Exploring Perspectives on Culturally Inclusive Practice: Institutional Emphasis of Diversity, Inclusive Coursework, and Student Gains

Allison BrckaLorenz
Jillian Kinzie
Sarah Hurtado
Berenice Sanchez

Indiana University Bloomington

**Abstract**

In the last few decades, diversity, inclusion, and equity goals have proliferated across institutions in the United States, and decades of research point to the benefits of culturally inclusive content and pedagogy on student outcomes. Despite these findings, it is not sufficient to simply know if students are exposed to these experiences; rather, we must understand how students interpret and perceive them as they relate to the institution's commitment to inclusion. Using data from undergraduates and faculty in a large-scale, multi-institution quantitative study, this session presents findings regarding the ways students engage in culturally inclusive content and pedagogy, faculty practices for inclusivity, and how this influences student's educational gains and perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity, inclusion, and equity goals.

In the last few decades, diversity, inclusion, and equity goals have proliferated across institutions in the United States (AAC&U, 1995; ACPA & NASPA, 2004; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012; Milem, Change, & antonio, 2005). Diversity courses are commonly used by institutions to promote cultural diversity and inclusion, and decades of research point to the benefits of culturally inclusive content and pedagogy on student outcomes (Hurtado, Mayhew, Engberg, 2003; Chang, 2002; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Hurtado, 2003, Pascarella, Palmer, Moye & Pierson, 2001). For example, interacting with diverse others and engaging in diversity courses have been positively linked to decreased racial bias, increased cultural awareness, and greater cognitive development (Bowman, 2010; Milem, 1994; Nelson Laird, 2005).

Given these findings, a growing number of institutions have established diversity course requirements (Cole, Case, Rios, & Curtin, 2011). Nelson Laird (2011) found that a greater number of faculty incorporate this type of curricula than might be assumed and in courses that are not necessarily designated as "diversity" courses. As the curriculum reflects institutional values, greater infusion of culturally inclusive content and pedagogy into the curriculum may articulate a stronger institutional emphasis on these issues (Quaye & Harper, 2007). However, the ways students experience culturally inclusive coursework broadly remains unclear.

Further, institutions have been criticized for their shortcomings in promoting inclusivity and equity (Patton, 2016), which has been heightened by campus activism in Black Lives Matter and the sanctuary campus movements. Others have argued that the benefits of diversity experiences are related to students' perceptions of institutional emphasis on diversity and equity; poor perceptions of the institution may lessen the gains associated with diversity experiences (Harper & Yeung, 2013: Hurtado, 1992; Rankin & Reason, 2005). It is not sufficient to simply know if students are exposed to these experiences; rather, we must understand how students interpret and perceive them as they relate to the institution's commitment to inclusion. Therefore, it is important to understand the ways students

engage in culturally inclusive content and pedagogy and how this influences student's educational gains and perceptions of institutional commitment to their diversity, inclusion, and equity goals. With that in mind, the following research questions guided this study:

1. How does an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging coursework relate to *student* perceptions of gains in personal and social development?

2. How does an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging coursework relate to *faculty* course goals for increasing students' personal and social development?

3. What is the relationship between an institution's emphasis on inclusivity and engagement with cultural diversity and students' perceptions of and faculty goals regarding inclusive and culturally engaging coursework?

4. What is the relationship between an institution's emphasis on inclusiveness and engagement with cultural diversity and student perceptions of support for various forms of diversity?

**Theoretical Framework**

This research was framed using a culturally relevant pedagogy framework. Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995b) created the framework following her research with successful African American students. Culturally relevant pedagogy includes three elements which work together to aid in the overall success of students. The three elements are (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). In addition, Ginsberg and Woldkowski's (2009) three functional dimensions of cultural relevant pedagogy—institutional, personal and instructional—emphasizes the role of educators for implementing cultural responsiveness in courses and the environment for learning.  Culturally relevant pedagogy focuses on the academic, personal and social development of students so that they may then be critical of the social structures that impact their daily experiences. This study engages these elements for

4

students and educators to explore the development of students and the perception of institutional

support for diversity and inclusion.

## Methods

**Data**

The data for this study come from the 2017 administrations of the National Survey of Student

Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). NSSE asks students about the

time and effort they put towards educational activities, and FSSE, a complimentary survey to NSSE, asks

faculty about their use of educational practices that are empirically linked with student learning and

development. In 2017, NSSE was administered to 525,264 first-year (FY) and senior students (SR) at 727

four-year colleges and universities. Institutions can choose from among a variety of additional item sets,

called Topical Modules, to append to the end of their NSSE and FSSE administrations. In 2017, FSSE was

administered to 24,418 faculty teaching lower-division (LD) and upper-division (UD) undergraduate

courses at 154 four-year colleges and universities. The focus of this study is on the NSSE and FSSE

Topical Module, *Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity* (ICD). This set was administered

to 132 NSSE institutions and 30 FSSE institutions, resulting in 55,305 student and 4,095 faculty

responses. The complete wording of items examined in this set can be found in Tables 1 and 2.

**Respondents**

**Students**. Two-thirds of students (FY: 63%, SR: 67%) identified as White with smaller proportions

identifying as Asian (FY: 9%, SR: 7%), multiracial (FY: 9%, SR: 7%), and Hispanic or Latino (FY: 8%, SR: 7%).

Over half (55%) identified as women, and two in five (43%) identified as men. The majority of students

(85%) identified as straight (heterosexual). Around one in ten (FY: 10%, SR: 6%) were student athletes,

and one in ten (FY: 10%, SR: 12%) were in a fraternity or sorority. Around two in five (FY: 38%, SR: 43%)

were first-generation students, with around the same number of seniors (FY: 7%, SR: 43%) identifying as

transfer students. Around a third of students (FY: 32%, SR: 28%) were STEM majors and most (FY: 96%,

SR: 82%) were enrolled full time. Three quarters of first-years (73%) and one in five seniors (17%) were living on campus. More details can be found in Table 3.

**Faculty**. Around three-quarters of faculty (LD: 74%, UD: 75%) identified as White, with smaller proportions identifying as Asian (LD: 5%, UD: 6%), multiracial (LD: 5%, UD: 3%), and Black or African American (LD: 3%, UD: 3%). A little less than half (LD: 47%, UD: 49%) identified as women, and a similar proportion (LD: 47%, UD: 46%) identified as men. Most faculty (LD: 82%, UD: 84%) identified as straight (heterosexual). Around a quarter of faculty were full Professors (LD: 26%, UD: 30%), Associate Professors (LD: 22%, UD: 23%), and Assistant Professors (LD: 21%, UD: 25%) with smaller proportions of full-time Lecturers or Instructors (LD: 14%, UD: 9%) and part-time Lecturers or Instructors (LD: 17%, UD: 13%). Less than a third were appointed in STEM fields (LD: 31%, UD: 23%). Around two in five faculty were tenured (LD: 38%, UD: 44%) and over two-thirds had earned a doctorate degree (LD: 64%, UD: 72%). Nearly all (LD: 91%, UD: 83%) of the courses faculty responded about were taught in a traditional classroom format, with lower-division faculty teaching general education courses more than upper-division faculty (LD: 70%, UD: 31%). More details can be found in Table 4.

**Measures**

The primary variables of interest in this study come from the NSSE and FSSE ICD Topical Modules. For students, these items asked about how much their coursework emphasized inclusive and culturally engaging activities, how much their institution emphasizes various aspects of inclusivity, and how much their institution provides a supportive environment for various forms of diversity. Many of these items were combined to create one of three scale measures. The *Coursework Emphasis* (ICDce) scale asked students how much their coursework emphasized such things as recognizing their own cultural norms and biases and learning about other cultures. The *Inclusive Environment* (ICDie) scale asked how much their institution emphasized such things as creating an overall sense of community and demonstrating a commitment to diversity. The *Anti-Discrimination* (ICDad) scale asked how much their

institution emphasized such things as taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously and providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies. The complete wording and descriptives of these items as well as scale information including descriptives, reliability, and amount of institution-level variance (ICC) can be found in Table 1. Another set of variables of interest come from the core NSSE survey. These questions ask students how much their experience at their institution has contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in (a) working effectively with others, (b) developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethnics, (c) understanding people of other backgrounds, (d) solving complex real-world problems, and (e) being an informed and active citizen. Other student demographics and characteristics examined can be found in Table 3.

For faculty, the ICD items in this study asked about how much their courses emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities and how much their institution emphasizes various aspects of inclusivity. These items were combined to create one of three scale measures. The *Coursework Emphasis* (fICDce) scale asked faculty how much their courses emphasized such things as discussing issues of equity or privilege and respecting the expression of diverse ideas. The *Inclusive Environment* (fICDie) scale asked how much their institution emphasized such things as ensuring they are not stigmatized because of their identity and providing faculty with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world. The *Anti-Discrimination* (fICDad) scale asked how much their institution emphasized such things as taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously and providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies. The complete wording and descriptives of these items as well as scale information can be found in Table 2. Another set of variables of interest come from the core FSSE survey. These questions ask faculty how much they structure their courses so that students learn and develop in the five areas of personal development named above. Other faculty demographics and characteristics examined can be found in Table 4.

**Analysis**

To answer the first research question about how an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging coursework related to student perceptions of gains in personal and social development, Pearson's *r* correlations were done between the individual items in the student *Coursework Emphasis* scale and the core NSSE items asking about students' perceived gains while at their institution. Similarly, to answer the second research question about how an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging course work related to faculty course goals for increasing students' personal and social development, Pearson's *r* correlations were done between the individual items in the faculty *Coursework Emphasis* scale and the core FSSE items asking about faculty course goals.

To answer the third research question about how an institution's emphasis on inclusivity and engaging with cultural diversity relates to inclusive and culturally engaging coursework, a series of Ordinary Least Squares regression equations were examined. In these models, the independent variable of interest was the student (ICDce) or faculty (fICDce) *Coursework Emphasis* scales. The dependent variables were either the *Inclusive Environment* or *Anti-Discrimination Practices* scales. Models were run separately for lower-division and upper-division faculty and first-year and senior students. Sometimes with nested data (students and faculty clustered within institutions), researchers use hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). Because the vast majority of variance in the dependent variables was at the student- or faculty-level as opposed to the institution level (see Tables 1 and 2), and parameter estimates tend to be similar between OLS and HLM when group level variance is small (Astin & Denson, 2009; Niehous, Campbell, & Inkelas, 2013), we chose to focus our analysis on the individual students and faculty. Controls included all demographics and characteristics listed in Tables 3 and 4.

To answer the fourth research question about how an institution's emphasis on inclusiveness and engagement with cultural diversity relate to student perceptions of support for various forms of diversity, Pearson's *r* correlations were done between the individual items in the student ICD module

about how much the institution provides a supportive environment for various forms of diversity and the *Inclusive Environment* and *Anti-Discrimination Practices* scales.

## Selected Results

**How does an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging coursework relate to student perceptions of gains in personal and social development?**

All the individual items asking about students' coursework emphasizing inclusivity and engagement with cultural diversity were positive and notable ($p < .01$) with correlations ranging from .308 to .529. The strongest relationships were between inclusive and culturally engaging coursework and students' gaining an understanding of people with different backgrounds and being an active and informed citizen. For example, there was a notably strong relationship between coursework that emphasized respecting the expression of diverse ideas and student gains in understanding people of other backgrounds (FY: $r = .509$, SR: $r = .520$). Coursework that emphasized recognizing students' cultural norms and biases was strongly related to student gains in being an informed and active citizen (FY: $r = .463$, SR: $r = .501$). See Table 5 for more details.

**How does an emphasis on inclusive and culturally engaging coursework relate to faculty course goals for increasing students' personal and social development?**

All the individual items asking about faculty emphasis on inclusivity and engagement with cultural diversity were positively ($p < .01$) related to faculty course goals for social and personal development with correlations ranging from .152 to .766. The strongest relationships were between inclusive and culturally engaging coursework and goals for students to develop or clarify a personal code of values or ethics and understanding people of other backgrounds. For example, faculty who structure their course for students to better understand people of other backgrounds also emphasize the recognition of students' cultural norms and biases (LD: $r = .766$, UD: $r = .761$). Faculty who structure their courses for students to develop or clarify a personal code of values or ethics also emphasize

9

students sharing their perspectives and experiences (LD: $r$ = .531, UD: $r$ = .556). See Table 6 for more details.

**What is the relationship between an institution's emphasis on inclusivity and engagement with cultural diversity and students' perceptions of and faculty goals regarding inclusive and culturally engaging coursework?**

Controlling for a variety of student demographics and characteristics, there are strong and significant relationships between students' perceptions of an institution that emphasizes an inclusive environment (FY: B = .596, $p$ < .001, SR: B = .591, $p$ < .001) and anti-discrimination practices (FY: B = .498, $p$ < .001, SR: B = .490, $p$ < .001) and coursework that emphasizes inclusive and culturally engaging activities. Controlling for a variety of faculty demographics and course characteristics, the relationship between an institution's emphasis on an inclusive environment (LD: B = .110, $p$ < .001, SR: B = .152, $p$ < .001) and anti-discrimination practice (LD: B = .063, $p$ < .05, SR: B = .120, $p$ < .001) and culturally engaging coursework is still positive, but less strong. See Table 7 for more details.

**What is the relationship between an institution's emphasis on inclusiveness and engagement with cultural diversity and student perceptions of support for various forms of diversity?**

Students who perceive their institutions more strongly emphasize inclusive environments and anti-discrimination practices also feel their institutions are more supportive of various forms of diversity ($p$ < .01). The strongest relationships are between support for diversity in racial/ethnic identifications and *Inclusive Environment* (FY: $r$ = .679, SR: $r$ = .703) and *Anti-Discrimination Practices* (FY: $r$ = .641, SR: $r$ = .671). Other notably strong relationships existed between support for diversity in gender identity and *Inclusive Environment* (FY: $r$ = .607, SR: $r$ = .633) and *Anti-Discrimination Practices* (FY: $r$ = .591, SR: $r$ = .614). Although still positive and moderately related, the lowest correlations are between support for diversity in political affiliation and *Inclusive Environment* (FY: $r$ = .473, SR: $r$ = .527) and *Anti-Discrimination Practices* (FY: $r$ = .460, SR: $r$ = .509). See Table 8 for more details.

10

**Conclusions and Significance**

This study provides a deeper understanding of how culturally inclusive content and pedagogy impacts students' educational gains and their perception of their institutions' commitment to diversity, inclusion, and equity goals. Results confirm that culturally inclusive coursework allow students to develop cultural competence and positively influences student gains in understanding people of other backgrounds. Although this echoes previous research findings (Bowman, 2010; Milem, 1994; Nelson Laird, 2005), this study provides deeper insight into the specific elements in a curriculum that best promote this gain.

As Quaye and Harper (2007) asserted, the curriculum reflects institutional values. The findings in this study support this claim as we found a strong, positive relationship between students' broader perceptions of the institution's inclusive efforts and their engagement in culturally inclusive coursework. This provides further evidence for incorporating inclusive content and pedagogy in courses across the curriculum, and for ensuring that students can recognize the practice. Interestingly, this relationship was less strong for faculty. This may indicate that faculty members' decision to incorporate culturally inclusive content and pedagogy is less dependent on their sense of institutional commitment to inclusivity and diversity and more related to their personal investment in inclusive practices. This aligns with previous findings (Nelson Laird, 2011) that more faculty than previously thought incorporate diversity into their courses.

An interesting finding from the study is the correlation between support for diversity of political affiliations and *Inclusive Environment*. With the recent presidential election and the polarizing effect it has had on what people perceive as a supportive political environment, it is imperative that institutions spend time discerning what influences students' feelings of a supportive political environment. Even though culturally inclusive content and pedagogy positively impacts a student's personal and social development, their level of critical consciousness will vary by student depending on their personal

identities and experiences. This demonstrates the importance of assessing, as advocated by researchers such as Alemán and Gaytán (2017), how students personally experience culturally inclusive coursework and to explore all students' perceptions of critical race pedagogy. Overall, this study lends greater support for and introduces new insights regarding undergraduates' perceptions of inclusiveness and engaging with cultural diversity and the extent to which culturally responsive instructional practices are being employed.

**References**

Alemán, S. M. & Gaytán, S. (2017). 'It doesn't speak to me': Understanding student of color resistance to critical race pedagogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 30(2), 128-146.

American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: Author.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (1995). [AAC&U]. *The drama of diversity and democracy: Higher education and American commitments*. Report prepared for American commitments: A national initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Washington, DC.

Astin, A. W. & Denson, N. (2009). Multi-campus studies of college impact: Which statistical method is appropriate? *Research in Higher Education*, 50(4), 354-367.

Bowman, N. A. (2010). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(1), 4-33.

Chang, M. J. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The Journal of General Education, 51*(1), 21-42.

Cole, E. R., Case, K. A., Rios, D., & Curtin, N. (2011). Understanding what students bring to the classroom: Moderators of the effects of diversity courses on student attitudes. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(4), 397-405.

Ginsberg, M.B. & Wlodkowski, R.J. (2009). *Diversity & Motivation: Culturally Responsive Teaching in College*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(1), 17-34.

Harper, C. E., & Yeung, F. (2013). Perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity as a predictor of college students' openness to diverse perspectives. *The Review of Higher Education, 37*(1), 25-44.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education, 63*(5), 539-569.

Hurtado, S. (2003). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 595-610.

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 41-122). Springer.

Hurtado, S., Mayhew, M. J., & Engberg, M. E. (2003). How diversity courses affect the development of moral reasoning. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education,* Portland, OR.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pederson, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, *34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465-491.

Milem, J. F. (1994). Attitudes change in college students: Examining the effect of college peer groups and faculty normative groups. *Journal of Higher Education, 69*(2), 117-140.

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(4), 365-387.

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2011). Measuring the diversity inclusivity of college courses. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(6), 572-588.

Niehaus, E., Campbell, C. M., & Inkelas, K. K. (2014). HLM behind the curtain: Unveiling decisions behind the use and interpretation of HLM in higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, *55*(1), 101-122.

Pascarella, E. T., Palmer, B., Moye, M., & Pierson, C. T. (2001). Do diversity experiences influence the development of critical thinking? *Journal of College Student Development*, *42*(3), 257-271.

Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education, 51*(3), 315-342.

Quaye, S. J., & Harper, S. R. (2007). Shifting the onus from racial/ethnic minority students to faculty: Accountability for culturally inclusive pedagogy and curricula. *Liberal Education, 92*(3), 19-24.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and White students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(1), 43-61.

Table 1. Select ICD Items and Scale Descriptives for Students

| | Mean | SD | Factor Loading | Scale Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **During the current school year, how much has your *coursework* emphasized the following?** | | | | |
| *Very much*, *Quite a bit*, *Some*, *Very little* | | | | |
| a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds | 2.62 | .94 | .786 | *Coursework Emphasis* (ICDce) α = .926 |
| b. Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases | 2.61 | .97 | .868 | ICC =.05 |
| c. Sharing your own perspectives and experiences | 2.78 | .90 | .839 | Range = 0-60 Mean = 32.09 |
| d. Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs | 2.45 | 1.00 | .821 | SD = 16.14 |
| e. Learning about other cultures | 2.52 | .99 | .844 | |
| f. Discussing issues of equity or privilege | 2.49 | 1.02 | .839 | |
| g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas | 2.76 | .95 | .831 | |
| **How much does your institution emphasize the following?** | | | | |
| *Very much*, *Quite a bit*, *Some*, *Very little* | | | | |
| a. Demonstrating a commitment to diversity | 2.96 | .89 | .882 | *Inclusive Environment* |
| b. Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world | 2.81 | .90 | .908 | (ICDie) α = .886 |
| c. Creating an overall sense of community among students | 2.89 | .90 | .840 | ICC = .04 Range = 0-60 |
| d. Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity (racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.) | 2.93 | .91 | .804 | Mean = 37.98 SD = 15.49 |
| e. Providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies | 2.88 | .91 | -.887 | *Anti-Discrimination Practices* |
| f. Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously | 2.97 | .91 | -.906 | (ICDad) α = .880 |
| g. Helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment | 2.70 | .95 | -.891 | ICC = .03 Range 0-60 Mean = 36.98 SD = 16.57 |
| **How much does your institution provide a supportive environment for the following forms of diversity?** | | | | |
| *Very much*, *Quite a bit*, *Some*, *Very little* | | | | |
| a. Racial/ethnic identification | 2.98 | .87 | | |
| b. Gender identity | 2.94 | .91 | | |
| c. Economic background | 2.67 | .96 | | |
| d. Political affiliation | 2.54 | .96 | | |
| e. Religious affiliation | 2.74 | .94 | | |
| f. Sexual orientation | 2.90 | .93 | | |
| g. Disability status | 2.82 | .95 | | |

Note: The individual ICD items were transformed to a 0-60 scale and then averaged together to create the ICD scales.

Table 2. Select ICD Items and Scale Descriptives for Faculty

| | Mean | SD | Factor Loading | Scale Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Earlier, you answered some questions based on one particular undergraduate course section that you are teaching or have taught during this academic year. Thinking again about that course, how much does it emphasize the following?** | | | | |
| *Very much*, *Quite a bit*, *Some*, *Very little* | | | | |
| a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds | 2.73 | 1.07 | .813 | *Coursework Emphasis* (fICDce) |
| b. Recognizing students' cultural norms and biases | 2.54 | 1.14 | .908 | α = .932 ICC =.03 |
| c. Students sharing their perspectives and experiences | 2.79 | 1.08 | .852 | Range = 0-60 Mean = 34.34 |
| d. Exploring students' backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs | 2.22 | 1.15 | .802 | SD = 15.54 |
| e. Learning about other cultures | 2.37 | 1.17 | .843 | |
| f. Discussing issues of equity or privilege | 2.31 | 1.17 | .841 | |
| g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas | 2.87 | 1.12 | .844 | |
| **How much does your institution emphasize the following?** | | | | |
| *Very much*, *Quite a bit*, *Some*, *Very little* | | | | |
| a. Demonstrating a commitment to diversity | 3.11 | .86 | .749 | *Inclusive Environment* |
| b. Providing faculty with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world | 2.53 | .93 | .896 | (fICDie) α = .857 |
| c. Creating an overall sense of community among students | 2.40 | .98 | .870 | ICC = .08 Range = 0-60 |
| d. Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity (racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.) | 2.82 | .94 | .763 | Mean = 34.34 SD = 15.54 |
| e. Providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies | 3.02 | .89 | .903 | *Anti-Discrimination Practices* |
| f. Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously | 3.05 | .92 | .896 | (fICDad) α = .866 |
| g. Helping faculty develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment | 2.57 | 1.01 | .831 | ICC = .07 Range 0=60 Mean = 37.69 SD = 30.93 |

Note: The individual ICD items were transformed to a 0-60 scale and then averaged together to create the ICD scales.

Table 3. Select Student Demographics and Characteristics

| | | First-Year (%) | Senior (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Racial/ethnic identification | American Indian or Alaska Native | .7 | .6 |
| | Asian | 8.7 | 6.5 |
| | Black or African American | 6.8 | 6.4 |
| | Hispanic or Latino | 7.8 | 6.7 |
| | White | 63.2 | 67.3 |
| | Other | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| | Multiracial | 8.6 | 6.8 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 2.6 | 4.1 |
| | | | |
| Gender identity | Man | 42.8 | 42.8 |
| | Woman | 54.9 | 54.7 |
| | Another gender identity | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| | Prefer not to respond | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| | | | |
| Sexual orientation | Straight (heterosexual) | 85.0 | 85.3 |
| | Bisexual | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| | Gay | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| | Lesbian | .8 | .8 |
| | Queer | .8 | 1.0 |
| | Questioning or unsure | 1.7 | .9 |
| | Another sexual orientation | 1.8 | 1.4 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 3.4 | 4.1 |
| | | | |
| Student athlete | | 10.2 | 5.7 |
| Fraternity/sorority member | | 9.5 | 11.5 |
| First-generation student | | 38.4 | 43.0 |
| STEM major | | 32.0 | 27.8 |
| Full-time enrolled | | 95.6 | 82.0 |
| Transfer student | | 7.4 | 42.7 |
| Living on campus | | 73.1 | 17.4 |

Table 4. Select Faculty Demographics and Course Characteristics

| | | Lower-Division (%) | Upper-Division (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Racial/ethnic identification | Asian | 4.5 | 5.9 |
| | Black or African American | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| | Hispanic or Latino | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| | White | 74.2 | 74.8 |
| | Other | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| | Multiracial | 4.5 | 3.3 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 9.0 | 8.5 |
| | | | |
| Gender identity | Man | 46.7 | 46.1 |
| | Woman | 47.1 | 48.7 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 5.7 | 5.1 |
| | | | |
| Sexual orientation | Straight (heterosexual) | 81.7 | 83.6 |
| | Bisexual | 2.3 | 1.4 |
| | Gay | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| | Lesbian | 1.2 | 2.1 |
| | Another sexual orientation | 1.2 | .8 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 11.3 | 10.3 |
| | | | |
| Academic rank | Full Professor | 25.6 | 30.3 |
| | Associate Professor | 22.2 | 23.2 |
| | Assistant Professor | 21.1 | 25.1 |
| | Full-time Lecturer/Instructor | 14.1 | 8.7 |
| | Part-time Lecturer/Instructor | 17.0 | 12.7 |
| | | | |
| STEM field | | 31.4 | 23.4 |
| Tenured | | 38.0 | 44.2 |
| Earned doctorate degree | | 63.9 | 71.8 |
| Traditional classroom format | | 90.8 | 83.3 |
| General education course | | 70.1 | 31.4 |

Table 5. Correlations between Coursework Emphasis and Student Perceived Gains

| | | Student Perceived Gains | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Working effectively with others | Developing or clarifying a personal code of values or ethics | Understanding people of other backgrounds | Solving complex real-world problems | Being an informed and active citizen |
| Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity Coursework Emphasis | Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds | FY: .477<br>SR: .466 | FY: .482<br>SR: .481 | FY: .507<br>SR: .528 | FY: .477<br>SR: .461 | FY: .471<br>SR: .485 |
| | Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases | FY: .359<br>SR: .359 | FY: .449<br>SR: .470 | FY: .487<br>SR: .529 | FY: .413<br>SR: .394 | FY: .463<br>SR: .501 |
| | Sharing your own perspectives and experiences | FY: .423<br>SR: .413 | FY: .461<br>SR: .471 | FY: .474<br>SR: .498 | FY: .432<br>SR: .411 | FY: .469<br>SR: .480 |
| | Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs | FY: .399<br>SR: .378 | FY: .447<br>SR: .462 | FY: .449<br>SR: .477 | FY: .436<br>SR: .407 | FY: .445<br>SR: .464 |
| | Learning about other cultures | FY: .328<br>SR: .318 | FY: .406<br>SR: .426 | FY: .498<br>SR: .526 | FY: .392<br>SR: .362 | FY: .449<br>SR: .479 |
| | Discussing issues of equity or privilege | FY: .308<br>SR: .296 | FY: .406<br>SR: .424 | FY: .483<br>SR: .509 | FY: .396<br>SR: .355 | FY: .459<br>SR: .488 |
| | Respecting the expression of diverse ideas | FY: .359<br>SR: .349 | FY: .419<br>SR: .440 | FY: .509<br>SR: .520 | FY: .399<br>SR: .381 | FY: .459<br>SR: .476 |

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

Table 6. Correlations between Coursework Emphasis and Faculty Course Goals

| | | Faculty Course Goals | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Working effectively with others | Developing or clarifying a personal code of values or ethics | Understanding people of other backgrounds | Solving complex real-world problems | Being an informed and active citizen |
| Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity Coursework Emphasis | Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds | LD: .440 UD: .477 | LD: .531 UD: .579 | LD: .673 UD: .665 | LD: .273 UD: .265 | LD: .489 UD: .451 |
| | Recognizing students' cultural norms and biases | LD: .263 UD: .317 | LD: .519 UD: .592 | LD: .766 UD: .761 | LD: .216 UD: .217 | LD: .545 UD: .543 |
| | Students sharing their perspectives and experiences | LD: .413 UD: .388 | LD: .531 UD: .556 | LD: .665 UD: .653 | LD: .296 UD: .236 | LD: .505 UD: .501 |
| | Exploring students' backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs | LD: .396 UD: .409 | LD: .504 UD: .544 | LD: .563 UD: .578 | LD: .281 UD: .285 | LD: .423 UD: .470 |
| | Learning about other cultures | LD: .189 UD: .254 | LD: .393 UD: .483 | LD: .730 UD: .709 | LD: .152 UD: .164 | LD: .491 UD: .498 |
| | Discussing issues of equity or privilege | LD: .173 UD: .231 | LD: .436 UD: .509 | LD: .713 UD: .710 | LD: .262 UD: .252 | LD: .576 UD: .585 |
| | Respecting the expression of diverse ideas | LD: .259 UD: .318 | LD: .470 UD: .535 | LD: .720 UD: .681 | LD: .228 UD: .204 | LD: .530 UD: .531 |

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

Table 7. OLS Regression Coefficients for *Coursework Emphasis* Scales

| | First-Year Students | Senior Students |
|---|---|---|
| *Inclusive Environment* | B = .596***, $R^2$ = .332 | B = .591***, $R^2$ = .341 |
| *Anti-Discrimination Practices* | B = .498***, $R^2$ = .241 | B = .490***, $R^2$ = .237 |
| | Lower-Division Faculty | Upper-Division Faculty |
| *Inclusive Environment* | B = .110***, $R^2$ = .066 | B = .152***, $R^2$ = .082 |
| *Anti-Discrimination Practices* | B = .063*, $R^2$ = .064 | B = .120***, $R^2$ = .080 |

Note. * $p < .05$ ***$p < .001$. All continuous variables were standardized before entry into models.

Student models included the following controls: racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, student-athlete status, fraternity/sorority membership, first-generation status, major field, enrollment status, transfer status, living situation, and sexual orientation.

Faculty models included the following controls: racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, sexual orientation, academic rank, tenure status, having an earned doctorate, teaching a general education course, and course format.

Table 8. Correlations Between Institution Emphasis and Support for Diversity

| | | Institution Emphasis Scales | | | |
| | | Inclusive Environment | | Anti-Discrimination Practices | |
| | | First-Year | Senior | First-Year | Senior |
| How much does | Racial/ethnic identification | .679 | .703 | .641 | .671 |
| your institution | Gender identity | .607 | .633 | .591 | .614 |
| provide a supportive | Economic background | .545 | .596 | .528 | .577 |
| environment for the | Political affiliation | .473 | .527 | .460 | .509 |
| following forms of | Religious affiliation | .541 | .567 | .515 | .541 |
| diversity? | Sexual orientation | .574 | .597 | .559 | .579 |
| | Disability status | .520 | .554 | .520 | .552 |

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.