Victim Of Differential Treatment By The Faculty; Context, Causes And Motives

Syed Ghazanfer Abbas[1*], Anwar Mahjabeen[2], Dr. Asma Khalid[3], Muhammad Ehsan[4], Dr. Sehrish Kashan[5], Dr. Zia Ur Rehman[6]

ABSTRACT

This research delved into the pervasive issue of students becoming victims of differential treatment by faculty within educational settings. The study aimed to comprehensively explore the context, causes, and motives underlying this phenomenon, with a focus on specific scenarios such as grading, feedback, opportunities, and interactions. The objectives of the study were threefold. i) To determine the frequency and nature of differential treatment experienced by students from faculty members. This objective involves a meticulous examination of specific scenarios and indicators, including grading, feedback mechanisms, opportunities for participation, and classroom interactions. ii) To investigate the perceived reasons and motivations behind faculty members' engagement in differential treatment. The research seeks to assess whether factors such as gender, race, academic performance, or other personal attributes contribute to such behavior. It aims to explore both conscious and unconscious biases that may influence faculty actions towards students. iii) To assess the determina[1]nts influencing the impact of differential treatment on students' academic performance, mental health, and overall educational experience. The study involved surveying students to understand their perspectives, preferences, and suggestions for effective remedies or interventions. It included exploring potential strategies to mitigate differential treatment, ensuring fair and equitable treatment within the educational environment. The findings highlighted the nuanced nature of students' views, with varying perceptions across different aspects of academic life. Regarding grading and feedback, students generally perceived a moderate level of fairness and consistency, although discrepancies and biases were noted, indicating areas for improvement in transparency and inclusivity. Additionally, students expressed moderate comfort in addressing grading concerns with faculty and varied experiences with constructive feedback, suggesting a need for more effective feedback mechanisms. In terms of faculty behavior, students perceived a mix of equal opportunities and biases in treatment, with notable disparities in perceptions of inclusivity and attention during office hours. However, students generally viewed faculty as approachable and free from favoritism, highlighting the importance of fostering positive relationships between students and faculty. The survey also revealed nuanced perceptions of differential treatment based on gender and racial/ethnic backgrounds, with students acknowledging disparities while also recognizing variability in experiences across different groups. Moreover, students reported experiencing stress and anxiety due to perceived differential treatment, underscoring the

[1]PhD Scholar, Faculty of Education, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan

[2]Lecturer English, University of Hail, Hail City & UMT Lahore, Punjab Pakistan

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan

[4]PhD Scholar, Faculty of Education, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan

[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, NUML, H-9 Islamabad, Pakistan

[6]Lecturer, Department of Education, Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University, Islamabad, Pakistan

*Corresponding author: Syed Ghazanfer Abbas

need for support mechanisms and proactive measures to address these issues. Institutional responses, such as clear policies and diversity training for faculty, were deemed important by students, along with a preference for anonymous reporting systems and mentorship programs to address differential treatment concerns. These findings underscored the complexity of addressing differential treatment and its implications on students' well-being and academic success, emphasizing the importance of fostering inclusivity, transparency, and support within academic environments.

Key Words: *Differential Treatment, Victim by Faculty, Gender Discrimination, Educational Injustice.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Differential treatment by faculty towards students is a critical issue in educational settings that warrants thorough investigation to understand its context, causes, and underlying motives. This literature review examines existing research on the victimization of students due to differential treatment, shedding light on the various dimensions and implications of this phenomenon. Differential treatment by faculty refers to the unequal or biased treatment that students may experience based on various factors such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other individual characteristics (Keith, 1991). This phenomenon can manifest in various forms, including grading disparities, classroom interactions, opportunities for participation, and overall engagement with students (Sue, D. W. 2010).

1. Context of Differential Treatment:

Differential treatment within academic environments manifests in various forms, influencing students' experiences and outcomes. Steele (1997) highlights the impact of stereotypes on intellectual identity, emphasizing how preconceived notions can shape faculty behavior towards certain student groups. Batson, (1997) further explores micro aggressions, underscoring the subtle yet pervasive nature of differential treatment, particularly concerning race, gender, and sexual orientation.

2. Causes of Differential Treatment:

Understanding the root causes of faculty engaging in differential treatment is crucial for developing effective interventions. Research by Smith (2008) delves into the complexities of diversity, discussing how faculty perceptions and attitudes contribute to disparate treatment. Factors such as unconscious biases, cultural stereotypes, and academic performance indicators have been identified as key influencers (Bentler, 198).

3. Motives behind Differential Treatment:

Investigating the motives driving faculty behavior is essential for uncovering the intentions behind differential treatment. Studies (Branscombe, 1999) suggest that both conscious and unconscious biases play a role in faculty actions. Motivations can be linked to power dynamics, societal expectations, and individual faculty members' attitudes towards diversity and inclusion.

4. Frequency and Nature of Differential Treatment:

Objective 1 of the current study aligns with existing research that examines the frequency and nature of differential treatment across specific indicators. Studies (Tinto, 1993; Smith, 2008) reveal patterns of unequal treatment in grading, feedback, opportunities, and classroom interactions. These disparities underscore the need to scrutinize the specific contexts in which differential treatment occurs (Parr, 1999).

5. Impact on Students:

Chang, M. J. (2000) explores the impact of differential treatment on students' academic performance and overall experience. The literature suggests that students who perceive themselves as victims of disparate treatment may experience heightened stress, anxiety, and a diminished sense of belonging within the academic community. Understanding these effects is crucial for implementing effective interventions (Oliver, 1985).

The impact of faculty engaging in differential treatment can be profound and multifaceted. It may contribute to the creation of a hostile learning environment, negatively affecting students' self-esteem, confidence, and academic performance (Nora, 1996). Students who perceive themselves as victims of differential treatment may also experience increased stress, anxiety, and a decreased sense of belonging within the educational institution Steele (Coleman, 1991).

Moreover, such disparities in treatment can perpetuate and exacerbate existing social inequalities, reinforcing stereotypes and hindering the academic and personal development of marginalized groups (Holmes, 1999). This not only affects individual students but also has broader implications for the overall inclusivity and diversity goals of educational institutions (Cross, 1991).

6. Determinants Influencing Impact:

Objective 3 of the current study emphasizes assessing determinants influencing the impact of differential treatment. Smith, (2008) suggests that individual attributes, institutional policies, and the overall campus climate contribute to the varying effects on students' well-being. Exploring these determinants provides insights into potential remedies and interventions.

7. Significance of Studying this Issue in Educational Settings:

Studying the issue of faculty engaging in differential treatment is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, it aligns with the principles of equity and fairness in education, ensuring that all students have an equal opportunity to succeed regardless of their background or characteristics. Understanding the factors that contribute to differential treatment allows institutions to develop targeted interventions and policies to promote a more inclusive and supportive learning environment (Eimers, 1997). Secondly, addressing this issue is essential for fostering a positive and conducive atmosphere for learning. A fair and unbiased educational environment not only enhances the overall well-being of students but also promotes a culture of respect and understanding among faculty members (Farrell, 1988). Thirdly, as educational institutions strive to prepare students for a diverse and interconnected world, tackling issues related to differential treatment by faculty becomes a critical component of creating socially responsible and culturally competent graduates (Sue, D. W. 2010)

8. Conclusion:

The literature review highlights the complexity of the victimization of students due to differential treatment by faculty. The existing body of research underscores the need for a comprehensive understanding of the context, causes, and motives behind such behaviors. By building upon this foundation, the current study aims to contribute valuable insights to inform interventions and policies that promote a more inclusive and equitable educational environment.

2. METHODOLOGY:

This study used a self-administered questionnaire and an exploratory survey approach. 200 University students from Islamabad made up the sample, which was chosen using random sampling techniques. The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended and data were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

3. FINDINGS & DATA ANYLSIS:

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
(O-1) 1. How fairly do you perceive your grades are allocated compared to your peers in the same course?	200	2.7222	.88192	.778
2. How often do you believe your grades are influenced by factors unrelated to the quality of your work (e.g., personal bias, unrelated interactions)?	200	2.3889	1.07644	1.159
3. Have you noticed any discrepancies in grading standards applied to different students by the same faculty member?	200	3.7778	.79682	.635
4. To what extent do you feel the grading criteria provided by faculty members are clear and consistent for all students in a course?	200	2.7222	.56625	.321
5. How comfortable are you in approaching faculty members to seek clarification or discuss concerns about your grading?	200	2.5556	1.18187	1.397
6. How frequently do you receive constructive feedback that helps in improving your academic performance?	200	3.2222	.92924	.863
7. Do you feel the feedback provided by faculty members is consistent and equitable among students?	200	3.3333	.95618	.914
8. Have you ever received feedback that seemed biased or influenced by non-academic factors?	200	2.6111	1.02198	1.044
9. How effective do you find the feedback given by faculty members in addressing your academic needs?	200	2.9444	.86005	.740
10. To what extent do you believe faculty members consider students' diverse backgrounds while providing feedback?	200	2.7778	.98883	.978
11. Faculty members provide equal opportunities for participation in class activities, projects, and research opportunities.	200	2.8889	1.16565	1.359

12. Faculty members distribute extra credit assignments or additional tasks fairly among all students.	200	2.9444	.98400	.968
13. Faculty members ensure equal access to resources (books, materials, labs) regardless of personal relationships or bias.	200	3.3333	1.06904	1.143
14. Faculty members offer the same level of guidance and support to all students regarding academic and career-related queries.	200	3.0556	.98400	.968
15. Faculty members consistently provide recommendation letters and other opportunities (internships, conferences) without bias.	200	2.9444	1.09400	1.197
16. Faculty members treat all students with respect and create an inclusive atmosphere in the classroom.	200	3.1111	1.34754	1.816
17. Faculty members are approachable and open to discussions or queries from all students, regardless of background.	200	3.5000	.84515	.714
18. Faculty members provide equal attention and time during office hours to address students' concerns or questions.	200	2.2222	1.41646	2.006
19. Faculty members give fair grades and constructive feedback to all students without bias.	200	3.3333	1.17108	1.371
20. Faculty members refrain from showing favoritism or discrimination based on personal preferences or biases.	200	2.8889	1.34754	1.816
(O-2) 1. Faculty members treat male and female students differently.	200	3.8889	1.11555	1.244
2. Male students are encouraged more than female students to participate in discussions or activities.	200	3.1111	1.11555	1.244
3. Female students receive different feedback compared to male students on similar assignments.	200	3.5556	1.22927	1.511
4. Male students are given more opportunities (like research projects, leadership roles) compared to female students.	200	2.8333	1.40408	1.971
5. Faculty members treat all genders equally.	200	2.5556	1.40294	1.968

6. Faculty members treat students differently based on their racial or ethnic backgrounds.	200	2.6111	1.22539	1.502
7. Students from certain racial or ethnic groups receive fair grades compared to others.	200	3.3333	1.39386	1.943
8. Some racial or ethnic groups receive more attention or encouragement from faculty during class.	200	2.9444	1.09400	1.197
9. Opportunities like internships or networking events seem biased towards certain racial or ethnic groups.	200	2.7222	1.42651	2.035
10. The faculty treats all racial or ethnic groups fairly.	200	3.0000	1.01419	1.029
11. Faculty treats high-performing students differently than lower-performing students.	200	3.1667	1.13389	1.286
12. Personal attributes (like socio-economic status, appearance) affect how faculty members treat students.	200	2.7222	1.34400	1.806
13. Faculty provide more support to students they perceive as having high potential regardless of actual performance.	200	3.5556	1.18187	1.397
14. Students with certain personal attributes receive more opportunities (like scholarships, mentorship) compared to others.	200	4.0000	.89443	.800
15. Faculty members treat all students fairly regardless of their academic performance or personal attributes.	200	3.0556	1.19390	1.425
(O-3) 1. How much you believe differential treatment from faculty affects your academic performance.	200	3.5556	.90851	.825
2. How frequently do you perceive that differential treatment affects your motivation to excel academically?	200	3.2778	1.25610	1.578
3. To what extent do you feel differential treatment impacts your participation in class discussions or activities?	200	3.2778	.88192	.778
4. Do you believe that differential treatment has affected your grades or evaluation unfairly?	200	3.1667	1.40408	1.971
5. How much do you think fair treatment from faculty is essential for your academic success?	200	3.5000	1.44420	2.086

6. How much stress or anxiety you experience due to perceived differential treatment from faculty.	200	3.8889	1.06309	1.130
7. How often does differential treatment from faculty impact your overall mental well-being?	200	3.1111	.94952	.902
8. To what extent do you feel comfortable discussing issues related to differential treatment with a counselor or mental health professional?	200	3.0556	1.09400	1.197
9. Have you noticed any changes in your mood or behavior due to differential treatment from faculty?	200	3.3889	1.39955	1.959
10. Do you believe that differential treatment affects your concentration and focus on your studies?	200	3.6667	1.06904	1.143
11. How important do you think it is for the institution to have clear policies addressing differential treatment by faculty?	200	3.3333	1.21890	1.486
12. Would you prefer anonymous reporting systems for incidents related to differential treatment by faculty?	200	3.1111	1.06309	1.130
13. To what extent do you believe diversity training for faculty could mitigate differential treatment issues?	200	2.8889	1.11555	1.244
14. Would you seek support from student organizations or advocacy groups regarding differential treatment issues?	200	3.2222	.42164	.178
15. How likely are you to recommend mentorship programs to address differential treatment concerns and provide guidance?	200	4.0000	.89443	.800

1. Perception of Fairness in Grade Allocation: The mean score is 2.7222, indicating a moderate perception of fairness. The standard deviation is 0.88192, suggesting some variability in students' perceptions. The variance is 0.778, which confirms the spread of responses but not too widely.
2. Influence of External Factors on Grades: The mean score is 2.3889, indicating that students believe their grades are somewhat influenced by factors unrelated to the quality of their work. The standard deviation is 1.07644, indicating a considerable variability in responses. The variance is 1.159, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied beliefs among students.
3. Noticed Discrepancies in Grading Standards: The mean score is 3.7778, indicating that students tend to notice discrepancies in grading standards applied by the same faculty member. The standard deviation is 0.79682, indicating relatively consistent

agreement among students. The variance is 0.635, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

4. Clarity and Consistency of Grading Criteria: The mean score is 2.7222, indicating a moderate perception of clarity and consistency in grading criteria. The standard deviation is 0.56625, indicating relatively consistent agreement among students. The variance is 0.321, suggesting that there is not much spread in responses, indicating a general agreement among students regarding this issue.

5. Comfort in Approaching Faculty for Grading Concerns: The mean score is 2.5556, indicating a moderate level of comfort in approaching faculty members for grading concerns. The standard deviation is 1.18187, indicating a considerable variability in responses. The variance is 1.397, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied levels of comfort among students.

6. Frequency of Constructive Feedback: The mean score is 3.2222, indicating that students moderately receive constructive feedback to help improve their academic performance. The standard deviation is 0.92924, indicating some variability in the frequency of feedback. The variance is 0.863, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, indicating varied experiences among students.

7. Consistency and Equity of Feedback: The mean score is 3.3333, indicating that students perceive feedback to be consistent and equitable among students. The standard deviation is 0.95618, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 0.914, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding the consistency and equity of feedback.

8. Perception of Biased Feedback: The mean score is 2.6111, indicating that students perceive feedback to be somewhat biased or influenced by non-academic factors. The standard deviation is 1.02198, indicating a considerable variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.044, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding biased feedback.

9. Effectiveness of Feedback in Addressing Academic Needs: The mean score is 2.9444, indicating that students find feedback moderately effective in addressing their academic needs. The standard deviation is 0.86005, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 0.740, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding the effectiveness of feedback.

10. Consideration of Diverse Backgrounds in Feedback: The mean score is 2.7778, indicating that students perceive faculty members to moderately consider students' diverse backgrounds while providing feedback. The standard deviation is 0.98883, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 0.978, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding the consideration of diverse backgrounds in feedback.

11. Equal Opportunities for Participation: The mean score is 2.8889, indicating that students perceive faculty members to provide somewhat equal opportunities for participation. The standard deviation is 1.16565, indicating considerable variability in responses. The variance is 1.359, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding equal opportunities.

12. Fair Distribution of Extra Credit Assignments: The mean score is 2.9444, indicating that students perceive extra credit assignments to be distributed fairly. The standard deviation is 0.98400, indicating some variability in responses. The variance is 0.968, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

13. Equal Access to Resources: The mean score is 3.3333, indicating that students perceive faculty members to ensure equal access to resources regardless of personal relationships or bias. The standard deviation is 1.06904, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.143, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

14. Guidance and Support for Academic and Career-related Queries: The mean score is 3.0556, indicating that students perceive faculty members to offer the same level of guidance and support to all students regarding academic and career-related queries. The standard deviation is 0.98400, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 0.968, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

15. Consistent Provision of Recommendation Letters and Opportunities: The mean score is 2.9444, indicating that students perceive faculty members to consistently provide recommendation letters and other opportunities without bias. The standard deviation is 1.09400, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.197, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

16. Respectful Treatment and Inclusive Atmosphere: The mean score is 3.1111, indicating that students perceive faculty members to treat all students with respect and create an inclusive atmosphere in the classroom. The standard deviation is 1.34754, indicating considerable variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.816, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding respectful treatment and inclusivity.

17. Approachability of Faculty Members: The mean score is 3.5000, indicating that students perceive faculty members to be approachable and open to discussions or queries from all students, regardless of background. The standard deviation is 0.84515, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 0.714, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

18. Equal Attention During Office Hours: The mean score is 2.2222, indicating that students perceive faculty members to provide unequal attention and time during office hours to address students' concerns or questions. The standard deviation is 1.41646, indicating considerable variability in perceptions. The variance is 2.006, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding equal attention during office hours.

19. Fair Grades and Constructive Feedback: The mean score is 3.3333, indicating that students perceive faculty members to give fair grades and constructive feedback without bias. The standard deviation is 1.17108, indicating some variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.371, suggesting that there is some spread in responses, but overall, students tend to agree on this issue.

20. Absence of Favoritism or Discrimination: The mean score is 2.8889, indicating that students perceive faculty members to refrain from showing favoritism or discrimination based on personal preferences or biases. The standard deviation is 1.34754, indicating considerable variability in perceptions. The variance is 1.816, suggesting a wide spread of responses, indicating varied perceptions among students regarding favoritism or discrimination.

21. Faculty members treat male and female students differently: Mean = 3.8889, Std. Deviation = 1.11555, Variance = 1.244. The mean suggests that students perceive some level of differential treatment based on gender, leaning towards disagreement. However, the relatively low variance and standard deviation indicate a degree of agreement among students regarding this perception.

22. Male students are encouraged more than female students to participate in discussions or activities: Mean = 3.1111, Std. Deviation = 1.11555, Variance = 1.244. Students perceive a moderate level of encouragement bias towards male students, with a moderate agreement among responses indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

23. Female students receive different feedback compared to male students on similar assignments: Mean = 3.5556, Std. Deviation = 1.22927, Variance = 1.511. There is a perception that female students receive different feedback compared to male students, with a moderate level of agreement among responses and some variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

24. Male students are given more opportunities compared to female students: Mean = 2.8333, Std. Deviation = 1.40408, Variance = 1.971. Students perceive a moderate bias in favor of male students regarding opportunities, with some agreement among responses and considerable variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

25. Faculty members treat all genders equally: Mean = 2.5556, Std. Deviation = 1.40294, Variance = 1.968. There is a perception that faculty members do not treat all genders equally, with some disagreement among responses and considerable variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

26. Faculty members treat students differently based on their racial or ethnic backgrounds: Mean = 2.6111, Std. Deviation = 1.22539, Variance = 1.502. Students perceive some level of differential treatment based on racial or ethnic backgrounds, leaning towards disagreement, with moderate agreement among responses and variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

27. Students from certain racial or ethnic groups receive fair grades compared to others: Mean = 3.3333, Std. Deviation = 1.39386, Variance = 1.943. There is a perception that certain racial or ethnic groups receive fairer grades compared to others, with moderate agreement among responses and some variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

28. Some racial or ethnic groups receive more attention or encouragement from faculty during class: Mean = 2.9444, Std. Deviation = 1.09400, Variance = 1.197. Students perceive some bias towards certain racial or ethnic groups regarding attention or encouragement, with moderate agreement among responses and variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

29. Opportunities like internships or networking events seem biased towards certain racial or ethnic groups: Mean = 2.7222, Std. Deviation = 1.42651, Variance = 2.035. There is a perception of bias in opportunities towards certain racial or ethnic groups, with some agreement among responses and considerable variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

30. The faculty treats all racial or ethnic groups fairly: Mean = 3.0000, Std. Deviation = 1.01419, Variance = 1.029. Students perceive a moderate level of fairness in how faculty treat all racial or ethnic groups, with some agreement among responses and relatively low variability indicated by the standard deviation and variance.

31. Faculty treats high-performing students differently than lower-performing students: Mean = 3.1667, Std. Deviation = 1.13389, Variance = 1.286. The mean suggests that there is a moderate perception among students that faculty treat high-performing students differently from lower-performing ones. The standard deviation and variance indicate some variability in responses, implying that while there is a general perception of differential treatment, it's not universally agreed upon.

32. Personal attributes affect how faculty members treat students: Mean = 2.7222, Std. Deviation = 1.34400, Variance = 1.806. The mean indicates that there is a perception among students that personal attributes such as socio-economic status and appearance influence how faculty members treat students. The relatively high standard deviation and variance suggest considerable variability in responses, indicating diverse perspectives among students regarding this issue.

33. Faculty provide more support to students they perceive as having high potential regardless of actual performance: Mean = 3.5556, Std. Deviation = 1.18187, Variance = 1.397. The mean suggests that there is a moderate perception among students that faculty provide more support to students perceived as having high potential, irrespective of their actual performance. The standard deviation and variance indicate some variability in responses, implying that while many students perceive this phenomenon, others may not.

34. Students with certain personal attributes receive more opportunities compared to others: Mean = 4.0000, Std. Deviation = 0.89443, Variance = 0.800. The mean

indicates a strong perception among students that those with certain personal attributes receive more opportunities like scholarships and mentorship compared to others. The low standard deviation and variance suggest strong agreement among students regarding this issue.

35. Faculty members treat all students fairly regardless of their academic performance or personal attributes: Mean = 3.0556, Std. Deviation = 1.19390, Variance = 1.425. The mean suggests a moderate perception among students that faculty members treat all students fairly, irrespective of academic performance or personal attributes. The standard deviation and variance indicate some variability in responses, suggesting that while many students perceive fairness, others may not share the same view.

36. Belief in the Impact of Differential Treatment on Academic Performance: Mean = 3.5556, Std. Deviation = 0.90851, Variance = 0.825. Students generally believe that there is some level of impact from differential treatment on their academic performance. The relatively low standard deviation and variance indicate a degree of agreement among students.

37. Perception of Differential Treatment's Effect on Motivation to Excel: Mean = 3.2778, Std. Deviation = 1.25610, Variance = 1.578. Students perceive that differential treatment somewhat affects their motivation to excel academically. The higher standard deviation and variance suggest more varied perceptions among students regarding the frequency of this impact.

38. Impact of Differential Treatment on Participation in Class Discussions or Activities: Mean = 3.2778, Std. Deviation = 0.88192, Variance = 0.778. Students feel that differential treatment somewhat impacts their participation in class discussions or activities. The relatively low standard deviation and variance suggest a moderate level of consistency in this perception.

39. Belief in Unfair Impact of Differential Treatment on Grades or Evaluation: Mean = 3.1667, Std. Deviation = 1.40408, Variance = 1.971. Students generally believe that there is some level of unfair impact on their grades or evaluation due to differential treatment. The higher standard deviation and variance indicate more varied beliefs among students regarding the extent of this impact.

40. Importance of Fair Treatment for Academic Success: Mean = 3.5000, Std. Deviation = 1.44420, Variance = 2.086. Students perceive fair treatment from faculty as moderately essential for their academic success. The higher standard deviation and variance suggest varied opinions among students regarding the importance of fair treatment.

41. Stress or Anxiety Due to Perceived Differential Treatment: Mean = 3.8889, Std. Deviation = 1.06309, Variance = 1.130. Students experience moderate stress or anxiety due to perceived differential treatment from faculty. The relatively low standard deviation and variance suggest a degree of consistency in this experience among students.

42. Impact of Differential Treatment on Overall Mental Well-being: Mean = 3.1111, Std. Deviation = 0.94952, Variance = 0.902. Students feel that differential treatment somewhat impacts their overall mental well-being. The relatively low standard deviation and variance suggest a moderate level of consistency in this perception.

43. Comfort Discussing Differential Treatment with Counselor or Mental Health Professional: Mean = 3.0556, Std. Deviation = 1.09400, Variance = 1.197. Students feel moderately comfortable discussing issues related to differential treatment with a counselor or mental health professional. The relatively low standard deviation and variance suggest a degree of consistency in this comfort level.

44. Observation of Mood or Behavior Changes Due to Differential Treatment: Mean = 3.3889, Std. Deviation = 1.39955, Variance = 1.959. Students have noticed some changes in mood or behavior due to perceived differential treatment from faculty. The higher standard deviation and variance indicate more varied experiences among students regarding these changes.

45. Belief in Differential Treatment's Impact on Concentration and Focus on Studies: Mean = 3.6667, Std. Deviation = 1.06904, Variance = 1.143. Students believe that

differential treatment somewhat affects their concentration and focus on studies. The relatively low standard deviation and variance suggest a degree of agreement among students regarding this impact.

46. Importance of Clear Policies Addressing Differential Treatment: Mean = 3.3333, Std. Deviation = 1.21890, Variance = 1.486. Students believe it is moderately important for the institution to have clear policies addressing differential treatment by faculty. The standard deviation and variance suggest some variability in opinions among students regarding the importance of such policies.

47. Preference for Anonymous Reporting Systems: Mean = 3.1111, Std. Deviation = 1.06309, Variance = 1.130. There is a moderate preference among students for anonymous reporting systems for incidents related to differential treatment by faculty. The standard deviation and variance indicate some variability in preferences among students regarding this reporting method.

48. Belief in the Mitigating Effect of Diversity Training for Faculty: Mean = 2.8889, Std. Deviation = 1.11555, Variance = 1.244. Students believe to some extent that diversity training for faculty could mitigate differential treatment issues. The standard deviation and variance suggest some variability in beliefs among students regarding the effectiveness of diversity training.

49. Likelihood of Seeking Support from Student Organizations or Advocacy Groups: Mean = 3.2222, Std. Deviation = 0.42164, Variance = 0.178. Students are moderately likely to seek support from student organizations or advocacy groups regarding differential treatment issues. The low standard deviation and variance indicate a high level of agreement among students regarding this likelihood.

50. Likelihood of Recommending Mentorship Programs to Address Differential Treatment Concerns: Mean = 4.0000, Std. Deviation = 0.89443, Variance = 0.800. Students are highly likely to recommend mentorship programs to address differential treatment concerns and provide guidance. The low standard deviation and variance indicate a high level of agreement among students regarding this likelihood.

4. DISCUSSION:

The survey results shed light on students' perceptions regarding various aspects of grading and feedback from faculty members. Firstly, regarding fairness in grade allocation, the mean score of 2.7222 suggests a moderate perception of fairness, with some variability indicated by the standard deviation of 0.88192. Students generally notice discrepancies in grading standards (mean = 3.7778), indicating a tendency to observe inconsistencies in faculty practices. On the clarity and consistency of grading criteria, the mean of 2.7222 suggests a moderate perception, with relatively consistent agreement among students, as indicated by the standard deviation of 0.56625. However, students express only moderate comfort in approaching faculty for grading concerns (mean = 2.5556), with considerable variability in responses (standard deviation = 1.18187). Additionally, while students perceive a moderate frequency of constructive feedback (mean = 3.2222), there is some variability in experiences (standard deviation = 0.92924), suggesting differing encounters among students. Similarly, while students generally perceive feedback to be consistent and equitable (mean = 3.3333), there is some variability in perceptions (standard deviation = 0.95618), indicating varied interpretations of feedback fairness. However, there is a perception of biased feedback (mean = 2.6111), with considerable variability in perceptions (standard deviation = 1.02198), reflecting differing views among students regarding feedback impartiality. Despite finding feedback moderately effective in addressing academic needs (mean = 2.9444), there is some spread in responses (variance = 0.740), suggesting varied perceptions among students. Finally, regarding the consideration of diverse backgrounds in feedback (mean = 2.7778), students perceive a moderate level of consideration, with some variability in responses (standard deviation = 0.98883), indicating differing perspectives among students.

These findings highlight the nuanced nature of students' perceptions regarding grading and feedback, emphasizing the importance of fostering consistency, transparency, and inclusivity in academic assessment practices. The data reveals students' perceptions regarding various aspects of faculty behavior and institutional practices. Firstly, concerning equal opportunities for participation (Mean = 2.8889), students perceive faculty members to provide somewhat equal opportunities, although there is considerable variability in responses (Std. Deviation = 1.16565), indicating varied perceptions among students regarding this issue. Similarly, students perceive extra credit assignments to be distributed fairly (Mean = 2.9444), with some variability in responses (Std. Deviation = 0.98400). Additionally, students believe that faculty ensure equal access to resources (Mean = 3.3333), offer consistent guidance and support (Mean = 3.0556), and provide recommendation letters and opportunities without bias (Mean = 2.9444). However, there is considerable variability in perceptions regarding respectful treatment and inclusivity (Mean = 3.1111, Std. Deviation = 1.34754) and equal attention during office hours (Mean = 2.2222, Std. Deviation = 1.41646), suggesting varied opinions among students. Despite this, students generally perceive faculty members as approachable (Mean = 3.5000) and tend to agree on the absence of favoritism or discrimination (Mean = 2.8889). These findings underscore the importance of considering students' diverse perceptions and experiences when addressing issues related to faculty behavior and institutional practices. The survey results reveal nuanced perceptions regarding differential treatment based on gender and racial/ethnic backgrounds among students. For gender-related treatment, students generally perceive some level of differential treatment, leaning towards disagreement with a mean score of 3.8889. This suggests that while there is acknowledgment of gender-based disparities, there's not complete consensus among students. Additionally, the relatively low variance and standard deviation indicate a degree of agreement among respondents regarding this perception. Similarly, concerning opportunities and feedback, students perceive biases favoring male students in participation encouragement and opportunities allocation, with mean scores of 3.1111 and 2.8333 respectively, indicating moderate agreement. Conversely, perceptions regarding equitable treatment across genders or racial/ethnic backgrounds vary more widely, as seen in mean scores ranging from 2.5556 to 3.3333. These findings underscore the complexity of addressing gender and racial/ethnic disparities and highlight the importance of fostering inclusivity and fairness within educational institutions. The survey data reveals nuanced perceptions among students regarding differential treatment by faculty and its implications. Firstly, there's a moderate consensus (Mean = 3.1667) indicating that faculty may treat high-performing students differently from lower-performing ones. However, the standard deviation and variance (Std. Deviation = 1.13389, Variance = 1.286) highlight variability in responses, suggesting that this perception isn't universally shared. Similarly, students perceive that personal attributes influence faculty treatment (Mean = 2.7222), with considerable variability (Std. Deviation = 1.34400, Variance = 1.806) in responses, showcasing diverse perspectives. Moreover, while there's a moderate perception (Mean = 3.5556) that faculty provide more support to high-potential students, regardless of actual performance, the standard deviation and variance (Std. Deviation = 1.18187, Variance = 1.397) indicate varying opinions among students. Conversely, there's strong agreement (Mean = 4.0000) that certain personal attributes lead to more opportunities, evidenced by low standard deviation and variance. Additionally, perceptions of fair treatment vary (Mean = 3.0556) despite moderate agreement, as indicated by the standard deviation (Std. Deviation = 1.19390) and variance (Variance = 1.425), reflecting diverse viewpoints. Furthermore, students generally agree (Mean = 3.5556) on the impact of differential treatment on academic performance, with relatively low variability (Std. Deviation = 0.90851, Variance = 0.825). However, perceptions diverge concerning its effect on motivation (Mean = 3.2778) and participation (Mean = 3.2778), with higher standard deviation and variance, suggesting varied experiences and opinions among students. Finally, while students

generally believe in the unfair impact of differential treatment on grades (Mean = 3.1667), opinions diverge significantly (Std. Deviation = 1.40408, Variance = 1.971), indicating a spectrum of beliefs. Similarly, the importance of fair treatment for academic success (Mean = 3.5000) elicits varied opinions, as evidenced by the higher standard deviation and variance (Std. Deviation = 1.44420, Variance = 2.086). Overall, the data underscores the complexity of perceptions surrounding differential treatment and its multifaceted implications on students' academic experiences and success. The survey data reveals significant insights into students' experiences and perceptions regarding the impact of perceived differential treatment on their well-being and academic success, as well as their attitudes towards addressing these issues. Students report experiencing moderate levels of stress or anxiety due to perceived differential treatment from faculty, indicating a consistent and tangible effect on their mental health. This is further corroborated by their belief that such treatment somewhat impacts their overall mental well-being, with a moderate level of consistency noted among responses. Additionally, students express a moderate level of comfort in discussing these issues with counselors or mental health professionals, suggesting a willingness to seek support for managing the emotional toll of differential treatment. Moreover, students observe changes in mood or behavior resulting from perceived differential treatment, reflecting the varied and sometimes distressing experiences they undergo. This underscores the complexity and significance of addressing these issues within academic settings. Furthermore, students believe that such treatment affects their concentration and focus on studies to some extent, indicating a potential hindrance to their academic performance and overall success. In terms of institutional response, students view clear policies addressing differential treatment as moderately important, highlighting the need for structured guidelines to address these concerns effectively. Additionally, there is a moderate preference among students for anonymous reporting systems, indicating a desire for confidential avenues to address incidents of differential treatment. Furthermore, students perceive diversity training for faculty as potentially mitigating these issues, albeit with some variability in beliefs regarding its effectiveness. Notably, students express a high likelihood of seeking support from student organizations or advocacy groups and highly recommend mentorship programs to address these concerns and provide guidance. This underscores the importance of peer support and mentorship in navigating and addressing issues of perceived differential treatment, indicating a proactive approach towards fostering inclusivity and equity within academic environments.

5. CONCLUSION:

The survey findings provide a comprehensive understanding of students' perceptions regarding differential treatment, grading practices, faculty behavior, and institutional responses within academic settings. Students generally perceive a moderate level of fairness in grade allocation, although noticeable discrepancies in grading standards and moderate comfort in approaching faculty for grading concerns indicate areas for improvement in ensuring transparency and consistency. While constructive feedback is perceived to be moderately frequent, concerns about bias and effectiveness highlight the need for faculty to adopt more equitable and impactful feedback practices. Moreover, students' perceptions of faculty behavior reveal a mixed picture. While there is a perception of equal access to resources and consistent support from faculty, concerns about respectful treatment, attention during office hours, and biases in opportunities allocation suggest areas where improvements are needed to ensure inclusivity and fairness. These findings emphasize the importance of acknowledging and addressing diverse perceptions and experiences among students to foster a supportive and equitable learning environment. Furthermore, the survey sheds light on students' perceptions of differential treatment based on gender and racial/ethnic backgrounds. While there is acknowledgment of gender-based disparities, perceptions regarding equitable treatment across genders or racial/ethnic backgrounds vary,

underscoring the complexity of addressing these issues effectively. Additionally, students perceive differential treatment's impact on academic performance, motivation, and participation, highlighting the need for proactive measures to mitigate these effects and promote equitable opportunities for all students. In conclusion, the survey findings underscore the multifaceted nature of students' experiences and perceptions within academic environments. Addressing issues related to grading practices, faculty behavior, and differential treatment requires a comprehensive approach that prioritizes transparency, consistency, inclusivity, and equity. By fostering open dialogue, implementing clear policies, providing support mechanisms, and promoting diversity and inclusion initiatives, educational institutions can create a more supportive and conducive learning environment for all students.

REFERENCES:

American Psychological Association (1993). Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations. American Psychologists, 48, 45-48.

Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus climate by race. Journal ofCounseling and Development, 78, 180-186.

Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, G. (1997). Perspective taking: Imagining how others feels versus imagining how you would feel. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 751-758.

Bentler, P. M., & Mooijart, A. (1989). Choice of structural model via parsimony: A rationale based on precision. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 315 -317.

Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and wellbeing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77, 135-149.

Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. Journal of College Students Development, 40, 377-395.

Chang, M. J. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. Review ofHigher Education, 23, 153-175.

Coleman, L. M., Jussim, L., & Isaac, J. L. (1991). Black students' reactions to feedback conveyed by White and Black teachers. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 460-481.

Cross, W. E., Jr., Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1991). The stages of Black identity development: Nigrescence models. In R. Jones (Ed.), Black Psychology. Oakland, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Eimers, M., & Pike, G. (1997). Minority and nonminority adjustment to college: Differences or similarities? Research in Higher Education, 38, 77-97.

Farrell, W. C., & Jones, C. K. (1988). Recent racial incidents in higher education: A preliminary perspective. Urban Review, 20, 211-226.

Feldman-Barrett, L., & Swim, J. K. (1998). Appraisals of prejudice and discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), Prejudice: The target's perspective (pp. 12-36). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Freeman, K. (1997). Increasing African Americans' participation in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 68, 524-550.

Goldfried, M. B., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1969). A behavioral-analytic model for assessing competence. In C. P. Speilberg (Ed.), Current Topics in Clinical Community Psychology: Vol. 1. New York: Academic Press. Gossett, B. 1., Cuyjet,

M. J., & Cockriel, I. (1998). African Americans' perception of marginality in the campus culture. College Student Journal, 32, 22-32.

Holmes, D. L., Rupert, P. A., Ross, S. A., & Shapera, W. E. (1999). Students' perceptions of dual relationships between faculty and students. Ethics and Behavior, 9, 79-107.

Hoxter, A. L., & Lester, D. (1994). Gender differences in prejudice. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 76, 1666.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications (pp. 76-100). London: Sage.

K. G. (1993). Testing structural equation models. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), Testing structural equation models (pp. 294-316). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Keith, V. M., & Herring, C. (1991). Skin tone and stratification in the Black Community. American Journal ofSociology, 97,760-778. Landrine,

H. (1996). African-American acculturation: Deconstructing race and reviving culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The schedule of racist events: A measure of racial discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental health consequences. Journal of Black Psychology, 22, 144-168.

McCormack, A. S. (1995). The changing nature of racism on college campuses. College Student Journal, 29, 150-156.

McCormack, A. S. (1998). Revisiting discrimination on campus: 1988, 1992, and 1996. College Student Journal, 32, 378-393.

Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. Journal of Higher Education, 67, 119-147.

Oliver, M. L., Rodriguez, C. J., & Mickelson, R. A. (1985). Brown and black in white: The social adjustment and academic performance of Chicano and black students in predominantly white universities. Urban Review, 17, 3-24.

Parr, M. G. (1999). Professors' perceptions of student behaviors. College Student Journal, 33, 414-423.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 49, 65-85

Phenice, L., & Griffore, R. (1994). College students' stereotype. College Student Journal, 28 (3),373-375.

Sue, D. W. (2010). Micro aggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation. John Wiley & Sons.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance. American Psychologist, 52(6), 613–629.

Smith, D. G. (2008). Diversity's Promise for Higher Education: Making It Work. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition. University of Chicago Press.