The Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI) was designed to assess campus climate on five dimensions of personal and social responsibility that describe developmentally appropriate goals for students in college. This survey was developed originally as part of an initiative called Core Commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social Responsibility which is sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

These five dimensions consist of a) Striving for excellence, b) cultivating academic integrity, c) contributing to the larger community, d) taking seriously the perspectives of others, and e) developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning. Each dimension is composed of two sub-dimensions which are examined in this report.

This survey was developed and conducted online by the Research Institute for Studies in Education. During the spring 2013 semester, the survey was administered to students and professionals at San Jose State University (SJSU). Of the 27,293 SJSU students invited to take the survey, 3,257 responded (a response rate of 12%). Of the, 2,248 SJSU professionals invited to take the survey, 501 responded (this is a response rate of 23%).

PSRI survey responses were analyzed comparing SJSU data and national results. Findings are presented in this report. National results will be referred to as the benchmark. Results are presented through three different perspectives: 1) SJSU students versus their benchmark (student national results), 2) SJSU professional versus their benchmark (professional national results), 3) SJSU student versus SJSU professionals.

The results of the survey are summarized below:

**Findings**

- For all five dimensions, and the two sub dimensions within them, SJSU students rated their campus lower than their benchmark.
- Except for three questions, SJSU professionals rated their campus lower than their benchmark for all five dimensions and the two sub-dimensions within them.
- These three questions are…
  - SJSU professionals are more likely to say formal course syllabi define academic dishonesty on their campus.
  - SJSU professionals are more likely to say that SJSU students are respectful of one another.
  - SJSU professionals are more likely to say students frequently tell other students to take a different perspective.
- SJSU student versus SJSU professionals perspective
  - SJSU students rate the overall climate for excellence on campus, the general climate for academic integrity, and the faculty role in academic integrity higher than SJSU professionals.
o SJSU students and SJSU professionals rated communicating expectations about excellence, the general climate for contributing to the larger community, and the general climate for ethical and moral reasoning at about the same level.

o SJSU professionals rated advocating for contributing to the larger community, the general climate of perspective taking, advocating for perspective taking, and sources of support for ethical and moral reasoning higher than SJSU students.
**Dimension 1: Striving for Excellence**

This dimension assesses the perceptions of developing a strong work ethic and consciously doing one's very best in all aspects of college. This dimension is a measure of how well the institution wants all its students to succeed.

**1.1: Overall Climate for Excellence**

The overall climate for excellence consists of five questions from the PSRI which measure an institution’s overall ability to get the very best effort from its students (Chart 1). It measures how high the expectations are in a campus community and if connections are emphasized between hard work and future outcomes.

- SJSU students rate the overall climate for excellence on campus lower than their benchmark for all five questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the overall climate for excellence on campus lower than their benchmark for all five questions.
- SJSU students rate the overall climate for excellence on campus higher than SJSU professionals for all five questions.

![Chart 1: Overall Climate for Excellence](image_url)
1.2: Communicating Expectations about Excellence

Communicating expectation of excellence consists of three questions from the PSRI. They measure the frequency students are told about high expectation in terms of academic work (Chart 2). The questions ask which segment of the professional community (faculty, senior administration, and student affairs professionals) most frequently communicates high academic standards to students.

- SJSU students rate the communication of high academic standards from all professional segments at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the communication of high academic standards from themselves to students at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- Both SJSU students and SJSU professionals are in agreement about how often faculty and senior administrators communicate high academic standards to students.

**Chart 2: Communicating Expectations about Excellence**

- **How often do senior administrators communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?**
  - Student: 3.24, SJSU: 3.22, Benchmark: 3.54
  - Professional: 3.68

- **How often do faculty members communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?**
  - Student: 4.17, SJSU: 4.24, Benchmark: 4.33
  - Professional: 4.38

- **How often do student affairs professionals communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?**
  - Student: 3.3, SJSU: 3.64, Benchmark: 3.96
  - Professional: 3.57
Dimension 2: Cultivating Academic Integrity

Cultivating academic integrity is recognizing and acting on a sense of honor, ranging from honesty, fairness, and respect for others and their work to engaging with a formal academic honors code. In other word, students must obey rules of honest scholarship and all academic work should result from their own efforts.

2.1 General Climate for Academic Integrity

The general climate for academic integrity consists of four questions from the PSRI which measures an institution’s ability to instill in its students a sense of honesty and fairness (Chart 3). It measures how much students respect the rules laid forth in the institution and how much effort the institution makes to emphasize those rules.

- SJSU students rate the general climate of academic integrity on campus lower than their benchmark for all four questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate of academic integrity on campus lower than their benchmark for all four questions.
- SJSU students are more likely to agree that campus academic policies help stop cheating than SJSU professionals.
2.2 Faculty Role in Academic Integrity

The faculty role in academic integrity is the degree to which faculty play in developing this fundamental value in students (Chart 4). This section measures the faculty understanding, support, and actions which ensure that students comprehend the value and importance of academic integrity.

- SJSU students rate the faculty role in academic integrity lower than their benchmark for all four questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the faculty role in academic integrity lower than their benchmark for all questions except how often course syllabi define academic dishonesty. In this case SJSU professionals say this happens on their campus more frequently than the benchmark.
- SJSU students rate the faculty role in academic integrity at a higher frequency than SJSU professionals.
Dimension 3: Contributing to the Larger Community

Contributing to the larger community is recognizing and acting on one's responsibility to the educational community and the local national and global society. This dimension measures a student’s civic engagement and social responsibility while attending an institution of higher learning.

3.1 General Climate for Contributing to the Larger Community

The general climate for contributing to a larger community consists of four questions from the PSRI which measures the institution’s overall ability to encourage students to become engaged in the community (Chart 5). It measures the value the institution places on contributing to the larger community and the greater good.

- SJSU students rate the general climate for contributing to the larger community lower than their benchmark for all four questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate for contributing to the larger community lower than their benchmark for all four questions.
- SJSU students say that they are aware of the importance of being involved in the community, SJSU professionals disagree with this assessment.
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3.2 Advocating for Contributing to the Larger Community

Advocating for contributing to the larger community consists of four questions from the PSRI which measures how frequently students and professionals (faculty, senior administration, and student affairs professionals) tell students the need to become more active and involved citizens (Chart 6).

- SJSU students rate the amount these groups advocate to students about making a contribution to the larger community at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the amount these groups advocate to students about making a contribution to the larger community at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the amount these groups advocate to students about making a contribution to the larger community at a higher frequency than SJSU students.

![Chart 6: Advocating for Contributing to a Larger Community](chart)

- How often do senior administrators publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?
- How often do faculty members publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?
- How often do student affairs professionals publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?
- How often do students publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?
**Dimension 4: Taking Seriously the Perspective of Others**

Taking seriously the perspective of others is recognizing and acting on the obligation to inform one's own judgment; engaging diverse and competing perspectives as a resource for learning, citizenship, and work. It is actively encouraging dissimilar viewpoints and engaging others with beliefs, opinions, and perspectives that are different from one’s own.

**4.1 General Climate for Perspective Taking**

The general climate for perspective taking consists of seven questions for the PSRI which measure the institution’s commitment to impart in its students an ability to be open and respectful (Chart 7). It measures how much students are open to other viewpoints and how welcoming the institution is to these diverse perspectives.

- SJSU students rate the general climate for perspective taking on campus lower than their benchmark for all seven questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate for perspective taking on campus lower than their benchmark for 6 out of 7 questions. SJSU professionals are more likely to say that students are respectful of one another than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate for perspective taking on campus higher than SJSU students for 6 out of 7 questions. SJSU students are more likely to say that it is safe to hold an unpopular view on campus than SJSU professionals.

**Chart 7: General Climate for Perspective Taking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SJSU Students</th>
<th>SJSU Benchmark</th>
<th>SJSU Professionals</th>
<th>Professional Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others is a major focus of this campus</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This campus helps students understand the connections between appreciating various opinions and perspectives and being a well-informed citizen</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is safe to hold unpopular positions on this campus</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at this institution teach about the importance of considering diverse intellectual viewpoints</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at this institution are respectful of one another when discussing controversial issues or perspectives</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Advocating for Perspective Taking

Advocating for perspective taking consists of six questions from the PSRI which measure how frequently students are told to respect the opinions of others (Chart 8). It also asks how often students explore diverse perspectives inside and outside of class.

- SJSU students rate the amount of times they are told to take different perspectives and the opportunity take a different perspective at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the amount of times students are told by professionals to take different perspectives and the opportunity take a different perspective at a lower frequency than their benchmark for 5 out of 6 questions. SJSU professionals say students more frequently tell other students to take a different perspective when compared to their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals perceive greater occurrences of encouragement for students to take a different perspective than students perceive receiving.
Dimension 5: Developing Competence in Ethical and Moral Reasoning

Developing ethical and moral reasoning is the fifth dimension. This dimension should incorporate the other four dimensions and should be used in learning and in life. Ethical and moral reasoning is also the ability to express and act upon these values responsibly, such as being able to identify and evaluate moral dilemmas and act appropriately.

5.1 General Climate for Ethical and Moral Reasoning

The general climate for ethical and moral reasoning consists of five questions from the PSRI which measures the institution's ability to instill character traits among its students, such as: integrity, honesty, responsibility, respect, courage, self-efficacy, compassion, and empathy (Chart 9).

- SJSU students rate the general climate for ethical and moral reasoning on campus lower than their benchmark for all five questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate for ethical and moral reasoning on campus lower than their benchmark for all five questions.
- SJSU professionals rate the general climate for ethical and moral reasoning on campus about the same as SJSU student do. However, SJSU professionals say there are more opportunities to develop ethical and moral reasoning in academic work, whereas SJSU students say there are more opportunities to develop ethical and moral reasoning in their personal lives.

5.2 Sources of Support for Ethical and Moral Reasoning
Sources of support for ethical and moral reasoning consist of four questions from the PSRI which measure how frequently students and professionals (faculty, senior administration, and student affairs professionals) give students opportunities to discuss their questions and concerns about their own ethical and moral thinking (Chart 10).

- SJSU students rate the amount of times these groups discuss personal ethical and moral issues with students at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professional rate the amount of times these groups discuss personal ethical and moral issues with students at a lower frequency than their benchmark.
- SJSU professionals rate the amount of times these groups discuss personal ethical and moral issues with students at a higher frequency than SJSU students.

**Chart 10: Sources of Support for Ethical and Moral Reasoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Support</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Not very often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students feel they can go to senior administrators to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel they can go to faculty members to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel they can go to student affairs professionals to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel they can go to students to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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