

Bringing their Perspectives to Campus:  
Students' Experiences with Inclusive Courses and Diverse Environments

Jillian Kinzie

Allison BrckaLorenz

Indiana University Bloomington

Paper presented at the 2018 Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference,  
Tampa, FL.

**Abstract**

How much do students experience courses that emphasize sharing their own perspectives or respecting diverse ideas? This study uses data from a multi-institution survey to explore student experiences with inclusive courses and perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity and discusses a dozen campus responses to their institutional assessment results.

### **Bringing their Perspectives to Campus:**

#### **Students' Experiences with Inclusive Courses and Diverse Environments**

In the last few decades, diversity, inclusion, and equity goals have proliferated across institutions in the United States (AAC&U, 1995; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012; Milem, Change, & Antonio, 2005). The benefits of experiences with diversity, both in and out of the classroom have been well documented (Bowman, 2010). Despite articulating goals to promote diversity within the institution, campus educators have fallen short in the ways they have enacted these goals (Patton, 2016). Further, students' course-based experiences of diversity and inclusion as well as their perceptions of institutional commitment to these goals, influences their experience. The value of assessing students' experiences and perceptions of inclusivity is critical given increased attention to inequities in the college experience and the need for more inclusive pedagogy. Research and institutional assessment efforts must also explore differences in perception of the experiences by race-ethnic groups. Although scholarship on diversity can guide college and university educators to adopt inclusive teaching practices and to create inclusive environments, campus assessment results provide even greater context and specific insights to explore the topic and take action.

#### **Extant Research**

##### **Inclusive Coursework**

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; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Hurtado, 2003). Furthermore, Nelson Laird (2011) found that more faculty incorporate this type of curricula than might be assumed and in courses that are not necessarily designated

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

as “diversity” courses. Ginsberg and Woldkowski’s (2009) three functional dimensions of cultural relevant pedagogy—institutional, personal and instructional—emphasize the role of educators for implementing cultural responsiveness in courses. As advocated by Alemán and Gaytán (2017), it is not sufficient to simply know if students are exposed to these experiences; rather, we must understand how students personally experience culturally inclusive coursework.

### **Institutional Emphasis on Diversity**

Institutional commitments to diversity are communicated in a variety of ways, including mission and diversity statements (Rankin & Reason, 2005), diversity curriculum, (Patton, 2016), institutional policies (e.g., harassment and discrimination policies), and diversity strategic plans (Iverson, 2010). Although articulating the importance of diversity is necessary (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999), institutions need to actively enact these commitments (Harris & Bensimon, 2007). The ways campus educators enact institutional diversity commitments are especially important in a time when students are expressing serious concerns about racism and free speech (Kendall-Ball, 2016). Regardless of campus educators’ approach to diversity initiatives, students’ perceptions of institutional emphasis influence their experiences (Rankin & Reason, 2005). Yet, not all students perceive the institution similarly. Students need to see themselves within the institutional emphasis on diversity (Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado et al., 1999).

### **Purpose**

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Recognizing the importance of students' experiences in inclusive courses and their perception of their institution's commitment to inclusion and diversity, this study explores factors affecting those perspectives. Our guiding questions are:

1. How much do students experience inclusive coursework and how does this vary by student demographics?
2. How do student perceptions of institutional emphasis on inclusive practice vary by student demographics?

This study uses multi-institution assessment data to expand on previous research. Exploring student perceptions by student demographics allows administrators to better understand how students are experiencing institutional diversity and inclusion efforts. Toward this end, we also feature an additional, practical research question that explores how campuses with institution-specific inclusion and cultural diversity data act on their results.

### **Framework**

This study is guided by the tenants of critical quantitative research, which specify that research should reveal inequities in educational processes and describe the experiences of those who have been underrepresented (Stage, 2007; Stage & Wells, 2015). According to Rios-Aguilar (2015), critical quantitative assessments of the campus environment should challenge policies and practices and provide more equitable opportunities for all students. Relatedly, the fact that the data source for this study explicitly aims to encourage institutional action on assessment results led us to adopt the Diversity Scorecard Project emphasis on using data to encourage the examination of campus inequities and to make changes to achieve equity (Bensimon, 2004). Culturally relevant pedagogy and critical race theory, which explicitly

acknowledge racism and aim to reveal how dominant pedagogy can fail to push students to examine racial biases (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Patton, 2016) frames our exploration on coursework. In particular, we aim to use assessment data to examine the extent to which courses provide space for inclusive pedagogy and expose racial realities of college life.

### **Scholarly Significance**

This study further illustrates the importance of identifying how students, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds, experience inclusive coursework and perceive the institution's commitment to diversity and inclusion. As stated, it is not enough for institutions to espouse commitments to diversity, inclusion, and equity if students are not perceiving these commitments are enacted (Harper & Yeung, 2013; Rankin & Reason, 2005). This study expands existing literature showing marginalized students are more likely to negatively perceive the institutional commitments to diversity by looking at student populations that are understudied (e.g., students with disabilities). Patton (2016) argued that diversity often becomes “synonymous with race” (p. 336) and this study points to some of the potential implications of this—students from marginalized populations often ignored by institutions and researchers perceive lower levels of institutional commitment to diversity.

### **Methods**

#### **Data Source**

The data for this study come from the 2017 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE measures the time and effort that undergraduate first-years and seniors invest in activities that relate to student learning and development. In 2017, NSSE was administered at 725 four-year colleges and universities. Institutions can append Topical

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Modules, short sets of questions on designated topics to collect more in-depth data on important content areas. In 2017, a new module, *Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity* (ICD) Topical Module was administered at 131 institutions. The ICD Topical Module examines the environments, processes, and activities that reflect the engagement and validation of cultural diversity (Table 2). Information about how a dozen campuses with ICD results considered and put their data to use will also be discussed to shed light on the practical implications of the assessment of inclusion and diversity.

### **Respondents**

The respondents for this study consist of over 23,000 first year and 29,000 senior students who attended institutions that administered the ICD Topical Module. Around two-thirds (68%) of students identified as White with smaller proportions identifying as multiracial (7%), Hispanic or Latino (7%), Asian (7%), Asian (6%) and other racial/ethnic identities. Two thirds (64%) of respondents identified as women, with smaller proportions identifying as men (34%) and other gender identities (1%). Around two in five (41%) students identified as first-generation, and one in ten (13%) had been diagnosed with a disability or impairment. Around one in ten (10%) identified with an LGBTQ+ sexual orientation. Most students (90%) were enrolled full-time with around one-quarter (25%) having transferred from another institution. About one-third (28%) majored in a STEM field, and out one in ten were student athletes (9%) or involved in a social fraternity or sorority (10%). Details about respondents by class standing are in Table 1.

### **Measures**

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

The focus of this study are items on the NSSE ICD Topical Module. These items asked students about their perceptions coursework emphasis and institutional values and commitment regarding various aspects of diversity and inclusivity. The questions are: “During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?” (developing skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds, recognizing your own cultural norms and biases, etc.) and “How much does your institution emphasize the following?” (demonstrating a commitment to diversity, providing students with resources needed for success in a multicultural world, etc.) Respondents could answer “Very much,” “Quite a bit,” “Some,” or “Very little.” Individual items were combined to create the *Coursework Emphasis* (ICD1) and the *Institutional Commitment to Diversity* (ICD2) scale. Information about the scales, the full list of individual items, and descriptive statistics are in Table 2. Table 3 shows the wide variety of demographic and student characteristics used in the analyses.

### **Analyses**

To answer our research questions, a series of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models were used to examine the differences in inclusivity emphasis in students’ coursework and students’ perceptions of institutional commitment and values for diversity and inclusion by student demographics and characteristics. Although the data are nested (students within institutions), the vast majority of variance (95.0% and 96.8%) is at the student level for our dependent variables, ICD1 and ICD2, respectively. With so little variance at the institution-level and knowing that parameter estimates tend to be similar between OLS and HLM (Hierarchical Linear Modeling) when group-level variance is small (Astin & Denson, 2009; Niehaus, Campbell,



& Inkelas, 2013), we chose to use analysis methods that were familiar to and easier to interpret for a larger audience. As recommended (Astin & Denson, 2009; Park, & Denson, 2009), we used a more stringent  $p$  value of .01 to interpret significance to account for possible clustering of the data when using OLS instead of HLM. More information about the coding of individual variables are in Table 3.

### Results

Generally, students averaged around 2.5 on the coursework emphasis items, and 3, or “Quite a bit,” on institutional emphasis. The items on which students averaged the highest were “Respecting diverse expression of ideas” and “Sharing your own perspectives” in the course emphasis set, and “Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously,” “Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity” in the institutional emphasis set. Students averaged the lowest scores on “Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs” and “Helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment.” Descriptive results reveal that students experience inclusive experiences in their courses at lower levels than they perceive an institutional commitment to diversity. About 3 in 5 students took courses that “substantially” (very much + quite a bit) emphasized sharing their own perspectives and experiences or respecting the expression of diverse ideas. However, only half said their courses emphasized learning about other cultures or discussing issues of equity or privilege. Overall, students perceived institutional commitment to diversity more favorably than coursework emphasis.

**How do students’ experiences of inclusive coursework vary by student demographics?**

**Student demographics.** Some student demographics predicted higher, or more positive perceptions of inclusive course work, but other demographics predicted lower, or more negative, views. Asian ( $B = 1.808, p < .001$ ), Black or African American ( $B = 1.117, p < .001$ ), and Hispanic or Latino ( $B = 1.196, p < .001$ ) students had more positive views, compared to White ( $B = -1.625, p < .001$ ) students who had more negative views compared to the average student. Women ( $B = 1.904, p < .001$ ) and first-generation students ( $B = .874, p < .001$ ) had more positive views of inclusive coursework than the average student. Gay ( $B = 2.028, p < .001$ ) and lesbian ( $B = 1.651, p < .001$ ) students had more positive views than the average student. Student views did not differ by disability status ( $p < .01$ ).

**Student characteristics.** Senior students ( $B = .685, p < .001$ ), student athletes ( $B = .551, p < .01$ ), members of a social fraternity/sorority ( $B = .820, p < .001$ ), and students enrolled full time ( $B = .738, p < .001$ ) had more positive views of inclusive coursework than the average student. Students majoring in STEM fields ( $B = -6.865, p < .001$ ) had more negative views of inclusive coursework than the average student. Students' views did not differ by transfer status or living on/off campus ( $p < .01$ ).

### **How do student perceptions of institutional emphasis on inclusive practice vary by student demographics?**

**Student demographics.** Some student demographics predicted higher, or more positive, views of institutional value and commitment, but other demographics predicted lower, or more negative, views. Hispanic or Latino ( $B = 1.861, p < .001$ ) and White ( $B = .787, p < .001$ ) students had more positive views than the average student. Students who preferred not to respond with a racial/ethnic identification had more negative views ( $B = -1.495, p < .001$ ) than average. Men

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

( $B = 1.346, p < .001$ ) and women ( $B = 1.783, p < .001$ ) had more positive views than average whereas gender variant (students who do not identify as men or women) ( $B = -1.498, p < .01$ ) and students who prefer not to respond to gender identity ( $B = -1.632, p < .01$ ) had more negative views than average. Students who identified as straight ( $B = 1.701, p < .001$ ), bisexual ( $B = .912, p < .01$ ), gay ( $B = 1.627, p < .01$ ), or lesbian ( $B = 1.941, p < .01$ ) had more positive views than average. Students who identified as queer ( $B = 3.873, p < .001$ ) and preferred not to respond to sexual orientation ( $B = -1.482, p < .001$ ) had more negative views than average. First-generation students had a more positive view ( $B = .423, p < .01$ ), and students reporting a diagnosed disability had more negative views ( $B = -.744, p < .001$ ) than students without a diagnosed disability.

**Student characteristics.** Some student characteristics predicted higher, or more positive, views of institutional value and commitment, but other demographics predicted lower, or more negative, views. Seniors had more negative views ( $B = -3.043, p < .001$ ) than first-year students, students with STEM majors had more negative views ( $B = -1.378, p < .001$ ) than students with non-STEM majors, and transfer students had more positive views ( $B = .673, p < .001$ ). The views of athletes/non-athletes, fraternity/sorority members/non-members, students enrolled full-time/part-time, and students living on/off campus did not differ in their perceptions of institutional commitment ( $p < .01$ ).

## Discussion

For this discussion, we focus on underrepresented groups of students who have negative perceptions of their institution's commitment to inclusion and diversity. Students who identify as having a disability reported more negative views than students without a disability.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

This population of students, who is often deemed invisible within college campuses, regularly encounter issues of mobility, support services, and faculty and staff understanding (Lombardi, Murray & Gerdes, 2012) which can potentially impact their perception of the institution's commitment to diversity and inclusion. Students who identify as somewhere on the spectrum with regards to their gender and sexual orientation also reported having negative perceptions of their institution's commitment to diversity and inclusion compared to the average student. Again, students who hold these identities are rarely recognized on their campus and therefore struggle with feeling like they are intentionally included as part of the campus' diverse community (McAleavey, Castonguay & Locke, 2011; Saltzburg & Davis, 2010).

Recognizing that students who have challenging experiences while on college and university campuses also have negative perceptions of their institution's commitment to diversity should provide campus administrators a starting point as to where their diversity efforts are lacking. These students, along with others who also reported more negative perceptions, are all historically marginalized and underrepresented students who should be the focus of institutional diversity and inclusion commitments. The disconnect between the presented diversity and inclusion commitments of an institution is a potential area of further exploration for creating inclusive and equitable spaces on campus.

As advocated in critical quantitative research, data should reveal inequities and open up space for conversations. Our investigation into what institutions with ICD results did with their results offers an opportunity to explore what data are salient and how data are used. Briefly, a good portion (but not all) institutions reported that they shared results with important stakeholders including college and university presidents, vice presidents of academic affairs,

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

vice presidents of student affairs, chief diversity officers, etc. One institution assembled a faculty data action team to analyze their data and submit recommendations to the president. Another institution is using their results as a baseline to gauge the impact of a new core curriculum with diversity components and a new diversity and inclusion action plan. These institutional uses demonstrate that assessment data hold promise for informing institutional efforts to establish more inclusive and equitable practices and policies.

## References

- 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.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2004). The diversity scorecard: A learning approach to institutional change. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Education*, 36(1), 44-52.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard educational review*, 72(3), 330-367.
- 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.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

- Harris, F., & Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The equity scorecard: A collaborative approach to assess and respond to racial/ethnic disparities in student outcomes. *New directions for student services, 2007(120)*, 77-84.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development, 44(3)*, 320-334.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education, 63(5)*, 539-569.
- 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., 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.
- Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43(5)*, 586-611.
- Iverson, S. (2010). Producing diversity: A policy discourse analysis of diversity action plans. In E. J. Allan, S. V. D. Iverson, & R. Ropers-Huilman (Eds.), *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives* (pp. 193-214). New York: Routledge.
- Kendall-Ball, G. (2016, March 18). Turmoil at Mizzou. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/specialreport/Turmoil-at-Mizzou/15>.
- Lombardi, A. R., Murray, C., & Gerdes, H. (2012). Academic performance of first-generation college students with disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*, 47-52.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Manne, K., & Stanley, J. (2015, November 13). When free speech becomes a political weapon.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/When-Free-Speech-Becomes-a/234207>.

Mayhew, M. J. & Simonoff, J. S. (2015). Non-White, no more: Effect coding as an alternative to dummy coding with implications for higher education researchers. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(2), 170-175.

McAleavey, A. A., Castonguay, L. G., & Locke, B. D. (2011). Sexual orientation minorities in college counseling: Prevalence, distress, and symptom profiles. *Journal of College Counseling, 14*, 127-142.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. I. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association American Colleges and Universities.

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.

Niehaus, E., Campbell, C. M., & Indelas, 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.

Park, J. J. & Denson, N. (2009). Attitudes and advocacy: Understanding faculty views of racial/ethnic diversity. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(4), 415-438.



## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

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

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.

Saltzburg, S., & Davis, T. S. (2010). Co-authoring gender-queer youth identities: Discursive tellings and retellings. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 19*(2), 87-108.

Stage, F. K. (Ed.). (2007). *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 133. Using quantitative data to answer critical questions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stage, F. K., & Wells, R. S. (2014). Critical quantitative inquiry in context. In F. K. Stage & R. S. Wells (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 158. New scholarship in critical quantitative research—Part 1: Studying institutions and people in context* (pp. 1–7). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Table 1.  
Select Respondent Characteristics

		First-Year (%)	Senior (%)	Total (%)
Racial/Ethnic identification	American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	< 1	< 1
	Asian	7.9	5.7	6.6
	Black or African American	6.2	5.9	6.0
	Hispanic or Latino	7.0	6.4	6.7
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	< 1	< 1	< 1
	White	66.0	69.6	68.1
	Other	1.2	1.4	1.3
	Multiracial	8.5	6.6	7.4
	I prefer not to respond	2.5	3.7	3.2
Gender identity	Man	33.0	33.9	33.5
	Woman	64.9	63.7	64.2
	Another gender identity	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Prefer not to respond	1.0	1.3	1.2
Athlete		11.2	6.9	8.8
Fraternity/ Sorority		9.5	11.2	10.4
First-generation		38.4	43.2	41.1
STEM major		30.3	25.6	27.7
Enrolled full time		96.8	84.4	89.8
Started elsewhere (transfer)		6.8	40.6	25.7
Living situation	Residence hall, dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity or sorority house)	78.0	18.2	44.1
	Fraternity or sorority house	< 1	1.7	1.2
	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) <i>within walking distance</i> to the institution	4.3	27.1	17.2
	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) <i>farther than walking distance</i> to the institution	14.2	47.2	32.9
	None of the above	3.0	5.8	4.6
Disability	No	84.0	83.1	83.5
	Yes	12.4	13.4	13.0
	I prefer not to respond	3.6	3.5	3.5
Sexual orientation	Straight (heterosexual)	84.7	85.4	85.1
	Bisexual	5.7	4.5	5.1
	Gay	1.1	1.6	1.4
	Lesbian	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Queer	< 1	1.0	< 1
	Questioning or unsure	1.8	< 1	1.3
	Another sexual orientation, please specify	1.8	1.5	1.6
	I prefer not to respond	3.1	4.0	3.6

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Table 2.  
Select Items and ICD Scale Information

	First-Year		Senior		Total		Factor Loading
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>During the current school year, how much has your <i>coursework</i> emphasized the following?</b>							
<i>(Very much = 4, Quite a bit = 3, Some = 2, Very little = 1)</i>							
Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds	2.55	.90	2.70	.96	2.63	.94	.785
Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases	2.60	.92	2.67	.99	2.64	.96	.866
Sharing your own perspectives and experiences	2.76	.86	2.83	.91	2.80	.89	.835
Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs	2.42	.96	2.51	1.02	2.47	1.00	.817
Learning about other cultures	2.53	.95	2.55	1.01	2.54	.98	.841
Discussing issues of equity or privilege	2.53	.97	2.52	1.05	2.53	1.02	.838
Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	2.77	.91	2.79	.97	2.78	.94	.831
<b>Coursework Emphasis (ICD1) scale</b>	<b>27.87</b>	<b>12.99</b>	<b>29.03</b>	<b>14.27</b>	<b>28.52</b>	<b>13.73</b>	
<b>How much does your institution emphasize the following?</b>							
<i>(Very much = 4, Quite a bit = 3, Some = 2, Very little = 1)</i>							
Demonstrating a commitment to diversity	2.99	.87	2.95	.89	2.97	.88	.802
Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world	2.87	.87	2.77	.91	2.81	.89	.839
Creating an overall sense of community among students	2.98	.86	2.85	.91	2.91	.89	.804
Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity (racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.)	3.02	.87	2.88	.92	2.94	.90	.844
Providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies	2.95	.88	2.83	.92	2.88	.90	.838
Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously	3.06	.85	2.90	.93	2.97	.90	.818
Helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment	2.81	.91	2.62	.97	2.70	.95	.829
<b>Institutional Commitment to Diversity (ICD2) scale</b>	<b>39.06</b>	<b>14.26</b>	<b>36.57</b>	<b>15.24</b>	<b>37.67</b>	<b>14.87</b>	

Note: Individual items were converted to a 0 to 60 scale and then averaged together to create the ICD scales.  
ICD1: Cronbach's  $\alpha = .93$ , ICC=.050; ICD2: Cronbach's  $\alpha = .92$ , ICC=.032.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Table 3.  
Student-Level Demographics and Variable Coding for Independent Variables

Student-Level Demographic		Variable Coding
Class level (senior)		Seniors=1, First-years=0
Racial/Ethnic identification*	American Indian or Alaska Native	Am. Ind. & AK Nat=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Asian	Asian=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Black or African American	Black or African American=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Other=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	White	White=1=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Other	Other=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Multiracial	Multiracial=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
I prefer not to respond		I prefer not to respond (race)=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
Gender identity*	Man	Man=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Woman	Woman=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Another gender identity	Another gender identity=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	I prefer not to respond	I prefer not to respond (gender) =1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
Athlete		Yes=1, No=0
Fraternity/ Sorority		Yes=1, No=0
First-generation		Yes (at least one parent/guardian has completed a four-year degree)=1, No=0
STEM major		STEM==1, Non-STEM=0
Enrolled full time		Full-time=1, Part-time=0
Started elsewhere (transfer)		Started elsewhere=1, Started at institution=0
Living situation	Residence hall, dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity or sorority house)	On campus=1
	Fraternity or sorority house	On campus=1
	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) <i>within walking distance</i> to the institution	On campus=0
	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) <i>farther than walking distance</i> to the institution	On campus=0
	None of the above	On campus=0
Disability	Yes	Disability yes=1, No=0
Sexual orientation*	Straight (heterosexual)	Straight=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Bisexual	Bisexual=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Gay	Gay=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Lesbian	Lesbian=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Queer	Queer=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Questioning or unsure	Questioning or unsure=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
	Another sexual orientation, please specify	Another sexual orientation=1, <i>ELSE</i> =0
I prefer not to respond		I prefer not to respond (orientation) =1, <i>ELSE</i> =0

\*Note that multi-categorical variables were effect coded so that comparisons could be made to the average student instead of a reference group.

## BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Table 4.  
OLS Regression Coefficients

		Coursework Emphasis				Institutional Commitment			
		B	SE	$\beta$	Sig.	B	SE	$\beta$	Sig.
Constant		29.592	.402		***	35.809	.449		***
Class level	Senior	.685	.152	.025	***	-2.920	.170	-.097	***
Racial/Ethnic identification	Am. Indian or AK Native	.926	.722	.012		-.706	.805	-.009	
	Asian	1.808	.285	.040	***	.224	.318	.005	
	Black or African American	1.117	.296	.024	***	-.228	.331	-.004	
	Hispanic or Latino	1.196	.289	.026	***	1.766	.322	.036	***
	Native HI or other PI	.400	1.277	.005		-.043	1.419	.000	
	White	-1.625	.213	-.063	***	.983	.238	.035	***
	Other	-.405	.516	-.006		-1.029	.577	-.014	
	Multiracial	-.623	.278	-.014	*	.472	.310	.010	
	I prefer not to respond	-2.794	.392	-.037	***	-1.439	.438	-.017	***
Gender identity	Man	.120	.245	.004		1.432	.275	.047	***
	Woman	1.904	.239	.070	***	1.778	.267	.060	***
	Another gender identity	-.940	.483	-.010		-1.720	.540	-.016	**
	I prefer not to respond	-1.085	.507	-.039	*	-1.490	.569	-.049	**
Athlete		.551	.206	.012	**	-.146	.230	-.003	
Fraternity/ Sorority		.820	.191	.019	***	.435	.213	.009	*
First-generation		.874	.125	.031	***	.423	.140	.014	**
STEM major		-6.865	.138	-.223	***	-1.241	.154	-.037	***
Enrolled full time		.738	.221	.015	***	.310	.248	.006	
Started elsewhere (transfer)		.264	.156	.008		.673	.175	.020	***
Living situation (on campus)		-.335	.153	-.012	*	-.315	.171	-.011	
Disability	Yes	-.168	.175	-.004		-.748	.196	-.017	***
Sexual orientation	Straight	-.433	.179	-.014	*	1.741	.200	.053	***
	Bisexual	.066	.280	.001		.687	.313	.013	*
	Gay	2.028	.469	.031	***	1.862	.524	.026	***
	Lesbian	1.651	.537	.024	**	1.736	.603	.023	**
	Queer	1.146	.548	.017	*	-3.945	.612	-.053	***
	Questioning or unsure	-1.595	.480	-.024	***	-.532	.535	-.007	
	Another sexual orientation	-.648	.445	-.010		-.222	.497	-.003	
	I prefer not to respond	-2.215	.348	-.074	***	-1.328	.390	-.041	***
F = 147.945***, R <sup>2</sup> = .074					F = 34.220***, R <sup>2</sup> = .018				

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Running head: BRINGING THEIR PERSPECTIVES

Table 5.  
Substantial<sup>a</sup> Emphasis on Inclusive and Culturally Engaging Coursework and Institutional Support by Racial/Ethnic Identity

	Am Indian or AK Native	Asian	Black or African Am.	Hispanic or Latino	Native HI or other PI	White	Other	Multi-racial	I prefer not to respond	Total
<b>During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?</b>										
<i>(Very much, Quite a bit, Some, Very little)</i>										
Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds	66.3	61.7	64.1	65.1	59.8	55.5	57.3	56.0	49.4	57.0
Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases	67.2	60.8	62.9	63.7	61.1	56.8	54.9	59.4	47.9	57.9
Sharing your own perspectives and experiences	70.2	68.4	70.2	72.3	66.7	65.5	64.2	66.6	54.0	66.2
Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs	64.4	56.7	58.3	58.1	52.2	48.8	51.5	50.2	41.7	50.5
Learning about other cultures	56.2	57.7	58.6	60.3	52.2	50.0	56.1	53.4	46.3	52.0
Discussing issues of equity or privilege	58.5	55.4	59.2	60.0	50.5	49.9	51.0	55.0	43.8	51.8
Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	67.7	67.4	68.6	71.3	65.2	62.5	64.6	65.7	53.9	63.8
<b>How much does your institution emphasize the following?</b>										
<i>(Very much, Quite a bit, Some, Very little)</i>										
Demonstrating a commitment to diversity	67.0	70.0	68.1	73.2	65.6	71.8	66.7	69.7	63.4	71.0
Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world	62.2	65.9	61.8	67.8	59.1	64.8	59.7	63.5	54.0	64.4
Creating an overall sense of community among students	66.9	67.0	65.7	72.3	65.6	70.5	59.8	68.6	54.8	69.3
Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity (racial/ethnic identification, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.)	64.5	68.8	66.4	71.9	71.0	71.0	63.8	69.3	55.8	69.9
Providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies	61.1	65.6	65.4	68.6	63.0	68.9	64.7	66.8	59.5	67.8
Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously	62.5	68.3	69.1	72.6	69.9	73.8	66.2	71.2	63.0	72.4
Helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment	56.3	59.1	57.7	62.5	59.8	60.3	55.8	57.2	49.9	59.6

a. Percentages represent the proportion of students who responded "Very much" or "Quite a bit."