

2001

The Influence Of Diversity Training On The Attitudes And Perceptions Of Freshmen Students

Michelle R. Jefferson
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jefferson, Michelle R., "The Influence Of Diversity Training On The Attitudes And Perceptions Of Freshmen Students" (2001). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1626.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1626>

**THE INFLUENCE OF DIVERSITY TRAINING ON THE ATTITUDES AND
PERCEPTIONS OF FRESHMEN STUDENTS**

BY

MICHELLE R. JEFFERSON

Dissertation Committee

Elaine Walker, Ph.D., Mentor

Manina Urgolo Dunn, Ed.D.

Byron Hargrove, Ph.D.

Shouping Hu, Ph.D.

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Seton Hall University**

2001

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to give recognition to my committee members, Manina Urgolo Dunn, Byron Hargrove, and Shouping Hu. My mentor, Elaine Walker, deserves a special expression of gratitude for assisting me through this process. I would also like to thank Joseph Stetar for working with me during the initial stage of topic selection and proposal preparation. I would like to acknowledge Shawn Utsey for his assistance in the selection of the survey instrument and Joseph Ponterotto for allowing me the use of the QDI survey instrument.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge the Housing and Residence Life Department and the Division of Student Affairs at the institution studied for making this research possible. With special thanks going to the Resident Assistants in the freshman residence hall and the Assistant Director for First-Year Experience for assisting me with data collection. I would also like to acknowledge Bettyna Brown, Regina Davis, Sandy Sarro, and Anthony Houston for their roles in assisting me during data collection and defense preparation.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my friends and family for their support during this process especially my parents, Ruth Jefferson and William H. Jefferson. Their support and encouragement has been unwavering. Special thanks to Shirley Matthews and Harold Bryant for dealing with me and helping me work through the many stumbling blocks along the way.

Dedication

This research is dedicated to my beloved brother W. Rodney Jefferson (1962-1995), for whom the implementation of sensitivity training would have made his burden lighter, his road less trodden, and taken the trouble out his way. You are the wind beneath my wings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | ii |
| DEDICATION..... | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | vi |
| | |
| I INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Research Question..... | 7 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 8 |
| Description of the Institution..... | 9 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 10 |
| | |
| II LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 13 |
| Racial Climate on Campus..... | 13 |
| Organizational Culture..... | 17 |
| Diversity Training..... | 23 |
| Conclusion..... | 30 |
| | |
| III METHODOLOGY..... | 32 |
| Data Collection..... | 33 |
| Participants-Focus Group..... | 34 |
| Measures-Focus Group..... | 34 |
| Procedures-Focus Group..... | 35 |
| Data Analysis-Focus Group..... | 36 |
| Participants-Intervention..... | 36 |
| Measures-Intervention..... | 37 |
| Procedures-Intervention..... | 39 |
| Data Analysis-Intervention..... | 44 |
| | |
| IV FINDINGS..... | 45 |
| Focus Group..... | 45 |
| Intervention Survey Analysis..... | 48 |
| Entire Group..... | 49 |
| Racial Groups..... | 50 |
| Gender Groups..... | 52 |
| Females by Racial Group..... | 53 |
| Males by Racial Group..... | 54 |
| General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity..... | 57 |
| Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Personal Comfort Level with Racial Diversity..... | 62 |
| General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality..... | 66 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| V DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION..... | 73 |
| Focus Group..... | 73 |
| Entire Group..... | 74 |
| General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity..... | 75 |
| Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Comfort Level with Racial Diversity..... | 76 |
| General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality..... | 77 |
| Males..... | 78 |
| Females..... | 79 |
| Black/African-Americans..... | 81 |
| White/Caucasians..... | 82 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders..... | 83 |
| Hispanic/Latino..... | 84 |
| Race Unknown..... | 86 |
| Positive and Negative Influence..... | 87 |
| Implications..... | 89 |
| Future Research..... | 91 |
| References..... | 93 |
| Appendix A Social Attitude Survey..... | 103 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 1 | Percentage of Minorities Enrolled in Colleges and Universities..... | 2 |
| Table 2 | Gender Division of Subjects in Percentages..... | 37 |
| Table 3 | Racial Division of Subjects in Percentages..... | 37 |
| Table 4 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Entire Group..... | 50 |
| Table 5 | Paired Samples T-test Results by Race..... | 51 |
| Table 6 | ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups..... | 52 |
| Table 7 | Paired Samples T-test Results by Gender..... | 53 |
| Table 8 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Females by Race..... | 55 |
| Table 9 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Males by Race..... | 56 |
| Table 10 | ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test for Males by Racial Group..... | 57 |
| Table 11 | ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity (RD)..... | 58 |
| Table 12 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Being Against Affirmative Action..... | 58 |
| Table 13 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Looking Forward to Having a Racial Minority as President..... | 60 |
| Table 14 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Wanting More Racial Minorities Appointed to the Supreme Court..... | 60 |
| Table 15 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Support for Being Bilingual..... | 61 |
| Table 16 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing that Schools Should Promote Values that are Representative of Diverse Cultures..... | 61 |
| Table 17 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Thinking that Racial Minorities Complain Too Much About Racial Discrimination..... | 62 |
| Table 18 | ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Personal Comfort Level with Racial Diversity (PC)..... | 63 |
| Table 19 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Comfort in Developing Intimate Interracial Relationships..... | 64 |
| Table 20 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Thinking that People Should Marry Within Their Own Race..... | 65 |
| Table 21 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Comfort Level with Letting Son or Daughter Date Someone From a Different Race..... | 66 |
| Table 22 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Having a Racially Diverse Friendship Network..... | 66 |
| Table 23 | Paired Samples T-test Results for General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality for Males..... | 67 |
| Table 24 | ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality (GE)..... | 68 |
| Table 25 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Maintaining Traditional Gender Roles with Respect to Caring for Children..... | 68 |
| Table 26 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Men Being Less Concerned with Building Relationships..... | 69 |
| Table 27 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Feeling Comfortable Having a Woman Physician..... | 70 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 28 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing it is Just as Easy for Women to Succeed as it is for Men..... | 70 |
| Table 29 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Looking Forward to Having a Woman President..... | 71 |
| Table 30 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Feeling More Secure Having a Man as President..... | 72 |
| Table 31 | Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing That There is as Much Female Violence Against Men as There is Male Violence Against Women..... | 72 |

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

“Race is one of the most volatile and divisive issues in American higher education and has been a flashpoint of crisis since the late 1980s. The racial situation manifests itself in many ways, from incidents on campus, to policy decisions concerning affirmative action, to debates on the introduction of multicultural content into the curriculum” (Altbach, Lomotey, & Kyle. 1999, p. 448). This crisis is about diversity and how America is responding to its changing diversity.

The demographic changes in the United States are forcing diversity issues to the forefront. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, by the year 2030, the Latino population will have grown 187%, Asian American, Pacific Islander, Native American population 79%, African-American 68%, and white American only 25% (Hon, Weigold, & Chance 1999). Because of these changing demographics in the United States the importance of embracing diversity on college campuses has escalated. The two national anti-affirmative action in higher education ballot measures, Proposition 209 in California in 1996 and Initiative 200 in Washington State in 1998, were in states where only a small percentage of the their populations are enrolled in colleges and universities (Ross 1999). According to the U.S. Department of Education in 2000, minorities enrolled in colleges and universities increased by almost 10% between the years of 1980 and 1997 (see Table 1).

Table 1

Percentage of Minorities Enrolled in Colleges and Universities

| | 1980 | 1990 | 1997 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|
| American Indian | .7 | .7 | .9 |
| Asian American | 2.4 | 4.1 | 5.9 |
| Black American | 9.1 | 9.0 | 10.7 |
| Hispanic American | 3.9 | 5.6 | 8.4 |
| Total | 16.1 | 19.4 | 25.9 |

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 2000

"Because students in late adolescence and early adulthood are at a critical stage of development, diversity (racial, economic, demographic, and cultural) is crucially important in enabling them to become conscious learners and critical thinkers, and in preparing them to become active participants in a democratic society. Universities are ideal institutions to foster such development" (Gurin, 2000, p. 1). The matriculation of minorities in colleges and universities is almost 20% of the total enrollment in higher education (Howard-Hamilton, Richardson, & Shuford, 1998). This growing enrollment has led to a heightened awareness of and sensitivity to multicultural issues. Although 94% of higher education institutions believe in the importance of understanding and appreciating diversity, only 68% require students to take a diversity course for graduation (Humphreys, 2000). Because race remains a critical issue in higher education (Davis 1998), institutions are utilizing many other methods to promote acceptance and tolerance on their campuses. These methods range from one hour training sessions to weekend retreats to some form of curriculum inclusion.

Training and education make a positive difference in the organizational culture of an institution. One of the advantages of having a diverse environment is that there is an increase in creativity, flexibility, and problem-solving skills. An institution's acceptance

of diversity leads to being open to new ideas and an increase in the ability to understand different needs (Law, 1998).

It is important to understand how the institution's organizational culture relates to the acceptance of diversity because organizational culture is the system of informal rules that govern how people are suppose to behave. Organizations are in existence to produce or serve. Higher education exists to serve primarily its students, but also its faculty, administrators, staff, and ultimately the community in which it resides. The culture of an institution has an enormous impact on its productivity, efficiency and success. The organizational culture in higher education as it relates to the acceptance and tolerance of diversity defines its racial climate.

In terms of understanding the racial climate on campus, there is little agreement on a common framework because diversity issues are so complex. It is difficult to develop a common framework that addresses all types of diversity. According to Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson & Allen, (1998), in order to understand the racial climate on campus, four areas need to be considered. The first area is the institution's history concerning racial/ethnic groups. The next area is the racial/ethnic representation percentages at the institution. The third area is the perceptions of discrimination and attitudes. The last area to be considered is the racial/ethnic group relations on campus. Administrators, students, and faculty who are racially and ethnically diverse tend to view the campus climate differently. The person's position or role at the institution impacts how that person will experience and perceive the institution's racial climate. Perceptions are important to assess because they are a product of the environment and a factor in future interactions and outcomes. Differences in perceptions have undeniable

consequences for each individual (Hurtado et al., 1998).

It is not sufficient to simply identify and eliminate aversive policies, programs, and conditions. Good educational practice, as well as fundamental fairness, also calls for the development of new policies, programs, and conditions that will create campuswide and specific learning environments and an institutional tone that is congenial to all students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Institutions of higher education presumably shape the attitudes and values of their students. "As socializing institutions, colleges and universities have the task of influencing students so that they leave the campus with improved or different knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values" (Milem, 1998, p. 118). However, there is little agreement as to which attitudes and values should be shaped. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that after 4 years of college attendance students are not the same in terms of their values and attitudes as they were in their first year. Students have a tendency to become more open and tolerant of diversity as well as having more of a concern for individual rights and human welfare. There is substantial research that indicates that these changes or shifts in attitudes and values lasted for at least 25 years beyond college attendance (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Past research on college student development has shown that students develop as whole and seamless people (Howard-Hamilton et al., 1998). For these reasons, many student affairs professionals have aimed to meet the challenges of a diverse student population by promoting a holistic approach to multicultural education. Focusing on the development of the whole student is how these institutions or colleges perpetuate the culture and promote community spirit. (Rice & Austin, 1988)

It is vitally important to reduce prejudice and discrimination in educational settings (Wolfe & Spencer, 1996). Prejudice and discrimination impact the academic performance of those students on the receiving end of this treatment. It is believed that requiring freshmen students to attend a racial or cultural awareness workshop has a significant positive effect on the students' openness to diversity, especially true for white students (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996).

In assessing the influence of the college experience in the first year on a student's openness to diversity, Pascarella et al. (1996) isolated four variables to determine openness to diversity. The first is the student background or precollege characteristics. The second is the environmental emphases of the institution attended. The third is the measure of the students' academic experience. The last variable is the measure of the students' social/nonacademic involvement. Having controlled for these precollege characteristics, Pascarella et al. (1996) found that certain measures of commitment to diversity had a positive impact on college outcomes. One is the extent to which an institution emphasized and supported racial and multicultural diversity among faculty and students. This had a positive impact on an individual student's commitment to promoting racial understanding. Another is that students who took academic courses in an ethnic studies area or women studies were impacted in the same positive way.

There are many factors or variables that impact college students during their first year (Pascarella et al., 1996). Students who were most involved in campus life were more likely to be open to diversity. Involvement in campus life included factors such as living on campus and being a member of a student organization. Only one type of involvement in particular had a negative impact on a student's openness to diversity.

This involvement was membership in a fraternity or sorority. This negative impact was greatest for white students versus nonwhite students. The last finding of Pascarella et al. (1996) was that the more students were able to interact with students from diverse backgrounds the more open they were to diversity in general.

It is a mistake to believe that a commitment to diversity means increasing the numbers of diverse students. It means having a clear picture of the climate as it relates, tolerates, and accepts diversity. Hurtado et al., (1998) found that perceptions of discrimination have consequences for all students. Therefore, all institutions should insure that students perceive their institutional climate as fair and impartial (Hurtado et al., 1998). Being able to have a clear understanding of how students perceive the climate is most important to the academic success of all students and the institution itself.

Nora and Cabrera (1996) found that perceptions of prejudice-discrimination negatively affected the adjustment of minority students. Therefore, it is important to know if there are differences based on gender and racially identity. In their study, the authors divided their results into two categories. These were minority students and non-minority students in which minority students were the combination of African-American, Asian, and Hispanic/Latino students.

While all students perceived a campus climate of prejudice and discrimination against minority students minority students themselves perceived a higher level of prejudice and discrimination than nonminority students did. Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr (2000) found that the perceptions of African-American, Asian American, Latino/a, and white students are different based upon their particular background, cultural values, and experiences. African-American students reported more negative experiences than did

Asian American, Latino/a and white students. Asian American and Latino/a students reported instances of prejudice and discrimination by faculty and other students. Latino/a students reported the least amount of prejudice and discrimination compared to African-American and Asian American students. White students tend to experience less racial tension and discrimination than all other students do (Ancis et al., 2000).

According to Gurin (2000), education serves as a foundation of our democracy by preparing our students for full participation in our democracy. Students that are educated in diverse settings are better prepared for participation in our democratic process and the global economy. Our students must be prepared to fully participate nationally and to flourish internationally.

Research Question

Are there changes in the perceptions and attitudes related to diversity issues in freshmen students as a result of mandatory diversity training at the university?

Subsidiary Questions

1. Do the diversity trainers believe that diversity training has an impact on the perceptions and attitudes of freshmen students?
2. Is diversity training more or less effective based on the race and gender of the student?
3. Is diversity training effective in changing general attitudes related to racial diversity?

4. Is diversity training effective in changing specific attitudes related to personal contact and comfort level with racial diversity?

5. Is diversity training effective in changing general attitudes related to gender equality?

Significance of the Study

There are only a few studies on the effectiveness of the diversity training in organizations (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Most of these studies are qualitative in nature. They tend to focus on diversity training in business and industry, not colleges and universities.

The impact of the interaction between the development of college students and the environment has been well established (Cuyjet, 1998). Despite this, research on the racial climate at institutions of higher education has not been valued by the higher education community itself (Hurtado et al., 1998). "The degree of racial tension affects college satisfaction, as measured by psychological sense of community for all students" (Lee, 2000, p. 3). The comfort level for minority students is significant for their development.

Wolfe and Spencer (1996) believe that intervention techniques or diversity training can reduce prejudice and discrimination in educational settings. They also found that the reduction of prejudice and discrimination in the classroom increased the achievement levels of the students. Therefore, it is important to effectively assess the impact of diversity training at the University because prejudice and discrimination are linked to the academic achievement of its students.

Description of the Institution

The institution selected for this study describes itself as a private, church-affiliated, comprehensive university located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Its campus has a suburban environment and is located just minutes away from a major metropolitan area. It is comprised of eight schools/colleges including a law school.

It was founded on the principles of building a community that values different races, cultures, religions, and ethnicities. A major goal of the university is to respect diversity. In a most recent self-study done by the institution, it indicated that the university's interest in creating a harmonious and caring campus community means that they want to be attentive to all members of the University, whatever their origins or beliefs, and to understand their history, culture, and special concerns.

Although 34 other countries are represented in its student body, most of the students that attend this institution are from the local area. The countries that are most represented in the student body are Canada, China, India, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. The most popular majors among the undergraduate students are communications, psychology, and accounting. There are approximately 9,000 total students with undergraduate students being about 60% of the total student body. The average age of the full-time undergraduate is 20 years old. Only 50% of undergraduate students live in university owned/operated housing and 25% of the undergraduate students join fraternities and sororities. The university provides NCAA division I sports with 8% of the student body participating in those sports.

There are over 600 members of the faculty. This number includes full-time tenured faculty as well as adjuncts and other part-time instructors. Approximately 89% of the faculty have terminal degrees.

Definition of Terms

Diversity is one of the biggest challenges facing higher education (Levine, 1991). In a study of diversity at 14 different institutions, Levine found that most listed diversity as an important issue. Yet none of them had a real definition of what diversity was suppose to look like at their campuses. There is no consistent definition of the term diversity (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Although diversity can be defined in a great many different ways, for the purposes of this study, diversity will be confined, primarily, to race, ethnicity, and gender.

Race is a biological classification that includes various physical features such as nose and lip construction, hair texture, and skin pigmentation. However, it is important to understand the social and political complexity of race terminology (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). For the purposes of this study, racial groups will include African-Americans (Black), European Americans (White), Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans. Hispanic/Latinos are able to belong to any of the racial groups listed (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993).

Ethnicity is a classification assigned to a group of people that share a language, customs, religion, and a social history. Ethnicity is not based solely on race and can include members of various races (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993).

Prejudice is simply defined as a precedent, belief, attitude, or a judgment made based solely on a prior experience. According to Ponterotto, prejudice is defined as a negative judgment made against a racial or ethnic group or an individual belonging to a racial or ethnic group. This judgement is made on false or unsubstantiated data and is based in a rigid generalization (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993).

Organizational culture is defined by Schein (1992) as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group has learned as it solved its problems of adaptation and cohesion. It worked well enough to be considered valid. Therefore, it is taught to new members as the appropriate way to think and feel. An organization's culture is defined by its values, heroes, and its rites and rituals. Every organization has a culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Japanese organizations have put emphasis on the symbolic features of organizational life (Dill, 1982). In this sense, organizational culture is defined as shared beliefs, ideologies, or dogma of a group, which impel individuals to action and give their actions meaning. The culture of the organization determines who gets promoted, how people dress, and even how decisions are made. A strong culture is, for the most part, the driving force behind successful organizations in America.

Institutions of higher education are more complex than most other organizations in three distinct ways: the culture of the enterprise, the culture of the academic profession at large, and the culture of academic discipline. The academic enterprise is defined by its symbols, rituals, examinations, titles, degrees, and curriculum. The culture of the academic profession is defined by its shared identity and its symbols of academic freedom and tenure. The culture of the academic discipline is rich with its own symbols

of status and recognition. The meaning of culture in higher education is defined through the institution's myth or history, its symbols, and its rituals.

In addition to this, a college campus is a complex social system (Hurtado et al., 1998). Along with its goals, values, and traditions, there are relationships, procedures, and structural arrangements that effect the climate. Institutions of higher education are stable cultural systems that are slow to change.

Training is defined as the transmission of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It is basic to the development of society itself. Training occurs when people master circumstances and demonstrate the ability to pass on to others, using signs and words, the knowledge and skills acquired (Law, 1998). Trainers are defined as those faculty, staff, administrators, and students who have completed a 3-day training session in order to become trainers. The group of people who serve as trainers went through the three-day training session to learn the skills that are necessary for implementing this type of workshop for the new students. These trainers continue to meet throughout the year and have had one renewal 2-day training session since their original preparation. The specific program used is the Prejudice Reduction workshop developed by the National Coalition Building Institute in Washington, D.C.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

An extensive search of the most recent and the classic literature was conducted using Proquest, ERIC, and Dissertation Abstracts International. Included in the review are research articles, books, journals, and unpublished dissertations. The literature selected for review is divided into 3 distinct sections. The first section is literature with respect to diversity and the racial climate on college and university campuses. Most of the relevant research done in this area is from quantitative multi-campus studies. However, there are a few notable qualitative and single-institution studies included.

The second section is organizational culture. The pieces included in this section are primarily qualitative single-institution and/or corporate studies. There is a distinct lack of quantitative, empirical studies on this topic available for inclusion in this section.

The final section is diversity training, in general, at various types of institutions including institutions of higher education. There are only a few studies on the actual effectiveness of the diversity training in organizations. Most of these studies are qualitative in nature. There are numerous descriptive studies done on diversity training at institutions but these studies have not been included in this review. The review focuses on studies that discuss the effectiveness or the impact of diversity training.

Racial Climate on Campus

The impact of the interaction between the development of college students and the environment has been well established (Cuyjet, 1998). Despite this, research on the

racial climate at institutions of higher education has not been valued by the higher education community itself (Hurtado et al., 1998). Researchers have discovered that the racial climate varies from institution to institution. However, very few realize the importance of the racial climate as it relates to the psychological and behavioral climate. "The degree of racial tension affects college satisfaction, as measured by psychological sense of community for all students" (Lee, 2000, p. 3). The comfort level for minority students is significant for their development.

Many institutions of higher education enroll a diverse student body (Ancis et al., 2000). Not all students perceive or experience the campus climate in the same fashion. Many minority students experience a lack of support and feel an unwelcoming academic culture (Ancis et al., 2000). In a study conducted by Cuyjet (1998), the results indicated that African American students' perceptions of the campus climate/college environment differed significantly from other students. "This reinforced our assumption that African American students were more likely to feel marginalized than the non-African Americans" (Cuyjet, 1998, p. 66).

In an annual survey of freshmen students conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles as cited in Shea, 1996, the proportion of students who support racial understanding as a personal goal decreased by three percentage points from 1992 to 1996. Despite this slight decline, more than 70% of students value diversity in their college experience (Landrum, Dillinger, & Vandernoot, 2000). Consistent with most college students, almost 90% of the American population believe in the importance of having diversity on college campuses (Schmidt, 2000).

Most students believe that diversity enriches their own personal experience and enhances America's competitiveness within the global community. Female students and older students tend to value diversity more than other students do. Students who attend multicultural institutions view their experience as a positive enhancement for their future career opportunities (Bensimon, Nora, Patriquin, Johnson, & Throgmorton, 2000).

"Exposure to prejudice and discrimination on campus is viewed as one of the most important factors impinging on the cognitive growth (that is, academic performance, critical thinking) and the affective development of minority students" (Nora & Cabrera, 1996, p. 121). In the Nora and Cabrera (1996) study on the role of perceptions of college students on prejudice and discrimination, they discovered that prejudice and discrimination play a part in the persistence rate of minority students. Minority students were more likely to drop out of college than were white students during the 6-year period of the study. Several reasons for this "decline in college participation rates" of minority students are discussed. One of the possible reasons for the decline is the perception of the campus climate as being prejudiced and discriminatory against them. This finding is supported by Ancis et al. (2000), who found that the perceptions of African-American, Asian American, Latino/a, and white students are different based upon their particular background, cultural values, and experiences.

All students perceived a campus climate of prejudice and discrimination; however, minority students perceived a higher level of prejudice and discrimination than nonminority students did (Ancis et al., 2000; Bensimon et al., 2000; Lee, 2000). Most significant for Black/African-American students is the perception of racial discrimination by college administrators (Gilliard, 1996). Black/African-American students and Native

American students tend to have a more dismal perception of the racial climate on campus than do White students (Ancis et al., 2000; Landrum, Dillinger, & Vandernoot, 2000).

The perception of racial discrimination can be related to the availability of resources for minority students on the college campus (Lee, 2000). White students tend to have a better, more satisfactory experience with the university/college environment than do African-American or Asian American students (Ancis et al., 2000). White students believe that there is less racial tension and that the climate is accepting and supportive of diversity. "White students seem relatively immune from such a hostile climate. White students not only experienced limited discrimination, they also seemed to lack a recognition that interracial tensions and conflict exist for a significant portion of the student body" (Ancis et al., 2000, p. 184).

The study conducted by Nora and Cabrera (1996) serves as a foundation to any research being done on the perception of prejudice and discrimination on college campuses. It is instrumental in proving that perceptions of prejudice and discrimination are held by both White students and non-White students and that these perceptions impact the success of minority students at predominately white institutions. This finding is supported by Lee (2000) in another single institution study done at the University of Texas at Austin.

The single institution study conducted by Henderson-King (1993) found that students' perceptions or levels of tolerance for a particular social group does change during college. Henderson-King (1993) found that the change is not consistent with past beliefs. In this study, it was concluded that the campus climate actually encourages intolerance. It is the use of cross-cultural courses and women's studies courses that

counteract the ill effects of the campus climate, thus giving the appearance that students become more tolerant (Henderson-King, 1993).

The racial climates at institutions of higher education are complex and vary greatly because the institutions vary in sizes, locations, racial composition, and so forth. It is important to not generalize the results of a single institution study but to use the information in building a bigger picture. The primarily qualitative study done by Bensimon, et al. (2000) and the multi-campus study done by Landrum, Dillinger, and Vandernoot (2000) at southern institutions supports the fact that regional differences need to be considered before generalizations can be made nation-wide.

Organizational Culture

The actual studying of organizational culture is difficult because culture is implicit and not explicit (Masland, 1985). Therefore, the data on culture tends to be qualitative which is generally collected through interviews and observations. Previous research conducted by Masland (1985) found "that there is more to organizations than formal structure" (p. 118). Organizational culture is defined as the internal environment that is comprised of beliefs, values, ideologies, and assumptions. The dimensions of the culture are the variables such as its distinctiveness, content, and continuity (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Organizational culture is vital to the success of the organization. It is the connection of thought and action that promotes this success (Masland, 1985). Corporate culture is notable because it is the sum total of values, virtues, behaviors, and the politics of a company (Bliss, 1999).

Organizational culture depends on several variables (Clark, 1980). These are the size, tightness, age, and the founding of the institution along with its transformation and its saga. However, Masland (1985) categorizes the cultural manifestations in four categories. These categories are "saga", heroes, symbols, and rituals.

Saga is a particularly distinctive accomplishment of that organization. One of the ways of strengthening an organization's culture is through an organizational saga (Clark, 1972). Clark describes an organizational saga as a collective understanding of [a] unique accomplishment in a formally established group. The saga creates an emotion in the organization community and strengthens the bonds of its members with each other and the institution itself.

The second is heroes, which are the people who are important to the organization or somehow significant to the representation of the organization's ideas.

The third is symbols. These are the values and beliefs in tangible form. An organization's culture is expressed through its symbolism (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The beliefs, values, and practices define the culture for the organization's members. The symbolism tells the members who they are and how they are suppose to carry out their jobs. Symbols find the meaning in chaos, the clarity in confusion, and the predictability in mystery. Symbols are myths that explain and resolve, rituals and ceremonies that provide direction, metaphors that take members to a deeper level of understanding the organization. Bolman and Deal (1997) clearly state that "every organization develops distinctive beliefs and patterns. Many of these are unconscious or taken for granted, reflected in myths, fairy tales, stories, rituals, ceremonies, and other symbolic forms" (p.

231). The underlying values and beliefs define the institution's culture. The attitudes and behavior define the climate (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

Lastly, rituals are used to translate culture into action. Culture is the ritualized patterns of beliefs, values, and behaviors shared by its members (Sherriton & Stern, 1997). It is the ceremonies, rites, and traditions that are unique to an organization or institution (Tierney, 1988). Culture is what shapes the behavior of those in the organization. Organizational culture has a way of not only shaping behavior but controlling it as well. It provides a framework for shared understanding (Umiker, 1999).

The study of Japanese organizations initiated the interest in studying the relationship between culture and management. "From the inception of organizational culture studies, scholars have attempted to show how organizational cultures have been a 'hidden' resource for management" (Van Buskirk & McGrath, 1999, p. 805). "Ever since the rise of Japan as a leading industrial power, organization theorists and managers alike have become increasingly aware of the relationship between culture and management" (Morgan, 1986, p. 111). In the study done by Morgan (1986) on organizational culture, culture is defined as how different groups of people have different ways of living.

The type of culture at an institution impacts its environment, the mission, how members are socialized, how information is processed, strategies in decision-making, and finally its leadership (Tierney, 1988). Morgan (1986) sees many strengths in the organizational culture. The first strength is that culture gives symbolic meaning to the organization. The second strength is that because of shared meanings the organization is more focused. Next, is that organizations can begin to visualize changes in the traditional

ways, then, become adaptable to environmental changes. Morgan (1986) describes organizations as societies that have their own patterns and even subcultures. These patterns have significant influence over how the organization reacts or responds to challenges.

Organizational culture helps in the understanding of organizational change. Change can destroy an organization, as well, if the culture of the organization is not able to adapt to change (Umiker, 1999). Improving the ways that cultures are assessed is important to the organization's ability to adapt. The ability to adapt easily to change is essential to the success of the organization (Tierney, 1988). Umiker (1999) suggests that despite an organization's low level of racial, gender, or ethnic conflict, it can still be shackled with a culture "that leads to low morale, high turnover, and financial distress" (p. 22). Changing the culture at an organization can be a very positive experience. Faulkner (1998) suggests that creating a new culture will make employees happier, more productive and more likely to stay on the job. Because organizational culture is created over time, changing the culture must also take place over time. Effective organizations are those whose cultures are in agreement with the challenges of the marketplace (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

It is believed that we do not completely understand all the functions of culture in the management of our institutions. Because of this, we are not able to adequately deal with the challenges and conflicts that occur in higher education or promote shared goals (Tierney, 1988). However, we do know that one of the functions of organizational culture in higher education includes providing the ability to understand the mission or purpose of the institution and the ability to socialize new members of the institution.

Another function of the new organizational culture, found in the corporate sphere, may be to just “increase(s) employee participation, commitment, motivation and empowerment, and organizational productivity” (Casey, 1999, p. 156). The overarching argument is that a sense of belonging to an organizational family gives us those warm feelings of acceptance while at the same time controls our behavior through discipline.

A further function of organizational culture in the corporate sphere is to condition the emotional experiences of employees on a daily basis that in turn maintains the identities of each member. These functions can be translated and applied to institution of higher education despite our lack of knowledge that is specific to higher education.

There are distinct differences between higher education institutions and other types of organizations, which is important in understanding the nature of higher education (Dill, 1982). The distinctness of higher education and the academic culture must be placed in proper perspective (Dill, 1982). Distinctive organizational culture is described as a “culture that permeates the fabric of the institution” (Rice & Austin, 1988, p. 209). The institution is distinct in its values, beliefs, and social commitments. The academic culture is characterized by its rituals, architecture, and focus on students.

The successful management of diversity as part of the organizational culture strengthens the organizations flexibility (Cox, 1993). There is evidence that suggests that minorities and women are more cognitively flexible and thus more able to handle ambiguous situations and tasks. In this day and age organizational flexibility is a key ingredient to its success in the marketplace.

Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1998) found that the successful management of diversity would improve productivity and assist the organization in remaining

competitive. Examples of this are "being more profitable and cost effective; having a more productive, creative, and innovative workforce; having a more talented pool of people to pick from; having lower levels of absenteeism and turnover; being more capable of serving a diverse customer base; and being more capable of competing globally" (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998, p. 240). From this study, diversity experts agree that successful diversity training will allow the employees to form better working relationships, enhance the organization's social responsibility, and address any legal concerns. An organization that embraces diversity has defined its culture by establishing that diversity is a primary value (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000). Organizations that are sensitive to diversity will attract and keep the best available human resources (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998).

The study of organizational culture has "provide[d] valuable insight into colleges and universities" (Masland, 1985, p. 123). We must also acknowledge the distinctiveness of higher education institutions (Dill, 1982) as well as how institutions of higher education adapt to change (Umiker, 1999). Masland (1985) discusses that organizational culture has a significant impact on campus life as well as the curriculum and the administration. The culture at an institution also impacts the management, decision-making, and the practices of that institution according to Masland (1985). The effort to change an institution will rely on its "leadership, firm commitment, adequate resources, collaboration, monitoring, and long rang planning" (Hurtado et al., 1998, p. 295). The management of the academic culture must be rediscovered and emphasized in order to increase the productivity, commitment and loyalty of the professional staff (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

Peterson and Spencer (1990) found that the function of organizational culture in institutions of higher education includes providing the ability to understand the mission or purpose of the institution and the ability to socialize new members of the institution. However, Tierney (1988) suggests that because we do not completely understand the function of culture in the management of our institutions. We are not able to adequately deal with the challenges and conflicts that occur in higher education or promote shared goals.

Diversity Training

Organizations want to create and foster an environment that accepts diversity and allows individuals to reach their full potential (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Diversity training is the method by which many organizations choose to do this. Diversity training should consist of

“building awareness, building skills, helping employees understand the need for and meaning of managing and valuing diversity, educating employees on specific cultural differences and how to respond to such differences in the workplace, providing the skills necessary for working in diverse work teams, improving employee understanding of the cultural mix within the organization, assisting employees in learning about the culture and community the organization is serving, and providing skills and development activities necessary for diverse groups to be able to integrate within the organization, do their jobs effectively, and have the opportunity for advancement” (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998, p. 240).

However, diversity training as a developing field, is still creating its own language, knowledge base, skills, and competencies.

The most successful diversity training programs use a combination of emotion-based learning and intellectual learning (Cox, 1993). Although, many diversity training programs "lack a sound theoretical basis in the stereotyping and prejudice-reduction literature" (Gingrich, 2000, p. 14), it is also suggested that the best diversity training facilitators or teachers should come from within the organization. They should be a diverse group of respected members of the organization in order to be the most effective. The training should begin by increasing awareness of what diversity means and why it is important (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998).

Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1998) asked diversity experts to identify components of successful and effective diversity training programs. The top response mentioned was commitment and support from the upper levels of management. Other responses were the inclusion of diversity training in the organization's strategic plan, training programs that address the specific needs of that organization, qualified trainers, training used in combination with other diversity efforts, mandatory attendance, and follow-up evaluation.

There are currently six paradigms of diversity training (Amey-Taylor, 1997). These are anti-'isms/liberation, intercultural, legal, managing diversity, prejudice reduction, and valuing differences. The first is the "anti-'isms/liberation" model. This model "seeks to create social and personal change through the redistribution of power and resources" (Amey-Taylor, 1997, p. 29). It is believed that intervention techniques

based on realistic conflict theory can reduce prejudice and discrimination in educational settings by forcing participants to share resources (Wolfe & Spencer, 1996).

The second is the "intercultural" model that "suggests that cross-cultural miscommunication and misunderstandings and value clashes create interpersonal problems that can be addressed through an increased understanding and tolerance of others' worldviews and values" (Amey-Taylor, 1997, p. 29). These programs "promote greater interracial comfort and safety for students of color" (Lee, 2000, p. 5).

The third is the "legal" model, which focuses on giving marginalized groups an equal opportunity to succeed. These programs are typically special recruitment programs for underrepresented racial and ethnic groups (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Affirmative action programs could be placed in this model. Affirmative action is a compliance issue while other diversity training models focus on fairness. Even though "courts have upheld challenges to affirmative action, state referenda have limited its use" (Grossman, 2000, p. 47).

Next is the "managing diversity" model that promotes a cultural transformation (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Programs typically focus on the management of a diverse workforce in order to increase productivity and remain competitive. One goal of a new culture program at an organization was to create and promote the desired values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors as well as to collapse or flatten the hierarchy and encourage participatory decision-making. It was designed to increase a sense of responsibility and feelings of belonging (Casey, 1999). Diversity training in the workplace usually includes techniques for integrating individuals from many cultures with different attitudes, values, and behaviors into one organization (Law, 1998). This is similar to the "managing

diversity” model. Burkart (1999) refers to this model as the systems model because it addresses the interconnectedness of dominance and subordination in organizational cultures (Burkart, 1999). It focuses on the issues of dominance and its relation to managing differences.

Then there is the “prejudice reduction” model, which centers on personal awareness and the healing of past hurts. Reducing prejudice and reconciliation are the goal of these programs (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Another goal of these diversity training programs is to improve self-awareness (Law, 1998). Chetkow-Yanoov (1999) suggests that by understanding our past conflicts and being able to resolve those issues will allow the peaceful coexistence of differing cultures. Allowing participants to take risks and raise tough issues in a proper balance permits them to not violate their own sense of integrity and self-worth (Brown, 1990).

Finally there is the “valuing differences” model that focuses on establishing meaningful interpersonal relationships (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Issues of assimilation, dominance, and privilege are typically not addressed in this type of diversity training. One of the advantages to using this type of diversity training is that it may be considered one of the least offensive (Burkart, 1999). According to Henson (1998), most of the people in this particular study believed that people learn to value diversity from observations and following examples. In addition, they also felt that creating an awareness of differences is more effective than trying to force attitudinal change. Burkart (1999) believes that expanding the awareness of differences will ultimately change the culture of the organization/institution. In learning to value differences, people will

behave differently. People will be compelled to use their empathy for or understanding of others to guide their behavior (Burkart, 1999).

One of the criticisms of diversity training programs is that they have a tendency to preach to the choir and are not likely to make any changes in the campus racial climate or organizational culture (Lee, 2000). Zhu and Kleiner (2000) suggest that most diversity training programs are too broad in context. Diversity training programs attempt to cover too many topics ranging from history to culture to ethnicity to race to age, and so forth. Another criticism is that there are no criteria for diversity trainers to measure themselves against beyond their personal experiences (Amey-Taylor, 1997).

Many institutions are concerned with offending specific people and avoid any type of diversity training. In particular, many White males have come to feel "picked on" (Raths, 1999). Zhu and Kleiner (2000) report that the number of discrimination lawsuits has increased by almost 34% since 1990. This is evidence of the national backlash of reverse discrimination against White men. "Diversity training's focus on understanding and valuing human differences doesn't reduce workplace discrimination" (Zhu & Kleiner, 2000, p. 13). Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1998) suggest that diversity training in the future should not be conducted in isolation but rather as an essential component of other types of training such as new employee training, management training, and sexual harassment training.

Diversity training has also been criticized by research that points to the need for the development of cultural competencies (Howard-Hamilton et al., 1998). These include empathy, thoughtfulness, compassion, respect, tolerance, and cooperation. For multicultural education to be successful there must be an agreement on the definition of

multiculturalism as it pertains to each individual institution of higher education. There must also be an agreement on what the outcome of multicultural education will look like in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors.

"Greater acceptance of diversity is achieved by using multiple efforts, constant reinforcement, and broadscale change initiatives. Rather than simply making a commitment to valuing diversity, creating an atmosphere of inclusion requires change on many fronts, including fairness, empowerment, and openness" (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000, p. 94). In order for diversity training to be more successful, organizations must monitor and evaluate the results. For diversity training to have any significant impact it must be targeted at the right audience at the right time (Burkart, 1999). Organizations must also anticipate variables that could lead to it having a negative impact and it must value diversity training as a long-term commitment. There must be a visible commitment from the administration of the organization as well. Fifty percent of the diversity training experts interviewed by Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1998) believed that diversity training should be mandatory.

Those who support mandatory training in organizations do so because it brings everyone to the training session and does not appear to target specific individuals that may need diversity training more than others (Amey-Taylor, 1997). Everyone needs to be exposed to diversity issues and understand the effect that these issues have on them and the organization to which they belong (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1998).

Mandatory training proves that there is a significant level of support and commitment from the organization's upper management. Diversity training programs are more effective when they do not exclude any individual or group (Wentling & Palma-

Rivas, 1998). An all-inclusive environment should be used for training because it shows that everyone is different or diverse in his or her own way.

According to Amey-Taylor (1997), most models of diversity training include some type of evaluation to measure its outcome or to assess its effectiveness. An effective evaluation should measure the participants' reaction to the material in the training, the knowledge learned, any changes in behavior, and an improvement in organizational performance.

Amey-Taylor (1997) points out that few qualitative or quantitative research studies have been done that measure outcomes and effectiveness. Most of the studies tend to be performed on businesses and corporations, not colleges and universities. One study done by Elliott (1997) at a university found that diversity training was ineffective in changing the attitudes and the perceived comfort level of students with respect to diversity. A study conducted by Hess (1991) measured the effectiveness in altering racial attitudes of mid-level managers in a public agency following an educational program. Hess (1991) found through the use of personal interviews that the managers demonstrated a slight positive improvement in racial attitudes. Another study done by Hanover (1993) on the impact of diversity training on middle managers in Fortune 500 companies found through a self-report survey that there was an increase in knowledge about diversity and they engaged in behaviors appropriate with managing diversity in the workplace. Neither of these studies were longitudinal and lacked clear data to substantiate their findings, according to Amey-Taylor (1997).

Conclusion

There are limitations to investigating perceptions of prejudice and discrimination (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). The first is that most studies in this area tend to be descriptive and cross-sectional. In addition, the studies tend to focus on outcomes while neglecting to link the perceptions of prejudice and discrimination to campus environmental factors or the organizational culture of the institution. With these limitations in mind, our generalizations from the research on the perceptions of prejudice and discrimination must be done cautiously. It is important to note that caution must always be taken in generalizing the results of diversity studies to all 4-year institutions (Pascarella et al., 1996).

The actual studying of organizational culture is difficult because culture is implicit and not explicit (Masland, 1985). Therefore, the data on culture tends to be qualitative which is generally collected through interviews and observations. Much of the information available on organizational culture is based on case studies of organizations that are not institutions of higher education. We must acknowledge that most studies of organizational culture were spawned from our interest in the success of Japanese organizations (Morgan, 1986). Scholars in this area tend to focus on the content of culture and how symbols contain meanings (Van Buskirk & McGrath, 1999). There is a significant lack of empirical studies done on organizational culture and climates at institutions of higher education.

The real threat to diversity training is the lack of reliable data on its effectiveness. There is a definite lack of empirical research on the success of diversity training and it has yet to be tracked in any factual way (Henson, 1998). Grossman (2000) supports the

claim that the effectiveness of diversity programs/training is difficult to gauge. A non-profit New York based research organization recently asked Black women if diversity programs were effective in addressing subtle racism and 64 percent of them said no (Grossman, 2000).

The campus diversity experience is unique in several ways. First, there are very few studies on how diversity works within educational environments. This is coupled with the fact that no institution has followed its students in relation to understanding diversity and the quality of experiences students have in contact with diverse peers during each year of attending college. One is not likely to find such detailed and multiple ways of understanding how diversity works in any single study currently in the research literature (Gurin, 2000).

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

A case study design was used as the overarching method for this particular single-institution study. Case studies are typically used when trying to attribute a causal relationship (Yin, 1993). In this case, does diversity training influence the perceptions and attitudes of freshman students?

The institution selected for this study describes itself as a private, church-affiliated, comprehensive university located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Its campus has a suburban environment and is located just minutes away from a major metropolitan area. It is comprised of eight schools/colleges including a law school.

It was founded on the principles of building a community that values different races, cultures, religions, and ethnicities. A major goal of the university is to respect diversity. In a most recent self-study done by the institution, it indicated that the university's interest in creating a harmonious and caring campus community means that they want to be attentive to all members of the University, whatever their origins or beliefs, and to understand their history, culture, and special concerns.

Although 35 countries are represented in its student body, most of the students that attend this institution are from the local area. The countries that are most represented in the student body are Canada, China, India, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. The most popular majors among the undergraduate students are communications, psychology, and accounting. There are approximately 9,000 total students with undergraduate students being about 60% of the total student body. The average age of the full-time

undergraduate is 20 years old. Only 50% of undergraduate students live in university owned/operated housing and 25% of the undergraduate students join fraternities and sororities. The university provides NCAA Division I sports with 8% of the student body participating in those sports.

There are over 600 members of the faculty. This number includes full-time tenured faculty as well as adjuncts and other part-time instructors. Approximately 89% of the faculty have terminal degrees.

Data Collection

Data collection for this study was divided into two distinctly separate research segments. The first segment was collecting descriptive information from a focus group. The second segment was collecting quantitative data from a selected population of students using a pre-test, intervention, post-test format.

Data collection began with a focus group of diversity trainers. This focus group provided insights into their perceptions of prejudice and discrimination at the institution for descriptive purposes only. After the focus group, the entire incoming freshman class received the survey instrument as a pre-test. Following the pre-test the freshman class participated in the mandatory diversity training provided by the University's Orientation Program and the Division of Freshman Studies. The students received the same survey again as a post-test after the diversity training was completed.

Participants-Focus Group

A focus group of quasi-experts in prejudice reduction was conducted. This focus group consisted of a random sample of the diversity trainers at the institution being studied. This focus group was conducted prior to the survey given to the freshmen. The purpose was to gain insight into their own perceptions of prejudice at the institution.

The 7 participants in the focus group ranged in ages from the early 20s to mid 50s. They were all female with the exception of one male. They represented various departments at the institution including Community Development, Career Center, Freshman Studies, Athletics, and Campus Ministry. Most of the subjects had been employed at the institution for less than 3 years. Only two individuals had been at the institution for more than 5 years. Race and ethnicity were diverse among the group. One subject was Asian, one was Jewish, two were African-American, one was Latino, and the other two were White/Caucasian.

Measures-Focus Group

Questions for the focus group were developed to solicit relevant information regarding opinions on the impact of diversity training. A set of 11 questions was used to facilitate the group discussion on prejudice reduction as a result of mandatory diversity training. These questions were:

1. What is your name and how long have you been working at the University?
2. Why they became diversity trainers?
3. Is the University committed to diversity?

4. Is diversity training effective in reducing prejudice?
5. Do people from diverse backgrounds feel accepted?
6. Is the University accepting of people from diverse backgrounds?
7. Why is diversity training done at the University?
8. What impact has diversity training had at the University?
9. Has diversity training affected the number of race-related incidents on campus?
10. What does the president of the university need to know about the impact of diversity training?
11. What issues were not discussed already, concerning diversity training?

Procedure-Focus Group

The participants for the focus group were selected at random from the list of diversity trainers at the institution. There were approximately 80 faculty, staff, administrators, and students who have attended a 3-day workshop to become diversity trainers. From this group, 15 individuals were selected to attend the focus group. The ideal number of participants for a focus group ranges from 8 to 12 (Krueger, 1994). The 15 selected individuals received an invitation to the focus group interview that contained information about the study that was being conducted, how they were selected, along with the time, date, and location of the focus group interview. They were asked to contact the focus group interviewer/facilitator to confirm their attendance.

From this group of 15 individuals, only 3 trainers were able to attend the focus group interview. Therefore, another 10 individuals from the original list were selected at

random to receive an invitation. A complete total of 25 individuals received invitations to the focus group interview. Eight individuals confirmed that they would attend. Seven individuals actually attended the focus group.

When the participants arrived, the researcher did formal introductions and then allowed the group to socialize informally. After several minutes, the focus group was called to order. Ground rules for the focus group discussion were given, participants were asked for agreement to the rules, and then the semi-structured, question/answer discussion began.

Data Analysis-Focus Group

The group discussion was highly interactive and all subjects participated fully. It was clear from the discussion that most of the individuals were passionate about this topic and had very strong opinions. The group was generally polite and orderly in their discussion and provided the researcher with a tremendous amount of descriptive information about their own feelings and perceptions.

The discussion was tape recorded and transcribed. There was also a note taker present. The notes were then compared with the transcription and the tape recording. Responses were grouped based on similarity of content.

Participants-Intervention

The participants were all new incoming freshmen university students. Slightly more than one half were men (see Table 2). The self-reported racial backgrounds of the subjects were as follows: African-American/Black 10.2%, Hispanic/Latino 8.2%,

Asian/Pacific Islander 6.8%. Twenty-three percent (23.2%) of the subjects declined to provide racial/ethnic information (see Table 3).

Table 2

Gender Division of Subjects in Percentages

| | |
|--------|-------|
| Male | 50.1% |
| Female | 49.9% |
| Total | 100% |

Table 3

Racial Division of Subjects in Percentages

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| White/Caucasian | 51.6% |
| Black/African-American | 10.2% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8.2% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 6.8% |
| Race Unknown | 23.2% |
| Total | 100% |

Measures-Intervention

The survey instrument used as the measure is known as the Quick Discrimination Index (see Appendix A). However, the title on the actual instrument given to the students is "Social Attitudes Survey". The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) was developed to fulfill the need for a reliable, valid, and moderate-length self-report measure of attitudes regarding racial diversity and women's equality (Ponterotto et al., 1995). The reasoning behind the title change was to control for potential subject demand characteristics and evaluation anxiety (Ponterotto et al., 1995).

The instrument was developed as a multidimensional measure to be used with adults and older adolescents. Because it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete, it is considered to be time efficient. It was designed to be used with both genders and across all racial groups. These factors made the instrument ideal for use with college freshmen from a variety of racial groups.

The instrument has 30-items on a 5-point Likert-type scale that was designed to allow the subject to self-report attitudes and feelings related to issues of racial diversity and gender equality. The scale options are: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=not sure, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. The survey's questions were designed to fall into three distinct categories. These categories are general attitudes related to racial diversity, specific attitudes related to personal contact and personal comfort level with racial diversity, and general attitudes regarding gender equality. One-half of the 30 items were worded and scored in a positive direction (high scores indicate high sensitivity to multicultural/gender issues), and 15 were worded and scored in the negative direction (where low scores are indicative of high sensitivity) (Ponterotto et al., 1995). The scores on the Quick Discrimination Index can range from 30 to 150. Higher scores indicate more awareness, sensitivity, and receptivity to racial diversity and gender equality (Ponterotto et al., 1995).

Ponterotto et. al. (1995) found QDI scores to be stable during a 15-week test-retest period (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999). The stability coefficient averaged to be .84 across the three samples used in the development study (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999) which is satisfactory in measuring its reliability. The coefficient of variation was .13. This coefficient is within the desired range recommended by Dawis (1987). In terms of its

validity, "Ponterotto et al. (1995) established the initial criterion-validity of the QDI through Walsh and Betz's (1990) group differences approach, and initial evidence of convergent validity was documented through predicted correlations with related measures of racial attitudes" (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999, p. 328). One of the related measures used by Ponterotto et al. (1995) was the New Racism Scale developed by Jacobson (1985). Ponterotto et al. (1995) found negligible correlation with the Social Desirability Scale developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960).

Procedure-Intervention

All new incoming freshman students were required to attend the Welcome Week Orientation program. This program began 6 days before classes began in the Fall 2000 semester. During the 6-day program, the freshman students were assigned to small groups of approximately 30 students and assigned to a Freshman Studies Mentor. This Mentor serves as their academic advisor during their first year. These small groups of students received a schedule of various activities that they were required to attend as a group. One of the mandatory activities was the 4-hour diversity training session that focused on prejudice reduction.

The diversity training model used was the Prejudice Reduction workshop developed by the National Coalition Building Institute based in Washington, D.C. The training itself consisted of several exercises that required the students to actively participate in the training session. The goal of the training session was to reduce prejudice by assisting participants in "identifying the information and misinformation we learned about other groups; identifying and expressing pride in the group(s) to which we

belong; learning how groups, other than our own, experience mistreatment; learning the personal impact of specific incidents of discrimination; and learning how to interrupt prejudicial jokes, remarks, and slurs" (Brown, 1984, p. 4).

The first exercise involved having the students identify or define themselves. This was done by having the trainer state a particular categorization of people. All members of that category were asked to stand up if they chose to identify with that categorization. This continued through numerous categories including racial, ethnicity, gender, age, social class, sexual orientation, birth-order, place of birth, languages spoken and so on. The purpose of this exercise was to simply allow students to connect with others in the group in ways, which they predicted, and ways that they could not predict.

The next exercise involved the exploration of stereotypes based on misinformation and prejudicial attitudes that developed from that misinformation. The students were asked to meet in pairs and select a category of people to which neither of them was a member. Once this was done, they took turns verbalizing uncensored thoughts about that group. The pairs were encouraged to select categories that were racial, ethnic, or gender specific. This exercise concluded with the students being able to share with the whole group some of the stereotypes that were verbalized in their pairs. The purpose of this exercise was to reveal that everyone has stereotypes and that no one group is singled out.

The third exercise involved the exploration of internalized oppression. The students were asked to meet in pairs again. This time, they were instructed to select a category to which they did belong and repeat the second exercise. Most prejudice reduction workshops focus on stereotypes that people learn about groups other than their

own. The purpose of this exercise was to allow the students to explore negative stereotypes they have about themselves or that other groups have about them.

The fourth exercise allowed students to express pride in a category or group to which they belong. It involved students meeting in the same pair as the third exercise and shouting out loud the one thing that they were most proud of about their own group. The purpose was to encourage students to accept themselves so that it would be easier to accept others.

The fifth exercise was to explore the power of group oppression. Students were asked to identify several racial, ethnic, or gender groups that at least three people in the room could belong to. Once this list was generated, students were asked to select the group that they belonged to and meet as a group. They were then instructed to generate a list of things that they as a racial, ethnic, or gender group never wanted other people to say, think, or do to them again. After they completed this list, the groups were asked to report or share this list in front of the entire room. The purpose of this exercise was to help the students heal themselves of mistreatment in the past by sharing it with other members of the same group and to identify for the other small groups in the room what types of things have hurt them in the past.

The next exercise allowed a few selected students to share, in front of the entire room, a personal story about mistreatment or discrimination that they experienced. For many students, this was a powerful turning point in the training session. Many of the stories brought out strong emotions in both the students telling the stories and in the students who were listening.

The final exercise was to introduce a skill to the students that would allow them to combat prejudicial remarks, slurs, or jokes. The students were asked to participate in a variety of role-playing situations in which they had to confront someone that was making an offensive remark, slur, or joke. The students role-played ineffective ways to confront offensiveness and then learned more effective strategies for confronting offensive remarks, slurs, or jokes. The purpose of this exercise was to empower students to combat prejudice and discrimination in everyday situations and to evoke behavioral changes such as thinking before making offensive remarks themselves.

The theory behind the prejudice reduction workshop includes six points. The first point is that it is our guilt that keeps our prejudice in place. The second point is that every issue with respect to being different matters whether it is racial, economic, ethnic, religious, and so forth. The third point is that to change attitudes we need to hear personal stories from people that have been mistreated or discriminated against. The fourth point is that skill training leads to empowerment. The fifth point is that we must end leadership oppression and become more supportive of those in leadership positions. The final point is that teams of people are necessary for changing the culture of the institution (Brown, 1984).

The day before the diversity training intervention 1008 surveys were distributed to the freshman class. Commuter students received the survey during their welcome session held in the student center. Residential students received the survey during their welcome session held in the residence halls. The resident assistants and the coordinator of commuter student services were asked to distribute the surveys and give the instructions for completing the survey. Once the surveys were completed, the resident

assistants and the commuter coordinator collected the surveys. The researcher retrieved the collected surveys immediately following each welcome session. A total of 761 surveys were returned. However, only 746 were completed and deemed usable for this study providing the researcher with a 74% return rate.

During the next 2 days, the students attended the required diversity training session. Each freshman was required to attend this session with their assigned group in their assigned classroom. Each group was assigned two diversity trainers who conducted their session. The diversity trainers had received 3 full days of training by the National Coalition Building Institute in order to become trainers for the Welcome Week Orientation program. The trainers were a combination of faculty members, administrators, staff, and upper-class students.

As a post-test, the survey was distributed to the 761 freshmen students who agreed to participate in the project. This was done approximately ten days following the completion their diversity training session. This time the survey was distributed electronically to their student e-mail accounts at the institution. Each student was sent a copy of the survey, directions for completing it, and directions on how to return it electronically. This time 261 useable surveys were returned for a 34% return rate. Surveys were deemed useable if they were completed in its entirety including the student's name for matching purposes. The return was expected to be low due to lack of anonymity.

Data Analysis-Intervention

A total of 1008 surveys were distributed to the incoming freshmen class during orientation week as the pre-test. Seven hundred sixty-one surveys were returned. Fifteen were not complete and deemed unusable for this study. Leaving 74% of the 1008 surveys distributed, deemed completed, and useable for the study.

Seven hundred sixty-one surveys were distributed electronically to each of the subjects who agreed to participate in the study as the post-test. Only 261 surveys were returned and useable, which provided the researcher with a 34% response rate. Frequency distributions, paired samples T-tests, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were performed in SPSS to analyze the results of the data collected.

Frequency distributions were used to provide general information about the demographics of the participants and how they responded to the survey. Paired samples T-tests were performed to provide information on how the entire sample and each racial/gender group measured against itself on the pre-test and post-test. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to flush out any significant differences between each racial/gender group and within each racial/gender group.

Chapter IV

FINDINGS

Focus Group

A set of 11 questions was used to facilitate the group discussion on prejudice reduction as a result of mandatory diversity training. The group discussion was highly interactive and all subjects participated fully. It was clear from the discussion that most of the individuals were passionate about this topic and had very strong opinions. The group was generally polite and orderly in their discussion and provided the researcher with a tremendous amount of descriptive information about their own feelings and perceptions.

Why they became diversity trainers? The responses to this issue varied. Some of the group commented that they became trainers because it is important to talk about diversity and they wanted to learn more or develop more tools for dealing with diversity issues. About a third of the group thought it would be a great way to get more involved and meet other employees. However, most of the group agreed that they had become diversity trainers because of a personal interest in diversity issues.

Is the University committed to diversity? The majority of the group felt that some departments or areas at the university are more committed than other areas and that the institution, as a whole, is too reactionary. One group member commented that the university's mission statement reflects the appreciation of diversity as important but another member felt that the university is "all talk and no action." Other comments were that the university leadership has a sincere commitment to diversity but does not know

how to implement effective programs in all areas of the institution.

Is diversity training effective in reducing prejudice? Almost all the group members felt that mandatory diversity training is effective in reducing prejudice. Some of the comments were that diversity training “creates awareness,” “plants a seed,” and “makes students more accepting.” There was also a general feeling that although the training is effective there needs to be additional follow-up.

Do people from diverse backgrounds feel accepted? The majority opinion of the group was negative to this issue. They did not believe that people from diverse backgrounds feel accepted at the institution. The researcher probed the group for more specifics or specific groups that they believed did not feel accepted. Those groups were people from non-Christian religious backgrounds, homosexuals, and international students. The group reasoned that the smaller the group in numbers the less accepted they would feel.

Is the University accepting of people from diverse backgrounds? This question polarized the group to some extent. About half the group said that the University is accepting and that it has become more open to diversity, while the other half of the group felt that University as an institution is too tolerant of prejudice and discrimination.

Why is diversity training done at the University? Most of the group agreed that diversity training is done because it is the politically correct thing to do especially because it is part of the mission statement of the institution. One group member felt strongly that diversity training is done now as a reaction to past racial incidents on campus.

What impact has diversity training had at the University? The reactions to this

question were varied and extremely enthusiastic. One group member commented that the mandatory training has a way of bringing the freshmen class together on a different level that can not be done any other way. Other comments were such that it creates "a closer community," "shows our commitment to diversity," "gives them permission to talk about the hard stuff and ask questions of each other," and "find common ground." In general, the group felt that it was one way to allow the participants to share their experiences, learn about other cultures, and become more accepting of differences. One group member felt that training takes the focus off race and "opens up" diversity to be more inclusive of other types of differences.

Has diversity training affected the number of race-related incidents on campus?

The overwhelming majority opinion was affirmative to this question. One group member pointed out that although race-related incidents have decreased, incidents against homosexuals have increased. The entire group agreed that the training program used at the university is weak in dealing with issues of sexuality and that being a Catholic institution does not allow the trainers to address homosexuality issues as effectively as they would like to address them.

What does the president of the university need to know about the impact of diversity training? One group member suggested that the president should become a diversity trainer. Other positive comments were that it is not just for students. All members of the community (faculty and staff) should be required to attend diversity training. Many felt that more support is needed for diversity training efforts, especially money. A few members of the group wanted the president to know that the mandatory diversity training for freshmen is "challenging," "raising the issues," "starting the

dialogue,” “cracked the door open to acceptance” but all agreed that the door needs to be “wider.”

The negative comments were that the leadership of the institution should go through training, including the board of regents. Overall, the group felt that the leadership’s commitment to diversity training is superficial and the commitment should start at the top. Also, the group expressed the need to have more faculty and staff as trainers. They believed that going through the training process to become a trainer should be mandatory.

What issues were not discussed already, concerning diversity training? The major concern from the group that was not addressed during the discussion was the need to get more White/Caucasians men as trainers. They also discussed the need to get more departments and more members of the faculty involved. Finally, some members felt that the university should have other avenues or types of diversity training available for the university community.

Intervention Survey Analysis

A total of 1008 surveys were distributed to the incoming freshmen class during orientation week as the pre-test. Seven hundred sixty-one surveys were returned. Fifteen were not complete and deemed unusable for this study. Leaving 74% of the 1008 surveys distributed, deemed completed, and useable for the study.

Seven hundred sixty-one surveys were distributed electronically to each of the subjects that agreed to participate in the study as the post-test. Only 261 surveys were returned and useable. Which would provide the researcher with a 34% response rate.

Frequency distributions, paired sample T-tests, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were performed in SPSS to analyze the results of the data collected.

Frequency distributions were used to provide general information about the demographics of the participants and how they responded to the survey. Paired samples T-tests were performed to provide information on how the entire sample and each racial/gender group measured against itself on the pre-test and post-test. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to flush out any significant differences between each racial/gender group and within each racial/gender group.

Entire Group

The pair samples T-test revealed a pre-test mean of 99.14 with a standard deviation of 8.12 and post-test mean of 99.00 with a standard deviation of 7.32 for $N=247$ (see Table 4). The highest possible score on the test is 150 and lowest possible score is 30 with a mid-point (average) score of 90. The pre-test and post-test correlation was .494 indicating a low positive relationship between the tests. The differences in the means was .1336 with a df of 246 and significance (2-tailed) of .788 indicating no significant difference between the means. The reliability analysis revealed an alpha = .82 for $N=247$.

Table 4

Paired Samples T-test Results for Entire Group

| | Pre-test | Post-test |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|
| Mean | 99.14 | 99.00 |
| Median | 99.00 | 99.00 |
| Mode | 102.00 | 96.00a |
| Standard Deviation | 7.83 | 7.28 |
| Variance | 61.25 | 52.93 |
| Skewness | .424 | -.271 |
| Range | 102.00 | 44.00 |

Multiple modes exist (a) is the smallest value shown.

Racial Groups

The paired samples T-test results by the racial group revealed no significant changes in the mean scores (see Table 5). The results did reveal that the students who classified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islanders had a higher mean score on both the pre-test (102.43) and post-test (102.57) than did any other racial group. This would indicate that the Asian/Pacific Islander students were more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues than the other racial groups before the intervention as well as after the intervention.

Those students whose race/ethnicity was unknown had the lowest mean score of 98.5 on the pre-test. This indicates that those students who did not identify their race were the least sensitive to and aware of diversity issues before the intervention. However, those students who identified as Hispanic/Latino had the lowest mean score of 97.83 on the post-test. Thus, making them the least sensitive and aware of diversity issues following the intervention.

The racial groups that had the largest difference in their mean scores were Black/African-American with an increase of 1.28 and Hispanic/Latino with a decrease of 1.22. This would indicate that the intervention had the largest positive impact on the Black/African-American students and had the largest negative impact on Hispanic/Latino students. This impact is not statistically significant. The Asian/Pacific Islanders had the least amount of change in their mean score with an increase of .14. These differences were not statistically significant.

Table 5

Paired Samples T-test Results by Race

| | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Paired Mean Difference | Correlation | Significance | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----|-----------------|
| Entire sample | 99.14 | 99.00 | -.14 | .494 | .000 | -.269 | 246 | .788 |
| Black/African-American | 100.16 | 101.44 | 1.28 | .369 | .070 | .777 | 24 | .445 |
| White/Caucasian | 99.05 | 98.62 | -.43 | .530 | .000 | -.696 | 139 | .487 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 102.43 | 102.57 | .14 | -.134 | .775 | .040 | 6 | .970 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 99.05 | 97.83 | -1.22 | .579 | .012 | -.784 | 17 | .444 |
| Race unknown | 98.5 | 98.79 | .29 | .503 | .000 | .235 | 56 | .815 |

The one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD and LSD post hoc tests between the racial groups found significant differences between White/Caucasian

students and Asian/Pacific Islander students on the pre-test. Asian/Pacific Islander students scored 102.43 which was 3.38 higher than White/Caucasian students who scored 99.05. The LSD post hoc test found that Asian/Pacific Islander students also scored significantly higher than the students whose race is unknown by 3.06 points on the pre-test (see Table 6).

Table 6

ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | F | Sig. |
|------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| PRESUM Between Groups | 503.217 | 4 | 125.804 | 2.07 | .084 |
| Within Groups | 42558.277 | 699 | 60.885 | | |
| Total | 43061.494 | 703 | | | |
| POSTSUM Between Groups | 345.481 | 4 | 86.370 | 1.65 | .163 |
| Within Groups | 13204.378 | 252 | 52.398 | | |
| Total | 13549.860 | 256 | | | |

The one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with an LSD post hoc test between the racial groups found significant differences between Black/African-American students and Hispanic/Latino students on the post-test. Blacks/African-American students scored 101.44 which was 4.43 points higher than Hispanic/Latino students (see Table 6).

Gender Groups

The pair samples T-test revealed that Females had higher mean scores on the both the pre-test of 99.64 and post-test of 100.39 than did Males with 98.46 and 97.12 respectively (see Table 7). This would indicate that Females were more aware of and

sensitive to diversity issues than males were on the pre-test as well as on the post-test following the intervention.

There was no significant difference in the mean scores for Males and Females. Males had the larger mean difference with a decrease of 1.34 in their mean score. Although not statistically significant, this means that the Males became less sensitive to diversity issues following the intervention. While the Females had an increase of .75 in their mean score indicating that the Females became even more sensitive to diversity issues following the intervention.

Table 7

Paired Samples T-test Results by Gender

| | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Paired Mean Difference | Correlation | Significance | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----|-----------------|
| Entire sample | 99.14 | 99.00 | -.14 | .494 | .000 | -.269 | 246 | .788 |
| All male | 98.46 | 97.12 | -1.34 | .493 | .000 | -1.54 | 104 | .127 |
| All female | 99.64 | 100.39 | .75 | .504 | .000 | 1.33 | 141 | .187 |

Females by Racial Group

The paired samples T-test for females sub-divided by racial group indicated that the females whose race is unknown scored higher on the pre-test (100.10) than did any other female racial group (see Table 8). This would imply that these females were the most sensitive to and aware of diversity issues prior to diversity training. Hispanic/Latina

females scored lower on the pre-test (97.72) than any other female racial group indicating that they had the least amount of sensitivity to and awareness of diversity issues prior to diversity training. The results of the post-test revealed Asian/Pacific Islander females had the highest mean score (103.33) and Hispanic/Latina females had the lowest mean score (99.27). This indicates that following diversity training Hispanic/Latina females still had the least amount of sensitivity to awareness of diversity issues and Asian/Pacific Islander females had the most.

The largest mean difference was found in the Asian/Pacific Islander females with an increase of 3.66 in their mean score. This would show a positive difference for Asian/Pacific Islander females following the intervention. Despite this large difference in the mean, there were no statistically significant changes for any of the female racial groups. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD and LSD post hoc tests revealed no significant differences between the female racial groups.

Males by Racial Group

The paired samples T-test for males by race showed Asian/Pacific Islander males to have the highest pre-test mean score of 104.5 and the race unknown males to have the lowest pre-test mean score of 95.32 (see Table 9). Asian/Pacific Islander males also had the highest post-test mean score of 102.0 and again the race unknown males had the lowest post-test mean score of 95.37. These scores would indicate that Asian/Pacific Islander males were the most sensitive to and aware of diversity issues both before and after the intervention. These scores also show that males whose race is unknown were the least sensitive to and aware of diversity issues before and after the intervention.

The largest difference in the mean scores was found for Hispanic/Latino males with 101.14 on the pre-test and a decrease to 95.57 on the post-test. This difference was not significant. This would indicate that Hispanic/Latino males became less sensitive to diversity issues following the intervention. The smallest mean difference was an increase of .05 for the race unknown males. This slight increase in mean score was not statistically significant.

Table 8

Paired Samples T-test Results for Females by Race

| | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Paired Mean Difference | Correlation | Significance | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|------|-----|-----------------|
| All females | 99.64 | 100.39 | .75 | .504 | .000 | 1.33 | 141 | .187 |
| Black/African-American females | 99.65 | 101.29 | 1.64 | .328 | .198 | .786 | 16 | .443 |
| White/Caucasian females | 99.68 | 100.18 | .5 | .519 | .000 | .640 | 72 | .524 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander females | 99.67 | 103.33 | 3.66 | .904 | .281 | 2.08 | 2 | .173 |
| Hispanic/Latina females | 97.72 | 99.27 | 1.55 | .604 | .049 | .971 | 10 | .355 |
| Race Unknown females | 100.10 | 100.5 | .4 | .544 | .000 | .350 | 37 | .729 |

Table 9

Paired Samples T-test Results for Males by Race

| | Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | Paired Mean Difference | Correlation | Significance | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----|-----------------|
| All males | 98.46 | 97.12 | -1.34 | .493 | .000 | -1.54 | 104 | .127 |
| Black/African-American males | 101.25 | 101.75 | .5 | .537 | .170 | .181 | 7 | .862 |
| White/Caucasian males | 98.37 | 96.94 | -1.43 | .542 | .000 | -1.48 | 66 | .143 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander males | 104.5 | 102.00 | -2.5 | -.684 | .316 | -.402 | 3 | .715 |
| Hispanic/Latino males | 101.14 | 95.57 | -5.57 | .800 | .031 | -2.29 | 6 | .062 |
| Race Unknown males | 95.32 | 95.37 | .05 | .420 | .074 | .019 | 18 | .985 |

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) with an LSD post hoc test revealed a significant difference between Asian/Pacific Islander male students and White/Caucasian males students on the pre-test (see Table 10). There was also a significant difference between Asian/Pacific Islander male students and the male students whose race is unknown on the pre-test. Asian/Pacific Islander male students scored 104.5 which was 3.76 points higher than White/Caucasian and 3.76 points higher than the race unknown male students. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) with an LSD post hoc test revealed a significant difference between Black/African-American male students and the race unknown male students. Black/African-American males students scored 101.25 which was 6.38 points higher than race unknown male students.

Table 10

ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test for Males by Racial Group

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | F | Sig. |
|------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| PRESUM Between Groups | 443.166 | 4 | 110.792 | 1.50 | .200 |
| Within Groups | 26048.767 | 354 | 73.584 | | |
| Total | 26491.933 | 358 | | | |
| POSTSUM Between Groups | 344.006 | 4 | 86.001 | 1.61 | .177 |
| Within Groups | 5389.400 | 101 | 53.360 | | |
| Total | 5733.406 | 105 | | | |

General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity

General attitudes related to racial diversity included items on affirmative action, being bilingual, multiculturalism, and racial discrimination. The paired samples T-test found no significant difference for the entire group from the pre-test to the post-test. The paired samples T-test for all Males and all Females on the pre-test and post-test revealed no significant differences.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the LSD post hoc test revealed a significant difference in the pre-test scores of Asian/Pacific Islander students and Black/African-American students (see Table 11). Asian/Pacific Islanders scored 40.80 which was 1.80 points higher than Black/African-American students on the pre-test on issues concerning general attitudes about racial diversity. On the post-test, Asian/Pacific Islanders scored 41.75 which was 3.45 points higher than Hispanic/Latino students on these issues.

Table 11

ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity (RD)

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| RDPRESUM Between Groups | 97.187 | 4 | 24.297 | 1.40 | .231 |
| Within Groups | 12312.146 | 712 | 17.292 | | |
| Total | 12409.333 | 716 | | | |
| RDPOSTSUM Between Groups | 79.243 | 4 | 19.811 | 1.26 | .285 |
| Within Groups | 3980.201 | 254 | 15.670 | | |
| Total | 4059.444 | 258 | | | |

The largest change in mean score for being against affirmative action was an increase of .24 for Females as a group (see Table 12). The change in the Females mean score was significant at the .002 level. This shows that after the intervention Females were more likely to agree that they were against affirmative action. The group as a whole had a significant increase of .20 and it was significant at the .001 level. White/Caucasians as a group had a significant increase of .22 at the .001 level.

Table 12

Paired Samples T-test Results for Being Against Affirmative Action

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.07 | 3.27 | .20 | 3.52 | 258 | .001 |
| Males | 3.30 | 3.46 | .15 | 1.646 | 104 | .103 |
| Females | 2.89 | 3.13 | .24 | 3.229 | 151 | .002 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.44 | 2.63 | .19 | .693 | 26 | .494 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.14 | 3.37 | .22 | 3.344 | 144 | .001 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.25 | 3.38 | .13 | .357 | 7 | .732 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 2.84 | 3.05 | .21 | .622 | 18 | .542 |
| Race Unknown | 3.19 | 3.36 | .17 | 1.802 | 57 | .077 |

The entire group showed a significant decrease of .13 at the .008 level for looking forward to having a racial minority as President (see Table 13) and a decrease in mean score of .17 for wanting more minorities on the Supreme Court (see Table 14). The difference for the Supreme Court issue was significant at the .005 level. Females also showed a significant decrease of .13 at the .045 level for looking forward to having a racial minority as President and showed a significant decrease of .18 at the .018 level for wanting more minorities on the Supreme Court. Lastly, White/Caucasians showed a significant decrease of .12 at the .046 level for wanting a racial minority for President and a decrease in mean score of .22 for wanting more minorities on the Supreme Court. The difference in mean score for the Supreme Court issue was significant at the .006 level. These decreases in mean scores following the intervention show that the entire group as a whole, Males as a group, Females as a group, and the White/Caucasian students all became less prone to looking forward to having a racial minority person as President of the United States and wanting more minorities appointed to the Supreme Court.

The largest difference in the mean scores for the item related to being bilingual was an increase of .48 in the score of the Black/African-American group (see Table 15). This increase in mean score was significant at the .001 level. This increase for Black/African-American students indicates that following the intervention; they became more inclined to believe that all Americans should speak two languages. This was true for Females and students whose race is unknown. Females as a group had a significant increase in their mean score of .23 that was significant at the .011 level. Those students whose race is unknown also had a significant increase at the .045 level of .33.

Table 13

Paired Samples T-test Results for Looking Forward to Having a Racial Minority as President

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.69 | 3.56 | -.13 | -2.66 | 260 | .008 |
| Males | 3.42 | 3.30 | -.12 | -1.738 | 104 | .085 |
| Females | 3.89 | 3.76 | -.13 | -2.020 | 153 | .045 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0 | .000 | 27 | 1.000 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.59 | 3.46 | -.12 | -2.008 | 144 | .046 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 4.63 | 4.38 | -.25 | -1.528 | 7 | .170 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 4.00 | 3.70 | -.30 | -1.552 | 19 | .137 |
| Race Unknown | 3.48 | 3.36 | -.12 | -1.224 | 57 | .226 |

Table 14

Paired Samples T-test Results for Wanting More Racial Minorities Appointed to the Supreme Court

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.25 | 3.08 | -.17 | -2.83 | 260 | .005 |
| Males | 2.90 | 2.73 | -.16 | -1.673 | 104 | .097 |
| Females | 3.51 | 3.33 | -.18 | -2.385 | 153 | .018 |
| Black/African-Americans | 3.90 | 3.83 | -.07 | -.386 | 28 | .702 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.10 | 2.88 | -.22 | -2.808 | 144 | .006 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.50 | 3.50 | 0 | .000 | 7 | 1.000 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.45 | 3.25 | -.20 | -.777 | 19 | .447 |
| Race Unknown | 3.26 | 3.14 | -.12 | -1.000 | 56 | .322 |

Table 15

Paired Samples T-test Results for Support for Being Bilingual

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.10 | 3.16 | .06 | .90 | 262 | .369 |
| Males | 2.93 | 2.78 | -.15 | -1.646 | 104 | .103 |
| Females | 3.18 | 3.41 | .23 | 2.565 | 155 | .011 |
| Black/African-Americans | 3.10 | 3.59 | .48 | 3.524 | 28 | .001 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.09 | 2.98 | -.11 | -1.244 | 145 | .215 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 2.88 | 3.00 | .13 | .552 | 7 | .598 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.20 | 3.30 | .10 | .462 | 19 | .649 |
| Race Unknown | 3.03 | 3.36 | .33 | 2.046 | 57 | .045 |

White/Caucasian students showed a significant decrease of .18 at the .035 level for believing in the promotion of multiculturalism in the school system. Indicating that White/Caucasians, following the intervention, became less likely to believe that schools should promote values that are representative of diverse cultures (see Table 16).

Table 16

Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing that Schools Should Promote Values that are Representative of Diverse Cultures

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.95 | 3.85 | -.10 | -1.52 | 259 | .131 |
| Males | 3.76 | 3.64 | -.12 | -1.146 | 104 | .254 |
| Females | 4.08 | 4.01 | -.07 | -.933 | 152 | .353 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.46 | 4.32 | -.14 | -.812 | 27 | .424 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.92 | 3.74 | -.18 | -2.127 | 145 | .035 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 4.14 | 4.14 | 0 | .000 | 6 | 1.000 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.90 | 4.25 | .35 | 1.324 | 19 | .201 |
| Race Unknown | 3.77 | 3.77 | 0 | .000 | 56 | 1.000 |

The entire group had a statistically significant increase of .13 at the .046 level for thinking that racial minorities complain too much about racial discrimination (see Table 17). White/Caucasian students also had a significant increase of .26 at the .003 level. Not only did the entire group increase in its belief that minorities complain too much after the intervention, so did White/Caucasians students specifically.

Table 17

Paired Samples T-test Results for Thinking that Racial Minorities Complain Too Much About Racial Discrimination

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.02 | 3.16 | .13 | 2.00 | 260 | .046 |
| Males | 3.25 | 3.33 | .08 | .779 | 104 | .438 |
| Females | 2.86 | 3.01 | .16 | 1.833 | 153 | .069 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.21 | 2.14 | -.07 | -.297 | 28 | .769 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.06 | 3.32 | .26 | 3.012 | 144 | .003 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 2.50 | 2.75 | .25 | .683 | 7 | .516 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.30 | 2.95 | -.35 | -1.324 | 19 | .201 |
| Race Unknown | 3.30 | 3.33 | .03 | .260 | 56 | .795 |

Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Personal Comfort Level with Racial Diversity

The specific attitudes related to personal contact and comfort level with racial diversity includes issues concerning interracial intimate relationships, interracial friendships, interracial neighborhoods, and interracial adoptions. The paired samples T-test found no significant difference for the entire group from the pre-test to the post-test for these issues.

However, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed a significant difference between the racial groups on both the pre-test and post-test concerning these issues (see Table 18). More specifically, the LSD post hoc test showed that Black/African-American students scored 30.96 which was 1.93 points higher than White/Caucasian students, 1.23 points higher than Hispanic/Latino students, and 1.85 points higher than race unknown students on the pre-test. This test also showed that Asian/Pacific Islanders scored 30.04 which was 1.01 points higher than White/Caucasian students on the pre-test concerning issues related to interracial contact and comfort level. LSD post hoc test showed that Black/African-American students scored 31.33 which was 2.47 points higher than White/Caucasian students and 2.39 points higher than race unknown students on the post-test. The univariate analysis revealed that race and gender have a significant relationship with respect to mean scores on the post-test regarding the issues of personal contact and personal comfort level with racial diversity with $F=2.799$ at the .027 significance level.

Table 18

ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Personal Comfort Level with Racial Diversity (PC)

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| PCPRESUM Between Groups | 270.188 | 4 | 67.547 | 5.93 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 8262.886 | 725 | 11.397 | | |
| Total | 8533.074 | 729 | | | |
| PCPOSTSUM Between Groups | 146.711 | 4 | 36.678 | 3.06 | .017 |
| Within Groups | 3035.401 | 253 | 11.998 | | |
| Total | 3182.112 | 257 | | | |

There were statistically significant changes in mean scores for the entire sample, Female students, and White/Caucasian students on the issue of interracial intimate relationships (see Table 19). There was a decrease of .15 for Female students. This change was significant at the .032 level. The decrease for White/Caucasian students was .15 and significant at level .052. This significant decrease for Female and White/Caucasian students indicates that following the intervention these students became less likely to feel that they could develop an intimate relationship with someone of a different race. The exception was Hispanic/Latinos students who had the largest change in mean score of .55. This decrease in mean score for Hispanic/Latinos was significant to the .024 level indicating that Hispanic/Latinos became even less likely to think that people should marry only within their own race (see Table 20).

Table 19

Paired Samples T-test Results for Comfort in Developing Intimate Interracial Relationships

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.97 | 3.87 | -.10 | -1.81 | 262 | .071 |
| Males | 3.79 | 3.77 | -.02 | -.220 | 104 | .826 |
| Females | 4.12 | 3.96 | -.15 | -2.163 | 155 | .032 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.48 | 4.34 | -.14 | -.849 | 28 | .403 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.91 | 3.76 | -.15 | -1.963 | 145 | .052 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.75 | 4.00 | .25 | .798 | 7 | .451 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 4.30 | 4.30 | 0 | .000 | 19 | 1.000 |
| Race Unknown | 3.84 | 3.81 | -.03 | -.322 | 57 | .749 |

Table 20

Paired Samples T-test Results for Thinking that People Should Marry Within Their Own Race

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 2.66 | 2.67 | .01 | .21 | 259 | .833 |
| Males | 2.79 | 2.81 | .02 | .225 | 104 | .822 |
| Females | 2.56 | 2.56 | 0 | .000 | 152 | 1.000 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.17 | 2.41 | .24 | 1.158 | 28 | .257 |
| White/Caucasians | 2.70 | 2.70 | 0 | .000 | 144 | 1.000 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 2.57 | 2.43 | -.14 | -.548 | 6 | .604 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 2.75 | 2.20 | -.55 | -2.463 | 19 | .024 |
| Race Unknown | 2.75 | 2.88 | .12 | 1.264 | 56 | .212 |

The largest change in mean scores for being comfortable with the idea of letting their child date someone of a different race was a decrease of .36 for Black/African-American students (see Table 21). This decrease in mean score was significant at the .057 level. This would mean that following the intervention Black/African-American students became less comfortable with allowing their child to date someone of different race.

The largest change in mean score was an increase of .17 for Males as a group with respect to interracial friendships (see Table 22). This change was significant at the .052 level. This tells us that following the intervention Males were more likely to have a friendship circle that was racially mixed.

There were no statistically significant changes in mean score for issues regarding living in interracial neighborhoods, attending racially mixed schools, or interracial adoption.

Table 21

Paired Samples T-test Results for Comfort Level with Letting Son or Daughter Date Someone From a Different Race

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.89 | 3.81 | -.08 | -1.71 | 260 | .088 |
| Males | 3.63 | 3.57 | -.06 | -.760 | 104 | .449 |
| Females | 4.09 | 3.99 | -.10 | -1.484 | 153 | .140 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.54 | 4.18 | -.36 | -1.987 | 27 | .057 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.84 | 3.77 | -.07 | -1.067 | 144 | .288 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.75 | 3.75 | 0 | .000 | 7 | 1.000 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 4.20 | 4.20 | 0 | .000 | 19 | 1.000 |
| Race Unknown | 3.67 | 3.66 | -.01 | -.163 | 57 | .871 |

Table 22

Paired Samples T-test Results for Having a Racially Diverse Friendship Network

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.81 | 3.86 | .05 | .99 | 261 | .323 |
| Males | 3.68 | 3.85 | .17 | 1.967 | 104 | .052 |
| Females | 3.90 | 3.88 | -.02 | -.250 | 154 | .803 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.29 | 4.25 | -.04 | -.197 | 27 | .846 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.68 | 3.77 | .09 | 1.112 | 145 | .268 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 4.38 | 4.38 | 0 | .000 | 7 | 1.000 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 4.25 | 4.40 | .15 | .767 | 19 | .453 |
| Race Unknown | 3.67 | 3.67 | 0 | .000 | 57 | 1.000 |

General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality

General attitudes regarding gender equality include issues dealing with traditional

gender roles, equal rights for women, women in power, violence against women and sexual harassment. The paired samples T-test found no significant difference for the entire group from the pre-test to the post-test on these issues. However, this test did reveal a significant difference for Males (see Table 23). There was a decrease of .90 from the pre-test to the post-test for Males concerning issues of gender equality and sexism. This decrease is significant at the .018 level.

Table 23

Paired Samples T-test for General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality for Males

| Pre-test Mean | Post-test Mean | N | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------|----------------|-----|------------------------|-------|-----|-----------------|
| 30.86 | 29.95 | 107 | -.907 | -2.40 | 106 | .018 |

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the LSD post hoc test revealed that Asian/Pacific Islander students scored 31.51 which was 1.06 points higher than White/Caucasian students on the pre-test concerning issues of gender equality (see Table 24). No other significant statistics were revealed for this issue.

The significant finding was found among the Black/African-American students in the sample (see Table 25). The pre-test mean was 2.79 and the post-test mean was 3.45 with an increase of .66. This difference in the mean was significant at the .004 level indicating that Black/African-American students became more inclined to believe that is better to maintain traditional gender roles with respect to caring for children.

Table 24

ANOVA for Pre-test and Post-test by Racial Groups for General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality (GE)

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| GEPRESUM Between Groups | 60.143 | 4 | 15.036 | 1.22 | .300 |
| Within Groups | 8915.983 | 724 | 12.315 | | |
| Total | 8976.126 | 728 | | | |
| GEPOSTSUM Between Groups | 35.492 | 4 | 8.873 | .660 | .620 |
| Within Groups | 3414.963 | 254 | 13.445 | | |
| Total | 3450.456 | 258 | | | |

Table 25

Paired Samples T-test Results for Maintaining Traditional Gender Roles with Respect to Caring for Children

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.20 | 3.32 | .12 | 1.66 | 262 | .098 |
| Males | 3.46 | 3.52 | .06 | .619 | 104 | .537 |
| Females | 3.03 | 3.17 | .15 | 1.547 | 155 | .124 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.79 | 3.45 | .66 | 3.176 | 28 | .004 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.13 | 3.21 | .08 | .821 | 145 | .413 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.63 | 3.38 | -.25 | -.552 | 7 | .598 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.55 | 3.55 | 0 | .000 | 19 | 1.000 |
| Race Unknown | 3.40 | 3.43 | .03 | .252 | 57 | .802 |

With respect to maintaining traditional gender roles in relationships, Males had the only significant change in mean score. This was a decrease of .24 in score and was significant at the .037 level. Following the intervention Males became even more

disagreeable with the statement that men seem less concerned with building relationships than do women (see Table 26).

Table 26

Paired Samples T-test Results for Men Being Less Concerned With Building Relationships

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.04 | 3.02 | -.02 | -.340 | 261 | .734 |
| Males | 3.00 | 2.76 | -.24 | -2.110 | 104 | .037 |
| Females | 3.08 | 3.20 | .12 | 1.410 | 154 | .161 |
| Black/African-Americans | 3.07 | 3.29 | .21 | .923 | 27 | .364 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.08 | 2.99 | -.09 | -.966 | 145 | .336 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.13 | 3.13 | 0 | .000 | 7 | 1.000 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 2.85 | 3.15 | .30 | 1.453 | 19 | .163 |
| Race Unknown | 3.03 | 2.93 | -.10 | -.772 | 57 | .443 |

With respect to maintaining traditional gender roles in occupations, Black/African-American students showed a statistically significant decrease of .52 at the .033 level in their mean score for feeling comfortable having a woman physician (see Table 27). Asserting that after the intervention, Black/African-American students became less comfortable having a woman physician.

The entire group mean score on the pre-test was 3.14 and 2.98 on the post-test for the issue of gender equality (see Table 28). This revealed a significant decrease in the mean by .16 at the .042 significance level. This would indicate that the group as a whole became less likely to believe that it was just as easy for women to succeed as it is for

men. Significant decrease was found for Hispanic/Latino students of .75 significant at the .010.

Table 27

Paired Samples T-test Results for Feeling Comfortable Having a Woman Physician

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 4.18 | 4.07 | -.11 | -1.57 | 260 | .118 |
| Males | 3.70 | 3.64 | -.06 | -.521 | 104 | .603 |
| Females | 4.52 | 4.38 | -.14 | -1.740 | 153 | .084 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.55 | 4.03 | -.52 | -2.241 | 28 | .033 |
| White/Caucasians | 4.12 | 4.05 | -.07 | -.803 | 144 | .423 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 4.38 | 3.75 | -.63 | -1.357 | 7 | .217 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 4.15 | 4.15 | 0 | .000 | 19 | 1.000 |
| Race Unknown | 4.16 | 4.19 | .03 | .244 | 56 | .808 |

Table 28

Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing it is Just as Easy for Women to Succeed as it is for Men

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.14 | 2.98 | -.16 | -2.05 | 262 | .042 |
| Males | 3.10 | 2.90 | -.20 | -1.749 | 104 | .083 |
| Females | 3.15 | 3.03 | -.12 | -1.107 | 155 | .270 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.72 | 2.79 | .07 | .220 | 28 | .828 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.21 | 3.03 | -.18 | -1.766 | 145 | .080 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 3.75 | 3.63 | -.13 | -.284 | 7 | .785 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.20 | 2.45 | -.75 | -2.881 | 19 | .010 |
| Race Unknown | 3.03 | 3.03 | 0 | .000 | 57 | 1.000 |

The largest change in mean score was found in the Hispanic/Latino group for looking forward to having a woman in power as President (see Table 29). They showed a significant decrease of .60 that was significant at the .024 level. The entire group as a whole had a significant decrease of .11 at the .041 level and had a significant increase in mean score of .11 at the .046 level for feeling better knowing that a man is currently President (see Table 30). Females as group also had a significant decrease of .17 at the .021 level. The significant decreases for the entire sample, Hispanic/Latinos, and Females show that following the intervention they became less comfortable with idea of having a female in power as President.

Table 29

Paired Samples T-test Results for Looking Forward to Having a Woman President

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 3.60 | 3.49 | -.11 | -2.05 | 262 | .041 |
| Males | 2.89 | 2.84 | -.05 | -.534 | 104 | .594 |
| Females | 4.10 | 3.94 | -.17 | -2.331 | 155 | .021 |
| Black/African-Americans | 4.07 | 4.00 | -.07 | -.420 | 28 | .677 |
| White/Caucasians | 3.52 | 3.44 | -.08 | -1.096 | 145 | .275 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 4.13 | 4.25 | .13 | .552 | 7 | .598 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 3.80 | 3.20 | -.60 | -2.449 | 19 | .024 |
| Race Unknown | 3.48 | 3.38 | -.10 | -.948 | 57 | .347 |

As far as violence against women and sexual harassment issues, Males did show a significant decrease of .30 in their score in believing that there is as much female violence against men as there is male violence against women (see Table 31). This decrease was significant to the .002 level. The race unknown group also had a significant

decrease of .30 to the .018 level. Following the intervention, Males and the race unknown group became less likely to believe that there is as much female violence against men as there is male violence against women. There was no statistically significant difference for issues related specifically to sexual harassment.

Table 30

Paired Samples T-test Results for Feeling More Secure Having a Man as President

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 2.70 | 2.82 | .11 | 2.01 | 260 | .046 |
| Males | 3.29 | 3.33 | .04 | .547 | 104 | .586 |
| Females | 2.29 | 2.45 | .16 | 2.163 | 153 | .032 |
| Black/African-Americans | 2.54 | 2.75 | .21 | 1.441 | 27 | .161 |
| White/Caucasians | 2.71 | 2.83 | .12 | 1.697 | 145 | .092 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 2.75 | 2.50 | -.25 | -1.000 | 7 | .351 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 2.65 | 2.75 | .10 | .370 | 19 | .716 |
| Race Unknown | 2.75 | 2.84 | .09 | .742 | 56 | .461 |

Table 31

Paired Samples T-test Results for Believing That There is as Much Female Violence Against Men as There is Male Violence Against Women

| | Pre-test mean | Post-test mean | Paired Mean Difference | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| All | 2.80 | 2.71 | -.09 | -1.41 | 259 | .161 |
| Males | 2.84 | 2.54 | -.30 | -3.255 | 104 | .002 |
| Females | 2.78 | 2.83 | .05 | .612 | 152 | .541 |
| Black/African-Americans | 3.07 | 3.18 | .11 | .500 | 27 | .621 |
| White/Caucasians | 2.75 | 2.71 | -.04 | -.417 | 145 | .677 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 2.86 | 2.43 | -.43 | -.812 | 6 | .448 |
| Hispanic/Latinos | 2.65 | 2.60 | -.05 | -.195 | 19 | .847 |
| Race Unknown | 2.86 | 2.56 | -.30 | -2.434 | 56 | .018 |

Chapter V

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the findings, the discussion will be categorized in several distinct sections. The first section will center on the information derived from the focus group interview. The second section will focus on the results of the subjects as an entire group. Then, there will be a section on how the diversity training intervention influenced the students' general attitudes regarding racial diversity, specific attitudes regarding personal contact and comfort level with racial diversity, and general attitudes regarding gender equality. The next section will focus on how Males and Females responded to the diversity training session based on the results of the pre-test and the post-test, followed by a section on how the different racial groups responded. Then, there will be a section on the positive influence and negative influence overall. Lastly, there will be suggestions for future research.

Focus Group

There is a perception on campus that mandatory diversity training has had a positive impact on the University community. There is also a perception that the institution's commitment to and acceptance of diversity is merely superficial. Although there are a few committed departments and individuals on campus, the upper-level administration needs to become more active in this cause to provide more depth to the university's level of commitment to this issue.

Diversity training has affected the perception of prejudice on campus. Most

trainers believe that what they are doing is working and that continued efforts in this area will reduce prejudice even more. There is a strong belief that those who attend diversity training are more accepting of differences and are less afraid of crossing perceived ethnic and racial boundaries. However, the results obtained from the students are inconsistent with that belief. Part of the inconsistency can be attributed to the fact that the trainers are mostly faculty and administrators. Faculty/administration is typically not well attuned to the intricacies of student culture. Therefore, their perception could be skewed.

While the trainers believe that diversity training has had a positive impact on the culture, more still needs to be done. There is a need to train more faculty and staff to become diversity trainers. With a stronger commitment and more resources devoted to diversity training, the University could become a leader among institutions of higher education in reducing prejudice. This will change the culture of institution forever.

Entire Group

The group did not become any more or any less sensitive to or aware of diversity issues due to the diversity training intervention. This is consistent with research done by Lee (2000) and Elliott (1997) yet inconsistent with the findings of Pascarella et al. (1996). Pascarella et al. (1996) found that requiring freshmen students to attend diversity training had a positive effect on their openness to diversity issues.

However, the entire group of students did experience several significant changes on specific issues. These changes were both positive and negative. One of the positive changes was that the group became more aware of sexism and believes that the glass ceiling does impact the success of women. Despite their increased awareness of sexism,

the entire group felt less comfortable with women in positions of power or authority following diversity training. The negative change was that the group as a whole became more opposed to affirmative action.

Along those lines, they also felt less comfortable with having a racial minority in a position of power or authority following the diversity training intervention. Even with the entire group becoming more conservative following diversity training, the entire group still believed that racial minorities complain too much about racism and discrimination.

General Attitudes Related to Racial Diversity

Males as a group and White/Caucasian students had a tendency to score higher than other groups both before and after diversity training on topics that related to being against affirmative action and multiculturalism. This finding is in direct contrast to the study done by Pascarella et al. (1996) in which they found that diversity training does make students more open to diversity and multiculturalism. Females as an individual group became more conservative in their attitude toward affirmative action, despite the finding by Bensimon et al. (2000) that suggests that Females tend to value diversity more than other students. Following the diversity training, White/Caucasian students became even more opposed to affirmative action. Black/African-American students and Hispanic/Latino students scored high on issues that were in support of affirmative action. This finding has been support by research done by Lee (2000).

White/Caucasians students changed to believe more so that school systems should have less focus on diversity issues. Despite the findings by Landrum, Dillinger, and

Vandernoot (2000), which indicate that over 70% of students value diversity in their educational experience. Black/African-American students scored high on issues pertaining to multiculturalism and sensitivity to racism. Asian/Pacific Islanders scored high on issues pertaining to racial equality and openness to multiculturalism. The race unknown students scored lower on these issues than other groups did.

Females as a group and White/Caucasian students also became less comfortable with the thought of having minorities in positions of political power. All students and especially the White/Caucasian students came to believe that racial minorities complain too much about discrimination, while Asian/Pacific Islander and Black/African-American students scored low in believing that racial minorities complain too much.

The next issue was related to being bilingual. Asian/Pacific Islander students scored low on their support for being bilingual. Females became more liberal in their view on being bilingual. Following the diversity training, Females believed even more that everyone in this country should be able to speak more than one language. Both Hispanic/Latino students and Black/African-American students scored high in their support for being bilingual. However, Black/African-Americans had a significant increase in their level of commitment to this issue following this diversity training intervention. The race unknown group also showed a significant increase in their support for being bilingual.

Specific Attitudes Related to Personal Contact and Comfort Level with Racial Diversity

Diversity training made Males more inclined to make and have friends from various racial backgrounds. Males became less apprehensive than any other group to

cross racial barriers for friendship. Black/African-Americans along with Hispanic/Latino students had a tendency to score high on all issues related to personal interactions with people of different races as well as intimate interracial relationships. Asian/Pacific Islander students also scored high on crossing racial barriers for friendship. In contrast, White/Caucasian students and the race unknown students scored high for not having friendships with people from other racial backgrounds.

Despite the high scores on issues pertaining to intimate interracial relationships, Black/African-American students showed a significant decrease in feeling okay about it. Hispanic/Latino students were more open to intimate interracial relationships. Females also became less inclined to feel comfortable developing intimate interracial relationships following the diversity training. White/Caucasian students, Asian/Pacific Islander students, and race unknown students scored high on not feeling comfortable developing intimate interracial relationships.

General Attitudes Regarding Gender Equality

Males as a group had a tendency to score higher than other groups both before and after diversity training on topics that related to their need to maintain traditional gender roles. Black/African-American students and White/Caucasian students exhibited an increase in believing in traditional gender roles. Hispanic/Latino students also scored high on issues regarding the maintenance of traditional gender roles.

Although scoring high for sexism, Males showed a significant decrease in sexist attitudes following diversity training. White/Caucasian students also showed a decrease

in sexist attitudes. While Hispanic/Latino students became generally more conservative in their opinions on sexism.

Already in favor of gender equality, Females became even more in favor of equal rights for women following diversity training. Black/African-American students and Asian/Pacific Islander students scored high on issues regarding gender equality but Black/African-American students showed a decrease in their comfort level with having a woman physician. White/Caucasian students showed an increase in their awareness of gender equality. Hispanic/Latino students scored low on support for most issues regarding gender equality.

Males

Overall, Males as a group scored lower than Females as a group on both the pre-test and post-test. This implies that before the diversity training men were less sensitive to and aware of diversity issues as a whole than were women. Further discussion will show that this may not hold true for each racial category. However, past research has implied that men are typically less sensitive to diversity issues than women. This research held true to that argument.

Males had a tendency to score higher than other groups both before and after diversity training on topics that related to their need to maintain traditional gender roles, sexism, anti-affirmative action, anti-multiculturalism, and anti-integration at most levels. Males tended to be more conservative in their views than any one else.

Males did experience several significant changes as a result of diversity training. The first change was related to sexism in the workplace. Although scoring high for not

believing in gender equality, they became more aware of and sensitive to sexism in the workplace. In agreement with this increased sensitivity to sexism, they became more aware of their own sensitivity in building relationships. Simply put, they became more concerned with the relationships in their lives following diversity training. Also, in tune with their increased sensitivity to sexism, they came to believe that there is more physical violence against women in this country than there is violence against men.

The next change involved their own personal interaction with other races. Apparently, diversity training made them more inclined to make and have friends from various racial backgrounds. They became less apprehensive to cross racial barriers for friendship. Despite this increase in having a racially mixed friendship network, they became more conservative in their view on affirmative action. Regardless of their own personal lives involving racial minorities they became less comfortable with having racial minorities in powerful government positions.

It could be safe to argue that this diversity training intervention had both positive and negative influences on Males. One positive influence was the increase in sensitivity to sexism and other issues affecting women. Another positive influence was their increased comfort with crossing racial lines for social interactions and or friendships. The negative influence on Males was their increased discomfort with our country becoming bilingual, minorities in government, and affirmative action programs.

Females

Overall, Females as a group scored higher than Males as a group on both the pre-test and post-test. This implies that before and after the diversity training intervention

women were more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues as a whole than were men. Further discussion will show that this may also hold true for each Female racial category. In addition, past research has implied that women are typically more sensitive to diversity issues than men (Bensimon et al., 2000). This research held true to that also.

Females as a group had a tendency to score higher than Males and any specific racial group on issues related to gender equality and their ability to adopt children from races other than their own. Their responses indicated that they believe more so in the equality of the sexes and were more comfortable with the thought of raising children from diverse cultures.

Females did experience several significant changes as a result of the diversity training. First, they became more conservative in their opinion on affirmative action. They became less comfortable with the thought of having minorities in positions of political power. Females became more liberal in their view on being bilingual. Following the diversity training, Females believed even more that everyone in this country should be able to speak more than one language.

Despite the fact that Females were more inclined to want to adopt children from other races, they became less comfortable with developing intimate interracial relationships. Already in favor of gender equality, Females became more in favor of equal rights for women following diversity training.

Diversity training had both a negative influence on Females and a positive influence. One positive influence is that diversity training reinforced their commitment to issues surrounding gender equality and combating sexism. Diversity training also made Females more supportive of being bilingual and more willing to adopt children

from any race. The negative influence was very similar to that of Males. Diversity training increased their discomfort with developing intimate interracial relationships, minorities in government, and affirmative action programs.

Black/African-Americans

This group had the largest increase in mean score over all. Although this increase in mean score was not statistically significant, past research tells us that Black/African-Americans respond well to diversity training interventions in general. This study confirmed this argument.

Black/African-Americans had a tendency to score high on all issues related to personal interactions with people of different races as well as intimate interracial relationships. This would mean that they were more willing to interact and develop intimate relationships with people from other races. This group scored high on issues that were in support of being bilingual, affirmative action, and multiculturalism. Black/African-Americans also scored high on issues regarding their awareness of and sensitivity to gender equality and racism.

This group did have a few significant changes as a result of the diversity training intervention. The first of those changes was an increase in thinking that traditional gender roles are appropriate to maintain. In line with this traditional thinking, this group showed a decrease with feeling comfortable dealing with women in professional position such as physicians.

Although they already scored high on their support for being bilingual, they had a significant increase in their level of commitment to this issue following the diversity

training intervention. Even though they scored higher than other racial groups on issues pertaining to intimate interracial relationships, they showed a significant decrease in feeling comfortable about it.

White/Caucasians

This group scored high on issues pertaining to reverse discrimination, racism, anti-affirmative action, and anti-multiculturalism. White/Caucasians scored high on not feeling comfortable developing intimate interracial relationships and not having personal relationships or friendships with people from other races. However, Pascarella et. al. (1996) found that diversity training had a significant positive effect on White/Caucasian students. Other research indicates that diversity training may have a negative impact on White/Caucasians especially the men in this group (Raths, 1999). This research does show some support for this argument.

Diversity training did have several significant changes for this group. One of these changes was an increased awareness of sexism in business. Despite this, they showed an increase in their need to maintain traditional gender roles by not wanting to see women in powerful government positions or having them in professional positions such as physicians.

Another change was a decrease in comfort level with respect to developing an intimate relationship with someone from another race. Following the diversity training intervention, White/Caucasians also saw a decrease in their support of affirmative action and their comfort with having a racial minority person in a powerful government position. After diversity training, they were more prone to think that racial minorities

complain too much about racism. White/Caucasians also changed to believe more so that school systems should focus less on diversity issues.

This research has shown that diversity training has had both a positive influence and negative influence on White/Caucasians students. The positive influence has been an increase in their sensitivity to and awareness of sexism in business. One negative influence has been an increase in wanting to maintain traditional gender roles. Another negative influence on White/Caucasians was that they became more conservative in their opinion on affirmative action at every level including positions of power. They also became more prone to think that school systems should stop focusing on diversity issues and racial minorities should stop complaining about racism.

Asian/Pacific Islanders

This group had higher mean scores than any other group on both the pre-test and the post-test. This indicates that this group was more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues than any other group in the study. They showed the smallest increase in their mean score following the diversity training intervention. This means that the intervention had little impact on their attitudes. Asian/Pacific Islander females had the highest mean score on the post-test than any other female racial group. These females also saw the largest increase in mean score following the intervention than did any other female racial group. This would indicate that these females became more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues than any other group.

Asian/Pacific Islander males received the highest mean score on the pre-test and post-test than any other male racial group. Compared to other males, Asian/Pacific

Islanders were more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues before and after the diversity training intervention.

Asian/Pacific Islanders scored high on issues pertaining to gender and racial equality. They believed that reverse discrimination exists due to the fact that there is too much emphasis on multicultural issues. However, they scored high on having a racially diverse friendship network and being open to multicultural issues. Although they scored high on being supportive of multicultural issues and having friends from different races, they were not as inclined to cross racial barriers for intimate relationships. Asian/Pacific Islanders scored low on their support for being bilingual. They also scored low on believing that racial minorities complain about racism too much and that domestic violence is just as prevalent for men as it is for women.

The diversity training intervention had no significant impact on Asian/Pacific Islander students on any issue. There is little research on how diversity training affects this racial group. The results of this research show that more needs to be done to address the specific needs of this group and the lack of research in this area.

Hispanic/Latino

Overall this group had the lowest mean score on the post-test than any other group meaning that they were less sensitive to and aware of diversity issues following diversity training than any other group. They also saw the largest decrease in their mean score, which indicates that diversity training had the largest negative impact on them. This statement would also hold true for Hispanic/Latino males. The men in this group also saw the largest decrease in mean score as compared to men from other racial groups.

Hispanic/Latina females had the lowest mean score on the pre-test than any other female group. This means that these females were the least sensitive to diversity issues prior to the training intervention. Past research shows that this group has been just as sensitive to and aware of diversity issues as Black/African-Americans. The results of this study contradict this argument. Past research also indicates that this group is more conservative when dealing with gender equality issues. The results of this study support this claim.

Hispanic/Latinos tended to score high on issues regarding maintaining traditional gender roles. They believed that sexism does exist in business; however, they still do not support gender equality.

They showed strong support for being bilingual and addressing multicultural issues in business as well as in education. They were also supportive of affirmative action despite thinking that racial minorities complain too much about racism.

Hispanic/Latinos were more prone to having a racially diverse friendship network and feeling okay with interracial dating and marriages.

This group did see a few significant changes as a result of the diversity training intervention. The one positive influence of diversity training is that Hispanic/Latinos became more open to the possibility of interracial marriages. One of the few negative influences was an overall decrease in mean score. This means that Hispanic/Latinos became less sensitive to diversity issues following diversity training. They became generally more conservative in their opinions on racism, sexism, and multiculturalism as a result of the intervention. In spite of the fact that they believed that sexism does exist, they became more willing to believe that the glass ceiling for women in business no

longer exists. Despite being aware of sexism, Hispanic/Latinos became more sexist overall and less supportive of women in powerful positions.

Race Unknown

Because the racial composition of this group is unknown, it is difficult to speculate the reasons behind their results or refer to past research. Overall, this group had the lowest mean score on the pre-test. This would indicate that they were the least sensitive to and aware of diversity issues prior to the diversity training intervention.

However, the females in this group managed to score higher than other females on the pre-test. Despite the performance of the group as a whole on the pre-test, the females were more sensitive and aware of diversity issues than any other female group. These females also experienced the smallest amount of change in their mean score than any other female group following the diversity training. This intervention had little impact on the attitudes of the females in this group.

The males in this group had the lowest mean score on both the pre-test and the post-test than other males. This would explain the overall performance of the group and substantiates that the males were the least sensitive to and aware of diversity issues before and after diversity training. Similar to the females in this group, the diversity training intervention had virtually no impact on the males in this group.

The race unknown group had a tendency to score high on issues concerning being against multiculturalism and thinking that racial minorities complain too much about racism. This group tended to be very conservative in their opinions on multiculturalism and diversity. They were not supportive of these issues. This group also had a tendency

to be conservative on issues related to personal contact with racial minorities. They scored high in having most of their friends from their own racial group, thinking people should marry within their own race, and not wanting their children to attend racially mixed schools. In some ways, this group was the most insensitive group in the study. This could be one of the reasons behind their refusal to divulge their racial identity.

This group did see a few significant changes due to the diversity training intervention. Despite their conservative opinion on multiculturalism, this group had a significant increase in their support for all Americans being bilingual. This could be construed as a positive influence of the diversity training. They also became more inclined to believe that violence against women is more prevalent than violence against men. This could also be construed as another positive influence of the intervention.

Positive and Negative Influence

Despite the sincere efforts of the diversity training intervention to help the students become more sensitive to and aware of diversity issues, the results of this study have shown that there is more of a negative influence on the students than there is a positive influence. Actually, the findings prove that there are twice as many negative affects on the students. Perhaps the diversity training intervention is too broad in its scope to make a difference in all areas of diversity.

The entire group and especially White/Caucasian students became more conservative in their attitudes on having more minorities reach positions of power in this country. The entire group and especially the White/Caucasian students became less supportive of affirmative action. Females and Black/African-American students became

less open to interracial relationships. The entire group and specifically White/Caucasian students came to believe that racial minorities complain too much about racial discrimination. White/Caucasian students tended to become more traditional with respect to gender roles. Believing more so that women should stay home with their babies. White/Caucasian students' attitudes toward multiculturalism in education became more conservative and repressed. Hispanic/Latino students' attitudes toward gender equality issues also became more conservative and more sexist. Finally, Hispanic/Latino students became more conservative and less sensitive to diversity issues in general.

The positive affects of this diversity training intervention were that the entire group became more aware of gender equality issues and less sexist in their opinions. This was especially true for White/Caucasian students. The group whose race is unknown became more sensitive in attitudes concerning domestic violence. Males became more inclined to make friends with people from different races, which is supported by the results of the focus group interview. However, the focus group believed this was true for everyone. The support for being bilingual grew for Females, Black/African-American students, and the race unknown students. Females' attitudes about cross-racial adoption became more liberal and supportive of this issue. Hispanic/Latinos became more open to accepting and experiencing interracial relationships.

From these results, it is easy to conclude that mandatory diversity training has a more negative influence on the attitudes and perceptions of freshmen students than it has a positive influence. White/Caucasian students were influenced more negatively than all other racial groups combined. Asian/Pacific Islander students were not influenced at all

and Black/African-American students were influenced less negatively than anyone else was. While the diversity training intervention was designed to increase the awareness and sensitivity to a variety of diversity issues as well as reduce prejudice in general, its only positive influence was the reduction of sexist attitudes and opinions.

Implications

These findings would imply that more research should be done on the effectiveness of this diversity training program at this university. In order for diversity training to be successful, the university must monitor and continue to evaluate the results (Burkart, 1999). It would be presumptuous to assume that similar results will occur again year after year. However, if similar results do continue to occur then this university will need to re-evaluate the use of this particular intervention with freshmen students. For training to have any impact it must target the right audience at the right time (Burkart, 1999). Perhaps using this program during the first few days of Freshmen Orientation is not the best time for it to be the most effective. Because there are a variety of training programs available for use in higher education it would be wise to select a program that would work best for the particular needs of the institution.

Because this diversity training program focuses on many issues, it may be too broad in scope to have a significant impact. Zhu and Kleiner (2000) found that many diversity training programs attempt to deal with too many topics and therefore lose the ability to make a difference. Perhaps the university should consider using a number of workshops or training programs that deal with one diversity issue at a time.

Another implication would be to re-evaluate the use of faculty and administrators as trainers. There has been some research that would indicate that peer to peer training is more effective. It may be reasonable to explore the possibility of utilizing upper-class students solely as trainers for the freshmen.

It would also be sensible to have the trainers' skills evaluated for effectiveness. As with most training programs, better skilled trainers will have more of an impact than poorly skilled trainers will. At present time, trainers are not evaluated for their effectiveness. In addition to this, some trainers may be more prepared to deal with or handle particular diversity issues and not others. For example, one of the results was the increased awareness of sexism. This finding could have been a direct result of having significantly more women trainers than men. It is important to have trainers that are competent in dealing with issues and pairing them with other trainers that compliment their deficiencies.

The results of this study should not imply that diversity training does not work. The results have shown that diversity training does work to some extent. In agreement with the results from the focus group, this intervention plants a seed and creates awareness. These are important steps in making students more sensitive to diversity issues in general. This study does show that this group of students needs to have more than just one day of training. It would be crucial for them to receive additional education or training in this area.

Future Research

Research should continue to be done in the area of diversity training for college students. First, it would be ideal for this particular group of students to be tested again at the conclusion of their freshman year. It would also be ideal to reconstruct this study to include a control group of subjects who would not experience the diversity training intervention. These are ways to rule out the effect that college has on students in general and could be a way to isolate the effect of diversity training itself.

As with most case studies, it is impossible to generalize the outcome of this study to all institutions of higher learning. These students are unique because their institution is unique. However, it may be possible to generalize these results to other similar institutions with similar student demographics. It could also prove worthwhile to duplicate this type of study on a national level or conduct several case studies at various types of institutions.

Other limitations of this study include that lack of control over the selection of trainers for each of the small group diversity training sessions. The races and genders of the trainers could have influenced the outcome. In addition, the competency of the trainers to conduct the sessions would also have influenced the opinions and attitudes of the students. Research has shown that in some cases peer to peer training is more effective. Therefore, the fact that most of the trainers were administrators and not fellow students could have had an impact on the overall outcome.

Another suggestion for future research would be to investigate and study the results of other types of diversity training programs. It is very possible that other training

programs would be more effective with this group at this institution. It would also be useful to research which methods are most effective with each racial and/or gender group.

It was clear that racial groups as well as the genders respond differently to diversity training. This could be based on where the students are in terms of their individual racial identity development and or gender identity development. It would prove worthwhile to repeat this study with the ability to control for identity development as a precollege characteristic. It would also make sense to find a diversity training intervention that is most effective with each specific racial group. Lastly, if we find that no diversity training intervention is useful in changing the attitudes and perceptions of college students then perhaps we should cease and desist in order to allow the experience of college itself to work its own liberalizing magic.

References

Altbach, P. G., Lomotey, K., & Kyle, S. R. (1999). Race in higher education: The continuing crisis. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.)

American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges (pp. 448-466). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Amey-Taylor, M. (1997). Diversity trainers: Personal profiles, paradigms and practices. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Ancis, J.R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. Journal of Counseling and Development, 78 (2), 180-185.

Bensimon, E. M., Nora, A., Patriquin, L., Johnson, P., & Throgmorton, D. (2000). Building a community of differences at Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, New Jersey. Diversity on campus: Reports from the field (Summaries of research sponsored by NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education). Washington, D. C.: Magnificent.

Bliss, W. G. (1999). Why is corporate culture important? Workforce (supplement), 8.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brewer, M. B. & Miller N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.) Scientific Inquiry and the social sciences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, C. (1984). The prejudice reduction workshop model. National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI).

Brown, C. (1990). The community leader as coalition builder: Building an intergroup relations movement in South Africa. Paper presented at Twenty-fifth Anniversary Conference of the University of Port Elizabeth, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, February 15, 1990.

Burkart, M. (1999). The role of training in advancing a diversity initiative. Diversity Factor, 8 (1), 2-5.

Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E., & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. The Journal of Higher Education, 70, 2.

Casey, C. (1999). "Come, join our family": Discipline and integration in corporate organizational culture. Human Relations, 52, 155-178.

Chetkow-Yanoov, B. (1999). Celebrating diversity: Coexisting in a multicultural society. New York: Haworth Press.

Clark, B. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. In M.W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 46-52). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Cox, T. (1993). Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Cuyjet, M. J. (1998). Recognizing and addressing marginalization among African American college students. College Student Affairs Journal, 18 (1), 64-71.

- Davis, W. (1998). Toward civility: Assessment as a means toward improving campus climate. College Student Affairs Journal, 18, 72-83.
- Davis, R. V. (1987). Scale construction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 481-489.
- Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Addison-Wesley.
- Dellana, S. A. & Hauser, R. D. (1999). Toward defining the quality culture. Engineering Management Journal, 11, 11-15.
- Dill, D. D. (1982). The management of academic culture: notes on the management of meaning and social integration. In M.W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and Governance in Higher Education (pp. 182-194). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Elliot, K. S. (1997). The effect of a diversity training intervention on the attitudes, perceived competencies, and level of comfort of undergraduate business students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.
- Faulkner, D. (1998). Creating culture. Credit Union Management, 21, 42.
- Feldman, K. A. & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). The impact of college on students, volume I: An analysis of four decades of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilbert, D. J. (1998). The prejudice perception assessment scale: Measuring stigma vulnerability among African American students at predominately Euro-American universities. Journal of Black Psychology, 24, 3, 305-322.
- Gilbert, J.A. & Ivancevich, J.M. (2000). Valuing diversity: A tale of two organizations. The Academy of Management Executive, 14 (1), 93-105.

Gilliard, M. D. (1996). Racial climate and institutional support factors affecting success in predominantly White institutions: An examination of African American and White student experiences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Gingrich, B. (2000). Individual and organizational accountabilities reducing stereotypes and prejudice within the workplace. Diversity Factor, 8 (2), 14-19.

Grossman, R.J. (2000). Is diversity working? HRMagazine, 45 (3), 46-50.

Gurin, P. (2000). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. [On-line].

Available: <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert>.

Hanover, J. (1993). Impact of workforce diversity training: The role of the environment in transfer training. Published doctoral dissertation, De Paul University, Chicago, IL.

Henderson-King, D. & Kaleta, A. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. The Journal of Higher Education, 71 (2), 142-164.

Henderson-King, D. (1993). The development of feminist consciousness: Effects of exposure to feminism and emotional stance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Henson, H. T. (1998) Gauging the outcomes of organizational diversity implementations: The intersection of attitudes, awareness, and behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Drake University.

Hess, J.J. (1991). The development of an educational program and an analysis of its effectiveness in altering racial attitudes of mid-level managers in a public agency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Hon, L. C., Weigold, M. & Chance, S. (1999). The meaning of diversity among the professorate. Journalism & Mass Communication, 54, 51-68.

Howard, L. W. (1998). Validating the competing values model as a representation of organizational cultures. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 6, 231-250.

Howard-Hamilton, M. F., Richardson, B. J. & Shuford, B. (1998). Promoting multicultural education: A holistic approach. College Student Affairs Journal, 18, 5-17.

Humphreys, D. (2000). National survey finds diversity requirements common around the country. Diversity Digest Fall 00. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pederson, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. The Review of Higher Education, 21 (3), 279-302.

Jacobson, C. R. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29, 306-329.

Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Landrum, R. E., Dillinger, R. J., & Vandernoot, E. A. (2000). Assessment of the cultural climate in a university setting. Diversity on Campus: Reports from the Field (Summaries of research sponsored by NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education). Washington, D. C.: Magnificent.

Law, D. Y. (1998). An evaluation of a cultural diversity training program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.

Lee, R. M. (2000). The multicultural climate at the University of Texas at Austin. Diversity on Campus: Reports from the Field (Summaries of research sponsored by NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education). Washington, D. C.: Magnificent.

Levine, A. (1991). The meaning of diversity. Change, 23 (5), 4-5.

Masland, A. T. (1985). Organizational culture in the study of higher education. In M.W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, and T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 118-125). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Milem, J. F. (1998). Attitude change in college students: Examining the effect of college peer groups and faculty normative groups. The Journal of Higher Education, 69, 2, 117-140.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Nora, A. & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. The Journal of Higher Education, 67 (2), 119.

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L., & Terenzini, P. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. The Journal of Higher Education, 67 (2), 174-195.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, M. W. & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In M.W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 140-152). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., Heenhan, M., Millstein, B., Parisi, M., Rath, J. F., & Sax, G. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55, 1026-1031.

Ponterotto, J. G. & Pedersen, P. B. (1993). Preventing prejudice: A guide for counselors and educators. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Raths, D. (1999). Communication is key to cross-cultural success. InfoWorld, 21 (45), 83-84.

Rea, L. M. & Parker, R. A. (1997). Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. E. & Austin, A. E. (1988). High faculty morale: What exemplary colleges do right. In M.W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 208-216). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Ross, K. A. (1999). Can diversity and community coexist in higher education? The American Behavioral Scientist, 42 (6), 1024.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmidt, P. (2000). Support for campus diversity does not mean support for preferences, survey find. [On-line].

Available: <http://chronicle.com/daily/2000/08/2000081401n.htm>.

Shea, C. (1996). Freshman survey reveals uncertainty on affirmative action. [On-line]. Available: <http://chronicle.com/che-data/arti...t-42.dir/issue-18.dir/18a03301.htm>.

Sherriton, J. & Stern, J. (1997). HR's role in culture change. HRFocus, 74, 27.

Silvester, J., Anderson, N. R., & Patterson, F. (1999). Organizational culture change: An inter-group attributional analysis. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 1-23.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: defining the essentials. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), Organization and governance in higher education (pp. 126-139). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Umiker, W. (1999). Organizational culture: The role of management and supervisors. The Health Care Manager, 17, 22-27.

Utsey, S. O. & Ponterotto, J. G. (1999). Further factorial validity assessment of scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59(2), 325-335.

Van Buskirk, W. and McGrath, D. (1999). Organizational cultures as holding environments: A psychodynamic look at organizational symbolism. Human Relations, 52, 805-832.

Vogt, W. P. (1997). Tolerance & education: Learning to live with diversity and difference. London: Sage.

Wentling, R. M. & Palma-Rivas, N. (1998). Current status and future trends of diversity initiatives in the workplace: Diversity experts' perspective. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9 (3), 235-253.

Wolfe, C. T. & Spencer S. J. (1996). The stereotypes and prejudice: Their overt and subtle influence in the classroom. The American Behavioral Scientist, 40 (2), 176-185.

Yin, R. K. (1993). Applications of case study research. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Zhu, J. & Kleiner, B. (2000). The failure of diversity training. Nonprofit World, 18 (3), 12-14.

Appendix A Social Attitude Survey

Social Attitude Survey

Please respond to all items in the survey. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Not Sure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1. I do think it is more appropriate for the mother of a newborn baby, rather than the father, to stay home with the baby during the first year. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. It is as easy for women to succeed in business as it is for men. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I really think affirmative action programs on college campuses constitute reverse discrimination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I feel I could develop an intimate relationship with someone from a different race. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. All Americans should learn to speak two languages. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I look forward to the day when a woman is President of the United States. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Generally speaking, men work harder than women. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. My friendship network is very racially mixed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I am against affirmative action programs in business. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Not Sure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 10. Generally, men seem less concerned with building relationships than do women. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I would feel O.K. about my son or daughter dating someone from a different race. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I look forward to the day when a racial minority person is President of the United States. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. In the past few years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural issues in education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I think feminist perspectives should be an integral part of the higher education curriculum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Most of my close friends are from my own racial group. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I feel somewhat more secure that a man rather than a woman, is currently President of the United States. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I think that it is (or would be) important for my children to attend schools that are racially mixed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. In the past few years there has been too much attention directed towards multicultural issues in business. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Overall, I think racial minorities in America complain too much about racial discrimination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. I feel (or would feel) very comfortable having a woman as my primary physician. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Not Sure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 21. I think the President of the United States should make a concerted effort to appoint more women and racial minorities to the country's Supreme Court. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. I think white people's racism toward racial minority groups still constitutes a major problem in America. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should encourage minority and immigrant children to learn and fully adopt traditional American values. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. If I were to adopt a child, I would be happy to adopt a child of any race. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. I think there is as much female physical violence towards men as there is male physical violence toward women. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should promote values representative of diverse cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. I believe that reading the autobiography of Malcolm X would be of value. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. I would enjoy living in a neighborhood consisting of a racially diverse population (e.g., Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, Whites). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. I think it is better if people marry within their own race. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. Women make too big of a deal out of sexual harassment issues in the workplace. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |