Factors Affecting Campus Climate: Creating a Welcoming Environment

Gloria D. Campbell-Whatley
Chuang Wang
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Ozalle Toms
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
Nakeshia Williams
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Abstract

As rising numbers of women and faculty with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (non-majority faculty) enter academia, there is increasing attention related to issues of campus climate. In this study, we explore the results of a university-wide survey designed to examine faculty perceptions of diversity and campus climate at a large research university in the southeast. Women and non-majority faculty indicated a less than welcoming climate than men and majority faculty. This study reveals five factors; Respect, Conflict, Diversity Engagement, Diversity Interest and Diversity Exposure that are relevant to adapting campus climate to a more welcoming environment for women and non-majority faculty. Implications to improve faculty climate are suggested.

Factors Affecting Campus Climate: Creating a Welcoming Environment

Diversity and climate is a major concern on college and university campuses (Hart, 2008). In the past two decades, the number of faculty with gender, racial, disability status, and religious differences has increased (Holley, Larson, Adelman, & Treviño, 2008; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Locks, Sylvia, Hurtado, Bowman, & Oseguera, 2008; Pittman, 2012; Vaccaro, 2010). Understanding the issues of diversifying institutions while addressing the psychological and behavioral dimensions of the climate is significant (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998). Sustaining and assuring a welcoming environment while incorporating a diversity of voices, knowledge, and lived experiences in the educational and academic process is of paramount importance to higher education.

Campus climate is the interplay among people, processes, institutional culture, and represent important aspects of an organization including perceptions and expectations of the people in the academic community (Hart & Cress, 2008; Vaccaro, 2010). A welcoming campus climate means an acceptance of faculty who bring varied perspectives, experiences, attitudes, and styles to campuses that positively affect teaching and research. Concerns may range from an understanding of diversity issues to a connection with students represented in the diverse campus community. Varied perceptions of representative groups on the campus are expected, but ensuring a greater possibility of creating a welcoming environment is embedded in efforts to embrace, accept, and understand differences and realize the need for diversity engagement and exposure. Conflict arises when faculty feel they experience difficulty at work as a result of sexual orientation, disability status, ethnicity, and gender on campus. Studies show that non-majority faculty and women continue to bring forth conflicting issues related to the climate and its effect on retention and promotion (Pittman, 2012).

The study seeks to examine the difference between majority faculty (White) and non-majority faculty (faculty of color) and male faculty and female faculty on the Campus Climate Diversity Survey. The present study also determines particular factors that are significant to the campus climate.

First, the study is significant because it provides information for diversity training initiatives specifically for one campus. Diversity training should be tailored to the needs of the campus community where the initiatives occur. Secondly, this study presents five factors relevant to campus climate: *(a) Respect, (b) Conflict, (c) Diversity Engagement, (d) Diversity Interest and (e) Diversity Exposure*. Although there have been studies performed on campus climate, these five aspects of diversity have not surfaced as key elements that categorize the type of experiences that are encountered on college campuses and universities. Usually studies on faculty discuss the aspects of promotion and tenure, but few examine the incremental elements that comprise campus climate.

The present study used an *Exploratory Factor Analysis* to determine five related factors from a diversity survey given to faculty at a midsized urban university in the southeast. A *MANOVA* was used to determine gender differences or differences between majority and non-majority groups on the combination of the five constructs from the factor analysis. Independent samples t-tests were then used to determine the significant difference of each item on the survey and differences between majority and non-majority groups and differences in males and females. The comprehensive literature review below offers variations in historical foci as diversity issued morphed through the years.

Literature Review

Early studies of campus climate show a difference in the perceptions of women and men, and majority and non-majority faculty. The literature review provides a glimpse of the changing landscape and difference in the focus of diversity surveys and campus climate through the years. Wood and Sherman (2001) examined surveys from 1975 to 1989 of faculty opinions through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In early surveys diversity content focused on affirmative action. On the 1975 survey, roughly 50% of the faculty indicated that affirmative action was unfair to White males. Seventy-five percent of indicated academic programs for African American students should not be controlled by African American people. Fifty percent agreed or strongly agreed that there was too much attention focused around the rights of diverse populations. In 1989, a campus climate survey at UCLA, using the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) instruct revealed that most faculty indicated that diversity is good (92%) but (67%) felt that too many unprepared students were admitted to the university. Forty-five percent of faculty felt that affirmative action led to the hiring of less qualified faculty. These studies show that, at that time, even hiring non-majority faculty was seen as a crippling effect on the university community.

In subsequent years, as the presence of non-majority faculty and females increased on college and university campuses, studies focused on issues involving faculty promotion and retention status rather than affirmative action. For example, Patitu and Hinton (2003) conducted a thorough literature review on issues that affect retention, promotion and tenure, and job performance of middle- to senior-level African American women administrators and faculty in higher education. This literature review revealed data from studies that identified issues of racism, sexism,

homophobia, isolation, salary issues, coping strategies, institutional ethos, and the impact of these and other issues on the lives and work of African American women (Delgado-Romero, Howard-Hamilton, & Vandiver, 2003). Patitu and Hinton (2003) concluded that universities and colleges revealed a lack of commitment to hiring, retaining, and promoting, non-majority faculty, especially women.

In a comprehensive review of higher education diversity related literature and campus surveys (i.e., Virginia Tech, Oregon State, University of Michigan), Brown (2004) found that rather than affirmative action, surveys now have more inclusive language, such as disabilities, sexual orientation, religion; but are still centered on racial and gender disparities. For example, in each study male and female White faculty had a more positive perception of the campus climate than CLD faculty. Typically, a higher percentage of women and non-majority male faculty wanted more diversity workshops and activities than White male faculty. Women and non-majority male faculty also thought the climate to be less welcoming than their White male counterparts. Cress and Hart (2002; 2008) also noted in their study that non-majority faculty and women and men thought diversity initiatives to be a low priority.

Vaccaro (2010) conducted a study that included voices from students, faculty, and staff regarding the connections between campus climate and institutional oppression. In this study, 1,450 faculty, staff and students completed a campus climate survey that revealed that women desired deeper sharing processes such as dialogue and depth in diversity discussions. Male respondents demonstrated signs of resentment toward these liberal practices.

Jayakumar et al. (2009) explored the influences of institutional and environmental factors on the retention of non-majority faculty in higher education. The authors used a cross-tabulation analysis to explore national survey data of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program. The survey was administered at 416 colleges and universities and had a 41% response rate. The results of this national study revealed that negative racial climate impeded job satisfaction for non-majority faculty that relate to retention, autonomy and independence. In the tenure and promotion process, this negative racial climate also biased reviews conducted by colleagues in the department. The negative student perceptions of non-majority faculty also influence tenure and promotion of faculty, which ultimately contribute to the negative mental and physical well-being of faculty. An analysis of student ratings of teaching effectiveness in the College of Education at a Research I institution in the Southern United States revealed that White faculty had significantly higher mean scores than Black faculty (Smith, 2007). Similar results were reached in another study with anonymous evaluations of 3,717 faculty from 25 liberal arts colleges: Black and Asian faculty were evaluated more negatively than White faculty in terms of overall quality, helpfulness, and clarity (Reid, 2010).

Recently, Pittman (2012) explored the interactions of 14 African American tenure-track faculty from a Midwestern university classified by Carnegie as Research University as having very high research activity. The researcher conducted a cross-case analysis and reported that 86% of the faculty felt that being non-majority faculty had a profound effect on their experiences; 71% of the faculty categorized their ethnicity as negative; 79% of the faculty disclosed that race shaped interactions with their White colleagues.

Recently, diversity has gained great attention in higher education as many universities make a commitment to implement a diversity plan (e.g., UNC Charlotte, 2008). Diversity interest coincided with the era, moving from affirmative action in the past, to the present initiatives related to promotion and retention issues. Because each college and university campus differs in several nuances (i.e., size, location, percentage of diverse students and faculty, environment, ranking, etc.), it is important to examine the diversity climate of every campus and relate training and initiatives to these findings.

For the present article, the differences in gender and ethnicity will be examined as these variables appear to be the focus of primary research related campus climate (Cress & Hart, 2008; Pittman, 2012; Vaccarro, 2010). Additionally, the present research identifies and examines five unique factors which categorizes the types of diversity experiences that faculty generally encounter: *(a) Respect, (b) Conflict, (c) Diversity Engagement, (d) Diversity Interest and (e) Diversity Exposure.* The *Respect* factor is defined as the degree to which faculty experienced an association or connection within their work environment. The factor was labeled *Conflict* reflected the degree to which faculty had experienced conflict at work as a result of sexual orientation, disability status, ethnicity, and gender on campus. The third factor, *Diversity Engagement,* reflected experiences of harassment or language difficulty. *Diversity Interest,* reflects the faculty's interest to include diversity in the curriculum or other teaching material. The fifth factor, *Diversity Exposure*, relates to diversity activity and programs on campus.

First, the purpose of the study is to examine the difference between majority and non-majority faculty and male faculty and female faculty on the Campus Climate Diversity Survey. Secondly, the purpose of study is also to determine particular factors that are significant to campus climate. The study tests the following research questions using the Campus Climate Diversity Survey instrument:

(1) Are there specific factors that the survey yields in relation to diversity?
(2) Is there a significant difference in the responses of males and females according to the factor groupings?
(3) Is there a significant difference in the responses of majority and non-majority according to the factor groupings?
(4) Is there a significant difference in gender when analyzing each item on the survey?
(5) Is there a significant difference in majority and non-majority groups when analyzing each item on the survey?

Method

The university in the present study is located in a midsized urban setting in the southeast. At the time of the study, there were roughly 22,000 students. The student body was 27% CLD and was 52% female and 47% male. Of the 895 faculty, 60% were male, while 40% were female. Culturally and linguistically diverse faculty comprised 19% of the non-majority population, while 81% of the faculty was Anglo American (majority faculty). The campus had seven colleges including Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Computing and Informatics, Education, Engineering, and Health and Human Services. The campus had 10 doctoral programs.

Participants

All ($N = 895$) full-time faculty members were eligible to participate in the survey. Of the 895 faculty, 323 (36%) responded. Seventy-four percent ($n=240$) of the participants were White, 15% ($n = 47$) were

from other races or ethnic categories, and 11% preferred not to respond. More participants were female (55%) (*n* = 174) than male (38%) (*n* = 126). Other factors of

demographics of the participants are represented in Table 1 but were not examined in this study due to the small size of the sample.

Table 1. Participant Demographics

Ethnicity		Gender		Disability		Sexual Orientation	
Black	5.88% (*n*=19)	Male	39.32% (*n*=126)	Yes	5.90% (*n*=19)	Heterosexual	83.54% (*n*=271)
White	74.30% (*n*=240)	Female	53.56% (*n*=174)	No	86.02% (*n*=279)	Gay/Lesbian	4.03% (*n*=13)
Asian	3.41% (*n*=11)	Transgender	0.31% (*n*=1)	No Response	8.07% (*n*=25)	Bisexual	1.86% (*n*=6)
Hispanic	2.79% (*n*=9)	No Response	6.81% (*n*=22)			No Response	9.94% (*n*=31)
Other	2.47% (*n*=8)						
No Response	11.15% (*n*=36)						
Majority	74.30% (*n*=240)						
Non-Majority	14.55% (*n*=47)						

Procedures

Over a 4-week period in the late spring semester, the survey was administered electronically through email by Student Voice, a company that the university contracts with for survey administration. All participation was confidential. Student Voice had the email addresses of all faculty and periodically sent out email reminders to non-responders. No individual information was gathered on persons who did or did not complete the survey. After the appointed time period, aggregated data (percentages) was provided to the researcher.

Instrument

The instrument used in the study, developed by the researcher, was the Campus Climate Diversity Survey the instrument had 26 items, 18 related to diversity concerns and the remaining included demographic data. The questions are listed on Table 2. Sample items include: (a) I feel welcome on this campus, (b) The campus climate is positive and sensitive to diversity, (c) I have been harassed on campus, (d) My accent/colloquialism/language causes me difficulty, and (e) The university's faculty is diverse.

For the survey, diversity was defined to include, religion, gender, ethnicity, race, disability status and sexual orientation. The rating scale contained Strongly Agree,

Agree, Neutral, Strongly Disagree, and Disagree on a 1–5 point Likert scale. The questions were adapted from several other diversity surveys used by various colleges and universities including Texas A & M University, Colorado University Boulder, University of Washington, Rutgers, North Carolina State University, Virginia Tech, and Mississippi State University. The questions were then tailored and crafted specifically to fit the present campus. To strengthen content validity, the survey was sent to 15 faculty at the present university who are known to conduct research related to diversity. The instrument was adapted accordingly. Internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .69.

Table 2. Survey Questions

(1) I feel welcome on this campus

(2) The campus climate is positive and sensitive to diversity

(3) I have been harassed on campus

(4) My accent/colloquialism/language causes me difficulty

(5) The university's faculty is diverse

(6) There are numerous efforts to increase diversity on this campus

(7) Faculty respect me as a professional

(8) Faculty recognize that I have important ideas to contribute

(9) Accessibility to campus facilities is good

(10) I feel socially accepted in my department

(11) In my department, if I work hard, I'm almost assured of being rewarded

(12) Multicultural education needs to be included in my curriculum or syllabus

(13) I am interested in attending workshops on diversity issues

I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my:

(14) Ethnicity

(15) Gender

(16) Sexual orientation

(17) Religion

(18) Disability

Design and Data Analysis

A quasi-experimental comparison group design was used to evaluate differences in responses for gender and cultural and linguistically diverse (CLD) (majority/non-majority) groups. In order to reduce data to a smaller set of summary variables, attempt to measure several constructs, and to enhance reliability and validity of the instrument, an exploratory factor analysis was performed on 18 of the 26 items relating to non-demographic data. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was used to check if the variables are able to be grouped into a smaller set of underlying factors. Barlett's test of sphericity was used to compare the correlation matrix to an identity matrix. Principal axis factoring was used as a method for extraction whereas direct oblimin was used as a method for rotation because the factors were believed to be correlated to each other according to the theories of diversity. Orthogonal rotations were not considered because orthogonal varimax and orthogonal quartimax methods both assume that the factors are not related to each other.

The data used were considered an interval scale due to the nature of the response options. Results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to see if there was a gender difference and if there was a difference between the majority and minority with respect to the five latent constructs from factor analysis. Independent samples t test was then used to test for differences for each item of on the survey. For each t test, Cohen's d was calculated to get an effect size to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables (Cohen, 1988). Due to the large number of t tests and to avoid a type 1 error (a "false positive," the error of rejecting a null hypothesis when it is actually true) a modified Bonferroni adjustment was calculated. A Bonferroni is used to make it more difficult for any one test to be statistically significant (Jaccard & Wan, 1996). It works by dividing the alpha level (usually set to .05 by convention) by the number of tests performed.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure resulted in a value of .88 and the Barlett's test of sphericity approximated a chi-square value of 2710.25 with a degree of freedom of 153, which is statistically significantly different ($p < .001$). KMO statistic is a summary of how small the partial correlations are relative to the original zero-order correlations. KMO values greater than 0.80 indicate that the factor analysis will be useful for these variables (Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974). These results indicated that the assumption of sample adequacy is met and that a factor analysis method is appropriate for the data (Cerny & Kaiser, 1977; Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974). Exploratory factor analysis suggested that five factors accounted for a majority of the variance (Table 3). These factors had Eigenvalues between 1.1 and 6.5 explaining 56% of the variance. An item was included if the factor loading exceeded 0.40. Two items were dropped because of lower loadings. These items were "I have

experienced conflict at work as a result of my religion" and "Accessibility to campus facilities is good." The first factor consisted of five items, accounting for 33.93% of the variance, and was labeled *Respect*. This factor contained items that measure the degree to which faculty experienced an association or connection within their work environment. The second factor consisted of four items, accounting for 8.59% of the variance. This factor was labeled *Conflict* because these items reflected the degree to which faculty had experienced conflict at work as a result of sexual orientation, disability status, ethnicity, and gender on campus. The third factor consisted of two items, accounting for 6.53% of the variance. This factor was labeled *Diversity Engagement* because these items reflected

the degree to which faculty had experienced harassment or language difficulty. The fourth factor consisted of two items, accounting for 3.89% of the variance, and was labeled *Diversity Interest.* This factor contained items related to faculty's interest to include diversity in the curriculum. The fifth factor consists of three items, accounting for 2.74% of the variance, and was labeled as *Diversity Exposure*. This factor contained items related to diversity activity or exposure on the campus. Although the fourth and fifth factor only explained 6.63% of the variance together, we decided to keep these two factors because the scree plot indicates a five-factor model and that these five factors match what we have in the design of the instrument.

Table 3. Factor Loadings

Item	Factor				
	Respect	Conflict1	Diversity Engagement	Interest	Exposure
(1) Faculty recognize that I have important ideas to contribute.	.916				
(2) Faculty respect me as a professional.	.918				
(3) I feel socially accepted in my department.	.689				
(4) In my department, if I work hard, I am almost assured of being rewarded.	.738				
(5) I feel welcome on this campus.	.533				
(6) Multicultural education needs to be included in my curriculum or syllabus.				-.629	
(7) I am interested in attending workshops on diversity issues.				-.702	
(8) I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my sexual orientation.		-.537			
(9) I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my disability.		-.884			
(10) I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my ethnicity		-.732			
(11) I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my gender.		-.709			
(12) There are numerous efforts to increase diversity on this campus.					.813
(13) This university's faculty is diverse.					.763
(14) The campus climate is positive and sensitive to diversity.					.610
(15) I have been harassed on campus.			-.575		
(16) My accent/colloquialism/language usage causes me difficulty.			-.515		

Note. *Pattern coefficients with values of .40 or less were suppressed.

Descriptive statistics of the five factors scores by gender and ethnicity are presented in Table 4. MANOVA failed to detect any gender differences or differences between majority and minority groups on the combination of all five latent constructs from factor analysis, $F(5, 265) = 0.26$, $p = .93$ for race and $F(5, 265) = 0.33$, $p = .89$ for

gender. As a result, the groups were compared at item-levels with *t*-tests. Table 5 shows results from independent sample *t* tests: six items that were statistically significant. Of particular note, are two of the six items related to the *Respect* on the factor analysis (Table 3): "Faculty respect me as a professional" and "In my department, if I work hard, I'm almost assured of being rewarded." On both items, men tended to agree with these statements more than women. Men agreed more than women on only one of the three *Exposure* factors: "The campus climate is positive." Also of note are

the statements related to two of the five *Conflict* factors, fewer women agreed than did men with the statement, "I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my gender" and "I experienced conflict at work as a result of my disability." The effect size of each calculation show one large effect (I experienced conflict at work as a result of my gender) size and the remaining items show a medium effect size. The modified Bonferroni adjustment calculation, obtaining new alpha levels of .050 to .010, confirmed the significance of the six items.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Five Factor Scores by Gender and Ethnicity

		Respect	Conflict	Diversity Engagement	Interest	Exposure
Gender	Male (*n* = 126)	4.12 (0.81)	2.39 (0.70)	1.80 (0.95)	1.52 (0.72)	3.73 (0.80)
	Female (*n* = 174)	3.88 (0.84)	2.63 (0.63)	1.91 (0.89)	1.71 (0.81)	3.49 (0.86)
Ethnicity	Majority (*n* = 239)	4.07 (0.79)	2.49 (0.59)	1.73 (0.84)	1.59 (0.73)	3.67 (0.80)
	Non-Majority (*n* = 47)	3.75 (0.81)	2.92 (0.79)	2.26 (0.98)	1.70 (0.85)	3.33 (0.95)

Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations, P-Values, and Effect Sizes for Males and Females

Item	Male (*n* = 126)		Female (*n* = 174)			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*P-Values*	*ES*
I feel welcome on campus	4.302	0.860	4.276	0.842	.796	0.030
The campus climate is positive	3.929	0.896	3.638	1.021	.011	*0.324
I have been harassed on campus	1.730	1.223	1.977	1.290	.096	0.202
My accent/colloquialism/language causes difficulty	1.825	1.036	1.862	0.908	.745	0.035
UNC Charlotte's faculty is diverse	3.389	1.066	3.132	1.086	.043	0.241
There are numerous efforts to increase diversity on this campus	3.881	0.909	3.701	0.951	.101	0.198
Faculty respect me as a professional	4.278	0.855	4.006	0.922	.010	*0.318
Faculty recognize that I have important ideas to contribute	4.191	0.953	3.948	0.920	.027	0.254
Accessibility to campus facto campus facilities is good	3.849	0.964	3.581	1.174	.036	0.279
I feel socially accepted in my department	4.183	0.898	3.931	1.029	.028	0.280
In my department, if I work hard, I'm almost assured of being rewarded	3.643	1.223	3.236	1.307	.007	*0.333
Multicultural education needs to be included in my curriculum or syllabus	3.389	1.200	3.603	1.157	.120	0.179
I am interested in attending workshops on diversity issues	3.064	1.079	3.649	1.122	<.001	*0.543

Item	M	SD	M	SD	P-Values	ES
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my ethnicity	1.603	1.005	1.701	0.933	.385	0.097
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my gender	1.706	1.074	2.609	1.397	<.001	**0.841
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my sexual orientation	1.444	0.806	1.575	0.723	.143	0.162
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my religion	1.619	0.920	1.787	1.023	.144	0.183
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my disability	1.381	0.656	1.655	0.884	.004	*0.418

Note. **=Large Effect Size; *=Medium Effect Size. Effect size computed using Cohen's *d*.

A *t* test was calculated to explore differences between majority and non-majority populations on various survey items. Table 6 shows seven items that were statistically significant. Of particular note, are two of the five items related to the *Respect* factor, that state, "I feel welcome on this campus" and "Faculty respect me as a professional." Majority faculty tended to agree with this statement more than non-majority faculty. Non-majority populations agreed more on only one item of the five items related to the *Conflict* factor, "I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my ethnicity." It is important to note that the effect size was large for this particular statistical significance. Majority and Non-Minority faculty had significant differences

in two of the five items related to the factor *Exposure*. Majority faculty significantly agreed more than non-majority faculty on the items, "The campus climate is positive" and "The university's faculty is diverse." Also of note are the statements, "I have been harassed on campus" and "My accent/colloquialism/ language causes me difficulty" as Non-majority faculty agreed more on these items than majority faculty. The effect size of each calculation show one large effect (I experienced conflict at work as a result of my ethnicity) size and the remaining items show a medium effect size. The modified Bonferroni adjustment calculation, obtaining new alpha levels of .050 to .007, confirmed the significance of the seven items.

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, Obtained t-Statistics, and Effect Sizes for Majority and Non-Majority

Item	Majority (n = 239)		Non-Majority (n = 47)			
	M	SD	M	SD	P-Values	ES
I feel welcome on campus	4.402	0.760	3.915	0.929	<.001	*0.524
The campus climate is positive	3.849	0.913	3.447	1.017	.007	*0.396
I have been harassed on campus	1.736	1.167	2.383	1.423	.001	*0.454
My accent/colloquialism/language causes difficulty	1.749	0.886	2.149	1.042	.006	*0.384
UNC Charlotte's faculty is diverse	3.280	1.034	2.894	1.255	.025	*0.308
There are numerous efforts to increase diversity on this campus	3.795	0.910	3.681	0.980	.438	0.116
Faculty respect me as a professional	4.213	0.830	3.851	1.000	.009	*0.362
Faculty recognize that I have important ideas to contribute	4.113	0.884	3.872	0.969	.094	0.248
Accessibility to campus facto campus facilities is good	3.686	1.133	3.787	0.883	.564	0.114
I feel socially accepted in my department	4.109	0.946	3.872	0.900	.116	0.263
In my department, if I work hard, I'm almost assured of being rewarded	3.477	1.283	3.255	1.170	.273	0.190

Multicultural education needs to be included in my curriculum or syllabus	3.527	1.133	3.745	1.242	.237	0.175
I am interested in attending workshops on diversity issues	3.406	1.111	3.745	1.113	.057	0.305
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my ethnicity	1.485	0.738	2.404	1.313	<0.001	**0.700
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my gender	2.188	1.326	2.362	1.390	.417	0.125
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my sexual orientation	1.511	0.777	1.660	0.815	.234	0.183
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my religion	1.682	0.952	1.787	1.041	.496	0.101
I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my disability	1.523	0.782	1.553	0.775	.809	0.039

Note. **=Large Effect Size; *=Medium Effect Size. Effect size computed using Cohen's *d*.

There was no significant difference in gender or ethnicity related to the items, "There are numerous efforts to increase diversity on campus," "Accessibility to campus facilities is good," "Faculty recognize that I have important ideas to contribute," "I feel socially accepted in my department," "I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my sexual orientation," and "I have experienced conflict at work as a result of my religion."

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to report the differences in gender and of majority and non-majority faculty on a survey related to diversity and campus climate. Additionally, the present research addresses five unique factors which categorizes the types of diversity experiences that faculty generally encounter. First, male and majority faculty felt more respected than female and non-majority faculty. Second, male and non-majority faculty reported more conflict encountered at work than female and majority faculty. Third, majority faculty agreed more than non-majority faculty that the campus climate is positive and that the university faculty is diverse. However, no statistically significant differences were noted between male and female and between majority and non-majority faculty with respect to either diversity engagement or diversity interest.

Despite overall opinions that the university has increased diversity efforts, there still remains non-majority groups and women who report more negative experiences to their race, and gender. As previous research indicates (Brown, 2004; Cress & Hart, 2008; Hyer et al., 1999; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Pttman, 2012; Vaccaro, 2010), non-majority faculty and women have different experiences from those of majority groups and White males. These experiences can translate into an overall lack of belonging. These phenomena ultimately affect recruitment and retention of underrepresented non-majority groups and women. Just as presented in previous studies (Cress & Hart, 2002; 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Pittman, 2012; Wood & Sherman, 2004; Vaccaro, 2010) women and non-majority faculty thought the climate to be less welcoming than their White male counterparts.

The factor analysis revealed five pertinent factors relevant to campus climate from the diversity survey that these events can be categorized; *(a) Respect*, (b) *Conflict (c) Diversity Exposure (d) Diversity Interest and (e) Diversity Engagement.* There is a need, however, to conduct more research to determine to what extent these findings may be generalized to other campuses in similar, as well as different geographical areas.

For future research, the present survey results will act as a springboard to gather

campus climate diversity data from the student populations. Information from students can help faculty focus on student

Limitations

Because participation in this study was voluntary, it is possible that faculty with more positive experiences were more likely to respond to a survey of attitudes toward campus diversity; and those with more negative opinions about campus climate may have chosen not to respond or vice versa. This possibility does not necessarily contradict the findings; it simply implies a need to replicate the study at other postsecondary institutions.

The survey was conducted at the end of the school year when faculty have other duties such as grading, end of course evaluations, and advising responsibilities that may have limited the number of responses. Additionally, some faculty may have felt the word "Diversity" in the title was an indication that the survey was for diverse faculty only. Although the sample size of the diverse population was large enough (15%) to perform the statistical analysis, the number of faculty was still small. The percentage of diverse faculty, however, is representative of the sample size, because the percentage of diverse faculty is only 19% at this university. Studies of this sort at Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs) would have small numbers of ethnically diverse faculty because there are so few employed at the university.

Although lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered populations (LGBT) were included in the study and persons with disabilities were also included in the study,

needs in the classroom and adjust their curriculum and learning activities accordingly.

samples were of such minute portions that we could not calculate statistical significance. We have however, included the number of participants in Table 1.

Conclusion

The discrepancies in perceptions and attitudes between faculty members indicate a need for increased awareness of issues that affect women and diverse faculty. This study adds to the research base and affirms previous research on campus diversity. Additionally, the study categorizes the types of experiences that faculty encounter.

The study of LGBT faculty, staff, and students adds to the discourse of campus climate in higher education. Findings from an ethnographic study conducted by Vaccaro (2012) suggest that it is a necessity to create a welcoming campus climate by affirming all campus community members and higher education practitioners while addressing the microclimate issues related to heterosexism, homophobia, genderism, and transphobia. Vaccaro expressed that these forms of marginalization should be addressed with a sense of urgency. Many persons with disabilities have less than welcoming experiences on college campuses. Future studies could also focus on this theme as well as people with disabilities. The university in the present study is part of a state system. Perhaps including the sister schools using the same variables as present study will yield a more favorable number of participants so that statistical analysis can be performed for other marginalized groups.

References

Brown, L.I. (2004). Diversity: The challenge for higher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 7* (1), 21–34.

Cerny, C. A., & Kaiser, H. F. (1977). A study of a measure of sampling adequacy for factor-analytic correlation matrices. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 12,* 43–47.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Cress, M.C. & Hart, J.L. (2002). The hue of campus climate: How faculty of color and white faculty view institution, paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of American Educational Research*, New Orleans, LA, April 1–5.

Delgado-Romero, E., Howard-Hamilton, M., & Vandiver, B. (2003). Predictors of burnout among faculty and admin-istrators who are people of color. {Unpublished manuscript}.

Dziuban, C. D., & Shirkey, E. C. (1974). When is a correlation matrix appropriate for factor analysis? *Psychological Bulletin, 81,* 358–361.

Hart, J., & Cress, C. (2008, January). Are women faculty just worrywarts? Accounting for gender differences in self-reported stress. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1/2), 175–193.

Higher Education Research Institute (1989). http://www.heri.ucla.edu/

Hyer, P. B., Conley, V., McLaughlin, G. (Spring, 1999). The campus climate for diversity: Faculty perceptions. Blacks-burg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Office of the Provost.

Holley, L., Larson, N., Adelman, M., & Treviño, J. (2008, March). Attitudes among university undergraduates toward LGB and five ethnic/racial groups. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *5*(1), 79–101.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Alen, W.R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*, 279–302.

Jaccard, J. & Wan, C. K. (1996). LISREL approaches to interaction effects in multiple regression. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jayakumar, U.M., Howard, T.C., Allen, W.R., & Han, J.C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*, 538–563.

Locks, A., Sylvia, S., Hurtado, H., Bowman, N., & Oseguera, L. (2008). Extending notions of campus climate and diversity to students' transition to college. *Review of Higher Education*, *31*(3), 257–285.

Patitu, C.L. & Hinton K.G. (2003). The experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed?. *New Directions For Student Services, 104*, 79–93.

Piercy, F., Giddngs, K.A., Dixon, B., Meszaros, P., & Joest, K. (2005). Improving campus climate to support faculty diversity and retention: A pilot program for new faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*, 53–66.

Pittman, C.T. (2012). Racial micro-aggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominately white university. *The Journal of Negro Education, 8*, 82–92.

Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessor .com. *Journal of Diversity in higher Education, 3,* 137–152.

Smith, B. P. (2007). Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: an analysis of end-of-course faculty evaluations. *College Student Journal, 41,* 788–800.UNC Charlotte (2008). The University of North Carolina at Charlotte plan for campus diversity, access, and inclusion. Retrieved from http://diversity.uncc.edu/sites/diversity .uncc.edu/files/media/CampusDiversityP lan.pdf

Vaccaro, A. (2010). What lies beneath seemingly positive campus climate results?: Institutional sexism, racism, and male hostility toward equity initiatives and liberal bias. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*, 202–215.

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs, Research, and Practice, 49*, 429–446.

Wood, T.E. & Sherman, M.J. (2001). Race and higher education: Why Justice Powell's diversity rationale for racial preferences in higher education must be rejected. Race and Higher Education. The National Association of Scholars Report retrieved from http://www.nas. org/ images/documents/report_race_and _higher_education.pdf