

Belongingness Matters: Places Matter

Office of Assessment and Research, Division of Student Life

Please contact Brian Clark (clark13@uoregon.edu) with questions.

Please use the following citation when using or referencing any tables or text from this document:
Office of Assessment and Research (2020). *Belongingness Matters: Places Matter*.

Summary

Inclusiveness

- *Erb Memorial Union*
 - *Gender*. Evenly inclusive of women and men students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Asian students, followed by White students, followed by Underserved students
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of continuing-generation students than of first-generation students
- *Knight Library*
 - *Gender*. Evenly inclusive of women and men students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of Underserved students, followed by Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by White students, followed by Asian students
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of first-generation students than of continuing-generation students
- *University Housing*
 - *Gender*. Slightly more inclusive of men students than of women students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of Asian students and least inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic and White students, with Underserved students in the middle
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of continuing-generation students than of first-generation students
- *Lokey Science Complex*
 - *Gender*. Evenly inclusive of women and men students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of Asian students and least inclusive of Underserved students, with Multiracial/ethnic and White students in the middle
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of continuing-generation students than of first-generation students
- *Student Recreation Center*
 - *Gender*. Slightly more inclusive of men students than of women students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. More inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic, Underserved, and White students than of Asian students
 - *Parent Education*. Evenly inclusive of first-generation and continuing-generation students

- *Lillis Business Complex*
 - *Gender*. Notably more inclusive of men students than of women students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of White students, followed by Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Underserved students, followed by Asian students
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of continuing-generation students than of first-generation students
- *Matthew Knight Arena*
 - *Gender*. Slightly more inclusive of women students than of men students
 - *Race/Ethnicity*. Most inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Underserved students, followed by Asian students, followed by White students
 - *Parent Education*. More inclusive of first-generation students than of continuing-generation students

Cultural Centers in the Erb Memorial Union

The Multicultural and Mills International Centers are cultivating belongingness particularly well among Asian students, the Women’s Center is cultivating belongingness particularly well among Underserved students, and the LGBTQA3 Alliance is cultivating belongingness particularly well among Underserved and men students. Interestingly, a sizable portion of men students feel like they belong at the Women’s Center.

The predominant sentiments students expressed as to why they feel like they belong in the Women’s Center were about interpersonal kindness and interpersonal similarity. The predominant sentiment regarding the Multicultural Center was about interpersonal similarity. And the predominant sentiments regarding the Mills International Center were about interpersonal kindness and interpersonal difference.

The predominant sentiment students expressed as to why they feel like they do not belong in any of the seven cultural centers located in the Erb Memorial Union (the LGBTQA3 Alliance, the Men’s Center, the Mills International Center, the Multicultural Center, the Nontraditional Student Union, the Veteran’s Center, and the Women’s Center) was generally about social exclusion, which broke down into gender or racial/ethnic identity reasons (e.g., “Being a white male, I feel like being here means that people have already made a negative view on me”), political reasons (e.g., “I’m moderate/conservative and most areas in the UO are safe places for liberals”), and a mixture of other idiosyncratic social reasons.

Belongingness Matters

“The desire for interpersonal attachment may well be one of the most far-reaching and integrative constructs currently available to understand human nature.”

[Baumeister and Leary \(1995, p. 522\)](#)

Two and half decades after publication of their seminal article on the need to belong, currently with 6,755 citations ([APA PsycNet, April, 2020](#)), Baumeister and Leary’s (1995) concluding statement may be bold, but it is not hyperbolic. Indeed, the need to belong is so fundamental to our nature that belongingness – e.g., having positive relationships with others ([Walton & Cohen, 2011](#)) – has been robustly linked to essentially everything that is important in life. Across ages and cultures, from domains of psychological and physical wellbeing ([Armstrong et al., 2016](#); [Arslan, 2018](#); [Arslan & Duru, 2017](#); [Barr](#)

et al., 2016; [Berry & Hou, 2017](#); [Cacioppo et al., 2006](#); [Caspi et al., 2006](#); [Caxaj & Gill, 2017](#); [DeWall et al., 2011](#); [Dickerson et al., 2004](#); [Grüttner, 2019](#); [Hackett et al., 2012](#); [Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010](#); [Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010](#); [Jaremka & Sunami, 2018](#); [Korpershoek et al., 2019](#); [Leary et al., 2013](#); [Mellor et al., 2008](#); [Oberle et al., 2019](#); [Pittman & Richmond, 2007](#); [Robles et al., 2014](#); [Rubin et al., 2019](#); [Torgerson et al., 2018](#); [Uchino, 2009](#); [Van Orden et al., 2008](#); [Verhagen et al., 2018](#); [Walton & Cohen, 2011](#); [Wentzel et al., 2019](#); [Yildiz, 2016](#)) to academic and work success ([Abdollahi et al., 2020](#); [Armstrong et al., 2016](#); [Cohen & Garcia, 2008](#); [Cook et al., 2012](#); [De Cremer & Blader, 2006](#); [Deci et al., 2001](#); [Delgado et al., 2016](#); [Den Hertog et al., 2007](#); [Ferris et al., 2009](#); [Good et al., 2012](#); [Hershcovis et al., 2017](#); [Holleran et al., 2011](#); [Korpershoek et al., 2019](#); [Lewis & Hodges, 2015](#); [Morales-Chicas & Graham, 2017](#); [Nifadkar & Bauer, 2016](#); [Oyserman et al., 2006](#); [Pittman & Richmond, 2007](#); [Rubin et al., 2019](#); [Sánchez et al., 2005](#); [Smith et al., 2014](#); [Spehar et al., 2016](#); [Thau et al., 2007](#); [Van den Broeck et al., 2008](#); [Vander Elst et al., 2012](#); [Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011](#); [Walton et al., 2015](#); [Wilson et al., 2015](#)), belongingness matters.

Regarding undergraduate students' academic success, in particular, multiple levels and aspects of belongingness are worth attending to. Overall school belonging ([Korpershoek et al., 2019](#); [Pittman & Richmond, 2007](#)), general academic/intellectual fit ([Lewis & Hodges, 2015](#); [Smith et al., 2014](#)), as well as classroom-specific (e.g., STEM courses; [Wilson et al., 2015](#)) and domain-specific (e.g., math; [Good et al., 2012](#)) feelings of belonging contribute to academic engagement and achievement, and interventions that focus on belongingness concerns ([Smith et al., 2014](#); [Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014](#); [Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011](#); [Walton et al., 2015](#)) may be effective ways to reduce inequity by improving academic outcomes among historically marginalized and structurally disadvantaged populations (e.g., Black students, first-generation college students).

Places Matter

Another aspect of belongingness worth attending to is that which is rooted in physical places. This is the subject of ongoing study at the University of Oregon through the [Student Wellbeing and Success Initiative](#), a multicohort, longitudinal research program designed to holistically understand institutional inputs to undergraduates' wellbeing and success across the college experience. Each summer, we collect baseline wellbeing data from the incoming cohort of undergraduate students. Each spring, we follow up to see how students are doing. Over the last several follow-ups, we have been incrementally exploring the notion of place-based belonging: the idea that people's affinity for physical places, or lack thereof, is intertwined with their sense of whether they fit in socially. This is a special case of the environmental-psychological concept of place attachment ([Altman & Low, 1992](#)), with conceptual focus on the place dimension over the person or process dimensions ([Scannell & Gifford, 2010](#)) and content focus on social meanings with which places are imbued as a subset of the general affective associations people have with places. The methodology, however, is a significant departure from the traditional psychometric approach of place attachment research (e.g., [Williams, 2014](#); [Williams & Vaske, 2003](#)). Adapting methods from ([Pitcher & Royal, 2016](#)), we ask students to click up to three places on a campus map they feel like they "belong, fit in, are connected, are accepted, etc.," and separately, to click up to three places they feel like they "**do not** belong, **do not** fit in, are **disconnected**, are **not** accepted, etc." This generates data that allow us to do several things (for things not focused on here, see [Clark & Bou Malham, 2019](#)).

Inclusiveness

One of things we can do is assess a place's inclusiveness. Operationally, a place is inclusive to the extent its "belong" click count is high and its "don't belong" click count is low. Dividing a place's belong click count by its total click count, which includes belong and don't belong, represents that place's inclusiveness in the form of a proportion or a percentage. Moreover, inclusiveness scores can be broken down by demographics variables to represent how inclusive a place is of different groups of people. Inclusiveness scores were computed for several high-click places¹ (Erb Memorial Union, Knight Library, University Housing, Lokey Science Complex, Student Recreation Center, Lillis Business Complex, and Matthew Knight Arena)² broken down by gender (Man, Woman)³ race/ethnicity (Asian, Multiracial/ethnic, Underserved, White),⁴ and parent education level (Continuing-Generation, First-Generation).⁵ A difference in inclusiveness scores between demographic groups for any given place can be thought of in terms of what portion of a group you would have to shift from feeling like they don't belong there to feeling like they belong to achieve parity. For example, as you will see below, the Lillis Business Complex is 36.1% inclusive of women students and 52.6% inclusive of men students, a difference of 16.5 percentage points. If the Lillis Business Complex wanted to achieve parity within two percentage points, 14.5% of women would have to move from the don't belong column to the belong column. Although we have made some judgments, readers can decide for themselves whether parity is in fact desirable and how large of a difference is meaningful, given the context.

¹ Place-based belonging data from the 2019 end-of-year follow-up were combined with data from unique participants in the 2018 end-of-year follow-up (i.e., students who participated in 2018 but not 2019). There were $n = 130$ unique participants from the 2015-16 cohort, $n = 248$ from the 2016-17 cohort, $n = 248$ from the 2017-18 cohort, and $n = 346$ from the 2018-19 cohort.

² This is the rank order of these places' overall inclusiveness (see [Clark & Bou Malham, 2019](#)). Additionally, because they are separate choices, students can indicate that they belong and don't belong in the same place. In most places, this is rare. Four students indicated that they both belong and don't belong at the Erb Memorial Union, two students did so regarding the Knight Library, one did so regarding the Student Recreation Center, three did so regarding the Lillis Business Complex, two did so regarding the Lokey Science Complex, and one did so regarding Matthew Knight Arena. None of these rare occurrences affect inclusiveness estimates. However, dual sentiment is quite common ($n = 73$) among University Housing places, which were aggregated to represent one unified sort of place. Therefore, there are three response categories regarding University Housing: "belong," "don't belong," and "both." Inclusiveness scores still work the same way for University Housing but are expressed slightly differently: $(n \text{ "belong" clicks} + n \text{ "both" clicks}) / (n \text{ "belong" clicks} + n \text{ "don't belong" clicks} + n \text{ "both" clicks}) \times 100$.

³ Collection of multicategory gender identity data began during the baseline wellbeing assessment among the 2018-19 cohort. However, because place-based belonging data to date include three preceding cohorts for whom multicategory gender identity data are not available, binary gender was obtained from student records data and joined to place-based belonging data.

⁴ Federal race/ethnicity categories were obtained from student records data and joined to place-based belonging data. Multiracial/ethnic = "Two or more races." Underserved = "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Black or African American," "Hispanic or Latino," or "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander." 85.6% of Underserved are "Hispanic or Latino." "Nonresident alien" was excluded from analysis.

⁵ Two sources of data contributed to the binary parent education level variable. The primary source was student records data. Parent education data are also collected during baseline wellbeing assessment, a binary version of which was used to fill in missing student records data. Continuing-Generation = at least one parent/guardian has at least of four-year college degree. First-Generation = no parent/guardian has a four-year college degree.

Gender

As depicted in Table 1, the Erb Memorial Union, the Knight Library, and the Lokey Science Complex are fairly evenly inclusive of women and men students. The Matthew Knight Arena is slightly more inclusive of women students than of men students. University Housing and the Student Recreation Center are slightly more inclusive of men students than of women students, and the Lillis Business Complex is notably more inclusive of men students than of women students.

Table 1. Inclusiveness of Campus Places by Gender

Place	Category	Inclusiveness	<i>n</i>
Erb Memorial Union	Man	82.8	128
	Woman	86.8	370
Knight Library	Man	73.7	99
	Woman	73.1	193
University Housing	Man	75.4	134
	Woman	68.4	266
Lokey Science Complex	Man	50.7	77
	Woman	52.4	168
Student Recreation Center	Man	57.5	120
	Woman	51.3	271
Lillis Business Complex	Man	52.6	78
	Woman	36.1	180
Matthew Knight Arena	Man	28.1	32
	Woman	32.4	71

Note: Generally, Inclusiveness = n “belong” clicks / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks) × 100. For University Housing, Inclusiveness = (n “belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) × 100.

Race/Ethnicity

As depicted in Table 2, most places have a sort of staircase pattern, where the most meaningful difference in inclusiveness is between the most and least included groups. The Erb Memorial Union is most inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Asian students, followed by White students, followed by Underserved students. The Knight Library is most inclusive of Underserved students, followed by Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by White students, followed by Asian students. University Housing is most inclusive of Asian students and least inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic and White students, with Underserved students in the middle. The Lokey Science Complex is most inclusive of Asian students and least inclusive of Underserved students, with Multiracial/ethnic and White students in the middle. The Student Recreation Center more inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic, Underserved, and White students than of Asian students. The Lillis Business Complex is most inclusive of White students, followed by Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Underserved students, followed by Asian students. Matthew Knight Arena is most inclusive of Multiracial/ethnic students, followed by Underserved students, followed by Asian students, followed by White students.

Table 2. Inclusiveness of Campus Places by Race/Ethnicity

Place	Category	Inclusiveness	<i>n</i>
Erb Memorial Union	Asian	88.0	50
	Multiracial/ethnic	91.5	47
	Underserved	82.9	82
	White	85.7	308
Knight Library	Asian	66.7	21
	Multiracial/ethnic	74.1	27
	Underserved	86.7	45
	White	70.4	189
University Housing	Asian	80.6	31
	Multiracial/ethnic	67.5	40
	Underserved	73.3	60
	White	68.8	256
Lokey Science Complex	Asian	59.3	27
	Multiracial/ethnic	51.9	27
	Underserved	43.8	32
	White	53.8	145
Student Recreation Center	Asian	42.9	35
	Multiracial/ethnic	57.6	33
	Underserved	52.8	53
	White	54.7	258
Lillis Business Complex	Asian	23.8	21
	Multiracial/ethnic	40.0	20
	Underserved	31.1	45
	White	46.3	164
Matthew Knight Arena	Asian	30.0	10
	Multiracial/ethnic	50.0	10
	Underserved	44.4	18
	White	25.0	64

Note: Generally, Inclusiveness = n “belong” clicks / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks) × 100. For University Housing, Inclusiveness = (n “belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) × 100. Multiracial/ethnic = “Two or more races.” Underserved = “American Indian or Alaska Native,” “Black or African American,” “Hispanic or Latino,” or “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.” 85.6% of Underserved are “Hispanic or Latino.” “Nonresident alien” was excluded from analysis.

Parent Education Level

As depicted in Table 3, the Student Recreation Center is evenly inclusive of first-generation and continuing-generation students. The Knight Library and the Matthew Knight Arena are more inclusive of first-generation students than of continuing-generation students. The Erb Memorial Union, University Housing, the Lokey Science Complex, and the Lillis Business Complex are all more inclusive of continuing-generation students than of first-generation students.

Table 3. Inclusiveness of Campus Places by Parent Education

Place	Category	Inclusiveness	<i>n</i>
Erb Memorial Union	Continuing-Generation	89.1	341
	First-Generation	79.0	186
Knight Library	Continuing-Generation	69.4	206
	First-Generation	80.6	98

Table 3 continued.

Place	Category	Inclusiveness	<i>n</i>
University Housing	Continuing-Generation	73.6	326
	First-Generation	65.0	160
Lokey Science Complex	Continuing-Generation	53.7	188
	First-Generation	43.3	60
Student Recreation Center	Continuing-Generation	54.4	281
	First-Generation	51.2	129
Lillis Business Complex	Continuing-Generation	45.1	182
	First-Generation	34.0	94
Matthew Knight Arena	Continuing-Generation	27.4	73
	First-Generation	35.0	40

Note: Generally, Inclusiveness = n “belong” clicks / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks) × 100. For University Housing, Inclusiveness = (n “belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) / (n “belong” clicks + n “don’t belong” clicks + n “both” clicks) × 100. Continuing-Generation = at least one parent/guardian has at least of four-year college degree. First-Generation = no parent/guardian has a four-year college degree.

Cultural Centers in the Erb Memorial Union

We can also delve into the Erb Memorial Union (EMU). If a student clicks on the EMU, we follow up to ask them to click on an EMU map where in the EMU they feel like they belong or don’t belong, depending on what they indicated at the campus level. The EMU is home to several cultural centers that may be well-positioned to cultivate belongingness: the LGBTQA3 Alliance, the Men’s Center, the Mills International Center, the Multicultural Center, the Nontraditional Student Union, the Veteran’s Center, and the Women’s Center.⁶ We can see how each of these places is cultivating belongingness among particular groups of students by calculating the percentage of each group that feels like they belong in each place.⁷

As depicted in Tables 4-6, the Women’s, Multicultural, and Mills International⁸ Centers and the LGBTQA3 Alliance are cultivating belongingness well. Additionally, the Multicultural and Mills International Centers are cultivating belongingness particularly well among Asian students, the Women’s Center is cultivating belongingness particularly well among Underserved students, and the LGBTQA3 Alliance is cultivating belongingness particularly well among Underserved and men students. Interestingly, a sizable portion of men students feel like they belong at the Women’s Center.

⁶ The Spring 2019 end-of-year follow-up preceded the Fall 2019 opening of the Lyllye Reynolds-Parker Black Cultural Center. Therefore, the present analysis cannot assess belongingness at the Black Cultural Center.

⁷ Because the portion of students who feel like they don’t belong at the EMU is so low overall, it is impossible to meaningfully break those data down by place and demographic group.

⁸ Until Spring 2020, international students had not been intentionally included in wellbeing data collection. A special, cross-sectional sample of international students of all undergraduate levels was recently collected during Spring 2020 and formal inclusion of incoming international undergraduates in longitudinal data collection is planned to begin with the 2020-21 cohort. Consequently, the data used here do *not* include international students, which make up roughly half of Mills visitors according to Mills staff.

Table 4. Percentages of Women and of Men Students who Felt Like They Belong at a Cultural Center in the Erb Memorial Union Rank-Ordered by Percentage within Category

Women		Men	
Place	%	Place	%
Multicultural	12.3	Multicultural	9.5
Mills International	10.5	LGBTQA3	7.8
LGBTQA3	2.8	Mills International	5.2
Nontraditional	0.6	Men's	0.0
Veteran's	0.3	Nontraditional	0.0
Men's	0.0	Veteran's	0.0

Note: $n = 351$ Women, $n = 116$ Men. Mills International Center numbers are likely underestimated, given that roughly half of their visitors are international students and international students are not included in these data. Nontraditional Student Union and Veteran's Center numbers are also likely underestimated, given that they are often classified as transfer students and transfer students have not (yet) been fully included in wellbeing data collection.

Table 5. Percentages of Asian, of Multiracial/ethnic, of Underserved, and of White Students who Felt Like They Belong at a Cultural Center in the Erb Memorial Union Rank-Ordered by Percentage within Category

Asian		Multiracial/ethnic		Underserved		White	
Place	%	Place	%	Place	%	Place	%
Multicultural	26.9	Multicultural	19.6	Women's	23.9	Women's	16.6
Mills International	17.3	Women's	17.4	Multicultural	15.5	Multicultural	6.6
Women's	13.5	Mills International	8.7	Mills International	11.3	Mills International	6.6
LGBTQA3	0.0	LGBTQA3	2.2	LGBTQA3	8.5	LGBTQA3	4.2
Men's	0.0	Nontraditional	2.2	Nontraditional	1.4	Veteran's	0.3
Nontraditional	0.0	Men's	0.0	Men's	0.0	Men's	0.0
Veteran's	0.0	Veteran's	0.0	Veteran's	0.0	Nontraditional	0.0

Note: $n = 52$ Asian, $n = 46$ Multiracial/ethnic, $n = 71$ Underserved, $n = 289$ White. Multiracial/ethnic = "Two or more races." Underserved = "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Black or African American," "Hispanic or Latino," or "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander." 85.6% of Underserved are "Hispanic or Latino." "Nonresident alien" was excluded from analysis. Mills International Center numbers are likely underestimated, given that roughly half of their visitors are international students and international students are not included in these data. Nontraditional Student Union and Veteran's Center numbers are also likely underestimated, given that they are often classified as transfer students and transfer students have not (yet) been fully included in wellbeing data collection.

Table 6. Percentages of First-Generation and of Continuing-Generation Students who Felt Like They Belong at a Cultural Center in the Erb Memorial Union

Continuing-Generation		First-Generation	
Place	%	Place	%
Women's	14.5	Women's	19.4
Multicultural	9.7	Multicultural	14.2
Mills International	9.1	Mills International	7.1
LGBTQA3	3.5	LGBTQA3	4.5
Men's	0.3	Nontraditional	1.3
Nontraditional	0.0	Veteran's	0.6
Veteran's	0.0	Men's	0.0

Note: $n = 339$ Continuing-Generation, $n = 155$ First-Generation. Continuing-Generation = at least one parent/guardian has at least of four-year college degree. First-Generation = no parent/guardian has a four-year college degree. Mills International Center numbers are likely underestimated, given

that roughly half of their visitors are international students and international students are not included in these data. Nontraditional Student Union and Veteran's Center numbers are also likely underestimated, given that they are often classified as transfer students and transfer students have not (yet) been fully included in wellbeing data collection.

In addition to asking students to click on where in the EMU they feel like they belong or don't belong, we ask students why they feel the way they do. These methods were somewhat different between Spring 2018 and Spring 2019 administrations of the end-of-year follow-up. In 2018, we asked students to click where in the EMU they feel like they belong or don't belong and then asked them to describe what specifically about the EMU place they clicked makes them feel like they belong or don't belong. In 2019, we asked students to describe what about the EMU makes them feel like they belong or don't belong, and then asked them to click where in the EMU they feel like they belong or don't belong. Because of this methodological difference, students' responses as to why they feel like they belong were substantially different between the years. However, there was a clear overarching sentiment across years in the limited number of "don't belong" responses. Hence, different years of "belong" data were analyzed separately and different years of "don't belong" data were analyzed together.

Sentiments of Belonging

In the 2019 data, the clearest way to see whether cultural centers figured into students' feelings of belonging was to take the subset of students who clicked on one of the seven cultural centers discussed above and count specific mentions of those cultural centers in students "why" responses. Remember, in 2019, students expressed why *before* they were asked to click where. Spontaneously mentioning a specific cultural center prior to being prompted to select places is a pretty good indication that the place figures heavily into students' feelings. Thirty and a half percent of these ($n = 111$) students explicitly mentioned at least one of the seven cultural centers *before* being asked about where they feel like they belong.

The 2018 data allow us to delve a bit more into how specific places figure into students' feelings. Focus was limited to the Women's, Multicultural, and Mills International Centers, and numbers of responses per place are still somewhat small, but three very clear, place-differentiating sentiments regarding diversity and inclusion nonetheless emerged when reading through students' responses.

- **People Like Me:** This is an expression of interpersonal similarity. Some expressions were very direct and literal, like "There are people like me." Some other expressions were more indirect. For example, some students will identify themselves in relation to the function of the cultural center they are referring to as in "I am a woman, and..." or "As a woman, I..." when referring to the Women's Center. This is a kind of "people like me" sentiment, because it is expressive of the person's identity and its relation to the referent cultural center. "People like me" is an expression of whether a place is inhabited by people who "look," "think," or "feel" like the student. "People like me" is *not* an expression of whether a place is inhabited by people the student "knows," is "familiar with," "likes," is "friends with," etc.
- **Diversity:** This is an expression of interpersonal difference. Expressions of this sort are about the variety of peoples represented in a place (e.g., "There are people from a wide range of cultures," "Lots of diversity," "...really open to all different cultures and people"). "Diversity" is an expression of whether a place is inhabited by people who are *unlike* the student rather than like the student.

- Warmth:** This is an expression of interpersonal kindness. These expressions are about interpersonal transactions with staff or other inhabitants of a place being warm, welcoming, kind, friendly, nice, supportive, etc. (e.g., “They make sure you don’t feel left out and they support you in any way they can,” “...people are friendly”) or person-place transactions where the place embodies such traits (e.g., “The space is really open and welcoming”). Expressions that people are “amazing,” are insufficient evidence of “warmth.” “Warmth” is *not* about comfort per se, because it can be ambiguous. For example, “Really comforting and homey environment” does not count. Does that mean something like “the couches are really comfortable...” or “The people are genuine, kind and make me feel completely comfortable?” “Warmth” is also *not* redundant with the feeling “connected” or “accepted” parts of the prompt to which students are responding (e.g., “I feel connected” and “people accept me” do not count).

The sentiments above were coded and percentages representing how frequently they were expressed were calculated by place (Table 7). The predominant sentiments regarding the Women’s Center were “warmth” and “people like me.” The predominant sentiment regarding the Multicultural Center was “people like me.” And the predominant sentiments regarding the Mills International Center were “warmth” and “diversity.” The absences revealed some stark differences between places. No one expressed a “people like me” sentiment regarding the Mills International Center. In contrast, no one expressed a “diversity” sentiment regarding the Women’s or Multicultural Centers. Additionally, almost no one expressed a “warmth” sentiment regarding the Multicultural Center.

Table 7. Percentages of “People Like Me,” “Diversity,” and “Warmth” Sentiment Expressions Regarding the Women’s, Multicultural, and Mills International Centers

Place	% People Like Me	% Diversity	% Warmth
Women’s	31.0	0.0	41.4
Multicultural	47.4	0.0	5.3
Mills International	0.0	35.0	45.0

Note: Text data generated via open response prompt “What specifically about this place makes you feel like you belong, fit in, are connected, are accepted, etc.?” in the 2018 end-of-year follow-up regarding three cultural centers in the Erb Memorial Union ($n = 29$ Women’s Center, $n = 19$ Multicultural Center, $n = 20$ Mills International Center) were coded for the presence (1) or absence (0) of three sentiments: “people like me,” “diversity,” and “warmth.” See p. 9 above for definitions of sentiments. Although “people like me” and “diversity” sentiments are conceptually contrary, codes are not necessarily mutually exclusive (i.e., it is possible for the one person to express both sentiments about one place).

Sentiments of Not Belonging

Across years/methods, when any of the seven cultural centers figure into students feeling like they do not belong, it is mostly because they feel socially excluded (82.8% of $n = 29$). This exclusion breaks down into gender or racial/ethnic identity reasons (33.3%, e.g., “Being a white male, I feel like being here means that people have already made a negative view on me”), political reasons (29.2%, e.g., “I’m moderate/conservative and most areas in the UO are safe places for liberals”), and a mixture of other idiosyncratic social reasons (50%).