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This study examines whether college students’ participation in diversity-related experiences instills motivation to take actions for a diverse democracy. Results suggest that interactions with diverse peers, participation in diversity-related courses, and activities inside and outside residence halls inspire students to challenge their own prejudices and promote inclusion and social justice.

As our society becomes increasingly diverse, preparing college students to become active participants and leaders in a pluralistic society becomes both more urgent and, potentially, more complex. Banks (2002) reflected on this challenge when he argued that the role of education in the 21st century is to prepare students “to know, to care, and to act in ways that will develop and foster a democratic and just society” and to “develop a commitment to personal, social, and civic action, as well as the knowledge and skills needed to participate in effective civic action” (p. 32). In response to similar challenges from scholars, marginalized social groups, and civic leaders, many higher education institutions have developed diversity-related initiatives designed to prepare college graduates to become engaged citizens of a diverse democracy (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998; Smith & Associates, 1997).

Studies focusing on the impact of diversity initiatives (e.g., diversity courses, racial awareness workshops, intergroup dialogues) on student outcomes suggest that participation in such programs is linked with positive socio-cognitive development and commitment to civic and racial engagement (Astin, 1993; 1995; Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado, Engberg, & Ponjuan, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). However, little is known about how student participation in diversity-related activities influences students’ motivation to take self-directed actions to reduce their own prejudicial thoughts and behaviors, or to take outward actions that promote inclusion and social justice (Hurtado, Nelson-Laird, Landreman, Engberg, & Fernandez, 2002; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004). Since many diversity initiatives were developed to teach about “tolerance, inclusion and structural inequities in society” (Smith & Associates, 1997, p. 11) as well as to support cognitive growth, identifying the action outcomes of student engagement with diversity is critical to our understanding of the potential and promise of curricular and co-curricular diversity-related activities.

Although a growing number of studies have shown that college influences the development of outcomes that support and
enable students to be engaged citizens in a
diverse democracy, few studies have isolated
which aspects of the college experience have
these effects (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado et al.,
2003). The purpose of this study is to examine
the influence of students’ participation in
cross-group interactions and curricular and co-
curricular activities on their motivation to take
actions to reduce their own prejudices, as well
as to promote inclusion and social justice.
Interrupting one’s own prejudicial thoughts
about or likely discriminatory behavior against
stigmatized groups (e.g., refusing to participate
in jokes that are derogatory to any social
group) and taking outward actions that
challenge exclusionary practices and social
injustice (e.g., getting together with others to
challenge discrimination) are necessary for the
actualization of the promise of democracy in
a socially diverse society (West, 1999).

Diversity and Student Outcomes
The positive influence of students’ intellectual
and experiential involvement with diversity has
been supported by a growing body of research
in higher education (Astin, 1993; 1995;
Chang, 1999; Hurtado et al., 1998; Pascarella,
Edison, Nora, Hagedorn & Terenzini, 1996;
Terenzini, Pascarella & Blimling, 1996). More
recently, the work of Gurin (1999) and Gurin
et al. (2002) has provided substantial evidence
of the benefits of diversity in enhancing
students’ intellectual and social experiences in
college. Using multi-institutional, institution-
specific, and program-specific data, Gurin and
Gurin et al. established that student engage-
ment with diversity promoted two categories
of student outcomes: learning outcomes,
which include active and more complex ways
of thinking, intellectual engagement and
motivation, and a range of academic skills; and
democratic outcomes, which include per-
spective taking, acceptance of difference and
conflict as normal aspects of social life, and
commitment to civic and racial/cultural
engagement. While learning outcomes are
central to the academic mission of higher
education, this paper is concerned with
attitudes and behaviors associated with
democratic outcomes. Democratic outcomes
are the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that
prepare college students for meaningful
participation in a pluralistic and diverse
democracy (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado,
2003). For instance, citizenship engagement
refers to students’ motivation to participate in
activities that have a social or political impact
(e.g., community service, political partici-
pation, community organizing) and a dis-
position to consider other people’s point of
view. Racial/cultural engagement refers to
students’ awareness and knowledge about
diversity issues and motivation to participate
in activities that promote racial understanding.
While several researchers have examined the
benefits of diversity on preparing citizens for
active participation in our increasingly diverse
society (Astin, 1993; Guarasci & Crownwell,
1997; Orfield & Whitla, 2001), Gurin (1999)
and Gurin et al. (2002) were the first to clearly
theorize and establish a link between diversity
and democratic outcomes.

Students’ Experiences with Diversity
and Democratic Outcomes
Building on the work of Gurin (1999), Milem
and Hakuta (as cited in Milem & Umbach,
2003) have identified three types of campus
diversity that may impact student outcomes:
structural diversity, which encompasses the
racial/ethnic composition of the student body;
diverse interactions, which refers to oppor-
tunities for meaningful formal and informal
cross-group interaction inside and outside the
classroom; and diversity-related initiatives,
such as diversity courses, cultural and social
awareness workshops, and intergroup dialogues. These researchers also have argued that the positive effects of these different types of campus diversity are cumulative and complementary. For example, diversity courses and diversity-related initiatives appear to benefit students who are exposed to them on predominantly White campuses, but their impact on students appears to be stronger on campuses that have greater racial diversity (Chang, 1999, 2001). While the question of the educational benefits of a more diverse student body along differences of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic class, religion, national origin, and the like, needs further study, the focus of this review is on the impact of diverse peer interactions and curricular and co-curricular diversity-related activities on democratic student outcomes.

The educational benefits of diverse interactions with peers on the college campus have received considerable attention in recent years. Drawing from the literature on the positive effects of intergroup contact (e.g., Allport, 1979; Pettigrew, 1998), several studies have examined the positive impact of interaction with diverse peers on students’ openness to diversity and challenging their own beliefs and experiences (Pascarella et al., 1996; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini & Nora, 2001); promoting racial understanding (Astin, 1993; Milem, 1994); leadership development and cultural knowledge (Antonio, 2001); acceptance of people of different races/cultures, cultural awareness, tolerance of people with different beliefs, and leadership abilities (Hurtado, 2001); and multicultural competencies (Hu & Kuh, 2003). More recently, two multi-institutional longitudinal studies have established that students’ interaction with diverse peers have a positive effect on outcomes such as citizenship engagement and racial engagement (Gurin et al., 2002), and social actions engagement (Hurtado et al., 2003). While civic engagement captures student participation in community service or political organizing and racial engagement reflects the motivation to promote racial understanding, social action engagement captures the importance students assign to speaking against social injustice, volunteering with community groups or agencies, promoting racial tolerance and respect, and working to end poverty (among other things). It is important to note that in one of these studies, interaction with diverse peers had a more consistent effect for citizenship engagement and racial engagement for all racial/ethnic groups (including Whites) than enrollment in diversity courses (Gurin et al., 2002). Taken together, these two studies suggest that interaction with diverse peers, whether it takes place inside or outside the classroom, tends to have a more consistent effect on various democratic outcomes than formal curricular or co-curricular activities.

Although a decade ago there was little evidence available to demonstrate the value and impact of curricular and co-curricular diversity initiatives on college campuses (Smith & Associates, 1997), today we can draw from a growing body of scholarship on the educational benefits of diversity-related activities. While a number of researchers have examined the impact of various diversity-related activities on attitudes, knowledge, and skills that prepare college students for meaningful participation in a pluralistic and diverse democracy (Antonio, 2001; Astin, 1993; Lopez, 1993; Pascarella et al., 1996), there is now an emerging body of work that focuses on the specific effects of curricular activities and co-curricular activities on democratic outcomes. For instance, participation in curricular activities that pay particular attention to issues of cultural and social diversity has been shown to have positive effects on a number of...
outcomes. These include increased compatibility of differences, the belief that conflict is normal and that differences are not necessarily irreconcilable in a democracy (Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Peng, Lopez, & Nagda, 1999), reduction of racial bias (Chang, 2002; Marin, 2000), and importance assigned to social action engagement, such as speaking against injustice, working toward ending poverty, or promoting racial tolerance and respect (Hurtado et al., 2003). Some studies have been able to establish that intergroup dialogue courses foster the development of the attitudes and skills needed for communication and working with disagreements (Zúñiga, Vasques-Scalera, Sevig, & Nagda, 1997) and that curricular activities that incorporate intergroup dialogue methods encourage democratic citizenship in college (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004). Other studies have linked participation in community service learning courses with increased cultural and racial sensitivity and enhanced communication and interpersonal skills in relation to difference (Rice & Brown, 1998).

Several studies also have demonstrated the influence of co-curricular activities on democratic outcomes. For instance, a number of studies relying on national databases have reported the positive effects of diversity workshops or events on promoting racial engagement (Gurin et al., 2002; Milem, 1994) and openness to diversity (Pascarella et al., 1996; Whitt et al., 2001). Astin and Sax (1998) found that participation in community service activities in the general campus environment positively impacts students’ racial understanding and the ability to relate to people of different races/ethnicities or cultures. In a more recent study conducted at 10 public higher education institutions, Hurtado et al. (2003) found that participation in co-curricular diversity-related events and community service activities had a positive effect on social action engagement whereas participation in intensive dialogue activities had a positive effect on compatibility of difference. Still other studies have noted the positive influence of living-learning communities in residence halls on students’ openness to diversity (Pike, 2002) and of special interest residential programs on students’ level of engagement with diversity issues (Gilbert, 2004).

Much of the research discussed is extremely valuable in helping us understand the impact of various dimensions of campus diversity on a wide range of democratic outcomes. However, these findings tend to highlight the influence of diverse interactions and curricular and co-curricular activities on knowledge and attitudes rather than their influence on actual behaviors or actions that students are willing to take to promote a more inclusive and socially just society. This distinction is important because only a few studies have focused on how students’ involvement with various dimensions of campus diversity influences behaviors that actively support the goals of social justice (Hurtado, Nelson-Laird et al., 2002). One study showed that White students and students of color who valued the dialogic learning process in seven-week intergroup dialogues were more motivated to take actions to bridge differences between social groups at the end of the course (Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003). Another classroom study found that taking an introductory course in social work that focused on cultural and social diversity had a significant effect on students’ assessment of the importance of engaging in self-directed actions toward prejudice reduction at the personal level and diversity and social justice at the social level, and increased their confidence in doing so (Nagda et al., 2004). The findings of these two
classroom studies echo the findings of a different type of study undertaken two years after the participants had graduated from college. Vasques-Scalera (1999), in a qualitative study of student facilitators of a diversity program, reported that facilitators’ involvement increased multicultural awareness, affected post-baccalaureate career choices, and resulted in increased efforts to address issues of prejudice and oppression in their spheres of influence (work, neighborhood, political organizations).

Taken together, this growing and compelling body of literature provides ample support for the positive effects of various types of campus diversity—cross-group interaction, and curricular and co-curricular programming—inside and outside the residence halls. The study described in this paper adds to the existing knowledge by examining the extent to which student interaction with diverse peers and participation in diversity-related curricular and co-curricular activities motivates them to take self-directed actions to challenge their own prejudices and take outward actions that promote inclusion and social justice.

CURRENT STUDY

Building on the argument that students are more likely to think actively and make informed decisions about their values and commitments if the college years include “a confrontation with diversity and complexity” (Gurin et al., 2002, p. 334), the current study posits that involvement in campus diversity—diverse interactions, curricular diversity, co-curricular diversity-related programs—may motivate students to become more engaged in actualizing inclusive and non-discriminatory behaviors at the personal and social level. This study adds to a small but growing number of research efforts that examine the relationship between student engagement with diversity and action-oriented democratic outcomes. These outcomes integrate Gurin et al.’s (2002) concern for active and complex thinking and a socially-just democratic action orientation. Interrupting or questioning one’s prejudicial thoughts or behaviors requires actively noticing and reflecting upon one’s attitudes, expectations of or behaviors toward members of another social identity group or toward the group as a whole (Dovidio et al., 2004). Taking outward actions that challenge others’ prejudicial biases or taking actions that promote inclusion and more equal relationships between social identity groups supports the goals of a diverse democracy (Nagda et al., 2004). More specifically, in this study we seek to increase understanding of whether and how students’ involvement in diversity-related activities motivates them to actively work to reduce their own prejudices and take outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice.

The review of the literature illustrates the importance and complexity of documenting the effects of diversity on democratic outcomes for college students. By examining the influence of specific co-curricular activities in residence halls, this study makes a new contribution to the literature on college impact. This research project builds upon existing knowledge by considering how background characteristics, participation in diverse interactions, and curricular and co-curricular activities combine to influence students’ levels of action-oriented democratic outcomes.

The conceptual framework used to situate this study and guide the analysis is depicted in Figure 1 and draws from Milem and Hakuta (as cited in Milem & Umbach, 2003) and existing models of college impact. Most generally, the conceptual framework is built on the well-established Input-Environment-
Output (I-E-O) model used by Astin (1993) in his national studies of the impact of college on students. As such, the action-oriented outcomes in this study are hypothesized to be influenced by the background characteristics of students upon commencing the fall semester, and year in school (inputs), and relevant aspects of the college experience (environment). Given the generic nature of Astin's I-E-O model, the works of Hurtado, Engberg, Ponjuan, and Landreman (2002) and Malaney and Berger (in press) informed our choice of specific variables to include as measures of student inputs and campus environment.

Gender, race, socio-economic status, and year in college have been included as individual characteristics that are likely to affect students’ motivation to actively reduce their own prejudices and take actions to promote diversity and social justice. A measure of high school racial/ethnic composition was also included as an input variable to control for the impact of pre-college experiences with diversity on democratic outcomes. Additionally, Fall measures of students’ motivation to take these two types of action have been included as inputs to control for existing differences among students prior to their engagement with the campus environment during the school year. Campus diversity is conceptualized as consisting of diverse interactions, curricular activities, and co-curricular activities. The measure of diverse interactions captures different types of cross-group inter-

FIGURE 1. Conceptual Framework for the Effects of Student Participation in Diversity-Related Experiences on Action-Oriented Democratic Outcomes
action across racial/ethnic, sexual orientation, and religious differences. The measure of curricular activities reflects the number of college diversity courses taken. The measures of co-curricular diversity engagement capture activities that take place in the broad campus environment (such as participation in cultural/ethnic activities) and in the residence halls (such as attendance at residence hall socials, social awareness events, and cultural/arts activities). Participation in general activities (such as sports, clubs, jobs, etc.) and residence hall socials are included in the model to control for general level of co-curricular involvement. This model features two action-oriented outcomes: (a) motivation for reducing one’s own prejudices, and (b) motivation for promoting inclusion and social justice.

**Method**

We analyzed survey data collected from undergraduate students to evaluate a diversity initiative (Project Mosaik) implemented in three residence halls at a large, predominantly White, public university in the northeastern United States. A total of 597 students completed both a Fall 2000 and a Spring 2001 survey, accounting for 57.8% of the 1,033
residence hall occupants that comprised the study’s target population. Table 1 compares self-reported demographic characteristics of the survey respondents to the demographic characteristics of the target population (as reflected by data from the university’s student database). The comparison shows that survey respondents mirror the target population with regard to gender and closely correspond with regard to class year (i.e., first-year students are slightly over-represented whereas juniors and seniors are slightly under-represented). However, with regard to race/ethnicity, Whites are over-represented among respondents, whereas Blacks and Latinos are under-represented.

The instrument was a four-page scannable questionnaire designed in-house and consisting of approximately 130 items. The questionnaire employed a number of items used in, or adapted from, previous studies (Astin, 1993; Davis, 1983; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2004; Hurtado, Engberg et al., 2002; Nagda et al., 2004; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003; Zúñiga, Nagda, Sevig, Thompson, & Dey, 1995) as well as items developed specifically for this study to measure several dimensions of students’ experiences on campus. Measures used in the Fall survey were repeated in the Spring administration, with the following two exceptions: (a) demographic questions were included only in the Fall survey, and (b) questions about students’ participation in co-curricular activities and questions about their enrollment in diversity courses were included only in the Spring survey.

The data were analyzed using blocked hierarchical regression and the conceptual framework described earlier and depicted in Figure 1. Table 2 details the specific items that comprise both of the dependent variable measures, which were composites constructed using exploratory factor analysis (as was the independent variable cross-group interaction).

Our Input variables consist of student demographics characteristics (Block I), college characteristics (Block II), and Fall scores on the dependent variable measures (Block III), to control for existing levels of motivation to take the two types of self-directed and outward directed actions (see Table 2). However, the independent variables of primary interest in this study are measures of student involvement with diversity-related activities on the campus environment (Block IV). As described previously, we conceptualized students’ experiences in the campus environment into three categories: (a) involvement in diverse interactions, (b) involvement in diversity-related curricular activities, (c) involvement in diversity-related co-curricular activities, and (d) general co-curricular activities (see Table 3). All but two measures of student involvement in campus activities are self-reported measures. We used Project Mosaik attendance records to measure the impact of student involvement in project-specific diversity awareness and cultural/arts events implemented in each of the three residence halls.

The two dependent variables are measures of the action-oriented outcomes discussed previously (Output). These outcomes are: (a) motivation to take self-directed actions to reduce one’s own prejudices (OWNPREJ), and (b) motivation to take outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice (PROMOTE). Table 3 details the specific items comprising each of these two composite measures, as well as corresponding alpha reliability coefficients.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

First, bivariate correlations were run for all independent variables in order to carefully examine interrelationships. (A correlation
Moderate-to-strong correlations exist between the Fall and Spring action-oriented measures (as expected) and weak-to-moderate correlations exist between many other pairs of independent variables.

With regard to entry demographics characteristics, positive correlations exist between gender and both of the Fall action-oriented variables, meaning that upon entry to the university, female students exhibited a greater motivation to reduce their own prejudices and motivation to promote inclusion and social justice than did males. Race/ethnicity is negatively correlated with two other background variables: economic class...

---

**TABLE 2.**

*Descriptions of Dependent Variables and Corresponding Fall Pretests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Name of Measure</th>
<th>Composition of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Reduce One’s Own Prejudices (OWNPREJ). (Adapted from Nagda, Kim, &amp; Truelove, 2004)</td>
<td>Composite measuring the student’s perceived likelihood that she/he will take each of 4 different self-directed actions to reduce own prejudices: refuse to participate in jokes that are derogatory to any group, make efforts to educate themselves about other groups, recognize and challenge biases that affect their own thinking, avoid using language that reinforces negative stereotypes (1 = Very Unlikely, 2 = Somewhat Unlikely, 3 = Somewhat Likely, 4 = Very Likely). Alpha reliability estimate is .82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Promote Inclusion and Social Justice (PROMOTE) (Adapted from Nagda, Kim, &amp; Truelove, 2004)</td>
<td>Composite measuring the student’s perceived likelihood that she/he will take each of 7 different outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice: challenge others on racially/sexually derogatory comments, join an organization that promotes cultural diversity, organize an educational program to inform others about social issues, challenge others who make jokes that are derogatory to any group, call or write to protest when a newspaper or T.V. show perpetuates or reinforces a bias or prejudice, make efforts to get to know individuals from diverse backgrounds, get together with others to challenge discrimination (1 = Very Unlikely, 2 = Somewhat Unlikely, 3 = Somewhat Likely, 4 = Very Likely). Alpha reliability estimate is .87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Measure (pretest) for Motivation to Reduce One’s Own Prejudices (FOWNPREJ)</td>
<td>Same as above. Alpha reliability estimate = .78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Measure (pretest) for Motivation to Promote Inclusion and Social Justice (FPROMOTE)</td>
<td>Same as above. Alpha reliability estimate = .84.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.
Descriptions of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Name of Measure</th>
<th>Composition of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block I – Demographics Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (FEMALE)</td>
<td>Self-reported sex used as a proxy for gender (Female = 1, Male = 0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (POC)</td>
<td>Dummy variable based on self-reported racial/ethnic background (Person of Color = 1, White = 0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Class (ECONCLASS)</td>
<td>Self-reported (1 = Lower class, 2 = Lower middle class, 3 = Middle class, 4 = Upper middle class, 5 = Upper class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Composition of High School Attended (HSRACE) (Adapted from Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, &amp; Gurin, 2004)</td>
<td>Self-reported (1 = All or nearly all non-White, 2 = Mostly non-White, 3 = Half White and Half non-White, 4 = Mostly White, 5 = All or nearly all White).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block II– College Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College (ACADCLASS)</td>
<td>Self-reported class year (1 = First-year student, 2 = Sophomore, 3 = Junior, 4 = Senior).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block III– Fall “Take Action” Measure (Pretest)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest for Motivation to Reduce One’s Own Prejudices (FOWNPREJ)</td>
<td>See description for dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest for Motivation to Promote Inclusion and Social Justice (FPROMOTE)</td>
<td>See description for dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block IV– Campus Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Interactions</td>
<td>Composite of the following 7 items measuring how often student has interacted with members of different social groups: socialized with someone of a different race/ethnicity, socialized with someone of a different sexual orientation, socialized with someone of a different religion, studied with other students, dined with someone of a different racial/ethnic group, studied with someone from a different racial/ethnic group, participated in ethnic or cross-cultural activities or organizations (1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often). Alpha reliability estimate is .76.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and racial/ethnic composition of high school attended. This means that students of color tended to be of a lower economic class than White students and were more likely than White students to have attended a high school on or near the “non-White” end of the student body spectrum (see Table 3). Positive correlations also exist between the race/ethnicity variable and the Fall action-oriented outcome variables, meaning that upon entry, students of color exhibited a greater motivation to reduce their own prejudices and to promote inclusion and social justice than White students.

In terms of Fall pretests for the “taking action” measures, it is important to note that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Name of Measure</th>
<th>Composition of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity-Related Curricular Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Courses (DIVCOURS)</td>
<td>Self-reported number of courses taken during semester with diversity as a major focus (1 = 0, 2 = 1-2, 3 = 3-4, 4 = 5-6, 5 = 7 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity-Related Co-Curricular Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Ethnic/Cultural Activities (PARCCULT)</td>
<td>Self-reported hours per week spent in past year participating in ethnic or cultural activities (1 = 0, 2 = 1-2, 3 = 3-5, 4 = 6-10, 5 = 11 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Residence Hall Social Awareness Programs (PARHAWAR)</td>
<td>Single item measuring number of times student attended social awareness programs in their residence hall during academic year (1 = 0 times, 2 = 1 time, 3 = 2-3 times, 4 = 4-6 times, 5 = 7 or more times).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Residence Hall Project Specific Diversity Awareness Events (MOSDA)</td>
<td>Number of Project Mosaic Diversity Awareness events attended. Based on Project attendance records (range = 0 to 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Residence Hall Project Specific Cultural/Arts Events (MOSCA)</td>
<td>Number of Project Mosaic Cultural/Arts Events attended. Based on Project attendance records (range = 0 to 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Co-Curricular Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in General Activities (ACTIVITY)</td>
<td>Composite of 10 items asking how many hours per week in the past year students spent participating in each of the following activities: recreation/sports/exercise, working for pay, academic clubs, arts/media, religious/spiritual involvement, socializing with friends, governmental/political involvement, student-run business, volunteer work, other organized activities (1 = 0, 2 = 1-2, 3 = 3-5, 4 = 6-10, 5 = 11 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Residence Hall Socials (PARHSOC)</td>
<td>Single item measuring number of times students attended socials in their residence hall during academic year (1 = 0 times, 2 = 1 time, 3 = 2-3 times, 4 = 4-6 times, 5 = 7 or more times).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
motivation to promote inclusion and social justice (upon commencing the Fall semester) is positively correlated with cross-group interaction, diversity courses, participation in general activities, participation in ethnic/cultural activities, and participation in residence hall socials, residence hall social awareness events, and residence hall project-specific diversity awareness events. These same correlations hold for motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices with the exception of residence hall socials and residence hall social awareness activities.

Correlations were also calculated among the variables that comprise the campus environment block (Block IV). Participation in general activities is positively correlated with participation in ethnic/cultural activities and cross-group interaction. Participation in ethnic/cultural activities is also positively correlated with cross-group interaction. Attendance at residence hall social awareness programs is positively correlated with attendance of residence hall socials, as well as Mosaik diversity awareness events. Positive correlations between residence hall social awareness events and cross-group interaction, participation in general activities, and participation in ethnic/cultural activities are also notable.

**Multivariate Analysis**

Two regression equations were estimated in which three input blocks (pre-college characteristics, college characteristics, and the pretest measure corresponding to the dependent variable) and one block of environmental measures were included as independent variables. Results of the regression models are displayed in Table 4. The equation predicting motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices accounted for nearly 40% of the explained variance. Not surprisingly, the pretest block had the strongest effect on the dependent variable ($B = .46, p < .001$) and accounted for a substantial proportion of the model’s explained variance. The block of entry characteristics was the second most influential, accounting for approximately 13% of the explained variance. Gender was the only entry characteristic with a statistically significant effect ($B = .17, p < .001$), indicating that female students scored higher than males on the scale measuring motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices. In other words, controlling for the other variables in the model, women exhibited a greater level of intention to engage in behaviors that challenge their own intergroup biases and behaviors. The campus environment block accounted for 5% of the explained variance, but three variables had significant positive effects on the dependent variable. Number of diversity courses taken ($B = .13, p < .001$) was the most influential of these variables, followed by extent of cross-group interaction ($B = .10, p < .01$) and time spent in ethnic/cultural activities ($B = .08, p < .05$). None of the other variables in the campus environment block had a significant effect on the dependent variable.

The equation predicting motivation to actively promote social justice explained 48% of the variance. As in the prior model, the pretest block (Block III) was the most influential, accounting for half of the total explained variance. The pretest was also the most influential individual variable in the model ($B = .43, p < .001$). The block of entry characteristics (Block I) was the second most influential block, accounting for 15% of the explained variance and only being female had a statistically significant effect ($B = .10, p < .01$) among the variables in this Block. Block IV, the campus environment variables, accounted for 9% of the explained variance, but four variables of interest had significant
TABLE 4.
Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation to Reduce One’s Own Prejudices (beta)</th>
<th>Motivation to Promote Inclusion &amp; Social Justice (beta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block I – Demographic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Person of Color</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Class</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Racial Composition</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for Block</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block II – College Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for Block (not sig.)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block III – Pretest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Measure of Dependent Variable</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for Block</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block IV – Campus Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Group Interaction</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Curricular Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Courses Taken</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Co-Curricular Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in Ethnic/Cultural Activities</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Social Awareness Activities (Times Attended)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Project-Specific Diversity Awareness Activities Attended</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Co-Curricular Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in General Campus Activities</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Socials (Times Attended)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for Block</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
positive effects. Cross-group interaction was the most influential of these variables \( (B = .12, p < .001) \), followed by diversity courses taken \( (B = .11, p < .001) \), attendance of residence hall social awareness activities \( (B = .09, p < .01) \), and attendance of project-specific diversity awareness activities \( (B = .10, p < .01) \).

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

It is not surprising that students with relatively high levels of motivation to actively reduce their own prejudice and promote inclusion and social justice in the Fall semester had high levels of these same measures in the Spring semester. The fact that the pretest for each dependent variable exerted the strongest influence in both equations confirms the predictive power of students’ pre-existing inclinations toward the action-oriented outcomes examined in this study. Nor is it surprising, as the correlations among independent variables indicate, that students with high levels of motivation toward actively reducing their own prejudices and promoting inclusion and social justice are more likely to be involved in the types of activities that would likely reinforce or strengthen such inclinations (e.g., enrolling in diversity courses, participating in ethnic/cultural activities, attendance in residence hall social awareness programs, etc.). Indeed, this pattern affirms existing literature on the impact of college on students, which consistently suggests that student preferences and orientations tend to be accentuated by, rather than influenced by, the college experience (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). As such, the findings from this study reinforce the importance of providing diversity-oriented opportunities in classrooms, in residence halls, and across campuses, to provide students who are already inclined to take social justice-oriented actions with experiences that support their further development.

Gender and the pretest scores accounted for more of the explained variance than did the campus diversity-related experiences variables of interest. This pattern is not surprising given that students’ orientations are usually well ingrained prior to entry in college (Hurtado, Enberg et al., 2002; Malaney & Berger, in press). The strong explanatory power of students’ background characteristics relative to their campus experiences may be attributable, in part, to the fact that many of the students in the sample were juniors and seniors whose “backgrounds” likely reflected prior impact by the university environment. In other words, it is possible that the pretest (Fall) scores of sophomores, juniors and seniors indirectly captured influences that the university environment may have exerted on them in the year (or years) prior to this study.

Controlling for other factors, women were likely to have higher scores than men on both action-oriented outcomes, which was true at the beginning of the year as well. Again, this is not surprising given that existing literature indicates that females are likely to score higher than males on outcomes associated with participation in a diverse democracy (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado et al., 2003). However, the correlations between gender and both action-oriented outcomes are roughly the same in both the Fall and Spring, indicating that although females tended to have higher levels of motivation to reduce their own prejudices or actively promote inclusion and social justice than males when the school year commenced, the gap did not appear to widen over the course of the two semesters. Moreover, only two environmental measures—number of diversity courses taken and cross-group interaction—were positively correlated with gender.

Several other campus environmental
measures were positively correlated with the dependent variables. Clearly there are interaction effects that influence the development of these outcomes. This suggests that further study should be given to the ways that cross-group interactions and participation in racial/ethnic cultural activities impact the development of both outcomes for males and females. Future studies should examine more closely the influence of participating in general campus activities and residence hall diversity awareness programs on motivation to engage in actions promoting inclusion and social justice for males and females.

The results of this study show that students of color in this sample are not likely to have higher levels of motivation than their White peers toward reducing their own prejudices or promoting inclusion and social justice. It is possible that this finding stems from our use of the umbrella concept “students of color,” which may render invisible real differences among specific racial/ethnic groups. While this pattern of findings may be surprising, previous research on the effects of diversity on democratic outcomes suggest that when separate analysis is conducted for racial groups (Whites, African American, Asian American and Latino students), students of color seem to respond differently to diversity experiences on campus and have different interaction patterns that affect different outcomes (Gurin et al., 2002). If at all possible, future studies should aim to avoid analyzing students of color as one monolithic group.

With regard to the impact of the campus environment on motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices and to promote inclusion and social justice, participation in diversity courses and level of cross group interaction were the strongest sources of influence on both motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices and taking outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice. This pattern of findings is not surprising since previous studies have been able to demonstrate the influence of these dimensions of campus diversity on cognitions and attitudes associated with democratic outcomes (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2003; Hurtado et al., 2003). Participation in co-curricular activities, such as ethnic/cultural activities and diversity-related residence hall activities, had a less clear pattern of effects on these two outcomes. For instance, participation in ethnic/cultural activities had a modest effect on motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices but not on motivation to take outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice. It is curious that participation in ethnic/cultural activities exerted an effect on one outcome but not the other. In general, it seems logical to assume that participation in ethnic/cultural activities is generally positively associated with democratic outcomes. However, the type and content of such activities may be more inwardly or more externally focused and may therefore influence one type of outcome more than another. It may also be that students need to reduce their own prejudices before taking outward actions. This is clearly an area in need of further study. Additionally, attendance of two types of residence hall-based programs did have positive effects on motivation to promote inclusion and social justice but not on motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices. The very nature of diversity-related programs in residence halls suggests that they should have this type of positive effect. However, it is surprising that residence hall activities appeared to have no significant effect on students’ motivation to actively reduce their own prejudices. Perhaps programming did not adequately address this issue. It is also possible that other aspects of the campus environment...
were simply stronger influences on this outcome. These findings clearly require further study.

Overall this pattern of findings makes sense, given that participation in curricular and co-curricular activities and exposure to diverse peers have been shown to have positive effects on students’ motivation “to change the world” for themselves and others (Astin, 1993; Hurtado, 2003; Hurtado et al., 2003). It is also likely that participation in multiple forms of educational activities (curricular and co-curricular) designed to promote inclusive and socially-just orientations would create additional opportunities for cross-group interaction, which would reinforce the benefits that accrue from each type of interaction and involvement. Moreover, the structure of engagement in formal curricular and co-curricular activities may facilitate the positive potential of cross-group interaction while mitigating the negative effects of biased or hostile cross-group interactions among students who are not developmentally ready or do not have the appropriate educational support for such engagement on their own. Structured activities can intentionally provide students with both content knowledge and practical tools for engaging in meaningful conversations about emotionally charged topics, and as a result motivate students to be more open to challenge their own and others’ biases and promote inclusion and social justice in their spheres of influence (Dovidio et al., 2004; Nagda et al., 2004; Tatum, 1997; Zúñiga & Chesler, 1993). Hence, these findings suggest that intentionally structured involvement and engagement with others both inside and outside the classroom is a key to fostering these types of outcomes. Taken together, our findings suggest that educators who want to foster student motivation to actively reduce their own prejudices and promote diversity and social justice in their communities should look for every opportunity to engage students in classes and co-curricular activities aimed at promoting these types of outcomes while also encouraging and supporting cross-group interaction. It also suggests that future studies should examine the quality and type of impact of co-curricular activities inside and outside the residence halls on the development of self-directed and outward-directed action-oriented democratic outcomes.

LIMITATIONS
This study has four limitations. First, because this is a single institution study the results may not be generalizable to other campuses. Second, this study did not control for campus-based sources of influence on participants who were students prior to the year in which the data were collected. Consequently, prior campus experiences may account for some of the differences, although this concern is mitigated by the inclusion of Fall measures of the dependent variables as controls. Third, this study included in its two regression models several non-continuous variables. This practice, although quite common among higher education researchers, is considered by some statisticians to violate “the mathematical logical system” on which parametric statistics, however robust, are based (Newton & Rudestam, 1999, p. 183). Finally, for pragmatic reasons (namely, too few cases in particular racial/ethnic groups), students of color were grouped together for the data analysis. We acknowledge that there may be important sub-group differences worthy of examination in subsequent studies.

CONCLUSION
This study extends the findings from previous research that indicate that interaction with
diverse peers has one of the strongest and most consistent effects on democratic outcomes (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado et al., 2003). In addition, it suggests that curricular activities have one of the strongest effects on motivating students to actively challenge their own prejudices and take outward actions to promote inclusion and social justice in their communities. Moreover, this study supports the idea that diversity-related curricular and co-curricular activities can work together to maximize the benefits of campus diversity by preparing graduates who will be more likely to take responsibility for issues of inclusion and social justice in society. The acquisition of these action-oriented democratic outcomes can be promoted in college as students are exposed to different histories, experiences, and perspectives; interact with diverse peers; and participate in a wide range of diversity-related activities inside and outside classroom.

Maximizing the educational benefits of diversity underscores the importance of developing intentional and purposeful diversity-related opportunities in multiple settings—curricular, co-curricular, and residential—across college and university campuses. Therefore, it is the responsibility of all educational agents on campus—administrators and staff as well as faculty members—to provide multiple and consistent opportunities for students to have diversity-related experiences. The strength of personal characteristics as predictors of the democratic outcomes examined in this study suggest that it is important to address issues of diversity, inclusion, and social justice with all of the different student populations on campus in order to provide all students with ongoing and consistent messages about the importance of democratic outcomes as core goals and values of a college education. Furthermore, this study supports the argument made by Dovidio et al. (2004) that educators who want to foster student motivation to take action toward reducing their own prejudices and promoting inclusion and social justice should give careful consideration to both “enlightenment” (content-based knowledge, such as history of various social groups in the US) and “encounter” (experiential opportunities, such as intergroup dialogue or collaborative learning in diverse groups) elements of diversity education in planning and facilitating curricular and co-curricular activities.

Today’s college graduates are likely to find themselves living and working in multicultural contexts in an increasingly diverse, socially stratified, and global society. As Banks (2002) argued, the challenges facing democracies in the 21st century require that educators foster the development of leaders and citizens who are motivated to act in ways that foster a democratic and just society. The findings from this study contribute in important ways to the evidence showing the value of diversity-related curricular and co-curricular activities (inside or outside the residence halls) in encouraging motivation to take actions that promote social justice.
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