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1. DOES an intentional emphasis on "E" obscure the impact of "I" too much?  Does "E" negate "I"?    Why or Why not?

* E cannot negate "I" because "I" refers to a student's specific (input) experiences that have shaped their identity. "E" can obscure the impact of "I", but if "I" truly does refer to the input that shapes a student's identity and perspectives a short experience in a higher education will never totally obscure this. It could, however, expose the student to a more constructive "E" that fosters diversity, critical thinking, and respectful discourse. If this is the case, I would argue that a student's "I" was substantially obscured, but it was in a beneficial way.

2. To what extent do the particular needs, theories, and strategies that were included with respect to one student subpopulation have applicability across subpopulations?  Implications?​

* Most theories we have studied evaluate students as complex individuals who are developing and experiencing multiple dimensions of that development. Naturally, the theories that specifically are based on a study of one subpopulation will not apply directly to another subpopulation, but I think the theories we have studied largely focus on the driving forces of humans in general. For example, reading about specific subpopulations brought up instances of discrimination, isolation, and preconceived ideals or prejudices. Each instance of these injustices result in a change in the individual being mistreated, so if one is studying how a black woman is marginalized or how a gay man is, there is some crossover between the theories in that foundationally they are addressing marginalization. The implications of the theories specific to subpopulations are generally, address this issue in an appropriate and constructive way, or accept that the campus environment will not provide an environment that fosters meaningful engagement for individuals in this subpopulation.

3. To what extent does every student have multiple identities?​  What are those identities?

* I fully believe that each student has multiple identities specifically referring to their race, gender, sexual orientation, age, social obligations, occupation, etc.. Each student must learn how to identify these multiple identities and rationalize how they interact with their personality. From there, students should decide if they want these multiple dimensions of their personality to impact them in the way it is, or if they should change something about themselves in one of those categories.

4. To what extent are institutions placing enough emphasis on "distinctive" or "particular" identity development efforts?​    If so, how, if no, how are they not?

* Foundationally, institutions provide a variety of possible majors and pre-occupational tracks of study. This begins emphasizing the occupation portion of student's identity development. College is also a place where students will encounter people with likely very different "I" than they have. This diversity is another way that universities place emphasis on identity development because encountering those who are different than you inspires introspection into how and why they are different. One cannot answer these questions without exploring their own identity.

1. To what extent are such efforts necessary? Possible? Effective? (I.e. to what extent can institutional data suggest that such institutional actions are "working"?)​

* Efforts to emphasize distinctive or particular identity development are necessary, challenging, and have the potential to be effective. Depending on the institution, different levels of emphasis are placed on gender, sexuality, age, etc.. Maybe this emphasis is shown through campus sponsored events and groups, or maybe it is shown through offering particular classes that encourage student engagement with the ideas. Institutional data that is longitudinal and comprehensive that asks questions pertaining to individual student's multiple identities could potentially reveal the effectiveness of higher education institution's influence on this development. Currently, I do not know if this data is available, so I cannot confidently say if institutional efforts are effective. I do believe that graduates in the last 20 years have reflected more interest in their own personal development and in understanding those who are different than themselves' perspectives and opinions. Hopefully higher education has had a substantial effort on this change.

1. What particular aspects of an institution's current environment may be altered and/or improved with the need of particular student subpopulation(s) in mind and without abrogating hoped-for-outcomes?

* The facilitation of opportunities for students to explore their "Whiteness" or their own ethnic identities through peer collaboration, professional presentations, or even required general education courses could help propel white students towards a higher cognitive level of thinking that allows them to begin understanding and respecting the perspective of peers of color. Nonbiased, accessible, trustworthy faculty could be made available for international students to discuss cultural differences with could provide a safe space that makes the country and the institution more hospitable. A lot of the research I have been reading has a common theme of students not knowing who to report an unjust situation to, so they just choose not to report it at all. Having a specific group of people to support these students could greatly aid in retention and continue fighting racial injustice.