1995

The relationship between college satisfaction and the variables: Ethnic identity, acculturation, and racial climate among African-American students

Cheris Renee Johnson

Recommended Citation

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE SATISFACTION AND THE
VARIABLES: ETHNIC IDENTITY, ACCULTURATION, AND RACIAL CLIMATE
AMONG AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology: Industrial Organizational

_____

by

Cheris Renee Johnson

June 1995

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE SATISFACTION AND THE

VARIABLES: ETHNIC IDENTITY, ACCULTURATION, AND RACIAL

CLIMATE AMONG AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Cheris Renee Johnson

June 1995

Approved by:

Diane Pfahler, Chair, Psychology

Janet Kottke

Stacey Hardy-Desmond

5/31/95
Date

ABSTRACT

Entrance and attrition rates among non-White college students continues to be a relevant concern in American society. The following study is offered to provide research on pertinent variables that can have a tangible impact on one's decision to enter and/or remain in college. Previous research has established that satisfaction can positively influence college persistence. Research from industrial/organizational psychology has contributed substantially to increased knowledge regarding concepts such as satisfaction, performance and organizational commitment. Developmental psychology research has found that ethnic identity development and acculturation have significant effects on college persistence, academic achievement and social involvement. With survey information collected from students attending both two and four year colleges, the following study utilized correlational analyses and significance testing in its investigation of the extent to which ethnic identity, acculturation, and racial climate relate to college satisfaction. In addition, differences in college satisfaction are examined among specific groups (i.e. males vs. females, two year vs. four year college attendees and freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors). A significant relationship was found between ethnic identity and college satisfaction. Furthermore, several significant positive relationships were found between subscales of the

three variables and college satisfaction. Recommendations are offered to institutions of higher education for steps toward more diversified and ethnically receptive campus environments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

While the number of women and minorities on college campuses is increasing, the percentage of African-American college students remains relatively low. As recently as 1992, the percentage of participation for African-Americans entering college was about 28% compared to that of White-Americans which was about 40% (Renner, 1993). Another source purports that African-Americans account for only 9% of all college enrollments (Hacker, 1992). Furthermore, drop out rates are significantly higher among nonwhites with factors contributing to attrition (e.g. modest academic standing, poor fit between the institution and student, breakdown of commitment to remaining in college and obtaining a degree, and low involvement in social and extra-curricular activities) consistently prevalent among African-Americans college students (Tinto, 1975; 1987). According to a 1991 report by the American Council on Education, 44% of African-American students obtained their degrees at four year institutions as compared to 54% of White students, 61% of Asian-American students and 54% of American Indian students (Carter & Wilson, 1991). In the African-American community, statistics such as these are extremely relevant and devastating to the attainment of social, economic and political gains. For this reason, it is necessary to examine why African-Americans enter college at such a dramatically reduced rate in comparison to White-Americans. Once

enrolled, it is then critical to determine how cultural differences and acculturation affect their perceptions of satisfaction and ultimately their educational outcomes.

In addition to the investigation of how ethnic identity and low levels of acculturation impact college satisfaction, this paper will contribute to the psychological literature by discovering how both factors serve to discourage African-Americans from entering college. With more than 100 campuses reporting racial/ethnic incidents of harassment and violence in 1989 and 1990 (Hurtado, 1992), this study also offers to investigate how perceived racial climate may contribute to the prediction of an African-American's satisfaction in college.

The study of culture, race and ethnicity seems to have traditionally taken a backseat in the study of psychology in the United States. In fact, when such variables have been examined by mainstream psychologists, they have used White-American norms and described pathological behavior rather than ordinary existence. Similarly, of the majority of literature that includes African-Americans in respect to biological and psychological determinants of cognitive ability, motivation, and social deviance, there are only a few studies that caution researchers of the eminent dangers of over-generalization. In addition, insufficient attention has been given to attribution without direct measurement of cultural elements and responsibility toward appropriate

2

research design, methodology and publication of controversial findings (Amir & Sharon, 1987; Betancourt & Lopez, 1993; Bond, 1988; Harrington, in press; Jones, 1991; McGovern, Furumoto, Halpern, Kimble & McKeachie, 1991; Pepitone & Triandis, 1987; Zuckerman, 1990). It is not surprising then that there is little research directly investigating how African-Americans perceive their performance in the context of higher education. Finally, little effort has been made to examine how ethnic identity, acculturation, and racial climate affect perceived satisfaction among African-Americans. Especially relevant is further understanding of how these variables affect African-Americans working within a system and dominant group which have remained a steadfast force in influencing their future in education and employment.

Ethnic Identity

Spencer and Markstrom-Adams (1990) assert that identity formation is particularly complex for children and adolescents of ethnic and racial minority groups. From an ecological perspective, environment and family context contributes considerably to identity development. Spencer (1970) found that negative connotations for the color black and African-Americans facilitate a (pro) white bias. Spencer and Markstrom-Adams (1990) further contend that as African-American children approach adolescence, they exhibit a greater appreciation of their own ethnic identity and a

3

valued perspective of themselves, their ethnic group and the majority. Erikson (1968) purports that such development is dependent on both the individual's developmental history as well as the historical period in which the child grows up. It appears that if identity is resolved in adolescence, the greater the success one will have in future identity-focused conflicts (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). In addition, Allen and Majidi-Ahi (1989) assert that a sense of unification and cohesion of the self provides the individual with meaning, direction and purpose which aids in competence and adaptive functioning. Fillmore and Britsch (1988) report that for minorities especially, internalization of one's ethnic or racial membership and maintenance of traditional values has positive implications for educability. In reference to psychological resilience and majority/minority status, research also reveals that those who report agreement between self and others' view of their ethnic identity, experience ethnic identity as ego systonic (positively reinforced identity), while those who believe that self and others' view of their ethnic identity is different, experience ethnic identity as ego dystonic (identity conflict) which is thought to eventually lead to maladaptive behavior (Smith, 1991). This study will examine the extent to which African-American students have developed ethnic identity and the degree to which it serves to manage racial conflicts that arise as a result of attending college.

4

It is not the position of this author to propose that the state of the African-American in society is hopeless and unyielding. But, at the same time, to deny that the African-American identity is regularly portrayed in a relentlessly negative regard would be an incredible fallacy. Thomas and Sillen (1972) confirm, "The distortion (of the African-American) is ubiquitous in social and behavioral sciences." Gaetner and Dovidio (1968) write, "....racist feelings and beliefs among White-Americans are generally the rule rather than the exception." McIntosh (1988) purports, "I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was "meant" to remain oblivious." She further contends that such privilege is like a "knapsack of special provisions, assurances, passports and blank checks."

Because such cultural differences exist, the process of securing positive relationships among peers and instructors while maintaining a sense of identity that favorably reflects the African-American heritage is sometimes challenging. Through clinical, social and developmental psychology there has been contribution to the literature regarding identity development as a reflection of race as well as ethnic group membership. These disciplines have also examined how these factors influence the individual's self concept, family structure, roles, belief systems and value orientations (Bandura, 1977; Devos, 1990; Erikson, 1966; Goodman, 1964;

5

Levine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, 1964; Shibutani & Kwan, 1965; Smith, 1991). Because the prevalence of color stereotyping and color bias exists and potentially affects ethnic identity formation in a unique manner (Spencer and Markstrom-Adams, 1990), it is conceivable to assume that minority students on predominantly White campuses across the United States would experience, however subtle, even socially condoned, various forms of negative regard or ambivalence. I propose that this type of degradation is disturbing to members of minority groups and serves to lessen their perception of satisfaction in virtually any circumstance where they must interact as the minority and adhere to White-American cultural practices for intragroup survival and acceptance. For example, Sandra, an African-American student, is dissatisfied with her college experience because as a history major she finds herself repeatedly compelled to dispel stereotypes and negative portrayals of her history and culture to counteract the choice of literary accounts her instructors choose. She may tend to expect little more that a myopic view of history, in particular African-American history, from her peers and instructors.

Because this conflict and many others similar to its negation are potentially destructive and experienced differently according to one's own majority/minority status, social, and economic position within the society, this study will limit its scope to intergroup comparisons among African-

Americans and White-Americans. In addition, it is anticipated that the sample collected will not allow for extensive comparisons between other racial/ethnic groups (e.g. Hispanics and Asians). Furthermore, research will be restricted to college students to contribute to the literature recommendations for managing ethnic diversity on campus. In other words, because the education offered in such institutions is deemed to be more liberal, exploratory and encompassing, it is anticipated that minority students who experience racism will be even more distressed by the incongruence.

Acculturation

One of the most disparate and relevant variables for educational institutions and work organizations to consider when managing diversity, is acculturation. Acculturation, the degree to which a minority adheres to majority traditional cultural practices, may pose a specific threat to a minority's valued way of life, thinking, and development. Specifically, acculturative stress, defined as the stress one experiences when adjusting from one culture to another, may be particularly harmful to the satisfactory maintenance of the minority's cultural legacy (Berry, 1990). Although this type of stress is commonly viewed as anxiety encountered between international groups, the term is well suited for addressing cultural diversity among ethnic groups within the constraints of common national boundaries (Betancourt &

Lopez, 1993). Several researchers have discussed this topic
in reference to their own experiences and scientific study,
reporting that levels of acculturation are correlated with
psychological adjustment and distress (Rogler, Cortes &
Malgady, 1991; Vega, Kolody & Warheit, 1985). Research has
found that those who remain with their culture, participating
in its institutional completeness (i.e. culturally
distinctive schools, churches, and stores) will acquire a
type of hardiness that serves to build better self images and
provide the latitude to effectively shield against
confrontations prompted in challenge of the value and dignity
of one's culture (Cichello, 1984; Mintz & Schwartz, 1964;
Rabkin, 1979). However, in a country where segregation was
not legally prohibited until as recently as two decades ago,
and where ethnic isolation is characteristic of communities
such as Harlem and East Los Angeles, many minorities still
suffer dramatically from economic strife and despair. The
hardiness acquired from such communities is often coupled
with harsh resentment toward a system (identified primarily
with White America) that permits such conditions and serves
to further aid in misconceptions and destructive interactions
between the majority and minority. For example, James, an
African-American male student, may find the pressures of
acculturation too intense, feeling that his Black male
identity must be compromised in order to obtain acceptance
and positive regard. In response, he drops out of college.

He may be satisfied with his decision despite knowing that an education is his best means to a secure future. So it follows, if African-Americans are prepared to adequately and necessarily acculturate to dominant cultural practices, what extent of acculturation is sufficient and to what degree must African-Americans exchange their own cultural practices to find the same levels of satisfaction that are experienced and clearly exhibited by White-Americans?

Psychological literature discernibly addresses this dilemma through various fields of study. Much of this study has sought to view acculturation stress in terms of majority/minority status considering not only African-Americans but several ethnic groups in their relation to the White-American majority. For example, Industrial/Organizational psychology incorporates Maslow's Need-Hierarchy theory (1965; 1970), Alderfer's ERG theory (1972), McClelland's Achievement Motivation theory (1961; 1975), Herzberg's Two Factor theory (1966), Adams' Equity theory (1965) and Vroom's VIE theory (1964) to provide meaningful study of individual and group differences toward the development of reward systems, increased work productivity and fairness in the workplace. While the field of education has made specific efforts to provide avenues for ethnic and racial minorities to commune and gain financial services and opportunities, the pressure to acculturate in order to survive and prosper prevails. Such

underrepresentation and/or absence of any real steps toward

acknowledgment and progress are part of a system where

African-Americans who seek to engage in higher education must

forge through with little choice or equally valued

alternatives.

Campus Racial Climate

Probably one of the most under-rated variables in

satisfaction among African-Americans in college is campus

race relations. Few studies have included it in their

investigation of African-American college students. Despite

the relevance of this variable, there are a scarce number of

studies that document its importance in terms of student

persistence, academic achievement and social involvement

(Allen, 1985 & 1988; Hurtado, 1992; Nettles, 1988; Nettles,

Theony & Gosman, 1986; Oliver, Rodriguez & Mickelson, 1985;

Smith, 1981; Tracey & Sedlacek, 1987 & 1984). Specifically,

in the field of education, there are striking differences

between African-Americans and White-Americans in terms of how

they are treated and the availability of various resources

allotted to them. Bernal and Padilla (1982) found that

programs designed to prepare minority students to work with

minority populations are severely underrepresented in

coursework, clinical practicum, research training and

language requirements for Ph.D. degrees in clinical

psychology. In addition, Carroll and Leydon (1988) assert

that existing courses do not adequately address multicultural

10

issues. These factors and many others such as the availability of African-American mentors and the minimum visibility of African-American students on the majority of college campuses across the nation are bound to have an effect on the African-American's college experience.

Furthermore, research has documented several factors that are indicative of minority/majority status on college campuses across the nation, even those campuses where there is a higher proportion of ethnic/racial minorities (Allen, 1988; Loo & Robinson, 1986; McClelland & Auster, 1990; Oliver, Rodriguez, & Mickelson, 1985; Peterson, 1978; Smith, 1989). First, there exists social distance and differences in racial attitudes among those of minority and ethnic backgrounds. Specifically, African-American students are more critical of their environments, experience higher levels of racial tension, and lower levels of commitment to diversity on the part of their host campuses. Second, feelings of alienation are particularly salient among minorities on predominately White-American campuses. To illustrate this point, Hurtado (1992) examined student perceptions of racial climate with 2493 subjects (1825 White, 328 Black, and 340 Chicano) and 22 variables. Findings revealed that only 12 percent of students in the study felt that racial discrimination was no longer a problem in America. In addition, one out of four expressed substantial racial conflict (i.e. harassment, racial incidents, protests)

and mistrust between themselves and administrators and majority students. And third, despite program implementation (i.e. EOP and international student services), institutions vary in their responses and commitment to diversity and management of racial conflict. In fact, less than a third of all students in the sample perceived steps toward change in student composition (Hurtado, 1992).

HYPOTHESES

The present investigation is offered to examine the variables: ethnic identity, acculturation and racial climate to provide necessary knowledge and direction toward adequate encouragement and support for African-Americans in college. Previous research has found that ethnic identity and acculturation facilitate such outcomes as useful adaptation strategies and educability (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Fillmore & Britsch, 1988; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). Therefore the present study will test the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1. Ethnic identity development will positively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. ethnic identity will relate to greater college satisfaction).

Hypothesis 2. Acculturation will positively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. acculturation will relate to greater college satisfaction).

Furthermore, to the extent that racial tension on campus influences college persistence, academic achievement, and social involvement (Allen, 1985; Hurtado, 1992; Oliver, et. al., 1985; Smith, 1981), the following are also hypothesized.

Hypothesis 3. Perceived racial tension will negatively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. perceived racial tension will be related to less college satisfaction).

Although the percentage of White males attending college has remained stable over the past two decades, the number of women attending college continues to rise. Recent figures

report that women now account for a little over half of all college students (Renner, 1993). However, even with increased representation on college campuses, women are still more likely than men to feel the brunt of discrimination and detrimental gender-typing. The fourth hypothesis is as follows.

Hypothesis 4. Males will experience significantly higher college satisfaction than females.

Educational attainment has been found to have significant effects on college satisfaction. Knox et. al. (1992) report that those students with more than two years of college, regardless of baccalaureate attainment, are significantly more satisfied than those with less than two years. Knox et. al. also found that those with a bachelor's degree have higher levels of academic satisfaction than those who have not reached the two year mark. Therefore, hypothesis five is as follows.

Hypothesis 5. Those with junior and senior status are significantly more satisfied than those with freshman and sophomore status.

Past research has also found significant differences between two and four year college students (Astin, 1975; Cohen, 1989; Dougherty, 1992; Tinto, 1968). Such findings reveal that baccalaureate attainment, academic aptitude and full-time attendance are lower among two year versus four year college students. Hypothesis six is as follows.

14

Hypothesis 6. Students attending a four year college will have significantly higher satisfaction than students attending a two year college.

METHOD

Subjects

Three hundred and two college students provided data for the current study. The mean age of the sample was 24.7. The minimum age was 18, the maximum was 68 and the median was 19. One hundred and fifteen (38%) participants were male and 186 (61%) were female. One hundred and fifteen (38%) participants were White, 63 (20.9%) were Hispanic, 52 (17%) were African-American, 38 (12.6%) were Asian, 20 (6.6%) described themselves as mixed, 11 (3%) described themselves as other, 2 were American Indian and 1 declined to respond to the ethnicity inquiry. One hundred and fifty-one (50%) students attended two year colleges, with the remaining attending a four year university. One hundred and fifty (49.7%) students were from California State University, San Bernardino, 83 (27%) students were from Mount San Antonio Community College, and 69 (22.8%) students were from San Bernardino Valley Community College (see Appendix A for college overviews). Sixty-eight (22%) students were freshmen, 86 (28%) were sophomores, 64 (21%) were juniors, and 84 (27.8%) were seniors (see Table 1).

Table 1
Sample Demographic Information

	n	%	Mean Age	Female	Male	2 yr.	4 yr.
Asian	38	13	23	23	15	26	12
African-American	52	17	26	28	23	44	7
Hispanic	63	21	23	34	29	34	29
White	115	38	30	81	34	26	89
American Indian	2	.7	18	1	1	1	1
Mixed	20	7	21	12	8	10	10
Other	11	4	23	6	5	9	2

<u>Measures</u>

A questionnaire packet was distributed to participants containing demographic items (see Appendix B), a college satisfaction scale (see Appendix C), a racial climate scale (see Appendix D), an ethnic identity scale (see Appendix E), and an acculturation scale (see Appendix F).

Demographic items. Demographic information sought consisted of the following: participant's age, gender, ethnicity, community college or university attendance, the name of the college attended, on or off campus residency, college class status and employment status.

College Satisfaction. College satisfaction was measured by the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ). The CSSQ consists of five dimensions based on job-satisfaction research. The five subscales of the CSSQ are as follows:

Working conditions The physical aspects of a student's environment (i.e. the quality of meals, the cleanliness/comfort of residence, study and lounge areas);

Compensation The ratio of input (e.g. study) to academic outcomes (e.g. grades);

Quality of Education Academic conditions related to intellectual and vocational goals such as the abilities of faculty and staff, the effectiveness of teaching methods and assignments, and the adequacy of the curriculum;

Social Life The availability of social opportunities such as making friends, finding a date, and attending campus events and informal social activities;

Recognition Feeling accepted and valued by faculty and students.

The CSSQ uses a 5-point Likert response format (1 very dissatisfied to 5 very satisfied). The scale appears as items 1-70 in the survey. Cronbach's alpha reliability for the entire scale is .97 (see Appendix G, Table 16). Subscale reliabilities range from .86 to .90 (see Appendix G, Table 17).

Racial Climate. A 15 item scale, utilizing a 6-point Likert format, was developed by the researcher. Designed to measure attitudes on race relations, cultural diversity and equity on campus, the scale was piloted with 75 subjects. Cronbach's alpha for the pilot administration was .68.

Cronbach's alpha for the current sample was .76 (see Appendix G, Table 18). The measure consists of two subscales: feeling discriminated against on campus (7 items) and acceptance of diversity (8 items). The scale appears as items 70-85 in the survey. Reliability for feeling discriminated against on campus was .78 and for acceptance of diversity, .69 (see Appendix G, Table 19). After reliability and principle components factor analysis, two items were deleted from the scale to enhance its reliability (item 72 was deleted from the feeling discriminated against on campus subscale and item 74 was deleted from the acceptance of diversity subscale).

Ethnic Identity. Ethnic identity was measured by the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (MEIM) developed by Phinney (1992). The 14 item scale measures ethnic identity with a 6-point Likert (1 strongly disagree to 6 strongly agree). Subscales included in the measure are 5 items that assess positive ethnic attitudes and sense of belonging, 7 items addressing ethnic identity achievement, and 2 items regarding ethnic behaviors or practices. The scale appears as items 86-99 in the survey. For the current college sample, Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale was .85 (see Appendix G, Table 20). Cronbach's alpha for the affirmation/belonging subscale was .84, for the ethnic identity achievement subscale .70, and for the two items assessing ethnic behaviors or practices, .35 (see Appendix, Table 21).

19

A principle components factor analysis was performed on the scale to determine if reliabilities may be improved by factor extraction specific to the current sample. Three new factors were extracted, pride and awareness which assesses the degree of value one places on their ethnic group membership, functioning ethnic which measures the extent to which one practices their ethnic traditions and way of life, and nonfunctioning ethnic which assesses the degree to which one does not participate in their ethnic group's traditions or lifestyle. Cronbach's alpha for the ethnic identity scale was .86 (see Appendix G, Table 22). Cronbach's alpha for the three subscales are as follows: pride and awareness, .86, functioning ethnic, .72, and nonfunctioning ethnic, .60 (see Appendix G, Table 23).

Acculturation. A 3 item, 6-point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree to 6 strongly agree) was used to measure acculturation in terms of attitudes toward assimilation, integration, and separation. The scale, developed by Phinney et. al. (1992), includes the following statements, "I feel that the best way for members of ethnic minority groups to get along is to play down their own culture and to become part of American society by being as much like other Americans as possible" (assimilation), "I believe that ethnic minority groups should maintain and practice their own cultural traditions, but also learn to get along in mainstream American society" (integration), and "I think that

members of different minority groups should emphasize their own cultural traditions with their communities and not try to mix with other Americans" (separation). The items are numbers 100-102 in the survey.

Because the measure consists of only three items, with each measuring specific aspects of acculturation, Cronbach's alpha was not calculated.

Procedure

Data was obtained from college students. An informed consent sheet was addressed to respondents concerning voluntary participation and research confidentiality (see Appendix H). In addition, respondents were told that the purpose of the study was to investigate college satisfaction among students in the effort to benefit educational institutions in the management of cultural diversity and race relations. With the consent of instructors from California State University, San Bernardino, San Bernardino Valley College, and Mount San Antonio Community College, surveys were completed during scheduled class time or personal time. Extra credit was offered by some instructors. A debriefing sheet was included providing sources where subjects may secure the opportunity to further address issues presented in the survey (see Appendix I).

Analyses

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested with correlational analyses to determine the relationships between each of the

three variables: ethnic identity, acculturation and racial
climate and college satisfaction.   Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6
were assessed with t-tests.

RESULTS

Analyses for hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are performed in part to determine relationships specific to ethnic group membership. Therefore, means and standard deviations for each scale and subscale by ethnicity are provided in Table 2.

Table 2
Scale and Subscale Means and Standard Deviations
by Ethnicity

Scale and Subscale	Asian		African-American		Hispanic	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
College Satisfaction	222.71	29.91	242.17	36.94	233.90	36.60
Working Conditions	44.06	7.52	46.60	8.33	44.93	8.17
Compensation	50.86	7.44	52.83	7.08	51.30	8.58
Quality of Life	44.54	6.67	49.27	8.01	48.95	8.06
Recognition	33.54	5.20	50.10	8.88	48.61	8.11
Social Life	44.97	7.43	37.15	7.54	34.98	6.28
Racial Climate	56.06	5.77	59.78	6.66	60.43	6.68
Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	23.31	4.29	23.31	4.29	25.69	4.19
Acceptance of Divesity	32.75	2.66	35.87	2.89	34.73	3.73
Ethnic Identity	54.46	9.46	60.83	8.39	56.58	9.87
Pride and Awareness	33.19	6.60	36.61	5.47	34.48	6.94
Functioning Ethnic	15.97	4.14	17.31	4.66	15.55	4.57
Nonfunctioning Ethnic	9.58	1.08	10.73	1.27	9.97	1.24
Acculturation	15.00	1.54	15.31	2.86	15.13	2.37
Assimilation	4.87	.78	4.96	1.35	4.90	1.26
Integration	5.05	.80	5.36	.78	5.16	.83
Separation	5.08	.78	5.38	.99	5.23	.82

Scale and Subscale Cont'd	White		Other		Mixed	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
College Satisfaction	229.82	35.55	208.72	26.74	217.67	37.01
Working Conditions	44.82	8.01	40.50	6.88	40.50	6.88
Compensation	50.52	8.87	47.65	7.65	47.73	8.55
Quality of Life	48.95	8.06	43.70	7.60	44.73	9.34
Recognition	45.72	9.32	43.50	8.22	43.73	3.98
Social Life	34.58	7.55	31.90	6.28	33.64	8.05
Racial Climate	60.44	6.66	58.47	5.86	57.10	8.53
Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	25.36	4.58	24.79	3.91	23.70	4.55
Acceptance of Divesity	35.17	3.55	33.70	4.01	33.40	4.38
Ethnic Identity	51.25	8.60	50.06	6.46	49.18	10.14
Pride and Awareness	31.77	6.01	30.37	4.19	29.18	7.67
Functioning Ethnic	13.24	4.22	14.00	4.29	13.64	3.32
Nonfunctioning Ethnic	9.80	1.32	9.68	.95	9.55	1.69
Acculturation	14.87	2.21	15.05	2.04	13.82	2.40
Assimilation	4.79	1.33	4.85	.81	4.36	1.36
Integration	4.90	.98	4.90	1.02	4.55	.93
Separation	5.35	.73	5.30	.80	4.91	.94

Note : American Indian is not included in the table because the sample consist of 2 participants.

Because the number of Hispanic and African-American subjects are comparable, and White students are clearly the majority in the sample, analyses for hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 will be performed for these groups. Due to the modest number of Asians and American Indians in the sample and the diversity of subjects in the "mixed" and "other" categories, they were not included in statistics performed for the aforementioned hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that ethnic identity would positively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. higher

levels of ethnic identity will relate to greater satisfaction with college). The correlation between ethnic identity and college satisfaction for the entire sample is shown in Table 3, as are correlations between all subscales of ethnic identity (affirmation and belonging, ethnic identity achievement and ethnic behaviors) and all subscales of college satisfaction (working conditions, compensation, quality of education, social life and recognition). Due to the modest sample of Hispanic and African-American students, independent samples t-tests were performed to determine if these groups may be combined for this correlational analysis. The t-tests revealed that these groups were significantly different in their responses to ethnic identity and thus are examined separately. Correlations for White students are presented in Table 4, Hispanic college students are presented in Table 5, and correlations for African-American students are presented in Table 6.

Hypothesis 1 was supported, with a positive significant relationship between ethnic identity and college satisfaction ($r = .26$). In addition, several positive relationships occurred between subscales of both the ethnic identity measure and college satisfaction measure. Among them, ethnic identity positively correlated with working conditions ($r = .14$), compensation ($r = .19$), quality of education ($r = .24$), social life ($r = .18$), and recognition ($r = .15$). Pride and awareness positively correlated with college satisfaction (r

= .26), working conditions (r = .15), compensation (r = .23), social life (r = .18), and recognition (r = .16). Functioning ethnic positively correlated with college satisfaction (r =.18) and quality of education (r = .19). Nonfunctioning ethnic positively correlated with college satisfaction (r = .13).

Table 3
Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity and
College Satisfaction for the Entire Sample

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Ethnic Identity	.26 (223) p=.00	.14 (244) p=.03	.19 (254) p=.00	.24 (264) p=.00	.18 (265) p=.00	.15 (269) p=.01
8. Pride and Awareness	.26 (226) p=.00	.15 (247) p=.04	.23 (258) p=.00	.24 (268) p=.87	.18 (268) p=.00	.16 (272) p=.01
9. Functioning Ethnic	.18 (230) p=.01	.11 (252) p=.09	.10 (264) p=.09	.19 (273) p=.00	.11 (275) p=.06	.08 (279) p=.17
10. Non-functioning Ethnic	.13 (226) p=.04	.08 (248) p=.18	.05 (261) p=.38	.06 (271) p=.29	.07 (271) .28	.04 (275) p=.48

Correlational analyses performed individually among White, Hispanic and African-Americans students revealed no significant relationships among the sample's predominant ethnic groups.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity and
College Satisfaction for White Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Ethnic Identity	.19 (84) p=.09	.11 (94) p=.30	.12 (93) p=.23	.15 (101) p=.13	.03 (97) p=.74	.03 (101) p=.73
8.Pride and Awareness	.16 (84) p=.14	.10 (94) p=.35	.16 (94) p=.12	.12 (102) p=.21	.06 (97) p=.55	.00 (101) p=.99
9.Functioning Ethnic	.13 (85) p=.24	.06 (96) p=.53	.03 (96) p=.23	.13 (103) p=.07	-.02 (100) p=.83	-.06 (104) p=.55
10.Non- functioning Ethnic	.12 (85) p=.27	.06 (96) p=.55	.01 (97) p=.88	-.03 (104) p=.75	-.09 (100) p=.36	-.06 (104) p=.53

Table 5
Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity and
College Satisfaction for Hispanic Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Ethnic Identity	.26 (47) p=.08	.14 (52) p=.33	.18 (58) p=.17	.23 (57) p=.09	.17 (58) p=.21	.12 (59) p=.37
8.Pride and Awareness	.26 (49) p=.07	.14 (54) p=.30	.23 (60) p=.07	.22 (59) p=.09	.13 (60) p=.30	.14 (61) p=.29
9.Functioning Ethnic	.36 (49) p=.09	.27 (54) p=.30	.26 (60) p=.23	.36 (59) p=.07	.26 (60) p=.10	.17 (61) p=.18
10.Non- functioning Ethnic	.06 (47) p=.68	.04 (52) p=.76	-.03 (58) p=.83	.01 (58) p=.95	.09 (58) p=.51	.02 (59) p=.88

Table 6
Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity and
College Satisfaction for African-American Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Ethnic Identity	.04 (35) p=.83	.08 (39) p=.62	-.11 (38) p=.50	.05 (41) p=.76	.03 (43) p=.85	-.12 (43) p=.46
8. Pride and Awareness	.09 (35) p=.61	.15 (39) p=.34	-.02 (39) p=.91	.11 (41) p=.51	.01 (43) p=.94	-.07 (43) p=.66
9. Functioning Ethnic	-.19 (36) p=.27	-.11 (40) p=.49	-.24 (40) p=.14	-.04 (43) p=.80	-.07 (45) p=.65	-.26 (45) p=.08
10. Non-functioning Ethnic	.10 (35) p=.56	.03 (39) p=.84	.03 (39) p=.84	.07 (42) p=.64	.09 (44) p=.54	-.07 (44) p=.64

Hypothesis 2 predicted that acculturation would positively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. high levels of acculturation would relate to greater college satisfaction). The correlation between these variables, and correlations between each subscale of the college satisfaction measure with each of the three items that comprised the acculturation measure for White students are presented in Table 7. Again, due to the modest sample of Hispanic and African-American students, independent samples t-tests were performed to determine if these groups could be combined for the current analysis. The t-tests revealed that these groups were not significantly different in their responses to scales measuring acculturation. Correlations

28

for Hispanic and African-American students are shown in Table
8.   Hypothesis 2 was not supported for either White students
or the combined sample of Hispanic and African-American
students.

Table 7
Correlation Matrix of Acculturation
and College Satisfaction for White Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Acculturation	.06	.09	.06	-.06	.06	-.15
	(85)	(96)	(97)	(104)	(100)	(104)
	p=.56	p=.36	p=.56	p=.51	p=.54	p=.12
8.Assimilation	-.06	-.00	.02	-.12	.02	-.09
	(85)	(96)	(97)	(104)	(100)	(104)
	p=.60	p=.97	p=.81	p=.21	p=.80	p=.36
9.Integration	.01	.06	.01	-.09	.01	-.18
	(84)	(95)	(96)	(103)	(99)	(102)
	p=.95	p=.54	p=.89	p=.39	p=.94	p=.07
10.Separation	.29	.16	.20	.15	.13	-.16
	(84)	(95)	(96)	(103)	(99)	(102)
	p=.01	p=.11	p=.05	p=.12	p=.19	p=.11

Table 8
Correlation Matrix of Acculturation and College
Satisfaction for Hispanic and African-American Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Acculturation	.02	.01	.06	.07	-.06	.07
	(85)	(94)	(101)	(105)	(107)	(109)
	p=.87	p=.88	p=.53	p=.45	p=.54	p=.12
8.Assimilation	-.07	-.05	-.01	.01	-.10	-.03
	(85)	(94)	(101)	(105)	(107)	(109)
	p=.50	p=.61	p=.94	p=.90	p=.32	p=.72
9.Integration	-.12	-.07	-.07	-.05	-.17	.02
	(83)	(92)	(99)	(103)	(105)	(107)
	p=.26	p=.50	p=.50	p=.59	p=.08	p=.86
10.Separation	.10	.02	.11	.08	.03	.09
	(83)	(92)	(99)	(103)	(105)	(107)
	p=.34	p=.81	p=.27	p=.41	p=.76	p=.33

Examination of correlations between subscales of the
college satisfaction measure with the three items of the
acculturation measure (assimilation--"I feel that the best
way for members of ethnic minority groups to get along is to
play down their own culture and to become part of American
society by being as much like other American as possible",
integration--"I believe that ethnic minority groups should
maintain and practice their own cultural traditions but also
learn to get along in mainstream American society", and
separation--"I think that members of different minority
groups should emphasize their own cultural traditions within
their communities and not try to mix with other Americans.")
were nonsignificant for the combined sample of Hispanic and
African-American students. Among the White student sample,

satisfaction and separation ($r = .29$) and compensation and separation ($r = .20$) were significantly correlated.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that perceived racial tension would negatively correlate with college satisfaction (i.e. racial climate would be related to less college satisfaction). The correlation between these variables and correlations between subscales within the racial climate and college satisfaction measures for the entire sample are presented in Table 9. Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was no significant relationship observed between the variables, racial climate and college satisfaction. However, there were several significant positive relationships found for college satisfaction and its subscales with both of the racial climate subscales. Significant positive relationships with feeling discriminated against on campus were with the following; college satisfaction ($r = .31$), working conditions ($r = .30$), compensation ($r = .29$), quality of education ($r = .21$), and social life ($r = .19$). Significant positive relationships with acceptance of diversity were; college satisfaction ($r = .33$), working conditions ($r = .33$), compensation ($r = .24$), quality of education ($r = .23$), social life ($r = .27$), and recognition ($r = .22$).

Table 9
Correlation Matrix of Racial Climate
and College Satisfaction for the Entire Sample

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Racial Climate	-.04 (213) p=.56	-.08 (231) p=.21	-.02 (240) p=.72	-.08 (247) p=.21	-.02 (250) p=.75	.01 (251) p=.91
8.Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	.31 (230) p=.00	.30 (252) p=.00	.29 (266) p=.00	.21 (277) p=.00	.19 (277) p=.00	.11 (282) p=.06
9.Acceptance of Diversity	.33 (230) p=.00	.33 (252) p=.00	.24 (266) p=.00	.23 (277) p=.00	.27 (277) p=.00	.22 (282) p=.00

Correlations between racial climate and college satisfaction and their respective subscales were also examined for the sample's predominant ethnic groups, White, Hispanic, and African-American college student groups (Independent t-tests results did not warrant the collapsing of Hispanic and African-American students). For all three ethnic groups, no significant relationships were observed between racial climate and college satisfaction. For White students, significant relationships were observed between feeling discriminated against on campus and the following; college satisfaction ($r = .36$), working conditions ($r = .34$), compensation ($r = .27$), and social life ($r = .21$). For White students significant relationships were also observed between acceptance of diversity and the following; college satisfaction ($r = .35$), working conditions ($r = .44$),

compensation (r = .24), quality of education (r = .22), social life (r = .28), and recognition (r = .16) (see Table 10). Among Hispanic students significant relationships were found between feeling discriminated on campus with the following; college satisfaction (r = .40), working conditions (r = .28), compensation (r = .39), quality of life (r = .36), and recognition (r = .26). For Hispanic students, significant relationships were also observed between acceptance of diversity and the following; college satisfaction (r = .54), Working conditions (r = .46), compensation (r = .38), quality of education (r = .37), social life (r = .40), and recognition (r = .34) (see Table 11). For African-American students, feeling discriminated against on campus positively correlated with compensation (r = .33) and acceptance of diversity correlated with recognition (r = .30) (see Table 12).

Table 10
Correlation Matrix of Racial Climate
and College Satisfaction for White Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Racial Climate	-.14 (78) p=.22	-.07 (86) p=.49	-.00 (84) p=.99	-.10 (89) p=.34	-.20 (89) p=.06	-.03 (90) p=.77
8.Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	.36 (85) p=.00	.34 (96) p=.00	.27 (97) p=.00	.18 (104) p=.06	.21 (100) p=.03	.09 (104) p=.38
9.Acceptance of Diversity	.35 (85) p=.00	.44 (96) p=.00	.24 (97) p=.00	.22 (104) p=.00	.28 (100) p=.00	.16 (104) p=.00

Table 11
Correlation Matrix of Racial Climate
and College Satisfaction for Hispanic Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Racial Climate	-.02 (46) p=.88	-.04 (51) p=.77	-.12 (55) p=.37	-.12 (55) p=.36	.18 (55) p=.20	-.03 (56) p=.84
8.Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	.40 (49) p=.00	.28 (54) p=.04	.39 (60) p=.00	.36 (60) p=.00	.14 (60) p=.29	.26 (61) p=.04
9.Acceptance of Diversity	.54 (49) p=.00	.46 (54) p=.00	.38 (60) p=.00	.37 (60) p=.00	.40 (60) p=.00	.34 (61) p=.00

Table 12
Correlation Matrix of Racial Climate and
College Satisfaction for African-American Students

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.Racial Climate	-.07 (34) p=.69	-.09 (37) p=.58	.10 (38) p=.55	.03 (40) p=.87	-.12 (41) p=.45	-.01 (46) p=.95
8.Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus	.22 (36) p=.20	.30 (40) p=.06	.33 (41) p=.03	.10 (45) p=.51	.25 (47) p=.09	.16 (48) p=.28
9.Acceptance of Diversity	.28 (36) p=.10	.25 (40) p=.11	.23 (41) p=.14	.15 (45) p=.34	.20 (47) p=.18	.30 (48) p=.00

Hypothesis 4 predicted males would experience significantly higher college satisfaction than females. An independent *t*-test was performed to determine mean differences in satisfaction with college among male and female students. Summary Statistics and analysis results are found in Table 13. There was no significant difference between groups for overall college satisfaction (*t*(227) = -.51, *ns*). Additional *t*-tests were used to examine mean differences among male and female college students for the ethnic identity, acculturation and racial climate variables (see Table 13). For only one of the variables, acculturation, the mean difference between groups was found significant (*t*(299) = -2.49, p < .01), with females reporting higher levels of acculturation than males.

Table 13

Summary Statistics and Independent

Samples *t*-tests for Males and Females

Variable	n	M	SD	t-value	df	Sign.
College Satisfaction						
males	92	228.33	36.08	-.51	227	.61
females	137	230.76	35.50			
Ethnic Identity						
males	112	56.57	10.73	-.16	281	.88
females	171	56.75	8.36			
Acculturation						
males	115	14.57	2.65	-2.45	299	.01
females	186	15.23	.99			
Racial Climate						
males	100	48.31	6.48	-1.82	254	.07
females	156	49.94	7.29			

Note: Higher means reflect greater presence of the variable.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that students with junior and senior status would report significantly more satisfaction with college than those students with freshman and sophomore status. Summary statistics and independent *t*-tests results for college satisfaction by class status are shown in Table 14. Although hypothesis 5 was not supported, groups were significantly different. College students with freshman or sophomore status reported more satisfaction with college than college students with junior or senior status ($t(228) = -2.80$), p < .01). Additional *t*-tests were performed to examine mean differences among groups and the variables, ethnic identity, acculturation and racial climate (see Table 14). Among these variables, significant mean differences for

groups were found only for ethnic identity ($t(282) = -3.64$, $p < .001$), revealing that college students with freshman or sophomore status reported higher levels of ethnic identity than college students with junior or senior status.

Table 14
Summary Statistics and Independent
Samples t-tests for Class Status

Variable	n	M	SD	t-value	df	Sign.
College Satisfaction						
1	120	236.17	35.15	-2.80	228	.01
2	110	223.14	35.10			
Ethnic Identity						
1	142	58.61	8.73	-3.64	282	.00
2	142	54.65	9.59			
Acculturation						
1	154	14.86	2.15	.98	300	.33
2	148	15.12	2.42			
Racial Climate						
1	133	48.71	7.08	1.44	255	.15
2	124	49.97	6.89			

Note: 1= freshman and sophomore, 2= junior and senior. Higher means reflect greater presence of the variable.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that students attending a four year college would have significantly higher satisfaction than students attending a two year college. Table 15 presents summary statistics and independent samples t-tests results for college satisfaction among two and four year college students. Because most of the minority students in the study were from two year colleges, no analysis was performed to explore mean differences for college versus university status by ethnic group.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported. A nonsignificant mean
difference was found among groups for the college
satisfaction variable ($t(227) = 1.42$, ns). Independent
samples t-tests were performed to determine if mean
differences existed among groups for the ethnic identity,
acculturation and racial climate variables (see Table 15).
Differences between groups reached statistical significance
for only one of these variables, ethnic identity ($t(281) =$
2.36, $p < .05$), with two year college students reporting
higher levels of ethnic identity than four year college
students.

Table 15
Summary Statistics and Independent
Samples t-tests for College versus
University Status

Variable	n	M	SD	t-value	df	Sign.
College Satisfaction						
College	115	233.10	34.58	1.42	227	.16
Univ.	114	226.43	36.59			
Ethnic Identity						
College	140	57.99	9.46	2.36	28	.02
Univ.	143	55.39	9.09			
Acculturation						
College	151	14.86	2.29	-.91	299	.36
Univ.	150	15.10	2.28			
Racial Climate						
College	128	48.61	7.58	-1.59	254	.11
Univ.	128	50.00	6.36			

Note: Higher means reflect greater presence of the variable.

DISCUSSION

College satisfaction continues to be an integral element
in a student's social and academic development. Hypothesis 1,
ethnic identity will positively correlate with college
satisfaction, was supported indicating that a self-concept
that is derived from one's ethnic group membership and the
value one places upon that membership is related to college
satisfaction. It appears that the development of ethnic
identity relates to one's view of how their college
accommodates their needs. In addition, functioning ethnic
positively correlated with working conditions and quality of
education. Therefore, practicing the lifestyle and culture
of one's ethnic group is related to a favorable outlook on
college faculty and staff, the curriculum, the effectiveness
of teaching efforts, and physical characteristics of the
campus (i.e. study areas and quality of meals). Ethnic
identity and college satisfaction may not have been
significant among the predominant ethnic groups for several
reasons. The subsamples, White, Hispanic, and African-
American students, may not have been large enough to exhibit
the predicted relationship. Furthermore, do White Americans
consider themselves to be an ethnic group? When one thinks
of ethnicity in its colloquial sense, is White referenced as
"ethnic"? Are there special foods, holidays, dialect, or
traditions that are celebrations of strictly White heritage?
It is quite possible that functioning ethnic does not apply

to Whites in the same manner as it does to other racial groups. Perhaps, what it means to be White is such a universal concept and way of life that it makes it difficult for some Whites to recognize their ethnic status.

It is suggested that the nonsignificant relationship between ethnic identity and college satisfaction occurred among African-American students because ethnic identity achievement has traditionally been a controversial matter among African-Americans. Classic studies with preschool and young school-aged children examining ethnic identification, reveal the conflict and struggle indicative of ethnic identity achievement common among African-Americans. In these studies, children are presented with White and African-American dolls and asked which they preferred. Startlingly, African-American children showed a strong preference for the White dolls. Perhaps, for some African-Americans, a lack of "goodness of fit" between the individual and society, caused and reinforced by stereotypes, prejudice and inequity act to hinder a relationship between ethnic identity and college satisfaction. Although nonsignificant, data revealed that there was a negative relationship with functioning ethnic and college satisfaction, with college satisfaction decreasing as functioning ethnic increases. A study by Allen (1985) found a significant relationship between expressing strong "pro-Black" racial attitudes and low social involvement on campus. Fleming also found that African-Americans expressing less

40

"pro-Black" racial attitudes had a more favorable outlook on faculty relations, positive views of campus race relations and better high school grades. Thus, it appears that strong "pro-Black" attitudes are incompatible with college satisfaction for African-American students attending predominantly White campuses. The message remains the same. To academically and socially succeed, African-American students, as well as other racial/ethnic group members, are expected to virtually give up their ethnic identity.

The correlation between functioning ethnic and college satisfaction may not have occurred among Hispanic students due to reasons that are similar to those provided for African-Americans. Spencer and Markstrom-Adams (1990) report that among Hispanics there is also a pro-white bias exhibited in childhood. Furthermore, constant exposure to their invisibility in academic materials and negative representation in the media may have contributed to the nonsignifiant relationship found betweeen ethnic identity and college satisfaction. Because of the many barriers to ethnic identity formation, identification with one's ethnic group may be difficult. However, once ethnic identity is acheived, it is likely that ethnic functioning may be exclusive from one's functioning in predominantly White settings. Such dualism is an adaptive strategy that enables many ethnic group members cope with dissonance and discomfort resulting from their evident mistreatment in society.

41

Hypothesis 2, acculturation will positively correlate with college satisfaction, was not supported among any of the predominant ethnic groups studied. However, among White students, college satisfaction and compensation were both related to separation (a subscale of the acculturation measure). Thus, for White students, the greater one's satisfaction with college and the extent to which one feels equity in the amount of effort put forth and rewards received, the greater one's attitude toward the notion that minority groups should concentrate on their own cultures and refrain from mixing with other Americans. Such an occurrence may stem from a historic demarcation between Whites and nonwhites in America. What is surprising, however, is that such a finding is evident among a college sample. College students and the college environment is often thought of as enlightened and socially tolerant. This particular finding is of eminent concern because it is reminiscent of era and conservatism that has served as an impetus for the civil rights movement and other attempts for social and political equality. Perhaps this finding is indicative of what Jackman and Muha (1984) refer to as "harmonious inequality". The influx of ethnic groups in traditionally White settings (i.e. the college campus) is threatening and cause for the protection of privilege that has long been characteristic of the dominant group. Thus, the correlation between separation and both college satisfaction and compensation may be an

attempt by White students to assert the dominant group's status by maintaining separation of power and other valuable resources.

Hypothesis 3, perceived racial tension will negatively correlate with college satisfaction, was also not supported. However, significant positive relationships were found among subscales of the racial climate measure and college satisfaction and its subscales. For instance, acceptance of diversity, a subscale of the racial climate measure, positively correlated with college satisfaction and all of its subscales (working conditions, compensation, quality of education, social life and recognition). While one may not find it difficult to acknowledge that acceptance of others and their relative contributions is related to greater college satisfaction, the following is not so easily accessible. Findings indicated that feeling discriminated against on campus positively correlated with college satisfaction and four of its subscales (working conditions, compensation, quality of education and social life). It appears that one can be satisfied with college regardless of one's experiences with racism or his or her appreciation of ethnic diversity. Such relationships were observed among all three predominant ethnic groups. Thus, in spite of the way a student is treated on campus, he or she may concede that the overall function of the college environment is adequate. That is, despite feeling alienated, stereotyped and/or

mistreated, the student may still feel that the college of their choice ultimately accomplishes its primary mission -- education.

It is possible that a phenomenon Arce (1978) has coined "academic colonialism" is at work in various institutions across the nation. Academic colonialism refers to the expression of the dominant group's culture, ideologies, and intellectual thought on campus. As the term infers, such practice is done so with the intention that the system operated by the dominant group should not be challenged. Therefore, ethnic group members are confronted with two options: one, brave the hardships and punishments associated with trying to change the system or two, acquiesce in order to reserve resources necessary for other goals and priorities. In order to triumph academically, many students may simply downplay their dislikes for the eventual attainment of a degree. Similarly, Fleming (1981) reports that the lack of support systems leads to the inclination of many African-Americans to block out or distract problems resulting from difficulties that compromise their academic careers at predominantly White colleges. As threatening as overt discrimination is, covert discrimination such as being ignored by faculty and students, lack of availability of services and support for ethnic issues and interests, and misrepresentation in academic materials and discussions, are damaging and a common factor in the collegiate experience of

many African-Americans. In spite of harmful effects, African-American students know that in order to succeed, the reality of discrimination must not be allowed to temper ultimate goals and desires.

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 explored differences among males and females, college class status and two versus four year college attendance. Contrary to the hypotheses, there was no significant difference in college satisfaction among males and females or two versus four year colleges. There was a significant difference between class status, with freshmen and sophomores experiencing higher levels of college satisfaction than juniors and seniors. While the hypothesized differences are widely represented in the literature, the present findings may simply be a result of characteristics that are specific to the colleges and university surveyed. The above findings are no less a commentary on the operations of the institutions surveyed. That there are no significant differences among males and females and two versus four year colleges may indicate an equity in treatment of male and female college students and among two year and four year students that was not anticipated and documented in the literature. Considering attrition is greatest the first and second year of college, the fact that freshmen and sophomores experienced significantly higher levels of college satisfaction certainly contributes to the reduction of attrition rates among the

institutions surveyed. In addition, such a finding sheds a favorable light on the institutions' ability to welcome and address the needs of new students.

Limitations

One, although the primary intention of this thesis was to explore differences in college satisfaction among ethnic groups, specifically White and African-American college students, the distribution of the sample prevented this endeavor. While only 52 (12%) participants in the sample were African-Americans, it is clear to this researcher that this estimate is not representative of those surveyed. Because contemporary research often neglects the representative inclusion of minorities in its exploration of psychological phenomena, the present research was guided by the desire to gather comparable numbers of White and African-American students. There are two reasons why fewer African-Americans were documented than were surveyed. First, it is suggested by this researcher that many of the African-American students intentionally marked themselves as "mixed" or "other" when asked to report their ethnicity so as to acknowledge their multiracial heritage. While an exhaustive listing of ethnic options were provided to participants, it is evident that this decision served to provide individuals with more ethnic options than were necessary for the study. This unexpected response pattern served to reduce statistical power and under-represent relationships concerning African-

American students. Second, it is also possible that African-American students purposely attempted to deceive the researcher by marking themselves as "mixed" or "other". The research conducted about African-Americans or reference of them has historically done so in an inappropriate, unfavorable, and ludicrous manner. For example, research such as that purported by Rushton (1989) who proclaims that the evloution of certain races is greater than others in terms of intelligence, alturism, and sexual behavior (i.e. Mongoloid > Caucasoid > Negroid), has left a bad taste in the mouths of many racial/ethnic group members and caused them to be leery of research endeavors. In my inquiry into the obvious under-representation of African-American students in this study, I found that among my African-American friends and family, the practice of not noting one's ethnicity as African-American/Black or checking a more inclusive option on survey materials is quite a common custom. Such an occurrence is quite interesting and deserves attention in future research.

Two, common method variance may have occurred in the investigation of college satisfaction and racial climate. A possible third variable, adaptive functioning, may have been operating to drive the significant positive relationship between college satisfaction and feeling discriminated against on campus. Future efforts may be directed toward exploring adaptive functioning as a coping mechanism of

47

college students and its contribution to overall performance and satisfaction.

Three, characteristics specific to the institutions surveyed may have limited purport for other institutions. Although the student sample was drawn from three institutions, characteristics specific to the Inland Empire may restrict generalizability. That is, students in the current study, may or may not be representative of college students in general. In addition, findings were not congruent with previous research. Future study should seek to enhance external validity with replication.

Recommendations for Managing Ethnic Diversity
in Institutions of Higher Education

The following recommendations are offered as a tool to aid institutions of higher education in their effort to more appropriately and completely address their obligations toward *all* college students. It should be duly noted that the recommendations provided herein should be initiated and followed through in a cooperative manner by students, faculty, administration and community. Only when these critical entities work together, can there be quantitative and qualitative change in higher education. One, specific efforts, such as special programs and services should be devoted to changing the institutions culture and operations so that they are pluralistic. Two, faculty and

administrators should be provided with cross-cultural

training in order to enhance sensitivity to racial/ethnic

issues. Three, students should be provided with information

and advertising that encourages participation in

organizations and programs that render support for interests

of particular ethnic/racial groups (i.e. Black Student Union,

Mexican-American Student Association). Four, measures such

as extensive communication voicing intolerance and structures

designed to handle complaints should be provided so as to

discourage discrimination and harassment. Five, the

curriculum should be amended to include courses that address

ethnic/racial interests in an effort to provide students with

the opportunity to academically explore cultural issues.

APPENDIX A

College Overviews

California State University, San Bernardino

5500 University Parkway

San, Bernardino, CA 92407-2318

Located approximately 60 miles east of Los Angeles,
CSUSB is a coed, state-supported, comprehensive university
within the California State University System. Founded in
1965, CSUSB awards both bachelor's and master's degrees.
Total enrollment is 12,121. Of this number, 59% are women,
20% are Hispanic, 9% are African American, 8% are Asian
American and 1% are Native American. In addition, 96% are
state residents, 34% are part-time students and 38% are 25
years or older (Peterson's College Database, 1995).

Mt. San Antonio College

1100 North Grand Avenue

Walnut, CA 91789-1399

Located approximately 25 miles east of Los Angeles, Mt.
San Antonio is a two-year, district supported, coed community
college. Founded in 1946, Mt. San Antonio awards associate
degrees. Total enrollment is 23,294. Of that population 53%
are women, 69% work part-time, 38% are 25 or older and 94%
are state residents. Thirty-two percent are Hispanic, 12%
are Asian American, 7% are African-American, and 1% is Native
American (Peterson's College Database, 1995).

San Bernardino Valley College

701 South Mount Vernon Avenue

San Bernardino, CA 92410

Founded in 1926, San Bernardino Valley College is located 60 miles east of Los Angeles. It is a two year, public, coed, community college. SBVC awards associate degrees. Total enrollment is 11,290. The mean age of students at SBVC is 27. Twenty-eight percent of the student population attend full-time, 13% are Hispanic, 20% are African-American, 1% is Asian, and .7% is American Indian (San Bernardino Valley College, 1995).

APPENDIX B

Demographic Items

The following 8 questions are for demographic purposes only.
Please circle the appropriate answer or fill in the space
provided as carefully and accurately as you can.

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your sex?
    (1)   male
    (2)   female

3. What is your ethnicity?
    (1)   Asian, Asian American, Asian-Pacific, or Pacific
          Islander
    (2)   Black/African American
    (3)   Hispanic or Latino/Latina
    (4)   White/Caucasian, European, not Hispanic
    (5)   American Indian/Native American
    (6)   Mixed; parents are from two different groups.
          If so, please specify:
          _____
    (7)   Other (please specify): _____

4. Are you attending a two-year or four-year college?
    (circle one)

5. What is the name of the college or university you are
    currently attending?
    _____

6. Do you live
    (1)   on campus
    (2)   off campus

7. What is your class status?
    (1)   freshman
    (2)   sophomore
    (3)   junior
    (4)   senior

8. Are you currently employed?
    (1)   yes   If yes, please specify hours per week___
    (2)   no

APPENDIX C

College Satisfaction Scale

The following questions concern your attitudes and opinions about a number of important issues concerning life on campus. Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that corresponds to your level of satisfaction or agreement. If a statement has more than one part, please indicate your reaction to the statement as a whole.

Please use the scale below to respond to the following items.

1 = I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2 = I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3 = I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4 = I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5 = I am VERY SATISFIED.

1 2 3 4 5   1. The opportunity to make close friends here.

1 2 3 4 5   2. The amount of work required in most classes.

1 2 3 4 5   3. The way teachers talk to you when you ask for help.

1 2 3 4 5   4. The competence of most of the teachers in their own fields.

1 2 3 4 5   5. The amount of study it takes to get a passing grade.

1 2 3 4 5   6. The chance of getting a comfortable place to live.

1 2 3 4 5   7. The chance you have of doing well if you work hard.

1 2 3 4 5   8. The amount of personal attention students get from teachers.

1 2 3 4 5   9. The chance "to be heard" when you have a complaint about a grade.

1 2 3 4 5   10. The friendliness of most students.

1 2 3 4 5   11. The help that you can get when you have personal problems.

53

```
1  =  I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2  =  I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3  =  I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4  =  I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5  =  I am VERY SATISFIED.
```

1 2 3 4 5 12. The availability of good places to live near the campus.

1 2 3 4 5 13. The ability of most advisors in helping students develop their course plans.

1 2 3 4 5 14. The cleanliness of the housing that is available for students here.

1 2 3 4 5 15. The chance to take courses that fulfill your goals or personal growth.

1 2 3 4 5 16. The kinds of things that determine your grade.

1 2 3 4 5 17. The preparation students are getting for their future careers.

1 2 3 4 5 18. The chance to have privacy when you want it.

1 2 3 4 5 19. The chance to work on projects with members of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 20. Teachers' expectations as to the amount that students should study.

1 2 3 4 5 21. The availability of good places to study.

1 2 3 4 5 22. The fairness of most teachers in assigning grades.

1 2 3 4 5 23. The interest that advisors take in the progress of their students.

1 2 3 4 5 24. The places provided for students to relax between classes.

1 2 3 4 5 25. The social events that are provided for students here.

```
1  =  I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2  =  I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3  =  I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4  =  I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5  =  I am VERY SATISFIED.
```

1 2 3 4 5   26. Teachers' concern for students' needs and interests.

1 2 3 4 5   27. The chance to get scheduled into the courses of your choice.

1 2 3 4 5   28. The activities and clubs you can join.

1 2 3 4 5   29. The difficulty of most courses.

1 2 3 4 5   30. The chance to get help in deciding what your major should be.

1 2 3 4 5   31. The chance to get acquainted with other students outside of class.

1 2 3 4 5   32. The availability of your advisor when you need him or her.

1 2 3 4 5   33. The chances to go out and have a good time.

1 2 3 4 5   34. The pressure to study.

1 2 3 4 5   35. The chance of getting a grade which reflects the effort you put into studying.

1 2 3 4 5   36. The quality of the education students get here.

1 2 3 4 5   37. The number of D's and F's that are given to students.

1 2 3 4 5   38. The concern here for the comfort of students outside of classes.

1 2 3 4 5   39. The things you can do to have fun here.

1 2 3 4 5   40. The chance for a student to develop his or her best abilities.

```
1 = I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2 = I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3 = I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4 = I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5 = I am VERY SATISFIED.
```

1 2 3 4 5   41. The chance of having a date here.

1 2 3 4 5   42. The chances of getting acquainted with the teachers in your major area.

1 2 3 4 5   43. The chances to explore important ideas.

1 2 3 4 5   44. The quality of the material emphasized in the courses.

1 2 3 4 5   45. The chance of getting into the courses you want to take.

1 2 3 4 5   46. The noise level at home when you are trying to study.

1 2 3 4 5   47. The amount of time you must spend studying.

1 2 3 4 5   48. The availability of comfortable places to lounge.

1 2 3 4 5   49. The chances for men and women to get acquainted.

1 2 3 4 5   50. The counseling that is provided for students here.

1 2 3 4 5   51. The chance to prepare well for your vocation.

1 2 3 4 5   52. The chance to live where you want to.

1 2 3 4 5   53. The chance you have for a "fair break" here if you work hard.

1 2 3 4 5   54. The friendliness of most faculty members.

1 2 3 4 5   55. The chances to meet people with the same interests as you have.

```
1  =  I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2  =  I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3  =  I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4  =  I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5  =  I am VERY SATISFIED.
```

1 2 3 4 5   56. What you learn in relation to the amount of time you spend in school.

1 2 3 4 5   57. The choice of dates you have here.

1 2 3 4 5   58. The amount of study you have to do in order to qualify someday for a job you want.

1 2 3 4 5   59. The kinds of things you can do for fun without a lot of planning ahead.

1 2 3 4 5   60. The willingness of teachers to talk with students outside of class time.

1 2 3 4 5   61. The places where you can go just to rest during the day.

1 2 3 4 5   62. The campus events that are provided for students here.

1 2 3 4 5   63. The practice you get in thinking and reasoning.

1 2 3 4 5   64. Your opportunity here to determine your own pattern of intellectual development.

1 2 3 4 5   65. The chance to participate in class discussions about the course material.

1 2 3 4 5   66. The activities that are provided to help you meet someone you might like to date.

1 2 3 4 5   67. The sequence of courses and prerequisites for your major.

1 2 3 4 5   68. The availability of quiet study areas for students.

```
1  =  I am VERY DISSATISFIED.
2  =  I am SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.
3  =  I am SATISFIED, no more, no less.
4  =  I am QUITE SATISFIED.
5  =  I am VERY SATISFIED.
```

1 2 3 4 5   69. The chance you have to substitute
                            courses in your major when you think
                            it is advisable.

1 2 3 4 5   70. The appropriateness of the
                            requirements for your major.

APPENDIX D

Racial Climate Scale

Please use the scale below to respond to the next items.

1 = Strongly Disagree   4 = Slightly Agree
2 = Disagree   5 = Agree
3 = Slightly Disagree   6 = Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6   71. Different viewpoints on issues of race or ethnicity are encouraged in class discussions.

1 2 3 4 5 6   72. Financial aid is given only to students from specific racial or ethnic groups.

1 2 3 4 5 6   73. I am pressured by students of my ethnic group to participate in campus activities related to my ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   74. Campus activities in which I have participated in have increased my sensitivity to other races and/or ethnic groups.

1 2 3 4 5 6   75. On campus, I am treated with respect by members of other races and/or ethnic groups.

1 2 3 4 5 6   76. I have felt unfairly treated on campus because of my race or ethnicity.

1 2 3 4 5 6   77. On campus, I have witness instances of racial conflict such as harassment, racial incidents, or protests.

1 2 3 4 5 6   78. On campus, I think that some races or ethnic groups receive preferential treatment.

1 2 3 4 5 6   79. The campus is generally supportive of minority students.

1 2 3 4 5 6   80. On campus, there are programs and /or services that help to reduce racial conflict.

```
1  =  Strongly Disagree        4  =  Slightly Agree
2  =  Disagree                 5  =  Agree
3  =  Slightly Disagree        6  =  Strongly Agree
```

1 2 3 4 5 6   81. On campus, there are programs and/or services that improve racial climate.

1 2 3 4 5 6   82. Racial discrimination is a problem on this campus.

1 2 3 4 5 6   83. There is little trust between minority students and administrators.

1 2 3 4 5 6   84. I think my campus makes an effort to create a diverse, multicultural environment.

1 2 3 4 5 6   85. I feel isolated on campus because of my race or ethnicity.

APPENDIX E

Ethnic Identity Scale

1	=	Strongly Disagree	4	=	Slightly Agree
2	=	Disagree	5	=	Agree
3	=	Slightly Disagree	6	=	Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6   86. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

1 2 3 4 5 6   87. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   88. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6   89. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.

1 2 3 4 5 6   90. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.

1 2 3 4 5 6   91. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life.

1 2 3 4 5 6   92. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   93. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   94. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.

1 2 3 4 5 6   95. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   96. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments.

61

1	=	Strongly Disagree		4	=	Slightly Agree	
2	=	Disagree		5	=	Agree	
3	=	Slightly Disagree		6	=	Strongly Agree	

1 2 3 4 5 6   97. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music or customs.

1 2 3 4 5 6   98. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

1 2 3 4 5 6   99. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

APPENDIX F

Acculturation Scale

1 = Strongly Disagree   4 = Slightly Agree
2 = Disagree   5 = Agree
3 = Slightly Disagree   6 = Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6   100. I feel that the best way for members of
                          ethnic minority groups to get along is to
                          play down their own culture and to become
                          part of American society by being as much
                          like other Americans as possible.

1 2 3 4 5 6   101. I believe that ethnic minority groups
                          should maintain and practice their
                          own cultural traditions, but also
                          learn to get along in mainstream
                          American society.

1 2 3 4 5 6   102. I think that members of different
                          minority groups should emphasize their
                          own cultural traditions within their
                          communities and not try to mix with other
                          Americans.

APPENDIX G

Tables for Scale Reliabilities

Table 16
Reliability Analysis for College Satisfaction Scale

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Item 1	3.14	0.97	.404	.966
Item 2	3.41	0.76	.360	.966
Item 3	3.67	0.89	.496	.966
Item 4	3.87	0.47	.850	.966
Item 5	3.43	0.80	.432	.966
Item 6	3.22	0.93	.435	.966
Item 7	3.96	0.92	.470	.966
Item 8	3.36	0.87	.544	.966
Item 9	3.30	0.94	.609	.966
Item 10	3.50	0.91	.445	.966
Item 11	3.26	0.85	.390	.966
Item 12	3.02	0.97	.369	.966
Item 13	3.17	1.02	.514	.966
Item 14	3.11	0.70	.305	.966
Item 15	3.47	1.00	.566	.966
Item 16	3.41	0.83	.609	.966
Item 17	3.29	0.96	.660	.966
Item 18	3.40	0.87	.499	.966
Item 19	3.35	0.87	.482	.966
Item 20	3.35	0.85	.586	.966
Item 21	3.63	1.00	.502	.966
Item 22	3.49	0.88	.578	.966
Item 23	3.09	0.98	.543	.966
Item 24	3.29	1.01	.552	.966
Item 25	2.97	0.99	.578	.966
Item 26	3.31	0.84	.688	.966
Item 27	3.09	1.44	.489	.966
Item 28	3.20	0.92	.544	.966
Item 29	3.30	0.81	.552	.966
Item 30	3.06	1.08	.540	.966
Item 31	3.13	0.90	.592	.966
Item 32	3.09	0.95	.582	.966
Item 33	3.29	0.97	.531	.966
Item 34	3.18	0.89	.401	.966
Item 35	3.49	0.98	.668	.966
Item 36	3.57	0.90	.591	.966
Item 37	3.00	0.78	.223	.967
Item 38	2.99	0.77	.548	.966
Item 39	2.93	0.90	.604	.966
Item 40	3.36	0.84	.663	.966

Items Cont'd.	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Item 41	3.03	1.02	.552	.966
Item 42	3.25	0.95	.596	.966
Item 43	3.37	0.83	.659	.966
Item 44	3.53	0.79	.621	.966
Item 45	3.06	1.11	.389	.966
Item 46	2.99	1.18	.181	.967
Item 47	3.13	0.89	.525	.966
Item 48	3.24	0.92	.581	.966
Item 49	3.06	0.91	.608	.966
Item 50	3.17	0.97	.579	.966
Item 51	3.04	0.88	.490	.966
Item 52	3.13	1.05	.470	.966
Item 53	3.38	0.95	.479	.966
Item 54	3.53	0.83	.649	.966
Item 55	3.36	0.93	.597	.966
Item 56	3.47	0.89	.683	.966
Item 57	2.96	0.94	.564	.966
Item 58	3.42	0.88	.669	.966
Item 59	3.14	0.88	.560	.966
Item 60	3.43	0.93	.574	.966
Item 61	3.15	0.98	.633	.966
Item 62	2.97	0.94	.594	.966
Item 63	3.45	0.86	.615	.966
Item 64	3.49	0.82	.704	.966
Item 65	3.69	0.82	.521	.966
Item 66	2.81	0.89	.516	.966
Item 67	3.29	0.93	.543	.966
Item 68	3.33	1.01	.568	.966
Item 69	3.12	0.97	.526	.966
Item 70	3.42	0.91	.543	.966

Alpha = .9664; N = 230; Mean = 229.648; SD = 35.447

Table 17

Reliability Analysis for College Satisfaction Subscales

Working Conditions

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Item 6	3.23	0.93	.469	.851
Item 12	3.03	0.97	.442	.853
Item 14	3.11	0.72	.416	.854
Item 18	3.41	0.89	.495	.850
Item 21	3.64	1.00	.584	.845
Item 24	3.26	1.03	.606	.843
Item 27	3.06	1.15	.401	.857
Item 28	3.21	0.94	.530	.848
Item 38	2.97	0.79	.453	.852
Item 46	3.00	1.17	.278	.865
Item 48	3.20	0.94	.671	.840
Item 52	3.15	1.05	.532	.848
Item 61	3.14	0.97	.691	.839
Item 68	3.35	1.00	.627	.842

Alpha = .8586; N = 252; Mean = 44.750; SD = 8.098

Compensation

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 2	3.45	.772	.485	.884
Item 5	3.48	.815	.549	.882
Item 7	3.99	.936	.534	.882
Item 16	3.46	.840	.624	.878
Item 20	3.43	.838	.627	.878
Item 22	3.52	.883	.541	.882
Item 29	3.37	.836	.662	.878
Item 34	3.22	.883	.528	.882
Item 35	3.56	.978	.717	.873
Item 37	3.00	.782	.317	.891
Item 47	3.20	.883	.617	.878
Item 53	3.40	.945	.479	.885
Item 56	3.50	.891	.645	.877
Item 58	3.44	.885	.624	.878

Alpha = .8884; N = 277; Mean = 48.029; SD = 7.789

Quality of Education

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 15	3.52	1.01	.603	.882
Item 17	3.33	0.95	.656	.879
Item 36	3.63	0.88	.601	.882
Item 40	3.38	0.87	.640	.880
Item 43	3.39	0.82	.613	.882
Item 44	3.58	0.78	.652	.880
Item 45	3.09	1.11	.400	.893
Item 51	3.04	0.84	.367	.892
Item 63	3.43	0.85	.600	.882
Item 64	3.49	0.83	.707	.878
Item 65	3.70	0.81	.507	.886
Item 67	3.31	0.94	.588	.883
Item 69	3.13	0.98	.544	.885
Item 70	3.42	0.90	.609	.882

Alpha = .8909; N = 277; Mean = 47.046; SD = 8.126

Social Life

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 1	3.18	1.00	.495	.903
Item 10	3.51	0.92	.507	.903
Item 19	3.38	0.89	.515	.902
Item 25	3.01	1.02	.642	.897
Item 31	3.14	0.92	.669	.897
Item 33	3.32	0.98	.544	.901
Item 39	3.94	0.92	.670	.896
Item 41	3.04	1.02	.641	.897
Item 49	3.10	0.93	.701	.895
Item 55	3.38	0.92	.648	.897
Item 57	2.97	0.96	.673	.896
Item 59	3.17	0.91	.541	.901
Item 62	3.00	0.97	.591	.899
Item 66	2.82	0.93	.641	.898

Alpha = .9055; N = 272; Mean = 43.971; SD = 8.897

Recognition

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 3	3.66	0.91	.595	.897
Item 4	3.89	0.84	.471	.901
Item 8	3.38	0.88	.665	.894
Item 9	3.33	0.93	.661	.894
Item 11	3.30	0.88	.440	.902
Item 13	3.18	1.03	.600	.897
Item 23	3.10	1.00	.624	.896
Item 26	3.31	0.87	.654	.895
Item 30	3.07	1.06	.571	.898
Item 32	3.08	0.95	.637	.895
Item 42	3.30	0.99	.619	.896
Item 50	3.18	1.01	.621	.896
Item 54	3.57	0.84	.631	.895
Item 60	3.46	0.93	.619	.896

Alpha = .9033; N = 282; Mean = 46.847; SD = 8.753

Table 18
Reliability Analysis for Racial Climate Scale
(After Item Deletion)

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 71	4.07	1.33	.290	.767
Item 73	5.03	0.80	.370	.754
Item 75	4.52	1.15	.480	.741
Item 76	5.12	0.81	.508	.742
Item 77	5.08	0.76	.444	.748
Item 78	4.84	0.79	.189	.768
Item 79	4.35	1.17	.398	.751
Item 80	3.83	1.23	.405	.750
Item 81	3.75	1.28	.413	.750
Item 82	4.74	0.74	.428	.750
Item 83	4.69	0.67	.365	.755
Item 84	4.33	1.16	.439	.746
Item 85	5.12	0.79	.514	.742

Alpha = .7658 ; N = 266; Mean = 59.474; SD = 6.680

Table 19
Reliability Analysis for Racial Climate
Subscales After Factor Analysis
(After Item Deletion)

Feeling Discriminated Against on Campus

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 73	5.04	.806	.521	.755
Item 76	5.13	.806	.591	.740
Item 77	5.08	.767	.571	.745
Item 78	4.86	.796	.397	.779
Item 82	4.75	.738	.470	.764
Item 83	4.69	.671	.463	.766
Item 85	5.11	.789	.559	.747

Alpha = .7845; N = 280; Mean = 34.679; SD = 3.554

Acceptance of Diversity

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 71	4.07	1.33	.333	.686
Item 75	4.51	1.14	.376	.688
Item 79	4.35	1.17	.352	.676
Item 80	3.83	1.23	.534	.616
Item 81	3.72	1.28	.505	.625
Item 84	4.31	1.17	.455	.644

Alpha = .6938; N = 273; Mean = 24.806; SD = 4.608

Table 20
Reliability Analysis for Ethnic Identity
(Before Item Deletion)

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 86	3.44	1.57	.473	.844
Item 87	2.75	1.47	.199	.861
Item 88	4.71	1.32	.562	.837
Item 89	3.71	1.55	.382	.850
Item 90	5.02	1.08	.443	.845
Item 91	5.03	0.76	.360	.849
Item 92	4.90	0.78	.260	.852
Item 93	4.52	1.35	.577	.836
Item 94	4.65	1.16	.605	.836
Item 95	3.66	1.55	.560	.838
Item 96	4.75	1.22	.686	.831
Item 97	4.09	1.54	.587	.836
Item 98	4.51	1.33	.741	.826
Item 99	4.96	1.14	.590	.837

Alpha = .8513; N = 284; Mean = 60.722; SD = 10.632

Table 21
Reliability Analysis for Ethnic Identity Subscales
(Before Item Deletion)

Affirmation and Belonging

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 90	5.01	1.11	.445	.852
Item 93	4.52	1.35	.575	.825
Item 96	4.75	1.22	.748	.775
Item 98	4.51	1.33	.764	.793
Item 99	4.96	1.14	.691	.793

Alpha = .8380; N = 290; Mean = 23.765; SD = 4.80

Ethnic Identity Achievement

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 86	3.44	1.57	.457	.656
Item 88	4.71	1.31	.482	.648
Item 89	3.71	1.55	.387	.678
Item 91	5.03	0.77	.281	.697
Item 92	4.90	0.78	.240	.703
Item 94	4.64	1.16	.478	.652
Item 95	3.67	1.55	.563	.620

Alpha = .7009; N = 289; Mean = 30.118; SD = 5.379

Ethnic Behaviors

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 87	2.74	1.47	.217	.
Item 97	4.05	1.56	.217	.

Alpha = .3556; N = 295; Mean = 6.800; SD = 2.364

Table 22
Reliability Analysis for Ethnic Identity Scale
(After Item Deletion)

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 86	3.44	1.57	.451	.857
Item 88	4.71	1.32	.566	.848
Item 89	3.71	1.55	.354	.864
Item 90	5.02	1.08	.463	.855
Item 91	5.03	0.77	.390	.859
Item 92	4.90	0.78	.292	.862
Item 93	4.52	1.35	.578	.848
Item 94	4.65	1.16	.619	.846
Item 95	3.66	1.56	.555	.850
Item 96	4.75	1.22	.703	.841
Item 97	4.09	1.54	.576	.848
Item 98	4.51	1.33	.749	.837
Item 99	4.96	1.14	.613	.847

Alpha = .8610; N = 284; Mean = 57.965; SD = 10.242

Table 23
Reliability Analysis for Ethnic Identity
Subscales After Factor Analysis
(After Item Deletion)

Pride and Awareness

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 88	4.71	1.32	.581	.855
Item 90	5.01	1.11	.469	.867
Item 93	4.52	1.35	.613	.850
Item 94	4.65	1.16	.629	.848
Item 96	4.75	1.23	.741	.832
Item 98	4.51	1.34	.755	.829
Item 99	4.96	1.14	.690	.840

Alpha = .8658; N = 288; Mean = 33.139; SD = 6.457

Functioning Ethnic

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 86	3.42	1.56	.498	.657
Item 89	3.70	1.54	.444	.689
Item 95	3.68	1.55	.607	.590
Item 97	4.05	1.55	.469	.675

Alpha = .7163; N = 295; Mean = 14.854; SD = 4.563

Nonfunctioning Ethnic

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 91	4.04	.767	.560	.
Item 92	4.91	.774	.588	.

Alpha = .6087; N = 294; Mean = 9.956; SD = 1.307

APPENDIX H

Informed Consent

The study you are about to participate in is designed to investigate the influence of variety of factors on college satisfaction. The study is being conducted by Cheris R. Johnson, a graduate student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. The researcher is under the supervision of Dr. Diane Pfahler, an instructor of psychology at CSUSB and San Bernardino Valley College, Dr. Janet Kottke, director of the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Department at CSUSB, and Dr. Stacey Hardy-Desmond, a clinician for the Human Services Department of San Bernardino.

Completion of the survey will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Please give the survey careful consideration and complete its contents in one sitting.

Your participation in this study in completely voluntary and you are free to end your participation at any time. If you have any questions about your participation, please contact Cheris R. Johnson or Dr. Diane Pfahler at:

CSUSB
Psychology Department
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2318
(909) 880-5585

Any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. Your name will not be reported along with your responses. In addition, all data will be reported in group form only. If you wish to receive results of the study, they will be made available to those who write to the above address.

Your signature below indicates that you acknowledge that you have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and freely consent to participate. Please sign and date:

Participant's Signature   Date

APPENDIX I

Debriefing Statement

Your responses to the survey you have just completed
were greatly appreciated and will remain anonymous.
Anonymity of your participation and confidentiality of
results are guaranteed in accordance with ethical and
professional codes set by the CSUSB Institutional Review
Board and the American Psychological Association. This study
is in partial fulfillment for a Master of Science degree in
Industrial/Organizational Psychology at California State
University, San Bernardino. The information collected will
be used to investigate differences in satisfaction among
college students. It is my intention to also use the results
as a means of providing institutions of higher education with
recommendations for managing cultural diversity and improving
race relations. It is unlikely that participation in this
study will result in any discomfort. However, if you have
concerns regarding distress or anxiety caused by your
participation in this study, please contact the researcher,
Cheris R. Johnson, Dr. Diane Pfahler or the CSUSB
Psychological Counseling Center for assistance.

CSUSB Psychological Counseling Center
(909) 880-5040, HC-112

If you have any further questions about your
participation or wish to receive survey findings, you may
contact Cheris R. Johnson or Dr. Diane Pfahler at the
following address.

CSUSB
Psychology Department
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2318
(909) 880-5585

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S. (1965). In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), <u>Advances in experimental social psychology</u> (Vol. 2, pp. 276-299). New York: Academic Press.

Alderfer, C. P. (1972). <u>Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings</u>. New York: Free Press.

Allen, W. R.. (1985). Black student, white campus: Structural, interpersonal, and psychological correlates of success. <u>Journal of Negro Education, 54</u>, 123-137.

Allen, W. R. (1988). Black students in U.S. higher education: Toward improved access, adjustment, and achievement. <u>The Urban Review, 20</u>, 165-87.

Allen, L., & Majidi-Ahi, S. (1989). Black American children. In J. T. Gibbs & L. N. Huang (Eds.), <u>Children of Color</u> (pp.148-178). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Amir, Y., & Sharon, I. (1987). Are social psychological laws cross-culturally valid? <u>Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 8</u>, 383-470.

Arce, C. H. (1978). Chicano participation in academe: A case of academic colonialism. <u>Grito del Sol: Chicano Quarterly, 3</u>, 75-104.

Astin, A. (1975). <u>Preventing Students from Dropping Out</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1977). <u>Social learning theory.</u> Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bernal, M. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1982). Status of minority curricula and training in clinical psychology. <u>American Psychologist, 37</u>, 780-737.

Berry, J. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. J. Berman (Ed.), <u>Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1989: Cross-cultural Perspectives, 37</u>, (pp. 201-234) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Betancourt, H., & Lopez, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity and race in American Psychology. <u>American Psychology, 48</u>, No. 6, 629-637.

Bond, M. (Ed.). (1988). <u>The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology</u>. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. <u>Developmental Psychology, 22</u>, 723-742.

Carroll, H. C., & Leydon, G. (1988). Training educational psychologist for working in multicultural communities: What are training courses in England and Wales doing? <u>Educational and Child psychology, 5(2)</u>, 57-61.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1991). <u>Minorities in higher education: Ninth annual status report</u>. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Cichello, A. (1984). <u>The meaning of two cultures: Ethnic identification and psychosocial development in Italian-Australian adolescents</u>. Unpublished bachelor of arts (honors) thesis, University of Melbourne.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). <u>The American Community College</u>. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crosby, F., Bromely, S., & Saxe, I. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black and white discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. <u>Psychological Bulletin, 87</u>, 546-563.

DeVos, G. A. (1990). Self in society: A multilevel psychocultural analysis. In G. A. DeVos & M. M. Surarez-Orozco (Eds.), <u>Status inequality: The self in culture</u> (pp. 17-74). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dougherty, K. J. (1992). Community college and baccalaureate attainment. <u>Journal of Higher Education, 63</u>, No. 2. Ohio State University Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1966). The concept of identity in race relations: Notes and queries. In T. Parsons & K. B. Clark (Eds.), <u>The Negro American</u> (pp.227-253). Boston: Beacon Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). <u>Identity: Youth and crisis.</u> New York: Norton.

Fleming, J. (1981). Stress and satisfaction in college years of Black students. Journal of Negro Education, 50, No. 3, 307-318.

Fillmore, L. W., & Britsch, S. (1988). Early education for children from linguistic and cultural minority families. Unpublished paper prepared for the Early Education Task Force of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1981). Racism among the well-intentioned. In E. G. Clausen & J. Bermingham (Eds.). Pluralism, racism, and public policy: The search for equality (pp. 208-222). Boston: G. K. Hall.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism. Academic Press.

Goodman, M E. (1964). Race awareness in young children (revised ed.). New York: Collier.

Hacker, A. (1992). Two nations: Black and white, separate, hostile, unequal. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Harrington, A. (in press). Studying race differences, or the problem of "value-free" science. Psychologische Beitrage.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland, OH: World.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. Journal of Higher Education, 63, No. 5 (September/October 1992).

Jackman, M. R., & Muha, M. J. (1984). Education and intergroup attitudes: Moral enlightenment, superficial democratic commitment, or ideological refinement? American Sociological Review, 49, 751-69.

Jones, J. M. (1991). Psychological models of race: What have they been and what should they be? In J. D. Goodchilds (Ed.), Psychological Perspectives on Human Diversity in America (pp. 5-46). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Katz, I. (1981). <u>Stigma: A social psychological analysis</u>. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Knox, W. E., Lindsay, P., & Kolb, M. N. (1992). Higher education, college characteristics, and student experiences: Long-term effects on educational satisfactions and perceptions. <u>Journal of Higher Education, 63</u>, 303-328.

Levine, R., & Campbell, D. (1972). <u>Ethnocentricism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior</u>. New York: Wiley.

Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. <u>Journal of Higher Education, 57</u>, 58-77.

Maslow, A. H. (1965). <u>Eupsychian management</u>. Homewook, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). <u>Motivation and personality</u> (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). <u>The achieving society</u>. New York: Van Nostrand.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). <u>Power: The inner experience</u>. New York: Irvington Press.

McClelland, K. E., & Auster, C. J. (1990). Public platitudes and hidden tensions: Racial climates at predominantly white liberal arts colleges. <u>Journal of Higher Education, 61</u>, 607-42.

McGovern, T. V., Furumoto, L., Halpern, D. F., Kimble, G. A., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). Liberal education, study in depth, and the arts and sciences major-Psychology. <u>American Psychologist, 46</u>, 598-605.

McIntosh, P. (1988). <u>White Privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies.</u> Center for Research on women, Wellesley College, MA.

Mintz, N., & Schwartz, D. (1964). Community factors in the incidence of schizophrenia and Manic depression among Italians in greater Boston. <u>International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 10</u>, 101-118.

Nettles, M. T. (1988). Black and White students academic performance in majority White and majority Black college settings. In <u>Desegregation America's Colleges and Universities</u>, edited by J.B. Williams III. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nettles, M. T., Theony, A.R., & Gosman. (1986). Comparative and predictive analyses of Black and White students' college achievement and experiences. <u>Journal of Higher Education</u>, <u>57</u>, 289-318.

Oliver, M. L., Rodriguez, C. J., & Mickelson, R. A. (1985). Brown and Black in White: The social adjustment and academic performance of Chicano and Black students in a predominantly White university. <u>The Urban Review : Issues and Ideas in Public Education</u>, <u>17</u>, 3-24.

Ortiz, V., & Arce, C. H. (1983). Language orientation and mental health status among persons of Mexican descent. <u>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</u>, <u>6(2)</u>, 127-143.

Pepitone, A., & Triandis, H. (1987). On the universality of social psychological theories. <u>Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology</u>, <u>18</u>, 471-498.

Peterson's College Database. (January 1995).(1.3 @ 93-94) [CompuServe Inc.] Available: CIS: PCD-5056, CIS: PCD-25197.

Peterson, M. W., et al. (1978). <u>Black students on White campuses: The impact of increased Black enrollments</u>. Ann arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Phinney, J. S., & Alipuria, L. L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students form four ethnic groups. <u>Journal of Adolescence</u>, <u>13</u>, 171-183.

Phinney, J. S., Chivira, V., & Williamson. (1992). Acculturation attitudes and self-esteem among high school and college students. <u>Youth & Society</u>, <u>23</u>, 200-312.

Rabkin, J. (1979). Ethnic density and psychiatric hospitalization: Hazards of minority status. <u>American Journal of Psychiatry</u>, <u>136</u>, 1561-1566.

Renner K. E. (1993). On race and gender in higher education: Illusions of change. <u>Educational Record</u>, 44-48.

Rogler, L. H., Cortes, D. E., & Malgady, R. G. (1991). Acculturation and mental health status among Hispanics: Convergence and new directions for research. _American Psychologist, 46_, 585-597.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). _Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis_ (2d ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

Rushton, J. P. (1989). Race differences in sexuality and their correlates: Another look and physiological models. _Journal of Research in Personality, 23_, 35-54.

San Bernardino Valley College (1995). _Student Load Statistics Report, Spring, 1995_. Office of Research.

Sears. D. O., & Allen, H. M., Jr. (1984). The trajectory of local desegregation controversies and whites' opposition to busing. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact: _The psychology of desegregation_ (pp. 123-151). New York: Academic Press.

Sherif, M. (1964). Reference groups in human relations. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.), _Group relations at the crossroads_ (pp. 203-231). New York: Harper & Row.

Shibutani, T., & Kwan, K. M. (1965). _Ethnic stratification_. New York: Macmillian.

Spencer, M. B., & Markstrom-Adams, C. (1990). Identity processes among racial and ethnic minority children in American. _Child Development, 61_, 290-310.

Spencer, M. B. (1970). _The effects of systematic social (puppet) and token reinforcement on the modification of racial and color concept- attitudes in preschool aged children_. Unpublished mater's thesis, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. _Journal of Counseling & Development, 70_, 181-188.

Smith, D. G. (1989). The challenge of diversity: Involvement of alienation in the academy? _ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 5._ Washington: George Washington University.

Smith, D.H. (1981). Social and academic enviroments of Black students on White campuses. Journal of Negro Education, 50, 299-306.

Starr, A. M., Betz, E. L., & Menne, J. W. (1971). College student satisfaction questionnaire (CSSQ) Manual. Ames, Iowa: Central Iowa Associates, Inc.

Tracey, T.J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). A comparison of White and Black students academic success using noncognitive variables: A LISREL analysis. Reaearch in Higher Education, 27, 333-348.

Tracey, T.J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1984). Noncognitive variables in predicting academic success by race. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 16, 171-178.

Thomas, A., & Sillen, S. (1972). Racism and Psychiatry. Secauscus, NJ: Citadel Press.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 45, 89-125.

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vega, W. A., Kolody, B., & Warheit, G. (1985). Psychoneuroses among Mexican Americans and other Whites: Prevalence and caseness. American Journal of Public Health, 75, 523-527.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences: Scientific, social, and ethical issues. American Psychologist, 45, No. 12, 1297-1303.