

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2007

Perceptions Of Student Organizations On Campus

Rachael Lunt
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Lunt, Rachael, "Perceptions Of Student Organizations On Campus" (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 3247.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/3247>

PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS ON CAMPUS

By

RACHAEL ANN LUNT
B.A. University of Virginia, 2004

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Department of Psychology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2007

© 2007 Rachael Ann Lunt

ABSTRACT

This two part study investigated whether perceptions of student organizations are related to participants' ethnicity as well as the ethnicity of the ethnic student organization. Study 1 (N = 460) assessed overall attitudes toward ethnic student organizations dependent upon ethnicity of the participants. Study 2 (N = 631) assessed how attitudes toward ethnic student organizations were affected not only by race of the participant but also by ethnicity of the student organization. Results of Study 1 indicate that overall White students found the ethnic student organizations least beneficial/necessary, most racist, and had the least interest in joining as compared to African American and Hispanic participants. Results of Study 2 indicate that, in addition, perceptions of student organizations are related to the ethnicity of the organization. Overall, White ethnic student organizations are seen to be least beneficial/necessary, least ethical/acceptable/fair, and the most racist as compared to African American and Hispanic organizations. In addition, a significant interaction effect was found between participant ethnicity and ethnicity of the organization. In addition ethnocentrism, ethnic identity, perceptions of cultural climate, and social responsibility were correlated with perceptions and it was found that these variables correlate differently with perceptions depending on the ethnicity of the participant. Implications of the results are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Perceptions of Racism.....	4
The Current Study.....	6
Hypotheses.....	7
Exploratory Questions	7
Overall Study Design.....	8
CHAPTER 2: METHODS.....	10
Study 1	10
Participants.....	10
Materials	10
Procedure	13
Study 2	13
Participants.....	13
Materials	14
Procedure and Study Design.....	14
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS.....	16
Factor Analysis	16
Study 1	16
Study 2	17
Students' General Perceptions of ESOs.....	18
Hypothesis 1.....	19
Hypothesis 2.....	22
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION.....	25
Limitations of the Current Study	32
Conclusion and Implications.....	33
APPENDIX A: TABLES.....	36
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE ESO QUESTIONNAIRE - STUDY 1.....	51
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE MISSION STATEMENT ESO QUESTIONNAIRE – STUDY 2.....	54
APPENDIX D: THE MULITGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE	57
APPENDIX E: CULTURAL ATTITUDES AND CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE	60

APPENDIX F: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY SCALE	62
APPENDIX G: MULTIETHNIC CLIMATE INVENTORY	66
APPENDIX H: MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE – SHORT FORM (M-C SDS)	68
APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	71
APPENDIX J: INFORMED CONSENT	73
APPENDIX K: PARENTAL INFORMED CONSENT FOR MINORS	75
APPENDIX L: ASSENT FORM FOR MINORS	77
APPENDIX M: DEBRIEFING FORM	79
REFERENCES	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Study 1 Means and Standard Deviations of ESO Subscale by Participant Ethnicity	37
Table 2 Study 2 Means and Standard Deviations of Subscale Scores by Ethnicity and Condition	38
Table 3 Intercorrelations among study variables for White in Study 1	39
Table 4 Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans in Study 1	40
Table 5 Intercorrelations ofr study variables for Hispanics in Study 1	41
Table 6 Intercorrelations among study variables for Whites with an African American ESO.....	42
Table 7 Intercorrelations among study variables for Whites with a Hispanic ESO	43
Table 8 Intercorrelations among study variablies for Whites with a White ESO.....	44
Table 9 Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with an African American ESO	45
Table 10 Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with a Hispanic ESO	46
Table 11 Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with a White ESO.....	47
Table 12 Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with an African American ESO	48
Table 13 Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with a Hispanic ESO	49
Table 14 Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with a White ESO	50

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

There have been significant demographic shifts regarding the student body at many college campuses in the United States. These changes have led to an increase in the number of African American, Asian American and Hispanic/Latino/a students attending colleges and universities (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). In 1971, for example, 8.4 percent of undergraduates were African American and 2.8 percent were Hispanic (Trower & Chait, 2002). Today, 11 percent of undergraduates are African American and 8 percent are Hispanic. Further, in 1976, 1.8 percent of undergraduates were Asian American compared to 6 percent today. These demographic changes at universities are the result, in part, of the diversification of the United States, and in part, of several landmark legal decisions allowing universities to proactively recruit and admit ethnic minority students (Niemann & Maruyama, 2005). This practice, often known as “affirmative action,” was implemented originally by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965. Upholding this decision, the Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that affirmative action is necessary in order to facilitate changes in structural diversity in the classrooms and institutions as a whole, as well as integrate a curriculum that fosters the knowledge of diverse groups.

According to the Council on Education (2001), diversity has many virtues on a college campus. Some of these virtues include fostering the examined life, preparing students for citizenship, and enhancing education for economic and scientific progress. The Council on Education also posits that diversity has positive effects on student retention, increases their self-confidence, interpersonal skills and leadership, and most importantly, challenges students to consider alternative viewpoints while developing tolerance for differences of opinion. Previous research has found that an ethnically diverse college setting is associated with positive intellectual and social outcomes. For example, Antonio et al. (2004) found that prolonged contact

with racially diverse others significantly influenced students' ability to analyze situations in more complex ways.

Literature on the ethnic diversification of college campuses has suggested that the nature of race relations on campus represents a microcosm of the racial issues that society faces as a whole (Kent, 1996). Regarding racism, Marcus et al. (2003) found that many college students perceive that prejudice exists on their campus. In their study of 398 students at a southeastern university, the researchers also found that the amount of perceived prejudice varied by gender as well as by ethnicity, with 66 percent of African Americans reporting discrimination compared with 41 percent of Whites. Smith, Roberts, and Smith (1997) report that racism is actually increasing on some college campuses, but that it is more complex and covertly expressed.

One way university administrators have sought to decrease campus racism while maintaining diversity on campuses has been to create and promote racial and ethnic student organizations (ESOs). Another reason for establishing ESOs was to minimize a potential disconnect between some ethnic minority students and the university environment. For example, African American retention rates at predominantly White universities typically are much lower than those at historically African American colleges and universities (Guiffrida, 2003). According to Tinto (1993), college attrition generally is linked to a disconnect between the student and the organization. ESOs are considered venues through which the "disconnect" for some minority students may be bridged.

Student organizations in general have been found to be related to increased skill development and personal growth (Abrahamowicz, 1988). ESOs commonly state specifically that their purpose is to serve as a voice for the ethnic minority, to establish and promote open lines of communication between ethnic minority students and the administration, faculty and staff at the university, and to work with other organizations to provide programming that

promotes a diverse educational atmosphere. According to Guiffrida (2003), in his qualitative study of 88 African American students, involvement in an ESO provides students opportunities for connecting with Black faculty outside the classroom. Establishing working relationships with racially similar faculty has been reported to be important to academic achievement and persistence among African American students.

Not all discussions about ESOs have been favorable. According to Sidanius et al. (2004), much of this previous research on ESOs failed to take into account intergroup attitudes. Sidanius et al. postulate that participation in ESOs may contribute to higher levels of ethnic tension and intergroup bias, as well as add to racial segregation among campuses. Contrary to prior research, Sidanius et al., in their study of one university, also found that there was no indication that these students' experiences in ESOs increased camaraderie with students in other organizations or with the university community as a whole.

Moreover, ESOs have been linked to what some perceive as racism against Whites. At one university, 28.8 percent of Hispanics, 42 percent of Asians, and 60.4 percent of African Americans were members of an ESO (Sidanus et al., 2004). This compares to approximately one percent of Whites who were members of an ESO. White students may have a mixed response to ESOs and separatist cultures (D'Souza, 1991). White students also may be confused because ethnic separatism contrasts distinctly from the message they have received from the university about integration and cultural interaction. Presumably, White students have little desire to establish their own racially-focused organization and may believe that universities are practicing a double standard by supporting ESOs to which Whites are not included or encouraged to belong. As an example, Kent (1996) cites the frustration of a UC Berkley student who claimed that "Being White means...that there are all sorts of tutoring groups and special programs that you can't get into, because you're not a minority" (p. 53).

To possibly complicate this situation, many White students do not see “whiteness” as a racial identity (McIntosh, 1998). According to the findings of Nosek, Banaji and Greenwald (2002), as a group, White Americans express less in-group favoritism than African Americans. This issue becomes even more controversial when considering the possibility of a White culture or club. Moreover, there is some evidence that White Americans experience their own set of racial difficulties. One somewhat dated study examining racial stereotypes among college students found that negative traits were almost exclusively attributed to Whites by the ethnic minority participants (Maykovich, 1971). Another study which examined jury decision-making found that within their mock criminal cases, White defendants were judged to be guilty significantly more than were African American defendants (Shaw & Skolnick, 1995).

Perceptions of Racism

According to the asymmetry theory, racial mistreatment by a dominant person towards a subordinate person will typically be viewed as more racially discriminatory than when the same mistreatment is committed by a subordinate person towards a dominant person (Jefferson & Caldwell, 2002). Jefferson and Caldwell tested the asymmetry theory using a sample of 92 African Americans. The asymmetry in perceptions of discrimination was assessed with vignettes, with half of the vignettes portraying a White individual as the discriminator and half portraying an African American as the discriminator. As the researchers had hypothesized, the asymmetry hypothesis was supported. African Americans perceived the White discriminator as being significantly more prejudiced than the African American discriminator, despite that the vignettes only differed on the race of the discriminator. It was also found that the stronger the African American participants identified with their ethnicity, the more they perceived the White discriminator in the vignette to be prejudiced. This latter finding was consistent with social

identity theory (Taifel & Turner, 1986) that proposes that the more strongly individuals identify with their groups (i.e., in-groups), the more negative bias they demonstrate toward out-groups.

Consistent with the asymmetry hypothesis, the idea of starting a White ESO is viewed generally as unacceptable by many people. An example of this is the case of Lisa McClelland in Oakley, California who began collecting signatures in support of starting a “Caucasian/White Club.” At the high school she attended there was a Black Student Union for African Americans, a Hispanic Unidos for Latin Americans, and an ALOHA club for Asian Americans (Vargas, 2003). McClelland’s vision of the club was to “create a comfortable environment” open to everyone for the purpose of discussing contemporary social issues with an emphasis on European/Caucasian American Heritage. As a result, McClelland was overwhelmed by the media, harassed, and was called a “racist” by other students. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People also publicly opposed the club. Several months later, McClelland transferred to another high school in order to avoid the harassment.

Perceptions of racism have also been linked to racial identity. Sellers and Shelton (2003), in their study of 149 African American college students, found that the amount of perceived discrimination was positively related to ethnic identity, and the most common form of reported prejudice involved more covert and indirect interactions. Supporting this idea, Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey (1999) also found that ethnic identity was related to perceptions of racism. In their rejection-identification model, they postulated that stable, long-term discrimination results in negative well-being, and that membership in minority groups may alleviate some of the negative effects caused by discrimination. Branscombe et al. found that their rejection-identification model was supported and they speculated that perceptions of discrimination may encourage, in a causal way, stronger ethnic identity in order to counteract the negative effects of the discrimination.

The Current Study

Due to the increasing diversification of many college campuses throughout the United States, and in light of real or perceived racial tensions and conflicts that persist on college campuses, it is important to re-examine the role ESOs play on campuses, particularly from the point of view of students. Four questions about students' perceptions and attitudes toward ESOs formed the basis of this study: (1) To what extent do college students believe that ESOs are necessary or beneficial to campus life for students and to the university community? (2) Do college students perceive ESOs to be fair or ethical to students in general? (3) Do college students perceive ESOs to be "racist" and contribute to ethnic separatism on campus? and (4) To what degree do students have an interest in becoming members of ESOs? These four research questions were examined as a function of the ethnicity of the student participants and the ethnic focus of the student organization.

To further explore students' perceptions and attitudes toward ESOs, four variables were measured to determine if they correlate with students' views of the ESOs. The variables were treated as continuous variables and included students' level of ethnic identity, their beliefs about the prevalence of racial tension on college campuses, their level of social responsibility, and their level of ethnocentrism. These four variables were selected for inclusion because they would seem to be associated logically with how students react and think about ESOs. Ethnic identity was defined as a commitment and loyalty to one's own ethnic group. Social responsibility was defined as having a concern for fairness, social equality, and issues of morality. Ethnocentrism referred to having prejudicial attitudes toward other ethnic groups (Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; Jussim, McCauley, & Lee, 1996). Because attitudes of prejudice or ethnocentrism generally are considered socially unacceptable, assessing ethnocentrism in the form of self-reports may be compromised by participants responding to such questions in a socially desirable manner

(Cozby, 2003; Paulhus, 1988). Because of this concern, a measure of social desirability was included in this study so that the response set of social desirability could be at least partially controlled for in the analyses.

Hypotheses

In this study, two formal hypotheses were made. Hypothesis one predicted that students generally will be more accepting of ESOs that focus on ethnic minority groups than an ESO focused on students who are White. This hypothesis was made based on the asymmetry theory of Jefferson and Caldwell (2002); namely, an ESO focused on White students would be viewed as more racist, and thus unacceptable, than an ESO focused on non-White students. The second hypothesis, based on social identity theory, predicted that ethnic identity would correlate with views of ESOs. This prediction was expected to occur in opposite directions based on the ethnicity of the participants. Specifically, for ethnic minority students, ethnic identity was expected to positively correlate with attitudes that ESOs are beneficial/necessary, are fair/ethical, and with students' own interest in joining an ESO; ethnic identity also was expected to correlate negatively with the view that ESOs are "racist" and promote ethnic separatism on campus. In contrast, for White students, ethnic identity was expected to negatively correlate with attitudes that ESOs are beneficial/necessary, are fair/ethical, and with students' own interest in joining an ESO; ethnic identity also was expected to correlate positively with the view that ESOs are "racist" and promote ethnic separatism on campus.

Exploratory Questions

Three additional questions were explored apart from the two formal hypotheses. The questions were: (1) does ethnocentrism—the students' own disinterest or negative views of other ethnic groups— correlate with their views toward ESOs? (2) does having a sense of social responsibility and the importance of equality and fairness correlate with attitudes toward ESOs?

And (3) does the perception of a high prevalence of racial tension on campus correlate with attitudes toward ESOs? These questions were examined in an exploratory manner because little is known about what influences students' perceptions of ESOs and because of the possibility that these variables (i.e., ethnocentrism, social responsibility, and perceptions of racial tension on campus) theoretically may correlate simultaneously in opposite ways with views toward ESOs. For example, students who are relatively ethnocentric may hold favorable views of ESOs if they think of ESOs in terms of their own ethnically-focused ESO; by contrast, ethnocentric students may hold negative views of ESOs if they think of ESOs in terms of ESOs existing to promote the interests of other ethnic groups but not the interests of their own ethnic group. Also, students concerned with social equality and fairness may support ESOs if they believe ESOs promote better racial relations on campus and provide a "voice" for disempowered minorities; by contrast, they may oppose ESOs on grounds that ESOs promote racial separatism or competitiveness. Last, students who believe racial tension is high on campuses may believe that ESOs are necessary to facilitate students' sense of belonging and security on campus; by contrast, they may hold the view that ESOs, in part, contribute to racial tension on campus, and thus oppose their existence.

Overall Study Design

To pursue these questions, this project was divided into two studies. In Study 1, university students responded to questions in reference to their views of ESOs in general. In Study 2, a different sample of university students responded to the same questions after reading an experimental passage that described the ESO mission statement of an ESO specific to a single ethnic group (White, Hispanic, or African American). The questions assessing students' views about ESOs were modified slightly in order to assess their views in reference to the specific ESO presented in the respective mission statement to which they were randomly assigned. The

rationale for dividing this project into two studies—with separate samples of college students—was to obtain students’ views of ESOs in both a descriptive manner and an experimental manner without biasing their responses (e.g., students’ responses to a specific ESO mission statement [as in Study 2] may be biased if they were first required to respond to survey questions about ESOs in general [as in Study 1]).

CHAPTER 2: METHODS

Study 1

Participants

Study 1's sample was composed of 460 (175 male, 277 female, and 7 non-respondent) undergraduate college students enrolled in Psychology courses at a large public university in the southeastern region of the United States. Regarding ethnicity, 309 (67.2%) of the students self-identified as White American, 65 (14.1%) as Hispanic/Latino/a, 44 (9.6%) as African American, and 42 (9.1%) as "other" or non-respondent. Questionnaire packets were distributed to willing participants during Psychology classes, and participants were compensated with academic credit toward their respective courses.

Materials

Demographic questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire was included that assessed students' age, gender, ethnicity, class standing, and parent's educational attainment.

Attitudes Toward Ethnic Student Organizations (ESOs). To assess students' perceptions and attitudes toward ESOs, all students responded to a 12-item questionnaire designed by the present authors (see Appendix A). Three items were designed to assess the respondent's belief that ESOs are necessary or beneficial to campus life for students and to the university community. Three items were designed to assess the respondent's perceptions about whether ESOs are fair or ethical to students. Four items were designed to assess the respondent's perceptions that ESOs are "racist" and contribute to ethnic separatism on campus, and two items were designed to assess the extent to which the respondent has an interest in becoming a member of an ESO. Participants responded to each item by rating the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale. This questionnaire was subjected to an

exploratory factor analysis to evaluate the factorial structure of the questionnaire (discussed below).

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R). The MEIM-R (Roberts et al., 1999) is a 14-item questionnaire designed to assess the degree to which individuals identify with and affirm their ethnic group. Respondents were presented with statements to which they indicate their agreement on a 4-point Likert scale. The overall score was obtained by averaging the item scores. Scores ranged 1 to 4; the higher the score, the more strongly respondents identify with and feel attached to their ethnicity. Subsequent studies to the initial publication of the MEIM support its reliability (typically Cronbach alphas = .80 or higher). Based on the present sample of White, Hispanic, and African American students, the MEIM obtained Cronbach alphas of .57, .46, and .15, respectively, in Study 1 sample, and .73, .71 and .86, respectively, in Study 2 sample.

Perceived Prevalence of Racial Tension on Campus. To assess the degree to which student perceive there to be racial tension present within the university campus, participants responded to six items constituting the Racial Tension subscale of the Cultural Attitudes and Climate Questionnaire (Helm, Sedlacek & Prieto, 1998). Participants responded to each item by rating the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The overall score was obtained by averaging the item scores. Scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores reflecting higher perceptions of the prevalence of racial tension on campus. This subscale has been reported to have a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .73 and to correlate negatively with students' overall satisfaction with their university experience (Helm et al.). Based on the present sample of White, Hispanic, and African American students, this instrument obtained Cronbach alphas of .70, .84, and .79, respectively, in Study 1 sample, and .83, .83 and .80, respectively, in Study 2 sample.

Social Responsibility Scale of the MMPI-II (Re Scale). The Social Responsibility scale of the *MMPI-II* (Gough, McClosky, and Meehl, 1952) is a 30-item, True-False questionnaire assessing concerns for social and moral issues, disapproval of privilege and favor, emphasis on duties and self-discipline, conventionality versus rebelliousness, trust and confidence in the world in general and poise, assurance and personal security. The Re Scale has test-retest coefficients that range from .74 to .85. High Re scale scores indicate the presence of incorporated societal and cultural values and the choice to behave in a manner that is consistent with those values (Graham, 1993). Individuals with high Re scale scores place high value on honesty and justice and are often confident and secure. Based on the present sample of White, Hispanic, and African American students, the Re Scale obtained Cronbach alphas of .64, .28, and .44, respectively, in Study 1 sample, and .42, .27 and .52, respectively, in Study 2 sample.

Multiethnic Climate Inventory (MCI). To assess students' level of ethnocentrism, they responded to 10 items from The Multiethnic Climate Inventory (Johnson & Johnson, 1996) using a 5-point Likert scale response format. The 10 items making up the subscales *cultural encapsulation* (a desire to associate only with members of one's own race or ethnic group) and *cultural hostility* (a dislike for those belonging to dissimilar ethnic groups) were used in this study because they appear to conjointly measure the construct of ethnocentrism. The MCI was considered an appropriate scale for measuring ethnocentrism because only a handful of instruments exist that attempt to measure ethnocentrism or prejudice. Moreover, they typically only measure Whites' prejudice toward nonWhites—usually African Americans. In contrast, the MCI was written in a way that makes the scale appropriate for individuals irrespective of their race or ethnicity, and was worded to assess prejudice against no single group in particular. The Cronbach reliability alphas of the MCI are reported to be .77 for the overall test; the reliability for the first two subscales are .77 and .71, respectively. Based on the present sample of White,

Hispanic, and African American students, the combined score of these two subscales obtained Cronbach alphas of .75, .69, and .84, respectively, in Study 1 sample, and .87, .81 and .78, respectively, in Study 2 sample.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale – Short Form (M-C SDS) The M-C SDS is a 13-item abbreviated version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). The scale is designed to measure attempts by participants to be perceived in a positive manner. Based on the present sample of White, Hispanic, and African American students, the M-C SDS obtained Cronbach alphas of .68, .68, and .77, respectively, in Study 1 sample, and .66, .73, and .69, respectively, in Study 2 sample.

Procedure

Data collection sessions occurred in multiple Psychology classes and lasted approximately a half an hour in length. Each participant was provided with a consent form at the beginning of the session and was then given a packet of questionnaires. During the session, the experimenters were available to answer questions regarding the questionnaires or study. After the data collection session ended, participants were given a debriefing sheet explaining the purpose of the study.

Study 2

Participants

Study 2's sample was composed of 631 (208 male, 420 female, and 3 non-respondent) undergraduate college students enrolled in Psychology courses at the same university as in Study 1. Regarding ethnicity, 433 (68.6%) of the students self-identified as White American, 85 (13.5%) as Hispanic/Latino/a, 54 (8.6%) as African American, and 59 (9.4%) as "other" or non-respondent. Questionnaire packets were distributed to willing participants during Psychology classes, and participants were compensated with academic credit toward their respective courses.

Materials

All participants completed the same set of questionnaires used in Study 1 (reported above) with two exceptions. Prior to completing the set of questionnaires, students in Study 2 read a paragraph containing the mission statement of an ethnically specific ESO (Appendix B shows the mission statement for the African American condition). The mission statement was taken from the actual mission statement of an ESO at the university where this study took place. The mission statement was held constant except for the ethnic focus of the organization, which was varied between focusing on Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans (each student was randomly assigned to participate in one condition only and thus read only one mission statement about an ESO that focused on a specific ethnic group). The other exception to the set of questionnaires is in relation to the 12-item questionnaire assessing students' attitudes toward ESOs. The questionnaire that required students to respond to statements about ESOs in general was modified so that students responded to the same statements, but in reference to the specific ESO that was indicated in their experimental mission statement. As an example, the statement "Ethnic student organizations are beneficial to their student members" was changed to "This student organization is beneficial to its student members."

Procedure and Study Design

The study design for Study 2 was a 3 (participant ethnicity) x 3 (student organization ethnicity) between-subjects design. Inadequate sample sizes were obtained for Asians and other ethnic groups; thus, although students from all ethnic groups were permitted to participate in Study 2, data only from Whites, Hispanics and African Americans were included for analysis. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (i.e., a White ESO, an Hispanic ESO, or an African American ESO), representing a mixed experimental design via an analog format.

Data collection sessions occurred in multiple Psychology classes, and lasted approximately a half an hour in length. Each participant was provided with a consent form at the beginning of the session, followed by a packet of questionnaires. During the session, the experimenters were available to answer questions regarding the questionnaires or study. After the data collection session ended, participants were given a debriefing sheet explaining the purpose of the study.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Factor Analysis

Study 1

Prior to analyzing the data for the study questions, it was necessary to conduct an exploratory factor analysis on the responses to perceptions of ESOs questionnaire separately for study 1 and study 2 data, using SPSS Windows 13.0. Using data from study 1, this analysis was based on responses from 452 students. For all analyses, an alpha level of .05 was set unless otherwise indicated. The data were screened for normality (e.g., skewness & kurtosis), outliers, multivariate outliers and multicollinearity. No significant deviations were found. A principal components extraction was conducted on the 12 items and yielded three components (using Kaiser criterion of Eigenvalue > 1 for truncation). The three components together accounted for 57.97% of the variance. The unrotated solution was subject to an orthogonal VARIMAX rotation.

Because several of the items loaded fairly equally on more than one component (e.g. item 7 loaded .50 on component 1 and -.41 on component 2), a decision was made to group the items in accordance to their conceptual development in order to address this study's specific research questions. According to this conceptual grouping, perceptions of ESOs were composed of four subscales. The first, which includes items 1 – 3, formed the beneficial/necessary subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .76, .74, .82 and .68 for all ethnicities together, Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans, respectively). The second, which includes items 4 - 6, formed the fair/ethical/acceptable subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .61, .76, .70 and .00 for all ethnicities together, Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans, respectively). The third, which includes items 7-10, formed the racist subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .50, .86, .37 and .73 for all ethnicities

together, Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans, respectively). The last, which includes items 11-12, formed the interest in joining subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .91, .44, .92 and .77 for all ethnicities together Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans respectively). Due to the low reliability of the ethical/fair/acceptable subscale for African American participants, data from the subscale were not included in the analyses for study 1. The remaining three subscales (beneficial/necessary, racist, interest in joining) served as the dependent variables in all subsequent analyses related to Study 1.

Study 2

A separate exploratory factor analysis was performed on the responses to perceptions of ESOs questionnaire with study 2 data, using SPSS Windows 13.0. This analysis was based on questionnaires from 631 students. For all analyses, an alpha level of .05 was set unless otherwise indicated. The data were screened for normality (e.g., skewness & kurtosis), outliers, multivariate outliers and multicollinearity. No significant deviations were found. A principal components extraction was conducted on 12 items and yielded two components (using Kaiser criterion of Eigenvalue > 1 for truncation). The two components together accounted for 55.09 % of the variance. The unrotated solution was subject to an orthogonal VARIMAX rotation.

As with study 1 data, because several of the items loaded fairly equally on more than one component (e.g. item 2 loaded -.43 on component 1 and .69 on component 2), items were grouped in accordance to their conceptual development in order to address the study's specific research questions. According to this conceptual grouping, perceptions of ESOs were composed of the same four subscales delineated for study 1. The first, which includes items 1 – 3, formed the beneficial/necessary subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .75, .68, and .64 for White, Hispanic, and African American mission statements, respectively). The second, which includes items 4- 6, formed the fair/ethical/acceptable subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .85, .77, and .78, for White,

Hispanic, and African American mission statements, respectively) The third, which includes items 7-10, formed the racist subscale (Cronbach's alpha = .75, .81, and .77 for White, Hispanic, and African American mission statements, respectively). The last, which includes items 11-12, formed the interest in joining subscale. This scale was deemed irrelevant for study 2 given the low likelihood of participants wishing to join an ESO that does not pertain to their ethnic group. Consequently, data from the interest in joining subscale were not used in study 2 analyses.

Students' General Perceptions of ESOs

The impact of student ethnicity on perceptions of the ESOs in general was evaluated using a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). This analysis was conducted using data from study 1. The independent variable (IV) was participant ethnicity. The dependent variables (DVs) were the three ESO subscales (beneficial/necessary, racist, and interest in joining). Scores from the MCSDS were used as a covariate in the model in order to control for socially desirable responding. Post hoc analyses were done by a series of analysis of covariance (ANCOVAs), covarying for social desirability when comparing participant ethnicities on each ESO Subscale. To control for Type I error due to multiple comparisons, a Bonferoni adjustment was made to the alpha level for 9 total comparisons. The new alpha level is .006 (.05/9).

Participant ethnicity was significantly associated with an effect on the students' views of the ESOs in general (using Wilks' Lambda, $F [6, 796] = 21.94, p < .001; \eta^2 = .14$). Participant ethnicity was significantly associated with an effect on the beneficial/necessary subscale ($F [2, 400] = 16.44, p < .001; \eta^2 = .076$). Post hoc analyses revealed that White students significantly differed from Hispanic students ($F [2,364] = 10.09, p < .006$) and African American students ($F [2,344] = 17.00, p < .0005$), but that the latter two groups did not significantly differ from each other ($F [2,105] = 3.66, p > .006$). White students ($M = 14.95; SD = 2.99$) rated ESOs as significantly less beneficial and necessary than did Hispanic ($M = 16.40; SD = 3.91$) and African

American students ($M = 17.70$; $SD = 2.95$). The MANCOVA also revealed a significant main effect for participant ethnicity on the racist subscale ($F [2, 400] = 14.49, p < .001; \eta^2 = .068$). Post hoc analyses revealed that White students significantly differed from Hispanic students ($F [2, 359] = 10.60, p < .006$) and African American students ($F [2, 341] = 22.41, p < .006$), but the two latter groups did not significantly differ from each other ($F [2, 103] = 2.69, p > .006$). Overall, White students perceived ESOs as significantly more racist ($M = 13.65$; $SD = 4.36$) than Hispanic students ($M = 11.61$; $SD = 4.06$) and African American ($M = 10.14$; $SD = 4.12$). Last, the MANCOVA revealed a significant main effect for participant ethnicity on the interest in joining subscale ($F [2, 400] = 70.00, p < .001; \eta^2 = .26$). Pos hoc analyses revealed that White students significantly differed from Hispanic students ($F [2, 362] = 63.83, p < .006$) and African American students ($F [2, 342] = 116.51, p < .006$), but the latter two groups did not significantly differ from each other ($F [2, 105] = 5.58, p > .006$). White students were significantly less interested in joining an ESO ($M = 6.03$; $SD = 2.94$) compared to Hispanic ($M = 9.48$; $SD = 4.00$) and African American students ($M = 11.32$; $SD = 3.25$). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations on the three ESO questions by student ethnicity.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis one predicted that students generally would be more accepting of ESOs that focus on ethnic minority groups than an ESO focused on students who are White. To test this hypothesis, a 3 x 3 MANCOVA was conducted on study 2 data, testing the impact of participant ethnicity (White, Hispanic, African American) and the ethnicity of the ESO (White, Hispanic, African American) on perceptions of the ESOs. MCSDS scores were used as a covariate in order to control for socially desirable responding. Post hoc analyses were done by a series of ANCOVAs, covarying for social desirability for comparing participant ethnicities or condition on each ESO subscale. To control for Type I error due to multiple comparisons, a Bonferoni

adjustment was made to the alpha level for 9 total comparisons. The new alpha level is .006 (.05/9). Only data from study 2 were used to test this hypothesis.

The MANCOVA did not reveal a significant multivariate effect for participant ethnicity ($F [6, 1094] = 1.64, p > .05$). Participants' ethnicity was not associated significantly with an effect on the perceptions of ESOs being beneficial and necessary ($F [2, 549] = 1.52, p > .05$), acceptable, fair and ethical ($F [2,549] = .084, p > .05$), or racist ($F [2, 549] = 2.71, p > .05$).

The MANCOVA revealed a significant multivariate effect for ethnicity of the ESO ($F [6, 1094] = 19.26, p < .001; \eta^2 = .096$). In addition, all three subscales were significant. On perceptions of the benefit and necessity of ESOs ($F [2, 549] = 53.85, p < .001; \eta^2 = .164$), post hoc analyses revealed that the White ESO significantly differed from the Hispanic ESO ($F [2, 405] = 53.50, p < .006$) and the African American ESO ($F [2, 420] = 73.21, p < .006$), but perceptions of the benefits and necessity of the latter two ESOs did not significantly differ from each other ($F [2, 398] = 1.95, p > .006$). The White ESO was perceived as significantly less beneficial and necessary ($M = 12.42; SD = 3.77$) than the Hispanic ESO ($M = 14.84; SD = 3.08$) and the African American ESO ($M = 15.28; SD = 2.98$). On perceptions of the ethics, acceptability and fairness of the ESOs ($F [2, 549] = 28.93, p < .001; \eta^2 = .095$), post hoc analyses revealed that the White ESO was perceived significantly differently than the Hispanic ESO ($F [2, 405] = 41.93, p < .006$) and the African American ESO ($F [2, 420] = 26.41, p < .006$); perceptions of the ethicality and fairness of the latter two ESOs did not significantly differ ($F [2, 398] = 1.97, p > .006$). The White ESO ($M = 14.15; SD = 4.31$) was perceived as significantly less ethical, fair, and acceptable compared to the Hispanic ($M = 16.81; SD = 3.20$) and African American ($M = 16.22; SD = 3.29$) ESOs. On perceptions of the racism of the ESOs ($F [2, 549] = 26.28, p < .001; \eta^2 = .087$), post hoc analyses revealed that the White ESO significantly differed from the Hispanic ESO ($F [2, 403] = 31.50, p < .006$) and the African American ESO ($F [2, 418]$

= 28.18, $p < .006$). The perceived level of racism of the latter two ESOs did not significantly differ ($F [2, 398] = .367, p > .006$). The White ESO was perceived as significantly more racist ($M = 15.31; SD = 5.46$) than the Hispanic ($M = 12.43; SD = 4.86$) and the African American ESOs ($M = 12.81; SD = 4.40$).

The MANCOVA also revealed a significant interaction effect between participant ethnicity and ethnicity of the ESO ($F [12, 1447.52] = 2.96, p < .001; \eta^2 = .021$). The effect of participant ethnicity on perceptions of benefit and necessity of ESOs depended on the ESO condition ($F [4, 549] = 7.78, p < .001; \eta^2 = .054$). Visual inspection of the graph shows that although all three ethnic groups rated the White ESO as less beneficial and necessary than the other two ESOs, there was less of a difference in perceived benefit and necessity of ESOs for White participants (African American ESO $M = 14.84, SD = 2.85$; Hispanic ESO $M = 14.57, SD = 2.95$; White ESO $M = 12.87, SD = 3.94$) than there was for Hispanic participants (African American ESO $M = 16.00, SD = 2.59$; Hispanic ESO ($M = 16.08, SD = 3.37$; White ESO $M = 14.63, SD = 3.61$) and African American participants (African American ESO $M = 18.58, SD = 3.09$; Hispanic ESO $M = 15.17, SD = 3.26$; White ESO $M = 13.98, SD = 4.38$). That is, White participants generally rated all ESOs as relatively unacceptable, whereas Hispanic participants and African American participants were conspicuously more accepting of non-White ESOs than White ESOs.

The effect of participant ethnicity on perceptions of ethics, acceptability and fairness of the ESOs also depended on the ESO condition ($F [4, 549] = 3.89, p < .005; \eta^2 = .028$). Visual inspection of the graph revealed that, again, although the White ESO was perceived as the least ethical, fair and acceptable by all three ethnic groups of students, the differences in perception of the acceptability, fairness and ethicality of the ESOs across the ESO conditions were smaller for White participants (African American ESO $M = 16.01, SD = 3.37$; Hispanic ESO $M = 16.59, SD$

= 3.25; White ESO $M = 14.55$, $SD = 4.29$) than it was for Hispanic participants (African American ESO $M = 16.29$, $SD = 2.96$; Hispanic ESO $M = 18.04$, $SD = 2.47$; White ESO $M = 13.27$, $SD = 4.41$) and African American participants (African American ESO $M = 18.50$, $SD = 2.32$; Hispanic ESO $M = 16.67$, $SD = 3.46$; White ESO $M = 12.83$, $SD = 4.09$). In addition, African American and Hispanic participants rated their own ESO as more acceptable, fair and ethical than they did the other ESOs.

The effect of participant ethnicity on perceptions of racism also was dependent on the ESO condition ($F [4, 549] = 4.92$, $p < .005$; $\eta^2 = .035$). Visual inspection of the graph revealed that the White ESO was perceived as the most racist by all three ethnic groups. However, White students viewed the level of racism of the ESOs more consistently across ethnic conditions (African American ESO $M = 13.35$, $SD = 4.08$; Hispanic ESO $M = 12.97$, $SD = 4.77$; White ESO $M = 14.93$, $SD = 5.46$) than did African American students (African American ESO $M = 8.67$, $SD = 4.12$; Hispanic ESO $M = 11.78$, $SD = 5.57$; White ESO $M = 15.75$, $SD = 5.43$) and Hispanic students (African American ESO $M = 11.90$, $SD = 4.98$; Hispanic ESO $M = 10.00$, $SD = 4.16$; White ESO $M = 15.31$, $SD = 5.46$). In addition, African American and Hispanic students rated the ESO of their own ethnicity as the least racist. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the ESO questions by student ethnicity and the ethnicity of the ESO

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis predicted that ethnic identity would correlate with views of ESOs. This prediction was expected to occur in opposite directions based on the ethnicity of the participants. To examine the relative contribution of ethnic identity in the prediction of the three subscales measuring the perceptions of ESOs (beneficial and necessary, racist, interest in joining), multiple regression analyses were performed separately by participant ethnicity for each of the three ESO subscales. Predictor variables included ethnic identity (as measured by the

MEIM total score), ethnocentrism (as measured by the MCI total score), perceptions of campus climate (as assessed by the CACQ total score) and social responsibility (as measured by the Re-Scale of the MMPI-II total score). Data from Study 1 were used to test this hypothesis.

White participants

The four variables significantly predicted White students' perceptions regarding how beneficial and necessary ESOs are ($R^2 = .036$, $F [4, 283] = 2.64$, $p < .05$). Ethnic identity was the only predictor variable that reached statistical significance ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$). The more Whites embraced their ethnic identity, the more they believed ESOs were beneficial and necessary.

The four variables significantly predicted White students' perceptions that ESOs are racist ($R^2 = .054$, $F [4, 283] = 3.91$, $p < .005$). Perceptions of campus racial climate, ethnocentrism, and ethnic identity reached statistical significance (β s = .12, .13, .12, respectively; p s < .05). The more Whites perceived there to be racial tension on campus, and the more ethnocentric and embracing they were of their ethnic identity, the more they viewed ESOs to be racist.

The four variables significantly predicted White students' interest in joining an ESO ($R^2 = .054$, $F [4, 281] = 4.16$, $p < .005$). Ethnocentrism and ethnic identity reached statistical significance (β s = -.15, .20, respectively; p s < .05). The less Whites were ethnocentric and the more they embraced their ethnic identity, the more interest they had in joining ESOs.

Hispanic participants

The four variables significantly predicted Hispanic students' perceptions regarding how beneficial and necessary ESOs are ($R^2 = .20$, $F [4, 59] = 3.43$, $p < .05$). Ethnic identity was the only predictor variable that reached statistical significance ($\beta = .36$, $p < .05$). The more Hispanics embraced their ethnic identity, the more they believed ESOs were beneficial and necessary.

The four variables significantly predicted Hispanic students' perceptions that ESOs are racist ($R^2 = .25$, $F [4, 57] = 4.35$, $p < .005$). Ethnocentrism and ethnic identity reached statistical significance ($\beta s = .32, -.37$, respectively; $ps < .05$). The more ethnocentric and less embracing of their identity they were, the more they viewed ESOs to be racist.

The four variables significantly predicted Hispanic students' interest in joining an ESO ($R^2 = .29$, $F [4, 59] = 5.71$, $p < .05$). Ethnic identity and social responsibility reached statistical significance ($\beta s = .38, .33$, respectively; $ps < .05$). The more Hispanics embraced their ethnic identity and were socially responsible, the more interest they had in joining an ESO.

African American participants

Altogether, the four variables did not significantly predict African American students' perceptions regarding how beneficial and necessary ESOs are ($R^2 = .097$, $F [4, 41] = .99$, $p > .05$). No single predictor reached statistical significance ($ps > .05$).

The four variables did not significantly predict African American students' perceptions that ESOs are racist ($R^2 = .023$, $F [4, 41] = .21$, $p > .05$). No single predictors reached statistical significance ($ps > .05$).

The four variables significantly predicted African American students' interest in joining an ESO ($R^2 = .23$, $F [4, 41] = 2.77$, $p < .05$). Ethnic identity was the only predictor variable that reached significance ($\beta = .45$; $p < .05$). The more African Americans identified with their ethnicity, the more interest they had in joining an ESO.

Bi-variate zero-order Pearson correlations for the measured variables are shown in Table 3 – 5 based on Study 1 data, and in Table 6 – 14 based on Study 2 data.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

Due to the increasing diversification of many college campuses throughout the United States, and in light of real or perceived racial tensions and conflicts that persist on college campuses, the purpose of this study was to examine multiethnic college students' attitudes toward ESOs. Due to sample size restraints, Whites, Hispanics/Latinos/as, and African Americans were the ethnic groups of focus in this study. Toward this goal, this investigation was divided into two separate studies. In study 1, students were asked questions in reference to ESOs in a general way; that is, no mention of any specific ethnically-focused ESO was referred to in the questions. In study 2, an independent sample of students was randomly assigned to read a mission statement for a specific ethnically-focused ESO (White, Hispanic, or African American) and was required to respond to a similar set of questions as in study 1, with the exception that the questions were directly in reference to the ethnically-focused ESO mission statement to which students had been assigned.

As a starting point for examining students' general views of ESOs, an analysis using study 1 data was conducted to compare the three ethnic groups' attitudes toward ESOs with respect to whether they believed ESOs were beneficial and necessary, were racist in nature, and in reference to their interest in joining an ESO (the questions of whether ESOs were fair and ethical were discarded from study 1 due to low reliability). The results indicated that, on average, Hispanic and African American students did not differ in their perceptions of ESOs, but differed significantly from the perceptions of ESOs held by White students. As a group, White students viewed ESOs to be significantly less beneficial and necessary, and more racist than did Hispanic and African American students. Whites also expressed significantly less interest in joining an ESO compared to Hispanics and African Americans.

These results add to the scant amount of literature on ESOs by providing empirical evidence of how university students from the three largest ethnic groups in the United States perceive ESOs on three dimensions. Hispanic and African American students generally were positive in their appraisal of ESOs, presumably because ESOs in general are promoted as serving the needs of ethnic minority students on campus, such as enhancing their ethnic identity, offering social support, and helping them feel connected to the larger university community (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999). By contrast, White students did not perceive ESOs in such a positive light, expressing less belief in the utility of ESOs and more belief that ESOs have racist intentions. Because White students likely hold the view that ESOs do not exist to serve their needs, they expressed relatively little interest in becoming a member of an ESO.

Despite those findings across ethnic groups in regards to ESOs in general, it was hypothesized that students generally would be more accepting of ESOs that focus on ethnic minority groups than an ESO focused on students who are White. This hypothesis was made based on the asymmetry theory of Jefferson and Caldwell (2002); namely, an ESO focused on White students should be viewed as more racist, and thus unacceptable, than an ESO focused on non-White students. This hypothesis was tested using data from study 2, and the results supported the hypothesis. It was found that the ethnicity of the ESO and the interaction between the ethnicity of the ESO and the participants' ethnicity significantly affected perceptions of ESOs. The White ESO was perceived as less beneficial/necessary, less acceptable/ethical/fair, and more racist than were the Hispanic and African American ESOs. These results occurred despite that each of the three ESO mission statements reported the same information about the respective ESO. Results also showed that students' perceptions of the Hispanic and African American ESOs did not differ significantly.

These results reflect students' perceptions that may have been shaped by the unique sociopolitical history of the United States in which African Americans and Hispanics have been historical targets of racial discrimination. As a result, many students—including White students—appear to accept the establishment of ESOs specifically focused on ethnic minorities as a means of facilitating ethnic minority students' camaraderie and sense of belonging on campus. Moreover, it is believed by some that ESOs help ethnic minority students maintain their identity as a member of an ethnic group and help shield them from potential discrimination by what is typically a White dominated university environment (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Moran, Yengo, & Algier, 1994). Consistent with the asymmetry hypothesis, Whites are not typically viewed as targets of racial discrimination, and thus ought not to form White ESOs. If a White ESO were to be founded, the organization and its members likely would be perceived by many (including fellow Whites) as advancing their dominance and potential for discriminating against minority group members.

In the context of the first hypothesis, an interaction effect also was found between participant ethnicity and the ethnicity of the ESO. One observed trend was that the White ESO was perceived the most negatively by all three groups of students. Visual inspection of the data also showed that, although all ethnic groups—including Whites—perceived their own ESO the least negatively, Hispanic and African American students viewed their own ESO as significantly less racist than they did the other ESOs. Taken together, and particularly the latter finding among Hispanic and African American students, these findings arguably reflect ethnocentrism among all three ethnic groups. Namely, all three groups of students, and particularly Hispanic and African American students, perceived their own ESO in a more positive light than how they perceived the ESOs of other ethnic groups.

The asymmetry hypothesis represents a paradox in contemporary United States. The country as a whole promotes equality, diversity, and anti-racism. Yet, on many college campuses, a double-standard exists fostering the acceptance of ethnic minority ESOs while discouraging the formation of a White ESO both officially and informally.

Three important findings related to students' views on ESOs were revealed from the analyses related to the first hypothesis. One, university students across all three ethnic groups were more favorable toward their own ESO more than they were toward other ESOs. As others have argued (e.g., D'Souza, 1991) and consistent with previous empirical studies (e.g., Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Sidanius et al., 2004), this suggests that ESOs to some degree either tap into individuals' previously existing ethnocentrism or ultimately promote in-group bias; either phenomenon theoretically may contribute to both ethnic tension and separatism on campus.

Two, compared to Hispanic and African American students, White students tended to be more consistent in their views of ESOs irrespective of the ESO's ethnic focus, particularly in regards to the racist nature perceived to be equated with each ESO. Hispanic and African American students viewed other ESOs as more racist than their own. This finding becomes more curious considering that each ethnic minority group viewed the other ethnic minority group's ESO as more racist than its own, a finding that was most pronounced among African American students. This raises some important questions about how ethnic minority students perceive themselves in the presence of other ethnic groups on a multi-ethnic university campus. Do ethnic minority students feel threatened by the presence of other ethnic minority groups on campus, particularly African Americans who increasingly are being outpaced by the presence of Hispanics/Latinos/as both on college campuses and across the nation? Do African Americans, who may consider themselves as the original champions of civil rights, feel a sense of

entitlement with respect to being able to have an exclusive right to form an ESO dedicated to their cultural group? Unfortunately, these data do not shed light on these important questions.

Third, possibly overlooked among the data is the amount of variation that existed among all three ethnic groups regarding their views of ESOs. Observation of the standard deviations of the scores on the 12-item questionnaire about perceptions of ESOs suggests some variability in perceptions of ESOs among students irrespective of ethnicity, including the existence of scores reflecting a range of pro-, neutral, and anti-ESO attitudes.

The second hypothesis, based on social identity theory, predicted that ethnic identity would correlate with views of ESOs. This prediction was expected to occur in opposite directions based on the participants' ethnicity. Specifically, for ethnic minority students, ethnic identity was expected to correlate positively with attitudes that ESOs are beneficial/necessary, and with the students' own interest in joining an ESO. Ethnic identity among ethnic minority students also was expected to correlate negatively with the view that ESOs are "racist" and promote ethnic separatism on campus. By contrast, for White students, ethnic identity was expected to correlate negatively with attitudes that ESOs are beneficial/necessary and with their own interest in joining an ESO. Ethnic identity was expected to correlate positively with the view that ESOs are "racist" and promote ethnic separatism on campus. This hypothesis was tested with data from study 1, whereby students were questioned about their views of ESOs in general. This presumes that all three ethnic groups likely were responding to minority-focused ESOs, given that virtually all ESOs on college campuses are focused on ethnic minority groups.

The hypothesis was fully supported for Hispanics, but only partially supported for African Americans and Whites. For Hispanic students, ethnic identity positively correlated with their views that ESOs are beneficial/necessary, negatively correlated with their views of ESOs being racist, and positively correlated with their desire to join an ESO. For African American

students, ethnic identity correlated positively with their interest in joining an ESO, and among White students, ethnic identity positively correlated with their perceptions of ESOs being racist. Ethnic identity did not correlate significantly (in either direction) with African Americans' views of how beneficial or racist ESOs are, and contrary to prediction, among Whites, ethnic identity correlated positively with their views of ESOs being beneficial and with their interest in joining an ESO.

The findings with Hispanic students were in line with social identity theory; namely, the more Hispanics identified with their ethnic group, the more favorably they viewed ESOs and the more they expressed interest in joining an (presumably Hispanic) ESO. The findings for African American and White students were mixed and somewhat perplexing. African Americans who identified more strongly with their ethnic group expressed more interest in joining an (presumably African American) ESO, and Whites who identified more strongly with their ethnic group expressed less interest in joining an (presumably ethnic minority) ESO. The remaining findings related to these two ethnic groups are challenging to explain and only speculative interpretations may be entertained.

Previous research has found that African Americans, as a group, tend to embrace their ethnic identity more than other ethnic groups (e.g., Negy, Shreve, Jensen, & Uddin, 2003). It may be the case that African Americans' commitment to their ethnic identity is relatively strong and relatively independent of other behaviors and attitudes. In a similar way, African Americans' views of (presumably African American) ESOs may also be relatively strong and independent of other attitudes. This may explain why their ethnic identity was unrelated to their views of ESOs being beneficial or racist. It bears noting that on the ethnic identity scale (MEIM), the data from African Americans in study 1 had unacceptable reliability, which may best explain why ethnic identity did not significantly correlate with their views on ESOs. For White students,

the fact that those with stronger ethnic identities tended to view ESOs as racist, yet beneficial and necessary, possibly reflect mixed feelings among Whites about (presumably ethnic minority) ESOs. Whites may, for example, generally view ethnic minority ESOs as racist in principle, but simultaneously recognize their importance to ethnic minorities vis-à-vis the country's historical and on-going problems with discrimination against ethnic minorities. The observed correlation between White's ethnic identity and their interest in joining an ESO is more difficult to explain and raises questions about the presumption made related to study 1 questions about ESOs. Specifically, given that ESOs on college campuses across the country are typically established for ethnic minorities exclusively, it is assumed that all students in study 1 also had assumed that the questions posed to them about ESOs were in reference to ethnic minority ESOs. This last finding with White students may call that assumption into question.

In addition to ethnic identity, ethnocentrism, attitudes about the cultural climate on campus, and social responsibility were examined in relation to ESOs. Among Hispanic and White students, the more ethnocentric they were, the more they viewed ESOs as being racist. Also, the more Whites were ethnocentric, the less interest they expressed in joining an ESO. In contrast, African American students' level of ethnocentrism did not correlate with any of their views of ESOs. Traditionally, African American ESOs have been the most prevalent on many college campuses given that African Americans have been the largest and most visible ethnic minority in the nation until recently (U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000; 2004). As indicated previously, it may be that African Americans generally view the sanctity of ESOs rather consistently, irrespective of their attitudes on other dimensions. Hispanics and White who are relatively high on the construct of ethnocentrism may view ESOs with skepticism, feeling that most ESOs do not have their interest in mind.

Only for White students did perceptions of the campus climate with respect to racial tension correlate positively with their views that ESOs were racist. The more they believed the racial relations on campus were problematic, the more they believed ESOs were racist. It is tempting to speculate that White students may believe ESOs to some degree are responsible for causing racial tension on campus. However, because of the correlational nature of these data, it is impossible to know that with certainty. What is certain was the absence of a relation between perceptions of racial tension on campus and ESOs being racist among Hispanic and African American students. Naturally, Whites, on average, would be expected to link ESOs with racial tension on campus more so than ethnic minorities for whom ESOs purportedly exist for their best interest in multiple ways.

Social responsibility only correlated with Hispanic's interest in joining an ESO. The higher Hispanic students scored on a measure of social responsibility, the higher interest they expressed in joining an ESO. As indicated earlier, the African Americans' approach to ESOs was generally favorable, whereas the White students' approach to ESOs was generally less favorable. Hispanic students' approach to ESOs tended to fall in between the other two ethnic groups' views. Hispanics who have an elevated social conscience may feel that ESOs are necessary to combat negative ethnic relations on campus and are beneficial for promoting and maintaining their ethnic heritage in light of the ever-present dominant (White) culture.

Limitations of the Current Study

Because study 2 was based on the experimental analog method which included randomly assigning participants to various conditions, the ability to attribute some of the outcomes to the variables that were experimentally manipulated was maximized (Lopez et al., 1993). Nonetheless, analog studies have limitations. Despite taking into consideration socially desirable

response patterns, the extent to which the beliefs that are expressed in analog scenarios translate into real-world situations remains uncertain.

Also, the reliability of some of the measures were either unacceptable (e.g., the fair and ethical questions about ESOs based on study 1 data, and the ethnic identity [MEIM] scale for African Americans in study 1) or marginally acceptable (e.g., the MEIM scale for Whites and Hispanics in study 1, and the social responsibility scale for study 1 and 2). Interpretation of the findings related to these measures must be done with caution given their lack of adequate or acceptable reliability.

Conclusion and Implications

In all likelihood, ESOs serve a valuable purpose on university campuses. They represent structured, university-sanctioned organizations for ethnic minority students whereby their members (and presumably students from other ethnic groups if they wish) may join, learn more about their cultural heritage and contributions to society, and have their ethnic identity reinforced. Members may also attain some sense of “safety” from either the dominant or other competing ethnic groups, and attain a sense of belonging at their respective university. In conjunction with ESOs, student counseling centers commonly offer “outreach programs” as a means of extending the university’s hand to diverse students with the goal of demonstrating the university’s commitment to creating a welcoming atmosphere that fosters the educational, intellectual, and emotional growth of students from historically under-represented backgrounds.

These goals and endeavors are laudable, but perhaps, as the data reported herein suggest, the manner in which ESOs have been implemented seem to leave a lot to be desired. Specifically, some ethnic minority students have their own reservations or ambivalence about the merits of ESOs. This was evidenced by the mixed and occasionally inconsistent findings among the current samples of ethnic minority students—particularly Hispanic students—about the

utility of ESOs and their interest in joining an ESO. This also was evidenced by various reactions of White students toward ESOs, whereby some Whites appeared to have viewed ESOs simultaneously as racist and beneficial, and even had some interest in joining an ESO.

At present, these findings conjointly point to a dilemma inherent to the existence of ESOs on college campuses. ESOs are perceived by many as serving myriad purposes, yet simultaneously are perceived by some (even by some non-White students) as being racist and fostering to some degree racial separatism on campus. This situation has been created by a confluence of variables, such as historical and on-going racism committed by Whites, unacknowledged racism (or at least “ethnic chauvinism”) on the part of non-Whites, good intentions of university administrators, White guilt, and so on. It remains to be seen if a viable solution is available for this dilemma. It is recommended, however, in light of these findings, that it may be time for university administrators to revisit their approach to having ESOs on campus.

For example, university committees involved in the establishment and maintenance of ESOs may consider holding focus groups made up of students and professors from diverse ethnic groups, including White students and professors, for the purpose of re-examining the mission, the pros and cons, and the generally unacknowledged consequences of ESOs (namely, White resentment and perhaps increased, rather than decreased, racial division on campus). Based on the collective feedback, those responsible for ESOs may discover ways to maintain ESOs while minimizing the adverse reactions they possibly create. Another example is the establishment of a multi-ethnic student organization whose overt mission is to attract students interested in joining an ethnically diverse but unified organization for the purpose of eradicating walls that divide students along ethnic lines. Such an organization may be an attractive alternative for students

who envision a truly multicultural society in which multiple ethnic groups join hands in the pursuit of common goals.

Finally, a challenge for university administrators is to grapple with the current double-standard that exists both within administration and among the student body; namely, that ethnic minority ESOs are sanctioned while White ESOs are prohibited. Many Whites are acutely aware of this double-standard and some Whites strongly resent it (see Myers, Negy, & Meehan [2005] for a discussion of this). In the end, universities—as well as the country as a whole—may have to decide either to celebrate all ethnic cultures, including White culture, or detach themselves altogether from the enterprise of promoting ethnic cultures. As university demographics parallel contemporary America's demographics with respect to increased diversification, it may prove too difficult to continue the current path of having it both ways (that is, celebrating and promoting ethnic minority cultures while ignoring and opposing the celebration and promotion of White culture). It is hoped that this investigation and the ideas reported herein stimulate increased and novel discussions about the wisdom and prospective roles of having ESOs on college campuses.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1
 Study 1 Means and Standard Deviations of ESO Subscale by Participant Ethnicity

		<u>PARTICIPANT ETHNICITY</u>		
<u>ESO Subscale</u>		Whites (<i>n</i> = 309)	Hispanics/ Latinos/as (<i>n</i> = 65)	African American (<i>n</i> = 44)
Subscale 1 (Beneficial/ Necessary)	<i>Means</i> (<i>SD</i>)	14.85 (3.02)	16.34 (3.83)	17.70* (2.95)
Subscale 3 (Racist)		13.71 (4.34)	11.67 (4.05)	10.14* (4.12)
Subscale 4 (Interest in joining)		5.98 (2.95)	9.49 (3.89)	11.32* (3.25)

* *ps* < .001

Table 2
 Study 2 Means and Standard Deviations of Subscale Scores by Ethnicity and Condition

<i><u>PARTICIPANT ETHNICITY</u></i>									
Mission Statement	WHITE			AFRICAN AMERICAN			HISPANIC/LATINO/A		
	African American	Hispanic	White	African American	Hispanic	White	African American	Hispanic	White
N	147	141	143	12	18	24	32	26	27
Subscale 1 (Beneficial/Necessary)	14.78 (2.94)	14.55 (2.93)	12.72 (4.00)	18.58 (3.09)	15.17 (3.26)	10.79 (3.00)	16.13 (2.65)	16.08 (3.37)	11.41 (3.00)
Subscale 3 (Racist)	13.37 (4.05)	12.96 (4.73)	14.94 (5.43)	8.67 (4.12)	11.78 (5.57)	15.75 (5.43)	11.97 (4.92)	10.00 (4.16)	17.07 (5.33)
Subscale 4 (Interest in Joining)	6.57 (2.32)	6.06 (2.32)	6.33 (3.19)	10.75 (3.57)	7.44 (2.09)	4.58 (2.30)	7.66 (2.27)	8.58 (3.42)	4.56 (2.67)

Table 3
Intercorrelations among study variables for White in Study 1

		ESOSubscale4	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale1	MEIMTOT	MCITOT	CACQTOT	RETOT
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	1.00	-0.29	0.43	0.19	-0.11	0.01	0.05
	Sig.		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.83	0.36
	N	306	303	306	294	306	306	293
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.29	1.00	-0.42	0.13	0.17	0.14	-0.03
	Sig.	0.00		0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.64
	N	303	305	305	293	305	305	292
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	0.43	-0.42	1.00	0.14	-0.10	-0.01	0.08
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.01	0.09	0.80	0.15
	N	306	305	309	297	309	309	295
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.19	0.13	0.14	1.00	0.10	0.06	-0.01
	Sig.	0.00	0.03	0.01		0.09	0.32	0.80
	N	294	293	297	297	297	297	284
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.11	0.17	-0.10	0.10	1.00	0.19	-0.21
	Sig.	0.06	0.00	0.09	0.09		0.00	0.00
	N	306	305	309	297	309	309	295
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.01	0.14	-0.01	0.06	0.19	1.00	-0.04
	Sig.	0.83	0.01	0.80	0.32	0.00		0.53
	N	306	305	309	297	309	309	295
RETOT	Correlation	0.05	-0.03	0.08	-0.01	-0.21	-0.04	1.00
	Sig.	0.36	0.64	0.15	0.80	0.00	0.53	
	N	293	292	295	284	295	295	295

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 4
Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans in Study 1

		ESOSubscale4	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale1	MEIMTOT	MCITOT	CACQTOT	RETOT
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	1.00	-0.41	0.46	0.44	0.02	-0.20	-0.06
	Sig.		0.01	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.20	0.71
	N	44	44	44	43	44	44	43
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.41	1.00	-0.47	-0.05	0.05	0.14	0.08
	Sig.	0.01		0.00	0.75	0.76	0.36	0.60
	N	44	44	44	43	44	44	43
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	0.46	-0.47	1.00	0.05	0.05	-0.18	-0.26
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.76	0.75	0.24	0.09
	N	44	44	44	43	44	44	43
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.44	-0.05	0.05	1.00	0.19	0.03	0.06
	Sig.	0.00	0.75	0.76		0.23	0.85	0.72
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	42
MCITOT	Correlation	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.19	1.00	0.34	0.11
	Sig.	0.88	0.76	0.75	0.23		0.02	0.48
	N	44	44	44	43	44	44	43
CACQTOT	Correlation	-0.20	0.14	-0.18	0.03	0.34	1.00	0.06
	Sig.	0.20	0.36	0.24	0.85	0.02		0.70
	N	44	44	44	43	44	44	43
RETOT	Correlation	-0.06	0.08	-0.26	0.06	0.11	0.06	1.00
	Sig.	0.71	0.60	0.09	0.72	0.48	0.70	
	N	43	43	43	42	43	43	43

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 5
Intercorrelations of study variables for Hispanics in Study 1

		ESOSubscale4	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale1	MEIMTOT	MCITOT	CACQTOT	RETOT
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	1.00	-0.48	0.46	0.32	-0.05	0.24	0.18
	Sig.		0.00	0.00	0.01	0.71	0.06	0.15
	N	65	63	65	63	65	65	62
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.48	1.00	-0.60	-0.29	0.30	0.21	-0.16
	Sig.	0.00		0.00	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.23
	N	63	63	63	61	63	63	60
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	0.46	-0.60	1.00	0.27	-0.16	0.02	0.12
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.04	0.19	0.85	0.35
	N	65	63	65	63	65	65	62
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.32	-0.29	0.27	1.00	0.22	0.02	-0.05
	Sig.	0.01	0.03	0.04		0.08	0.85	0.69
	N	63	61	63	63	63	63	60
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.05	0.30	-0.16	0.22	1.00	0.23	-0.31
	Sig.	0.71	0.02	0.19	0.08		0.06	0.01
	N	65	63	65	63	65	65	62
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.24	0.21	0.02	0.02	0.23	1.00	0.10
	Sig.	0.06	0.11	0.85	0.85	0.06		0.45
	N	65	63	65	63	65	65	62
RETOT	Correlation	0.18	-0.16	0.12	-0.05	-0.31	0.10	1.00
	Sig.	0.15	0.23	0.35	0.69	0.01	0.45	
	N	62	60	62	60	62	62	62

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 6
Intercorrelations among study variables for Whites with an African American ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.48	0.31	0.15	0.06	0.14	-0.01
	Sig.		0.00	0.00	0.07	0.49	0.10	0.95
	N	147	147	143	142	144	139	147
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.48	1.00	-0.37	-0.05	0.27	-0.18	0.17
	Sig.	0.00		0.00	0.58	0.00	0.03	0.04
	N	147	147	143	142	144	139	147
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.31	-0.37	1.00	0.04	-0.05	0.09	-0.11
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.68	0.59	0.28	0.19
	N	143	143	143	140	142	137	143
RETOT	Correlation	0.15	-0.05	0.04	1.00	-0.08	0.09	-0.05
	Sig.	0.07	0.58	0.68		0.34	0.28	0.58
	N	142	142	140	142	141	136	142
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.06	0.27	-0.05	-0.08	1.00	0.16	0.18
	Sig.	0.49	0.00	0.59	0.34		0.05	0.03
	N	144	144	142	141	144	139	144
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.14	-0.18	0.09	0.09	0.16	1.00	0.11
	Sig.	0.10	0.03	0.28	0.28	0.05		0.21
	N	139	139	137	136	139	139	139
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.01	0.17	-0.11	-0.05	0.18	0.11	1.00
	Sig.	0.95	0.04	0.19	0.58	0.03	0.21	
	N	147	147	143	142	144	139	147

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 7
Intercorrelations among study variables for Whites with a Hispanic ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.42	0.32	-0.02	-0.06	0.25	-0.17
	Sig.		0.00	0.00	0.83	0.46	0.00	0.04
	N	141	141	141	134	139	136	141
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.42	1.00	-0.41	0.02	0.25	-0.01	0.19
	Sig.	0.00		0.00	0.86	0.00	0.87	0.03
	N	141	141	141	134	139	136	141
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.32	-0.41	1.00	-0.04	-0.04	0.17	-0.13
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.62	0.62	0.05	0.12
	N	141	141	141	134	139	136	141
RETOT	Correlation	-0.02	0.02	-0.04	1.00	-0.18	-0.17	-0.15
	Sig.	0.83	0.86	0.62		0.03	0.06	0.07
	N	134	134	134	134	132	131	134
CACQTOT	Correlation	-0.06	0.25	-0.04	-0.18	1.00	0.14	0.14
	Sig.	0.46	0.00	0.62	0.03		0.10	0.10
	N	139	139	139	132	139	134	139
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.25	-0.01	0.17	-0.17	0.14	1.00	0.28
	Sig.	0.00	0.87	0.05	0.06	0.10		0.00
	N	136	136	136	131	134	136	136
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.17	0.19	-0.13	-0.15	0.14	0.28	1.00
	Sig.	0.04	0.03	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.00	
	N	141	141	141	134	139	136	141

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 8
Intercorrelations among study variables for Whites with a White ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.61	0.59	-0.02	0.00	0.37	0.21
	Sig.		0.00	0.00	0.78	0.98	0.00	0.01
	N	143	141	141	139	143	140	143
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.61	1.00	-0.56	0.04	-0.03	-0.16	-0.16
	Sig.	0.00		0.00	0.66	0.71	0.05	0.06
	N	141	141	139	137	141	138	141
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.59	-0.56	1.00	-0.08	0.07	0.24	0.35
	Sig.	0.00	0.00		0.33	0.43	0.00	0.00
	N	141	139	141	137	141	138	141
RETOT	Correlation	-0.02	0.04	-0.08	1.00	-0.07	0.18	-0.17
	Sig.	0.78	0.66	0.33		0.42	0.03	0.04
	N	139	137	137	139	139	136	139
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.00	-0.03	0.07	-0.07	1.00	-0.02	0.41
	Sig.	0.98	0.71	0.43	0.42		0.82	0.00
	N	143	141	141	139	143	140	143
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.37	-0.16	0.24	0.18	-0.02	1.00	0.18
	Sig.	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.82		0.04
	N	140	138	138	136	140	140	140
MCITOT	Correlation	0.21	-0.16	0.35	-0.17	0.41	0.18	1.00
	Sig.	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	
	N	143	141	141	139	143	140	143

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
Subscale 3 = racist
Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 9
Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with an African American ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.55	0.63	0.83	-0.40	0.39	-0.27
	Sig.		0.06	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.21	0.40
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.55	1.00	-0.57	-0.32	-0.10	-0.33	0.13
	Sig.	0.06		0.05	0.32	0.76	0.30	0.70
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.63	-0.57	1.00	0.35	-0.08	0.44	0.16
	Sig.	0.03	0.05		0.26	0.81	0.15	0.61
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
RETOT	Correlation	0.83	-0.32	0.35	1.00	-0.31	0.16	-0.55
	Sig.	0.00	0.32	0.26		0.33	0.61	0.06
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
CACQTOT	Correlation	-0.40	-0.10	-0.08	-0.31	1.00	-0.19	0.08
	Sig.	0.20	0.76	0.81	0.33		0.55	0.80
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.39	-0.33	0.44	0.16	-0.19	1.00	0.24
	Sig.	0.21	0.30	0.15	0.61	0.55		0.46
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.27	0.13	0.16	-0.55	0.08	0.24	1.00
	Sig.	0.40	0.70	0.61	0.06	0.80	0.46	
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 10
Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with a Hispanic ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.36	0.48	0.00	0.10	0.21	-0.18
	Sig.		0.14	0.04	0.99	0.70	0.41	0.48
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.36	1.00	-0.32	0.43	-0.04	0.11	0.06
	Sig.	0.14		0.20	0.08	0.87	0.67	0.80
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.48	-0.32	1.00	-0.22	0.47	0.47	-0.17
	Sig.	0.04	0.20		0.39	0.05	0.05	0.51
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
RETOT	Correlation	0.00	0.43	-0.22	1.00	-0.18	-0.01	0.02
	Sig.	0.99	0.08	0.39		0.48	0.96	0.95
	N	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.10	-0.04	0.47	-0.18	1.00	-0.05	0.29
	Sig.	0.70	0.87	0.05	0.48		0.85	0.24
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.21	0.11	0.47	-0.01	-0.05	1.00	-0.09
	Sig.	0.41	0.67	0.05	0.96	0.85		0.71
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.18	0.06	-0.17	0.02	0.29	-0.09	1.00
	Sig.	0.48	0.80	0.51	0.95	0.24	0.71	
	N	18	18	18	17	18	18	18

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 11
Intercorrelations among study variables for African Americans with a White ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.58	0.28	-0.09	0.14	0.11	0.29
	Sig.		0.00	0.19	0.68	0.50	0.63	0.17
	N	24	24	24	23	24	23	24
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.58	1.00	-0.12	0.20	0.30	-0.51	0.00
	Sig.	0.00		0.59	0.36	0.15	0.01	0.99
	N	24	24	24	23	24	23	24
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.28	-0.12	1.00	-0.35	0.26	0.04	0.45
	Sig.	0.19	0.59		0.10	0.23	0.85	0.03
	N	24	24	24	23	24	23	24
RETOT	Correlation	-0.09	0.20	-0.35	1.00	-0.04	0.01	0.00
	Sig.	0.68	0.36	0.10		0.84	0.95	1.00
	N	23	23	23	23	23	22	23
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.14	0.30	0.26	-0.04	1.00	-0.47	0.37
	Sig.	0.50	0.15	0.23	0.84		0.02	0.07
	N	24	24	24	23	24	23	24
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.11	-0.51	0.04	0.01	-0.47	1.00	-0.40
	Sig.	0.63	0.01	0.85	0.95	0.02		0.06
	N	23	23	23	22	23	23	23
MCITOT	Correlation	0.29	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.37	-0.40	1.00
	Sig.	0.17	0.99	0.03	1.00	0.07	0.06	
	N	24	24	24	23	24	23	24

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 12
Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with an African American ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.41	0.20	0.27	0.09	0.23	-0.08
	Sig.		0.02	0.27	0.13	0.62	0.22	0.68
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.41	1.00	-0.23	-0.22	0.47	-0.25	0.49
	Sig.	0.02		0.21	0.22	0.01	0.17	0.00
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.20	-0.23	1.00	-0.28	0.02	0.27	0.06
	Sig.	0.27	0.21		0.12	0.90	0.14	0.75
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32
RETOT	Correlation	0.27	-0.22	-0.28	1.00	-0.28	-0.15	-0.21
	Sig.	0.13	0.22	0.12		0.13	0.41	0.25
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.09	0.47	0.02	-0.28	1.00	-0.09	0.56
	Sig.	0.62	0.01	0.90	0.13		0.63	0.00
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32
MEIMTOT	Correlation	0.23	-0.25	0.27	-0.15	-0.09	1.00	0.13
	Sig.	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.41	0.63		0.49
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.08	0.49	0.06	-0.21	0.56	0.13	1.00
	Sig.	0.68	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.49	
	N	32	32	32	32	32	31	32

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 13
Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with a Hispanic ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.35	0.42	0.24	0.09	-0.14	-0.39
	Sig.		0.08	0.03	0.24	0.68	0.51	0.05
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.35	1.00	-0.40	-0.29	0.11	-0.05	0.19
	Sig.	0.08		0.04	0.15	0.59	0.83	0.34
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.42	-0.40	1.00	0.22	-0.24	0.05	-0.38
	Sig.	0.03	0.04		0.28	0.24	0.82	0.06
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
RETOT	Correlation	0.24	-0.29	0.22	1.00	-0.22	0.36	-0.63
	Sig.	0.24	0.15	0.28		0.29	0.07	0.00
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.09	0.11	-0.24	-0.22	1.00	-0.10	0.36
	Sig.	0.68	0.59	0.24	0.29		0.64	0.07
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
MEIMTOT	Correlation	-0.14	-0.05	0.05	0.36	-0.10	1.00	-0.15
	Sig.	0.51	0.83	0.82	0.07	0.64		0.45
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.39	0.19	-0.38	-0.63	0.36	-0.15	1.00
	Sig.	0.05	0.34	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.45	
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
Subscale 3 = racist
Subscale 4 = interest in joining

Table 14
Intercorrelations among study variables for Hispanics with a White ESO

		ESOSubscale1	ESOSubscale3	ESOSubscale4	RETOT	CACQTOT	MEIMTOT	MCITOT
ESOSubscale1	Correlation	1.00	-0.12	0.30	-0.07	0.13	-0.03	-0.11
	Sig.		0.54	0.13	0.71	0.51	0.88	0.60
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
ESOSubscale3	Correlation	-0.12	1.00	-0.66	-0.12	0.33	0.19	0.24
	Sig.	0.54		0.00	0.54	0.09	0.35	0.23
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
ESOSubscale4	Correlation	0.30	-0.66	1.00	0.07	-0.19	-0.06	0.20
	Sig.	0.13	0.00		0.72	0.33	0.77	0.33
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
RETOT	Correlation	-0.07	-0.12	0.07	1.00	-0.29	-0.51	-0.40
	Sig.	0.71	0.54	0.72		0.15	0.01	0.04
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
CACQTOT	Correlation	0.13	0.33	-0.19	-0.29	1.00	0.02	0.44
	Sig.	0.51	0.09	0.33	0.15		0.91	0.02
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
MEIMTOT	Correlation	-0.03	0.19	-0.06	-0.51	0.02	1.00	0.15
	Sig.	0.88	0.35	0.77	0.01	0.91		0.46
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
MCITOT	Correlation	-0.11	0.24	0.20	-0.40	0.44	0.15	1.00
	Sig.	0.60	0.23	0.33	0.04	0.02	0.46	
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27

*Note: Subscale 1 = beneficial/necessary
 Subscale 3 = racist
 Subscale 4 = interest in joining

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE ESO QUESTIONNAIRE - STUDY 1

8. Ethnic student organizations have “racist” intentions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

9. Ethnic student organizations are not racially offensive.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

10. Ethnic student organization contribute to positive racial relations on campus.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

11. I would be interested in becoming a member of an ethnic student organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

12. I would not want to join an ethnic student organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

**APPENDIX C: SAMPLE MISSION STATEMENT ESO QUESTIONNAIRE
– STUDY 2**

:

Instructions: After reading the mission statement for the ethnic student organization below, please read each statement carefully and indicate your agreement or disagreement to the statement by circling the appropriate number that corresponds best with your response to the statement.

NOTE: THE STATEMENTS REFER TO THE ETHNIC STUDENT ORGANIZATION BELOW.

The **Hispanic Student Union** at the University of Central Florida was founded in 1982.

Mission State of the Organization:

- To serve as an official voice for the Hispanic community at the University of Central Florida
- To establish and promote open lines of communication between Hispanic students, the administration, faculty, and staff at the university
- To work with other organizations and provide programming that promotes a diverse learning atmosphere for all UCF students.
- To raise awareness of Hispanic issues and culture in and around UCF Orlando
- To bring together people of Hispanic descent and heritage.

1. This student organization is beneficial to its student members.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

2.. This student organization is beneficial to the university community.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

3. This student organization is not necessary for students or for the university.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

4. The existence of this student organization is unethical.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

5. This student organization is “fair” to students in general.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Unsure			Strongly Agree

6. The existence of this student organization is unacceptable.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX D: THE MULTIGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or *ethnic groups* that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in:

In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be _____

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

4: Strongly
Agree

3: Somewhat
Agree

2: Somewhat
Disagree

1: Strongly
Disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. _____
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. _____
3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me _____
4. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____
5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. _____
6. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. _____
7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn't try to mix together. _____
8. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life. _____
9. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____
10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group. _____
11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. _____
12. 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. _____
13. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. _____
14. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments. _____
15. I don't try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups. _____
16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. _____
17. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups. _____
18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. _____
19. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own. _____

20. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. _____

Write in the number that gives the best answer to each question.

21. My ethnicity is

- (1) Asian, Asian American, or Oriental
- (2) Black or African American
- (3) Hispanic or Latino
- (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic
- (5) American Indian
- (6) Mixed; parents are from two different groups
- (7) Other (write in): _____

22. My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above) _____

23. My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above) _____

**APPENDIX E: CULTURAL ATTITUDES AND CLIMATE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

Racial Tension

There is racial conflict on campus.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

There is racial/ethnic separation on campus.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

There are interracial tensions in the classroom.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

I have been exposed to a racist atmosphere in the classroom.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

I have been exposed to a racist atmosphere outside the classroom.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

Students are resentful of others whose race/ethnicity is different from their own.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	

APPENDIX F: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY SCALE

1. I like to read newspaper articles on crime
True False
2. When people do me a wrong, I feel I should pay them back if I can, just for the principle of the thing
True False
3. At times I feel like swearing
True False
4. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences
True False
5. I was suspended from school one or ore times for bad behavior
True False
6. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it
True False
7. I enjoy a race or game more when I bet on it
True False
8. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for bad behavior
True False
9. I feel that I have often been punished without cause
True False
10. I liked school
True False
11. I seldom or never have dizzy spells
True False
12. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement
True False

13. I like science

True False

14. I very much like hunting

True False

15. My parents often objected to the kind of people I went around with

True False

16. I was a slow learner in school

True False

17. I have never been in trouble with the law ***

True False

18. In school I found it very hard to talk in front of the class

True False

19. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first

True False

20. When I was young I often did not go to school even when I should have gone

True False

21. I would like to be an auto racer

True False

22. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it

True False

23. I am often sorry because I am so irritable and grouchy

True False

24. In school my marks in classroom behavior were quite regularly bad

True False

25. I am fascinated by fire

True

False

26. I usually work things out for myself rather than get someone to show me how \

True

False

27. I would like to wear expensive clothes

True

False

28. I like to read about science

True

False

29. I am afraid of being alone in a wide-open place

True

False

30. A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct

True

False

APPENDIX G: MULTIETHNIC CLIMATE INVENTORY

1. It is important to me to live only with someone of the same race and culture as I am.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I am angry with people of other races or cultures much of the time.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I want to live in the same neighborhood only with people who are my own race or cultural background.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I don't trust people of some other races or cultures.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I don't trust most people.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I want to do social things only with people of my own race and culture.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Belonging to a group of people of my same race or culture is important to me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I don't trust most people whose race is different from mine.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I don't like some other races or cultures.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I want most people in my school to be the same race as I am.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

**APPENDIX H: MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE –
SHORT FORM (M-C SDS)**

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
True False
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
True False
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
True False
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
True False
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
True False
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
True False
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
True False
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
True False
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
True False
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
True False
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
True False

12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

True

False

13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

True

False

APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Your Gender (circle one): M F
2. Your age: _____
3. Your ethnicity (circle one): White American (non-Hispanic)
African American/Black
Asian
Hispanic (see below)
Other
4. If Hispanic, please indicate subgroup (circle one): Cuban
Puerto Rican
Mexican
Central American
South American
Dominican
Other (please indicate): _____
5. Class standing (circle one):
Freshman (0-30 hrs) Sophomore (31-60 hrs) Junior (61-90 hrs) Senior (91+ hrs)
6. Highest level of education attained by your father (circle one only):
Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6
Secondary (Junior High) 7 8
High School 9 10 11 12
Vocational School/Community College 1 2
College/University 1 2 3 4
Graduate School/Professional School 1 2 3 4 5
7. Highest level of education attained by your mother (circle one only):
Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6
Secondary (Junior High) 7 8
High School 9 10 11 12
Vocational School/Community College 1 2
College/University 1 2 3 4
Graduate School/Professional School 1 2 3 4 5
8. Circle the generation the best applies to you (circle only one):
1st generation=You were born in a country outside of the USA.
2nd generation=You were born in the USA; either parent born outside the USA.
3rd generation=You were born in the USA, both parents were born in the USA,
and all grandparents born in a country outside the USA.
4th generation=You and your parents were born in the USA and at least one
grandparent born in a country outside of the USA.
5th generation=You, your parents, and all grandparents born in the USA.
9. Are you currently employed (circle one)? YES NO
Hours per week? _____ How long have you been at your present job? _____

APPENDIX J: INFORMED CONSENT

APPENDIX K: PARENTAL INFORMED CONSENT FOR MINORS

Dear Parent or Legal Guardian:

My name is Rachael Lunt and I am a graduate student here at the University of Central Florida working under the supervision of a faculty member, Dr. Charles Negy. We are seeking your permission to allow your son or daughter to participate in a study to gather information on the way in which various personality traits are related to one's attitudes toward student organizations. This study contains information about a potentially sensitive topics, race and ethnicity. This study involves completing a survey packet and was designed solely for research purposes. Thus, no one except the research team will have access to any of the responses provided by your son or daughter. All responses will be kept confidential. The identity of all participants will be kept confidential using a numerical coding system.

Participation in this project is voluntary. Your child will not have to answer any question(s) that s/he does not wish to answer. Please be advised that s/he may choose not to participate in this research, and may withdraw from the experiment at any time without consequence. Non-participation will not affect his or her grade. Your child will receive extra credit points, as determined by the professor in the class in which s/he is currently enrolled, for participating. There are no other direct benefits or compensation for participation. If your child does not wish to participate in this study for any reason, an alternative activity of equal effort for extra credit will be available from their professor.

This experiment will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. There are no anticipated risks associated with participation.

If you have any questions or comments about this research, or wish to have a copy of the final results, please contact me, Rachael Lunt, at (407) 823-5238, or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Charles Negy, Department of Psychology, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32826; (407) 823-5861. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCFIRB office, Office of Research and Commercialization, University of Central Florida, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL, 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

I have read the above description of this study, and I grant permission to my child,

_____ to participate in the study.

(print child's name)

(parent's or legal guardian's signature)

(date)

APPENDIX L: ASSENT FORM FOR MINORS

Dear Student:

My name is Rachael Lunt and I am a graduate student here at the University of Central Florida working under the supervision of a faculty member, Dr. Charles Negy. You are being asked to participate in a study to gather information on the way in which various personality traits are related to one's attitudes toward student organizations. The study involves the filling out of a questionnaire packet. This research project was designed solely for research purposes and no one except the research team will have access to any of your responses. All responses will be kept confidential. Your identity will be kept confidential using a numerical coding system.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. You do not have to answer any question(s) that you do not wish to answer. Please be advised that you may choose not to participate in this research, and you may withdraw from the experiment at any time without consequence. Non-participation will not affect your grade. You will receive extra credit points, as determined by your professor, in the class in which you are currently in, for participating. There are no other direct benefits or compensation for participation. If you do not wish to participate in this study for any reason, an alternative activity of equal effort for extra credit will be available from your professor. Your professor can give you detailed information regarding this alternative activity. This experiment will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. There are no anticipated risks associated with participation.

If you have any questions or comments about this research, or wish to have a copy of the final results, please contact me, Rachael Lunt, at (407) 823-5238, or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Charles Negy, Department of Psychology, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32826; (407) 823-5861. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCFIRB office, Office of Research and Commercialization, University of Central Florida, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL, 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

Sincerely,

Rachael Lunt

I have read the procedure described above

I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure

Participant Signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX M: DEBRIEFING FORM

Dear Student:

Thank you for your participation in this experiment. As you may have gathered from the questionnaires, we are interested in the ways in which people perceive ethnic student organizations, and how various personality traits may be related to those perceptions. The mission statement you were asked to read and answer questions about was one of three possible mission statements that were randomly assigned to the participants of this study. The vignettes were identical except for the ethnicities of the ethnic student organization, which varied with each different version of the vignette. We will be analyzing how responses to the mission statements may vary with different ethnicities of the student organizations, and with participants' personality traits as assessed by the other questionnaire included in the packet. If you do not wish for your results to be part of this study, please inform the experimenter at this time. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, or would like a copy of the final results, contact me, Rachael Lunt, at (407) 823-5238, or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Charles Negy, Department of Psychology, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32826; (407) 823-5861.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamowicz, D. (1988). College involvement, perceptions, and satisfaction: A study of membership in student organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 233-238.
- American Council on Education. (2001). Amicus brief filed with the Sixth U.S. Court of Appeals for Gratz v. Bolinger (http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/gra_amicus/gra_ace.html, December 2, 2005).
- Antonio, A.L., Chang, M.J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D., Levin, S., Milem, J. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science, 15*, 507-510.
- Abranscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 135-149.
- Chang, M.J., Witt, D., Jones, J., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (2003). *Compelling interest: examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cozby, P. C. (2003). *Methods in behavioral research* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal Education: The politics of race and sex on campus*, New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. (1998). Group identification and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 80-85.

- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change. Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 233-246.
- Evans, D.C., Garcia, D.J., Garcia, D.M., & Baron, R.S. (2003). In the privacy of their own homes: Using the internet to assess racial bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 273-284.
- Gough H.G., McClosky, H., & Meehl, P.E. (1952). A personality scale for social responsibility. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47*, 73-80.
- Graham, J.R. (1993). *MMPI-2: Assessing Personality and Psychopathology*, 2nd Ed., New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guiffrida, D.A. (2003). African American student organizations as agents of social interaction. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 304-319.
- Helm, E.G., Sedlacek, W.E., & Prieto, D.O. (1998). The relationship between attitudes toward diversity and overall satisfaction of university students by race. *Journal of College Counseling, 1*, 111-120.
- Hurtado, A. (1997). Understanding multiple group identities: Inserting women in cultural transformations. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*, 299-328.
- Hurtado, A., Milem, J., Clayton-POedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 26*, 8.
- Jefferson, S. D., & Caldwell, S. (2002). An exploration of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the perception of racial bias. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28*, 174-192.
- Johnson, P., & Johnson, R. (1996). The role of concrete-abstract thinking levels in teachers' multiethnic beliefs. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29*, 134-140.

- Jussim, L. J., McCauley, C. R., & Lee, Y.-T. (1996). Why study stereotype accuracy and inaccuracy? In Y. -T. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 3-28). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kent, N.J. (1996). The new campus racism: What's going on? *Thought & Action, 12*, 45-57.
- Lopez, S., Smith, A., Wolkenstein, B., & Charlin, V. (1993). Gender bias in clinician judgement: An assessment of the analog method's transparency and social desirability. *Sex Roles, 28*, 35-45.
- Marcus, A., Mullins, L.C., Brackett, K.P., Tang, Z., Allen, A.M., & Pruett, D.W. (2003). Perceptions of racism on campus. *College Student Journal, 37*, 611-626.
- Maykovich, M.K. (1971). Changes in racial stereotypes among college students. *Human Relations, 24*, 371-386.
- McIntosh, P. (1998). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack, In McGoldrick, M., Giordano, J., & Pearce, J.K. (Eds.) *Ethnicity & family therapy* (2nd Ed.), (pp. 1-27). New York: Guilford Press.
- Moran, J. J., Yengo, L., & Algier, A. M. (1994). Participation in minority-oriented cocurricular organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 143.
- Myers, C.A., Negy, C., & Meehan, D.C.M. (2005). Caucasian American culture: contemporary identity, challenges, and clinical impressions. *Psychology and Education – An Interdisciplinary Journal, 42*, 21-37.
- Negy, C., Shreve, T. L., Jensen, B. J., & Uddin, N. (2003). Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and ethnocentrism: A study of social identity versus multicultural theory of development. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 333-344.

- Niemann, Y.F., & Maruyama, G. (2005). Inequities in higher education: issues and promising practices in a world ambivalent about affirmative action. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*, 407-426.
- Nosek, B.A., Banaji, M.R., and Greenwald, A.G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site [Special issue]. *Group Dyn. 6*: 101-115.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1988). Assessing self-deception and impression management in self-reports: The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. Unpublished manual, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Phiney, J.S. (1992). Multigroup ethnic identity measure: a new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short-forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology 38*, 119-125.
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J., Masse, L., Chen, Y., Roberts, C., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity in young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 301-322.
- Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1079-1092.
- Shaw, J.I., & Skolnick, P. (1995). Effects of prohibitive and informative judicial instructions on jury decisionmaking. *Social Behavior and Personality, 23*(4), 319-326.
- Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 96-110.
- Smith, T.B., Roberts, R.N., & Smith, C.S. (1997). Expressions of prejudice among college students over three assessments. *Student Journal, 31*, 235-237.

- Taifel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In Worchel, S., & Austin, W. (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Trower, C.A. & Chait, R.P. (March-April 2002). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. Harvard Magazine. <http://www.harvard-magazine.com/on-line/030218.html>.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (2004). *The Hispanic population in the United States: 2004 Detailed Tables. (Population Characteristics)*. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- Vargas, J.A. (2003, October 21st). Caucasian Club founder decides to leave school: Oakley freshman decides to transfer, cites harassment. *San Francisco Chronicle*, A-5.
- WorldNetDaily (2003, September 20th). No whitewash: Student pitches Caucasian Club. http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ED=34708.