

Marquette University: See then be the difference

Dyon Bryant

Advanced Composition 3210

Dr. Godbee

Introduction

I have had a passion for issues of social justice and equity since junior year of high school that has just been intensified over my undergraduate career at Marquette University. Second semester sophomore year, I began to work at the Office of Service Learning, which is an academic program that allows students to learn the concepts taught in the classroom and apply it to real-world situations through working within a Milwaukee community through a non-profit organization. It was there my passion for social justice intensified as well as through courses throughout my undergraduate career that opened my eyes to various forms of institutional discrimination. I have also had personal experiences of racial discrimination that I can only dream will be eradicated from our society as a whole one-day.

This research aims to explore how Marquette University can literally “be the difference” in its approach to fostering an informed and racially aware approach to “safety” without the racially charged bias and perceptions currently on campus. How are conversations about safety exhibiting racial bias? And how do we intervene into or change these conversations and perceptions.

In order to answer these questions, a mixed-methodology was eventually implemented in my research. The initial methodology was to conduct interviews with undergraduate students as well as Department of Public Safety to gauge attitudes of safety on campus. In the end, two interviews were conducted, one with an undergraduate student and the other with a Department of Public Safety (DPS) officer. The undergraduate interview is used to express a singular perception of safety on campus that is formulated by explicit and implicit racial biases exacerbated by society as well as DPS safety alerts. The DPS officer interview is used to provide information as to what is included in public safety reports and why. However, one-on-one

interviews hindered the progression of research and data collection, because participants would feel compelled to answer in socially acceptable ways, so naturalistic observation became the main method of data collection. To attain research, I unobtrusively observed students around campus that were engaged in conversation or activity that pertained to racial biases at work. But before data collection and analysis, it was important to note the attitudes and perceptions already at work on campus and within the student body in terms of racial biases and perceptions, providing a foundation to compare future research and further personal observations. It was also important to take note of caveats that my research would inevitably encounter as well as the stereotypes and racial perceptions already at work. Data and literature to help define terms as well as describe the information collected were found in PSYCINFO and ERIC databases. Finally, all of the collected data was compiled and rhetorically analyzed to legitimize my claim. Programs at different universities or colleges that engage in difficult dialogues in regards to diversity were analyzed and critiqued: in hopes that Marquette University could formulate and enact a similar discourse. This leads to my proposal of creating more publicity and wide spread knowledge of Revitalizing Marquette, a student run forum on campus, that has begun to engage in difficult dialogues about diversity (i.e., race, religion, and sexuality).

My research essentially boils down to a sense of prejudice that is innately built in an individual by our society. It is within one's human nature to stereotype and classify because it is preferred to be able to cast objects into distinct categories because it creates a sense of comfort. Stereotypes are a social construct used in order to help cognitively process, classify, and generalize information. My research explores how public safety reports perpetuate implicit and explicit racial stereotypes by creating an 'us (Marquette student body) versus them (greater Milwaukee community)' mentality. Instead of creating knowledge about how to be safe on and

off campus, it feels as if the reports are meant to teach students what—who to fear and regard as “unsafe” or “dangerous”. When asking the interviewed student if they fear what is reported, “I guess, yeah. Geez, I don’t know. You’re going to be afraid of what is being reported about...because it’s...I don’t know...”. And what is being reported? Black males as perpetrators of robberies and assaults, and if race is not stated in the email the student body is left to assume a race. The goal is to have that mentality eradicated through the start of perpetual dialogue(s) acknowledging and addressing the issue of stereotypes and biases at work on Marquette’s campus as well as society at large.

Methodologies

My initial methodology was to conduct one-on-one interviews with various undergraduate students at Marquette University. The purpose of the interviews was to find how implicit and explicit racial stereotypes and biases were at work through the individual’s perceptions of safety on campus. The initial and only undergraduate student interview was coded to find themes that were examples of racial stereotypes and biases. However, it was decided that unobtrusive observation of students on and off campus would be a more proficient method. One-on-one interviews would have the interviewee feel as if he or she would have to give socially acceptable answers rather than honest answers. Very rarely, people will speak openly about his or her own racial stereotypes or biases. Often people do not even know that he or she is acting in a way that is guided by implicit racial stereotypes. Considerable evidence now supports the view that social behavior often operates in an implicit or unconscious fashion. The identifying feature of implicit cognition is that past experience influences judgment in a fashion not introspectively known by the actor (Greenwald, 2006). The unobtrusive observation of students would provide me with answers that would otherwise not be attained through a question and answer session.

The other methodology that was thrown out after short deliberation was passing out surveys to fellow undergraduates. However, self-report measures are constantly questioned for their validity and scientific rigor (Haefffel & Howard, 2010). People very rarely accurately describe his or her actions, self-perceptions, or attitudes when asked. People tend to project a self, through his or her answers, that they aspire to be or incorrectly perceive him or her self to be.

An interview with a DPS officer was necessary because it would provide answers to sub-questions that arose from my initial research questions. Such as, why is the race of the perpetrator depicted in some Public Safety Alert emails and absent from others? Do DPS emails follow some sort of script? What is the purpose of identifying race only some of the time?

I interviewed the DPS officer, Joseph Secanky, and he provided me with the information of how those Public Safety Alert emails are written and what information goes into them.

My third methodology was to conduct frequency counts through unobtrusive observation of students around campus. This methodology does not require informed consent but allows the most honest data to be collected because people will act naturally. I sat outside of Raynor Library earlier in the semester, when tours were in full swing and jotted down snippets from conversations about locations on and off campus that were deemed 'safe' or not. The themes from the coded interview transcript provided me with a list of buzzwords to listen for around campus and tally when heard in conversation. Of course, I tallied those words only when heard in the context of describing a neighborhood of Marquette or Milwaukee. I then sat in a restaurant on 17th and Wells for an hour one day and tallied the amount of times a student showed signs of apprehension (a ducked head, averted eyes, or moving to the opposite side of the street or sidewalk) when passing an African-American (predominately male) on the street. I also observed students while sitting on the porch of my house, on 19th and Kilbourn, and observing students

ranging from sober to drunk on a weekend night that roamed the block in search of a party. The fact that students were mostly drunk played a helpful role in those being observed played a role in them being especially honest and unaware of my observation. To find if the data collected was normal or deviant from the norm, I had to find research to support my findings. The databases of PSYCINFO and ERIC provided a plethora of information that provided definitions and psychological literature/research that could be used to analyze and discuss the data I have collected. The themes that arose from the coded transcript with an undergraduate student were used as keywords and search terms in those databases.

Reservations to Research

I am an African-American woman asking questions to people about innate racial attitudes and know that some will answer questions in a skewed way in order to be ‘socially acceptable’. I am also aware that I am doing research of safety perception in one of the most segregated cities in America, so there will be assumptions about neighborhoods and residents of those neighborhoods. I am also aware that Marquette University itself is predominately a homogeneous campus with sparse racial diversity. Also, that many if not most students hail from a town or area that is also very homogeneous and Marquette does seem diverse. The variation of perceptions of campus diversity lead me to assume/predict that participants will not state the race of the individual in stories told when asking about experiences in which the participant was uncomfortable or not. I will also assume the race of the individual will be assumed to be African-American unless otherwise stated. I will also continue to assume that the term ‘they’ would mean to collectively classify the African-American race. Language has become racially coded and there is countless research backing up this claim as well. “Racism is becoming more taboo than politics and religion as subjects for casual conversation” (Villanueva, 2006). This ideology is

affirmed within my interview conducted with a current undergraduate student because not once does the interviewee state the race of an individual during a story of discomfort on campus. Instead the student refers to him as “a man” and fears that their keys would “be taken or something”. The student even goes so far as to classify the man as “dangerous”. This finding in my research goes along with the research conducted by Bernd, Park and Wittenbrink; “results showed reliable stereotyping and prejudice effects: Black primes resulted in substantially stronger facilitation to negative than positive stereotypic attributes, whereas White primes facilitated positive more than negative stereotypic traits” (Bernd, Park & Wittenbrink, 2006). So the association of black individuals with negative perceptions is largely implicit and conveyed through language and underlying assumption of identifying race with the negative connotations. There has been numerous proving that despite having egalitarian views in terms of race relations and belief/support of civil rights, that implicit test of the subconscious proves existence of implicit racial biases/stereotypes (Murphy, 1998). Despite beliefs of being tolerant and equitable does not dismiss the possibility of harbored racial intolerance.

Collection

The databases ERIC and PsychINFO are plentiful in regards to scholarly peer reviewed psychological journals and research. I am conducting similar research for my Psychological Research Methods and Design class, so the collection of scholarly peer reviewed literature overlaps. The journal articles helped me define terms such as ‘stereotype’ as well as describe the human nature of stereotyping. The articles also provided a foundation of research that has been conducted prior to my own that can either confirm or disapprove findings that I have collected. The databases provided plentiful information when plugged with the key words: safety perception, campus, fear, college students, racial bias, and stereotyping.

I conducted a singular interview with a Marquette undergraduate student in regards to their personal feelings of safety perception on campus. The interview is used as a singular example of attitudes and racial bias within the Marquette student body. The interview was coded and helped the creation of the keywords used to search in the databases ERIC and PsycINFO. The same keywords were used as buzzwords that I listened for in students' conversations on and off campus. Other buzzwords I listened for on and off campus are as follows: sketch, dangerous, unsafe, fear, and paranoid.

I also spoke to DPS Officer, Joseph Secanky in order to attain information in regards to the Public Safety Reports and personal attitudes of safety perception on Marquette's campus. The interview was short and informal. However, it provided a lot of information about that DPS officer's perceptions of safety on campus, what is included in DPS Public Safety Alerts and why, and the reaction he believes students to have. This coded interview transcript was used to answer the main research question as well as some of the sub-questions that arose from the initial question.

Finally, there were two methods of collecting discreet observation of Marquette students. There were the times I sat in the library, academic buildings, or in the process of walking to and from class or home I heard students mention some of the aforementioned buzzwords. However, I figured that would not be a fair representation of attitudes because it would be over time and it is inconsistent. So I limited the frequency count to an hour of unobtrusive observation on an October weekend at my house. I live on 19th and Kilbourn and the block is always abuzz on weekends because of house parties being thrown. So for an hour I listened to students, of all grades most likely, ranging from buzzed to completely drunk, who walked around and critiqued the neighborhood. The combination of liquor and being unaware of observation allowed for a lot

of honest critiques and opinions to come out within the hour. The other methodology was to sit in a restaurant on 17th and Wells due to the heavy student and Milwaukee-area resident traffic. This would provide me with plentiful data in regards to the interaction or lack thereof that occurs between Marquette students and the greater Milwaukee community and if those same actions are guided by racial biases.

Observations

Prior to conducting this research, I have noticed that bowed heads, quick glances, and clutching of personal items are positively correlated when passed by an African-American man or men. This has been noticed when walking with friends or noticing strangers and I myself have been guilty of such behavior in some instances but am now more prone to catch myself and stop that behavior. Perhaps—this behavior can be noted because Marquette University is a predominately homogeneous campus situated within one of the most segregated cities in America. The campus is nearly at the crux of downtown and affluent suburbs, which are predominantly Caucasian, and downtrodden and impoverished neighborhoods, which are predominately African-American or Hispanic. My research essentially boils down to an issue of prejudice and racial profiling; I know that people will be more cautious to talk openly to me about it. The inconspicuous observations of students will provide me with the most honest and valid results because it is the student or students speaking honestly and without the need to appear socially acceptable.

There is also the observation of students watching people walking outside or near his or her place of residence. However, it is noted that students who reside in this area (the blocks of 17th and Kilbourn to 19th) often watch an African-American passerby (that has no known Marquette affiliation) longer than that of a known Marquette student or African-American with Marquette

affiliation. It stems from the explicit stereotyping of an individual as “dangerous” and having to be able to watch him or her in order to assure that nothing dangerous or out of the ordinary occurs.

Also, there is the observation of the belief that there are certain areas on and off campus that female students are not allowed to walk alone. I have not been allowed to walk home from a male friend’s house that could see me enter my house from his doorstep. The belief was that it was a “shady neighborhood” and that I am “an attractive, young female” and the combination of those two factors is far from ideal. Why are females being watched so carefully and encouraged to take advantage of safety resources when males are the predominant victims of reported robberies and assaults?

It seems as if the farther a student heads south, north or west from the main campus, the more dangerous it becomes. All of the aforementioned directions lead to predominantly minority neighborhoods. Coincidence? But what makes the main campus so safe? People do get robbed on campus. People have things stolen from them in the library all the time from leaving their property unattended. Why not receive a DPS public safety report about that as well?

Results

Data collected over this semester proved that safety perceptions on campus are strongly guided by racial stereotypes and biases. Granted, it was what was expected but there was the desire to be wrong. However, it is not just my research and Marquette University that affirms this unfortunate truth. Results showed reliable stereotyping and prejudice effects: Black primes resulted in substantially stronger facilitation to negative than positive stereotypic attributes, whereas White primes facilitated positive more than negative stereotypic traits...correlated reliably with participants' scores on explicit racial attitude measures, indicating that people's spontaneous

stereotypic associations are consistent with their more controlled responses (Wittenbrink, Judd & Park, 1997). So individuals are more prone to classify black individuals negatively and with more negative attributes than whites. This result was true across races and sexes, so it is not a behavior that could be attributed to one specific race or sex.

My own research has produced similar results. I interviewed a friend and fellow Marquette undergraduate student and encountered implicit racial language in regards to perceptions of safety. For example,

“I...uh...turned down 17th street to go north and this man was in front of me and he kept on looking over his shoulder. And then he like slowly started walking slower and slower and slower until I was right behind him just waiting and then he pretty much stopped and looked around at me. I just didn't feel comfortable, so I turned around and went back home...Cause I didn't wanna have my keys taken away or anything like that”.

It was safe to assume that the man described in that situation was African-American and instantly stereotyped into the category of “dangerous” and “thief”. The participant in the interview cast no hesitancy about the telling the story but did not attribute race or provide any racially charged language; it was to be assumed. At the end of the interview, I inquired about the race of the man in the story and the interviewee hesitated before saying ‘black’. What does that say about perceptions of black males on Marquette campus or society at large? Are negative stereotypes so closely assumed or associated with African-Americans that identification is not necessary? Or was it because the student was talking to an African-American that race was not identified in order not to offend?

I am assuming this because unfortunately, this has always been the norm. There are numerous studies done about race and situational circumstances that back up my claim, for example the book *Eyewitness Testimony* by Elizabeth E. Loftus that says that eyewitness testimony are more unreliable than not.

Beginning with the basics of eyewitness fallibility, such as poor viewing conditions, brief exposure, and stress...[Loftus] moves [makes associations] to more subtle factors, such as expectations, biases, and personal stereotypes, all of which can intervene to create erroneous reports...eyewitness memory is chronically inaccurate in surprising ways. An ingenious series of experiments reveals that memory can be radically altered by the way an eyewitness is questioned after the fact. New memories can be implanted and old ones unconsciously altered under interrogation (Loftus, 1994).

Another personal experience/observation helped reiterate this ideology that race is to be assumed—even if the faulty assumption—when a crime is committed. On November 4, 2011 around 5 p.m. I was watching TV with my roommates, we heard incessant knocking on our neighbors' door, and when two of my roommates peered out of the window to see who was knocking, he moved out of eye sight. Shortly after, the door opened then was followed by a piercing scream. Before we knew it, the man ran down the steps then jogged up the block towards Wells. One roommate and myself went to our neighbor's back door and stated that it was the neighbors and wanted to check in to ensure that everything was okay. They opened the door and informed us of what had just happened while the victim called DPS. Questions of appearance were quickly thrown amongst the neighbors as anxiety peaked. My roommate and I quickly divulged the information we had; he was a white male, short brown hair, wearing a large winter coat, and he headed south towards Wells. When we had informed them of the information

we had; he was white, and he had short cut brown hair, he headed south towards Wells, he wore a large winter coat. Disbelief colored their faces as they asked, shocked, “he was white?!” It was then that I realized that a faulty eyewitness testimony would have been given if my roommate and I had not come over. Due to our report, the perpetrator was caught within 10 minutes. Was the race to be assumed to be black? If so, why?

However, these preconceived racial notions are not formed when a student begins to attend Marquette University but before a student even decides if the university is a proper fit. On a day of unobtrusive observation, a tour guide of a three-person family informed them of the areas that are “safe” and “unsafe”. The tour guide went on to say that the east side of town is “beautiful, often frequented by Marquette students, and always has something going on”. Conveniently, this is also the predominately white and affluent neighborhood of Milwaukee. The west and south sides of town were conveyed as “dangerous” and “nowhere to be at any time of the day”. The tour guide continued on to note that even passing the 2040s was not ideal, noting that the McDonalds gets held up and the LIMOS do not even like going there due to fear of being held up. Instantly, perceptions were made and racial bias was at play.

This tour guide was not alone in informing prospective students of what areas are “okay” and “dangerous”. A father asked jokingly, “you’re showing us all of the academic stuff, where will the parties happen?” All in the party then laughed as the tour guide showed hesitancy of whether or not to actually divulge the information to the father-son duo. The tour guide laughed, “Well, there is always something happening on 19th and Kil”. In which the son and prospective student asked where 19th and Kilbourn was, the tour guide answered, “West of here, but no worries DPS always patrols the area and keeps it safe because the area is shady. Plus LIMOS can pick you up,

no problem.” What made it shady exactly? Is it because of the local Rescue Mission or because it is off-campus? Would the mention of constant DPS patrol placate or exacerbate the worries?

The final tour guide observation waxed on about how beautiful the Third Ward and east side was. When asked about other neighborhoods and pointing towards the west side of town, the tour guide responded, “the only things worthwhile over there are Leon’s, Target and Wal Mart, but only go if you have access to a car or if there’s a group of you taking the bus”. Now why all of the pre-requisites to head south or west in Milwaukee? And why make sound going that way only appealing if in a group? It was implicitly setting stereotypes of various neighborhoods and the residents of those neighborhoods of Milwaukee.

How would those references to certain areas surrounding Marquette University influence the decision to attend the school? Do they create or enhance the racial biases already at work in those touring the school?

When subtly observing students at the two locations, either 17th and Wells or 19th and Kilbourn, produced results that were shocking. The frequency count I conducted at a restaurant at 17th and Wells, produced the result that there were 43 different accounts/times that students bowed his or her head and/or averted their eyes when passing an African-American male on the street. It is the idea of “perceived threat”[assumptions about individual perceptions of minority groups as threatening] that is positively correlated with the presence of African-Americans (King, R.D., Wheelock, D., 2007). It is important to note that two non-Marquette affiliated African-American males stood at this corner for approximately 30 minutes, talking to one another then one male left and the other remained for an additional 15 minutes. It can also be noted that it was 35 females that bowed their heads/averted their eyes when passing a black male on the street and 8 males that engaged in this behavior. In addition to the bowed head response,

students that silently walked in pairs often had one of the individuals step behind or in front the other and walk until he or she had passed the African-American male. And it is not as if the sidewalk is not wide enough to accommodate three people walking on it at once. In fact, when a Marquette-affiliated individual was standing on the corner, either waiting for a light to change or some other reason the silent pairs walking did not walk behind each other, instead they remained side-by-side. Coincidence? The act of averting a gaze or averting eyes is stereotyping an individual as cause for concern or possible detriment to feelings of personal safety.

The interview with DPS Joseph Secanky proved very informative. In fact, I found that Public Safety Alert descriptions are based solely on the eyewitness testimony. “We try to get all of that information in there. Again, if it isn’t in there, I’m assuming it’s because we had no idea of what the race of this person was. Or whoever reported didn’t know or so on and so fourth”.

Eyewitness account is essential for identifying and hopefully apprehending the perpetrator, but then again, it has been proven that eyewitness testimony is unreliable (Loftus, 1994). Plus when an event that is largely negative occurs, individuals are more prone to report the perpetrator as black. So there is a lot of room for faulty eyewitness testimony and accounts, leading to apprehending the wrong individual. How could this process become more efficient?

When asked about if Officer Secanky would describe the campus as safe or not, he provided an answer about all of the resources available to students that keep them safe. He also made constant reference that DPS is here for the Marquette University student body as well as the Milwaukee community. However, I am guessing that the Milwaukee community is not informed when a robbery or assault is reported on-campus.

The unobtrusive observation of students of 19th and Kilbourn produced the frequency count of 25. Students referenced to the area and/or residents of 19th and Kilbourn as “sketchy” or some

variation of the word. One example that is prominent in my mind was a drunken student literally being supported by another drunken student, voicing their concern of being robbed. The student was adamant on not going further because “we’re too close too the Mission, we’re going to be killed...my wallet will be stolen. Where is this party?” The other student quickly and sloppily assuaged the concerns of the other student with a pat on the head. However, the residents of the Mission are not allowed to be out after the streetlights come on, so the concern of being robbed was not feasible. I wanted nothing more than to warn the students about being careful because sexual assault by an acquaintance has a much more possibility of happening. Why isn’t sexual assault feared amongst students? One in four women will be sexually assaulted in her lifetime. In the interview with an undergraduate student, I asked if they fear being sexually assaulted more so than being robbed. The student admitted to being afraid of what was being reported more so than what is actually probable of happening. The student even attributed the neighborhood they reside in, 19th and Kilbourn, to the fear of being robbed. However, there has been one incident reported from the block of 19th and Kilbourn out of the twelve DPS Public Safety Alerts. The block of 19th and Kilbourn is closely associated with the Rescue Mission as well as the residents of the greater Milwaukee area. Therefore, it has been assumed to be more dangerous. However, most of the robberies reported have come from between the 1600 and 1800 block of Wells and Kilbourn, spanning much more of the off-campus student’s residences.

Proposal

There was the overwhelming fear that a feasible proposal could be thought of in order to get the issue of race and racial biases on the forefront. However, while collecting data and reading over academic literature I came up with three possible proposals. The initial idea was to create a

universal script for all DPS public safety alerts. The script would require certain information from the victim of the crime, for example, race, sex, approximate height and weight, and clothing. However, this relies on eyewitness testimony and that has been proven to be unreliable and racially biased. But the proposal is not to just have the race of the individual stated, physical features or oddities should be reported as well. The goal would be to not only have the race and sex stated of the individual, because that causes fear of all members of that race and sex. In an informal focus group, a student remarked that he received a report about a black perpetrator who had dreadlocks and consequently feared all black males he saw that day that had dreadlocks. The idea behind the reports is not to create a mentality of fear towards other individuals, but foster an aware student body.

Then there was the idea of having a campus wide symposium about difficult dialogues and taboos about issues regarding diversity. There would be a symposium about race, sexuality, religion, gender inequalities, etc. The symposiums would happen at least twice a semester and would be mandated. Then it dawned on me that no one wants to be mandated to do anything, you cannot make people feel passion towards an issue by forcing him or her to hear about it. And those that would show up would be impassioned about the issue(s) at hand and want to rectify it. So it was then that it was decided that the example Marquette University would follow would be the University of Missouri's example of their Dialogues Program.

“The activities focus on teaching and reinforcing knowledge, skills, and awareness of diversity issues in higher education related to race, gender, sexual orientation, and religious literacy that encourage difficult dialogues on important, challenging topics and are essential to democratic citizenship in an increasingly diverse society...The University of Missouri is one of only a handful of institutions to receive renewal grants from the Difficult Dialogues Initiative. This

program began at MU in 2006. Phase I of the program started in the two-year period of 2006-2007. This phase was designed (a) to assist its participants to understand some of the controversial and divisive issues in the student body; (b) teach them how to engage their students in these difficult dialogues; and (c) to enhance the learners' self-efficacy and confidence in facilitating the discussions. Phase II of the MU Difficult Dialogues Program will (a) sustain our campus-wide faculty development program, and (b) provide a summer institute for other universities to develop difficult dialogues programs on their campuses" (University of Missouri, 2006). The Office of Chancellor's Diversity Initiative (CDI) backs the program and the goal is to expand opportunities for faculty, students and staff to engage and thrive in an increasingly diverse environment. The office continuously evaluates the campus climate and develops new programs and strategic planning efforts that "foster a diverse and inclusive campus environment. Through workshops, seminars and facilitated dialogues, we increase understanding of diverse communities". Over time the program has expanded, for example, the 2008-09 year was a resounding success with approximately 230 students (the primary group), faculty and staff participating, an increase of 233 percent from the 69 total participants from the year before. "The majority of participants responded in the post-dialogue evaluations that they have learned something about themselves or how others viewed the issues". So the program has had continued success and involvement from both students and faculty.

The successfully run Mizzou program is what Marquette University should model their own after. Right now, a difficult dialogue has been started on campus through 'Revitalizing Marquette'. It is a student run forum, created in fall 2010 after the controversy of possibly hiring Jodi O'Brien, as the dean for College of Arts and Sciences. Unfortunately, it has had a drop-off in numbers in regards faculty. At these sessions, students are assured a confidentiality agreement,

in order to actually get the ball rolling on the difficult dialogues in regards to; religion, sexuality, race, etc. However, this event is not mandated by the university and is not publicized as widely as other events that occur around campus. The Difficult Dialogues program at Mizzou is backed by the university and has its own webpage on the university website. Revitalizing Marquette sends out emails prior to their events on campus, and I only receive those emails due to working in the Office of Service Learning—an academic office on campus that integrates service into the classroom. But there are so many individuals that are not aware or informed of Revitalizing Marquette and the issues at hand that they are trying to rectify.

Revitalizing Marquette is mentioned in the University News Briefs prior to the next meeting, but too often News Briefs are deleted before they are read, it's a universal sentiment amongst the undergraduate student body. There is a dialogue being started on campus, but not all are partaking in the difficult conversation because they do not know about it. More would be apt to participate if the program received adequate funding and publicity.

Dyon Bryant

Annotated Bibliography

- 1) Anthony, A.G., Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*. 102(1), 4-27.

It is within human nature and a social function to stereotype and classify individuals in order to feel comfort. However, stereotypes can be hurtful to a race or group of people and over generalize, resulting in self-fulfilling prophecies and hurt esteem of those stereotyped groups. Those stereotyped groups could face negative repercussions due to the belief of stereotypes holding some grain of truth. The nature to stereotype is innate, but it's relationship to feelings of safety and esteem is closely intertwined.

- 2) Williamson, A.M., Feyer, A.M., Cairns, D., Biancotti, D. (1997). The development of a measure of safety climate: The role of safety perceptions and attitudes. *Safety Science*. 25(2). 15-27.

How safe one is feeling in a particular instance is tied to the environment he or she is currently in. That being said, some feel that his or her safety is compromised when in a neighborhood predominately of minorities. Those neighborhoods have been perceived as "dangerous" or "sketchy". But how closely tied are those feelings of esteem and safety to race? Would one feel safer in a predominately black neighborhood if that individual were black as well or no?

- 3) Fox, K.A., Nobles, M.R., Piquero, A.R. (2009). *Security Journal*. Gender, crime, victimization and fear of crime. [Abstract].

Why are females encouraged to walk home in groups or with someone, when it is predominately males being robbed? Why protect women? They are not fragile beings that cannot protect themselves if necessary. Shouldn't safety being emphasized to all students and not just a particular gender? This article examines if women are more fearful of crimes happening than men or vice versa. Is it just a stereotype that women are more fearful or actuality?

- 4) King, R.D., Wheelock, D. (2007). Group threat and social control: Race, perception of minorities, and the desire to punish. *Social Forces*. 85(3). 1255-80.

Are humans more inapt to harshly criticize a minority than white male? Are eyewitness testimonies trustworthy? Why is it that black males are overcrowding prisons? And have faces splashed across the news as bandits or thugs? Are these workings of society to enforce a history of prejudice and social order due to the social construct of race? Is this stereotyping only coming from other races and not blacks? No. It has been found that across races stereotype black males faster to negative stereotypes or conceptions. Is this at work in the Marquette University community? This is what my research aims to address.

- 5) Jennings, W.G., Grover, A.R., Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*. 18(2). 191-208.

What is the state of safety among colleges? With recent events such as the shooting at Virginia Tech, what can colleges do to protect students? What is the responsibility of colleges to enforce safety and feelings of esteem? What dialogue can be started to have safety measures implemented?

- 6) Butler, A. Lafreniere, K.D. (2010). *Journal of College Student Development*. Campus reactions to mass notification. 51(4). 436-39.

Recently reported crimes on campus are meant to cause sense of relief and awareness, however; many claim paranoia and fear. The mass emails, marked as high importance, frequent inboxes and cause a panic in undergraduate students. This article examines if mass communication actually pacifies fear or exacerbates it. Is the fear that being promoted of robberies in general or specific individuals reported in robberies? What is the point of describing the assailants if he or she was not caught?

- 7) Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C.M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personal Social Psychology*. 72(2). 262-274.]

This article focuses on the implicit racial stereotypes at work despite claims of complete racial tolerance. Shows how racial attitudes are acted upon on an implicit level, not even known to the perpetrator. It is helpful in explaining the phenomenon of racial stereotypes at work beyond the recognition of those acting.

- 8) Villanueva, V. (2006). New Racism or The Master's Four Tropes. *Rhetoric Society of America*. *The Rhetorics of America*.

This article speaks about how racism and race have become taboo subjects. This is at the core of what my research aims to explore. What are the functions of stereotypes in today's society? Is there truth to those stereotypes? How is racism function in today's society? These are all questions that my research aims to answer as well.

- 9) Greenwald, A. (2006). Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-esteem, and Stereotypes. *Psychological Review*. 102. 4-27.

This article focuses on the implicit racial stereotypes at work despite claims of complete racial tolerance. Shows how racial attitudes are acted upon on an implicit level, not even known to the perpetrator. It is helpful in explaining the phenomenon of racial stereotypes at work beyond the recognition of those acting.

10) Murphy, P.A. (1998). Where Bias Begins: The Truth about Stereotypes. *Psychology Today*.

This article helps cite areas of research that look to prove or disprove various beliefs about stereotypes. Stereotypes are actually a core of my research and I want to explore how we can eradicate them from our society.

11) Haefffel, J.G. & Howard, S.G. (2010). Self-report: Psychology's four-letter word. *American Journal of Psychology*. 123(2). 181-188.

Talks about how invalid self-report measures are, gives legitimacy to the claim as to why I threw out the idea of surveying students. Self-report measures are faulty because people are less apt to be truthful and perceive themselves honestly.

12) Loftus, F.E. (1994). The problem with eyewitness testimony. *Psychological Research and Legal Thought*. 253.

This provided me with information that could poke holes in the current way DPS reports are made. It shows the fallacies that are committed when crimes are reported to authorities because there are implicit racial biases at work. This work gives validity to the claim that implicit racial stereotypes are at work when crimes/assaults are reported on and off campus.