

IMPLICATIONS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC CLIMATE *
DIVERSITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Charles E. Morris, Ph.D.
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Illinois Board of Regents
and
Senior Associate, Center for Higher Education
Illinois State University

Jeanne B. Morris, Ed.D.
Professor of Education and Assistant Chair
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Illinois State University

Presented at the
ENHANCING TEACHING CONFERENCE

Sponsored by

The University of South Carolina
The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
The National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment

February 6-9, 1993
Charleston, South Carolina

* The data used for this presentation are drawn from research conducted under the auspices of the Assessment of the Status of Minorities in Education (ASME) Project, Dr. Charles E. Morris, Director; Dr. Ira L. Neal, Associate Director; Dr. Maria Canabal, Research Coordinator. The Project is housed in the Center for Higher Education at Illinois State University.



DIVERSITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Campus climate was cited by Abner and Yates (1989) as the single most important factor in the recruitment and retention of minority students. Blackwell (1981) asserted that "the presence of minority faculty is the most consistently powerful predictor of enrollment and persistence of minority students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels." Minorities who have been students, faculty or staff on predominantly white campuses can emphatically attest to the inequities they have experienced and observed. Several researchers (Minatoya and Sedlacek, 1983; Clewell and Ficklen, 1986, and others) have suggested that the assessment of campus environment is an important step for improving the retention of minority students and maintaining a climate conducive to their success.

The absence of a campus environment or climate which nurtures and supports minority student achievement and graduation and minority faculty/staff professional growth and development is more readily acknowledged at predominantly white institutions today. This is due in part to the conscious and concerted efforts now prevalent on campuses to make educational opportunity a reality, but due as well to recent trends of increasingly open racial hostility and animosity also evident in college and university communities.

In his studies, Tinto (1975) described academic climates which provide students with the support needed for their successful matriculation and graduation. He contended that the following are necessary conditions:

- 1) the institution embraces all of its students, irrespective of race, origin, gender, or disability;
- 2) the institution actively supports all students' education-related endeavors by providing support services and by encouraging staff responsiveness to students' needs;
- 3) all students have equal opportunities for mentoring and for academic relationships and informal interactions with faculty; and
- 4) all students have equal opportunities to participate in educational, cultural, social, and political activities on campus.

Tinto describes a model based on two constructs, academic and social.

Astin (1982) identified the absence of a critical mass of minorities as a primary reason minorities are often uncomfortable on predominantly white campuses, a condition that is still the norm. He also asserted that institutional structure often interferes with the implementation of an "holistic, university-wide model which facilitates" minority student recruitment, retention and graduation.

Other research studies have shown that, in general, minority students in predominantly white universities are in a more stressful situation than are white students. Their stressful experiences in meeting college expectations, coupled with their perception that university activities are directed more toward servicing the needs of white students, often lead to feelings of isolation and frustration. In some cases, they act out this frustration by associating themselves primarily with other minority students or by leaving the university.

Using the resources of the Project "Assessment of the Status of Minorities in Education" (see Appendix I) for data collection, analyses and reporting," several studies on institutional climate have been completed; others are in progress. In "Perceptions of Institutional Attractiveness" (Morris, Neal, Knollenberg;1992), Factor Analysis was applied to 26 items from the Institutional Attractiveness section of the ASME inventory. One of the factors, defined by ten inventory items, is titled "A Culturally Diverse Environment." Statistical methods applied in the case study showed that a culturally diverse campus environment is a very important factor for minority students. This factor and a second one, Nationality/Race-specific Activities, were identified as more important to African American students who responded to the survey than to Asian, Hispanic or European American students. These conclusions, along with others derived from the case study, have prompted a comparable analysis using the full data set.

In another case study based on ASME data, statistical methods were employed to identify factors that correlate to retention of minority students. Three factors have been determined to be significant. This case study, by Morris, Gumia and Neal (unpublished), focuses on three factors -- cultural, academic and social. One implication of the study is that students perceive the cultural factor as having the most pivotal effect on their survival and success, both before and after graduation.

An ASME study based on data collected in 1989 (Morris and Neal; 1989) offers evidence that predominantly white campuses continue to fall short of providing level learning fields for all students. Reasons cited for this condition focus on the fact that certain minority student cultures and experiences are not embraced or authenticated in the curriculum, in the life of the institution, or in the life of the mainstream community. This study showed that minority students who responded to the survey found the campus environment uncomfortable, a feeling which inhibited their full and equal participation in the life of the institution. Minority males indicated that campus racial climate worsens as they persist through the system and African American females revealed that they view the campus racial climate as physically threatening.

"Implications of Student Perceptions of Academic Climate: Diversity on College Campuses" is based on ASME data obtained in surveys collected from more than 10,600 students on Illinois public and private campuses in the spring of 1990 and examines campus climate with a focus on cultural diversity. Survey items which pertain to the concept of cultural diversity were selected for analysis. In order to measure perceptions, each respondent was asked to designate a satisfaction or importance level (to her/him) relative to the institution of enrollment. Respondents were instructed to use a Likert-type scale with responses ranging from 1 to 4, with 1 meaning strongly disagree. Generally, the higher the rating, the more important the item or factor was to the respondent.

Characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1 (Appendix II). While this paper is based on six items extracted from the 42 items in the Institutional Attractiveness section, a reliability test (Cronbach's Alpha) was performed to test the internal consistency of the entire instrument. The reliability coefficients are displayed in Table 2 (Appendix III).

In the section on Institutional Attractiveness students were asked to "indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree that each of the following is important to you with respect to the institution you are currently attending" and were instructed to use the following scale for responses:

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree

The following definitions should be used to interpret responses:

A score of 3 or above means agreement that the item is important.

A score of 2.5 or above but less than 3 means the respondent or group is inclined to agree that the item is important.

A score above 2 but less than 2.5 means the respondent or group is inclined to disagree that the item is important.

A score of 2 or below means disagreement that the item is important.

The items selected for this examination of perceptions of diversity on college campuses are:

- IA2. Presence of an ethnically diverse faculty and administrative or professional staff
- IA3. Presence of women faculty and administrative or professional staff
- IA4. Presence of an ethnically diverse student body
- IA11. Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs
- IA13. Women's Studies or Programs
- IA28. Residence hall room assignments for the purpose of promoting diversity

The analyses and implications developed as a part of this paper are based on mean responses to the selected items. Some lists and groupings of those means are provided on the following pages.

MEANS OF ITEMS BY RACE OR GROUP

IA2. RACIAL DIVERSITY OF FACULTY/STAFF

African Americans	3.275	Minorities	3.18
Hispanic Americans	3.15	Min Males	3.11
Native Americans	3.09	Min Females	3.22
Asian Americans	2.97	Disabled	2.89
Sample	2.86	Males	2.73
European Americans	2.79	Females	2.93

IA3. GENDER DIVERSITY OF FACULTY/STAFF

African Americans	3.283	Minorities	3.23
Hispanic Americans	3.23	Min Males	3.09
Native Americans	3.21	Min Females	3.30
Sample	3.17	Disabled	3.18
European Americans	3.16	Males	2.91
Asian Americans	3.10	Females	3.33

IA4. RACIAL DIVERSITY OF STUDENTS

African Americans	3.262	Minorities	3.22
Hispanic Americans	3.260	Min Males	3.18
Native Americans	3.24	Min Females	3.24
Asian Americans	3.07	Disabled	3.02
Sample	2.98	Males	2.84
European Americans	2.93	Females	3.05

IA11. ETHNIC/MINORITY STUDIES OR PROGRAMS

African Americans	3.24	Minorities	3.10
Hispanic Americans	3.02	Min Males	2.97
Asian Americans	2.85	Min Females	3.17
Native Americans	2.82	Disabled	2.68
Sample	2.68	Males	2.52
European Americans	2.59	Females	2.77

IA13. WOMEN'S STUDIES OR PROGRAMS

African Americans	3.01	Minorities	2.95
Hispanic Americans	2.92	Min Males	2.76
Asian Americans	2.84	Min Females	3.04
Sample	2.78	Disabled	2.79
European Americans	2.75	Males	2.47
Native Americans	2.74	Females	2.94

IA28. RACIAL DIVERSITY BY RESIDENCE HALL ASSIGNMENT

Asian Americans	2.89	Minorities	2.84
Hispanic Americans	2.86	Min Males	2.82
Native Americans	2.85	Min Females	2.86
African Americans	2.82	Disabled	2.64
Sample	2.55	Males	2.47
European Americans	2.49	Females	2.59

MEAN RESPONSES BY CATEGORY OF GROUPINGS**

	IA2 Racial Diversity of Fac/Staff			IA3 Gender Diversity of Fac/Staff			IA4 Racial Diversity of Students		
	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>
African Americans			*			*			*
Males			*			*			*
Females			■			*			*
Hispanic Americans			*			*			*
Males			*			*			*
Females			*			*			*
Native Americans			*			*			*
Males			*			*			■
Females		*				*			*
Asian Americans		*				*			*
Males		*				*			*
Females		*				*			*
European Americans		*			*	*		*	
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females		*			*	*		*	
Minorities			*			*			*
Males			*			*			*
Females			*			*			*
Disabled		*				*			*
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females			*			■			*
Sample		*				*		*	
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females		*			*	*		*	

	IA11 Ethnic/Min Studies/Progs			IA13 Women's Studies/Programs			IA28 Diversity by Res Hall Assign		
	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>	<u>2 to 2.5</u>	<u>2.5 to 3</u>	<u>3+</u>
African Americans			*			*			*
Males			*		*	*		*	
Females			■			■		*	
Hispanic Americans			*		*	*		*	
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females			*			*		*	
Native Americans		*			*	*		*	
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females		*			*	*		■	
Asian Americans		*			*	*			
Males		*			*	*			
Females		*			*	*			
European Americans		*			*	*	*		
Males	*			*		*	*		
Females		*			*	*		*	
Minorities			*		*	*		*	
Males		*			*	*		*	
Females			*			*		*	
Disabled		*			*	*		*	
Males	*			*		*	*		
Females		*			*	*	*		
Sample		*			*	*		*	
Males		*		*		*	*		
Females		*			*	*		*	

■ denotes highest mean.

** A score of 3 or above means agreement that item is important; 2.5 to 3 means inclined to agree that the item is important; 2.0 to 2.5 means inclined to disagree that the item is important.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

BY RACE

African Americans

		<u>N</u>	<u>ITEM MEAN</u>	<u>SET MEAN</u>
IA3.	Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff	1019	3.283	
IA2.	Racial Diversity of Faculty/Staff	1018	3.275	
IA4.	Racial Diversity of Students	1016	3.262	
IA11.	Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs	1012	3.24	
IA13.	Women's Studies or Programs	1010	3.01	3.12
IA28.	Racial Diversity by Residence Hall Assignment	988	2.82	

When ranked according to the values of the means, African American students agreed that Items IA3, IA2, IA4, IA11, and IA13 are all important. Within this group, Item IA13 was viewed as least important. They were inclined to agree that Item IA28 is important. Among the racial groups, African American students gave highest importance to Item IA3 (by a slight margin [0.008]) over Item IA2.

Hispanic Americans

		<u>N</u>	<u>ITEM MEAN</u>	<u>SET MEAN</u>
IA4.	Racial Diversity of Students	407	3.260	
IA3.	Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff	409	3.23	
IA2.	Racial Diversity of Faculty/Staff	404	3.15	
IA11.	Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs	405	3.02	3.07
IA13.	Women's Studies or Programs	401	2.92	
IA28.	Racial Diversity by Residence Hall Assignment	398	2.86	

Hispanic students agreed that Items IA4, IA3, IA2, and IA11 are important in that order, with the last item being of least importance. They were inclined to agree that Items IA13 and IA28 are important.

Native Americans

		<u>N</u>	<u>ITEM MEAN</u>	<u>SET MEAN</u>
IA4.	Racial Diversity of Students	34	3.24	
IA3.	Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff	34	3.21	
IA2.	Racial Diversity of Faculty/Staff	34	3.09	
IA28.	Racial Diversity by Residence Hall Assignment	34	2.85	
IA11.	Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs	34	2.82	
IA13.	Women's Studies or Programs	34	2.74	2.99

Native American students agreed that Items IA4, IA3, and IA2 are important in that order. They were inclined to agree that Items IA28, IA11, and IA13 are important.

Asian Americans

		<u>N</u>	<u>ITEM MEAN</u>	<u>SET MEAN</u>
IA3.	Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff	372	3.10	
IA4.	Racial Diversity of Students	372	3.07	
IA2.	Racial Diversity of Faculty/Staff	374	2.97	
IA28.	Racial Diversity by Residence Hall Assignment	370	2.89	2.95
IA11.	Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs	373	2.85	
IA13.	Women's Studies or Programs	371	2.84	

Asian American students agreed that Items IA3 and IA4 are important in that order. They were inclined to agree that Items IA2, IA28, IA11, and IA13 are important. They, among the groups, gave the highest rating to Item IA28.

European Americans

		<u>N</u>	<u>ITEM MEAN</u>	<u>SET MEAN</u>
IA3.	Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff	8517	3.16	
IA4.	Racial Diversity of Students	8505	2.93	
IA2.	Racial Diversity of Faculty/Staff	8508	2.79	2.79
IA13.	Women's Studies or Programs	8454	2.75	
IA11.	Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs	8452	2.59	
IA28.	Racial Diversity by Residence Hall Assignment	8415	2.49	

European American students agreed that Item IA3 is important. They were inclined to agree that Items IA4, IA2, IA13, and IA11 are important. They were inclined to disagree that Item IA28 is important. For them, gender diversity was distinguished as most important.

When Items IA2, IA3, IA4, IA11, IA13, and IA28 were considered as a set of items to use to assess diversity on college campuses, among the racial groups responding, African American students viewed the set as having the greatest importance and European American students consider the set least important. African American students rated each of Items IA2, IA3, IA4, IA11 and IA13 higher than any other group.

Only African American and Hispanic American students gave Item IA11 a mean higher than 3, i.e., agreed conclusively that this item is important. No group gave a mean higher than 3 to Item IA28. Item IA3 received the highest mean for all students and was considered conclusively and solely by all groups to be of importance to them, while Item IA28 received the lowest.

BY RACE AND GENDER

When the data were analyzed by race and by gender, with the exception of European American males, all subgroups, males and females, had means higher than 3.0 on IA3, i.e., they agreed that Gender Diversity of Faculty/Staff is important to them. European American males, with a mean of 2.87, were inclined to agree that Item IA3 was important to them.

European American males with, a mean of 2.77, were inclined to agree that Racial Diversity of Students (IA4) is important. All other subgroups, by race and gender, had means higher than 3.0, meaning therefore that they agreed that Item IA4 is important.

African American males and females and Hispanic American females agreed that Ethnic/Minority Studies or Programs (IA11) is important; European males were inclined to disagree that Item IA11 is important; all other subgroups were inclined to agree that Item IA11 is important.

Only African American females (3.08) and Hispanic American females (3.04) agreed that Women's Studies or Programs (IA13) is important; European American males were inclined to disagree that Item IA13 is important; all other subgroups were inclined to agree that IA13 is important.

Females rated each item higher than males; minority females rated each item higher than minority males; European females rated each item higher than European males; Hispanic females rated each item higher than Hispanic males; and Disabled females rated each item higher than Disabled males. Except for one item (IA28), African American females rated items higher than African American males and except for one item (IA4), Asian females rated items higher than Asian males. Native American males rated three items (IA2, IA4 and IA11) higher than Native American females.

No group or subgroup gave a mean of 2 or less to any of the selected items, i.e., no group or subgroup indicated disagreement with any of the items.

DISCUSSION

For institutions and individuals, the challenges associated with cultural diversity are not new. There have been numerous efforts to address, alleviate and reconcile impending discord so regularly associated with and expected in diverse cultural environments. Results of the investigation of student perceptions of diversity as related to academic climates indicate that specific elements impact attitudes and comfort levels.

Knowledge of student perceptions can be instructive, presenting meaningful directions to institutions seeking to improve, strengthen, or redirect their efforts whether the context is institutional attractiveness or racial, academic or institutional climate. Several questions are immediately generated:

- (1) What institutional responses are warranted when distinct groups of students indicate that the identified notion, concept, or idea related to diversity is of little importance to them? What is the magnitude or impact of this devaluing of diversity?
- (2) What institutional responses are warranted when distinct groups of students indicate that the identified notion, concept or idea related to diversity is important to them? What is the magnitude or impact of this valuing of diversity?

Student perceptions of the importance of diversity (to them) may be interpreted as indicators of attitudes about race, gender, bigotry and harassment which so often result in continuing and increasing acts of violence on college campuses. As reported in this study, student perceptions of diversity are strong indicators that (1) the experiences of distinct groups of students could be broadened so that they might come to know the differences that separate and commonalities that bind all people and cultures in proper perspective (Kayes; 1992) and (2) distinct groups of students require institutional support as they seek access and equity in the academy.

Institutions which take their missions seriously must engage in salient measures to address these and other penetrating questions and assumptions. Action and compliance are critical to the integrity of the academy. Responses must stem from institutional missions which are energized by a comprehensive, long-term plan with a focal point drawn from the following:

1. Development of mechanisms which establish and facilitate faculty and staff development programs designed to confirm an intellectual climate in which diversity is widely recognized as a priority to which the institution is committed (Floyd and Batsche, 1992).

Universities must provide fundamental and continuing access to experiences which prepare those responsible for establishing, designing and implementing transformative and emancipatory education. This involves close monitoring of the delivery of programs, practices and procedures regarding their relationship to goals related to cultural diversity from the highest level of responsibility and leadership.

2. Establishment of and support for broad-based programs for all students which promote awareness, acceptance and positive perceptions of diversity;
3. Development and implementation of courses which enhance and validate diversity for all students.

Regardless of specific institutional practices or the characteristics of student populations, each institution is obligated to provide all students with experiences which prepare them to live in an increasingly diverse and international work force and society.

4. Critical curriculum (Kayes, p. 88) review to ensure that instructional materials, methodology and experiences enhance and validate diversity for all students.

Validation of diversity is not effective without a curriculum that is free of gender and race bias. (Kayes, p. 85)

5. Activation of secured and increased efforts to recruit and retain faculty and staff which results in the enhancement and validation of racial and gender diversity.

The validation of diversity is not effective without concomitant increases in diverse faculty and staff (Kayes, p. 85)

6. Creation of and support for mentoring and other student assistance programs to enhance and validate diversity.

To create a climate of inclusiveness, diversity should not be trivialized; institutions should face real issues (Kayes, p. 85)

7. Establishment and enforcement of policies and disciplinary systems that enhance and validate diversity.

These policies and practices cannot be viewed as supplementary or peripheral.

Many institutions have cultivated climates in which understanding and acceptance of diversity have occurred with the implementation of several of the recommendations listed above. On campuses where there have been conscious and calculated efforts, there have been high degrees of success in 1) establishing a knowledge base of the tenets of multiculturalism, 2) modifying adverse attitudes, and 3) counteracting unfavorable behaviors.

In the early years of the 1990s, positive perceptions of and attitudes toward diversity may be more crucial to the health of the nation than they were twenty years ago when this nation witnessed one of the largest ever reactions to diversity. Segments of the society engaged in initiatives, at that time, however fragmented, to promote coexistence of harmony in spite of differences in values, race, sex, religion or human condition. Today's society may or may not choose to boast of its increasing dimensions of diversity, but it must at least acknowledge its pluralistic nature and respond to eradicate obstacles which debase some cultures while extolling others. Major responsibility lies with the nation's educational institutions.

College student perceptions are measurable and instructive. Appropriate responses are imperative. Although the history of educating for diversity attests to the trauma and difficulties of the task, it is essential that educational institutions refine, amplify and strengthen attempts to effect accord among and between individuals and groups of diverse cultures until coexistence exudes harmony and equality. There is no other rational choice.

In addition to items used in this paper, responses to other items in the ASME inventory are being used for a more extensive analysis of the implications of student perceptions about diversity. These items include:

IA32: "If I could start over, I would attend this institution."

IA34: "This institution is sensitive to the needs of students of all races/nationalities."

IA35: "This institution is sensitive to the needs of female students."

IA36: "This institution is sensitive to the needs of disabled students."

IA37: "Campus police/security officers treat students of all races/nationalities in a fair and equitable manner."

IA38: "I feel comfortable at my current institution and have a sense of belonging."

IA39: "Students of all races/nationalities are treated in a fair and equitable manner through the processes of the student judicial system."

Another item which is included in the future study is in the section on Academic Climate in which students are asked to "indicate your perception of the extent to which the following exists on your campus". The item is

AC8. Course content and forums which attempt to reflect contributions of all races/nationalities."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abner, R., and Yates, A. (May 9, 1979). Recruitment of Minority Graduate Students. *Communicator*.
- Astin, A.W. (1982). *Minorities in Higher Education*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Blackwell, J.E. (1981). *Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals*. Bayside, NY: General Hall.
- Clewell, B.C. and Ficklen, M.S. (1986). *Improving Minority Retention in Higher Education: A Search for Effective Institutional Practices*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.
- Floyd, Carol E. and Batsche, Catherine N. (1992). "Cultural Diversity on College Campuses: The Leadership Role of the Academic Vice President" in *Multicultural Education: Strategies for Implementation in Colleges and Universities, Vol. 2*. Adams and Welsh (Eds.). Macomb, IL: Western Illinois University.
- Kayes, P.E. (1992). "Access, Equity, and Cultural Diversity: The Community College Potential." *Multicultural Education: Strategies for Implementation in Colleges and Universities, Vol. 2*. Adams and Welsh (Eds.). Macomb, IL: Western Illinois University.
- Minatoya, L.Y. and Sedlacek, W.E. (1983). *Assessing Differential Needs Among University Freshmen: A Comparison Among Racial/Ethnic Subgroups*. Journal of Non-White Concerns, 11(4), 126-132.
- Morris, C.E. and Neal, Ira L. (1989). *Perceptions: Campus Racial Climate*, ASME, Vol. 1, Number 2.
- Morris, C.E., Gumia, L. and Neal, Ira L. (1992). *Perceptions of Academic Climate*, ASME, Vol. 2, Number 1.
- Morris, C.E., Neal, Ira L. and Knollenberg, Laura (1992). *Perceptions of Institutional Attractiveness*, ASME, Vol. 2, Number 3.
- Morris, C.E., Gumia, L. and Neal, Ira L. (1992). *Institutional Attractiveness and Student Retention*, (unpublished)
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

The ASME Project was launched in December of 1987 when the Illinois Board of Higher Education provided a small grant for the development of survey instruments to be used for assessing the progress and effectiveness of institutional efforts to enhance the educational status of minorities. The instruments, called inventories, were later broadened to assess the status of women and of the disabled as well. In the fall of 1989, additional funds were provided for 1) refining and administering the inventories on post-secondary campuses statewide, and 2) developing studies and reports.

Stratified, random sample techniques, with special efforts to reach minority students, are used in the data collection procedures. Individual participants are not identified. In addition to answering survey questions, respondents are encouraged to give written reactions or suggestions in a section provided for comments and recommendations.

The primary objectives of ASME studies are: 1) to determine factors that contribute to building a supportive academic climate; and 2) to compare views of student respondents about the extent to which certain factors exist on campus, given their race, gender and class level.

Students are asked to indicate: 1) whether certain conditions existed on campus, and 2) whether faculty behave in a particular manner. On statements relative to the institution they were attending, students are instructed to use a Likert-type scale ranging from 1, indicating Strongly Disagree, to 5, indicating Strongly Agree.

Descriptive statistics are used to illustrate the characteristics and representativeness of the samples. Statistical procedures, including factor analyses, canonical analyses, discriminant analyses, regression and correlational analyses, analyses of variance (ANOVAS), and multiple analyses of variance (MANOVAS) -- with follow-up tests -- are used to study the data and formulate conclusions and recommendations. Computer software programs used include SSPC and SASS.

The same form of the inventory is used for all undergraduate students participating in the surveys. The 1990 undergraduate inventory consisted of 164 items divided into the following six sections:

Demographic Characteristics -- questions regarding gender, race, student status, grade point average, employment, residence and financial aid, and other demographic information.

Institutional Attractiveness -- statements about programs and services provided the institution.

Racial Climate -- opposite-pair objectives items to be rated on semantic 7-point differential-scaling systems.

Relationships and Interactions -- statements about relationships between and among individuals and groups.

Academic Climate -- statements about the level and nature of interaction between and among faculty and students and about student awareness of requirements for academic success.

Faculty and Classroom Behavior -- statements about academic endeavors and classroom interaction.

TABLE 1

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE COMPARED TO THE
TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE POPULATIONS OF (A) THE PARTICIPATING
INSTITUTIONS AND (B) THE GROUP OF SIMILAR ILLINOIS INSTITUTIONS***

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Total	10,592		83,768		249,924	
Gender						
Female	6,983	66.0	45,889	54.8	130,852	52.4
Male	3,609	34.0	37,879	45.2	119,072	47.6
Race/Ethnicity						
Asian	377	3.6	2,116	2.5	11,684	4.7
Native American	35	0.3	162	0.2	729	0.3
Black (Non-Hispanic)	1,031	9.7	9,851	11.8	26,468	10.6
Hispanic	412	3.9	2,413	2.9	10,800	4.3
White	8,623	81.6	67,629	80.7	194,158	77.7
Other	94	0.9	1,597	1.9	6,085	2.4

- Race/Ethnicity counts do not include non-resident aliens or unknowns.
- Percentages in charts are based on the total number of persons responding.

- (1) = Number of respondents;
- (2) = % of the total number of respondents;
- (3) = Total undergraduate enrollment at the eight public and three non-public multi-purpose institutions that participated in the survey;
- (4) = % of the total undergraduate enrollment at the participating institutions;
- * (5) = Total undergraduate enrollment at all Illinois public universities and non-public multi-purpose institutions;
- (6) = % of the undergraduate enrollment at institutions in (5).

TABLE 2

**ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE
NON-DEMOGRAPHIC SECTIONS OF THE UNDERGRADUATE
STUDENT INVENTORY USED IN THE SURVEY (SPRING, 1990)**

Section	Reliability Scale Coefficient
Institutional Attractiveness	.9233
Racial Climate	.8455
Relationships and Interactions	.6429
Academic Climate	.8910
Faculty and Classroom Behavior	.7369

Descriptive statistics are used to identify the representativeness and the characteristics of the sample. Additionally, factor analyses, multiple analyses of variance (MANOVAs) and analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with follow-up tests--specifically Scheffe--are performed to identify statistically significant differences among the groups' perceptions and to determine the magnitude of the differences. The computer software program SPSS-PC is used to perform the analyses.

The ASME undergraduate student inventory was distributed to both on-campus and off-campus undergraduate students.

ASME Publications include:

1. *Perceptions: Campus Racial Climate (1990)*
2. *Perceptions of an Undergraduate Student:
Assessing the Status of Minorities in Education (1991)*
3. *Perceptions of Institutional Attractiveness (1992)*
4. *Perceptions of Academic Climate (1992)*

Single copies may be ordered for \$3.00 each.

**Orders of five (5) or more copies will receive
a twenty (20) percent discount.**

Send orders and/or editorial inquiries to:

**ASME
Center for Higher Education,
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois, 61761-6901**

**Copyright © Applied For By ASME
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**