9-2017

REACTIONS TO THE PRIVILEGE WALK: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Gloria Jean Magana
California State University - San Bernardino

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd

Part of the Sociology Commons

REACTIONS TO THE PRIVILEGE WALK:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology:

Clinical Counseling

_____

by

Gloria Jean Magana

September 2017

REACTIONS TO THE PRIVILEGE WALK:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Gloria Jean Magana

September 2017

Approved by:

Dr. Manijeh Badiee, Committee Chair, Psychology

Dr. David Chavez, Committee Member

Dr. Donna M. Garcia, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

Those who hold multiple disadvantaged identities (i.e., women of color) are subject to inequalities that are not experienced by those who harbor privileged identities. Those with multi-disadvantaged identities have additive disadvantages due to holding multiple subordinate identities and as a result face many barriers. It is critical to recognize these differences in society by raising awareness of privilege. Previous studies have targeted privilege awareness, but have inconsistent findings. However, methods that incorporated experiential learning have shown promising results; an intervention that integrates experiential learning to target privilege may be effective in raising privilege awareness. The Privilege Walk exercise is an experiential learning activity intended to elicit awareness of privilege; it was utilized in this study, integrating racism and microaggressions of gender, race, and ethnicity. However, there are few assessment tools to effectively measure Privilege Walk interventions. In this study, we aim to develop initial Privilege Walk items that we anticipate will improve the effectiveness of the Privilege Walk. The purpose of this study is to qualitatively explore college students' reactions to the Privilege Walk. This study will allow us to develop items in service of developing a measure that will be used as an assessment element of a larger study. Results revealed that the qualitative data captured participants' awareness and beliefs in response to the Privilege Walk that helped researchers develop potential Privilege Walk items. Future studies should incorporate balancing gender, race, and ethnicity, develop

items that are inclusive of intersectional identity experiences, and track

participants' movements during the activity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Sexism and racism are prevalent occurrences that persist across various institutions in the U.S. Women who were employed full-time made eighty cents for every one dollar that a male earned (Hegewisch & DuMonthier, 2016). Women in traditionally male dominated fields, such as science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) experience even more inequalities. Only 2.5 percent of Nobel Prize award winners in the STEM fields and 2.1 percent of Fields Medal winners have been women (STEM Women, 2016). Additionally, women in STEM regularly experienced remarks that suggest that their presence in these fields was due to other forces besides their intellect. Women were also reported to regularly experience being ignored by male counterparts (Camacho & Lord, 2011). Gender inequality has been prevalent in women's workplaces as well (Mueller, Mulinge, & Glass, 2002). It was found that women were given smaller workloads compared to men and less opportunities to excel in their work environments (e.g., promotional opportunities within the workplace). Women in the field of museum and art are also victims of disparities. According to Reilly (2015), only 14 percent of women were granted solo exhibitions in major art institutions (e.g., Los Angeles County Museum of Art) in 2014.

Women face barriers other than their career fields. Women are six times more likely to be victims of sexual violence compared to men (Snyder, 2000). Moreover, 90 percent of all adult rape victims reported to law enforcement were found to be women (Snyder, 2000).

<center>Women of Color</center>

Women of color in particular face numerous barriers. African American women experience feelings of powerlessness and disempowerment associated with their socioeconomic status (SES) that has been highly influenced by their gender and race. The lack of access to available resources as well as their experiences in regard to racism and sexism perpetuates their experiences of disempowerment (Thomas & González-Prendes, 2009). In 2010, it was reported that 30 percent of White women earned a college degree whereas only 21.4 percent of Black women and 14.9 percent of Latinas earned a college degree (Kerby, 2012). In terms of higher education, only 4 percent of Latinas completed a master's degree or higher by the age of 29 in 2013 (Gandara, 2015).

Ethnic differences in gender stereotypes may play a role in women's career paths. Implicit gender stereotypes are individual's associations of their personal characteristics with stereotypical traits of masculine or feminine roles (Kiefer & Sekaquaptewa, 2007). One example of these implicit gender stereotypes includes the STEM field; STEM fields have been typically

stereotyped as a masculine field (O'Brien, Blodorn, Adams, Garcia, & Hammer, 2015). African American women were found to have weaker implicit gender-STEM stereotypes and were more likely to major in STEM fields compared to European American women. This finding suggests that a) careers linked with masculinity may discourage women's participation within that field and b) race and ethnicity play a role. Additionally, women of color in academic fields encounter disparities. According to Singh and Robinson (1995) only 21.9 percent of African American women received tenure compared to 39 percent of their male equivalents.

Women of color have also been found to be overrepresented in disadvantageous positions, such as the low-wage workforce. African American and Latinas make up a substantial percentage of the low-wage workforce, 11.6 percent being African American and 15 percent being Latina (Entmacher, Frohlich, Robbins, Martin, & Watson, 2014). Women experience sexism in different domains of their life, such as academic, work, or social setting that may further hinder women's status in society and their performance.

Consequences of Sexism and Racism

Women's overall well-being may be compromised while experiencing sexism and racism. Lemonaki, Manstead, and Maio (2015) found that women who were exposed to hostile, or blatant sexism, had a decreased sense of

readiness to participate in social competition. This finding suggests that women who were exposed to sexism presented an inhibited readiness to be a part of a collective (e.g., women's group) and take action that competes with the opposing gender (e.g., males). Women who have had a more recent experience of sexism reported engaging in self-silencing behavior (i.e., curtailing their own needs to put others first) (Watson & Grotewiel, 2016). African American women may be more susceptible to developing psychological distress as a consequence of sexism and racism compared to other stressors in their lives (Stevens-Watkins, Perry, Pullen, Jewell, & Oser, 2014). African American women were encouraged to avoid and/or change their career aspirations if there was known discrimination in the field(s) and if African American women were expected to meet higher qualifications compared to White women (Evans & Herr, 1991). Women who face discrimination may attribute their experiences of discrimination to their own characteristics. According to Remedios, Chasteen, and Paek (2012), Asian women internalized racism more than sexism and become more susceptible to developing depressive symptomatology as a consequence of experiencing racism.

Types of Gender Discrimination

Gender discrimination is a prevalent occurrence that is encountered in most women's everyday lives. This discrimination emerges in various forms; for

example, women can be exposed to hostile sexism (Lemonaki et al., 2015), ambivalent sexism, or benevolent sexism. Fields, Swan, and Kloos (2010) found that 99 percent of participants reported encountering or knowing women who have encountered ambivalent sexism. Ambivalent sexism interrelates hostile sexism (i.e., blatant sexist remarks) and benevolent sexism where the perpetrator perceives women in restricted stereotypical roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Similarly, 96 percent of the participants reported experiencing hostile sexism in their lives (Fields et al., 2010).

Gender discrimination has been shifting in its expression from blatant sexism (e.g., direct comments, harassment, etc.) to more subtle sexism. One form of subtle sexism that is often experienced is referred to as microaggressions (Sue, 2010). Those who face recurrent microaggressions may also experience inequalities in other aspects of their lives. Given the prevalence and impact of various forms of discrimination in contemporary times, research is warranted to enhance prevention. Despite the prevalence of racism and sexism, many individuals still deny that they exist. The present study is part of a larger project to raise awareness of these forces within contemporary U.S. society. This portion of the project will be focused on open exploration of an activity designed to raise awareness of these forces.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Microaggressions

It has been suggested that contemporary discrimination has shifted from

overt forms (e.g., name calling) to more subtle forms (Dovidio, Gaertner,

Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002). This shift may have been due to a variety of

elements, such as politics and changes in laws regarding discrimination (Dovidio

et al., 2002; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2009). For example, blatant

discrimination may not have resulted in severe consequences in the 1970s

compared to now, which could have permitted more open discrimination in

previous eras. Although the political atmosphere surrounding discrimination has

changed to incorporate severe punishments in attempt to discourage

discriminatory practices, White individuals' views on racial policy, however, have

not shown notable changes in the last twenty years (Hutchings, 2009).

Additionally, research demonstrated that dominant group views influence

attitudes towards policies to enhance or maintain the dominant group's interests.

According to Lowery, Unzueta, Knowles, and Goff's (2006) study, racial identity

was associated with attitudes towards Affirmative Action. They found that White

individuals were opposed to Affirmative Action if it meant it would affect their

group (e.g., loss of privilege), irrespective of its impact on minority group

members. Discriminatory attitudes and behaviors, such as racism and sexism, have not disappeared; instead, they have manifested in subtle forms.

Microaggressions have generally been introduced as one form of subtle discrimination (Solorzano, 1998; Sue et al., 2007). Subtle discrimination signifies ambiguous situations that often go unnoticed and have low emotional intensity (Cortina et al., 2002; Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2016; Sue, 2010). Microaggressions have been defined as everyday indignities (i.e., intentional or unintentional) that convey negative messages to the targeted group(s) (Sue et al., 2007). Microaggressions often present themselves through a variety of channels: a) through the environment (e.g., cues from the educational, political, and social spheres that demean or threaten marginalized groups), b) verbal communication, and c) non-verbal behaviors. Microaggressions are typically dismissed or minimized by the perpetrator (Sue, 2010). However, experiencing microaggressions has been associated with detrimental mental health outcomes amongst its victims, such as depression (Nadal, Davidoff, Davis, Wong, Marshall, & McKenzie, 2015; Nadal, Griffin, Wong, Hamit, & Rasmus, 2014). Thus, it is critical to address microaggressions because of their link with mental health issues and identify their various forms to enhance understanding of how they may be damaging.

Sue (2010) theorized that microaggressions are commonly presented in three different forms: microinvalidations, microinsults, and microassaults.

Microinvalidation directly denies the experiences, feelings, and thoughts of the targeted group. Microinvalidations have been characterized as a difficult type of microaggression to detect because they are typically outside of the perpetrator's and victim's conscious awareness (Sue, 2010; Sue et al., 2007). An example of a microinvalidation may include a person being continuously asked where they were born based on their physical characteristics. Alternatively, microinsults are more subtle forms of microaggressions that often occur outside of the perpetrator's consciousness that demean or ridicule aspects of the targeted person's identity (Sue et al., 2007; Sue, 2010). One example of a microinsult may include a woman of color who is told that "you are pretty, for a dark-skinned girl." Conversely, microassaults are explicit negative messages towards the targeted group that are conscious and purposeful when committed (Sue et al., 2007). A conspicuous example of a microassault may be an adult who purposefully wears Ku Klux Klan related symbols. Microaggressions tend to be recognized by target groups more often than non-target groups.

Microaggressions have been shown to be especially salient to racial and ethnic minority groups. Alexander and Hermann (2015) found that African American women in STEM fields experienced frequent microaggressions, such as racial stereotyping, feelings of invisibility, and having their intelligence questioned. Additionally, in a college institution made up of primarily White students, Black males were perceived as threatening by others and reported

consistent negative experiences with on-campus police (e.g., unreasonable

suspicions) (McCabe, 2009).

Faculty members on college campuses are also susceptible to

microaggressions. Louis and colleagues (2016) found that faculty members

reported experiencing microaggressions almost daily, which resulted in feelings

of stress and isolation from the perpetrating faculty members. Although racial and

ethnic minority groups have been shown to be vulnerable to microaggressions,

gender can also be the focus of microaggressions.

Women are vulnerable to microaggressions, particularly women of color.

Latinas were found to more likely experience microaggressions compared to

Latinos; specifically, Latinas comparatively encountered more workplace and

school microaggressions (Nadal, Mazzula, Rivera, & Fujii-Doe, 2014). African

American women were found to experience microaggressions regarding their

natural hair, ethnic dress, or professional title on a close to daily basis (Pittman,

2012). These findings suggest that institutional racism and sexism may be most

prevalent for women of color. Women may also face microaggressions in their

professional fields of study, particularly those fields traditionally identified as

"male" in nature. Women of color who were in the engineering field frequently

experienced their male colleagues attributing their professional positions to

Affirmative Action (Camacho & Lord, 2011). They also received comments that

suggested they were not suitable engineers due to their gender. Although there

are other gender groups that may be susceptible to microaggressions, this study will primarily focus on women. Furthermore, victims' responses to microaggressions can be an adverse experience as well.

Response to Microaggressions

Victims of microaggressions may not be able to immediately respond when presented with a microaggression. This lack of response may be due to the ambiguity that microaggressions tend to leave their victims feeling (Sue, 2010). One example of ambiguity in relation to microaggressions may be that targets of racial microaggressions tend to question whether the incidents were racially motivated (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). Sue and colleagues (2008) also described how people who encounter microaggressions frequently displayed healthy paranoia, engaged in sanity checks (e.g., asking others about their perceptions of the situation), empowered and validated themselves (e.g., not attributing the microaggressions to their own faults), and engaged in rescuing the offender (e.g., putting the offenders' feelings before their own). Although victims engage in a variety of these healthy and non-healthy behaviors as listed above, victims of microaggressions are commonly left with subtle messages despite these behaviors that Sue (2010) described as "back-handed" statements. Responding to these messages may leave the victim in a "catch-22" (Sue, 2010).

Sue (2010) suggests that individuals who experience microaggressions may react in a variety of ways. Microaggressions often make victims think that they must respond immediately; as a result, they feel unable to respond. An alternative reaction may be that victims deny their reality of experiencing a microaggression and believe that the microaggression did not occur. In addition to these types of victim responses to microaggressions, they may also develop a sense of hopelessness. Victims may experience what Sue (2010) described as an impotency of action in which victims' previous experiences of responding to microaggressions were consequently negative and contribute to their current response. Similarly, victims may not want to expend their energy on conjuring up a response because responding may be perceived as ineffective. Many victims who were placed in these ambiguous circumstances (e.g., situations that involved microaggressions) expressed that even the decision to confront the situation placed them in an unfavorable position. One instance of this unfavorable position is when participants addressed microaggressions, the perpetrators attributed victims' reactions to being "overly sensitive" (Sue et al., 2007). Victims who did not respond and/or did not know how to react were often left with feelings of self-blame and inner turmoil (Sue et al., 2007). Lastly, victims may fear the consequences of addressing microaggressions due to the power differences that may be present when faced with a microaggression (i.e., groups

that particularly experience microaggressions typically have less power in a variety of circumstances) (Sue, 2010).

Microaggressions have been linked to target group members' emotional well-being. Black women who experienced microaggressions in the classroom often report feelings of isolation, alienation, or categorization as a "spokesperson" for their perceived affiliated minority group (McCabe, 2009). These microaggressions can leave individuals with emotional turmoil that impacts their mental health (McCabe, 2009). Moreover, Sue and colleagues (2007) found that Asian Americans who experienced microaggressions described feelings of belittlement, invalidation, and anger.

Victims of microaggressions may also experience psychological distress as a result of these experiences. According to Torres and Taknint (2015), Latino/a individuals experienced what they defined as "traumatic stress" in response to microaggressions. Traumatic stress was described by Torres and Taknint (2015) to be a negative response that includes emotional turmoil, avoidance, and hypervigilance in response to an immediate and involuntary occurrence. Their study suggested that microaggressions were correlated with traumatic stress symptomatology, which acted as a predicting variable that heightened depression. Additionally, lower degrees of ethnic-group affiliation and self-efficacy were contributing factors to traumatic stress symptoms. Furthermore, Torres, Driscoll, and Burrow (2010) found that African American

graduate students' experiences with racial microaggressions were linked with perceptions of life stressors and negative mental health outcomes.

Contrarily, Lilienfeld (2017) proposed a different view of microaggressions and its link to negative outcomes. First, Lilienfeld (2017) argued that the history of microaggressions' empirical foundations are questionable. Lilienfeld (2017) stated that although microaggressions may exist, the current research that allegedly supports their existence lacks clarity, coherence of construct, incremental validity of measures beyond overt prejudice measures, criterion-related validity of measures, and replication. Lilienfeld (2017) states that the term microaggression lacks a consistent definition that would allow appropriate scientific research. One example of this problem is the paucity of research on what behaviors fit the "criteria" of a microaggression. Thus, two people may experience the same event but only one may consider it a microaggression. Additionally, Lilienfeld (2017) proposed that microaggressions may be unable to be independently verified due to their subjectivity and minimal consideration of contexts. Lilienfeld (2017) also critiqued the lack of research on the link that has commonly been made between microaggressions and negative messages.

Lastly, Lilienfeld (2017) suggested that the "aggression" within the term microaggression is misleading because it implies intent, in contrast to previous researchers who have conceptualized microaggressions as unintentional acts. Moreover, the element of "micro" in the name microaggression suggests that

microaggressions are subtle and slight, but Lilienfeld (2017) highlights how microinsults and microassaults are both blended as microaggressions. This blend presents a problem of combining a more subtle form (i.e., microinsults) with a more blatant form (i.e., microassaults), which may mislead researchers by categorizing both under microaggressions. In light of the largely cohesive perspective presented by previous research conducted on microaggressions, these critiques represent a number of critical points that must be addressed by microaggression research. The exploration of microaggressions in the present preliminary study and its future phases can help address these critical issues.

Furthermore, microaggressions have been found to be primarily directed towards marginalized groups and have demonstrated detrimental effects on its victims in previous studies. Overall, microaggressions were included in this study in an attempt to capture contemporary experiences of participants who may have faced discrimination. We hope to raise awareness among targets and recipients of microaggressions to eventually develop a measure to test the effectiveness of the Privilege Walk. Exploring microaggressions qualitatively provides researchers with the opportunity to explore participants' reactions to the questions that incorporate microaggressions. Another important aspect of contemporary discrimination (i.e., microaggressions) is its relationship to individuals' inhibited awareness of privilege.

Privilege

Perpetrators of microaggressions tend to victimize marginalized groups and are often not members of the group being targeted (Sue, 2010). Johnson (2006) described how differences between marginalized and non-marginalized groups reflect social constructs that contribute to marginality. These social constructs create a cultural contextual reality that has rooted itself in the dominant culture's perception of "normal." Normality is organized as a social hierarchy, with those who fit the norm in a higher position than those who differ from it, thereby indicating privilege (Johnson, 2006). Privilege is conceptualized as individuals from particular groups being granted unearned advantages from society. These benefits vary depending on many factors, such as geographical location, race, ethnicity, gender identity, etc. (Atewologun & Sealy, 2014; McIntosh, 1988; Johnson, 2006). Through recognition of these different factors, privilege can be perceived through multiple lenses (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) that makes each experience of privilege different depending on the individual (Atewologun & Sealy, 2014). Thus, privilege is experienced through unique group identities that one may harbor (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender).

Privilege reflects various positions in the societal hierarchy (Johnson, 2008) and creates a division between groups who do not share the same benefits (Johnson, 2006; McIntosh, 1988). The majority who share common privileges become the dominant group whereas those who have lesser privilege

become the minority, non-dominant groups (Johnson, 2008). These different privileges shape one's position in that particular social sphere, positioning those who share the most privileges at the top (Black & Stone, 2005; Levine-Rasky, 2011). These inequalities are experienced by various minority groups including those that are defined by marginalized racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic status (SES).

Privilege manifests in a variety of forms; it may be experienced differently by individuals who are members of assorted privileged groups. McIntosh (1988) asserted that members of privileged groups may not recognize their privilege and instead believe their benefits to be natural. Lack of privilege awareness may leave those with lesser privileges in vulnerable positions while maintaining the powerful positions of more privileged groups. Thus, recognition of privilege is critical. Persistent lack of acknowledgment could ultimately stagnate the possibility of change (Johnson, 2006).

Intersectionality

The importance of confronting multiple forms of discrimination and privilege dates back to Audre Lorde's critique of feminism (1984). She asserted that it was not the differences in issues like race and sex that separated people; instead, the problem was refusal to acknowledge these differences, which results in misnaming and distortions. Her recognition that women's experiences are shaped not only by gender but also by factors such as race and age is now

referred to as intersectionality. Intersectionality when applied to privilege means that privilege is perceived through the intersections of one's identity (Atewologun & Sealy, 2014). By incorporating intersectionality in the topic of privilege, the complexity of identity and how it relates to privilege is illuminated (Black & Stone, 2005; Robinson, 1999; Wing, 2003). The integration of intersectionality and privilege also provides a pathway to challenge privilege (Atewologun & Sealy, 2012).

Intersectionality is conceptualized as a person's life being shaped by a multitude of identities that intersect with each other of which makes each identity that one harbors unique to the individual experiencing them. These different identities create a multilayered distinctiveness that may influence one's position of power in society (Wing, 2003). Women's identities are often negotiated to gain access to privileges that may not have been easily accessible without identity negotiation. Identity negotiation means holding multiple identities (e.g., ethnic, religious) that may clash or integrate themselves, but are flexible enough to be used to fit a "socially acceptable" circumstance (Zimmerman, 2015). For example, Zimmerman (2015) concluded that Muslim women's identities in the U.S. intersect at race, gender, and religion. These identities may often be negotiated as a strategy (e.g., wearing the hijab or not wearing the hijab) to integrate themselves into the dominant culture. Findings from Mirza's (2013) qualitative study of Muslim professional women revealed that one participant

created a fluid background (e.g., coming from different cities or countries depending on the circumstance) for herself when she felt it was needed. Another participant felt the need to negotiate language, skin color, and her head scarf in the professional world where those unique traits were symbols of difference between herself and her environment (e.g., not saying particular words due to having an accent outside the dominant culture's language) (Mirza, 2013).

Intersectionality is relevant for other ethnic and racial groups as well. Neblett, Bernard, and Banks (2016) found that the occurrence of racial discrimination was influenced by the interaction between gender and SES in African American women. African American women from high SES backgrounds reported higher levels of interpersonal sensitivity (e.g., feeling self-conscious or that others do not understand) during greater racial discrimination compared to African American women of lower SES. The authors suggested that this difference was possibly due to the additional pressures (e.g., familial expectations or greater awareness of racism and discrimination) they encounter when transitioning into adulthood (Neblett et al., 2016). Moreover, Patterson, Cameron, and Lalonde (1996) found that women of color were more aware than White women of how race shaped their gender associated identities and experiences. Patterson and colleagues (1996) proposed that the results may have occurred due to White women being less aware of their race compared to African American women. By not addressing intersectional identities, one limits

the experiences of women by undermining the interaction between their identities as well as marginalizing those who do not conform to traditional identity roles (e.g., gender) (Crenshaw, 1991; Patterson et al., 1996). These different instances demonstrate the various privileges that one may receive and how an individual's experience is drawn from their multilayered identity. Privileges may also be influenced by an accumulation of identities.

Double Jeopardy. According to Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach (2008) previous studies have addressed the topic of intersectionality through concepts such as double jeopardy. Double jeopardy is conceptualized as an individual holding more than one subordinate identity and experiencing disadvantages as a result of having these identities accumulated (Beale, 1979; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). In previous literature, double jeopardy is commonly conceptualized through the additive model. The additive model was presented by Epstein (1973). Epstein (1973) addressed Black women's discrimination by recognizing their experience of being both Black and female. Thus, several disadvantaged identities can increase discrimination whereas people with more privileged identities may lack awareness of discrimination.

Hayes, Chun-Kennedy, Edens, and Locke (2011) proposed that those who can be categorized under the concept of double jeopardy would experience more distress than those who hold separate identities. Their study demonstrated that the double jeopardy hypothesis was supported. Participants who identified

as lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB) and a person of color were found to experience additional distress by having these identities compared to heterosexual students of color (Hayes et al., 2011).

According to Chappell and Havens' (1980) study, the double jeopardy hypothesis was supported in a sample examining elderly participants with a mean age of seventy-five. Chappell and Havens (1980) found that elderly women experienced worse mental health functioning compared to elderly men. Additionally, Eaton and Rios (2017) demonstrated that queer Latino individuals face barriers in relation to their identity of being Latino and a member of the LGB community. Qualitative findings revealed that 68 percent of the queer Latino participants reported experiencing negative responses when they revealed their sexual identity. Specifically, one participant described feeling an obligation to maintain group (i.e., family) harmony due to having collectivistic values as a Latino. The feeling of obligation to maintain collectivistic values conflicted with the participant's desires to reveal his sexual identity and added an additional stressor to homophobia he encountered (Eaton & Rios, 2017).

In contrast to double jeopardy, other researchers have started investigating the intersectional interactive hypothesis (D. Garcia, personal communication, May 25, 2017). According to this perspective, different aspects of identity interact to shape one's experiences opposed to the additive model where one's experiences of discrimination are added together as a result of having

more than one disadvantaged identity. For example, because Black women may feel invisible due to how their race and gender interact, they may experience lack of attention from faculty members in a college setting in comparison to their peers who may not have their race and gender interact in the same way.

The Importance of Addressing Privilege

Previous studies exhibited significant differences in societal treatment between White individuals and racial/ethnic minorities in countless institutions (e.g. legal, professional, academic, etc.) (Bottiani, Bradshaw, & Mendelson, 2016; Devos & Banajai, 2005; Kim, 2015; Langellier, Chen, Vargas-Bustamante, Inkelas & Ortega, 2016; McCall, 2001). These differences in academic, economic, social, and healthcare stature may not be readily apparent to those who hold privilege under these circumstances, but they are easily recognized by those who have lesser privilege. Although privilege has been found to be a source of oppression for people in positions of less power, it is a controversial topic that has been interpreted by individuals in a myriad of ways.

McIntosh (1988) described a list of benefits that were provided to her as a White, middle class woman that she recognized as not having earned. These were benefits that she described as "everyday" occurrences that became her assets without her awareness. Likewise, she asserted that these privileges were given to her without her control. Privilege may continue to be undetected by

those who benefit from them because as McIntosh (1988) explicated, they are unconscious daily assets.

The topic of privilege provides a foundation to help conceptualize differences and illuminate seemingly invisible social hierarchies. Most of those who are privileged view it as a norm (McIntosh, 1988; Johnson, 2008), but do not realize that social standards are molded from these advantages. Viewing privilege as a norm reinforces the privileged while making those less privileged experience the adverse consequences of it.

Dominant groups may not realize they receive privileges or how their positions in society are part of a hierarchy. Privileged groups may deny, minimize, or blame those who are less privileged when referring to their advantages (Johnson, 2008). Johnson (2008) suggested that staying silent (e.g. denying privilege existence) perpetuates the established social hierarchies, but merely speaking about privilege is not enough either (Johnson, 2008). Privilege should be comprehended thoroughly enough so that tools of change can be identified and implemented (Johnson, 2008). Moreover, there is a need for elaborate comprehension of privilege that not only applies to those who are privileged, but also to those who have lesser privileges.

Disadvantaged Groups

Privilege impacts groups with less societal advantages. Although underprivileged groups may notice some instances of disadvantage, the system of privilege may continuously go unnoticed and thus can be perpetuated. This pattern of not acknowledging the system of privilege may be partly due to the fundamental attribution error, the myth of meritocracy, internalized discrimination, denial, and discrimination towards other groups.

According to Heider's (1958) attribution theory, individuals may attribute behaviors to a person's internal characteristics or external factors (Myers & Dewall, 2015). Ross (1977) found some pitfalls to the theory and expanded it by incorporating the fundamental attribution error. The fundamental attribution error means that individuals attempt to attribute others' social behaviors to their personal traits more than external factors (Ross, 1977). Thus, people often underestimate individual's environmental influences. One example of the fundamental attribution error may be applied to car incidents. A person driving down a busy highway may cut off another driver. According to the fundamental attribution error, the driver who was cut off would instinctively blame the other driver's actions to their internal character (e.g., the person is a bad person) while undermining external causes (e.g., the person may have a family emergency).

Many people are susceptible to the fundamental attribution error (Myers & Dewall, 2015). This topic may be relevant to disadvantaged groups.

Disadvantaged groups may attribute privileged groups' "unawareness" of

privilege to their internal characteristics (i.e., fundamental attribution error) (e.g.,

that person is a bad person) and underestimate the influence of external factors

(i.e., the system of privilege). Thus, disadvantaged groups may not acknowledge

the systemic aspect of privilege and thus perpetuate it. According to Greene

(2003), every person moves within the system of privilege.

Both privileged and lesser privileged groups are vulnerable to the myth of

meritocracy (Greene, 2003). According to McNamee and Miller (2014),

meritocracy is a widely held belief that in the U.S., people within the system are

placed on "equal" and "fair" playing grounds where everyone is said to have a

chance to "get ahead." This getting ahead was proposed to be based on merit

(e.g., working hard, playing "by the rules"). The underlying assumption of

meritocracy is that anyone can overcome hardships and succeed in the system.

McNamee and Miller (2014) described meritocracy as a myth because there are

multitudes of other elements (e.g., social capital) that influence one's position in

society. These elements are not based on merit and may even suppress merit.

Lesser privileged groups may also fall victim to this myth.

Internalized discrimination, such as racism, plays a role in the experiences

of disadvantaged groups as well. In particular, racism was presented by Speight

(2007) as a form of oppression that integrates itself in interpersonal, structural,

and cultural frameworks. Due to racism's immersion in these spheres, Speight

(2007) described racism as a piece of everyday life that can go unrecognized because it has been so deeply intertwined in societal structure. It was proposed that internalizing societal beliefs (particularly racism) may lead individuals to accept their groups' stereotypes, such as proposed limits, self-devaluation, rejection of one's own ancestral culture, and embracing "Whiteness" (Jones, 2000). Due to racism's deep immersion in the various institutions (Speight, 2007), disadvantaged groups may fall victim to internalizing racism. According to Greene (2003), internalized racism is indicative of a person of color as someone who believes that the dominant group (White group) is in fact superior and embraces the dominant culture's beliefs of others (Jones, 2000).

Another phenomenon that may occur within the disadvantaged groups in relation to discrimination is denial. Denial may be adaptive to the lesser privileged group because it may assist in the avoidance of uncomfortable social situations. Greene (2003) described how disadvantaged groups may be confronted with negative feedback (e.g., anger) from privileged groups when starting a discussion on privilege; thus, denial may be more comfortable and acceptable.

Denial of privilege may also be attributed to one's belief in the importance of addressing modern forms of oppressive behaviors. According to Perry's (2011) study that consisted of participants mostly identifying as European decent, students denied instances of discrimination even when they were perhaps

25

sensitized to the blatant signs of discrimination. In a qualitative study, Perry (2011) found that students did not place high value in topics (e.g., racism, sexism, discrimination) that were considered "irrelevant" to modern times. Additionally, students were found to minimize instances of racism, sexism...etc. due to perceiving the intent behind these oppressive behaviors as "harmless."

Greene (2003) described how being a member of disadvantaged groups does not preclude participation in oppressive behaviors towards other disadvantaged groups. One example of this is provided by Farrow's (2004) illustration of the Black and gay community. Farrow (2004) identified how the Black community is pummeled with messages from Black community members via media (i.e., music lyrics) that promote homophobia. Farrow (2004) described media outlets as defining what Black masculinity and sexuality "look like" (anti-gay). Similarly, Farrow (2004) also described the gay community as having "anti-Black" stances.

Farrow (2004) clarified a common assumption that people make about minority groups. A common mistaken belief is that because the gay community is disadvantaged, gay community members understand other types of oppressions and therefore, cannot be racist, sexist…etc. Farrow (2004) indicated that the gay community is typically represented by White males. White gay males representing the forefront of the gay community excludes people of color and other genders who identify as a part of the LGBTQ community. Additionally,

Farrow (2004) described ways in which the gay community participates in oppressive behaviors. One example included that gay White males have been typically recognized to appropriate Black cultural norms, such as language.

Those who are members of lesser privileged groups may also experience oppressive behaviors within the group due to their skin tone. According to Ibañez, Van Oss Marin, Flores, Millett, Diaz, and colleagues (2012) 58 percent of Latino gay males experienced discrimination within the gay community. Participants with darker skin tone and Indian features experienced higher instances of discrimination in contrast to those who did not share these features (Ibañez et al., 2012).

Disadvantaged groups exert oppressive behaviors towards others in some contexts. For example, Peterson and Hamrick's (2009) qualitative findings of White students' experiences at historically Black colleges and universities demonstrated that White students reported feelings of hypervisibility and instances of discomfort. White students experienced instances of involuntarily becoming a representative for the White community on topics that involved discriminatory practices, such as slavery. Thus, incorporating disadvantaged groups' within the Privilege Walk may be useful to raise awareness of privilege and how members of lesser privileged groups are able to perpetuate the system of privilege.

Summary

Most individuals are susceptible to beliefs that perpetuate the dominance of privileged groups. These beliefs include the fundamental attribution error, the myth of meritocracy, internalized discrimination, denying the existence of privilege, and discrimination towards other groups. This indicates that both majority and minority group members are vulnerable to believe in a system that promotes dominance and privilege. Moreover, it is critical to raise awareness to these issues relating to privilege by incorporating the majority and minority group. As described above, Greene (2003) illustrated that everyone moves within the system of privilege and it is the responsibility of the individual to understand how they contribute to the system. Thus, exploring previous privilege awareness strategies is essential to further examine how privilege awareness has been addressed in previous methods and what conclusions were drawn as a result of the investigations.

Previous Strategies to Raise Privilege Awareness

Previous scholarly papers demonstrated several interventions intended to address privilege awareness. McIntosh (2015) utilized a self-awareness exercise that examined privilege by having participants partake in an interactive discussion based activity. This gave participants the opportunity to openly discuss the advantages and disadvantages that society had granted them.

Additionally, diversity courses have been used to address privilege. Whiting and Cutri (2015) conducted a qualitative analysis of White pre-service teachers' (soon-to-be teachers) experience after participating in a fourteen week multicultural education course that addressed differences of privilege (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender). Pre-service teachers were able to name some of the privileges that they held individually, but somewhat struggled with the idea of intersectionality. One example of this struggle was that pre-service teachers viewed immigration issues as unrelated to English language development (Whiting & Cutri, 2015). Whiting and Cutri (2015) found that pre-service teachers were unable to recognize that immigration issues were highly related to English language development due to the different experiences one immigrant may harbor if they were to speak English fluently versus another immigrant who does not speak or write in English at all. These identities of being English speaking or non-English speaking impact one's identity along with being an immigrant.

Additionally, previous research has found that merely incorporating diversity structures (e.g., diversity trainings) in institutions has been shown to have some negative effects. According to Kaiser and colleagues (2013) the presence of having diversity structures increased the higher-status groups' perception of fairness for underrepresented groups even when provided evidence to the contrary. Participants from an underrepresented group who reported discrimination were undermined by the higher-status group members.

This study demonstrates that although diversity structures may be present in establishments, it may perpetuate the perception of "fairness" even when it is not present. Thus, higher-status groups may be placed in a position to overlook discrimination and underrepresented groups may face discrimination without support (Kaiser et al., 2013). Thus, it is important to carefully examine diversity structures to ensure they are not producing an adverse impact on underprivileged groups.

Privilege awareness has also been addressed with workshops. A seven week experiential workshop (e.g., drawing, discussion, worksheets) with college level students enhanced self-awareness through drawing and engaging in process groups with culturally diverse individuals (Bozalek & Biersteker, 2010). This study also demonstrated that group based discussions were useful in that they helped students understand the differences in power and unequal societal treatment of groups (Bozalek & Biersteker, 2010).

These studies provide initial support for various strategies to enhance privilege awareness. In particular, an experiential workshop led to greater understanding of power and inequality (Bozalek & Biersteker, 2010). Thus, experiential learning should be further explored as a tool to increase privilege awareness.

Experiential Learning Theory and Application

Experiential learning theory is a holistic approach to learning that incorporates behavior, perception, cognition, and experience. This theory encourages participants to comprehend information in the present moment, corroborate, and then assess the material (Kolb, 1984). Experiential theory is based on the learners' ability to create knowledge and meaning through real life experiences (Yardley, Teunissen, & Dornan, 2012). Its most distinct feature from other learning theories is that it focuses on the process of learning and not on the outcome; experiential learning theorists suggest that the creation of knowledge is a continuous endeavor that cannot be captured by a single outcome. Instead, it is an endless, adaptive interaction between the learner and their environment (Kolb, 1984). This approach differs from traditional learning methodology because traditional models of learning have been primarily based on static, rational, idealist epistemology that centers on the outcome of knowledge (Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 1984; Kolb, 2015).

Due to experiential learning being an integrative approach, there are countless methods that can be used to elicit these functions, such as role-plays, outdoor activities, and private reflection (Rodgers, Simon, & Gabrielsson, 2017). Although these activities would be useful to promote experiential learning, there are no exclusive methods to help create this experience for learners based on the theory (Tomkins & Ulus, 2016). The core of experiential learning exercises

engage learners' involvement in activities that incorporate cognitive and behavioral stimulation (Tomkins & Ulus, 2016).

Previous studies have shown that applying the experiential learning theory has resulted in promising outcomes. Chan (2012) utilized an experiential project in which engineering students participated in community service activities that encouraged them to design, build, and execute engineering systems in a school damaged by an earthquake. This project brought forth an assortment of outcomes that perhaps may not have been reached through the traditional textbook focused classroom, such as the connection of emotions to the project, reflection, and empathic understanding. McLeod (2013) described a common theme that emerged by implementing experiential learning in the classroom; students were able to conceptualize class material easily and were motivated to face the challenges that the class presented. Furthermore, McLeod (2013) found that students who participated in the experiential activities were successful in the course.

Experiential learning could also be used as a tool for understanding social change. An experiential activity in a study by Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube and Shields (2014) increased participants' perceptions of "everyday sexism" as harmful and increased their likelihood to seek more information on gender inequity compared to the information only group (e.g., traditional learning format). These studies suggest that students who participate in experiential based

learning may be creating knowledge by using a variety of connections (e.g.,

emotion) in contrast with the traditional classroom format where these

connections may not be elicited at all. Compared to experiential learning,

traditional learning models may not be suitable for presenting abstract concepts,

facilitating the application of knowledge, or fostering cognitive and behavioral

changes.

Sensitive and controversial topics, such as privilege and diversity may not

be sufficiently taught in information-only settings (Cundiff et al., 2014). One

method that attempts to address these topics include discussion based diversity

courses and programs. Although diversity courses may provide the student with

valuable material, the courses may not have as much of an impact as

experiential learning, especially for distinct groups. Cole, Case, Rios, and Curtin

(2011), found that diversity courses increased White students' intersectional

consciousness (i.e., understanding the multiplicity of oppressions that intersect)

and decreased their endorsement of Protestant work ethic (i.e., belief that those

who are unsuccessful are to blame for their own position in society), but it did not

show the same results for students of color. Bowman (2010) found similar

outcomes, students of color did not benefit from taking multiple diversity courses

unlike the White students. Additionally, men demonstrated poorer outcomes than

women after taking one diversity course (Bowman, 2010). These studies reveal

that contemporary diversity courses may not be as effective as educators may

strive for, and that both privileged and disadvantaged groups' reactions should be further explored.

According to Bowman (2010) students who completed one diversity course did not report greater well-being or orientation towards diversity compared to students who did not complete a diversity course. Furthermore, Case and Stewart (2010) found that students enrolled in diversity courses did not display significant reduction in prejudice compared to the non-diversity oriented courses, such as behavioral statistics. Although the diversity courses may differ in terms of methodology and curriculum, the outcomes suggest that these courses may be missing a critical component that influences student outcomes. Despite diversity courses variable approaches to address diversity issues that may include the use of an experiential activity, an effective standardized activity was not observed. In Sue and Sue's (2013) outline of learning situations that encourage the development of a nonracist White identity, one principle mentioned was learning from experiential reality. This type of learning may help to increase the understanding of one's social realm (i.e., microaggressions, privilege).

The Privilege Walk

Given the difficulty of addressing an abstract, sensitive topic such as privilege, utilizing a highly engaging activity bodes well for enhancing awareness of privilege. One example of such an activity is the Privilege Walk. A Privilege

34

Walk is an experiential activity that was based on McIntosh's (1988) essay on White Privilege. McIntosh (1988) created a list of privileges from personal accounts that were later made into an exercise by others, referred to as the Privilege Walk. The exercise consists of a group that is instructed to initially form a line standing shoulder-to-shoulder. Participants are instructed to move forward or backward to symbolize their position in society when listening and responding to statements. The facilitator subsequently reads statements that address forms of privilege (e.g., gender privilege) to their participants (Irby-Shasanmi, Oberlin, & Saunders, 2012). Web-based search engines indicate that the Privilege Walk has been widely used across a variety of contexts, such as by educators, popular websites (e.g., Buzzfeed), and community events.

Although the Privilege Walk exercise has been widely used across a variety of settings, it remains understudied in the psychology field. This activity is largely known and gained momentum on social media websites. McIntosh (2015) stated that her initial essay on privilege was influential but could be enhanced by including a self-awareness activity. To that effect, Irby-Shasanmi and colleagues (2012) were able to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Privilege Walk exercise by adapting it to fit the topic of health privilege (e.g., access to healthcare, good health). The study was able to raise awareness in its participants and elicit insight about health privilege.

Beside the Privilege Walk being a popular activity when it comes to understanding privilege, there are two missing components that may further understanding and elicit participant experiential understanding and application: the action plan and a focus on microaggressions.

The action plan is a critical component to add for a variety of reasons. Individuals' behaviors and beliefs may often fall into what Lerner and Miller (1978) summarized as the "just world" hypothesis. This theory states that individuals hold beliefs that help them make their environment more predictable and stable. Some of these beliefs essentially include that people who are "good" and work hard get what they deserve and those who are "bad" and do not work hard will get what they deserve. Because this belief is an adaptive mechanism for people, specifically for people with privilege and those who succeed, they are more likely to struggle finding evidence against this idea (Lerner & Miller, 1978). Thus, people may engage in a variety of behaviors to maintain their beliefs, especially if they are provided with contradictory evidence. This belief may then lead to inaction when confronted with situations that are unjust and do not "fit" their belief.

One form of inaction is the bystander effect. The bystander effect was summarized by Myers and Dewall (2015) as individuals feeling less responsible to take action when others are present. Myers and Dewall (2015) proposed after examining previous findings that in order for people to take action they must first

interpret the situation as a critical circumstance and assume responsibility to help. This may be a critical element when individuals are faced with issues that relate to social justice. Individuals may not feel personally responsible to take action if it does not appeal to them. One method of appeal may be making the matter salient.

According to Glasford and Pratto (2014), participants who observed an injustice that showed a dramatic impact were more likely to engage in helping behaviors compared to those who interpreted an injustice as a normative occurrence. Another method to promote helping behaviors is group cohesion. It was suggested that once group members were able to get to know each other, they may create a cohesive group relationship and group identity which in turn would promote helping behaviors (Stürmer & Snyder, 2009). Thus, in relation to privilege, highly privileged groups may not interpret privilege as a critical matter due to multiple factors, such as privilege not being a salient issue that is impactful on their group or not being able to relate to those that experience lesser privileges.

Powell, Branscombe, and Schmitt (2005) proposed that highly privileged groups think about privilege in terms of outgroup disadvantages. This perception was suggested to help privileged groups perpetuate the idea that something is wrong with the out-group and not the group they belong to. Powell and colleagues (2005) found that framing privilege influenced participants' perception

of racism. Specifically, when privilege was framed as White advantage, in contrast to Black disadvantage, it decreased racism in White participants. This framing helped reveal to the more privileged group that the issue of privilege affects both the highly privileged and the lesser privileged. Framing is a critical element to consider when addressing the topic of privilege in a group setting because those who may not be presented this framework may further develop in-group and outgroup bias.

In-group and out-group bias occurs when individuals engage in behaviors that help the group that they belong to rather than the out-group. Members of the in-group may also view outgroup activity as negative and competitive compared to their in-group members (Levine & Cassidy, 2010). Thus, it is vital to incorporate an element that could possibly allow individuals to interpret matters as salient to themselves and within a framework that presents a holistic illustration of privilege. One way to accomplish this is through the creation of an action plan.

The action plan is a tool that helps users create a series of realistic actions that one would plan to accomplish (Lorig, 2006). The action plan has shown promising results to those who have utilized it. According to Damen, van Baaren, Brass, Aarts, and Dijksterhuis (2015), action plans were found to influence the intensity of emotions that one feels upon experiencing the activity. Action plans were also found to enhance one's sense of responsibility (Damen et al., 2015).

Moreover, it was suggested that action plans influenced self-management knowledge and implementation of plans for those using them (Choi, Chung, & Han, 2014; Müllersdorf, Zuccato, Nimborg, & Eriksson, 2010). The action plan may be a critical component to use after the Privilege Walk to help participants develop their own plans for social change.

The action plan may also help create cognitive dissonance for those who may harbor feelings of less responsibility toward social justice. According to Eisenstadt and Leippe (2005), participants who advocated for counter beliefs and took part in an essay that advocated for that counter belief induced dissonance and promoted attitude change. This finding was made especially apparent for participants who engaged in the same activity, but also felt personal relevance to the issue. It could be suggested that participating in an action plan may help participants not only think about ways they could contribute to social justice, but also employ ideas that may help them reduce their dissonance through attitude adjustments. The inclusion of microaggressions may also be helpful in this aspect.

Including microaggressions in the Privilege Walk could possibly enhance the participants' experience of the activity. Sue (2010) described how microaggressions typically leave the victim feeling ambivalent. This ambivalence occurs in most individuals, even in individuals who typically perceive themselves as having power in the social sphere. People in power were more likely to not

take action when faced with ambivalence compared to those who felt powerless (Durso, Briñol, & Petty, 2016). People who exhibit ambivalence are often persuaded by social norms (Hohman, Crano, & Niedbala, 2016). This link to social persuasion was also found in Hohman, Crano, Siegel, and Alvaro's (2014) study; adolescents who reported high ambivalence about marijuana usage were more likely be persuaded by their peers' social norms to either use or resist marijuana. Thus, if inaction is the social norm, then those who are presented with ambivalence (i.e., microaggressions) would be more likely to choose inaction to address microaggressions. The social influence on ambivalence is also a critical element to consider. The power of social influence to persuade ambivalent individuals underscores the appropriateness of using a group format in which social norms are safely questioned and ambivalence may be voiced.

Furthermore, incorporating intersectionality and the concept of double jeopardy in the Privilege Walk will allow researchers to explore the impact of intersectional identities during the Privilege Walk. According to the additive model in double jeopardy, participants' identities are recognized as entities that are added to the experience of an already existent subordinate identity (Epstein, 1973). This concept may help in the consideration of being inclusive of identities among participants and provide an opportunity for researchers to continue developing Privilege Walk items.

The Privilege Walk's widespread use has been documented on social media, but researchers in only one study systematically tested its effectiveness to date. The Privilege Walk activity is unique because it is inclusive of minority and majority groups. Moreover, it incorporates experiential learning by allowing these groups to physically see where they stand in terms of advantages and disadvantages in society (i.e., reflection of privilege). Minority and majority participants are provided the opportunity to challenge and question their positions through facilitated discussion. Previous research on raising privilege awareness has shortcomings.

McIntosh (2015) described an interactive activity designed to increase awareness of self and privilege but did not examine its effects post intervention. Thus, the lasting effects (if any) are unknown. Diversity courses have been an alternative intervention to raise privilege awareness, but may not be sufficient when provided singularly. Whiting and Cutri (2015) showed promising findings in raising privilege awareness, but were unable to get participants to fully examine the impact of intersectionality. Previous utilization of diversity courses have also shown inconsistent findings between racial and ethnic groups. Moreover, Bozalek and Biersteker (2010) revealed that workshops demonstrated promising results when using experiential activities, but they did not encourage participants' commitment through action plans. Furthermore, the incorporation of microaggressions have commonly been absent from interventions that have

attempted to raise privilege awareness. In sum, further study is needed to incorporate these missing or underutilized components into interventions on privilege awareness and to one day develop a tool of measure to better understand the Privilege Walk's impact on its participants.

Purpose

The present study is the initial phase of a larger project to qualitatively explore the Privilege Walk. This walk will also be referred to as the Awareness Walk due to our attempt to raise awareness of disadvantage in addition to privilege. In this study, we aim to develop potential items that may elicit awareness of privilege that focuses on various forms of racism (e.g., wage differences) and microaggressions of gender, race, and ethnicity. Specifically, the purpose of this preliminary study is to qualitatively explore college students' reactions to the Privilege Walk and how it impacts their understanding of privilege to assist in the development of potential Privilege Walk items. We hope to build on this first phase to develop initial items and in future phases, we plan to refine items and test the activity experimentally. We will address the following research questions:

- What were participants' cognitive awareness and beliefs in response to the Privilege Walk?

- What impact did the Privilege Walk have on participants?

- How did the activity impact participants' awareness of privilege and discrimination?

Although the experiential nature of the Privilege Walk makes it promising, its effectiveness has been minimally tested. We hope that this preliminary study can be a first step towards addressing this deficiency.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

Participants of this study were comprised of 15 California State University,

San Bernardino (CSUSB) students. Individuals considered for this study were

students of all genders above the age of eighteen who had access to SONA

research systems. Participants were mostly made up of female ($n = 13$) with few

males participating ($n = 2$). Three participants identified as White. Other ethnic

and racial identities included Asian ($n = 3$), African American ($n = 1$), Native

American ($n = 1$), Latino ($n = 4$) (one being male), Middle Eastern ($n = 1$), and Bi-

racial/multiracial ($n = 2$). Of the two men, one was White and the other was

Latino. Eleven participants identified as speaking more than one language.

Participants' age ranged from 19 -32 years old (M = 22.33).

Design

The present initial preliminary study is part of a larger mixed methods

project that will engage factor analysis in order to refine the measure. Mixed

methods means that qualitative and quantitative data will be collected, analyzed,

and integrated in some way (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For this study

specifically, we utilized the first phase of an exploratory sequential design. In this

type of design, researchers qualitatively explore a topic initially in order to build to

a subsequent quantitative phase. A common application of the exploratory

sequential design is to use the qualitative data to develop items for an

instrument; thus, it is often referred to as the instrument development design

(Creswell, Fetters, & Ivankova, 2004). The focus of the present study consisted

of the initial exploratory phase in which the qualitative data is emphasized over

the quantitative data. Therefore, qualitative scales were developed and used to

generate potential scale items before they are incorporated into quantitative

scales. This data will be further explored in the larger project that will incorporate

additional pilot testing with a student sample at California State University, San

Bernardino. In the larger study, psychometric properties, reliability, and factor

structure will be established and evaluated.

Procedure

Students were asked to participate in an activity entitled the Awareness

Walk Activity led by the researchers. The study was entitled the Awareness Walk

Activity in the SONA research system so participants would receive minimal

information about the nature of the activity. The demographic questionnaire and

post-survey were stored in Qualtrics, an online research management system.

The study can be conceptualized as having three parts and participants received

extra credit for each part of the study.

Part 1: Demographics

After completing the informed consent forms online (see Appendix A), SONA research systems directed participants to answer a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix B). After completing the demographics in Qualtrics, participants were asked to go to a specific room on campus where they completed the Privilege Walk exercise and discussion.

Part 2: Activity

In the informed consent form, the Awareness Walk Activity was discussed as part two of the study, an in-person lab activity that required 60-90 minutes to complete with 50 privilege items to respond to. This number was chosen to minimize participant fatigue in combination with other measures. The Privilege Walk exercise and subsequent discussion questions that were used in the current study were developed from extensive internet searches, examination of numerous Privilege Walk protocols, and thorough discussion by primary investigators. Statements were edited for clarity, effectiveness, and application to gender. Finally, statements were edited to include intersections of gender with other factors, such as race/ethnicity (see Appendix C for activity instructions and discussion protocol). After the Privilege Walk was completed, participants were asked to stand in the last position that they were in during the Privilege Walk. A discussion portion was then led by the researcher while having participants

remain standing in their positions for the first half of the discussion. During the second half of the discussion portion, the participants were asked to have a seat. Immediately after the activity and semi-structured discussion, participants completed action plans (see Appendix D for action plan protocol and participant form).

Part 3: Post-survey

Part 3 of the study was the post-survey stored in Qualtrics. This survey was emailed to participants one week after completion of the Part 2 activity. It included an informed consent form (see Appendix E). The post-survey typically took 10-30 minutes to complete and contained questions about how the exercise influenced their perception of privilege (see Appendix F). The study concluded with a debriefing statement (see Appendix G).

Materials

The materials for this study included the online demographic questionnaire. Additionally, materials consisted of access to SONA research systems to gain student recruitment at CSUSB. The Awareness Walk Activity protocol ensured that the script was relayed to each group of participants in a similar manner. We utilized a semi-structured discussion protocol to provide a framework for discussion while permitting flexibility as well as probing. Other

materials included the paper-pencil action plan document completed immediately after the Privilege Walk as well as the post-survey.

<u>Demographics</u>

Participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire via the SONA research system. This questionnaire requested information about the participants' age, gender, where they grew up, current city/state of residency, and race/ethnicity. The demographics questionnaire was generally completed in 5-10 minutes or less.

<u>Awareness Walk Activity</u>

Participants were initially briefed on the content of the exercise. Participants were instructed about the definition of privilege. The participants were then briefed on how the activity may be uncomfortable for some and that the intention of the exercise was not meant to shame individuals. The researcher then notified the group of the duration of the activity (i.e., 60-90 minutes). The briefing portion was adapted from Privilege Walk Activity (n.d.a).

Afterward, the researcher explained that participants should be "fully present" and were provided the definition of what that meant. The researcher then addressed how the activity may elicit certain responses that may be emotional and asked participants to be respectful of each other. Lastly, the participants were told that their sharing was exclusively their decision and the activity was not meant to force people to share what they did not wish to

disclose. The introduction of the Privilege Walk and expectations from it was adapted from Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk (n.d.) and Privilege Walk Activity (n.d.b). These particular sources were chosen after extensive internet searches due to their clarity in instruction and topics that were addressed.

Next, the researcher read aloud the instructions on how the activity would be executed. The instructions were adapted from Privilege Walk Activity (n.d.b). The participants were instructed to remain silent and become aware of their emotional reactions during the activity. Participants were instructed to stand and line up evenly shoulder-to-shoulder on a designated area demonstrated by the researcher. After participants aligned, the researcher explained that she will read a series of statements and it is the choice of the participant to respond. The researcher explained that if the statement applied to the participants' unique experiences, they either move forward or backward depending on the statement's instructions. A sample statement was provided after; such as, "if you have blue eyes, please take one step forward." All participants with blue eyes would subsequently take one step forward. The researcher explained that if the participants did not wish to disclose information or if they did not agree with the statement, they should remain in the same position. After ensuring that participants did not have questions and were ready to begin, the researcher initiated the reading of the statements. The participants' steps forward represented privilege while the steps backward represented the lack thereof.

The statements utilized in the activity were chosen from a series of sources. The statements were particularly chosen for the type of topic they addressed. The statements were selected to coincide with this study's objective and relation to gender, privilege as well as intersectional identities. Some statements were also chosen for their ability to incorporate microaggressions in relation to race, ethnicity, gender, and privilege. Some of the statements that included microaggressions are "I have been called "feisty" when I am being confident," "Someone has asked me to cook a "traditional" dish from my assumed ethnic background," and "People do not typically ask me when will I be getting married multiple times in my life."

After the completion of all statements, the researcher told participants to remain standing where they were and that a discussion will proceed. An explanation of how the discussion will be led and some issues that came up were addressed.

The discussion portion of the project was adapted from Crossing the Gender Line (n.d.), Arizona Residency Life (n.d.), and IPAS (n.d.). These resources were chosen for their clarity, issues they addressed, and questions that were highly relatable to researcher's Privilege Walk Activity.

After participants were notified that the discussion began, the researcher asked the first question of the semi-structured discussion form. During the discussion, the researcher probed the participants to elicit further discussion of

topics. The researcher continued through the list of questions during the discussion. Afterwards, the discussion concluded and the participants were directed to complete an action plan.

Action Plan

The paper-pencil action plans were distributed after the Privilege Walk exercise and discussion. The action plan was utilized to assess participants' reactions to the Privilege Walk and assess whether the activity elicited actions for participants to engage in after participating in the Privilege Walk. The participants were instructed once they completed the action plan that they were welcome to leave and to expect an email with a post-survey from researchers in one week. Data collected from the action plans were stored in a locked filing cabinet and will be destroyed after two years.

Post-survey

One week after the Privilege Walk, participants received the post-survey. The post survey contained questions that asked participants about their experiences after their participation in the Awareness Walk Activity. The quantitative and qualitative questions were designed to explore the impact of the Privilege Walk on participants' thoughts and behaviors. The questions were placed as qualitative first then quantitative to prevent potential priming effects. Researchers considered this format to avoid influencing participants' responses, such as coaxing participants to respond in an affirmative way to the open-ended

51

questions if the quantitative questions were placed before the qualitative

questions.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

In the current study, qualitative analysis and open coding were utilized to

understand participants' responses to the intervention. Descriptive coding was

used to help the researcher examine participants' responses on the action plan

questionnaire (Richards & Morse, 2007). Responses were first summarized into

phrases that incorporated the responses' key attributes (i.e., evocative, essence

of the whole response). Participants' statements were divided into segments of

related meaning. Each segment was summarize in approximately 4-7words.

Summarized responses were then clustered together according to their

similarities to then create categories. These categories were created after two

researchers examined the content of the responses. Next, these categories were

organized by subthemes to help identify patterns in responses through the use of

pattern coding (Saldaña, 2015). Findings will be used to develop a potential

scale for the Privilege Walk. The open-ended questions helped us develop

quantitative items that can address these themes. Our goal was to develop 50-55

items to minimize participant fatigue. The quantitative items were analyzed with

descriptive statistics to determine if participants believed the activity impacted

them. Lastly, although quantitative items were included in action plans and post-

questionnaire, these were only for descriptive statistics and were not used for the overall purpose of study (e.g., qualitatively explore potential Privilege Walk items and potential psychometrics).

The current study will result in an initial set of Privilege Walk items. Future phases of the project will include further psychometric refinement of items, creation of scales, and pilot testing.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this exploratory study, we analyzed qualitative data for CSUSB participants over the age of 18 years who completed the action plan questionnaire (*N* = 15). Descriptive coding was used to examine participants' responses on the action plan questionnaire (Richards & Morse, 2007). By examining the responses, researchers were able to develop categories that were then coded into different themes and subthemes aimed to capture participants' responses.

Four themes and nine subthemes emerged from the action plan questionnaire. Themes included a) *awareness* with self-awareness, group awareness, and societal awareness as its subthemes b) *psychosocial growth* with personal growth, self-worth, and connections with others as its subthemes c) *action* with taking action as its subtheme and d) *impact*.

Awareness

Participants whose responses were grouped in this category described how the activity promoted their awareness of themselves, their awareness of others within the group context, and awareness of general society. In regard to self-awareness, one participant responded, "We don't often realize how

privileged we are compared to others" whereas another participant reported

becoming "…more aware of what types of privileges I don't have." These

responses as well as others helped us create eight different items for the self-

awareness subthemes (see Appendix H). These eight items include 1)

confidence in defining privilege; 2) ability to define privilege; 3) meaning of

privilege; 4) belief of privilege impacting one's life; 5) recognition of how one's

privileges compares to others; 6) knowledge of which privileges one does not

harbor; 7) awareness of one's own privileges and; 8) awareness of how gender

privilege has shaped one's experiences.

      Another subtheme that emerged was group awareness. Participants who

were categorized in this theme provided answers that revealed their awareness

grew in relation to specific groups in society (e.g., racial and ethnic minority

groups, women). For instance, one participant expressed that they can address

the issue of privilege by, changing their "attitudes towards minorities because I

now understand the struggle that most ethnic women go through." Another

participant mentioned realizing that a multitude of issues can "influence gender

roles and privileges." These responses contributed to the generation of eleven

items for the group awareness theme. The items include 1) society has the ability

to make women feel negative; 2) assumptions can be made about people based

on their gender; 3) comprehension that racial/ethnic minority women experience

barriers; 4) danger of walking alone as more dangerous for women than men; 5)

assumptions are made about people based on their age; 6) women of various backgrounds face obstacles; 7) awareness of unequal treatment based on an individual's gender; 8) societal expectations for people based on age, 9) assumptions about people based on their race; 10) recognition that women face more difficulties at work; and 11) awareness of other CSUSB students' lack of privileges.

Societal awareness became an additional subtheme that emerged within the theme of awareness. Participants categorized by this subtheme responded to the questionnaire by showing that their awareness centered on societal matters (e.g., discussed multiple societal processes) and/or intersectional perspectives (e.g., mentioned gender and racial/ethnic group). One participant responded, "Some have to work harder to achieve success or wait longer because they have obstacles and face more discrimination." Another participant responded, "…dominant males are in higher positions than women." Responses allowed us to construct eight items for the societal awareness subtheme. These items included that 1) acknowledgment of privilege is essential to progress; 2) privilege can relate to multiple factors (e.g., race, gender); 3) awareness of discrimination; 4) privilege provides advantages to some groups; 5) privilege is unearned; 6) everyone has some privilege 7) privilege is not always visible to others and; 8) some groups have to work harder to be successful.

Psychosocial Growth

A theme that emerged from this preliminary study was psychosocial growth. Participants were placed in this category if their responses coincided with the subthemes of personal growth and connections with others. In regard to personal growth, responses revealed that participants felt that they developed as an individual in relation to others. For instance, one participant responded, "…be confident in everything you do, even if you don't have the privilege to do it." Another participant stated, "Privilege is something to value when we have it. Everyone faces it." Responses such as these helped us create seven items: 1) attempt to be authentic in every context; 2) do not allow others to belittle one's self; 3) refuse to allow one's gender or race/ethnicity to interfere with one's goals; 4) use negativity as motivation for one's self; 5) cease stereotyping others; and 6) do not allow gender to dictate one's goals.

Connections with others emerged as a subtheme of personal growth. Participants who were categorized under this subtheme provided responses that revealed how connections or the lack thereof influenced their perspective of how they relate or can contribute to the social justice movement. One participant stated, "I was able to see that I am not the only one that is fighting for change." Additionally, another participant answered, "…despite gender and ethnic differences there are still many ways that people can connect." These responses demonstrate participants' awareness of how others may share paralleled goals in

terms of the social justice movement. These responses, along with others, were

able to help us develop four items; 1) others do not understand one's obstacles

in life; 2) feeling of being alone when committing to changing society; 3)

recognition of many people try to improve society; and 4) one's own privilege

stops other from making a connection.

Action

The next theme that materialized was action. Participants who were

placed in the action theme provided responses that demonstrated the desire to

implement actions that promote sharing knowledge about privilege and standing

up for one's self. Some of the responses from participants include, "…spreading

the knowledge of what privilege is…" and "...teaching others to be open-minded

…and not follow the stereotypes..." These responses and more have helped

create eleven items for this theme, such as 1) standing up for one's self; 2)

attempt to solve societal issues; 3) stand up for one's self; 4) spread the

knowledge of topics like privilege, discrimination, stereotypes; 5) awareness of

how one's own privilege affects others; 6) stand up for the rights of others; 7)

share personal experience of privilege with others; 8) willingness to sign a

petition that helps reduce sexism; 9) weekly contribution to improve gender

equality; 10) willingness to sign a petition to reduce racism; and 11) indication of

future commitment.

Impact

Lastly, participants discussed the impact of the activity. Participants in this theme gave responses that revealed how they were impacted by the topic of privilege or the Privilege Walk activity. One participant responded, "Discussing privilege in a productive, positive, and open environment helped create empathy for one another." While another participant responded, "I felt committed and unified with fellow participants." Five items were created to help capture participants' impression of the activity. The following five items were created 1) feeling the activity should be repeated with others; 2) appreciation of others sharing their experiences; 3) learning a lot from the activity; 4) feelings of connectedness and; 5) describing changes in thoughts or behaviors since the completing of the activity. In this preliminary study, we used descriptive coding to develop potential psychometric items for a possible scale for future studies. This scale includes awareness, psychosocial growth, action, and impact.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In this study, we aimed to develop an initial set of Awareness Walk items that may elicit awareness of privilege that primarily focus on racism (e.g., wage differences) and microaggressions of gender, race, and ethnicity. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to qualitatively explore college students' reactions to the Privilege Walk and how it may relate to their understanding of privilege. This preliminary study can provide an initial phase to the Privilege Walk item development and pave an avenue for future phases to establish psychometric properties based on this study's qualitative findings. The following questions were addressed: What were participants' awareness and beliefs in response to the Privilege Walk? What impact did the Privilege Walk have on participants? How did the activity impact participants' awareness of privilege? How well did the Privilege Walk items capture the participants' experience of having intersectional identities?

The aim of the study was achieved in terms of collecting qualitative data that explored participants' cognitive awareness and beliefs in response to the Privilege Walk. These responses helped researchers create themes that include awareness, psychosocial growth, action, and impact. Those who were

categorized in each theme described awareness of privilege in regard to self, group, and societal contexts.

Some participants in the awareness category provided responses that described the development of a moderate understanding of how privilege affects particular groups (e.g., ethnic minority women). One participant responded, "More women are not as privileged as men are…especially Hispanic women." Another participant stated, "…males are (typically) in higher positions than women." This finding could be partially attributed to being a part of a predominantly minority group setting ($n = 12;$ White $n = 3$) during the Privilege Walk activity.

According to Adams (1980) group status characteristics should be observed when implementing group formatted tasks. It was found that Black females displayed more dominant behaviors (e.g., disagreement) in a group task when challenged by White individuals compared to White individuals and Black males. Additionally, Black males became more dominant when they were partnered with a Black individual versus when they were paired with a White individual. This study suggests that the group members' racial and ethnic status influences group behaviors in terms of agreement and disagreement with group based activities (e.g., discussion).

Participants were predominantly comprised of racial/ethnic minority groups, which may have increased participant relatability to each other and

fostered entitativity (e.g., group cohesion). This may have helped participants recognize disadvantages and advantages at a deeper-level in terms of comprehending them as privileges. Previous studies have shown that participants of groups where entitativity was perceived increased participants' confidence in their own thoughts and described attitudes that were more reflective of their thoughts irrespective of ethnicity (Clark & Thiem, 2015). This study also showed that participants who thought about issues more thoroughly were high in group cohesion (Clark & Thiem, 2015). Thus, group cohesion could have helped participants become more deeply aware of disadvantages and help them become aware of privilege in accordance to particular groups.

Another reason for participants' privilege awareness may be due to not having realized privilege was a matter until they watched and listened to others share their experiences. McIntosh (1988) presented privilege as an experience that is typically deemed close to unnoticeable due to its prevalence in an individual's daily life. Therefore, having others verbalize their experiences may help elicit awareness of privilege.

Participants also reported in their responses how they noticed what privileges they lack. One example of one's lack of privileges may be that one participant responded "I became more aware of what privileges I don't have" while another participant stated, "I am not as privileged as most White men and others have noticed this as well." These responses may have been provided due

to the common framing of privilege that is used when speaking of privilege. Pratto and Stewart (2012) recognized that the topic of privilege typically centers on outgroup disadvantage. This trend sends underlying messages that presume that the referential groups is problematic in contrast to the more privileged group being of concern. The dominant, more privileged group goes frequently unrecognized as being the "problematic group" due to dominant group norms that reinforce that the outgroups are of concern. Pratto and Stewart's (2012) study found that the dominant group was less able to recognize their dominant group identity and supports the notion that the dominant group does not place concern on their in-group advantages.

Additionally, participants' responses that modestly indicated privilege awareness may have been elicited due to having a rather large dispersion that researchers observed between participants and from the initial standing point during the activity. It was observed by researchers that participants were widely dispersed; one participant was extremely beyond the initial starting point (forward), while it was observed that approximately two participants were at the opposing end. Other participants were found to be dispersed moderately from the initial starting point (forward and backward), but no participants were observed to be relatively close to the starting line. According to the additive model of double jeopardy, individual's identities are summed products that are able to be added to another identity (Epstein, 1973). Thus, when each item in the Privilege Walk was

used and addressed different identity experiences, it may have helped create a visualization of how these identities are able to be added on top of each other through participants' steps forward and back. Moreover, having participants at the extreme ends of the Privilege Walk may have provided participants with a deeper level of awareness due to witnessing this dramatic difference between these participants. In summary, the Privilege Walk items have shown to be appropriate for this preliminary study's goal: development of Privilege Walk items that are somewhat able to capture a wide range of participants' experiences in relation to their identity and how it relates to privilege. In a larger study, these Privilege Walk items can be further improved and one day evaluated.

Generally, all participant responses in this study may have been influenced by having few respondents who were White within the group. The White participants may have experienced what has been commonly termed as "White guilt" and may have wanted to show others in the group that they were able to relate to them in terms of lacking privilege.

According to Steele (1990) White guilt is a potential feeling that White individuals in America experience due to being somewhat being aware of having been provided unearned privileges as a result of their group membership. White individuals are part of a group who has historically exploited others (people of color) for personal gain. Steele (1990) claimed that this feeling of guilt is not a genuine type of guilt, but a guilt that involves self-preoccupation (Iyer, Leach, &

Crosby, 2003). This guilt applies enough pressure on the White individual to desire to escape it through acts that make them appear "innocent." White guilt also incorporates a White individuals' gratitude for not being Black and being a member of an advantaged group (White) (Steele, 1990). In-group guilt has often been observed when individuals endure self-reflection in regard to their privilege (Pratto & Stewart, 2012; Steele, 1990). White guilt was associated with one's personal evaluations of White people (i.e., those who feel less guilt view White individuals more favorably) (Swim & Miller, 1999). Additionally, Leach, Iyer, and Perdersen (2006) found that group-based guilt was not associated with taking action to promote equality. White participants who did not view their in-group as advantaged did not agree with concepts, such as in-group privilege or inequality. Thus, eliciting White guilt has been shown to deter participants from taking action to promote equality (Leach et al., 2006).

Participants have also described a sense of personal growth in their action plan responses. One participant said, "…despite gender and ethnic differences there are still many ways in how people can connect." This suggests that participants felt some connection with others in the Privilege Walk despite learning differences and disadvantages. This group connectedness may help motivate individuals to continue learning about societal differences (i.e., privilege) and continue raising awareness about aspects of privilege or disadvantages that

they did not consider. The feelings of group connectedness after discussing systemic injustices has been observed in other studies as well.

In previous studies, group connectedness was found to be one of the outcomes of group deliberation. According to Rosenwasser's (2005) dissertation, Jewish participants were placed in a group to talk about anti-Semitism and to conjure up strategies on how to address Jewish oppression. Women within the group felt a sense of connectedness from the group where they felt that others understood their oppression, group members gained different perspectives of their disadvantages, and shared their belief that social justice for the Jewish community had not been met (Rosenwasser, 2005). One participant from this group described that one real way to make change is to establish these connections with others (Rosenwasser, 2005).

Participants in this study also expressed a sense of taking action; what they can do after participating in the Privilege walk. One participant said, "…having knowledge about privilege, I can be a function of change." This suggests that participants were engaged with the idea that understanding privilege may lead to change. This sense of action may have been evoked in the Privilege Walk participants possibly due to having the opportunity to discuss privilege with others. According to O'Laughlin and Malle (2002) the group dynamic has been found to elicit different responses from participants in contrast to individual interventions. Additionally, group settings may make participants

explicitly explain how they will take action later for others to understand

(O'Laughlin & Malle, 2002). Moreover, participants had partaken in the creation

of action plans of which could have helped increase participants' commitment to

taking action.

Previous literature has shown that participant commitment to action and

taking behavioral action lacks a bridging element to ensure action commitments

(Sheeran, 2002). One study revealed that the combination of participant

motivation and action plans were key elements in increasing participant

behavioral commitment (Galla, Baelen, Duckworth, & Baime, 2016). By

incorporating the action plan in the Privilege Walk, the focus is to gain

participants' commitment to further consider how they will commit to social justice

action. Moreover, individuals may present themselves to the group with

ambivalence in relation to social justice. According to Galla et al. (2016) it was

found that those of lower status groups (minority groups) experienced in-group

ambivalence (in relation to marginalized group differences compared to non-

marginalized groups) and outgroup (non-minority) favoritism if they perceived

that stereotypical status differences (low-status groups are inferior to higher

status groups) were true. Thus, having the action plan completed after the

Privilege Walk and discussion may have helped highlight systemic injustices that

may have helped bring about privilege awareness in participants who

experienced ambivalence in comprehending discrimination of their in-group

67

(marginalized group) and commitment. Although participants' responses were reflective of taking action, their responses were vacant of any mentioning of microaggressions.

Participants who provided researchers with their responses did not reference any relation to microaggressions. This may be due to participants' having an unclear conceptualization of microaggressions. Due to research in this area being fairly novel, it can be expected that participants may have encountered microaggressions, but were unable to label that transaction. Another possibility is that previous understanding of what discrimination may look or feel like has been commonly stereotyped as blatant forms. Microaggressions have been referred to as a more subtle practice of discrimination; thus, participants may engage in a variety of responses that discount their experience. Some of these responses include sanity checks or rescuing the offender (Sue et al., 2008; Sue, 2010). This may have caused participants to second-guess themselves as to "what counts" as discrimination.

Contrarily, another contributing factor that may have influenced participants' lack of microaggression responses is how they conceptualize discrimination. Participants may be aware of microaggressions and perhaps, categorized the Privilege Walk items that attempted to produce microaggression related experiences as forms of blatant discrimination. Therefore, the Privilege Walk items that attempted to capture microaggression related experiences need

to be further developed in a way that is able to be considered more subtle forms of discrimination.

Although participants did not mention microaggressions in their responses, microaggressions were utilized in this study with the intention to capture participants' contemporary experience of discrimination. According to Dovidio and colleagues' (2002) review of the literature, discrimination has progressed to a more subtle form due to many occurrences, such as political changes in racial policies and the current social sphere molded from these policies. Microaggressions could be conceptualized as a more adaptive form of discrimination for those who are perpetrators of it. Thus, perpetrators deter from more blatant forms of discrimination due to its subtlety (Dovidio et al., 2002). After this consideration, this study incorporated microaggressions in hope of capturing participants' possible daily experiences of these discriminatory experiences.

By capturing participants' responses qualitatively, data helped create potential Privilege Walk items. Data also helped create potential psychometric items that address privilege awareness in regard to self, group, and societal contexts. Although this study was able to capture these experiences, some unique experiences may have not been included.

Limitations

This study's intention was to incorporate intersectionality throughout the Privilege Walk activity, but lacked the ability to control for gender, race, and ethnicity due to having a convenience sample of participants engage in the activity during the summer session of the academic year. Participants' responses to the Privilege Walk (e.g., steps taken, discussion, responses to action plan questionnaire) may have been influenced by having mostly women and not having a balanced ratio of White individuals ($n = 3$) as well as males ($n = 2$).

According to Salerno and Peter-Hagene (2015), in a group setting where decisions had to be made, the gender of the person who opposed others greatly influenced the group. It was found that even when males were outnumbered 5-1 in a group setting and held an opposing opinion angrily, they were able to sway the entire group by making them less confident in their opinions. Contrarily, in a similar scenario, when a women was outnumbered 5-1 and held an opposing belief while expressing anger, the group became more confident in their opinions, discrediting the woman (Salerno & Peter-Hagene, 2015). This study demonstrates that having an unequal balance of gender is able to dramatically influence others in the group, especially because the current study employs discussion where "heated debates" may be elicited.

Moreover, the balance of race and ethnicity in group settings were found to influence group behaviors as well. According to Li, Karakowsky, and Siegel's

(1999) study, Asian participants were placed in three different groups (e.g., Asian ethnicity underrepresented in a Caucasian group, Asian and Caucasian balanced group, and an all Asian group) all of which influenced their group behavior. When the Asian participants were placed in a group where they were the minority, they became more passive, introverted, and withdrawn from group discussion. When Asian participants were placed in a racially balanced group and placed in an Asian majority group, participants displayed opposite behaviors as well as higher self-efficacy (Li et al., 1999). This study demonstrates the impact that unbalanced racial and ethnic background groups has on participants.

The interaction of one's gender and ethnic background may also influence the group setting. In a study that observed the group format of a substance abuse treatment program, African American women exhibited less self-disclosure, non-positive feedback, and were less receptive to receiving advice compared to Hispanic women (Johnson, Connolly Gibbons, & Crits-Christoph, 2011). It was also found that African American women were found to have lower-levels of group behaviors compared to African American men (Johnson et al., 2011).

The present study did not include the possibility of incorporating the unique experiences of particular ethnic groups as an outcome. There may be differences between how one member of a group experiences the Privilege Walk compared to another. One example of this includes the unique experience of

those who are a part of a minority group, but also experience the feelings of invisibility. For example, Asian men and African American women have been found to be more excluded in mass media outlets compared to Whites (Schug, Alt, Lu, Gosin, & Fay, 2015). This suggests that although one may be a member of a minority group, their experience of their unique identity in relation to privilege may influence their perceptions of being included or heard.

Additionally, we were unable to reach our target privileged population, such as White individuals and males. This study had a profound number of women participants who were primarily of an ethnic minority background. By not incorporating privileged groups, this study has limited information on how the Privilege Walk may (or may not) influence privileged groups. This also limits participants' discussion after the Privilege Walk activity in terms of gaining those who are members of privileged groups' perspective on the topic of privilege. Due to the lack of privileged group participants, this study was unable to collect qualitative data that can be considered a representative sample of the group.

Another limitation is that the data did not track where participants' positions ended upon completion of the Privilege Walk activity. Thus, we were unable to match the qualitative statements with the participants' various identities. The final position during the Privilege Walk activity was a metaphor for their privilege within societal hierarchies. Thus, the number of steps taken backwards and forwards could have significantly impacted their reactions to the

intervention. Additionally, by not tracking participants' positions, particularly the last position they held during the activity, it limits the researcher's abilities to interpret how well the Privilege Walk items were able to capture participants' intersectional identities and participant responses to each other's positions (e.g., participant may take an additional step backward at the end because they observed their neighbor had symbolically less privilege than they did).

Furthermore, this study did not link the qualitative information of participants during the discussion portion and the action plans with their demographic information. If implemented effectively, linking the demographic information with the action plans may be useful information for researchers to further investigate given that this information may provide additional contextual background during the discussion. This would also help researchers better understand how the Privilege Walk was impactful or not impactful to whichever demographic. This could also potentially help researchers comprehend the possible differences between the experiences of privilege between the lesser privileged groups and the privileged groups.

An additional limitation of this study includes the type of questions incorporated in the semi-structured discussion portion of the Privilege Walk activity. Although researchers probed participants during the discussion, the questions that opened up the discussion should have been more thoroughly developed (e.g., exempting closed-ended questions) and were topic focused

(e.g., microaggressions). In a study that observed opinions on Affirmative Action, participants who were provided closed-ended questions supported Affirmative Action, in contrast to those who were asked open-ended questions (Jordan-Zachery & Seltzer, 2012). However, those who were asked open-ended questions provided rationales to their opinions and their opinions were influenced depending on which questions they were asked first (open-ended then closed-ended and vice versa) (Jordan-Zachery & Seltzer, 2012). This study reveals that participants' responses are influenced by the type of question asked and how the type of question influences how much information the participant is willing to disclose. Additionally, by having questions that were topic driven it may have helped promote in-depth discussion of discrimination, privilege, or microaggressions. By doing so, it provides the opportunity for students to talk about their thoughts on the topic and to explore if the topic of microaggressions was a relatable topic for the participants if directed by the researchers.

Furthermore, this study lacked questions that provided participants with the opportunity to express more emotionality in their responses during the discussion. One example of this may be to ask what emotions arose during the activity, if any and to elaborate versus asking if participants were "surprised." Lacking this element deprives the study of rich content the participants could provide. This study could have also included more probing elements during the discussion phase to help stimulate more elaborate responses from the

participants. Incorporating more probing could improve the discussion phase by helping eliminate the need to have ample discussion questions and produce more opportunity for elaborate participant narratives.

Lastly, this study had a relatively small sample size. This study's focus was to collect qualitative data, thus having a small sample size ($N = 15$) may not be as relevant to its ability to contribute to research. Qualitative studies typically focus on the quality of data it is able to capture with samples that ordinarily range from six to twelve or more participants. The outcome of qualitative studies is mostly to focus on comprehensive understanding rather than generalizability (Leong & Austin, 2006). Although the current study exhibited some limitations, it is able to lay a foundation for future research.

Future Research

In future phases of this project, we will add to this initial set of items with subsequent preliminary qualitative studies. We will then utilize the initial set of items developed from the present study to engage in pilot testing with a student sample at CSUSB, engage in factor analysis, and establish psychometric properties. This preliminary study represents the first step in creating a measure to evaluate the Privilege Walk.

Future studies that utilize the Privilege Walk should account for balancing gender, race, and ethnic background through inclusive outreach efforts that

target participants of a wider-range versus rather than a convenience sample. As mentioned above, previous studies have found that the separation and combination of these characteristics can be highly influential in group settings (Johnson et al., 2011; Li et al., 1999; Salerno & Peter-Hagene, 2015). Balancing gender, race, and ethnic background in attempts to have equally represented groups could benefit the study by almost eliminating external factors in relation to gender, race, and ethnic bias. Moreover, studies should also incorporate intersections of identities that may have been unobserved in this study such as intersectional invisibility, rural community upbringing, or immigrant status depending on the focus of the study. Future studies may observe the importance of distinguishing and understanding the potential outcome in intersectionality theories when incorporating the concept of double jeopardy as well.

Double jeopardy is subsequently deconstructed into different models to capture how discrimination is accumulated through these subordinate identities. Two commonly referenced models in previous literature are the additive model and the interactive model. The interactive model argues that identities are not separate experiences that can be added (additive model) (Epstein, 1973), but an interaction between identities that create a unique experience (Smith & Stewart, 1984). Although double jeopardy was considered during the development of the Privilege Walk items, it needs to be continuously explored. Furthermore, those who hold multiple subordinate identities may experience feelings of invisibility.

Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach (2008) proposed that individuals with more than one subordinate identity may not fit the "prototype" of their identities and due to that may experience intersectional invisibility. Intersectional invisibility is recognized as the failure to identify and acknowledge individuals with intersecting identities as a unique group. Additionally, intersectional indivisibility also entails social groups making those with intersecting identities fit into a model that coincides with the prototypical group (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). One example of intersectional invisibility comes from one study that found that participants who were predominately White failed to distinguish Black women's characteristics from other groups and were unable to recognize Black women's contributions during a discussion even after the study assured distinctiveness between Black women's characteristics (Sesko & Biernat, 2010). This finding suggests that Black women's experiences (as well as others) are overlooked and contribute to those with multiple subordinate identities relative invisibility. Incorporating intersectional invisibility in the Privilege Walk statements and discussion could help capture a more holistic view of participants' experiences.

Additionally, other studies should account for the framing of questions being asked during the group discussion. Previous studies have shown that the framing of questions influence participant response. Specifically, it was found that solution-focused questions (e.g., questions that presume positives) influence people's negative affect, goals, action plans, and self-efficacy (Neipp, Beyebach,

Nuñez, & Martínez-González, 2016). For example, solution-focused questions are framed in a way where those who are asked are essentially prompted to provide positive feedback. Additionally, future studies should have topic focused questions to help improve researchers understanding of participant responses to particular topics that are relevant to the topic of privilege.

Future studies can apply the potential Privilege Walk items we developed to examine whether the impact of this activity generalizes to college populations. They can incorporate a pre-test/post-test experimental design with a control group to examine causality. Several related variables should be taken into account when applying the Privilege Walk items in future studies. Gender, ethnicity, and White guilt could be control variables. Additionally, the mediator variable that explains changes in the dependent variable would be experiential learning.

Moreover, the Privilege Walk items should incorporate more specific statements. Specific statements in the items should be used to capture the different experiences between gender groups, people of color, and intersectional identities (e.g., instead of "I was raised to be afraid of walking alone in the dark" it could be replaced with "I am a woman who is fearful of walking alone in the dark"). By doing so, this may also assist in the dispersion of participants' placement during the Privilege Walk.

Given that the activity may make privilege salient for some and disadvantage salient for others, the number of steps forward minus backward could serve as a moderator variable due to the possible influence the number of steps may have on participants' pre and post-survey scores. Counting the steps participants have taken could provide more context as to where the participants are in relation to privilege and if that influences their responses within that particular group. Additionally, future studies could integrate observations of participants' placement in relation to their last position in the Privilege Walk (e.g., front, middle, back). This could help advance analysis of how the Privilege Walk possibly influenced participants' reactions during the discussion portion if they were placed in the front (more privileges) compared to the back (lesser privileges). Although multi-sensory tasks enhance memory more than non-multisensory tasks (Heikkilä, Alho, Hyvönen, & Tiippana's study, 2015), those who experienced negative affect will have a more salient memory of the stimuli compared to those who did not encode stimuli with a negative affect (e.g., feelings of negativity) (Spachtholz, Kuhbandner, & Pekrun, 2014). This suggests that those who find themselves in the Privilege Walk who are also at the more extreme ends of it (e.g., front, back) may have a more impactful experience than those in the middle because it may induce a negative affect (e.g., feelings of having too much privilege or too little).

Furthermore, action plans should be incorporated into future studies to observe its direct or indirect effects. The action plan has shown to be a critical element in previous studies. According to Galla et al. (2016) the action plan along with strong participant commitment revealed that participants practiced meditation more often than those who did not have an action plan. These indirect effects should be further explored in relation to the Privilege Walk on its possible effects on participants' commitment to the social justice movement.

The action plan should also be linked with the participants' demographics. Incorporating the demographics to the action plan could help researchers understand the differences between participants' responses to the items. One example of these differences that could be beneficial to research is analyzing the responses of a person of color compared to a White person. This may also help distinguish which racial and ethnic group that the Privilege Walk impacts the most or least. Moreover, future research should incorporate a White privilege awareness scale. Swim and Miller (1999) incorporated a White privilege awareness scale as an element to their study that observed participants' attitudes towards Affirmative Action. This may help capture White participants' awareness of privilege as a function of participating in the Privilege Walk activity. Additionally, prospective researchers who wish to incorporate concepts, such as privilege or microaggressions should provide distinct definitions and elicit feedback from participants about their understanding of them. In regard to

microaggressions, future researchers should consider continuously exploring microaggressions and how it can be incorporated in the Privilege Walk without providing suggestibility. It may be worth exploring how participants conceptualize discrimination and its many forms (e.g., blatant, subtle) prior to utilizing microaggressions in the Privilege Walk items.

Likewise, future researchers can further develop the Privilege Walk by conducting additional preliminary studies that will help enhance the development of the Privilege Walk items as well as incorporate more Privilege Walk items that address intersectionality. Future Privilege Walk items that should be considered to be generated should aim to develop a significant amount more of the Privilege Walk items to allow possible discarding of items that were ineffective for the Privilege Walk. Forthcoming Privilege Walks should also consider employing small to moderate focus groups after the Privilege Walk activity where participants who identify as similar demographic backgrounds are able to discuss their experiences. Afterward, the focus groups could be combined to create a large discussion group. This may help elicit new responses to the Privilege Walk and a different understanding of privilege.

Researchers who consider to further explore the Privilege Walk should also consider the focus of how the Privilege Walk is presented and discussed. For example, participants may be less resistant to the idea of privilege if the topic focused on privilege that incorporated the individual's unique experiences rather

than disadvantage. If the Privilege Walk solely focused on one's disadvantage without a resolution, the activity may be more detrimental to the participants than helpful.

Lastly, impending studies should explore developing a Privilege Walk that is more exclusive to participants in relation to their demographics. The reason being is that some participants may not "fit" the race/ethnic background category that we have provided. It may be worth employing a Privilege Walk that outreaches participants of only two demographics, such as having a Latino/a group with a White group. This may help eliminate potential confounding variables, such as the racial/ethnic background categorization problem. Additionally, researchers should consider the participants' residency (e.g., long-term residency) due to participants possibly having different experiences of privilege as a result of their residency.

Summary

This preliminary study serves as the first phase of a larger study that will continue the exploration of the Privilege Walk. The aim of the study was to explore contemporary experiences of racism and sexism (microaggressions) to develop and refine potential Privilege Walk items. Failing to develop these components of the Privilege Walk can result in more harm than benefit. The potential items developed from the present study will help create a foundation for

future research to assist in the evaluation of the Privilege Walk's impact on its participants. The qualitative findings assists in the future exploration of Privilege Walks and serves as a step towards raising awareness of societal inequalities.

Furthermore, it is critical to explore the development of potential items that incorporate intersectionality and microaggressions in the Privilege walk and develop potential psychometric items due to its popularity. After a vast internet search, the Privilege Walk was observed to be utilized throughout colleges and other institutions, but the items on the Privilege Walk(s) were observed to vary tremendously. It is critical to standardize the Privilege Walk items in order to scientifically explore its effectiveness. Moreover, it is vital to incorporate contemporary experiences (i.e., microaggressions) in the Privilege Walk. As stated above, oppressive behaviors have taken on a subtle form and are continuously experienced by its victims. Lastly, Privilege Walk items that address intersectional identities are critical to use in the Privilege Walk to help demonstrate how the system of privilege has impacted each participant with multiple subordinate and privileged identities.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PRIVILEGE WALK

Informed Consent

Principal Researchers:

Gloria Magana, Clinical/Counseling Graduate Student at California State
University, San Bernardino

Manijeh Badiee, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at California State University, San
Bernardino

Identification of Project:

Awareness Walk Activity

Approval Statement:

This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional
Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino,
and a copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear on
this consent form. The University requires that you give your consent before
participating in this study.

Description of the Research:

The purpose of this project is to explore your awareness of society and
understand how others are impacted by society. You will be asked to participate
in a walking activity, discuss responses in a group, and write responses to open-

ended questions about your experiences and the actions you may take in the future. We will use this information to see how we can best help those who face barriers in society. In one week, you will also receive an email with a link to participate in a brief online questionnaire.

Statement of Time Required:

The Awareness Walk Activity will last about 60-90 minutes.

Risk and Benefit Statement:

Participants in this study will experience minimal risk as defined by the Institutional Review Board and will pose no threat beyond that encountered in routine psychological testing (e.g., answering questions regarding feelings and life experiences). In the event that a participant experiences distress from sharing their experiences, appropriate resources will be provided.

You will receive 5 extra credit points for participating in this portion of the study.

Voluntary Participation:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to stop at any time during the study, or refuse to answer any questions without penalty or losing any benefits.

Confidentiality:

Your name will not be used and if we use your words when we share the study

with others, you will be given a different name.

Sharing Results:

We will share the results with the community through presentations, newsletters,

or meetings. We will also publish articles and present the results at conferences.

Your anonymity will be maintained throughout these processes and the data

collected will be stored in a password protected computer in the researcher's

locked office at CSUSB. All data will be destroyed seven years after publication.

At the conclusion of the study in June 2017, you may receive a report of the

results by contacting Dr. Manijeh Badiee.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to

contact Dr. Manijeh Badiee, Assistant Professor of Psychology, at

mbadiee@csusb.edu or (909) 537-7305. You can also contact the Department of

Psychology IRB Subcommittee at Psych.irb@csusb.edu or the Human Subjects

office at California State University, San Bernardino (909) 537-7588 if you have

any further questions or concerns about this study.

Potential for Harm:

Sometimes people feel discomfort from sharing life experiences. If you would like to discuss any distress you may have experienced, please contact the CSUSB Psychological Counseling Center at (909) 537-5040.

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:

You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Clicking "Next" certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information in this document.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand the true nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age. Please indicate your desire to participate by checking "Yes" below.

_____ Yes

_____ No

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

SONA Online Survey

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions. Please answer each question to the best of your knowledge.

Age: _____

Gender: M ____   F ____   Other (please specify) ____

Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply):

Asian (Asian American) _____

African American (Black) _____

Caucasian (White) _____

Native American _____

Latino (Hispanic) _____

Middle-Eastern _____

Bi-racial/Multiracial _____ (please specify multiple ethnic origins)

_____

Other _____ (please specify) _____

Primary Language(s) spoken ____

Rate your fluency in this language 1 (no fluency) 2   3   4   5   (completely fluent)

Secondary Language(s) spoken (if applicable) _____

Rate your fluency in this language 1 (no fluency) 2   3   4   5   (completely fluent)

Third Language spoken (if applicable) _____

Rate your fluency in this language 1 (no fluency) 2   3   4   5   (completely

fluent)

Yearly Income:

$0 - $14,999 _____ $15,000-$29,999 _____

$30,000-$44,999 _____ $45,000-$59,999 _____

$60,000-$74,999 _____ $75,000-$89,999 _____

$90,000-$99,999 _____   Over $100,000 _____

Highest education level completed by parents or caretakers (Check one):

Grade school _____

Middle school _____

Some High school _____

High school diploma or GED_____

Some College _____

College Degree _____

Post-Graduate _____

Marital Status:

Single___   Married___

Divorced_____   Co-habitating_____

APPENDIX C

PRIVILEGE WALK ACTIVITY AND DISCUSSION PROTOCOL

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____ and we will be discussing the topic of privilege. Has anyone heard of privilege before?

Privilege is one of those words that can have different meanings. Here, we will discuss privilege as something that we may be unaware that we have, but we all have it. Privilege means access simply based on groups that you belong to. It can come in many different forms and make itself more subtle in one circumstance opposed to another. For example, as a woman I have the privilege of sitting at a kids' playground by myself without someone questioning my presence there. This exercise was created to help its participants become aware of their own privilege.

Please note that this exercise may cause uncomfortable emotions. We often don't talk about these issues, partly because they are uncomfortable. However, our intention is not to make anyone feel guilty or ashamed of her or his privilege or lack of privilege related to any social identity categories. Instead, the exercise seeks to highlight the fact that everyone has SOME privilege, even as some people have more privilege than others. By illuminating our various privileges as individuals, we can recognize ways that we can use our privileges individually and collectively to work for social justice. Also, even though learning about our privilege can at first be uncomfortable, if we are able to move past that discomfort we can often grow from this knowledge. Thus, the purpose of this exercise is to identify both obstacles and benefits experienced in our life.

This exercise will last 60-90 minutes. If you feel that you cannot participate due to other circumstances that may prevent you from standing for this duration of time you are free to sit down.

During this exercise I encourage you to be "fully present." This means I would like for you to become fully aware of your own emotions and thoughts that may occur during this exercise. I would like for you to participate at your own comfort level, but I would encourage you to push yourself outside of your comfort zone because most learning occurs outside of one's comfortability. This exercise may elicit feelings of indifference around one particular topic and may trigger strong emotional responses, therefore I would like for everyone to show respect for one another's beliefs, values, experiences, and to respect and maintain privacy. This is an introspective exercise and it is important for you to understand how privilege affects yours' and others' lives, but it is not designed to make you share things you do not wish to share.

Privilege Walk Instructions

This activity should be done in silence. Please line up shoulder-to-shoulder and arms-length apart. I will read a series of statements to you one at a time. As I do this, I want you to think about how the statements apply to you. If the statement does apply to you please take one average length step forward or backward, depending on the context of the question. For example, "If you have blue eyes, take one step forward." Those who have blue eyes will take one step forward. Those who do not have blue eyes will remain standing in their position. Please listen carefully and take a mental note of your emotional responses, if any, that were elicited during this activity. If anyone feels uncomfortable sharing (stepping forward or back), please remain standing in the same position. I encourage everyone to look around them during this activity to note where others stand around you. As you do this, please remain silent.

Privilege Walk Statements

I do not have to stop to think about how my gender may be held against me, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I never have to wonder whether people will take me less seriously because of my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I have been uncomfortable with a joke or statement that I heard about my gender, please take one step backward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I can be confident that my co-workers won't think that I got the job just because of my gender, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have experienced or witnessed people of my gender experience sexual harassment, such as unwelcomed sexual advances, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I was not taught to fear walking alone after dark in average public places, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I worry about whether my hairstyle "fits-in" with my gender and the dominant U.S. culture, please take one step backward (Nigatu, n.d.).

I have noticed that someone who has the same job title as me, but is of a different gender and ethnic background has received a higher salary, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

If I congregate with people of my own gender at school, people will not accuse me of being unfriendly with others or accuse me of gossiping, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

When I am walking alone, I worry about being raped, please take two steps backward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have heard "you've come a long way baby" before, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

If I have children and pursue a career, no one will think I am selfish for not staying home, please take one step forward Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk (n.d.).

Women of color earn close to 56 percent less than white males. If you identify as a woman of color, please take one step backward (The Gender Pay Gap Is Worse for Women of Color, 2016).

It is assumed my place is in the home, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

When I was a child I was able to pick out positive, active heroes of my own gender, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk (n.d.).

I can be careless of driving and not have it be attributed to my gender, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk (n.d.).

Women who are CEOs make up fewer than 5 percent of the Fortune 500 CEOs. If you fall within this gender category, please take one step backward (Johnson, 2017).

When I have made mistakes, people of another gender attribute my mistake to my gender, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I have felt that I have not been elected for a position due to my gender, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

If I have sex with a lot of people, people will not shame my character (like by calling me a slut), please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

People have made racist comments towards me, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I can be confident that the ordinary language of day-to-day existence will always include my sex. "All men are created equal…," please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

Barely 10 percent of Latinas earn degrees in computer and information science. I have felt that when I need extra help on my school assignments from professors, they have questioned my interest in this topic due to my gender, especially in topics related to information science., please take one step backward (Women of Color in the United States, 2016).

I find it common that a person of a different gender will interrupt me without invitation, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

On average, a woman who is white will earn 78 cents to a white male's dollar amount and women of color earn even less proportionately. If you are a white male, please take one step forward (Johnson, 2017).

My ability to make important decisions and my capability in general will never be questioned depending on what time of the month it is, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I worry that since I am a woman of color who, according to statistics, makes up almost half of the low-wage workforce, ever receives welfare and has children, I will be shamed for it, please take one step backward (Women of Color in the United States, 2016).

I will never be expected to change my name upon marriage, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I feel that people of my gender are often portrayed as leaders in the media, please take one step forward (Module 5: Privilege Walk Activity, n.d.).

I do not anticipate that my coworkers will presume that I am less competent because of my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I have been called "feisty" when I am being confident, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I have heard that it must be nice to be in a relationship with someone of my ethnic background and gender because we are "submissive," please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

The decision to hire me will not be based on whether or not I intend to have a family sometime soon, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

At social functions, when I take my significant other, I am most likely to be mistaken as "just the spouse," please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I believe most popular media is filled with images of a gender that is intended to sexually appeal to me, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

When I am assertive I don't worry that someone will call me bossy because of it, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I can be pretty sure that if I look for "someone in charge" it will be someone of my own gender, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have been discredited from the work I have presented due to my ethnic background and gender, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

Someone has asked me to cook a "traditional" dish from my assumed ethnic background, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

No advertising exists to sell me products to make my crotch smell "meadow fresh," please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have been discouraged from a career choice due to my gender, please take one step backward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I do not have a letter or gender identifier before my sport such as women's basketball, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

Someone has questioned if I was competent "enough" in my field of study due to my gender and ethnic and racial background. For example, in Science and Engineering, there are only 1/10 women of color employed in this field, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I have to worry about facial body hair to be seen as "more appropriately like those of my gender," please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I am able to mostly see people of my own gender as elected representatives since I understand that out of 197 heads of state around the world, 89 percent are male, please take two steps forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have been a victim of violence due to my gender, please take two steps backward (Module 5: Privilege Walk Activity, n.d.).

If I got a position and people are not likely to assume that I only got it due to my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I have felt I have been passed up for an elected position at school due to my gender, please take one step backward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

I have felt unsafe walking alone past a group of another gender, please take one step backward (Module 5: Privilege Walk Activity, n.d.).

I can be assertive in a position of power without being called a bitch, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

If I wait until my 30s to have children, people will ask me, why am I waiting? Please take one step backward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

People have not stereotyped me based on my ethnic background, take one step forward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I believe I was given less academic attention than others due to my gender, please take one step backward Privilege Walk Activity, n.d.).

If you were sexually active with more than one person and felt that your social reputation would benefit from this, please take one step forward Privilege Walk Activity. (n.d.).

When I act aggressively, someone has told me to be like someone who fits my gender stereotype, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

When I look at the distribution of people in the academic hierarchy, I am likely to see those who are of the same gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I have been told that people of my gender do not initiate sex, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

I am not likely to be restricted from business related networking opportunities due to my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

I feel that when I go on interviews, what constitutes as attractive for my gender may be considered, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

If I fail in my job career, I can feel sure this won't be seen as a black mark against my entire gender's capabilities, take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

When I act in a serious or assertive way, I may be seen as violating my gender's stereotype, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I can assume that I will not be patronized or pitied on account of my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

If I wear something "too attractive" in an academic or work related setting I may be punished in some shape or form, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

Someone has asked me if I was majoring in cooking or cleaning due to my gender and ethnic background, please take one step backward (Power, privilege, and everyday life, n.d).

I can assume that my mentoring relationships with superiors will remain (appropriately) professionally focused and not become sexualized on account of my gender, please take one step forward (Maier, n.d.).

Having children and being married may impact my ability of advancement in the academic sphere, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I can assume that my partner will view my career as more important than their own, please take one step forward (Arizona Residency Life Privilege Walk, n.d.).

If I lack parenting skills, I may be viewed as a bad person due to my gender, please take one step backward (Maier, n,d,).

No one has told me, "Don't worry your pretty little head," please take one step forward (Sue, 2010).

When my partner and I have been in conflict someone has told me to "bite my tongue" and let my partner determine the outcome of the situation, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

I have been told to stop being bitchy multiple times in my life, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

People do not typically ask me when will I be getting married multiple times in my life, please take one step forward (Sue, 2010).

I have heard the pronoun "he" used to represent all people and I was not represented by this pronoun, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

When I am alone at a bar or a restaurant, it is common that my space may be violated by others of a different gender, please take one step backward (Maier, n.d.).

I believe men and women have equal opportunities for achievement, please take one step forward (Sue, 2010).

After being asked my age, I have witnessed someone look quickly at my ring finger after I disclosed I was over 25, please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

Someone of a different gender has placed their hands on me and felt that it was appropriate to do so due the setting (e.g., clubs, bars), please take one step backward (Sue, 2010).

I do not worry that because of my gender, if I were in a high level job position, I would be mistaken for someone in a lower position based on gender stereotypes, please take one step forward (IPAS, n.d.).

Findings of the American Community Survey indicate that even though women earn more graduate degrees, a woman who possesses a graduate or professional degree earns about 66.4 percent of what men earn. If you relate to the category that earns more, please take one step forward (Fact Sheet: Women & Socioeconomic Status, n.d).

Thank you for participating and disclosing your experiences.
Discussion Protocol

After participants experience the Privilege Walk, they will be directed to participate in the discussion group.

Introduction to Discussion
As mentioned, many of you may have experienced uncomfortable reactions. Please honor those reactions and try to listen to what they are telling you, not judge them.

101

Now look around the room, take note of where you stand in comparison to others.

Now, I will lead a discussion that asks you all to reflect on your feelings during the exercise, focusing on discomforts or surprises, and any new insights that may have gleaned as a result of participating. The goal is to help make you aware of the privilege that comes with possessing certain identities. This activity may be triggering to some of you. Therefore, please be respectful of others and their privacy. I would like for those who are participating to listen respectfully to each other, provide the opportunity for others to be fully heard, and to encourage others to participate.

Now we will be discussing some of the responses you all experienced during this exercise and what this all means.

What did you see around the room?

Who (gender) did you see in the front, middle and back?

Were you surprised to see who was in the front, middle, and back?

What is your reaction to this activity?

At what points in the activity were you surprised?

At what points in the activity were you uncomfortable?

Which questions or question groups resulted in you being unsure of whether or not you should step forward?

What went through your mind as you moved forward and backward?

Which of the statements did you find most meaningful or eye opening? Why?

Which of the statements, if any, hurt? Why?

What does your position in the room say about societal messages about your worth and the worth of people with similar privilege levels?

What lessons can you take away from this activity that will affect your daily life from here on?

What are some things that you can do differently to help others who may not have as much privilege?

APPENDIX D

ACTION PLAN PROTOCOL AND PARTICIPANT FORM

Action Plan Protocol

Dr. Badiee: We are going to conclude today by making an action plan based on the exercise. We will pass out forms that will ask you to write down your experience with the privilege exercise today.

Gloria pass out forms and take them up when done

As each participant turns in their action plan, Gloria tells them:

Thank you for your participation today. We really appreciate your time and thoughtfulness in completing this exercise. You will receive a short post-survey in about a week so please complete that at your earliest convenience. Have a wonderful day.

Action Plan Participant Form

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

I found today's activity interesting (1-Strongly disagree, 7- Strongly Agree).

What new understanding did you gain today about yourself in relation to privilege?

My understanding of what privilege is became clearer due to participating in today's activity (1-Strongly disagree, 7-Strongly agree).

The activity today made me realize how important privilege is in shaping individuals' lives (1-Strongly disagree, 7-Strongly agree).

Now that you learned about privilege, name 2 ways in which you can address issues of privilege in your own life.

Name 2 things you can share about this activity that can help others be more aware of their own privilege.

The activity motivated me to take action to create a more equal society (1-Strongly disagree, 7-Strongly agree).

What additional knowledge did you gain today that was not mentioned in your above answers?

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FOR POST-SURVEY

Informed Consent

Principal Researchers:

Gloria Magana, Clinical/Counseling Graduate Student at California State

University, San Bernardino

Manijeh Badiee, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at California State University, San

Bernardino

Identification of Project:

Awareness Walk Activity Post-Questionnaire

Approval Statement:

This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional

Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino,

and a copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear on

this consent form. The University requires that you give your consent before

participating in this study.

Description of the Research:

The purpose of this project was to explore your awareness of society and

understand how others are impacted by society. You were asked to participate in

a walking activity, discuss responses in a group, and write responses to open-

ended questions about your experiences and the actions you may take in the future. We will use this information to see how we can best help those who face barriers. In this part of the study, you will complete an online questionnaire.

Statement of Time Required:

The online questionnaire will take up to 30 minutes to complete.

Risk and Benefit Statement:

Participants in this study will experience minimal risk as defined by the Institutional Review Board and will pose no threat beyond that encountered in routine psychological testing (e.g., answering questions regarding feelings and life experiences). In the event that you experience distress from sharing your experiences, appropriate resources will be provided.

You will receive 1 extra credit unit for your participation in the online study.

Voluntary Participation:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to stop at any time during the study, or refuse to answer any questions without penalty or losing any benefits.

Confidentiality:

All data collected will be anonymous. Once you begin your participation, you will be assigned an anonymous ID which will be stored separately from your survey responses to protect the anonymity of your responses. This ID number will be destroyed after credit has been assigned via SONA. Your Coyote ID and SONA ID will be stored only for the purposes of granting credit; once credit is granted, this information will be removed.

Sharing Results:

We will share the results with the community through presentations, newsletters, or meetings. We will also publish articles and present the results at conferences. Your anonymity will be maintained throughout these processes and the data collected will be stored in a password protected computer in the researcher's locked office at CSUSB. All data will be destroyed seven years after publication. At the conclusion of the study in June 2017, you may receive a report of the results by contacting Dr. Manijeh Badiee at mbadiee@csusb.edu.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Manijeh Badiee, Assistant Professor of Psychology, at mbadiee@csusb.edu or (909) 537-7305. You can also contact the Department of Psychology IRB Subcommittee at Psych.irb@csusb.edu or the Human Subjects

office at California State University, San Bernardino (909) 537-7588 if you have any further questions or concerns about this study.

Potential for Harm:

Sometimes people feel discomfort from sharing life experiences. If you would like to discuss any distress you may have experienced, please contact the CSUSB Psychological Counseling Center at (909) 537-5040.

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:

You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Clicking "Yes" certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information in this document.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand the true nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age. Please indicate your desire to participate by checking "Yes" below.

_____ Yes

_____ No

APPENDIX F

POST-SURVEY

Online Post-Questionnaire

Thank you for completing the Awareness Walk Activity. Below, you will be asked about your experiences since you completed this activity.

1. Please describe any new thoughts related to the Awareness Walk Activity since you completed it.

2. Please describe any new emotions related to Awareness Walk Activity since you completed it.

3. Please describe any new behaviors related to Awareness Walk Activity since you completed it.

4. Please describe any changes to your life in general since you completed the Awareness Walk Activity not mentioned in your answers above.

Please complete the following items on a scale of 1 (not at all impacted) to 7 (extremely impacted).
5.   My thoughts have been impacted by the Awareness Walk Activity.
6.   My emotions have been impacted by the Awareness Walk Activity.
7.   My behaviors have been impacted by the Awareness Walk Activity.
8.   My life in general has been impacted by the Awareness Walk Activity.
9.   What else would you like to share related to your participation in the Awareness Walk Activity?

APPENDIX G

DEBRIEFING

The purpose of this study was to understand your awareness of privilege and the impact of the Privilege Walk. The information you provided will allow us to get a sense of how the Privilege Walk is impactful and how we could possibly combat everyday forms of discrimination. After analyses of your responses, we intend to improve the Privilege Walk with some of the suggestions and insight you have provided us. In the event that your participation caused you distress, please contact the CSUSB Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) at (909) 537-5040.

Thank you for your participation; we value your time and honesty. For more information or resources, please contact Dr. Manijeh Badiee, Assistant Professor of Psychology, at mbadiee@csusb.edu or (909) 537-7305. You can also contact the Department of Psychology IRb Subcomittee at Psych.irb@csusb.edu or the Human Subjects office at California State University, San Bernardino (909) 537-7588 if you have any further questions or concerns about this study.

APPENDIX H

SCALE OF MEASURE

AWARENESS

Self-awareness
1. I am confident that I can define privilege.
2. Define privilege. (open-ended)
3. Privilege means access simply based on groups that you belong to, such as being invited to a career networking event mainly because of your gender.
4. I believe privilege (or the lack of it) has impacted my life.
5. I recognize how my privileges compares to other CSUSB students.
6. I know what privileges I do not have.
7. I am aware of my privileges.
8. I am aware of how my gender privilege has shaped my experiences.

Group awareness
9. Society makes women feel negative.
10. I assume things about people based on their gender.
11. Racial/ethnic minority women experience barriers in society.
12. Walking alone is more dangerous for women than men.
13. I make assumptions based on a person's age.
14. Women of various backgrounds face obstacles (e.g., violence from partners, educational barriers).
15. I am aware that people are treated unequally because of their gender.
16. Society has different expectations for people based on age.
17. I assume things about people based on their race.
18. Women face more difficulty at work (e.g., more likely to face sexual harassment).
19. I am aware of other CSUSB students lack privileges that I have.

Societal awareness
20. Acknowledgment of privilege is essential to progress.
21. Privilege relates to multiple factors like race, gender, etc.
22. I am aware of discrimination in our society.
23. Privilege provides advantages to some groups.
24. Privilege is often unearned.
25. Everyone has some privilege.
26. Privilege is not always visible to others.
27. Some groups (such as women and or/racial ethnic minority groups) have to work harder to be successful.

PSYCHOSOCIAL GROWTH

Personal growth

28. I am true to myself in every situation.
29. I do not let other people insult me.
30. My race/ethnicity does not stop me from doing what I want to do.
31. I use negativity as motivation to improve myself.
32. I appreciate the privileges I have.
33. I try not to stereotype other people.
34. I do not allow my gender to stop me from doing what I want to do.

Connections with others
35. No one understands the struggles I have experienced in my life.
36. I feel alone in my commitment to changing society. If you do not feel committed to changing society, click N/A.
37. Many people work to make society more equal.
38. My privilege stops me from connecting to others.

ACTION

Take action
39. I stand up for myself in my personal life.
40. I try to solve the inequalities (based on gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) we have in society.
41. I stand up for myself in classrooms.
42. I try to teach others around me about topics like privilege, discrimination, stereotypes, etc.
43. I try to be aware of how my privilege may affect how other people feel.
44. I stand up for the rights of others.
45. I share my own experiences of privilege with others.
46. I am willing to sign a petition to reduce sexism (e.g., create laws to address wage gap).
47. How many hours per week would you be willing to volunteer to help improve gender equality? (scale would go from 0 to 6 or more hours per week)
48. I am willing to sign a petition to reduce racism (e.g., enact policies that increase number of people from underrepresented racial/ethnic minority groups).
49. Please indicate whether you are willing to help us with future activities like this.

MICROAGGRESSIONS

Awareness of microaggressions
50. I feel confident that I can define microaggressions.
51. Define microaggression. (open-ended item)

52. Discrimination in today's world is often subtle, such as sexual objectification of women that seems like a compliment.
53. I am able to define microaggressions.
54. Microaggression means being directly aggressive.

Impact of microaggressions
55. Microaggressions make people feel like outsiders.
56. People feel degraded when they hear microaggressions against them.
57. Subtle, everyday forms of discrimination can be hurtful.
58. Microaggressions make people feel insulted.
59. Microaggressions are barriers to success for some groups like women and ethnic minorities.
60. People feel ridiculed when they hear microaggressions against them.

IMPACT OF ACTIVITY (Post-survey only)
61. The activity should be repeated with other people.
62. I appreciated other students sharing their experiences during the activity.
63. I learned a lot from the line activity.
64. I felt connected to the other students who were participating in the activity.
65. Please describe any changes in your thoughts, emotions, or behaviors since completing the Line Activity.

APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

(SONA Online Post-Questionnaire)

Principal Researchers:

Gloria Magana, Clinical/Counseling Graduate Student at California State University, San Bernardino

Manijeh Badiee, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at California State University, San Bernardino

Identification of Project:

Awareness Walk Activity Post-Questionnaire

Approval Statement:

This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino, and a copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear on this consent form. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in this study.

Description of the Research:

The purpose of this project was to explore your awareness of society and understand how others are impacted by society. You were asked to participate in a walking activity, discuss responses in a group, and write responses to open-ended questions about your experiences and the actions you may take in the future. We will use this information to see how we can best help those who face barriers. In this part of the study, you will complete an online questionnaire.

Statement of Time Required:

The online questionnaire will take up to 30 minutes to complete.

Risk and Benefit Statement:

Participants in this study will experience minimal risk as defined by the Institutional Review Board and will pose no threat beyond that encountered in routine psychological testing (e.g. answering questions regarding feelings and life experiences). In the event that you experience distress from sharing your experiences, appropriate resources will be provided.

You will receive 1 extra credit unit for your participation in the online study.

Voluntary Participation:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to stop at any time during the study, or refuse to answer any questions without penalty or losing any benefits.

Confidentiality:

All data collected will be anonymous. Once you begin your participation, you will be assigned an anonymous ID which will be stored separately from your survey responses to protect the anonymity of your responses. This ID number will be destroyed after credit has been assigned via SONA. Your Coyote ID and SONA ID will be stored only for the purposes of granting credit; once credit is granted, this information will be removed.

Sharing Results:

We will share the results with the community through presentations, newsletters, or meetings. We will also publish articles and present the results at conferences. Your anonymity will be maintained throughout these processes and the data collected will be stored in a password protected computer in the researcher's locked office at CSUSB. All data will be destroyed seven years after publication. At the conclusion of the study in June 2017, you may receive a report of the results by contacting Dr. Manijeh Badiee at mbadiee@csusb.edu.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Manijeh Badiee, Assistant Professor of Psychology, at mbadiee@csusb.edu or (909) 537-7305. You can also contact the Department of Psychology IRB Subcommittee at Psych.irb@csusb.edu or the Human Subjects office at California State University, San Bernardino (909) 537-7588 if you have any further questions or concerns about this study.

Potential for Harm:

Sometimes people feel discomfort from sharing life experiences. If you would like to discuss any distress you may have experienced, please contact the CSUSB Psychological Counseling Center at (909) 537-5040.

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:

You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Clicking "Yes" certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information in this document.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand the true nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age. Please indicate your desire to participate by checking "Yes" below.

_____ Yes

_____ No

California State University		
Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee		
Approved 6/22/16	**Void After** 6/22/17	
IBB # H-16SP-26	**Chair**	

REFERENCES

Adams, K. A. (1980). Who has the final word? Sex, race, and dominance behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 1-8.

Alexander, Q. R. & Hermann, M. A. (2015). African-American women's experiences in graduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education at a predominantly white university: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 9*(4), *307-322*.

Ancis, J. R. & Szymanski, D. M. (2001). Awareness of white privilege among white counseling trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(4), 548-569.

Arizona Residency Life (n.d.). Privilege Walk-Race. Retrieved March, 2016 from https://www.life.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/privilege-walk---race.pdf

Atewologun, D. & Sealy, R. (2014). Experiencing privilege at ethnic, gender and senior intersections. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *29*(4), 423-439.

Balsam, K. F., Molina, Y., Beadnell, B., Simoni, J., & Walters, K. (2011). Measuring multiple minority stress: The lgbt people of color microaggressions scale. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(2), 163-175.

Beale, F. (1979). Double jeopardy: To be black and female. In T. Cade (Ed.), *The Black Woman* (pp. 90–100). New York: New American Library.

Bean, R. A. (2014). *Clinical Supervision Activities for Increasing Competence and Self-Awareness*. Hoboken:Wiley.

124

Black, L.L. and Stone, D.A. (2005), "Expanding the definition of privilege: the

    concept of social privilege*", Journal of Multicultural Counseling and*

    Development, *33*(*4*), 243-255.

Bottiani, J. H., Bradshaw, C. P., & Mendelson, T. (2016). Inequality in Black and

    White high school students' perceptions of school support: An

    examination of race in context. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*(6),

    1176-1191.

Bowman, N. A. (2010). Disequilibrium and resolution: The nonlinear effects of

    diversity courses on well-being and orientations toward diversity. *Journal*

    of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, *33*(4), 543-568.

Bozalek, V., & Biersteker, L. (2010). Exploring power and privilege using

    participatory learning and action techniques. *Social Work*

    Education, *29*(5), 551-572.

Camacho, M., & Lord, S. (2011). "Microaggressions" in engineering education:

    Climate for asian, Latina and white women. *Frontiers in Education*

    Conference (FIE), 2011, S3H-1-S3H-6.

Case, K. A., & Stewart, B. (2010). Changes in diversity course student prejudice

    and attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of*

    Psychology, *37*(3), 172-177.

Chan, C. K. Y. (2012). Exploring an experiential learning project through Kolb's

    learning theory using a qualitative research method. *European Journal of*

    Engineering Education, *37*(4), 405-415.

Chappell, N. L. & Havens, B. H. (1980). Old and female: Testing the double

jeopardy hypothesis. *The Sociological Quarterly, 21, 157-171.*

Choi, J. Y., Chung, H. C., & Han, G. (2014). Patient outcomes according to

COPD action plan adherence. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 23(*6*), 883-891.

Clark, J. K., & Thiem, K. C. (2015). Group communicators, perceived entitativity,

and persuasion: A self-validation analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social*

Psychology, *61,* 5-11.

Cole, E. R., Case, K. A., Rios, D., & Curtin, N. (2011). Understanding what

students bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity

courses on student attitudes. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority*

Psychology, *17*(4), 397-405.

Cortina, L., Lonsway, K., Magley, V., Freeman, L., Collinsworth, L., Hunter, M., &

Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the

federal courts. *Law & Social Inquiry*, *27*(2), 235-270.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and

violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241.

Creswell, J. W., Fetters, M. D., & Ivankova, N. V. (2004). Designing a mixed

methods study in primary care. *Annals of Family Medicine, 2*(1), 7-12.

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed*

methods research. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.

Crossing the Gender Line PDF - The Safe Zone Project. (n.d.). Retrieved March

21, 2016, from

http://thesafezoneproject.com/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/Crossing-the-Gender-Line.pdf

Cundiff, J. L., Zawadzki, M. J., Danube, C. L., and Shields, S. A. (2014). Using experiential learning to increase the recognition of everyday sexism as harmful: The WAGES intervention. *Journal of Social Issues*, *70*(4), 703-721.

Damen, T. E., van Baaren, R. B., Brass, M., Aarts, H., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2015). Put your plan into action: The influence of action plans on agency and responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*(6), 850-866.

Devos, T. & Banajai, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(*3*), 447-466.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *8*(2), 88-102.

Durso, G. O., Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2016). From power to inaction: Ambivalence gives pause to the powerful. *Psychological Science*, *27*(12), 1660-1666.

Eaton, A. A., & Rios, D. (2017). Social Challenges faced by queer Latino college men: Navigating negative responses to coming out in a double minority

sample of emerging adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *1,* 1-11.

Eisenstadt, D., & Leippe, M. R. (2005). Dissonance and importance: Attitude change effects of personal relevance and race of the beneficiary of a counterattitudinal Advocacy. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *145*(4), 447-467.

Entmacher, J., Frohlich, L., Robbins, K. G., Martin, E., & Watson, L. (2014). Underpaid & overloaded: Women in low-wage Jobs. Retrieved March 21, 2016, from https://www.nwlc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/final_nwlc_lowwagereport2014 .pdf

Epstein, C. (1973). Black and female: The double whammy. *Psychology Today*, *7*(3), 53-57.

Evans, K. M., & Herr, E. L. (1991). The influence of racism and sexism in the career development of African American women. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *19*(3), 130-135.

Fact sheet: Women & socioeconomic status. (n.d.). Retrieved March, 2016, from http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/publications/factsheet-women.aspx

Farrow, K. (2014). Is gay marriage anti-black??? In Conrad, R. (Eds.), *Against equality* (pp. 33-44). Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Fields, A., Swan, S., & Kloos, B. (2010). "What it means to be a woman:"

    Ambivalent sexism in female college students' experiences and attitudes.

    Sex Roles, *62*(8), 554-567.

Galla, B. M., Baelen, R. N., Duckworth, A. L., & Baime, M. J. (2016).

    Mindfulness, meet self-regulation: Boosting out-of-class meditation

    practice with brief action   plans. *Motivation Science*, *2*(4), 220-237.

Gandara, P. (2015). *Fullfilling America's Future: Latinas in the U.S*., *2015*.

    Retrieved November 27, 2016, from The White House Initiative and

    Educational Excellence for Hispanics website: http://sites.ed.gov/hispanic-

    initiative/files/2015/09/fulfilling-americas-future-latinas-in-the-u.s.-2015-

    final-report.pdf

Glasford, D. E., & Pratto, F. (2014). When extraordinary injustice leads to

    ordinary response: How perpetrator power and size of an injustice event

    affect bystander efficacy and collective action. *European Journal of Social*

    Psychology, *44*(6), 590-601.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating

    hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, *70*(3), 491-512.

Greene, B. (2003). What difference does a difference make? Societal privilege,

    disadvantage, and discord in human relationships. In Robinson, L. C. &

    James, J. D. (Eds.), *Diversity in human interactions: The tapestry of*

    America (pp. 3-20). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Hayes, J. A., Chun-Kennedy, C., Edens, A., & Locke, B. D. (2011). Do double

    minority students face double jeopardy? Testing minority stress

    theory. *Journal of College Counseling, 14*(2), 117-126.

Hegewisch, A., & DuMonthier, A. (2016). *The gender wage gap: 2015; Annual*

    earnings differences by gender, race, and ethnicity (Rep.). Retrieved April

    14, 2017, from Institute for Women's Policy Research website:

    https://iwpr.org/publications/the-gender-wage-gap-2015-annual-earnings-

    differences-by-gender-race-and-ethnicity/

Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. Hillsdale, NJ:

    Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Heikkilä, J., Alho, K., Hyvönen, H., & Tiippana, K. (2015). Audiovisual semantic

    congruency during encoding enhances memory

    performance. *Experimental Psychology, 62*(2), 123-130.

Hohman, Z. P., Crano, W. D., & Niedbala, E. M. (2016). Attitude ambivalence,

    social norms, and behavioral intentions: Developing effective antitobacco

    persuasive communications. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 30*(*2*),

    209-219.

Hohman, Z. P., Crano, W. D., Siegel, J. T., & Alvaro, E. M. (2014). Attitude

    ambivalence, friend norms, and adolescent drug use. *Prevention Science,*

    15(*1*), 65-74.

Hutchings, V. L. (2009). Change or more of the same? Evaluating racial attitudes

    in the Obama era. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 73*(5), 917-942.

Ibañez, G., Van Oss Marin, B., Flores, S., Millett, G., Diaz, R., et al., (2012). General and gay-related racism experienced by Latino gay men. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, *1*, 66-77.

Irby-Shasanmi, A, Oberlin, K. C., & Saunders, T. N. (2012). Teaching with movement: Using the health privilege activity to physically demonstrate disparities in society. *Teaching Sociology*, *40*(*2*), 123-141.

IPAS (n.d.). Privilege Walk. Retrieved March 21, 2016 from www.ipas.org/~/media/Files/Ipas%20Publications/IpasAdvokitPrivilege20 8.ashx

Iyer, A., Leach, C., & Crosby, F. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*(1), 117.

Johnson, A. G. (2008). Getting off the hook: Denial and resistance. In *Privilege, power, and difference* (pp. 108-124). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, A. (2006). Privilege, oppression, and difference. In *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed., pp. 12-40). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, A. G. (2008). Rodney King's Question. In *Privilege, power, and difference* (pp. 5-40). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Johnson, J. E., Connolly Gibbons, M. B., & Crits-Christoph, P. (2011). Gender, race, and group behavior in group drug treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *119*(3), 39-45.

Johnson, M. Z. (2017, January 30). 160 Examples of male privilege in all areas of

life. Retrieved March, 2016, from

http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/02/160-examples-of-male-privilege/

Jones, C. P. (2000). Levels of racism: A theoretic framework and a gardener's

tale. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(8), 1212-1216.

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not

so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and

overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, *42*(6), 1588-1613.

Jordan-Zachery, J. S., & Seltzer, R. (2012). Responses to affirmative action: Is

there a question order affect? *The Social Science Journal*, *49*(2), 119-126.

Kaiser, C., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T., Brady, L., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013).

Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal

of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*(3), 504-519.

Kerby, S. (2012). The State of Women of Color in the United States. Retrieved

May 14, 2017, retrieved from

https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/reports/2012/07/17/11923/t

he-state-of-women-of-color-in-the-united-states/

Kiefer, A. & Sekaquaptewa, D. (2007). Implicit stereotypes and women's math

performance: How implicit gender-math stereotypes influence women's

susceptibility to stereotype threat. *Journal of Experimental Social

Psychology*, *43*(5), 825-832.

132

Kim, C. (2015). New color lines: Racial/ethnic inequality in earnings among

      college-educated men. *The Sociological Quarterly, 56*(1), 152-184.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning*

      and development. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning*

      and development. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Langellier, B. A., Chen, J., Vargas-Bustamante, A., Inkelas, M., & Ortega, A. N.

      (2016). Understanding health-care access and utilization disparities

      among Latino children in the United States. *Journal of Child Health Care,*

      20(2), 133-144.

Leach, C. W., Iyer, A., & Perdersen, A. (2006). Anger and guilt about ingroup

      advantage explain the willingness for political action. *Society for*

      Personality and Social Psychology, 32(9), 1232-1245.

Lemonaki, E., Manstead, A. R., & Maio, G. R. (2015). Hostile sexism

      (de)motivates women's social competition intentions: The contradictory

      role of emotions. British *Journal of Social Psychology, 54*(*3*), 483-499.

Leong, F. T., & Austin, J. T. (2006). *The psychology research handbook: A guide*

      for graduate students and research assistants (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,

      CA: Sage Publications.

Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution

      process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*(5), 1030-

      1051.

Levine, M., & Cassidy, C. (2010). Groups, identities, and bystander behavior: How group processes can be used to promote helping. In S. Stürmer, M. Snyder, S. Stürmer, M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 209-222). Wiley-Blackwell.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2011). Intersectionality theory applied to whiteness and middle-classness. *Social Identities*, *17*(2), 239-253.

Li, J., Karakowsky, L., & Siegel, J. P. (1999). The effects of proportional representation on intragroup behavior in mixed-race decision-making groups. *Small Group Research*, *30*(3), 259-279.

Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). Microaggressions: Strong claims, inadequate evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(1), 138-169.

Lorde, Audre (1984). Sister outsider: Essays and speeches. Crossing Press. pp. 114– 123.

Lorig, K. (2006). Action planning: A call to action. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine: JABFM*, *19*(3), 324.

Louis, D. A, Rawls, G. J., Jackson-Smith, D., Chambers, G. G., Phillips, L. L., and Louis S. S. (2016). Listening to our voices: Experiences of black faculty at predominantly white research universities with microaggression. *Journal of Black Studies*, *47*(5), 454-474.

Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Goff, P. A. (2006). Concern for

the in- group and opposition to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology*, *90*(6), 961-974.

Maier, M. (n.d.). *Invisible Privilege What White Men Don't See* (Rep.). Retrieved

from https://www.whiteprivilegeconference.com/resources/09-Invisible-

Privilege-What-White-Men-Dont-See.pdf

McCabe, J. (2009). Racial and gender microaggressions on a predominantly-

White campus: Experiences of Black, Latina/o and White undergraduates.

Race, Gender, and Class, *16*(1), 133-151.

McCall, L. (2001). Sources of racial wage inequality in metropolitan labor

markets: Racial, ethnic, and gender differences. *American Sociology

Review*, *66*, 520-541.

McIntosh, P. (2015). Extending the knapsack: Using the white privilege analysis

to examine conferred advantage and disadvantage*. Women & Therapy*,

38, 232-245.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of

coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies.*

Retrieved from http://www.collegeart.org/pdf/diversity/white-privilege-and-

male-privilege.pdf

McIntosh, P. (2006). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack.

Retrieved March 21, 2016, from

https://www.pcc.edu/resources/illumination/documents/white-privilege-
essay-mcintosh.pdf

McLeod, P. L. (2013). Experiential learning in an undergraduate course in group
communication and decision making. *Small Group Research*, *44*(4), 360-
380.

McNamee, S., & Miller, R. (2014). *The Meritocracy Myth*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman
& Littlefield Pub.

Mirza, H. S. (2013). 'A second skin': Embodied intersectionality, transnationalism
and narratives of identity and belonging among Muslim women in Britain.
Women's Studies International Forum, *36*, 5-15.

Module 5: Privilege Walk Activity. (n.d.). Retrieved March, 2016, from
http://www.albany.edu/ssw/efc/pdf/Module%205_1_Privilege%20Walk%20
Activi ty.pdf

Mueller, C. W., Mulinge, M., & Glass, J. (2002). Interactional processes and
gender workplace inequalities. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*(2), 163-185.

Müllersdorf, M., Zuccato, L. M., Nimborg, J., & Eriksson, H. (2010). Maintaining
professional confidence—monitoring work with obese schoolchildren with
support of an action plan. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *24*(1),
131-138.

Myers, D. G., & Dewall, C. N. (2015). *Psychology* (11th ed.). New York, NY:
Worth.

Nadal, K. L., Davidoff, K. C., Davis, L. S., Wong, Y., Marshall, D., & McKenzie, V.

    (2015). A qualitative approach to intersectional microaggressions:

    Understanding influences of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and

    religion. *Qualitative Psychology*, *2*(2), 147-163.

Nadal, K. L., Griffin, K. E., Wong, Y., Hamit, S., & Rasmus, M. (2014). The

    impact of racial microggressions on mental health: Counseling

    implications for clients of color. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *92,*

    57-66.

Nadal, K. L., Mazzula, S. L., Rivera, D. P., & Fujii-Doe, W. (2014).

    Microaggressions and Latina/o Americans: An analysis of nativity, gender,

    and ethnicity. *Journal of Latina/0 Psychology*, *2*(2), 67-78.

Neblett, E. J., Bernard, D. L., & Banks, K. H. (2016). The moderating roles of

    gender and socioeconomic status in the association between racial

    discrimination and psychological adjustment. *Cognitive and Behavioral*

    Practice, *23*(3), 385-397.

Neipp, M., Beyebach, M., Nuñez, R. M., & Martínez-González, M. (2016). The

    effect of solution-focused versus problem-focused questions: A

    replication. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *42*(3), 525-535.

Nigatu, H. (n.d.). 21 Racial microaggressions you hear on a daily basis.

    Retrieved May 21, 2017, from http://www.buzzfeed.com/hnigatu/racial-

    microaggressions-you-hear-on-a-daily-basis#.uqrZOKBJ

O'Brien, L. T., Blodorn, A., Adams, G., Garcia, D. M., & Hammer, E. (2015).

   Ethnic variation in gender-STEM stereotypes and STEM participation: An

   intersectional approach. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority*

   Psychology, *21*(2), 169-180.

O'Laughlin, M. J., & Malle, B. F. (2002). How people explain actions performed

   by groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social*

   Psychology, *82*(1), 33-48.

Patterson, L. A., Cameron, J. E., & Lalonde, R. N. (1996). The intersection of

   race and gender: Examining the politics of identity in women's studies.

   Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des

   Sciences Du Comportment, 28(3), 229-239.

Pearson, A., Dovidio, J., & Gaertner, S. (2009). The nature of contemporary

   prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality*

   Psychology Compass, *3*(3), 314-338.

Perry, B. (2011). "No biggie:" The denial of oppression on campus. *Education,*

   Citizenship and Social Justice, *5*(3), 265-279.

Peterson, R., & Hamrick, F. (2009). White, male, and "minority:" Racial

   consciousness among white male undergraduates attending a historically

   black university. *Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(1), 34-58.

Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African

   American faculty at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Negro*

   Education, *81*(1), 82-92.

Powell, A., Branscombe, N., & Schmitt, M. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege

    or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt

    and interracial attitudes. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4),

    508.

Power, privilege, and everyday life (n.d.). Retrieved May 21, 2017, from

    http://www.microaggressions.com/

Pratto, F. & Stewart, A. L. (2012). Group dominance and the half-blindness of

    privilege. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68(*1*)*, 28-45.

Privilege Walk Activity. (n.d.a). Retrieved March, 2016, from

    https://ginsberg.umich.edu/content/privilege-walk-activity

Privilege Walk Activity. (n.d.b). Retrieved March, 2016, from

    https://www.lakelandcollege.edu/cm/diversity/content/documents/Classroo

    m_Activity_Privilege_Walk.pdf Privilege Walk Workshop 1-6.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The

    distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group

    identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5-6), 377-391.

Reilly, M. (2015, May 26). Taking the measure of sexism: Facts, figures, and

    fixes. Retrieved March 21, 2016, from

    http://www.artnews.com/2015/05/26/taking-the-measure-of-sexism-facts-

    figures-and-fixes/

Remedios, J. D., Chasteen, A. L., & Paek, J. D. (2012). Not all prejudices are

    experienced equally: Comparing experiences of racism and sexism in

female minorities. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *15*(3), 273-287.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2007). *README FIRST for a user's guide to qualitative research*. London: SAGE.

Robinson, T. (1999). The intersections of dominant discourses across race, gender, and other identities. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *77*(1), 73-79.

Rodgers, W., Simon, J., & Gabrielsson, J. (2017). Combining experiential and conceptual learning in accounting education: A review with implications. *Management Learning*, *48*(2), 187-205.

Rosenwasser, P. (2005). Exploring, resisting, and healing from internalized Jewish oppression: Activist women's cooperative inquiry. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, *66*, 1975.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 10,* 173-220.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, UK: SAGE.

Salerno, J. M., & Peter-Hagene, L. C. (2015). One angry woman: Anger expression increases influence for men, but decreases influence for women, during group deliberation. *Law and Human Behavior*, *39*(6), 581-592.

Schug, J., Alt, N. P., Lu, P. S., Gosin, M., & Fay, J. L. (2015, August 24).
Gendered race in mass media: Invisibility of Asian men and Black women in popular magazines. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture.* Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000096

Sesko, A. K., & Biernat, M. (2010). Prototypes of race and gender: The invisibility of Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 356-360.

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention—behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *12*(1), 1-36.

Singh, K., & Robinson, A. (1995). Differences in perceptions of African American women and men faculty and administrators. *Journal of Negro Education*, *64*(4), 401.

Smith, A., & Stewart, A. (1984). Approaches to studying racism and sexism in black women's lives. *Journal of Social Issues*, *39*(3), 1-15.

Snyder, H. N. (2000, July). Sexual assault of young children as reported to law enforcement: Victim, incident, and offender characteristics. Retrieved March 27, 2016, from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/saycrle.pdf

Solorzano, D. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of chicana and chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 121-136.

Spachtholz, P., Kuhbandner, C., & Pekrun, R. (2014). Negative affect improves the quality of memories: Trading capacity for precision in sensory and

working memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(4), 1450-1456.

Speight, S. L. (2007). Internalized racism: One more piece of the puzzle. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*, 126–134.

Stürmer, S., & Snyder, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping*. Hoboken, GB: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com

Steele, S. (1990). White guilt. *The American Scholar*, *59*(4), 497-506.

STEM Women (2016, January 5). Same auld lang syne: Dearth of diversity in 2016 American Chemical Society Awards. Retrieved March 05, 2017, from http://www.stemwomen.net/american-chemical-society-awards/

Stevens-Watkins, D., Perry, B., Pullen, E., Jewell, J., & Oser, C. B. (2014). Examining the associations of racism, sexism, and stressful life events on psychological distress among African-American women*. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(4), 561-569.

Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., and Holder, A. M. B. (2008). Racial microaggressions in the life experience of Black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(3), 329-336.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., and Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday

life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: theory and practice*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Swim, J. K., & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(4), 500-514.

The gender pay gap is worse for women of color. (2016, July 01). Retrieved March, 2016, from http://www.payscale.com/career-news/2016/04/the-gender-pay-gap-is-worse-for-women-of-color

Thomas, S. A., & González-Prendes, A. A. (2009). Powerlessness, anger, and stress in African American women: Implications for physical and emotional health. *Health Care for Women International, 30*(2), 93-113.

Tomkins, L., & Ulus, E. (2016). 'Oh, was that 'experiential learning'?!' Spaces, synergies and surprises with Kolb's learning cycle. *Management Learning, 47*(2), 158-178.

Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Burrow, A. L. (2010). Racial microaggressions and psychological functioning among highly achieving African-Americans: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29*(10), 1074-1099.

Torres, L., & Taknint, J. T. (2015). Ethnic microaggressions, traumatic stress

symptoms, and Latino depression: A moderated mediational model.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, *62*(3), 393-401.

Watson, L. B., & Grotewiel, M. (2016). The protective role of commitment to

social change in the relationship between women's sexist experiences

and self-silencing. *Sex Roles, 75*(4), 139-150.

Whiting, E. F., & Cutri, R. M. (2015). Naming a personal "unearned" privilege:

What pre-service teachers identify after a critical multicultural education

course. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *17*(1), 13-20.

Wing, A. K. (2003). *Critical race feminism: a reader* (2nd ed.). New York: New

York University Press.

Women of color in the United States (2016, April 27). Retrieved May, 2016, from

http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-color-united-states-0

Yardley, S., Teunissen, P., & Dornan, T. (2012). Experiential learning:

Transforming theory into practice. *Medical Teacher*, *34*(2), 161.

Zimmerman, D. (2015). Young Muslim women in the united states: Identities at

the intersection of group membership and multiple individualities. *Social

Identities*, *20*(4-5), 299-313.