by Racial Group								
		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	International	No Racial Group Dominates	Total
Academic	0	0	0	0	--	9	0	0	9
Art	0	0	0	1	--	0	0	0	1
Culture	2	2	0	2	--	2	3	2	13
Faith or religion	0	0	0	0	--	3	0	0	3
Graduate student-oriented	0	0	1	0	--	5	0	0	6
Ideology or politics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pre-professional	0	0	1	0	--	10	0	1	12
Recreational	0	0	0	0	--	3	0	0	3
Service or philanthropy	0	0	0	0	--	7	0	2	9
Special interest	2	0	0	0	--	4	1	1	8
Student governance	0	0	1	0	--	4	0	2	7
Totals	4 (5.63%)	2 (2.82%)	3 (4.23%)	3 (4.23%)	--	47 (66.20%)	4 (5.63%)	8 (11.27%)	71

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71

Demographic Data Literacy

Table 12 presents data points that include the student organization leaders' involvement with his or her organization and whether he or she knows where to find

data that describes the demographics of students at the University of Oklahoma to determine if student leaders have the ability to hold the university accountable. The majority of student leaders, 64.38% of respondents, do not know where to find demographic data, otherwise known as the University of Oklahoma Fact Book. There was a significant difference in the students who did know and who did not know where to find student demographic data, $\chi^2_{(5,73)} = 11.54$, $p < .05$.

Of the 26 students (35.62%) who confirmed they know where to find student demographic data, ten said they would use the University of Oklahoma Fact Book located on the Institutional Research and Reporting website, which is the office exclusively tasked with providing information about the university to the general public (including student demographic data). Two students vaguely said "the University of Oklahoma Website." Four students said they would access Student Life website which lists information about registered student organizations, scholarship organizations, and fraternity and sorority life, but does not contain student demographic data. Two students said they would "Google it." One student mentioned visiting the provost's website and one student mentioned the School of Library and Information Studies accreditation report. Many students mentioned they would use external websites unaffiliated with the University of Oklahoma. Of these students, three said they would go to Forbes.com to look for demographic data. One student mentioned visiting Niche.com, CollegeFactual.com, or USNews.com and one student mentioned visiting CollegeFactual.com. Of these external websites, Niche.com and CollegeFactual.com listed demographic information that was out-of-date or incorrect and Niche.com's data was supported by student polls presumably taken by University of Oklahoma students

that varied with 18 to 113 responses. USNews.com's student body data was available for a fee of $29.95. Forbes.com's data was accurate, but limited to Fall 2013/Spring 2014 year only. One student who indicated he or she know where to find demographic student data did not provide a source he or she would use to access such data.

Table 12: Student Leaders' Understanding of Where to Find Data that Describes the Demographics of Students at the University of Oklahoma by the Student Leaders' Year of Involvement with their Organization

	Student Leaders' Involvement with their Organization						
Data Literacy	**≤ One Semester**	**1 Year**	**2 Years**	**3 Years**	**4 Years**	**> 4 Years**	**Total (%)**
Yes	4	2	4	8	8	0	26 (35.62%)
No	3	8	15	17	3	1	47 (64.38%)
Total (%)	7 (9.59%)	10 (13.70%)	19 (26.03%)	25 (34.25%)	11 (15.07%)	1 (1.37%)	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one, structural diversity at the institutional level will be positively related to structural diversity within student organizations, is discussed below. Table 13 presents racial demographic information for student organization leadership (including presidents, secretaries, and treasurers), student organization membership according to self-reported demographics by student leaders, and student enrollment by race at the University of Oklahoma. Each non-White student race category represents about three to six percent of student organization leaders (with the exception of about 11 percent for "two or more races"), four to eight percent of enrollment, and about four to 12 percent of student organization membership. Expectedly, White students, who are the majority

of enrolled students (60.31%), are also the majority of student organization self-reported membership (55.24%) and the majority of student leadership (62.64%). Native Hawaiian/Pacific students are least represented in enrolled students (0.20%) and are not represented within student leadership in this survey. While African American/Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, and international enrolled students are represented from four to eight percent, they are represented in student leadership by 6.85%.

Data suggests when each minority racial category is represented by less than eight percent of student enrollment, the mean percent of non-White student leadership is about five percent per minority category. Further, White students and students who identify with two or more races are the two racial categories that are significantly more likely to lead a student organization than merely join a student organization.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three, Black Students are less likely to be involved in student organizations than other non-White students, according to four-year graduation rates and remedial course enrollment at the University of Oklahoma, as well as data that suggests Black students are more likely to be harassed by members of their own ethnic group after they associate with members of another racial group, is discussed below. While African American/Black students are the third-least represented racial group enrolled at the University of Oklahoma (4.74%), behind Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and American Indian/Alaska Native students (0.15% and 4.03%, respectively), they are tied with American Indian/Alaska Native students and international students as the third least represented in student leadership (6.85%) and the second most represented racial group (11.65%) behind White students (55.24%) and

international students (9.09%) in terms of student leaders' self-reported student organization membership (Table 13). It should be noted the conservative sample size of student organization leadership in this study (n=73) does not markedly distinguish African American/Black student leaders (n=5), American Indian/Alaska Native student leaders (n=5), and international student leaders (n=5) from Asian student leaders (n=3) or Hispanic student leaders (n=2) and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander students were not represented in this study. While Black students are not the least represented in student leadership, they are in the company of other groups that are marginally represented.

Table 13: University of Oklahoma Student Leaders, Student Leaders' Self-Reported Student Membership, and Fall 2013 Enrollment by Race

Race	**Student organization leaders by race n=73**		**Student leaders' self-reported membership by race n=71**	**Student enrollment by race, Fall 2013 n= 23,944**	
	Number	Percent	Percent (SD)	Number	Percent
African American/Black	5	6.85%	11.65% (23.20)	1,135	4.74%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	5	6.85%	4.42% (13.95)	964	4.03%
Asian	3	4.11%	9.28% (18.05)	1,249	5.22%
Hispanic	2	2.74%	6.27% (14.00)	1,912	7.99%
International	5	6.85%	9.09% (19.24)	1,751	7.31%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0.20% (0.71)	34	0.15%
White	45	62.64%	55.24% (31.98)	14,441	60.31%
Two or more races	8	10.96%	3.86% (6.25)	1,409	5.88%
Not reported	0	0	0	1,049	4.38%

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two, a homogenous student organization will be negatively related to informal interactional diversity and cross-racial relations, is discussed extensively below. Table 14 presents data points discussing the racial composition of the student leaders' high school and the majority racial composition of the student organization in which the student leader leads. There is a high level of significance between these two data points, $\chi^2_{(1,71)} = 15.00$, $r = .46$, $p < .0001$, with a moderate level of correlation. It should be noted that the sample size of this data point is n=71 because two respondents did not reveal the majority demographic of their student organization's membership.

The majority of student leaders who participated in this survey responded that they lead an organization with a majority White student membership demographic (66.20%). Additionally, a higher percentage of student leaders responded they graduated from a high school with a majority White student enrollment demographic (67.61%). There is a positive correlation between the two data points, with 82.98% of student leaders who graduated from a high school with a majority White student enrollment demographic also leading a student organization with a majority White student membership demographic. That is, as the population of student leaders who graduated from a high school with a majority White demographic increases, so too does the number of student organizations with a majority White membership demographic. Likewise, there is a positive correlation between the student leaders who graduated from a high school with either a majority non-White student demographic or an equal

White and non-White student demographic and the student leaders who lead organizations with a majority non-White student membership demographic (62.50%). That is, as the population of student leaders who graduated from a high school that did not have a majority White demographic, so too does the number of student organizations with a majority non-White student membership demographic.

Table 14: Racial Composition of Student Leaders' High School by Majority Membership Demographic of Student Leaders' Organization

	Racial Composition of Student Leader's High School		
Majority Racial Composition of Student Organization	**Majority White**	**Majority non-White and no racial group dominates**	**Total**
Majority White	39 (82.98%)	8 (17.02%)	47 (66.20%)
Majority non-White and no racial group dominates	9 (37.50%)	15 (62.50%)	24 (33.80%)
Total	48 (67.61%)	23 (32.39%)	71

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71.

Table 15 presents whether student organizations with a White majority student membership or a non-White majority student membership have partnered with other student organizations for events over the last year, n=71. While 70.42% of all student organizations surveyed reported to have partnered with another student organization over the past year, student organizations with a majority non-White membership (83.33%) were more likely than student organizations with a majority White student membership (63.83%) to partner with other student organizations. While 29.58% of student organizations surveyed reported not to have partnered with another student

organization over the last year, 80.95% of these student organizations that did not form partnerships are composed of a majority White membership. These data points are trending toward significance, $\chi^2_{(1,71)} = 2.90$, $p < .10$.

Table 15: Partnerships with One or More Student Groups over the Last Year by Student Organizations with a Majority White Membership and Majority Non-White Membership

	Partnerships with One or More Groups over Last Year		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
Majority White Membership	30 (63.83%)	17 (36.17%)	47 (66.20%)
Majority non-White membership and no racial group dominates	20 (83.33%)	4 (16.67%)	24 (33.80%)
Total	50 (70.42%)	21 (29.58%)	71

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71.

Table 16 presents whether student organizations have partnered with other student organizations for events over the last year by majority of racial membership to determine partnership activity according to racial demographics, n=71. It should be noted that groups with a majority of White student membership compose 66.20% of the sample, n=47. While organizations with a majority American Indian/Alaska Native membership and a majority of Asian membership have partnered with at least one organization in the past, organizationss with a majority African American/Black majority membership and a majority of White membership are least likely to partner with other student organizations (50% and 63.83%, respectively). Organizations in which no racial group dominates membership are likely to partner with at least one other student organizations over the past year, with 87.50% of student leaders

confirming their organization with heterogeneous membership demographics has had partnerships.

Table 16: Partnerships with Other Student Organizations by Majority of Racial Membership in Student Leaders' Respective Organization

	Partnerships with One or More Groups Over Past Year		
Majority racial membership	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
	Number (%)	**Number (%)**	
African American/Black	2, 50%	2, 50%	4
American Indian/Alaska Native	2, 100%	0	2
Asian	3, 100%	0	3
Hispanic	3, 100%	0	3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	--	--
White	30, 63.83%	17, 36.17%	47
International	3, 75%	1, 25%	4
No racial group dominates membership	7, 87.50%	1, 12.5%	8
Totals	50, 70.42%	21, 29.58%	71

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71. Because of the conservative sample of student organization leaders that represented student organizations in which a majority minority group dominated membership, combining all of the non-White organizations into one dichotomized group allows for statistical significance, as reported in Table 15.

Table 17 shows that a significant difference exists in the type of groups in which student leaders reported their student organization had partnered with one or more student organizations in the past year. While 69.86% of all groups in this study had partnered with at least one student organization in the past year, significant differences were reported between various groups. Culture groups (100%), pre-professional groups (91.67%), and service or philanthropy groups (88.89%) are most likely to have

partnered with one or more student groups in the past year, $\chi^2_{(9, 73)} = 24.92$, $p < .01$. While 100% of art groups in the study have partnered with another student group in the past year, only one art group was represented in this study.

Table 17: Partnerships with Other Student Organizations by Group Type

	Partnerships with One or More Groups in Past Year		
Group Type	**Yes**	**No**	**Totals**
	Number (%)	**Number (%)**	**Number (%)**
Academic	5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)	9 (12.33%)
Art	1 (100%)	0	1 (1.37%)
Culture	14 (100%)	0	14 (19.18%)
Faith/religion	1 (33.33%)	2 (66.67%)	3 (4.11%)
Graduate student-oriented	2 (33.33%%)	4 (66.67%)	6 (8.22%)
Ideology or politics	--	--	--
Pre-professional	11 (91.67%)	1 (8.33%)	12 (16.44%)
Recreational	1 (33.33%)	2 (66.67%)	3 (4.11%)
Service or philanthropy	8 (88.89%)	1 (11.11%)	9 (12.33%)
Special interest	3 (33.33%)	6 (66.67%)	9 (12.33%)
Student governance	5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)	7 (9.59%)
Totals	51 (69.86%)	22 (30.14%)	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73, p = .003.

Table 18 shows a marked difference was also recognized within the group type each student leader represented and the majority racial demographic of each student leader's high school. Most student leaders attended high schools with a majority White demographic (68.49%), with fewer attending high schools with an equally White/non-White demographic (16.44%) and even fewer attending a high school with a majority non-White demographic (15.07%). Culture groups have the largest representation of student leaders that graduated from a Non-White or equally White and non-White high

school, with 50% of student leaders from culture groups graduating from a high school that did not have a majority White demographic. Additionally, 88.89% of student leaders of an academic group, 83.33% of student leaders of a pre-professional group and 75% of leaders from a service or philanthropy group graduated from a high school with a majority White demographic.

Table 18: Student Leaders' Majority High School Demographic and Group Type

	Majority of High School Demographic			
Group Type	**White**	**Non-White**	**Equally White/non-White**	**Total**
Academic	8 (88.89%)	0	1 (11.11%)	9 (12.33%)
Art	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (1.37%)
Culture	7 (50%)	4 (28.57%)	3 (21.43%)	14 (19.18%)
Faith/religion	2 (66.67%)	0	1 (33.33%)	3 (4.11%)
Graduate student-oriented	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	6 (8.22%)
Ideology or politics	--	--	--	--
Pre-professional	10 (83.33%)	0	2 (16.67%)	12 (16.44%)
Recreational	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0	3 (4.11%)
Service or philanthropy	6 (66.67%)	0	3 (33.33%)	9 (12.33%)
Special interest	5 (55.56%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)	9 (12.33%)
Student governance	5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)	0	7 (9.59%)
Totals	50 (68.49%)	11 (15.07%)	12 (16.44%)	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73.

A significant difference exists between the racial identity of student leaders and their family income level, $\chi^2_{(24, 73)} = 41.97$, $p < .05$. Table 19 shows the majority of student leaders surveyed represent the middle class and upper middle class categories, with 72.60% of student leaders representing these two income levels combined. The least represented family income levels are upper class (2.74%) and lower class (4.11%).

About one in five student leaders surveyed reports his or her family income level is lower middle class (20.55%).

While White student leaders represent 61.64% of all student leaders surveyed, their family income levels were distributed across the lower-middle income, middle income, and upper middle income levels, with one respondent identifying his or her family fit within the upper income level. Recognizing each minority category is represented by two to eight student leaders, their family income levels are more represented along the lower income, lower-middle income, and middle-income lines. While there are not any White student leaders whose family fit within the lower income level, 20% of American Indian/Alaska Native student leaders, 50% of Hispanic student leaders, and 33.33% of international student leaders identified their family income level fell within lower income.

Table 19: Racial Groups of Student Leaders by Self-Reported Family Income Level

	Racial Group of Student Leader								
	African American/Black	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	International	Two or more races	Total
Lower class	0	1 (20%)	0	1 (50%)	--	0	1 (33.33%)	0	3 (4.11%)
Lower-middle class	2 (40%)	0	0	0	--	10 (22.22%)	0	3 (37.50%)	15 (20.55%)
Middle class	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (50%)	--	19 (42.22%)	1 (33.33%)	5 (62.50%)	32 (43.84%)
Upper	1	1	1	0	--	15	3	0	21

Middle Class	(20%)	(20%)	(33.33%)			(33.33%)	(60%)		(28.77%)
Upper Class	0	0	1 (33.33%)	0	--	1 (2.22%)	0	0	2 (2.74%)
Total	5 (6.85%)	5 (6.85%)	3 (4.11%)	2 (2.74%)	--	45 (61.64%)	5 (6.85%)	8 (10.96%)	73

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=73, p = .013.

Table 20 describes the application process for student organizations by organizations with majority White membership and majority non-White membership. Understanding White majority membership is significantly higher for all group types than specific minority memberships, save for culture groups (see Table 10), collapsing the samples into a White majority membership and a non-White majority membership allows a discussion for statistical significance.

Student organizations with a majority White demographic are more likely to require an application, interview, review of applicant by a selection committee, and a qualification from a potential member, such as one's major, classification, or an accolade. Considering the percentage of organizations that require various components to a selection process before offering membership to an individual, student organization with a majority White demographic are slightly more likely to require an application, more than three-times as likely to require an interview of the applicant, more than twice as likely to compose a selection committee to review the applicant and almost twice as likely to require a qualification from the applicant. It should be noted 22 leaders of organizations with majority White membership (46.81%) and 16 leaders of

organizations with majority non-White membership (66.67%) stated applicants, interviews, a selection committee, or qualifications were not required of applicants.

Table 20: Components of Granting Membership to Potential Members of Student Organizations

	Required of Applicant for Membership							
	Application		Interview		Selection Committee		Qualification	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Majority White membership	13 (27.66%)	34 (72.34%)	7 (14.89)	40 (85.11%)	9 (19.15%)	38 (80.85%)	11 (23.40%)	36 (76.60%)
Majority non-White membership	6 (25%)	18 (75%)	1 (4.17%)	23 (95.83%)	2 (9.09%)	22 (91.67%)	3 (12.50%)	21 (87.50%)

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71.

Table 21 describes if and why membership is denied to applicants of student organizations by majority of White student membership and majority of non-White student membership. Of the 71 student leaders who represent student organizations with a majority White membership and a majority non-White membership, 8.51% of student leaders representing a majority White membership and 12.50% of student leaders representing a majority non-White membership report applicants did not complete their application. Similarly, 10.64% of student leaders representing a majority White membership and 4.17% of student leaders representing a majority non-White membership report applicants did not attend the interview. A significant difference was found between majority White and majority non-White organizations using selection committees and turning applicants away in general. For example, 23.40% of leaders

representing a White majority membership and 4.17% of leaders representing a non-White majority membership reported using a selection committee to determine applicants did not fit the qualifications required for membership, $\chi^2_{(1, 71)} = 4.19$, $p < .05$. Additionally, 53.19% of leaders representing a majority White membership and 79.17% of leaders representing a majority non-White membership responded applicants are not turned away from membership, $\chi^2_{(1, 71)} = 4.55$, $p < .05$.

Table 21: Student Leaders' Reported Reasons for Declining to Offer Membership to Applicant

	If Membership is not Offered to Applicant							
	Incomplete Application		Did not Attend Interview		Selection Committee determined applicant unfit		Applicants are not Turned Away	
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Majority White membership	4 (8.51%)	43 (91.49%)	5 (10.64%)	42 (89.36%)	11 (23.40%)	36 (76.60%)	25 (53.19%)	22 (46.81%)
Majority non-White membership	3 (12.50%)	21 (87.50%)	1 (4.17%)	23 (95.83%)	1 (4.17%)	23 (95.83%)	19 (79.17%)	5 (20.83%)

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=71.

Table 22 describes student leaders' residency status and their perceptions of whether the University of Oklahoma has contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. Overall, 83.33% of all student leaders agreed that the University of Oklahoma has contributed to their understanding of people of other backgrounds. While 18.46% of student leaders who are U.S. residents responded that the University of Oklahoma has

not contributed to their understanding of people of other backgrounds, every international student who participated in this survey agreed that the University has contributed to their understanding of people of other backgrounds. These data points exhibit statistical significance, $\chi^2_{(2, 73)} = 6.15$, $p < .05$.

Table 22: Student Leaders' Perception of their Diversity Experiences at the University of Oklahoma According to their Residency Status

	Has Your Experience at OU Contributed to your Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Development in Understanding People of Other Racial and Ethnic Backgrounds?		
Leaders' Residency Status	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
U.S. Resident	53 (81.54%)	12 (18.46%)	65 (90.28%)
International Student	7 (100%)	0	7 (9.72%)
Total	60 (83.33%)	12 (16.67%)	72

Note: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and students from an Ideology or politics group were not represented in this study. N=72.

Chapter 10: Phase Two Results

Data Collection and Analysis

The author conducted five focus group sessions with members of registered student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. One of the following groups were represented: an academic group (group one), an environmental group (group two), a student governance group (group three), a service group (group four), and a cultural groups (group five). Each session included three to thirty-five participants and lasted from approximately thirty minutes to one hour. The participants represented a small portion of their respective student organizations that ranged in membership size from ten to more than 100 students. While the author was equipped with a list of questions,

conversation veered in the direction that was most important to each group. The principal investigator used Long and Bert's (2010) study as a model to report qualitative data and apply a qualitative analysis.

The principal investigator identified 17 themes: one's previous environment, the university as a microcosm, the university's historical White culture, the luxury of one's circumstances, homophily, cliques, exclusivity, performing and stereotyping one's culture, comfort in similarities, doing "normal" things, Student Life organizations, class, Greek letter organizations, student leadership, diversity training, perception of international students, and international students' voices and suggestions. Because Greek letter organizations were discussed so extensively, three sub-themes were identified: perceived disingenuous programming, inherent segregation and exclusion, and Greek-affiliated involvement in campus activities. The sections that follow describe each group that participated in a focus group.

It should be noted that four of the five focus group sessions were conducted months before the video of the University of Oklahoma Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity engaging in a racist chant went viral (hereafter referred to as the "SAE incident"), which prompted university-wide and nation-wide discussions about race relations, Greek letter organizations, and racial diversity on college campuses. All references to Greek organizations in this research were documented in January and February. The SAE incident occurred March 7, 2015 and the viral video was released March 8, 2015.

Focus Group Descriptions

Group one was an academic group composed of twelve students with six active participants. Four of the active participants appeared to be White females, one active

participant identified himself as a Native American male, and one active participant identified himself as a Lebanese-American male. While only about half of the students participated in the focus group, the silent half were actively engaged. The silent group included two males and six females who appeared to be White students.

Group two was an environmental group composed of eight students with four active participants. The active participants appeared to include three White males and one White female. While only half of the student participated in the focus group, the four silent students appeared to be White males.

Group three was a student governance group composed of thirty-five students with fifteen active participants. The active participants included one Black male, eight White males, a student who identified himself as a Lebanese-American male, and five females. One female described herself as half Asian and a quarter Hispanic and the other females appeared to be White.

Group four was a service group composed of seven students and all students were active participants. The participants included one male who identified himself as Hispanic, and six females. One female identified herself as Iranian-American, one three females appeared to be White, one female identified herself as Hispanic, and one female identified herself as Pakistani.

Group five was a cultural group composed of three international students and all students were active participants. To protect the identity of the members and the organization that participated in this focus group, the participants' self-described race will not be revealed. One participant was a female and two participants were male.

Previous Environment

When rating the University of Oklahoma's racial diversity on a scale of one to ten, where one was the least diverse and ten was the most diverse, participants in each group qualified their observations by comparing the university to their hometown or their previous university or high school. While one student from group one, who rated the university a "three or a two," said, "…[the University of Oklahoma] was a big change of pace for me compared to my high school when we were, like, 50% African American, 30% Caucasian, and 20% other," another student from group one who rated the university a seven said, "I came from a really small high school where the vast was, like, 80%, well, like, 75% of the people in my high school were just White." The diversity of students' previous environments determined their understanding of the University of Oklahoma's diversity. This may suggest students from an environment with demographics similar to the University of Oklahoma may not be phased by the racial climate. Perhaps, as long as students hailed from environments that were more homogeneously White than the University of Oklahoma, they would perceive the university to be diverse. This may cause students from White homogenous environments to be less sensitive to minority students' concerns than students who come from racially heterogeneous schools or hometowns.

Similarly, one student from group three rated the university an eight in terms of diversity, qualifying, "not because this campus is particularly more diverse than other schools that I've been to, but just thinking about the diversity of this campus versus the diversity of any place else I've been in Oklahoma. I'd say it's much more diverse." Comparing the university's demographics to the state of Oklahoma's demographics

may set a very low bar for racial diversity at a research university with a responsibility to remain competitive and serve a global marketplace, especially considering one-third of the students are out-of-state students and trends that show the in-state student demographic is shrinking over the last decade.

Microcosm

When asked to describe the racial diversity of their student organization, participants were also likely to use a reference environment to qualify their claims. Students included that, though their organization might not look very diverse, it was diverse compared to other student organizations or compared to the campus community as a whole. One student from group three said,

> …I don't think the diversity of this group is anything but reflective of our campus, in general. Our campus isn't as diverse as many would like it to be. But [our organization] is reflective of how diverse our campus is.

Several students in various focus groups used the word "microcosm" to describe their organization in relation to the university or to describe the university in relation to the nation's demographics. One student in group one said,

> What I like to do is compare racial populations. OU is a microcosm. To see if the percentage of African American students would play out to the percentage of African American students living in Oklahoma. Are they on par with each other or is there great disparity between the two?

A student from group two, in answering why the university's demographics are stratified the way they are, said "…because of Oklahoma's demographics, probably. It might be just a microcosm of its larger surroundings." Allowing student organizations

to remain homogeneous based on the university's structural diversity or, to a greater extent, failing to monitor or question the university's demographics because they fall in line with the state's demographics is a dangerous disservice to current and future students, the university, and the state.

Historical White Culture

Three of the five focus groups discussed how the university's historical white culture enacts structural barriers to accessing resources and leadership positions, both at the student-level and the administration-level. While discussing the university's demographics, a student from group two said,

> OU was White-only and now it's a predominately White institution, so I think some of those demographic structures, as well as historical and cultural trends, are still very much present at OU and it's going to take many decades to further integrate a more diverse student demographic.

Similar sentiments showed an understanding of White individuals dominating the power structures. One student from group three said,

> People go to universities because of being able to identify with faculty and staff and, I think if you guys look upward, you're going to see a common denominator for a lot of the administration, faculty, and staff that serve on this campus.

A student from group one said, "…once you know someone, it's easier to get into the door and since more White people have historically come to this university, it's easier for other people similar to those people to then also come through the door." Most students in the focus groups and most participants who contributed to conversation were

White students, save for the cultural organizations, suggesting some of the members of the majority White demographic this is involved on campus have the ability to look critically at power structures that benefit them.

On the other hand, some racial groups are not only cognizant of the historical White culture that pervades all segments of campus life, but they are aware of the significant lack of representation of their racial or cultural group. One Hispanic female in group four described her personal experience with another Hispanic female positively reinforcing her participation in predominately White organizations to cultivate the opportunity for other Hispanics. While the Hispanic friend providing the encouragement was described to belong to the Hispanic student associations that advocate for diversity at the University of Oklahoma, in this situation she was not engaging in borderism or inflicting sanctions on her Hispanic friend who had chosen to become involved in predominately White student organizations. According to the focus group participant,

> I love the organization that I'm a part of right now and, you know, [my friend] told me, 'I see your organizations that you're involved with. Are there any other Hispanics in your organization?' I said, 'There's a few, but not a lot.' She said, 'I am very proud of you.' I said, 'Why is that?' She said, 'Despite the fact that you're not involved in the Hispanic organizations, you are involved in other organizations where you can grow that for them.'

The Luxury of One's Circumstances

While some of the White students understood the power structures at play within the university, others were vocal about not ever having thought about the university's

demographics or leadership because of their circumstances. For example, one White student from group two said, "I got a minor in African American Studies, so I was surprised when you said only 4.7% of the study body is Black because I… in so many of my classes… I would have never guessed that." The same student later included, "[Most of my classes] were composed of predominately Black students and I guess I didn't realize… I kind of assumed the student body was at least around 12% African American, so that was just surprising to hear."

Another White participant in group two expressed that it was "hard to reflect" on the university's racial demographics. By the end of the focus group session, this same participant expressed interest in asking his lifelong friend, who is Black, whether his life course and choices were influenced by his race. He said, "I'd be really interested to know if he feels like it was a racial bias or not, as far as his college experience was," especially considering he and his friend were raised by the same family since the 6th grade. This participant's evolution in the focus group exemplifies how he had previously not thought about racial demographics or race relations but, by the end, he was thinking about it and he had questions that he had never thought about before.

When answering whether they ever think about the racial demographics of a student organization before they pledge membership, non-White participants were more likely to answer in the affirmative and White students were likely to pause and say they had never thought about it. One White student in group four who is an active member of a National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) sorority said,

> I think [students think about the racial demographics of a student organization] with multicultural organizations because, I mean… I would never thought of it,

like, before this, but if I wanted to, like, be in a traditionally African American sorority, that doesn't really happen – that a White girl goes and is like, 'I want to join your group.'

Her response suggests, as a White student, she had never had to think about entering a student organization as a racial minority,

Homophily

Many White and non-White participants discussed the ways in which students engage in homophily both inside and outside of student organizations. When guessing the percentage of White students they thought were enrolled at the University of Oklahoma, participants in most groups guessed there was a higher percentage of White students than there actually are. One White student from group one reconciled that perhaps the predominately White group guessed high because "it could also be a factor that you look for your own race. We thought there were more White people on campus than obviously what is, and so is it because our own race catches our eye more?"

Other students discussed their aversion to joining a student organization in which the members' race differed from theirs. Another White student from group one said, "…I don't know if I would feel comfortable or welcome walking into an Asian-American club meeting. Like, first off, I don't even know if I'm allowed to be in there because I'm not Asian-American." Another student said he thought the organization had to let anyone join or they would not receive funding. In reply, the first student said, "…how much do you have in common with that group to really want to participate, to understand what they're speaking on and fully integrate yourself with that group?" While it is important to note not all student organizations receive funding for the

university, there are other benefits to being inclusive and allowing all members to join a student organization that are discussed throughout this paper. That the student questioned whether she would feel comfortable and belong in the organization reinforces homphily and de facto racial segregation within and outside student organizations.

A White student in group two discussed her aversion to reaching out to a student organization primarily composed of a race that was not her own because she would feel like she did not belong. She said,

> I personally have not [reached out] and I think that's because I feel like I would be an outsider if I did. When I see that they have an event on the South Oval or Walker-Adams Mall, it just kind of seems like it's marketed more towards people of that group rather than inviting all students to come and learn about it.

While this statement supports the theme of homophily and de facto segregation, it also represents the same feelings non-White students may feel about navigating a predominately White campus.

One participant in group four, who identified herself as an Iranian-American, said that while she does not think of a student organization's racial demographics before she joins, she may become uncomfortable while in the organization over time. She said, "I never think about [an organizations diversity before pledging membership], but once you're in it, you do experience a sort of 'I don't feel included.' That's why I picked this one. It's the least political, most unifying organization."

Similarly, a student from group four who identified as Pakistani, said she has felt uncomfortable in student organizations sometimes because of the homogenous demographic. She said,

> Sometimes, it's really hard to put yourself in a group like that and have them accept you for who you are so a lot of time you feel you might have to change who you are to adapt to what other people are doing so you feel like you fit in.

Additionally, a participant from group four described how one of her male Black friends had been shunned from his Black community at the University of Oklahoma because of his decision to participate in Inter-Fraternity Council rush, or "regular rush," as she described it. She said he elected to rush and the "whole community has turned on [him] because they think [he has] gone to the dark side and separate [himself] from his heritage." Another participant in group four raised the problem that,

> People express they either have to be 'in' with the Black people or 'in' with the White people and there's no way to, sort of, be the people – the people who have crossed that line in being both have really been looked at as, I don't know, as like fakers.

In this way, it is difficult for some individuals to find a community.

The principles of homophily are often reinforced by lack of informal interactional diversity created by a lack of co-programming among organizations. Groups one and three said a group's co-programming model may depend heavily on its level of funding. Group one described co-programming as "fundamental" to its organization, "while the rest of [the student organizations] seem to exist without ever talking to anyone else." According to group three, some of the largest student

organizations, including Campus Activities Council and the Union Programming Board, "already have the money to do whatever they want, while [we are] not as well off. We don't get as much money so being able to co-program helps us put on better events." Group three had similar thoughts, including, "… in order for us to be successful, we need resources and we reach out because we want to have good events that do introduce people to these other cultures."

Group one also reasoned the lack of partnerships is sustained by the exclusive campus culture. One student said,

> It's kind of, like, they accept that culture as it continues and it has been unchanged and I don't think it can be changed until we can get more people who want to change it who are working on those events.

Some student organizations may be content with their past programming and their current level of funding so they are not motivated to increase the diversity of membership or leadership, partner with diverse organizations, or challenge a culture that encourages the group and members to remain siloed.

Cliques

In lieu of the homophily trend, some students used the words "cliques" and "clique-y" to describe a negative experience with a student organization. The same Pakistani student from group four elaborated on her experiences in one student group, discussing the high likelihood that homogenous students would break up into smaller groups based on their racial or religious identity. She recognized the organization she represented was predominately White, but also recognized this was a predominately White university. She said,

> A lot of the times I felt like people wouldn't approach me because I was different and I had to work extra hard to go to talk to people to get them to talk to me and if I didn't do that, no one would approach me. I would always be in the corner and there would be a bunch of people in their cliques.

While this student recognized the operations branch of her organization was racially homogenous and did not prioritize inclusivity, she mentioned the other branch – the executive branch of the organization – was a bit more racially diverse and inclusive. This may suggest those with leadership skills or responsibilities are more likely to be concerned with creating diversity or an inclusive culture for their organization.

One Black student in group three refuted ideas of cliques and exclusion, despite his admission that the student organization he is in is predominately White and that he had not "been to much outside of this [organization]." He said,

> Being Black at a predominately White school, I know I kind of hesitated to join some groups because it's mostly White males in the groups, and, you know, if I have the confidence to try it out, I learn people aren't as exclusive as you think they are, usually.

Exclusivity

In the same vein as homophilia and cliques, some participants discussed how various student organizations were exclusive to certain segments of the University of Oklahoma population. One participant in group four, who is involved in Crimson Club, an exclusive organization that requires an invitation, was candid about the membership and leadership. She said,

> Crimson Club is the most ridiculous organization. It's a bunch of people who choose people just like them to sit in a room just, like, if we could have cigars and scotch and laugh about how we are leaders on campus, that's what it would be.

She elaborated on how pertinent it is for current members to nominate diverse candidates for the organization. She continued,

> This recent recruitment, I told every African American student you better submit names and nominate people that are diverse or this organization will never change. It's a bunch of people who pick people just like them to do nothing, honestly, but socialize. And I hate it.

A different White student in group four discussed the exclusivity in Campus Activities Council (CAC). After discussing the lack of racial diversity in the organization, she included,

> A lot of these organizations [including CAC and the umbrella organizations] aren't even diverse in personalities. I couldn't connect with these people because I wasn't that personality and fake and just putting on a persona to have everyone like me. It was draining.

The student went to on describe interview practices that were disconnected from and inconsistent with the responsibilities and skills required of the position, including "randomly getting up and do[ing] a dance or song that you [came] up with on the spot." She asked, "How would you not be qualified for that position? It's like, I'm applying for sponsorship, why would I need to be able to sing a song? It's just very odd."

A Hispanic student and former Campus Activities Council member from group four said, "CAC is very clique-y and it's very 'are you Greek [affiliated] or are you not?' and I'm not." While she did not elaborate on why she left the organization, she emphasized the divide between students who are and are not members of White Greek letter organizations. She said, "It's pretty obvious that people feel more strongly about this separation between Greek and non-Greek than maybe a racial difference."

Two other White participants in group four discussed the exclusivity within another student organization, Oklahoma Crew. One student said it is mostly made up of White females, save for one "diverse" member. She said,

> It's all these friends who know each other… if you come into an organization and you already have friends, you don't feel the need to branch out and meet new people. So it was just kind of, like, people who didn't know each other were kind of in the corner and these huge groups of people who knew each other were in the middle and they were having a blast.

Another student included, "I think it's almost an extension of fraternity and sorority life, because most of the leaders are from there." Though the principal investigator told the participants she wanted to discuss racial diversity in registered student organizations, not White Greek letter organizations, the Greek system was discussed often in all focus group conversations.

Performing and Stereotyping One's Culture

When asked about their organization's past co-programming efforts – which organizations the group has partnered with, what occasion the partnership honored, and why the partnership was initiated – many of the organizations discussed partnering with

culture groups to put that particular group's culture on display or "show the culture." For example, group three reached out to the Black Student Association and Black fraternities during Black History Month, programmed with a German emphasis with a faculty-in-residence who is German, hosted an African Cultural Night and Gambia Night with residents who are from Gambia, Africa, co-hosted a Hispanic Cultural Night, and programmed a sushi night with an Asian student association. Group three expressed an interest in "creat[ing] a social environment where people of other cultures feel more welcome." Group one described an event in which they invited the African Student Association to come and perform. One student in group one said giving student organizations options by "… reaching out to people and saying, 'You do what you want to do and we want to learn about your culture,' is the best way to go out [co-programming]." Inviting individuals in an organization to co-program in an effort to learn from the cultural group may assume the individuals in the group are able and willing to represent and speak for the culture(s) with which they identify.

Comfort in Similarities

One White student from group three discussed his involvement with an unofficial student soccer organization composed of mostly international students, illustrating his perspective of international students' willingness to bond over similarities instead of teasing out their differences to put them on display in a performance or cultural night. While he said he is usually the minority within his friend group, he is more comfortable around international students because of their emphasis on community. He said,

> Whereas in America we focus on the individual and personal rights, personal freedom, personal comfort, in the international community, they focus more on – and this parallels with soccer – they want to be a team, and they want to work together to play the game. They just want everyone to be together and it's not individualistic.

This student also discussed how his friends in the international community want to connect with others by unifying in similarities. He said,

> …When international students, at least the ones I've been around – they don't try to introduce you to their culture and they don't feel that's necessary because a lot of the time they don't even care about emphasizing their differences. They would rather relate to you on a level that you understand so you can find some common ground, even if you come from really different backgrounds. They'll find some way to relate to you just as another human being.

Instead of receiving invitations to perform or lecture on their culture, which assumes these individuals are the experts on the history of their ancestors, perhaps inclusion should be approached by inviting non-White and international students to do "normal" things/ allowing non-White and international students to embrace commonalities instead of asking them to highlight their differences when they already are a member of the non-dominant culture/outgroup.

Doing "Normal" Things

Group three described service projects that were organized solely to help international students. One student mentioned his group was in charge of the international student check-in at Traditions Square Apartments. Members of the

organization would show international students new to the university to their rooms and orient them with the apartment complex and campus. The student said,

> When I have done this for the last few years, I just really get to know people really well to the point where they add me on Facebook and always say, 'Hi,' and all I did was show them to their apartment, but that's super important that we get to do that…Most of them barely speak English, so it's really awesome to get to help them break some of the barriers.

Instead of separating people by their differences by asking them to teach the university community about their culture, perhaps this event is so well-received by international students because members of the dominant culture are leveling with them and treating them as a member of the ingroup.

Student Life Organizations

One White participant in group one identified a concern with the multiple Student Life organizations on campus for different races. According to the student,

> …to integrate [minority students] equally before they come to college they're given all this information, they're given a family before they come to OU. A lot of, you know, just White people, we don't really have that. We have regular Student Life that includes everybody. That kind of does leave us out but at the same time it helps them kind of congregate together.

When group one was asked if any of them had reached out to a student organization or a student life that is different from their own ethnicity, this same White student said she did not think White students (referring to White students as "us regular 'Whiteys'") had their own Student Life organization to claim. She said,

> ...I feel like we are just kind of floaters. We kind of just fit in... There's really no single place [for us]. As someone said earlier, everyone needs a place – needs their own safe place. I feel like that's a huge disconnect between the rest of us, even though we are a majority.

The student said she did not feel like she had avenues made for her, exclusively, including, "I think as a stereotypical White privileged person on campus, I feel like we kind of have to make our own way."

Class

Four of the five focus groups discussed class in relation to racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma. A participant in group one suggested there is a greater disparity in class representation as opposed to racial representation. Similarly, a participant in group four recognized the diversity within racial diversity, stating,

> It's not just race and ethnicity. Being [a] first-generation [college student], I almost feel more pressured... It's being Greek [affiliated] or not, sexual identity... we are a polarized campus in some ways but there are a million other things that, I think, makes us feel insecure and not accepted.

In the same vein, a participant in group three stated, "... I am very aware that in a lot of the things I'm in, most of the people I'm involved with come from a higher class." In relation to class and financial constraints, a participant in group two recognized historical circumstances may impact a family's ability to send future generations to college, whether these future generations are children or grandchildren. According to this participant, "... If you come from a family that didn't go to school, [attending the university] is an extra hurtle you need to get past."

Greek Letter Organizations

Despite the principal researchers' project focusing on racial diversity in registered student organizations at the University of Oklahoma, three of the five focus groups discussed White Greek letter organizations extensively both in relation to diversity and registered student organizations. The author recognizes White Greek letter organizations differ from registered student organizations and identifies value within identifying the sub-themes focus group participants discussed within this theme, including perceived disingenuous co-programming, the lack of structural diversity, inherent segregation and exclusion, and Greek-affiliated involvement in campus activities.

Perceived Disingenuous Co-Programming in Greek Letter Organizations

In discussing diversity within the context of co-programming, group one spoke about National Panhellenic Council and Inter-Fraternity Council's co-programming with culturally diverse student organizations. One participant said various White Greek letter organizations will partner with other organizations for philanthropy events, though she is unsure of the impact of the partnership and she does not know if anyone in either organization talks to one another after the partnership. She said,

> I had a young lady in my anthropology class that's on race and ethnicity and she said that some sororities have actually contacted their organization, I think it's the African American Student Organization, and they've said, 'Hey, come dress in some traditional clothes and we'll talk to you.' It makes things really awkward for that situation instead of saying, 'Hey, what do you think we could

do as a program to learn about your culture?' instead of saying 'Let's look at you in traditional clothes and maybe we'll talk to you.'

In the same vein, another student in group one discussed his perception of co-programming efforts between White Greek letter organizations and multicultural organizations. He said,

> I've head of different fraternities doing philanthropy with different groups, such as the Hispanic American Student Association (HASA), and the fraternity members would just stay in one room and the HASA members would end up doing all of the work for the philanthropy… not really interacting with one another.

Similarly, a White male in group two discussed his organization's involvement and history with White Greek letter organizations. Laughing, he said their environmental organization has tried to work with them in the past,

> …but they all kinda want their hours and then go. They have their own philanthropy already set up…They're good for certain types of partnerships. So, one event where you just need people to show up. But if it's a two-stage process of helping, then no.

The Lack of Structural Diversity in Greek Letter Organizations

In response to a comment about the University of Oklahoma being a historically White university, one female in group two expressed an interest in determining the demographics of sororities and fraternities and comparing them to the demographics of the enrolled student on campus. She said it would be interesting to learn how the demographics of the university compared to the demographics of predominately White

sororities and fraternities and the historically Black sororities and fraternities. This participant was surprised to learn there are so few African American students enrolled at the University of Oklahoma, for example, because she had taken many African American Studies courses and routinely interacted with a diverse group of students in her classes.

Another White female in group two mentioned the lack of diversity in sorority recruitment materials. She said,

> My best friend is Black and before we came [to OU] we got the sorority thing in the mail… I didn't notice at all, obviously, because it's not the first thing I think about, but [my friend] said, 'There are no Black people in here.' There was, like, one in the whole book. That should have tipped me off that there wasn't going to be too much diversity here.

Inherent Segregation and Exclusion in Greek Letter Organizations

Group four discussed, in detail, the inherent segregation and exclusion within White Greek letter organizations at the University of Oklahoma. Two of the females in group four had experience in White Greek letter organizations. One participant was a former member and one participant is a current member. The former member, who identified herself as Iranian-American, discussed the difficulties she encountered being a part of the organization for a short time. While she disclosed the name of her former sorority, to protect her identity, the name of the sorority will not be disclosed. She said at the time of her membership, there were two Black students in the sorority and, though she thought she was the only Middle Eastern student, there might have been one or two others. She describes,

> ...It is that moment where you kind of have to choose before you come to the university. Will I choose a multicultural fraternity or will I join a regular one where I will be one of a few. And you probably won't even get into a very nice – a good house – because those 'good' houses only take a very few, for whatever reason. It's kind of a weird choice to make before you even get here.

This participant later reflected on her leaving the sorority, claiming that while she did not quit because of her race, exclusively, the way in which she was raised and her situation as a first-generation college student funding her education indirectly included her race and circumstances. She said the sorority members did not understand her circumstances, elaborating,

> I was working at the cafeteria, which isn't the most glamorous job ever and they would openly make fun of me for that. And it was just stuff like that. People do not know what living like that means, you know?

The current sorority member in group four, a White student, said she was in a "traditional sorority" (National Panhellenic Council sorority) and elaborated on her experience as a member of a predominately White sorority. She said,

> I'm in a traditional sorority and most of our members are White. And I don't feel like that was something I thought of before but I do notice that when I was rushing that there were some sororities that didn't have any Black girls or Middle Eastern girls. I didn't want to be a part of an organization that only chose blonde, blue-eyed girls.

She also included her perception of desegregating multicultural sororities when she was asked if she ever thinks about the racial demographics of an organization before she joins. She said,

> I would have never thought of it before this, but if I wanted to be in a traditionally African American sorority…that doesn't really happen, that a White girl goes and is like, 'I want to join your group.' And I know there's this boy from Norman High School who is White but is in an African American fraternity because that was his culture growing up… and he really identified with it and they accepted him for that and that's really surprising but it's also really awesome.

A female participant in group two reflected on the "molds" each Greek organization assumes. She was bothered by the fact that the general student population can very easily identify which Greek organization is a "Black sorority" or a "White sorority" by name, including that clearly exemplifies the level of segregation in each organization. She said it is easy for people to think, "Okay, since we're [legally] desegregated, everyone get back into your isolated groups and do what you're doing."

After discussing Greek organizations in relation to diversity within and outside of registered student organizations, a Hispanic male in group three said Greek organizations may be part of the larger problem at the University of Oklahoma. He said, "I think what we are getting at is it may be less racially diverse – the diversification between Greek and non-Greek." Later, he reaffirmed his statement, repeating,

> …I think it's pretty obvious that people feel more strongly about this separation between Greek and non-Greek than maybe a racial difference. Myself, and the

people I've interacted with, that definitely seems to be a broader issue at hand on this campus.

The Iranian-American female participant, and former sorority member, agreed with the previous students' claims and rationalized that segregation continues because multicultural organizations have their own separate space and the majority student demographic has its own space. Additionally, she theorized perhaps the lack of diversity and inclusion persists within some segments of student organizations at the University of Oklahoma because of the homogeneity of White Greek letter organizations and their members' ability to both infiltrate many student leadership positions and create an exclusionary culture similar to their White Greek letter organizations. She said,

> I feel like the Greek system is just a systematic way to allow this to happen, you know what I mean? They literally sit there and say, 'Who is like us that's coming into rush and who isn't like us?' It's really just an 'in' and 'out' issue that normalizes this and I think that's where it stems from and why it's a greater issue [than race] because it's totally saying, 'Yeah, this multicultural fraternity and sorority thing and this other one, it's okay… We'll just do it and it's okay.

She continued to discuss the privilege that enables girls to break into Greek letter organizations, saying, "Like, it's okay to put girls one by one and say, 'Oh, you were in President's Leadership Class? I was in President's Leadership Class. What are the odds?' It's ridiculous, truthfully." This participant felt those privileged with resources and support were more likely and more able to join organizations such as President's Leadership Class.

Group four also theorized that members of White Greek letter organizations have a "false sense of confidence" because they are saturated in a homogeneous community with continual positive reinforcement. One student said,

> Campus Activities Council always says people don't apply and if people put themselves out there… if diverse people put themselves out there… but they're afraid to because they don't have a group of girls saying, 'You'd be good at this,' you know? Because they didn't initially put themselves out there.

While another student replied that many of the Greek members have "put themselves out there their whole lives" because of their support system, another student said student leaders should lead because of their ability. She said,

> Student leaders shouldn't be student leaders because they're the only ones being told they can do it. And I don't think everyone should have to put themselves out there to find out what there is.

These comments suggest there may be a weak support system (or at least a perceived weak support system) for non-White students at the University of Oklahoma, on top of an exclusionary structural system that may make it more difficult for non-White students to hold certain student leadership positions.

One White student in group four who had gone through recruitment but not pursued membership after the second rounds questioned the legitimacy of the involvement in White Greek letter organizations, especially in comparison to registered student organizations' involvement on campus. She said,

> One of the things I was very interested in learning is how these girls are involved around campus, because I had no idea. I mean, I am from Texas and I

still didn't know really what OU had to offer. But what really scared me about it is, like, 'I'm very involved in my sorority, I'm very involved in my sorority, I'm on the t-shirt committee.' Good for you. That's what you came here to do is pay all this extra money…?

Greek-Affiliated Involvement in Campus Activities

In addition to the observation by group four that particular registered student organizations are dominated by members of White Greek letter organizations, they also maintained homecoming is dominated by White Greek letter organization members and the system does not give a non-White Greek letter organization member a chance to pursue court and win the title. One female from group four said that her organization nominated her, but she did not accept the nomination because she knew she did not have the massive "backing of an entire sorority or fraternity" to win. She lamented not accepting the nomination, saying,

> I hate that [I did not accept nomination] for my organization because I think for [our organization] it would have been great to have somebody on homecoming court, but I couldn't get myself to support something that was a popularity contest.

Other participants in group four discussed the most recent homecoming king and queen were Greek-affiliated. One participant said, "And the winders of it was the Inter-Fraternity Council president and a Kappa who was a chair of a Campus Activities Council organization."

Group one discussed their involvement with the President's Trophy program, in which awards are given to organizations based on their academics, campus activities,

volunteerism, and multicultural participation. In discussing their involvement with Inter-Fraternity Council groups in this competition, a participant in group one observed the majority of the Inter-Fraternity Council groups are composed of a majority White demographic and they are typically "just confused about how to go about multicultural programming." Group one highlighted the importance of cooperation and planning, because multicultural programming is a "learning process." In light of this comment, another participant in group one said, "I used to know a lot of people in a couple of the fraternities and I think a lot of the problem [with multicultural programming] – the disconnect – I mean, there's a lot of hate speech."

Student Leadership

When prompted to talk about the racial demographics of student leadership at the University of Oklahoma, group three and group four agreed student leadership is overwhelmingly White, though there are anomalies that fit within obvious categories. One participant in group three described the current student body president's cabinet, stating,

> I remember when Kunal's cabinet introduced themselves to us at Congress, and, you know, the cabinet chairs – there was only one non-White person up there. He was Black. And they were introducing themselves… and they get to him and he says, 'I'm with the department of diversity.' They have one Black person and he's in charge of the diversity in the executive branch.

Considering the participant's comment, it should be noted the participant was describing the cabinet, exclusively. It should be noted the student body president, Kunal Naik, is Indian.

Another participant in group three said even though student leadership is predominately White, their race is not necessarily a bad thing. This participant said,

> Just in general, leadership in student organizations is White. That's not necessarily a bad thing because all of them – most of them – are good at selecting people based on qualifications and not for their background or – background is the wrong word – or ethnicities. But some people try to exploit that. I have personally seen someone, while describing their qualifications for the position, be like, 'Hey, everyone else is White.'

Understanding some students do not want to pursue various leadership positions because they fear they lack the support, especially in terms of homecoming court, groups three and four said they are glad the leadership in their respective organizations is diverse. According to one student in group three,

> Our executive board is rather diverse. We were just talking about it one day… It's not typical for all of campus organizations, but ours is pretty diverse and I'm kind of proud that we are.

One member in group four laughed when the principal investigator asked the group to describe the racial diversity of student leadership at the University of Oklahoma. She qualified the executive committee within her organization was diverse, but general student leadership lacks diversity.

Diversity Training

Groups one and four discussed diversity training. During the early spring semester, prior to the Sigma Alpha Epsilon incident, it was rumored the University of Oklahoma was to implement diversity training in response to a rumor of a racially-

insensitive "cowboys and Indians" party allegedly taking place at an anonymous fraternity member's residence. One student in group one suggested all new members of the University of Oklahoma community should be subject to diversity training. Another participant in group one responded,

> I know that they're talking about implementing that in Camp Crimson (the university's freshman orientation camp) during the summers or they're going to start trying to form a program, but it definitely needs to be everybody from everywhere needs to be involved in that. I think that would make people aware that, you know, this is our community. We have all of these students from all over the world and all over the country coming to learn and learn from each other but if there's hate speech going on and this really weird, you know, lack of multicultural programming, it won't work.

Participants in group four were also vocal about the prospect of diversity training at the University of Oklahoma. Many agreed it is ideal for diversity training to start early, perhaps before high school. Another participant said if diversity training is done as well as One Sooner training, the university's two-hour workshop on recognizing and stopping sexual assault and sexual misconduct, it will be a success and it will "really open some minds." Other students were more critical of diversity training. One participant said,

> I personally don't have high hopes for whatever university-instituted diversity training because I think the university has done a great job of putting a band-aid on issues for the longest time. I think they put a band-aid on it and they say 'We've done this. Isn't that great?' And it's almost a negligible effect.

The participant proceeded to qualify his statements by discussing the university-mandated alcohol training for incoming students. He elaborated,

> Going off of the university-mandated alcohol training – there's a lot of binge drinking, unsafe drinking, that goes on on campus. It's almost cartoonish in any sort of way to act like it doesn't happen and I think that any kind of student conduct organization that is supposed to build a policy is so neutered that it's not affective in any way, shape, or form. The same will probably happen with this diversity training. The people who should hear it will take nothing from it. And I think that's unfortunate because the university can't be so pushy without infringing on people's rights. I don't think it's going to do much.

Another student from group four discussed Stanford's poor handling of a recent reported rape on campus and how universities must not only react appropriately to incidents on campus, but be proactive to create a culture that prevents atrocities. In reference to the student at Stanford who raped a fellow student, she said the student simply dropped out and apologized, but that doesn't remedy the situation or remove harm done to the victim.

> I don't know what you want to do with [an apology]. I feel like students need to realize that their actions have consequences and if it takes them realizing that their consequences will also affect them, then so be it. It needs to have that to really hit it at home – to be wary of what you say at diversity training.

Perception of International Students

Two groups discussed their perception of international students at the University of Oklahoma. Participants in group one were surprised to learn of what they perceived

to be the low number of international students at the University of Oklahoma. One participant said international students were more visible than the American students on campus. Another participant in group one hypothesized, "I feel like you see more international students because they pay more to be a student here, so it goes into an issue of class." A participant in group two was also surprised to learn of the amount of international students on campus. She said, "I was thinking there was a lot more international students than that maybe because they tend to stay – they stick around campus quite a bit and they go out and do things. They're just more visible."

A student in group one discussed that international students frequently "congregate" together, making them more visible, and she theorized why. She said,

> One, obviously there is a language barrier, so for some that might be why the congregate together. Also, when they come over, it's typically for a specific major so they tend to hang out with not only those who speak their language, but those who are in their major.

This understanding suggests international students are visible on campus, but yet they only associate with those who are most like them in terms of place of origin and field of study.

International Students' Voices and Suggestions

Group five, a cultural group composed of only international students, described in length their group's mission, their feelings of international events on campus, and their perceptions about why more White students do not attend their events. Further, they offered suggestions for the University of Oklahoma administration and students so

both the international and U.S.-student community can benefit from cultural organizations.

When asked to rate the University of Oklahoma's racial diversity on a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse, the female student who is an undergraduate replied "ten," while the two male graduate students replied "five to six." When prompted to qualify their scores, the female participant whose diversity score was a ten said she attended a United World College that was very diverse, including, "Most of my friends are from the Middle East, Africa, everywhere, so maybe that's why I feel more diverse." Her friends at the University of Oklahoma are from those same groups. The males expressed concern being segregated in their department as graduate students, so they could only speak on behalf of their departments, in which "there aren't a lot of different ethnic groups and races." One male said there are Chinese, Iranian, and American students in his department. The other male student agreed and offered there are not many females in his field.

When asked about the type of co-programming in which their organization engages, they prefaced their response with the fact that their organization is composed of many graduate students who have families and have lacked the time to participate in many events this year, compared to their activity in previous years. The undergraduate representative said she participates in the Eve of Nations, an international student event in which various groups can showcase their culture. While their organization does not formally partner with other groups, it is common for one international group to participate in another international group's event, especially if both students represent countries that are geographically close and have a similar culture.

The group described the purpose of their organization to be two-fold. First, the organization is to showcase the group's culture – to orient U.S. students with their country and explain events like cultural festivals. Second, it is a space in which students of the same geographic background can foster community. According to one graduate student,

> ...The organization sometimes tries to help [new students from our country] – try to help them if they don't have a car, try to help them go grocery shopping and stuff. It's unofficial, I think... and make this feel like home."

The second graduate student agreed bringing students from their geographic region together was an important tenant of their organization.

Though the students in group five would not necessarily lack a sense of community without their student organization, they agreed the organization has helped create a sense of cohesion. One graduate student said, "I used to live by myself and it would be days before I would even talk in my own language. If you have someone to talk to in your language, it's easier to feel more connected." The other graduate student agreed and said, "[Members of this organization] have grown in the same culture that you would have and it's easier to relate with them as opposed to finding someone else who has grown up in a different culture and different environment."

When asked if they had attended an event hosted by a racial group that was different from their own, all three participants said yes. One participant described the Latin Flavor event that took place days before. Collectively, the group discussed the other culture events they attended. When asked what they would say to a person who does not attend events hosted by racial groups different from their own, one graduate

student rationalized maybe the individual lacks the time or does not know about the event because it was poorly advertised. He also suggested the individual could simply lack interest. The other graduate student suggested the individual should "try to give it a shot. Go there and try to get something to eat. If you like it, eat it. If you don't like it, throw it away." After thinking about it more, the first graduate student said since society is growing more and more diverse, it would greatly benefit this individual to learn about other cultures. He said,

> If you want to understand what is going on – if you want to solve some of society's problems – you have to understand how people think, what people eat, how people dance… you have to understand people and the only way [to do that] is by participating in different events and knowing them, talking to them.

The participants highlighted the great resources at the University of Oklahoma, in terms of a wide range of international students and free events. According to the undergraduate student, "You don't have to travel to that country to get experience because there's so much diversity here." The second graduate student added attending international students' events is a great opportunity because so many of the events are free. Sometimes, students' involvement depends on the students' major and level of interest in other cultures. According to the undergraduate student, a lot of Americans studying international area studies are inclined to attend cultural events. In discussing their personal commitment to cultural events, the participants described involvement requires time and practice. The undergraduate student said,

> If I want to participate in a cultural night, I have to do a lot for it. I have to be there for practice every week and meet with the people. I don't think all people have the same time [to pursue involvement].

Similarly, the participants said the attendance of an international-student event is usually dominated by the membership of the organization hosting the event, despite the aim of the event being for American students to attend to teach others about their culture. They rationalized this is partly because of an inherent cultural barrier, including one's language. According to one graduate student,

> If this person comes in and doesn't speak my language, he is not going to be able to talk or understand what is going on. That may be a factor. Maybe the organization should be able to have a conversation with [them].

He suggested that international students try to speak English during their events so they do not alienate potential participants and because "it is the language of the land." This participant later said, while the fault lies with both the international student organization and the White Americans not attending, "…the fault lies on the organization itself because they are not being as inclusive as they need to be."

The participants rationalized there are many faults within the international student communities' cultural events. For example, if the organization holds a dance program, they will try to explain the dance and clothing and translate the songs in English, but many times the fault lies within the programming. According to one graduate student, "They are not making [events] very attractive for people of other cultures. Many times, people are busy and they don't have time to figure it out and say, 'What are we doing to attract specific people?' They just have fun and go home." The

other graduate student explained there is a recognizable pattern at cultural events, including songs, danced, food, and a fashion show. He included,

> …I don't think that is enough to attract White Americans. It kind of sounds boring. If I was coming to watch another international student organization – just watching song and dance – it gets boring after a while of two songs and dances.

The participants suggested international student organizations become more creative in hosting cultural events, perhaps by introducing more conventional activities, like movies, to their events. One graduate student recommended playing a marathon of international movies that have won or were nominated for an Oscar to attract the majority student population to their events. One graduate student said,

> Rather than show them some dance or fashion or food that's completely alien to Americans… it's difficult for them to cope with that. But if you can ease that transition by saying, 'Okay, this movie has been nominated for an Oscar, it must be good.'

He suggested showing foreign films in the Meacham auditorium.

The group also suggested that the university create a day called "International Day" in which all international student organizations came together with each other in one event, rather than having separate events throughout the year. According to one graduate student, such a day would "make it easier for everyone to mingle with each other rather than to have separate [days]." The group alternatively suggested creating a flier or website that lists all of the international events throughout the year. They suggested organizing it by month, rationalizing that since there are five continents and

five months per semester, each month could focus on a particular continent or international culture to raise awareness and celebrate diversity.

Additionally, the undergraduate student recommended faculty become more involved in international diversity awareness and programming. In the same way her dance class requires her to attend shows and write a paper over the program, she said there is opportunity to integrate cultural events into academics. She recommended,

> I think a university professor can approach it that way to say to other students, 'Oh, you should be open to other cultures.' And I think some Americans feel like… Okay, America is a great country. No offense… In fact, I know some friends who think America is the whole world. There is no world besides America so I don't know why I need to know other cultures and other languages. So I think they shouldn't have that mentality. They should be more open-minded. Let's learn about different cultures maybe like [another participant] said earlier since the world is changing every day.

The group also suggested the university administration could do more to promote events so it was not solely a task left for students to organize independently.

The undergraduate member in group five who was more involved on campus than the graduate students discussed her perception of student leadership, describing the differences she saw in international student leadership and American student leadership. She said,

> Of course, all of the international student organizations are going to have an international president, like someone who knows about the country and who can answer questions about the country. But if we talk about organizations that are

more related to the university, like Campus Activities Council, I feel like the campus- related organizations have more White leaders and international organizations have more international leaders. It's not equally distributed by race.

She also discussed her involvement, as an undergraduate student with less of an academic commitment compared to the graduate students and more time to become involved in student organizations. Her involvement is exclusive to her cultural organization and similar internationally-minded organizations because there is community in difference. She said,

> I would be more attracted to join an international organization [rather] than an American organization because I will feel [the other international students] will say, 'Oh, she's not from America, so she has a different background like me.' If I go to an American organization, like Campus Activities Council, I would think, 'Okay, maybe my English is not as good as theirs,' so I might feel excluded kind of like how they feel excluded when they come to our organizations.

In his closing remarks, one graduate student reflected on how pertinent it is for international students and American students to be inclusive and embrace one another, especially considering how diverse the U.S. is becoming. He said,

> There should be an effort. Definitely should be an effort. And many times people may not be forthcoming, so it's a slow process. It's a long and slow process. It's not going to happen in one day. It's not going to happen soon. It takes time. And there should be some administrative apparatus that will help

make this change, this transition for people to be more inclusive. Internationals and Americans can do it. Many internationals separate themselves for various reasons. It takes time for Americans to be welcoming. This person may be welcoming and a good person, but maybe the way he does his business, he may be excluding many internationals from his life or from his friend circle. It could happen unwillingly. It is a slow process. I will say there should be an administrative apparatus so that people will be trying to get together.

Chapter 11: Phase One and Phase Two Discussion

Data Implications

Overall, the principal investigator found registered student organizations are dominated by White membership (save for cultural organizations), student organization leaders are most likely to lead organizations composed of members of the same race, and student organizations exist within de facto segregated structures that are very siloed from one another. Further, student organization leadership and membership does not perceive incentives to co-program with other student organizations. While the Miville-Guzman Universality-diversity scale was included in the survey to measure student leaders' awareness and acceptance of similarities and differences within and outside of student organizations at the University of Oklahoma, the principal investigator did not find any significance or measurable variance in individuals' answers. This may be attributed to the small sample size of the participants who reached this portion of the survey. Additionally, participants may have been less likely to truthfully answer Likert-scale questions that were perhaps too obvious in their methodology to determine attitudes about diversity on campus.

Data suggests the structural racial diversity in registered student organizations was of an overwhelmingly White demographic. While White students composed 60.31% of enrolled students in 2013, quantitative data suggests White students compose 61.64% of student leaders and 55.24% of membership in registered student organizations at the University of Oklahoma. This data confirms hypothesis one, suggesting structural diversity at the institutional level is positively related to structural diversity within registered student organizations. Qualitative data suggests White membership is greater than 55.24% of all student organization membership, considering each focus group contained mostly White students, with the exception of one or two token individuals in each group. Generally, White students were more likely to participate in focus group discussion. Literature suggests token individuals may be less likely to participate in group discussions and interactions because of their perceived lack of power and access to resources (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011; Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Smedley, Myers & Harrell, 1993).

In addition to the lack of structural diversity, quantitative and qualitative data suggests there is also a lack of class diversity within registered student organizations. Quantitative data suggests the majority of student leaders surveyed are middle class (43.84%) and a majority of the middle class participants identified as White (59.38%). Quantitative data suggests the second most represented income level in student organization leadership is upper middle class (28.77%). Additionally, most students who identified as upper-middle class also identified as White students (71.43%). Together, middle class and upper-middle class family income levels represent 72.60% of all student leaders surveyed. While White students represent 66.67% of all lower-

middle class family incomes and 50% of upper class family incomes in this study, no White student leaders reported a family income level of lower class. Similarly, qualitative data suggests low-income students and first-generation college students are polarized on campus, especially in terms of student leadership. Some focus group participants said they experience a lot of pressure from multiple venues on campus because they feel insecure and unaccepted because of their class. Another student said she was very aware of the class differentials within student organizations, including, "I am very aware that in a lot of the things I'm in, most of the people I'm involved with come from a higher class."

Many focus groups discussed co-programming within the lens of multicultural programming, suggesting the aim of the partnership was for the perceived exotic group to show or perform their culture. Many of the occasions for co-programming were stereotypical and suggestively ingenuous, honoring a cultural holiday that occurred during that particular month. For example, group one co-programmed with the Black Student Association during Black History Month and group three co-programmed with the Asian Student Association to host a sushi night. Quantitative data suggested cultural organizations have the highest instances of co-programming among all University of Oklahoma student organizations, with 100% of all cultural organizations confirming they had partnered with one or more groups in the past year.

This research study suggests if an organization co-programs with another organization, it is likely to honor a cultural event. Inviting individuals in an organization to co-program in an effort to learn from the cultural group may assume the individuals in the group are able and willing to represent and speak for the culture(s) with which

they identify. Aligning the partnership during a token holiday month, like Black History Month, may portray an insincere interest in the culture group's history, practices, and people. This mindset may also consciously or unconsciously exoticize fellow students who, though they are members of the Hispanic Student Association, may have lived in Oklahoma their whole lives and may have little connection to traditional garb, dances, and beliefs. This may further alienate students of color from White students who may or may not genuinely want to learn from another group and it may prevent students of color from joining particular cultural groups. Many of the students who are a part of cultural organizations may want to identify with others by finding similarities instead of being asked to perform their differences like a traveling circus or revel in stereotypical cultural markers. There were no instances in this study in which any type of student organization discussed partnering with a cultural organization for cultural-neutral purposes – to host a book drive or sponsor a fundraising campaign, for example. Data suggests cultural organizations are perceived to be one-dimensional and only able to perform their culture, leaving one to wonder if cultural organizations exist for others to experience.

Additionally, qualitative and quantitative data suggests cultural organizations are the most racially diverse student organizations, but, while much of their programming is organized with White and American students in mind, other members from the cultural group's demographic or region are the most likely to attend a cultural night. Focus group data from a cultural group suggests cultural groups could do more to make the programming more accessible to students who do not speak the group's language. On the other hand, focus group data from student organizations with a White

majority demographic suggests these organizations could do more to genuinely co-program with organizations that do not look like, act like, or think like them. This data confirms hypothesis two, suggesting a homogenous student organization is negatively related to informal interactional diversity and cross-racial relations.

While quantitative data did not exclusively confirm the third hypothesis, (Black students are less likely to lead or join student organizations), Black students were among a small minority of non-White students involved in student organizations. While African American/Black students are the third-least represented racial group enrolled at the University of Oklahoma (4.74%), behind Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students and American Indian/Alaska Native students (0.15% and 4.03%, respectively), they are tied with American Indian/Alaska Native students and international students as the third least represented in student leadership (6.85%) and the second most represented racial group (11.65%) behind White students (55.24%) and international students (9.09%) in terms of student leaders' self-reported student organization membership. Qualitative data suggested some Black students are pressured to join particular organizations or pressured not to join some organizations that lack the markings of one's cultural group. Focus group data included an anecdote which described a Black student being shunned from his Black student community for joining a White Greek letter organization. This second-hand anecdotal evidence is consistent with literature which suggests Black student participation in predominately White campus organizations produces borderism, which includes sanctions in the form of discrimination, name-calling, or complete disassociation from one's cultural group to preserve a collective identity (Smith & Jones, 2011).

On the other hand, some racial groups are not only cognizant that their racial group lacks representation in segments of campus life, but they reinforce members' participation in predominately White organizations because of the lack of representation. Focus group data included a Hispanic female describing her Hispanic friend's encouragement to pursue opportunities in which Hispanics are underrepresented to cultivate the opportunity for other Hispanics. While the Hispanic friend providing the encouragement was described to belong to the Hispanic student associations that advocate for diversity at the University of Oklahoma, in this situation she was not engaging in borderism or inflicting sanctions on her Hispanic friend who had chosen to become involved in predominately White student organizations. Perhaps this is because Hispanic students exist within an "in-between status" in the racial hierarchy in ways that Black students do not (Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Lee & Bean, 2004).

Three of the five focus groups exhibited great interest in discussing White Greek letter organizations at the University of Oklahoma. The fact that the subject was an urgent one and on many participants' radars even before the SAE incident demonstrates how divided Greek-affiliated and non-Greek-affiliated students can be. It was very apparent many people connected White Greek letter organizations to exclusion and homogeneity. The principal investigator continually emphasized the research study was on registered student organizations only and did not include White Greek letter organizations. Even so, such discussion persisted and continually surfaced in conversation. While White Greek letter organizations have their own events and philanthropy, it seems these organizations are a hot topic because they also pervade venues common to registered student organizations, like the President's Trophy contest,

Campus Activities Council and "other umbrella organizations," and co-programming opportunities.

Focus group participants may have wanted to discuss the exclusivity of White Greek letter organization because quantitative data suggests most registered student organizations have an open door policy, allowing any and all students to pursue membership. According to quantitative data, 14.89% of student organizations with a majority White membership demographic, and 4.17% of student organizations with a majority non-White membership demographic require an interview before granting membership to members. Additionally, few student organizations with majority White membership and majority non-White membership compose a selection committee to review the applicant (19.15% and 9.09%, respectively). This is in comparison to the multiple formal and informal interviews required of a potential member of a Greek letter organization that includes a formal panel.

Because focus group participants discussed the polarizing class divide among students at the University of Oklahoma, White Greek organizations may exacerbate this polarization. According to the University of Oklahoma's *Panhellenic Association's 2013-2014* formal recruitment literature, the first-year member dues per year range from $2,058 to $3,761, in-house member dues per year range from $6,140 to $10,700, and out-of-house member dues per year range from $1,800 to $2,980 (University of Oklahoma Panhellenic Association, n.d.). Similarly, the Inter-Fraternity Council's first-year member dues range from $500 to $2,000, in-house member dues range from $4,800 to $8,000, and out-of-house member dues per year range from $600 to $3,500 (University of Oklahoma Interfraternity Council, n.d.). Considering resident tuition and

fees for 30-hours and per-hour and per-semester fees at the University of Oklahoma is $9,275, costs associated with joining a White Greek letter organization are likely to total at least one-third of the cost of tuition (University of Oklahoma Office of Admissions, n.d.) Students who are cognizant of the fact that many students at the University of Oklahoma come from a higher class may also be aware of the class distinction within White Greek letter organizations.

Limitations

This study has a variety of limitations that must be taken into account when interpreting the findings. The sample size of 73 complete survey responses out of a total of 381 registered student organizations with accurate contact information in October 2014 yields a 17.32% response rate. For this reason, some categories, including racial groups, reported family income, and high school demographic were underrepresented or not represented at all. For the purposes of reporting a dataset as robust as possible, some data points include a larger sample size than others and each sample size is reported when necessary.

While the researcher understands that the number of registered student organizations grows throughout the academic year, for the purpose of conducting a year-long project, it was ideal for the researcher began collecting data in October, 2014. Collecting quantitative data two months into the fall semester yielded an overall smaller sample size, but it allowed for the most in-depth collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.

The survey was administered via email, requiring the principal investigator locate current email addresses for each student organization leader. Keeping in mind the

nature of student organization participation, changing leadership, a lull in an organization's activity, or the availability of a student leader may dictate whether the survey was received, began, and completed in full.

The survey required student organization leaders to self-report information on behalf of their organization, for example, the demographics of membership, the frequency the organization has partnered with other organizations, and the organization's application process. Many self-reported items are based on the best guess of the student leader. Time and logistical limitations prevented the principal investigator from administering the survey to each member of a registered student organization in order to guarantee more accurate or robust data. Additionally, to remain consistent with the categories used by the University of Oklahoma to describe student enrollment and student organization leaders, "two or more races" is an option for student leaders' self-reported membership. The author realizes this is an ambiguous category because multiracial individuals are not obviously identifiable.

Additionally, the survey included a 15-item Miville-Guzman Diversality Scale questionnaire, which aimed to determine student leaders' awareness and acceptance of similarities and differences. The answers to this set of questions were markedly uniform and respondents seemed to choose the most politically correct answer. This question set may have been too obvious in its attempt to gauge student leaders' awareness and acceptance of diversity at the University of Oklahoma. This data was not included in the study's results because they were not found to be significant.

Although the principal investigator recommended focus groups best reflect the membership of the student organization, since the principal investigator did not choose

which individuals participated in each organization's focus groups, it is difficult to determine how representative each group was of the larger organization. Four of the five focus groups were conducted before or after an organization's general membership meeting. Members who were not present at the general membership meetings for a plethora of reasons were therefore unable to participate in a focus group. Sometimes, members who were present at the general membership meeting could not stay to participate in the focus group, due to other commitments. The sample size and representative nature of focus groups is limiting for these reasons.

Recommendations and Future Directions

This research study was proposed to the author's thesis committee September 2014. The quantitative phase launched in October 2014 and the qualitative phase launched in January 2015. While the University of Oklahoma community, and, to a certain extent, the nation, engaged in a discussion about racial diversity, opportunity, inclusion, and White Greek letter organizations after the University of Oklahoma's Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity chapter made national news after engaging in a racist chant about Black students barred from membership in the White Greek letter organization, it should be noted the vast majority of data was collected before the SAE incident. That is, the author held one focus group with a cultural organization after the SAE incident. While this group knew of the incident, as it was hard to miss the five to eight news trucks parked on the North Oval of the University of Oklahoma campus, the news reporters walking around campus to collect student interviews the week following the viral video's release, and the student-led silent protests, demonstrations, and vigils that were published in the student newspaper, they did not make it a component of their

conversation. Essentially, all data reflects the minds and hearts of student leaders and members of registered student organizations at the University of Oklahoma before it was salient to discuss and research racial diversity on campus.

The principal investigator hopes the data from this research establishes baseline for demographic data in registered student organizations where there currently exists a lack in such research. Recording demographic data of student organization leaders and members hereafter may potentially forecast the direction the University of Oklahoma student organizations are going to become representative of a quickly changing global demographic and to become more inclusive. While there has been an increase in town hall meetings, surveys, and focus group sessions that attempt to categorize and discuss racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma since the SAE incident, to the principal investigator's knowledge, this is the only such research that was collected prior to March 2015 that sought to determine the racial diversity of University of Oklahoma student organizations. Future directions of research must take into account the salient nature of topics, such as racial diversity at the University of Oklahoma, and one must understand an increase in such scholarship momentarily will not lead to genuine research with sustainable solutions. For the University of Oklahoma, and universities across the nation, to improve race relations, the explosion of mass-mailed surveys and town hall meetings sponsored by the administration only after an incident cannot be the norm. Universities must become proactive and not remain complacent in systems of injustice.

Diversity Initiatives and Reactions Post-SAE Event

The White Greek letter organization community began to discuss ways to build more inclusive communities prior to the SAE incident in January 2015 after Panhellenic Association and Inter-Fraternity Council executive members called a meeting with the University of Oklahoma's greek council presidents, greek faculty adviser, and the vice president of Student Affairs (Friend, 2015). The meeting's purpose was two-fold. White Greek letter organization representatives and University of Oklahoma administration discussed the ways in which the greek council could create representation and tolerance within the greek communities (Friend, 2015). Additionally, the group discussed planning an event to recognize all members of the University of Oklahoma community (Friend, 2015). According to reports by *The Oklahoma Daily*, Haphuong Nguyen, the vice president of external affairs for the University of Oklahoma Multicultural Greek Council, said many members of her organization have felt excluded from university activities such as homecoming (Friend, 2015). Currently, the Greek council hopes to finalize its plans after attending the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education, an annual conference organized by the University of Oklahoma's Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies (Friend, 2015).

Three weeks after the SAE incident, President Boren named Jabar Shumate, University of Oklahoma alumnus and former legislator, the first Vice President for the University Community (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, 2015b). This position requires Shumate to oversee all diversity programs at the university, from admissions to activities within Student Affairs (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, 2015b). According to a University of Oklahoma press release, one facet of Shumate's

responsibilities is to work closely with administration to broaden the pool of applicants for faculty and staff positions (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, 2015b).

Current Recommendations

Recommendations for the University of Oklahoma to become more racially diverse and inclusive are explored in the following sections. Increasing the structural diversity of the university's student enrollment, holistically supporting low-income and first-generation college students, providing opportunities for diverse interactions that are high in quality and quantity, diversifying the faculty and staff appointments, better supporting academic departments that offer classes on diversity, and proving a serious commitment to diversifying the university experience are some ways in which the University of Oklahoma can invest in its students, generally, and ensure its minority students have access to and entry into leadership positions, specifically.

Because conflicting literature does not agree diversity courses provide benefits for all students (Bowman, 2009; Bowman, 2010a; Hurtado, 2001; Hurtado 2004; Mayhew & Engberg, 2003; Nelson-Laird, 2005; Tsui, 1999), the university should not stop at instituting diversity courses. Diversity and inclusion in terms of race, but also in terms of one's class, sexuality, gender identity, ability, religion, political affiliation, and many other identifiers, requires a holistic look at course requirements and instruction, campus programming, funding, housing, appointed faculty and staff and many other venues.

To achieve real, measurable progress and to encourage a culture of accountability, the university should declare specific targets and goals in relation to diversity efforts. Brown University, for example, announced in March 2015 that it will

double the proportion of diverse faculty by 2025 (Borg, 2015). Brown is creating new postdoctoral fellow programs, conferences, and funding to increase a pool of diverse candidates that would otherwise lack the opportunity (Flaherty, 2015). On the other hand, exclusive universities across the nation have programs for low-income and first generation college students to better afford the institution. Students at Yale whose families earn less than $65,000 annually are exempt from tuition (University of Yale, 2013). Many other schools, such as Harvard, Amherst, Stanford, Vanderbilt University, and Georgetown University, have similar programs and incentivized scholarship programs for low-income families and first generation college students.

Finally, while the University of Oklahoma continually prides itself on being the university with the most enrolled National Merit Scholars (University of Oklahoma Public Affairs, 2015a) – even among the Ivy League and other exclusive schools – it is important to recognize the students the University of Oklahoma must attract to ensure a diverse community will not be some of the 9,000 students who score highest on the PSAT out of the 1.5 million high school sophomores and juniors who take them exam annually (the top one percent of students who take the exam) (National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 2014). To rightfully compare itself to exclusive schools, the university should also invest in low-income, first-generation students that perhaps lack resources and instruction to perform among the top one percent on a standardized test during their sophomore year of high school instead of racing to enroll the most National Merit Scholars and celebrating a culture of exclusivity. While the author acknowledges privately-funded and Ivy League universities are better able to provide financial assistance to low-income students, the University of Oklahoma should continually

strive to serve all students to the best of its ability. This includes serving high-achieving students who score high on the PSAT and become National Merit Scholars to the same degree as high achieving students who are offered admission to the University of Oklahoma and also have a financial need.

It should be the university's priority to continually apply a stringent look at all structures that enable complacency to ensure accessible paths exists for all students to contribute to the culture and progress of the university community and the state of Oklahoma though student leadership, involvement, and racial and cultural diversity. The aim to achieve diversity should be holistic and considered from an intersectional perspective. While evaluation and action will take many forms and should take many forms, it is vital not to leave students in a worse state than they were before. As diversity town hall meetings and focus groups continue to emerge at the University of Oklahoma, the administration and researchers should keep students' best interest in mind and take care not to exclude, hurt, or invalidate students' experiences.

References

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class and race in organizations. *Gender and Society*, 20, 441-464.

Alon, S. (2009). The evolution of class inequality in higher education: Competition, exclusion, and adaptation. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 731-755.

Alon, S. (2011). The diversity dividends of a need-blind and color-blind affirmative action policy. *Social Science Research*, 40, 1494-1505.

Antonio, A. L. (2004). The influence of friendship groups on intellectual self-confidence and educational aspirations in college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 446-471.

Baylor University Institutional Research and Testing. (2014). Baylor trends, XXV, 12. Retrieved from http://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/215790.pdf

Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94, 991-1013.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA, *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 27, 931-950.

Bowman, N. A. (2009). College diversity courses and cognitive development among students from privileged and marginalized groups. *Journal of Diversity of Higher Education*, 2, 182-194.

Bowman, N. A. (2010a). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 80, 4-33.

Bowman, N.A. (2010b). The development of psychological well-being among first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51, 180-200.

Bowman, N. A. (2013). How much diversity is enough? The curvilinear relationship between college diversity interactions and first-year student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 54, 874-894.

Borg, L. (2015). Brown holds a diversity summit, promises to make the university more welcoming. *Providence Journal*, Retrieved from http://www.providencejournal.com/article/20150308/NEWS/150309383/11669/NEWS

Boyraz, G., Home, S. G., Owens, A. C. & Armstrong, A. P. (2013). Academic achievement and college persistence of African American students with trauma exposure. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60, 582-592.

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

Callender, C. & Jackson, J. (2008). Does the fear of debt constrain choice of university and subject of study? *Studies in Higher Education*, 33, 405-429.

Callendar, C. & Wilson, D. (2003). 2002/3 student income and expenditure survey: Students' income, expenditure and debt and changes since 1998. Research report no. 487. Nottingham: Department of Education and Skills.

Carnegie Foundation. (2010). Carnegie classifications and methodology. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/methodology/basic.php

Carter, D.F. (2006). Key issues in the persistence of underrepresented minority students. *New Directions for Educational Research*, 130, 33-46.

Chang, M. J. (2003). Racial differences in viewpoints about contemporary issues among entering college students: Fact or fiction? *NASPA Journal*, 40, 55-71.

Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Saenz, V. & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 431-455.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. College completion: Oklahoma public colleges (4 years). Retrieved from http://collegecompletion.chronicle.com/state/#state=ok&sector=public_four

Crisp, R. J. & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137, 242-266.

Davidson, J. (2011). University of Oklahoma program outcomes assessment report for gen-ed students taking courses in African and African-American studies: 2010-11 academic year, University of Oklahoma.

Denson, N. (2009). Do curricular and cocurricular diversity activities influence racial bias? A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 805-838.

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

Dey, E. L. (2008). Should colleges focus more on personal and social responsibility? *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, 1-10.

Di'Tomaso, N., Post, C. & Parks-Yancy, R. (2007). Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33. 473-501.

Espenshade & Radford. (2009). *No longer separate, not yet equal: Race and class in elite college admissions and campus life*. Princeton, NJ Princeton University Press.

Finch, S., Jones, A., Parfrement, J., Cebulla, A., Connor, H., Hillage, J., Pollard, E., Tyers, C., Hunt, W. & Loukas, G. (2006). Student income and expenditure survey 2004/5. Research report RR725. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.

Fisher v. University of Texas. The Oyez Project of IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. Retrieved from http://www.oyez.org/cases/2010-2019/2012/2012_11_345

Flaherty, C. (2015, April 6). Does faculty diversity need targets? *Inside Higher Ed*, Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/04/06/brown-u-declares-it-will-double-faculty-diversity-2025

Friend, A. (2015, April 30). OU greek councils' plans to be finalized this summer. *The Oklahoma Daily.* Retrieved from http://www.oudaily.com/news/ou-greek-councils-plans-to-be-finalized-this-summer/article_824c2dc6-eecc-11e4-9914-f37258858a2c.html

Fuertes, J. N., Miville, M. L., Mohr, J. J., Sedlacek, W. E. & Gretchen, D. (2000). Factor structure and short form of the Miville-Guzman universality-diversity scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 33, 157-169.

Grasgreen, Allie. (2013, September 9). It's not just Alabama. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/09/19/segregated-sororities-not-limited-alabama-experts-say

Grutter v. Bollinger. The Oyez Project at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. Retrieved from http://www.oyez.org/cases/2000-2009/2002/2002_02_241/

Hale, F. W. Jr. (2004). The complications and challenges in the championing of diversity. In F. W. Hale (Ed.), *What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies*. (3-23). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Harper, S. R. & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black identity expression and development among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 127-144.

Humes, K. R., Jones, N., A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010 (2010 census briefs, C2010BR-02). Washington: U.S. Census Bureau.

Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.) *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187-203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Hurtado, S. (2004). Preparing college students for a diverse democracy: Final report to the U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and

Improvement. Field Initiated Studies Program. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan.

Hurtado, S., Cater, D. F. & Spuler, A. (1996). Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 135-157.

Hurtado, S. Mayhew, M. J. & Engberg, M. E. (2003, November). Diversity in the classroom and students' moral reasoning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.

Iowa State Office of the Registrar. (2014). Minority summary, 2013-2014. Retrieved from http://www.registrar.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/stats/minority/minf13.pdf

Jayakumar, U. M. (2008). Can higher education meet the needs of an increasingly diverse and global society? Campus diversity and cross-cultural workforce competencies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78, 615-651.

Jonsen, K., Maznevski, M. L. & Schneider, S. C. (2011). Diversity and its not so diverse literature: An international perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 11, 35-62.

Jonsen, K., Tatli, A., Ozbilgin, M. F. & Bell, M.P. (2013). The tragedy of the uncommons: Reframing workforce diversity. *Human Relations*, 66, 271-294.

Lee, J. & Bean, F. (2004). America's changing color lines: Immigration, race/ethnicity, and multiracial identification. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 221-242.

Long, W. & Bert, S. S. C. (2010). African American delinquent youth: Overcoming zero-tolerance policies and finding educational success. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 38, 23-33.

Lorenzo-Hernandez, J. (1998). How social categorization may inform the study of Hispanic immigration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 29-59.

Kansas State University Office of the Registrar. (2014). Enrollment summary by ethnicity. Retrieved from http://www.k-state.edu/registrar/statistics/ethnic.html

Maramba, D. C. & Velasquez, P. (2012). Influences of the campus experience and the ethnic identity development of students of color. *Education and Urban Society*, 44, 294-317.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J. & Antonio, A. L. (2005). Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1-38.

Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M. & Chugh, D. (2014). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into organizations. *Social Science Research Network*, 1-70. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2063742

Moses, M.S. & Chang, M.J. (2006). Toward a deeper understanding of the diversity rationale. *Educational Researcher*, 35, 6-11.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2013). Race and gender demographics search. Retrieved from http://web1.ncaa.org/rgdSearch/exec/saSearch

National Merit Scholarship Corporation. (2014). National Merit Scholarship Corporation 2013-2014 Annual Report. Retrieved from http://www.nationalmerit.org/annual_report.pdf

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

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (2011). Participation in developmental education: 2011 Oklahoma high school graduates as Fall 2011 college freshman in public higher education. Retrieved from http://www.okhighered.org/oeis/preparation/

Oklahoma State University Institutional Research and Information Management. (2014a). Oklahoma State University diversity ledger: Stillwater and Tulsa campuses combined. Retrieved from https://irim.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/DiversityLedger/diversityledger.pdf

Oklahoma State University Institutional Research and Information Management. (2014b). Student profile: Present student body. Retrieved from http://irim.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/StudentProfile/2013/pdf/2013psb.pdf

Pascarella, E., Pierson, C.T., Wolniak, G.C. & Terenzini, P.T. (2004) First-generation college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 249-284.

Pike, G. R. & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions, and perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29, 425-450.

Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D. & Gonyea, R. M. (2007). Evaluating the rationale for affirmative action in college admissions: Direct and indirect relationships between campus diversity and gains in understanding diverse groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 1-17.

Rivera, L. A. (2011). Diversity within reach: Recruitment versus hiring in elite firms. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639, 71-90.

Smedley, B. D., Myers, H. F. & Harrell, S. P. (1993). Minority-status stresses and the college adjustment of entnic minority freshman. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64, 434-452.

Smith, S. S. & Jones, J. A. M. (2011). Intraracial harassment on campus: Explaining between- and within-group differences. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34, 1567-1593.

Stroub, K. J. & Richards, M. P. (2013). From resegregation to reintegration: Trends in the racial/ethnic segregation of metropolitan public schools, 1993-2009. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50, 497-531.

Tauriac, J. J. & Liem, J. H. (2012). Exploring the divergent academic outcomes of the U.S.-origin and immigrant-origin Black undergraduates. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5, 244-258.

Tienda, M. (2013). Diversity does not equal inclusion: Promoting integration in higher education. *Educational Researcher*, 42, 467-475.

Terenzini, P. T., Cabrera, A. F., Colbeck, C. L., Bjorklund, S. A. & Parente, J. M. (2001). Racial and ethnic diversity in the classroom: Does it promote student learning? *Journal of Higher Education*, 72, 509-531.

Texas Christian University Office of Institutional Research. (2014). 2013 Fact Book: Student data, ethnic distribution of student headcount. Retrieved from http://www.ir.tcu.edu/zfiles/FB/2013/ethnicdist.pdf

Texas Tech University Office of Institutional Research. (2014). Texas Tech University fact book, total enrollment by ethnic – fall 2013. Retrieved from http://www.irim.ttu.edu/FactBook/Enrollment/ENRETHNIC.aspx

Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and instruction affecting critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, 40, 185-200.

United States Census Bureau. (2012). U.S. Census Bureau projections show a slower growing, older, more diverse nation a half a century from now [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-243.html

United States Census Bureau. (2013). State & County QuickFacts: California. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html

United States Census Bureau. (2013). State & County QuickFacts: Oklahoma. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/40000.html

United States Census Bureau. (2013). State & County QuickFacts: Texas. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48000.html

University of Kansas Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (2014). The University of Kansas profiles, enrollment by race/ethnicity. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/profiles/current/4-116.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (1997). Profile of the University of Oklahoma, page 38. S. R. Hall, personal communication, August 21, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2004). On-campus students: Enrollment of international students, summary by region, 2-37. K. J. Betz, personal communication, September 18, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2006). On-campus students: Enrollment of international students, summary by region, 2-37. K. J. Betz, personal communication, September 18, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, (2010). Profile of the University of Oklahoma. 2-20. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Fact%20Book%202010.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting, (2011). Profile of the University of Oklahoma. 2-20. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Fact%20Book%202011.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2012). Profiles of the University of Oklahoma. 2-20. Retrieved from

http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Fact%20Book%202012.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2014). Profiles of the University of Oklahoma. 2-20. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Fact%20Book%202014.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institution Research and Reporting, (2013a). Common data sets: First-time, first-year (freshman) admission. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Common%20Data%20Sets/Norman%20Campus%20Only/Current%20Year/CDS%201314%20NC%20C.First-Time%2C%20First-Year%20Admission.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2013b, February). Profiles of the University of Oklahoma. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Fact%20Book%202013.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2013c). Remediation study of first-time students, AY 2012-2013. S. B. Livingood, personal communication, July 21, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2013d). Retention of undergraduate students, Fall 2013. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Annual%20Reports/First%20Time%20Student%20Retention/First_Time_Student_Retention_Fall2013.pdf

University of Oklahoma Institutional Research and Reporting. (2014). Faculty and staff: Full-time faculty and staff by race/ethnicity and gender (excludes student employees), Fall 2013. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/dam/irr/docs/Fact%20Book/Current%20Year%20Fact%20Book/14_2_66%20facstaff.pdf

University of Oklahoma Interfraternity Council. "Interfraternity council FAQs." Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/studentlife/get_involved/fssl/ifc/join/faqs.html

University of Oklahoma Office of Academic Assessment. (2005). The University of Oklahoma assessment report, 2004-2005. N. J. Campbell, personal communication, September 24, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Office of Academic Assessment. (2010). The University of Oklahoma assessment report, 2009-2010. N. J. Campbell, personal communication, September 24, 2014.

University of Oklahoma Office of Admissions. (2013). Future Sooners: Affordability and cost. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/content/go2/affordability/cost.html

University of Oklahoma Panhellenic Association. (2013). "The University of Oklahoma panhellenic association 2014 membership and recruitment guide." http://www.ou.edu/content/studentlife/get_involved/fssl/panhellenic/join.html

University of Oklahoma Public Affairs. (n.d.). OU facts. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/publicaffairs/oufacts.html

University of Oklahoma Public Affairs. (2015a). OU sets record with number of freshman National Merit Scholars. Retrieved from

http://www.ou.edu/content/web/news_events/articles/news_2015/nationalmerit.html

University of Oklahoma Public Affairs. (2015b). Jabar Shumate named OU VP for the university community. Retrieved from http://www.ou.edu/web/news_events/articles/news_2015/jabarshumate.html

University of Oklahoma University College. (2013). The new student survey: Trends in backgrounds and attitudes of new freshman at the University of Oklahoma.

University of Texas at Austin Office of Information Management and Analysis. (2013). Fall enrollment by ethnicity/race and gender, 2009-2013. Retrieved from https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_S_EnrlRaceGen_2013_Fall.pdf

University of West Virginia Office of Institutional Research. (2014). West Virginia University – main campus enrollment trends, fall 1995 to fall 2013, by race. Retrieved from http://www.wvu.edu/~planning/Reports/PDFs/WVU_Enrollment_Trends.pdf

University of Yale Office of Admissions. (2013). Financial aid for prospective students in-depth. Retrieved from http://admissions.yale.edu/financial-aid-prospective-students

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). Graduation rates of first-time fullt0me bachelor's degree-seeking students at 4-year postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, time to completion, sex, and control institution: Selected cohort entry years, 1996 through 2006 (Table

326.10). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_326.10.asp

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). Profile of undergraduate students: 2007-2008. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010205.pdf

Wolff, E. N. (2012). The asset price meltdown and the wealth of the middle class (Working Paper No. 18559). Retrieved from National Bureau of Economic Research website: http://www.nber.org/papers/w18559.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Consent Form

University of Oklahoma

Institutional Review Board

Information Sheet to Participate in a Research Study

Project Title: Racial Diversity in University of Oklahoma Student Organizations: Phase One

Principal Investigator: Kayley Gillespie

Department: Human Relations

You are being asked to volunteer for this research study. This study is being conducted at the University of Oklahoma. You were selected as a possible participant because of your leadership position within a University of Oklahoma student organization. Please read the following information before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the racial diversity within University of Oklahoma student organizations and to determine who extracts benefits from leadership positions.

Number of Participants

I will solicit the 391 student leaders of the 2014-2015 registered student organizations to take part in this survey.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire on-line.

Length of Participation

The study will take about 30 minutes.

Risks

There are no known risks associated with this study.

Benefits

Benefits include an opportunity for students to share experiences, perceptions, and ideas to perhaps influence the University of Oklahoma's policy and procedures and impact future student's diversity experiences.

Compensation

Your participation is voluntary and no compensation will be offered.

Confidentiality

In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you or your organization. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records.

The University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board may inspect and/or copy research records for quality assurance and data analysis.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

Contacts and Questions

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted at

Kayley Gillespie (Principal Investigator)

Email: Kayley.M.Gillespie-1@ou.edu

Dr. Shannon Bert (Faculty Sponsor)

Email: Bert@ou.edu

Phone: (405) 325-1766

Contact the researcher(s) if you have questions or if you have experienced a research-related injury.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Please keep this information sheet for your records. By providing information to the researcher(s), I am agreeing to participate in this study.

This study has been approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB.

IRB Number: 4825 **Approval date:** 10/21/14

Appendix B: Focus Group Consent Form

University of Oklahoma

Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Project Title:	Racial Diversity in University of Oklahoma Student Organizations: Phase Two
Principal Investigator:	Kayley Gillespie
Department:	Human Relations

You are being asked to volunteer for this research study. This study is being conducted at the University of Oklahoma. You were selected as a possible participant because of your membership within a University of Oklahoma student organization.

Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to determine student organization members' perceptions of and feelings about diversity within University of Oklahoma student organizations and the University of Oklahoma campus.

Number of Participants

One of each of the following group types will take part in a focus group: academic group, art group, culture group, faith and religion group, graduate student-oriented group, ideology and politics group, pre-professional group, recreational group, service and philanthropy group, special interest group, student governance group. The number of group members within each group that volunteers to participate in a focus group will vary and the faculty advisor may or may not participate, depending on his or her attendance.

Procedures

If you agree to participate in this one-time focus group, you will be asked to respond to a pre-determined list of questions about racial diversity within University of Oklahoma student organizations. A natural ebb and flow of conversation is expected and discussion may vary from the pre-determined list of questions.

Length of Participation

Discussion facilitated within this one-time focus group is expected to last 15 to 30 minutes.

Risks of being in the study are

There are no known risks associated with this study.

Benefits of being in the study are

Benefits include an opportunity for students to share experiences, perceptions, and ideas to perhaps influence the University of Oklahoma's policy and procedures and impact future student's diversity experiences.

Compensation

Your participation is voluntary and no compensation will be offered.

Confidentiality

In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify individual group members or student organizations. Your name and your organization's name will not be retained or linked with your responses and all data will be retained in anonymous form. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records.

The University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board may inspect and/or copy research records for quality assurance and data analysis.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

Audio Recording of Study Activities

To assist with accurate recording of your responses, focus groups may be recorded on an audio recording device. You have the right to refuse to allow such recording without

penalty. If you do not agree to audio-recording, you cannot participate in this study. Please select one of the following options:

I consent to audio recording. ___ Yes ___ No

Contacts and Questions

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted at

Kayley Gillespie (Principal Investigator)

Email: Kayley.M.Gillespie-1@ou.edu

Dr. Shannon Bert (Faculty Sponsor)

Email: Bert@ou.edu

Phone: (405) 325-1766

Contact the researcher(s) if you have questions, or if you have experienced a research-related injury.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not given a copy of this consent form, please request one.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received satisfactory answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Participant Signature	Print Name	Date

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent	Date

Print Name of Person Obtaining Consent

Appendix C: Survey

1. What type of group is this?

a. Academic group (ex. Honors Society)

b. Art group (ex. Anime club, a capella group)

c. Culture group (ex. Chinese Student Association, a foreign language association)

d. Faith and religion group (ex. Campus ministries organization)

e. Graduate student-oriented group (ex. Pharmacy student organization)

f. Ideology and politics group (ex. University democrats/republicans organization)

g. Pre-professional group (ex. Pre-med organization)

h. Recreational group (ex. Intramural sports)

i. Service and philanthropy group (ex. American Red Cross organization)

j. Special interest group (ex. Culinary organization, Board game organization)

k. Student governance group (ex. Residence hall organization, student government)

l. Another voluntary organization _____

2. What is your best estimate of the number of members in your organization?

_____

3. Of the members in this organization, the racial and/or ethnic composition is best expressed as:

a. Majority of African American/Black membership

b. Majority of American Indian/Alaska Native membership

c. Majority of Asian membership

d. Majority of Hispanic membership

e. Majority of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander membership

f. Majority of White membership

g. Majority of international membership

h. No racial group dominates membership

i. Other _____

4. What is your best estimate of the percentage of your membership that is non-White?

_____

5. What is your best estimate of the racial composition of your organization's membership by percent?

African American/Black _____

American Indian/Alaska Native _____

Asian _____

Hispanic _____

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

White _____

International _____

Multiracial _____

6. Does organization membership require a(n): (Check all that apply)

a. Application

b. Interview

c. Selection committee

d. Qualification such as major, classification, accolade

e. Faculty or administration nomination

f. Other _____

7. Are there applicants who are turned away from membership?

a. Yes

b. No

8. If applicants are turned away from membership, please check all that apply:

a. The application was incomplete

b. The applicant did not attend interview

c. The selection committee determined the applicant did not fit the qualifications required for membership

d. Other (Please explain) _____

9. Has your organization partnered with other student organizations for events?

a. Yes

b. No

10. If yes, what type of student organization has your group partnered with over the last year? (Select all that apply)

a. Academic group (ex. Honors Society)

b. Art group (ex. Anime club, a capella group)

c. Culture group (ex. Chinese Student Association, a foreign language association)

d. Faith and religion group (ex. Campus ministries organization)

e. Graduate student-oriented group (ex. Pharmacy student organization)

f. Ideology and politics group (ex. University democrats/republicans organization)

g. Pre-professional group (ex. Pre-med organization)

h. Recreational group (ex. Intramural sports)

i. Service and philanthropy group (ex. American Red Cross organization)

j. Special interest group (ex. Culinary organization, Board game organization)

k. Student governance group (ex. Residence hall organization, student government)

l. Another voluntary organization _____

11. If your organization partnered with at least one other student group over the past year, briefly list the purpose of events

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Has your organization invited speakers or guests to meetings or events?

a. Yes

b. No

13. If yes, what was the guest speaker's reason for speaking? (Check all that apply)

a. Motivational

b. Educational/instructional

c. Career development advice or consultation

d. Diversity development

e. Other _____

14. Does your organization require diversity programming?

a. Yes

b. No

15. If so, how does your organization encourage, promote, or support diversity programming?

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. What is your role in this group or organization?

a. President

b. Vice president

c. Secretary

d. Treasurer

e. Member

f. Other _____

17. What is your classification?

a. Freshman

b. Sophomore

c. Junior

d. Senior

e. Graduate student

f. Other _____

18. What is your race or ethnicity?

a. African American/Black

b. American Indian/Alaska Native

c. Asian

d. Hispanic

e. International

f. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander

g. White

h. Two or more races

i. _____

19. What is your gender? _____

20. What is your resident status?

a. U.S. resident

b. International student

21. Estimate your family's income level:

a. Lower class

b. Low-middle class

c. Middle class

d. Upper-middle class

e. Upper class

22. Estimate the racial composition of your high school:

a. Mostly White demographic

b. Mostly non-White demographic

c. Equal White/non-White demographic

23. Do you live on campus?

a. Yes

b. No

24. Are you employed?

a. Yes

b. No

25. If you are employed, what best describes your employment location?

a. Work on campus

b. Work off campus

c. Work both on and off campus

26. Which best represents your involvement with this organization?

a. One semester or less

b. 1 year

c. 2 years

d. 3 years

e. 4 years

f. More than 4 years

27. Do you know where to find data that describes the racial composition of University of Oklahoma students?

a. Yes

b. No

28. If yes, please provide source(s) and/or websites you would access to find data that describes the racial composition of University of Oklahoma students

_____

29. On a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse, how racially diverse do you consider the University of Oklahoma?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

30. What is your best estimate of the percentage of the overall University of Oklahoma student population that is **White**?

a. 0-10%

b. 11-20%

c. 21-30%

d. 31-40%

e. 41-50%

f. 51-60%

g. 61-70%

h. 71-80%

i. 81-90%

j. 91-100%

31. What is your best estimate of the percentage of the overall University of Oklahoma student population that is **non-White**?

a. 0-10%

b. 11-20%

c. 21-30%

d. 31-40%

e. 41-50%

f. 51-60%

g. 61-70%

h. 71-80%

i. 81-90%

j. 91-100%

32. To what extent has your experience at the University of Oklahoma contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds?

_____

_____

_____

Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree A Little Bit	Agree A Little Bit	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can best understand someone after I get to know he/she is both similar to and different from me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am only at ease with people of my own race.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I often listen to music of other countries.	1	2	3	4	5	5
Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is really hard for me to feel close to a person from another race.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.	1	2	3	4	5	6
In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and how he/she is similar to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6

I attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps me understand my own problems better.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I often feel irritated by a person of a different race.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D: Focus Group Questions

1. How long have you been involved with this organization?

2. On a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse, how racially diverse would you consider the University of Oklahoma? Why?

3. On a scale of one to ten, where one is the least diverse and ten is the most diverse, how racially diverse would you consider this organization? Does this categorization differ from your experience with other University of Oklahoma student organizations?

4. What are your individual or your organization's experiences with racial diversity on campus?

5. What is your best estimate of the percentage of the overall University of Oklahoma student population that is White? Non-White?

6. Why do you think the University of Oklahoma's racial demographics are stratified the way they are?

7. To what extent has your experience at the University of Oklahoma contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds?

8. Is becoming more open-minded important to the college experience? Why or why not?

9. Is interacting with people whose ethnic backgrounds are different than yours important to the college experience? Why or why not?

10. Is understanding social issues and/or social problems more fully important to the college experience? Why or why not?

It should be noted that conversation is expected to deviate from the above list of questions. The researcher will yield to focus group participants who prefer to guide conversation based on individual ideas and experiences.

Appendix E: Big 12 Institutional Growth Charts for Racial Demographics of Enrolled Students

Baylor University				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of Total Enrollment	Fall 2013 % of Total Enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	5.99	7.28	21.54	
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.59	0.36	--	38.98

Asian	--	8.61	--	--
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.83	--	--	--
Pacific Islander	--	0.03	--	--
Hispanic	7.46	13.13	--	--
Multiracial	--	4.50	--	--
Other	1.84	--	--	--
Not Specified	1.32	1.07		18.94
Total Minority Population	**27.7**	**33.9**	22.38	
White	75.17	65.04		13.48
Non-resident Alien	2.86	--	--	--

Note: In 2010, in order to fulfill new federal government reporting requirements on race and ethnicity, students were given the opportunity to select multiple race categories. In addition, Pacific Islander was designated as its own category (separate from Asian). The students were asked who questions. The first question asked the student "Are you Hispanic/Latino?" The second question allowed students to select among five race categories, with multiple responses allowed.

Iowa State University				
Racial category	Fall 2003 % of total enrollment	Fall 2013 % of total enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/ Black	2.64	2.49		5.68
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.28	0.20		28.57
*Asian	2.68	2.66		0.75

Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	--	0.09	--	--
Hispanic	1.89	4.05	114.29	
*Two or More Races	--	1.71	--	--
Total Minority Population	**7.49**	**11.19**	49.40	
White	83.37	77.52		7.02
International	9.03	11.52	149.39	

Note: International includes non-resident alien students regardless of race/ethnicity affiliation. Beginning in Fall 2009, ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" was split into two groups. "Two or more races" was added and the names of several ethnic groups were revised. International students not tabulated into total minority population.

Kansas State University				
Racial category	Fall 2003 % of total enrollment	Fall 2013 % of total enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	2.75	3.93	42.91	
Native American	0.48	0.42		12.5
Asian	--	1.48	--	--

Asian American	1.38	--	--	--
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	0.13	--	--
Mexican American	1.32	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.89	5.46	513.48	
Multiracial	0.84	2.64	214.29	
Not Specified	1.70	1.70	0	
Other	0.56	--	--	--
Total Minority Population	**9.92**	**15.77**	58.97	
White	85.10	75.66		11.09
International	4.98	8.57	72.08	

Note: Beginning in 2008, Kansas State University removed the term "Asian American" and instituted the term "Asian." During this time, it removed the "Other" category and added the following categories: "Hawaiian/Pacific Islander," "Not Specified," and "No Preference." Beginning in 2010, it removed the "Mexican American" and "No Preference" categories.

University of Kansas				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of total enrollment	Fall 2013 % of total enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	3.02	3.83	26.67	
Native American	1.21	--	--	--
American Indian/Alaska Native		0.64	--	--
Asian	3.53	3.77	8.57	

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	0.09	--	--
Hispanic	3.11	5.55	77.42	
Two or more races	--	3.72	--	--
Unknown	2.24	1.30		40.91
Total Minority Population	**13.11**	**18.90**	44.16	
White	80.98	71.93		11.23
Non-Resident Alien	5.91	9.19	55.93	

Note: Beginning Fall 2010, Federal Reporting Guidelines required institutions to collect race/ethnicity information in a two question format. Students who answered the first question (Are you Hispanic?) in the affirmative are included in the Hispanic counts but may have reported other race/ethnicities for the second question. Students answering no to the first question were allowed to select one or more race/ ethnicity categories in the second question. A new category, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, was included in the second question section.

Oklahoma State University				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of Total Enrollment	Fall 2013 % of Total Enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	3.30	4.46	35.15	
Native American	7.80	5.37		31.15
Asian	1.57	1.63	3.82	
Pacific Islander	--	0.03	--	--

Hispanic	1.88	4.44	136.17	
Multiracial	--	6.31	--	--
Unknown	--	0.81	--	--
Total Minority Population	**14.55**	**23.05**	59.63	
White	75.96	69.45		8.57
International	9.48	7.48		21.10

Note: This table includes professional students and OSU-Tulsa students for all years listed. Student Profile books prior to Fall 2003 do not contain OSU-Tulsa students on this page. Beginning in 2011, the following racial categories were added: "Pacific Islander," "Multiracial," and "Unknown."

Texas Christian University				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of total enrollment	Fall 2013 % of total enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	5.50	4.94		10
American Indian	0.50	0.93	86.00	
Asian	1.98	2.31	16.67	

Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	--	0.25	--	--
Hispanic	6.11	10.15	66.12	
Multi-Ethnic	--	0.83	--	--
Unknown	4.50	2.81		37.66
Total Minority Population	**18.59**	**22.22**	19.53	
White	76.70	72.68		5.24
Nonresident	4.75	5.12	7.79	

Note: The U.S. Department of Education added the reporting category of Multi-Ethnic as mandatory starting Fall 2010. Fall 2009 figures have been restated to include study abroad students and Intensive English students taking credible hours from TCU. The Hawaiian Pacific Islander students for Fall 2009 were included under the category of Asian/Pacific Islander in the 2009 Factbook.

University of Texas				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of Total Enrollment	Fall 2013 % of Total Enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	3.37	--	--	--
Black only	--	3.96	--	--

Black (2 or more races, excluding Hispanic)	--	0.53	--	--
American Indian	0.36	0.21		41.67
Asian American	14.15	--	--	--
Asian	--	15.38	--	
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	0.09	--	--
Hispanic	12.73	19.06	49.73	
Two or more (excluding Hispanic/Black)	--	2.24	--	--
Unknown	1.04	0.90		13.46
Total Minority Population	**31.65**	**42.37**	33.87	
White	59.32	48.44		18.34
Foreign	9.03	9.19	1.77	

Note: Foreign student figures include foreign exchange students. Beginning in 2010, the University of Texas instituted the following categories: "Black (two or more races, excluding Hispanic)," "Black only," "Hawaiian/Pacific Islander," and "Two or More Races." During this time, it removed "Asian American" and instituted "Asian."

Texas Tech University				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of Total Enrollment	Fall 2013 % of Total Enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	2.99	5.53	84.95	
African American Multiracial	--	0.65	--	

American Indian/Alaska Native	.55	0.33		40
Asian	2.07	2.61	26.09	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	0.09	--	--
Hispanic	10.31	19.04	84.66	
Unknown/Unspecified	1.30	0.68		-47.69
Multiple	--	2.01	--	--
Total Minority Population	**17.22**	**30.94**	79.67	
White	78.71	62.16		21.03
Non-Resident Alien	4.07	6.92	70.02	

Note: Beginning in 2009, Texas Tech University instituted the following racial categories: "Multiple" and "Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander."

West Virginia University				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of total enrollment	Fall 2013 % of total enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	3.55	4.09	15.21	
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.35	0.18		48.57

Asian or Pacific Islander	1.80	--	--	--
Asian	--	1.79	--	--
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	--	0.09	--	--
Two or More	--	2.75	--	--
Hispanic	1.28	3.16	114.84	
Unknown	--	0.48	--	--
Total Minority Population	**6.98**	**12.54**	79.66	
White	87.24	81.30		6.81
International	5.78	6.18	6.92	

Note: During 2004, the University of West Virginia instituted the "Unknown" racial category. During 2009, the university instituted the following categories: "Asian," "Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander," and "Two or More Races."

University of Oklahoma				
Racial Category	Fall 2003 % of Total Enrollment	Fall 2013 % of Total Enrollment	% Increase	% Decrease
African American/Black	5.47	4.74		-13.35
American Indian/Alaska	6.93	4.03		41.85

Native				
Asian	4.75	5.22	9.89	
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	--	0.15	--	--
Two or More	--	5.88	--	--
Hispanic	3.53	7.99	126.35	
Not Reported	--	4.38		
Total Minority Population	**20.68**	**32.39**	56.62	
White	72.08	60.31		16.18
International	7.24	7.31	.97	

Note: As of 2010, the University of Oklahoma instituted the following racial categories: "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander," "Two or More Races," and "Not Reported."