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Overview

This file provides an overview of the Diversity Effect Project including the methods utilised, the data preparation process and the coding of the archived SPSS dataset.

Accompanying files are as follows:

* ***Measures\_manual\_DEP***; copy of the full questionnaire including citations for the measures.
* ***DEP\_survey***; SPSS datafile.
* ***DEP\_parent\_consent***; parental consent forms.
* ***DEP\_participant\_consent***; participant consent forms.
* ***Intervention\_overview\_DEP***; a summary of the intervention materials and a link to the intervention files.

**Project Overview**

The Diversity Effect Project examined the ways in which intergroup interaction experiences happen amongst youth attending ethnically diverse secondary schools, the impact of these interactions on social attitudes and soft educational outcomes, and how teachers might intervene to promote more intergroup relations in the school classroom. The project utilised a survey methodology, collecting paper and pen survey responses from participants at three time points over the period of a school year. At each time point, the survey explored the relationship between contact experiences and social and soft educational outcomes. Working alongside teachers in each of the four schools involved in the project, the research also designed a bespoke 4-week intervention that aimed to promote more positive social attitudes and better educational outcomes for youth. Within each school, the intervention was implemented either by half of the classes or by all classes. The effectiveness of the intervention was assessed using the third survey time point. Below, we describe the overall project design as well as details of the archived dataset (***DEP\_Survey***). The dataset comprises the survey responses from the three matched timepoints enabling users to examine changes over time as well as the effects of the intervention on social attitudes and soft educational outcomes.

**Project Design**

**Recruitment**

Schools were recruited from an ethnically diverse region of England and were selected and approached (matched on student numbers, ethnic diversity and percentage of free school meals) to take part in the project. At the grant writing stage, a number of schools were contacted by email and sent a project outline. Based on this outline, three schools provided letters of support for the project that were included in the grant application. One school was recruited following notification of the funding award. Once funding was awarded, a series of communications and meetings were held with either the Head or Assistant Head and subsequently with Year 7 coordinators and Year 7 tutors in each school. Prior to the commencement of the research, an additional project outline was either sent to or discussed with schools and the project Case for Support and questionnaire were circulated to Schools who asked for these. In all Schools a meeting was held with Year 7 tutors to inform them of the project and all tutors received a copy of the questionnaire and instructions at each data collection time point.

Prior to data collection, parents were sent a letter outlining the research and were asked to complete opt-out consent for the research (see ***DEP\_parent\_consent***). Letters were sent in at least two ways; usually email and sent home via post/with young people and sent at two time points during the project. Consent was also obtained from participants prior to completing the questionnaire at each of the three timepoints (see ***DEP\_participant\_consent***).

**Participants**

The focus was on Year 7 students (age 11) as this is the first year at secondary school and pupils are at an age where prejudices and identities are becoming increasingly important. The sample size was 729 at Time 1, 694 at Time 2 and 654 at Time 3. Participants were nested within classes, 32 in total (8 in each of the four schools). Where possible, participant responses were matched across the three time points. Matching, however, was not always possible due to missing information. As a result, the dataset (***DEP\_Survey.sav***) comprises 931 rows of data; unmatchable surveys were maintained to ensure that the full data obtained could be utilised in any subsequent analyses.

**Research Phases**

The project involved three related Phases, described in more detail below.

**Phase 1: Pilot testing surveys.** Surveys, using previously established scales and the expertise of the research team were designed. The questionnaires included a range of items relating to young peoples’ interactions with those from different racial groups, the extent to which they perceive their friends, school and teacher support diverse interactions, there attitudes towards different groups, their academic self-efficacy and aspirations for higher education. These surveys were piloted tested first amongst a number of young people from different racial groups and then, in each of the four schools. A wide range of changes were made to the questionnaire as a result of this piloting and the feedback received from teachers and students. The pilot data is not archived.

**Phase 2: Main data collection: surveys and observations.** The second phase of the project involved distributing two surveys (one in autumn and one in winter) and in some schools, lunchroom observations. In each school of the four secondary schools, the entire cohort of Year 7 students were involved in the research. The survey was designed to measure educational and social attitudes and were adapted following feedback from Phase 1. Lunchtime observations, whereby the researchers stood in the corner of the lunchroom and made notes on who students chose to sit beside were also conducted. This, however, proved difficult in some schools and due to the dynamic nature of the lunchroom setting, these observations were only trialled at the first time point. To ensure anonymity, observations are not archived.

**Phase 3: Intervention and Evaluation.** The third phase of the project focused on designing, implementing and evaluating an intervention. The researchers worked with teachers in a series of workshops to develop an intervention that would be implemented in their classrooms. Interested tutors or PSHE teachers were invited to take part in this part of the project. In each School, up to 4 x Year 7 tutors (or all PSHE tutors) volunteered to take part in designing and delivering the intervention. Tutors were compensated for their time or teacher cover was provided, depending on the School. Intervention workshops were held from March 2017- April 2018. The first workshop was designed to inform teachers of the research (including full details of the methods), provide background to relevant theory and to share intervention design ideas. The second workshop was designed to review and get feedback on a draft of the intervention materials developed from the first meeting. The final workshop involved the handover of intervention materials and a Q&A opportunity. All meetings were audio-recorded for record keeping purposes, permission to record the sessions was sought from teachers. In each school, the teachers delivered the intervention in their classrooms over a four-week period. An overview of the intervention can be found in the archived ***Intervention\_overview***\_***DEP*** file and all intervention materials are available on [www.diversityeffect.wordpress.com](http://www.diversityeffect.wordpress.com). Post-intervention surveys were distributed to test immediate and mid-term effects of the intervention on the same outcomes measured in Phase 2 of the project.

**Data Preparation and Coding**

Participants completed, amongst others, a series of questions on their intergroup contact experiences, social attitudes, educational efficacy and aspirations as well as perceptions of peer, school, family and teacher support. The full list of measure and their citations are provided in archived ***Measures\_manual\_DEP*** file***.*** Raw questionnaire responses from the paper and pencil surveys were entered into SPSS. As far as possible, participants were matched to their previous responses. Where participants completed only one time point or were unmatchable due to not providing their date of birth and/or initials, these responses were retained in the dataset. Missing data is coded as ‘999’. For the social network questions, only the reported race and gender of each friend is archived, to ensure anonymity. The dataset codes are presented per section of the survey below using the following key:

[sca] Continuous variable name; *if multi-item scale* items in the scale numbered sequentially (e.g., sca1, sca2, sca3…)

[nom] Nominal *categorical* variable name

**Classification variables**

The following variables were created to enable classification of the participants, schools and classes and to recognise intervention participation (v not) and the survey timepoint.

* *PartID* = each row of data was given a unique ID in the dataset
* *School* = labelled 1-4 representing the four schools
* *Class* = labelled 1-32, representing each of the 32 classes. Data missing from this variable is from School 4 where the first data collection timepoint took place in a large group. Students who were unmatchable with classes at later timepoints were allocated 999, representing missing, for class.
* *Inter* = this variable notes whether participants took part in the intervention or not with codes of 0= control and 1=intervention.
* T1 at the end of a variable refers to Time 1, T2 to Time 2 and T3 to Time 3

**Section 1: Demographics**

In this section participants were asked to respond to a series of demographic questions. The variable codes and numbering are provided in parentheses. Here, participant responses to the three time points were crossed checked and combined into single variables.

1. Gender [gender]

Female [0] Male [1] Prefer not to say [2]

1. Racial group [race]

White [0] Black [1] Asian [2] Mixed Race [3]

Participants also completed a measure asking for their ethnic group, this information was used to cross-check the racial categories and is not included in the archived dataset.

**Section 2: Friendships and Interactions**

In this section participants were asked to respond to a series of questions on the types of contact they have with people from different racial groups. Here, participants responded to interactions with White people, Black people and Asian people. In line with intergroup contact research, participants answered quantity, quality and negative contact. Participants were also asked to provide the initials, perceived race and perceived gender of their top three friends in the class they were currently in (tutor group or PSHE class). The variable codes and numbering are provided in parentheses.

Contact quantity: three items measured on 1-7 (none- a lot)

* At school with *White people* [wsconf], *Black people* [bsconf], *Asian people* [asconf]
* Neighbourhood with *White people* [wnconf], *Black people* [bnconf], *Asian people* [anconf]
* Social situations with *White people* [waconf], *Black people* [baconf], *Asian people* [aaconf]

Contact quality: three items measured on 1-7 scale

* Unpleasant- pleasant with *White people* [wple], *Black people* [bple], *Asian people* [aple]
* Compete- work together with *White people* [wcoo], *Black people* [bcoo], *Asian people* [acoo]
* Casual- meaningful with *White people* [wdee], *Black people* [bdee], *Asian people* [adee]

Negative contact: single item measured on a 1-5 scale (never to very often). Participants were asked to report their negative contact experiences with *White people* [wneg], *Black people* [bneg], *Asian people* [aneg]. This measure was included at Time 1 and Time 2 only as the questionnaire was shortened at Time 3 to ensure higher levels of completion.

Social networks:participants wereasked to give race and gender of best three friends in class. Initials are not included in the archived data to ensure anonymity.

* Friend 1: Race:[snar1; White = 0, Black = 1; Asian = 2, Mixed Race = 3) Gender: [snag1; Female = 0, Male = 1, Other = 2]
* Friend 2: Race:[snar2; White = 0, Black = 1; Asian = 2, Mixed Race = 3] Gender: [snag2; Female = 0, Male = 1, Other = 2]
* Friend 3: Race:[snar3; White = 0, Black = 1; Asian = 2, Mixed Race = 3] Gender: [snag3; Female = 0, Male = 1, Other = 2]

Peer norms [pnor]**:** measured by 4 items on a 1-5 scale (not at all to very much). Participants were asked to respond to items related to how supportive their peers are of them engaging in interactions with people from different racial groups.

**Section 3: Education**

In this section participants were asked to respond to a series of questions relating to their academic self-efficacy, their aspirations, the extent to which they perceive stereotype threat in school and their ability to take the perspective of others. These items served to examine the extent to which intergroup contact experiences are associated with soft education related outcomes as well as to ascertain any intervention effects at Time 3. The variable codes and numbering are provided in parentheses.

Academic efficacy [efi]: measured by 6 items on a 1-7 scale (not at all true of me to very true of me).

Stereotype threat perceptions [thr]: measured by 5 items on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Academic aspirations [aca]: measured by 5 items on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Perspective taking [per]: measured by 7 items on a 1-7 scale (does not deceive me well to describes me well).

# Section 4: Attitudes, Identity and Ideology

In this section participants were asked to respond to a series of questions relating to their social attitudes, support for colourblind/multicultural ideology, their strength of identity and their feelings of intergroup anxiety. These items served to examine the extent to which intergroup contact experiences are associated with social attitudes, as well as to ascertain any intervention effects at Time 3. The variable codes and numbering are provided in parentheses.

Intergroup bias: measured using a feeling thermometer on a 0-100 scale (intervals of 10) noting feelings of warmth towards the three groups: Asian [atta], Black [attb], White [attw]

Colourblind ideology [clb]: single item measured on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Multicultural ideology [mlt]: single item measured on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Strength of social identity [idi]: single item measured on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Intergroup anxiety [anx]: single item measured on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

**Section 5: School, Teachers and Family**

In this section participants were asked to respond to a series of questions relating to the extent to which their school, teachers and family support inclusive norms of interactions. These items served to examine the extent to which norms are associated with intergroup contact experiences, as well as to ascertain any intervention effects on teacher and school norms at Time 3. The variable codes and numbering are provided in parentheses.

School norms [snor]: measured by 4 items on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Teacher norms [tnor]: measured by 4 items on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Family norms [fnor]: measured by 5 items on a 1-7 scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). This measure was included at Time 1 and Time 2 only as the questionnaire was shortened at Time 3 to ensure higher levels of completion.