



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

COMPREHENSIVE
CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY
FOR DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION
2012-13

Roger L. Worthington, Ph.D.
Research Consultant

May 28, 2013



REVISED July 3, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| Introduction | 13 |
| Context of the WMU Campus Climate Study | 14 |
| Strengths and Limitation of Campus Climate Research | 15 |
| Research Questions | 16 |
| Research Methods | 18 |
| Survey Data Collection | 18 |
| Survey Data Preliminary Analyses | 20 |
| Focus Group Data Collection | 26 |
| Major Findings | 28 |
| Overview | 28 |
| Research Question #1 | 28 |
| Research Question #2 | 31 |
| Research Question #3 | 34 |
| Research Question #4 | 39 |
| Research Question #5 | 41 |
| Research Question #6 | 44 |
| Additional Important Findings | 45 |
| Conclusions | 48 |
| Recommendations | 50 |
| References | 52 |
| Appendix #1: WMU Campus Climate Study Respondent Demographics | 54 |
| Appendix #2: WMU Campus Climate Survey Data Reduction Variable List | 61 |
| Appendix #3: Summaries and Tables for Analyses by Student, Staff, Faculty and Administrator Status | 69 |
| Appendix #4: WMU Campus Climate Survey Instrument | 152 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the various phases of this study, the campus climate survey steering committee made a concerted effort to include and value contributions of employees and students at all levels of the University. Several units, committees, and individuals played a significant role in developing, funding, and implementing the survey. The following groups played a sustained and significant role: Academic Leadership Academy, Campus Climate Survey Advisory Committee, Campus Climate Survey Steering Committee, Committee for Developing Leadership in Diversity, Social Justice, and Inclusion (LDSI), Dining Services, Department of Facilities Management, Division of Student Affairs Business Operations and Information Systems, Everyone Counts Learning Community, Lee Honors College, Lewis Walker Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnic Relations, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Faculty Development, Office of Information Technology, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Office of Institutional Equity, Office of Institutional Research, Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Registered Student Organizations, University Budgets and Financial Planning, and individual graduate and undergraduate students.

We are particularly grateful to those who participated in the survey and focus groups and to senior administration and other leadership for providing an opportunity for people to participate.

WMU CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides an executive summary of the findings for the WMU Campus Climate Study conducted during the 2012-13 academic year. Although the executive summary does not provide a detailed and technical set of findings for the numerous analyses and findings from the data, it offers some broad brushstrokes that reflect the most important outcomes. Readers are referred to the primary report of findings for additional detail.

Major Findings

Overall the campus climate at WMU was reported by respondents to be more positive than negative. Average ratings on the campus climate variables for (a) diversity climate, (b) general climate, and (c) equity climate were above the mid-point on the rating scales used to measure these variables. Nearly 92% of respondents positively endorsed (i.e., “somewhat agree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree”) the item, “Overall, diversity and inclusion are respected and appreciated at WMU.” A smaller but still sizable percentage (80.5%) of respondents positively endorsed the item, “I believe that the leadership at the university-level supports diversity and inclusion on campus.”

In contrast, a large percentage (28.5%) of the survey participants reported “personal experiences of discrimination” based on endorsement of one or more of the four items used to measure this variable. Furthermore, among the 367 individuals (6.5% of the entire sample) who indicated that they had experienced unfair or inequitable treatment, only 111 (30.2% of those reporting unfair or inequitable treatment) indicated that they made an official complaint regarding one or more of those incidents. In addition, among the 104 individuals offering a response to the items regarding the outcomes of those reports, only 21 (20.2%) indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and only 10 (9.6%) indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Thus, whereas the survey findings were generally positive regarding *overall* perceptions of “diversity climate,” “general climate,” and “equity climate” based on ratings from the entire sample, there were a number of negative findings specific to experiences of discrimination at WMU and issues related to experiencing and reporting unfair and inequitable treatment. Moreover, focus group findings broadly highlighted concerns regarding personal experiences of discrimination and issues in reporting unfair or inequitable treatment.

Preliminary analyses revealed that there were significant and meaningful differences between faculty, staff, student and administrator groups in their perceptions of the various climate variables. Based on these preliminary analyses, it was determined that subsequent analyses designed to address the central research questions should be conducted separately for faculty, students, staff and administrators.

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

Dependent variable: DIVERSITY_CLIMATE

Whereas students, staff and administrators were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Diversity Climate, faculty consistently rated the Diversity Climate at WMU lower than the other three groups. In addition, within the student group, there was a significant difference between graduate students and undergraduate students in which graduate students rated the climate similarly to faculty. A number of important demographic differences emerged on this variable, in particular for race/ethnicity in which White only participants tended to rate the Diversity Climate at WMU more positively than other racial-ethnic groups. Personal Experiences of Discrimination (i.e., experiences of harassment, bullying or intimidation; unfair or inequitable treatment; experiences of tokenism; and/or experiences of being devalued as a member of the WMU community) was a strong negative predictor of Diversity Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 23.3 – 33.4 percent of the variance in this variable. Zero Tolerance Climate (i.e., the degree to which students, faculty, staff and administrators are perceived to express zero tolerance for harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation) and Diversity Engagement Climate (i.e., the degree to which students, faculty, staff and administrators are perceived as engaging in efforts to improve relations and understanding of diversity and inclusion on campus) were positive predictors of Diversity Climate for all four groups.

There were mixed reactions in the focus group interviews to the relatively positive findings for perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU ($M = 5.18$, $SD = .96$ on a scale from 1 to 6.75). Most participants were pleased about the generally positive direction of the findings and also expressed some level of surprise that the findings were more positive than anticipated. Focus group discussions tended to reflect efforts to make sense of these survey findings that went against their expectations. A number of focus group participants expressed concern that the more positive findings could be promoted in a way that overshadows or supplants efforts to address other more problematic issues apparent in the findings.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that campus is welcoming and affirming?

Dependent variable: GENERAL_CAMPUS_CLIMATE

Whereas administrators were statistically equivalent to the other three groups on their ratings of General Campus Climate (e.g., not directly related to diversity, equity, or inclusion), students consistently rated the General Campus Climate at WMU higher than faculty and staff. There were no significant differences between graduate students and undergraduate students for this variable. A number of important demographic differences emerged, in particular for race/ethnicity in which White only participants tended to rate the General Campus Climate at WMU more positively than other racial-ethnic groups. Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of General Campus Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 31.3 – 40.2 percent of

the variance in this variable. Diversity Engagement Climate was a positive predictor of General Campus Climate for students, staff, faculty, but not administrators. Kalamazoo Climate was a unique positive predictor for students, staff and administrators.

Similar to the responses regarding Diversity Climate, focus group participants tended to engage discussions about the General Campus Climate in ways that attempted to make sense of findings they felt were counter to their experiences on campus and their expectations about how the survey findings would turn out. There were frequent attempts to provide counter-examples to the positive outcomes of the survey findings for General Campus Climate. In addition, broad issues regarding the general campus climate were identified as undermining the morale among employees (especially staff and faculty occupying lower levels of the hierarchy), and ultimately contributing to problems in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusion by increasing the likelihood of incivility, bullying, harassment, and intimidation that is channeled through the equity and discrimination complaint processes (see the main report for an in depth analysis of these findings).

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

Dependent variable: EQUITY_CLIMATE

Dependent variable: FEAR_REPORTING_INEQUITY (Employees Only)

Experiencing and Reporting Unfair and Inequitable Treatment: For two sets of items on the survey, respondents were asked to indicate whether they reported one or more of the unfair or inequitable incidents they experienced or witnessed. In addition, participants who indicated that they reported incidents were also asked whether they believed their complaints were (a) handled with fairness, and (b) resolved to their satisfaction. Among the 367 individuals who indicated that they had experienced unfair or inequitable treatment, only 111 (30.2%) indicated that they reported one or more of those incidents. In addition, among the 104 individuals offering a response to the items regarding the outcomes of those reports, only 21 (20.2%) indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and only 10 (9.6%) indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Similarly, among the 399 individuals who indicated that they believed others received unfair or inequitable treatment, only 21 (5.3%) indicated that they reported one or more of those incidents. In addition, only 1 indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and only 1 indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Equity Climate: Whereas students, staff and administrators were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Equity Climate at WMU, faculty consistently rated this variable lower than the other three groups. In addition, within the student group, there was a significant difference between graduate students and undergraduate students for Equity Climate. Demographic differences were observed on this variable for people with disabilities (lower for student and faculty samples), racial-ethnic group members (lower for staff sample), and gender (lower for administrator sample). Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a

strong negative predictor of Equity Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 23.3 – 30.0 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort (i.e., comfort stating thoughts about racial/ethnic issues in a variety of campus contexts), Zero Tolerance Climate, and Diversity Engagement Climate were strong positive predictors of Equity Climate for students, staff and faculty, but not for administrators.

Fear of Reporting Inequity (Employees Only): Whereas staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Fear of Reporting Inequity, administrators consistently rated this variable lower than the other two groups (i.e., less fear). There were no meaningful statistical differences between demographic groups based on gender race/ethnicity, sexual minority status, religious minority status, veteran status, or disability status. Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong positive predictor of Fear of Reporting Inequity consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 34.6 – 38.3 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort was the only other unique negative predictor of Fear of Reporting Inequity for faculty, staff and administrators.

Without question the most prominent theme produced by the focus group interviews was with respect to Equity Climate at WMU, in part because the most striking findings in the preliminary report of the survey results were about experiencing and reporting unfair and inequitable treatment. Overwhelmingly, focus group participants reported that they were disappointed about this finding and that it would be important for the campus to address the underlying issues related to it. In addition, a substantial number of faculty, staff, students and administrators indicated that they were “not surprised,” although a small minority expressed shock and surprise over these findings. Whereas a number of participants connected this issue directly to identity-based discrimination, participants mostly related this issue back to the general campus climate (e.g., not directly related to diversity, equity, or inclusion). Part of the discussion of these findings addressed how the policy structure and culture of the institution interact in ways that make people reluctant to make reports or feel unsatisfied with outcomes of complaints. A variety of observations were made with speculations about how to correct the underlying issues.

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

Dependent variable: CLASSROOM_CLIMATE (Students Only)

Dependent variable: WORK_VALUED_CLIMATE (Employees Only)

Classroom Climate (Students Only): There was no difference between undergraduate and graduate students on ratings of Classroom Climate. On average, students rated the classroom climate in the positive direction. There was a significant difference between people with and without disabilities among students on this variable. There were no other significant differences between demographic groups. Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Classroom Climate, uniquely accounting for 23.7 percent of the variance. Race Talk Comfort, Zero Tolerance Climate, and Diversity Engagement Climate also were unique positive predictors of Classroom Climate.

Work Valued Climate (Employees Only): Administrators consistently rated Work Valued Climate higher than the other two groups, whereas staff rated Work Valued Climate consistently lower than the other two employee groups. In addition, among faculty, people with disabilities rated this variable lower than people without disabilities. There was a small but meaningful difference on this variable between men and women (lower) among administrators. Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Work Valued Climate across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 25.2 – 31.7 percent of the variance. Race Talk Comfort also was a unique positive predictor of this variable.

Focus group interviews produced extensive data related to Work Valued Climate but not for Classroom Climate. In particular, faculty expressed concerns about the tenure and promotion process, specifically in terms of specific examples of inequities they had observed or experienced. In addition, term faculty expressed concerns about feeling devalued as members of the faculty at WMU. Staff focused on power differentials and bullying based on hierarchy, along with numerous examples of harassment, incivility, and insensitivity related to a wide range of identity characteristics.

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

Dependent variable: DIVERSITY_SATISFACTION

Whereas administrators, staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Satisfaction with Diversity, students consistently rated this variable higher than the other three groups. There were significant and meaningful differences between White only participants (higher) and various other racial-ethnic groups on ratings of Satisfaction with Diversity across all status groups (students, faculty, staff and administrators). In addition, there were significant differences on the basis of disability status (students), religious/spiritual identity (faculty), sexual minority status (staff) and gender (administrators), in all cases lower for minority groups. Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Satisfaction with Diversity consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 25.1 – 33.6 percent of the variance in this variable. In addition, the variable Personal Diversity Engagement (i.e., the extent to which a participant is personally engaged in the meaningful activities related to diversity on campus) was a significant negative predictor of Satisfaction with Diversity for staff, faculty, and administrators, meaning that individuals who indicated that they were deeply engaged in the work of diversity were less likely to be satisfied with diversity at WMU. Positive perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate were also predictive of Satisfaction with Diversity for all four groups, suggesting that experiences with the city of Kalamazoo are a significant contributor to satisfaction with diversity at WMU.

Focus group interviews generated a substantial amount of discussion about the ongoing efforts to continue to advance the climate for diversity, and ways WMU has made efforts to improve its image with respect to diversity. In addition, focus group participants offered numerous examples of areas that need improvement where dissatisfaction exists, including a perceived lack of progress in areas identified in the DMAP. Particular attention was

focused on faculty and student recruitment and retention efforts to increase the compositional (numerical) diversity on campus.

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school? To what extent does the Kalamazoo Climate predict perceptions of WMU climate?

Dependent variable: KALAMAZOO_CLIMATE

Whereas staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on Kalamazoo Climate, students consistently rated this variable lower than the other three groups, and administrators consistently rated it higher than the other three groups. Only staff had significant demographic differences between groups on the basis of race/ethnicity and sexual minority status (lower among minority group members). Campus Safety became a strong positive predictor across all four groups, accounting for 21.9 – 41.7 percent of the variance.

Focus group discussions regarding the Kalamazoo Climate focused extensively on the extent to which Kalamazoo is a safe place to live, work and attend college. For students in particular, there were strong themes related to discomfort going to specific parts of town and fear related to people from the community coming to campus who are not affiliated with WMU. Some students, faculty and administrators discounted fears they have heard about Kalamazoo as a potentially unsafe place.

Conclusions

The WMU Campus Climate Study has produced an expansive amount of data from which a rich set of findings has been obtained. Overall, there are many positive findings, along with a number of focal issues of concern for members of the WMU community to address. Among the positive findings were the following:

1. Students, faculty staff and administrators tend to view the climate for diversity at WMU more positively than negatively.
2. Students in particular tend to have the most positive views of the climate for diversity and equity.
3. Some participants view the campus as making progress in some important areas of diversity and inclusion, and demonstrating a commitment to the work of continuous improvement related to diversity and inclusion.
4. Some of the strongest predictors of campus climate indices reflect positively on the ways WMU is promoting the diversity mission on campus (e.g., Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, Zero Tolerance Climate, Diversity Engagement Climate). These predictors of climate can help to serve as the foundation for efforts to improve campus climate at WMU.

5. The DMAP was identified in focus group discussions as a preexisting roadmap for advancing diversity, equity and inclusion at WMU that can be reaffirmed and implemented as one immediate step toward improving the climate at WMU.
6. Focus group discussions revealed that there are large numbers of campus stakeholders among students, faculty, staff, and administrators who are deeply invested in the success of WMU to advance the mission of diversity, equity and inclusion—who are committed to helping the campus take advantage of the findings from the comprehensive campus climate study through immediate and decisive action.

In addition to the positive findings, there were a host of issues raised in both the quantitative and qualitative data that indicate specific areas for improvement, especially regarding issues of equity climate at WMU. The most salient areas for improvement in the data include the following:

1. Personal experiences of discrimination were a powerful and consistent predictor of all of the dependent variables related to campus climate at WMU (except Kalamazoo Climate).
2. A large percentage (28.5%) of the survey participants reported Personal Experiences of Discrimination based on endorsement of one or more of the four items used to measure this variable.
3. There were significant differences between members of demographic identity groups on Personal Experiences of Discrimination, in which members of minority groups (e.g., people of color, LGBTQ individuals) were more likely to report discrimination as part of their experience at WMU. When examining experiences of bias based on a specific identity, members of the targeted identity groups tended to report substantially higher percentages of bias-related experiences.
4. Survey respondents who reported experiences of unfair or inequitable treatment reported a low incidence of reporting those experiences. Among those who made reports of unfair or inequitable treatment, very few indicated that they were satisfied with the outcome, and even fewer reported that the issue had been resolved to their satisfaction. Focus group participants overwhelmingly believe this set of findings is related to broad structural and cultural conditions at WMU that have existed for many years and have been resistant to change.
5. Broad issues regarding the general campus climate (e.g., not directly related to diversity, equity, or inclusion) were identified as undermining the morale among employees (especially staff and faculty occupying lower levels of the hierarchy), and ultimately contributing to problems in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusion by increasing the likelihood of incivility, bullying, harassment, and intimidation that is channeled through the equity and discrimination complaint processes.

6. Focus group discussions prominently portrayed the WMU campus as consistent with what Sue (1995) would describe as “nondiscriminatory” (e.g., a non-systemic, fragmented approach to diversity intended to meet legal standards for nondiscrimination and avoid lawsuits), despite its own best efforts, especially in recent years, to advance to the status of “multicultural” (e.g., actively valuing diversity in its many forms in a manner that permeates all aspects of the institution). That is, there are pervasive perceptions among focus group participants that diversity, inclusion and equity efforts at WMU lack sufficient administrative support and an integrated organizational structure to achieve a truly multicultural climate, and thus often are reduced to maintaining only a level of engagement necessary to achieve minimum compliance.

Recommendations

If WMU is to become a more diverse, inclusive, equitable and multicultural institution, the entire campus community will need to actively engage in efforts to reduce personal experiences of discrimination on campus and improve the systemic processes that promote the development of a diverse, equitable inclusive campus. The following recommendations are intended to operate at individual and systemic levels towards those ends:

1. Develop a plan for the public distribution of findings from the WMU Campus Climate Study. Convene meetings of different types and sizes for a variety of different audiences, from town hall meetings to staff workshops to faculty meeting presentations to small group student dialogue sessions. Promote the positive aspects of the findings while at the same time openly addressing the areas that need improvement. Continue this process for 6-12 months with regular updates for the campus community about actions taken to enhance the climate at WMU.
2. Identify *immediate, short-term, and long-term* actions that will begin to shape and address the most salient findings of the WMU Campus Climate Study. Convene and charge a task force to develop an accountability plan for addressing the short-term and long-term actions, as well as developing any additional action steps needed along the way. Emphasize issues of *equity climate* in these efforts; attend particularly to reducing fears of reporting inequity.
3. Reaffirm the DMAP as the WMU diversity and multiculturalism action plan. Take steps to advance the work of diversity and multiculturalism at WMU as described in the DMAP. Identify specific actions included in the DMAP that have been achieved. Identify several specific actions from the DMAP that are yet to be completed, and initiate steps to achieve them among the immediate and short-term actions identified as part of Recommendation #2. Make appropriate updates and revisions to the DMAP on the basis of actions that have been achieved and those that are yet to be accomplished. Allocate adequate human, fiscal and physical resources.

4. Work with senior campus leaders to develop division-level and unit-level plans to promote and advance positive morale and civility among employees as a means of increasing the general campus climate. Provide campus-wide trainings at all levels (including senior leadership) for promoting a positive working and learning environment that discourages discrimination, harassment, bullying, intimidation and incivility through educational workshops. Increase accountability of campus leaders for implementing or enforcing zero tolerance for discrimination, harassment, bullying, intimidation and incivility.
5. Identify and enhance existing multicultural programs and/or develop new programs that serve to advance the multicultural competencies encompassed within the prominent predictor variables from the WMU Campus Climate Study (e.g., Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, Social/Academic Engagement, Zero Tolerance Climate, Diversity Engagement Climate). For example, an intergroup dialogue program or a difficult dialogues program would have the capacity to facilitate interactions across differences in ways that serve to decrease problematic behaviors (including intentional and unintentional discrimination) and increase positive awareness, attitudes, knowledge and culturally competent behaviors and skills.

REVISED June 26, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Our public universities have advanced the notion that in educating college students for the world they will inhabit, it is necessary to bring people together from diverse parts of society and to educate them in that context. Far from being optional or merely enriching, it is the very essence of what we mean by a liberal or humanistic education.

Lee C. Bollinger
President, Columbia University
Former President, University of Michigan
Chronicle of Higher Education, June 1, 2007

Decades of scholarly research in higher education has demonstrated that diversity on college campuses is associated with: (a) greater learning, (b) increased interpersonal competencies, (c) greater self-confidence among students, (d) fewer irrational prejudices, (e) greater gains in critical thinking, and (f) greater involvement in civic and community service (Antonio, 2001; Chang, 1996; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2001; Smith et al., 1997).

Sue (1995) pointed out that organizations are categorized in one of three ways with regard to the valuing of diversity:

- “Monocultural” (e.g., Eurocentric, androcentric, monolingual, heterosexist values, and a view of minorities as “tokens”) through
- “Nondiscriminatory” (e.g., a non-systemic, fragmented approach to diversity intended to meet legal standards for nondiscrimination and avoid lawsuits) to
- “Multicultural” (e.g., actively valuing diversity in its many forms in a manner that permeates all aspects of the institution).

According to Grieger (1996), institutions of higher education that are “multicultural” (a) are composed of faculty, staff and students that are representative of the diversity found in the population; (b) express a valuing of diversity in public statements of commitment, vision, mission, processes, structures, policies, service delivery, and allocation of resources; (c) act in accordance with their positive public statements; and (d) value and reward multicultural competencies, including diversity-positive attitudes, knowledge about salient aspects of diverse groups, and skills in interacting with and serving diverse groups effectively, sensitively, and respectfully.

Campus climate research is a well-established form of inquiry in the study of higher education (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano & Cuellar, 2008; Worthington, 2008; Worthington, 2012). Data collected by institutions regarding campus climate are commonly used to inform institutional policy and practice, as well as contribute

to the scholarly literature on diversity in higher education. These studies are intended to assess the climate for diversity and multiculturalism (Hurtado, Carter, & Kardia, 1998) in the hopes of helping campus leadership make evidence-based decisions in order to improve the climate for everyone. Garcia, Hudgins, Musil, Nettles, Sedlacek, and Smith (2001) have suggested that evaluation research on college campuses should be used to determine whether diversity efforts are successful, whether they can be replicated, and whether they could be improved. In addition, they have suggested that diversity research can be used to help communicate the benefits of diversity work and justify their investments in diversity to audiences that may be skeptical of these efforts.

Hurtado et al. (1998) defined campus climate as a multidimensional construct, subject to and shaped by the policies, practices, and behaviors of those within and external to colleges and universities, representing the attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and expectations regarding issues of diversity. In addition, Hurtado et al. (1998) proposed four climate-related dimensions of higher education institutions: (a) an institution's history and legacy of inclusion or exclusion, (b) compositional or structural diversity (the numbers and percentages of underrepresented group members within an institution), (c) the psychological dimension of the climate, and (d) the behavioral dimension of the climate.

External forces in the larger society impact institutions, and individuals within them, when it comes to the climate. Specifically, government policy and socio-historical context are two external forces influencing the institutional context for diversity. The U.S. Supreme Court cases of *Gratz and Grutter versus the University of Michigan*, along with the more recent *Fisher case at the University of Texas at Austin*, and the Michigan ballot amendment Proposal 2, are all good examples of these external forces and contexts related to diversity in higher education. Thus, Worthington (2012) added a fifth dimension to Hurtado's (1998) model: diversity leadership.

Worthington (2012) proposed a 3-dimensional model of comprehensive and integrated diversity initiatives in higher education institutions to help frame the complexities of higher education diversity on university campuses that included (a) stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, administrators and others), (b) identity characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion, national & geographic origin, language use, socio-economic status, first generation status, veteran/military status, political ideology), and (c) core functional process areas (e.g., recruitment/retention, curriculum and instruction, research and inquiry, intergroup relations, leadership development and success, nondiscrimination, external relations, strategic planning).

The Context of the WMU Campus Climate Study

Planning for the Western Michigan University (WMU) Campus Climate Study was formalized with the Diversity and Multicultural Action Plan, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2006. The WMU Diversity and Multiculturalism Action Plan (DMAP) states, "We will build a diverse and inclusive community." The creation of a welcoming and inclusive university environment was one of the six central goals of the DMAP, along with

“the development and implementation of a campus climate survey that includes diversity” to provide data “regarding policies and procedures related to diversity and multicultural needs at WMU...[that] will be useful in ongoing University-wide planning.” This report serves the purposes described in the DMAP to collect data on campus climate for diversity at WMU in a manner that informs policies, procedures and planning at WMU.

During subsequent years, the work of the DMAP was carried out by Committee to Develop Leadership in Diversity, Social Justice, and Inclusion (LSDI) building capacity through many efforts including a large group of WMU employees who attended Eliminating Racism and Claiming/Celebrating Equality (ERAC/CE) trainings. During late fall and summer 2010, a large diverse group (52 invitees) of campus stakeholders developed research and survey questions. This large group included faculty, staff, and students from various backgrounds. In November 2010, a group of faculty, staff, and students reviewed the survey items in an electronic format and provided feedback about the feasibility of the items on the survey instrument. In December 2010, the group of reviewers was invited to attend a face-to-face session to provide additional feedback in another format. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive.

With President Dunn’s approval, in early February 2011, a small group of the Campus Climate Survey Committee members met with seven experts in the field from the University of Michigan to continue the evaluation of the development of the survey instrument and the data collection plan. Again the feedback was overwhelmingly positive. In May 2011, the Committee consulted with President Dunn to provide an update, receive direction, and seek approval to pursue hiring an external consultant to assist in finalizing and implementing the survey. Proposals were solicited from potential external consultants who would be hired to assist with finalizing the tool, developing plans for survey roll out, promoting campus-wide survey awareness, gathering and analyzing data, and reporting outcomes.

In February of 2012, Dr. Roger L. Worthington visited campus to meet with President Dunn, Provost Greene and the WMU Campus Climate Steering Committee (chaired by Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Dr. Martha Warfield). At the conclusion of that meeting, there was agreement to move forward with establishing a contract with Dr. Worthington to serve as an external consultant to carry out the next steps of the campus climate research. By June Dr. Worthington was working with the steering committee to prepare for data collection in the fall of 2012. Survey data collection began on September 25, 2012 and continued through October 20, 2012 (with some paper surveys continuing beyond that timeframe). Qualitative focus group interviews took place in January, 2013.

Strengths and Limitations of Campus Climate Research

Campus climate research is a common but often misunderstood component of most higher education institutional diversity and inclusion plans. Indeed, many university stakeholders misunderstand the underlying purposes and characteristics of campus climate research.

The purpose of this section is to clarify the focus of campus climate research, and to dispel some of the most common myths associated with it.

One of the most common questions regarding campus climate research is, “Are the findings going to be generalizable?” Unfortunately, the nature of campus climate research inevitably involves samples of volunteers—participants that may be representative of the broader population in some ways but not in others. The representativeness of the sample is inextricably tied to the credibility or validity of the research findings, which for many people are based upon the ability of the researchers and stakeholders to precisely and numerically quantify the climate for diversity—as if to say, “How much ‘good climate’ or ‘bad climate’ is being measured by the survey?” However, there is ultimately no way to measure a specifically quantifiable amount of “good climate” or “bad climate” at a given institution, no matter how representative the sample might be.

The question above is related to another frequent question regarding campus climate research, “How does our institution compare to other (peer) institutions in terms of the climate for diversity and inclusion?” Again, in order to respond to this question, we would need to feel confident that we are able to measure or quantify the amount of “good climate” or “bad climate” in our own institution as well as for one or more other institutions. However, because the social, cultural, political and historical contexts of higher education institutions differ dramatically, the goal of comparing our findings to other institutions would remain relatively elusive.

Thus, the central goal of campus climate research is to obtain a sample that is “inclusive” (i.e., contains a substantial number of representatives from as many different stakeholder identity groups as possible), and to evaluate the patterns in the data in such a way as to inform our understanding of the perceptions and experiences of many different groups of people on our campuses.

As a result, the best approach to campus climate research is to use mixed methods (i.e., both quantitative and qualitative data). In that way, campus climate research provides a multi-layered set of data obtained from a broadly diverse group of participants representing a multitude of perspectives and experiences. The patterns from the depth and breadth of data collected in a comprehensive campus climate study can be used to achieve greater understanding of the variety of experiences and perceptions of people belonging to many different identity groups. Ultimately the findings from campus climate research can be used to inform important decisions regarding “policies and procedures related to diversity and multicultural needs...[and] will be useful in ongoing University-wide planning,” as was intended for the campus climate research described in the WMU DMAP.

Research Questions

The research questions proposed by the WMU campus climate study steering committee were as follows:

1. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?
2. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that campus is welcoming and affirming?
3. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?
4. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?
5. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?
6. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school? (NOTE: During the course of preliminary data analyses, the steering committee added the following sub-question: To what extent does the Kalamazoo Climate predict perceptions of WMU climate?)

RESEARCH METHODS

As with most comprehensive campus climate research studies, the current investigation of the WMU campus climate utilized a mixed methods approach, including quantitative (survey) and qualitative (focus group) data. This chapter provides an overview of the data collection for both the survey and focus groups.

Survey Data Collection

E-mail invitations were distributed to 28,223 faculty, students, staff and administrators at WMU. In addition, paper surveys were distributed to 335 staff in units where employees were presumed to be unlikely to respond via the online format. Some form of survey response was received from approximately 7560 individuals for an initial survey delivery rate of approximately 26.8%. From among that group, there were a substantial number of blank surveys, incomplete surveys, invalid response patterns, and multivariate outliers that were ultimately removed from the data set, resulting in a total of 5615 useable surveys (19.9% overall response rate and 74.3% useable surveys). The overall response rate for this survey is nearly double the typical response rate (10-12%) for surveys of this nature on a campus like WMU. Table 1 presents the breakdown of respondents by WMU status.

Table 1: *Numbers and Percentages of Participants by Sub-Classifications*

| PARTICIPANT STATUS AND SUB-CLASSIFICATIONS | N | % |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Students | 4072 | 72.5 |
| Undergraduate | 3213 | (78.9) |
| Graduate | 835 | (20.6) |
| Faculty | 493 | 8.8 |
| Tenured/Tenure-track | 356 | (72.2) |
| Term | 30 | (6.1) |
| Part-time instructor | 107 | (21.7) |
| Staff | 924 | 16.5 |
| Bargaining staff | 111 | (12.0) |
| Non-bargaining staff | 698 | (75.5) |
| Bargaining staff leader | 5 | (0.5) |
| Non-bargaining staff leader | 42 | (4.5) |
| Temporary staff | 61 | (6.6) |
| Administrators: | 126 | 2.2 |
| Senior leaders | 38 | (30.2) |
| Non-academic leaders | 49 | (38.9) |
| Academic leaders | 39 | (31.0) |
| TOTAL | 5615 | 100 |

Note. Bold indicates numbers and percentages for the overall sample of faculty, staff, students and administrators. Numbers in parentheses indicate percentages of sub-classifications of participants within faculty, staff, student and administrator groups.

Demographic information provided by the respondents is reported in Table 2. Note that these demographic characteristics of the sample are roughly similar to the percentages of WMU demographics for race/ethnicity among students, but slightly over-represent Whites among staff and faculty (no comparative data were provided for administrators or other demographic characteristics for the WMU campus as a whole).

Table 2: *Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants by WMU Status*

| | Student | | Faculty | | Staff | | Administrator | | Total | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| N = | 4072 | 72.5 | 493 | 8.8 | 924 | 16.5 | 126 | 2.2 | 5615 | 100.0 |
| Gender | | | | | | | | | | |
| Women | 2536 | 62.3 | 257 | 52.1 | 633 | 68.5 | 55 | 43.7 | 3481 | 62.0 |
| Men | 1503 | 36.9 | 233 | 47.3 | 286 | 31.0 | 70 | 55.6 | 2092 | 37.3 |
| Transgender | 11 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.8 | 13 | 0.2 |
| Other | 8 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.2 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino only | 214 | 5.3 | 19 | 3.9 | 13 | 1.4 | 4 | 3.2 | 250 | 4.5 |
| AIANPI only | 22 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 0.5 |
| Asian only | 138 | 3.4 | 23 | 4.7 | 14 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 177 | 3.2 |
| AA/Black only | 332 | 8.2 | 21 | 4.3 | 74 | 8.0 | 11 | 8.7 | 438 | 7.8 |
| Multi-racial | 211 | 5.2 | 12 | 2.4 | 23 | 2.3 | 2 | 1.6 | 248 | 4.4 |
| White only | 3109 | 76.4 | 407 | 82.6 | 785 | 85.0 | 105 | 83.3 | 4406 | 78.5 |
| Decline to state | 46 | 1.1 | 9 | 1.8 | 10 | 1.1 | 2 | 1.6 | 67 | 1.2 |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bisexual | 152 | 3.7 | 16 | 3.2 | 20 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 188 | 3.3 |
| Gay or Lesbian | 129 | 3.2 | 23 | 4.7 | 27 | 2.9 | 6 | 4.8 | 185 | 3.3 |
| Heterosexual | 3575 | 87.8 | 430 | 87.2 | 836 | 90.5 | 114 | 90.5 | 4955 | 88.2 |
| Queer | 36 | 0.9 | 3 | 0.6 | 5 | 0.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 46 | 0.8 |
| Questioning | 48 | 1.2 | 3 | 0.6 | 3 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.8 | 32 | 0.6 |
| Same-gender Loving | 26 | 0.6 | 2 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 | 0.6 |
| Asexual | 53 | 1.3 | 4 | 0.8 | 4 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 61 | 1.1 |
| Same-sex Attractional | 56 | 1.4 | 3 | 0.6 | 9 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 69 | 1.2 |
| Pan-sexual | 50 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.8 | 54 | 1.0 |
| Disability | 191 | 4.7 | 21 | 4.3 | 32 | 3.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 246 | 4.4 |
| Veteran | 135 | 3.3 | 31 | 6.3 | 42 | 4.5 | 8 | 6.3 | 216 | 3.8 |

Note. Subsequent data analyses required some demographic categories to be modified or collapsed into larger groups. For example, although participants could check any racial-ethnic category, those who checked more than one were collapsed into a single “multiracial” category while all others were categorized under singular racial-ethnic identities (e.g., White only, etc.). Pacific Islanders were so small in number that they were grouped with American Indian/Alaska Natives (e.g., AIANPI). AA/Black = African American/Black. Due to their very small numbers, participants identifying as “transgender” or “other” on the gender item were collapsed into the LGBTQQ group, which is consistent with Fassinger and Arseneau’s (2007) argument that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people share common experiences of gender transgression as well as societal sexual prejudice. Additional information is provided in [Appendix 1](#) regarding demographic breakdowns for citizenship status, relationship status, social class, religious/spiritual identification, and political ideology, which may not match Tables in the report precisely due to variable transformations described above.

Survey Data Preliminary Analyses

Once the data sets for the three different surveys were combined (i.e., staff, faculty, students) and cleaned for incomplete surveys, as well as random, inattentive and/or malicious responding, they were combined into a single data file containing all 5615 useable survey responses. The data set contained more than 900 discrete variables. Thus, initial analyses used data reduction techniques designed to combine sets of items into scaled variables to measure specific constructs for the 6 central research questions. Using standard psychometric assessment techniques, a set of variables was generated to provide scaled dependent variables and a set of predictor variables. Means, standard deviations and a correlation matrix for the dependent variable list are presented in Table 3.

Research Questions with Corresponding Dependent Variables

- 1. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?**

Dependent variable items for DIVERSITY_CLIMATE

1. Overall, diversity and inclusion are respected and appreciated at WMU.
2. I believe that the Board of Trustees supports diversity and inclusion on campus.
3. I believe that the leadership at the university-level supports diversity and inclusion on campus.
4. WMU values the contributions of administrators, faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds.
5. My experience on campus is accurately portrayed in the way WMU publications depict the diversity of the student body (e.g., brochures, websites, etc.).

- 2. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that campus is welcoming and affirming?**

Dependent variable items for GENERAL_CAMPUS_CLIMATE

In general, how would you rate your overall experiences of the campus environment at WMU? NOTE: (-) = reverse scored items.

1. Supportive (+)
2. Hostile (-)
3. Fair (+)
4. Indifferent (-)
5. Welcoming (+)
6. Intimidating (-)
7. Respectful (+)
8. Oppressive (-)
9. Open (+)
10. Threatening (-)
11. Cold (-)
12. Inclusive (+)

3. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

Dependent variable items for EQUITY_CLIMATE

1. Campus policies provide a means for filing grievances related to discrimination or harassment when needed.
2. In my experience, WMU policies concerning hiring and compensation result in equitable treatment of individuals from underrepresented groups.
3. I am easily able to locate WMU policies and procedures meant to protect me from harassment and discrimination.
4. Overall, WMU policies are written in a way that promotes equity.
5. If I were to report a concern of unfair and inequitable treatment I believe it would be adequately addressed.
6. I feel comfortable reporting harassment or discrimination.

Dependent variable items for FEAR_REPORTING_INEQUITY (Employees Only)

1. I have a fear of losing my position if I were to report inequitable behavior.
2. I have a fear of receiving an undesirable workload if I were to report inequitable behavior.
3. I have a fear of being passed over for promotions if I were to report inequitable behavior.

4. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

Dependent variable items for CLASSROOM_CLIMATE (Students Only)

1. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in my major/learning environment.
2. When I need assistance with course work, faculty members are willing to help me.
3. I am comfortable participating in class.
4. I believe that faculty have equal expectations of me compared to other students.
5. WMU adequately supports the learning environment for students with learning differences.
6. I have encouraged others to avoid taking a class from a faculty member on campus because I believed that the faculty member would treat the student unfairly. (REVERSE SCORED)

Dependent variable items for WORK_VALUED_CLIMATE (Employees Only)

1. My participation in my department/unit is valued.
2. My participation in my college/division is valued.
3. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by the administration.
4. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by my colleagues.
5. Opportunities to be involved in leadership roles have been available to me.
6. Professional mentoring has been available to me.
7. Faculty or staff development resources are available to me.
8. I believe the options for promotion in my current job/position are limited or unavailable. (REVERSE SCORED)

5. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

Dependent variable items for DIVERSITY_SATISFACTION

1. How satisfied are you with the level of commitment to diversity and inclusion on campus?
2. I would recommend WMU to family or friends as a good place to work or attend school.
3. I have considered seeking employment or attending school elsewhere due to the lack of progress with diversity and inclusion on campus. (REVERSE SCORED)

6. To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school? To what extent does the Kalamazoo Climate predict perceptions of WMU climate?

Dependent variable items for KALAMAZOO_CLIMATE

1. I would recommend attending higher education in Kalamazoo to my friends and family.
2. I would recommend living in Kalamazoo to my friends and family.
3. Overall, Kalamazoo is a safe city in which to reside.

Table 3: *Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Climate Study Dependent Variables*

| Variables | DC | GCC | EC | DS | KC | WVC | FRI | CC | M | SD |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----|------|------|
| DIVERSITY (DC) | -- | | | | | | | | 5.18 | .96 |
| GENERAL (GCC) | .56 | -- | | | | | | | 4.65 | .72 |
| EQUITY (EC) | .52 | .61 | -- | | | | | | 4.46 | .81 |
| SATISFACTION (DS) | .58 | .68 | .62 | -- | | | | | 4.93 | .81 |
| KALAMAZOO (KC) | .27 | .35 | .33 | .44 | -- | | | | 4.61 | .87 |
| WORK_VALUED (WVC) | .46 | .61 | .59 | .55 | .31 | -- | | | 4.11 | .90 |
| FEAR_REPORTING (FRI) | -.46 | -.61 | -.64 | -.59 | -.26 | -.61 | -- | | 2.48 | 1.25 |
| CLASSROOM (CC) | .45 | .61 | .61 | .61 | .41 | -- | -- | -- | 4.91 | .65 |

Note. All bivariate correlations significant at $p < .001$. WORK_VALUED and FEAR_REPORTING include only employees (i.e., faculty, staff, administrators), and CLASSROOM includes only students.

Predictor Variables and Other Variables of Interest

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES DISCRIMINATION

1. My experience at WMU has been free of harassment, bullying, and intimidation. (-)
2. Overall, I receive fair and equitable treatment on campus. (-)
3. On campus, I experience tokenism. (+)
4. The atmosphere of diversity and inclusion helps me to feel like I am a valued member of the campus community. (-)

HEAR DISCRIMINATORY COMMENTS

I hear discriminatory comments made by members of the following groups:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

TENSE GUARDED EXPERIENCES

How frequently have you experienced the following with people from racial groups different from your own:

1. Had guarded, cautious interactions
2. Had tense or somewhat hostile interactions

RACE TALK COMFORT

I am comfortable stating my thoughts about racial/ethnic issues in:

1. My Department/Unit
2. My College/Division
3. Campus Wide Committees or Activities I participate in

PERSONAL DIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

For the following, how often have you had in-depth conversations...

1. About racism, racial differences, or racial equity
2. About sexism, gender differences, or gender equity
3. About able-ism or disability issues

Indicate how often you have engaged in each of the following at WMU...

1. Challenged others on issues of discrimination
2. Become aware of the biases that affect my own thinking
3. Made an effort to educate others on diversity topics

SOCIAL ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT

How frequently have you experienced the following with people from racial groups different from your own:

1. Dined
2. Socialized
3. Attended an event sponsored by a cultural group different than my own
4. Attended a study session or collaborated on work

Indicate how often you have engaged in each of the following at WMU...

1. Made an effort to get to know people from backgrounds different from my own

For the following, how often have you had in-depth conversations...

1. With someone whose race is different than your own
2. With someone from a country other than your own
3. With someone whose religion is different from your own
4. With someone whose sexual orientation is different from your own
5. With someone whose socioeconomic class is different from your own

DIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT CLIMATE

The following groups engage in efforts to improve relations and understanding of diversity and inclusion on campus:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

ZERO TOLERANCE CLIMATE

In my experience at WMU, members of the following groups express zero tolerance for harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation on the WMU campus:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

CAMPUS SAFETY

1. WMU offers a sufficient amount of security on campus.
2. I feel safe on campus at night.

The data reduction variable list is contained in Appendix 2 of the final report along with internal consistency reliability statistics for the scaled items. Preliminary analyses were conducted to evaluate the extent to which students, faculty, staff and administrators differed on each of the major dependent variables. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) revealed that there were significant and meaningful differences between faculty, staff, student and administrator groups in their perceptions of the various climate variables. Results of the one-way ANOVAs are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: *Univariate ANOVAs for Participant Status on Seven Dependent Variables*

| Dependent Variables | Participant Status | | | | <i>F</i> | η^2 |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------|
| | Admin | Staff | Faculty | Student | | |
| DIVERSITY CLIMATE | 5.06 _a (.99) | 5.08 _{ab} (.97) | 4.83 _{ac} (1.20) | 5.25 _{ad} (.91) | 32.44* | .02 |
| GENERAL CAMPUS CLIMATE | 4.60 _a (.90) | 4.52 _{ab} (.79) | 4.42 _{abc} (.98) | 4.71 _{ad} (.64) | 35.62* | .02 |
| EQUITY CLIMATE | 4.47 _a (.84) | 4.34 _{ab} (.84) | 4.19 _c (1.01) | 4.53 _{ad} (.75) | 31.33* | .02 |
| FEAR REPORTING INEQUITY | 2.06 _a (1.18) | 2.56 _{bc} (1.22) | 2.47 _c (1.29) | -- -- | 8.95* | .01 |
| WORK VALUED CLIMATE | 4.52 _a (.85) | 4.02 _b (.84) | 4.21 _c (.97) | -- -- | 20.76* | .03 |
| DIVERSITY SATISFACTION | 4.76 _a (.98) | 4.86 _{ab} (.85) | 4.61 _{ac} (1.10) | 5.01 _d (.74) | 35.84* | .02 |
| KALAMAZOO CLIMATE | 5.13 _a (.62) | 4.80 _b (.73) | 4.73 _{bc} (.89) | 4.52 _d (.90) | 41.30* | .03 |

Note. * = $p < .001$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below the means. Means with differing subscripts within rows are significantly different at $p < .05$ based on Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons. Classroom Climate does not appear in these analyses because it pertains only to students.

In general, students provided the most positive ratings on campus climate variables (i.e., diversity climate, general campus climate, equity climate), whereas faculty provided the least positive ratings. Students were also more positive than all of the other groups on diversity satisfaction, with faculty again providing the least positive ratings. In contrast, Administrators were the most positive regarding the Kalamazoo Climate, with students providing the least positive ratings for the city. Generally, there were no significant meaningful differences between subgroups of faculty, staff and administrators regarding perceptions of campus climate; however, graduate students tended to rate the climate less favorably compared to undergraduate students (with the exception of classroom climate).

Based on these preliminary analyses, it was determined that subsequent analyses designed to address the central research questions should be conducted separately for faculty, students, staff and administrators.

Focus Group Data Collection

The purpose of the qualitative focus group data collection was to provide an opportunity for a sizeable number of WMU campus stakeholders from a variety of backgrounds to review the preliminary findings from the survey research, and to provide their reactions and recommendations for the campus about how to improve the campus climate for diversity on the basis of those findings.

Purposeful recruitment strategies commonly employed in qualitative research were used to solicit participation in this phase of the WMU Campus Climate Study. Students and employees at WMU were solicited for participation via nominations by other faculty, staff and students. The nomination process emphasized members of the WMU community that (a) had experience, knowledge and/or expertise regarding the campus climate for diversity at WMU, (b) represented a broad cross-section of students, faculty, staff and administrators, and (c) were available to participate in one of the pre-scheduled focus group sessions on January 23 – 26, 2013. In addition, respondents to the survey research were randomly sampled and solicited for participation in the focus groups. Approximately 220 individuals were contacted and invited to participate in the focus groups and requested to RSVP to the primary researcher/external consultant. A total of 81 students (n = 27), faculty (n = 40), staff (n = 28) and administrators (n = 13) participated in the focus groups representing a broad cross-section of the WMU campus community.

Focus groups were arranged so that participants were grouped into student and employee classifications (e.g., graduate and undergraduate; faculty with term and tenured/tenure-track appointments; bargaining staff and non-bargaining staff; administrators at the level of unit director or above). The rationale for this configuration was that participants would feel more comfortable openly discussing their viewpoints if they were in groups with similar experiences and perspectives about the WMU campus (e.g., students might feel intimidated by being in a group with faculty; staff might feel intimidated by being in a group with administrators).

Focus group meetings were scheduled for 90-minutes each, and began with an overview of the informed consent process along with guidelines for dialogue and a group consensus regarding how group members would avoid disclosing information discussed inside the group to anybody outside the meeting (to assure some level of respect for confidentiality within the group). The external consultant (primary researcher) facilitated all of the focus group meetings, and began each focus group meeting with a 20-30 minute overview of the preliminary findings from the survey research. NOTE: Preliminary findings were presented on the basis of the total sample and had not been disaggregated by status within WMU or by identity groups, which were more positive than disaggregated findings in later analyses.

The focus discussions were semi-structured around the following questions:

- On the basis of the findings of the WMU Campus Climate Study, what are your immediate reactions?
- How do these findings make you personally feel as a member of the WMU community?
- What environmental changes might be beneficial for WMU to address the needs of underrepresented groups?
- What policy recommendations should be made to the university administration on the basis of these findings?

All focus group meetings were audio recorded and transcribed. The researcher listened to audio recordings of the focus group discussions and took notes regarding the themes of the discussions with particular attention to themes that arose regarding specific issues related to the campus climate for diversity for faculty, students, staff and administrators belonging to specific identity groups. The researcher maintained an ongoing working document for the purposes of compiling the data and findings. He used the constant comparative method to analyze the data (Boeije, 2002). This method entails comparing and contrasting data to determine and assess the array of themes that emerge from participants. The analysis began by examining the list of themes generated in each group. Researcher notes were then examined and compared to develop a complete set of themes. Specific comparisons of lists were made across constituent groups (students, faculty, and staff) and various identity groups. The researcher examined how quotes from the audio recordings fit into the list of themes developed. The researcher progressively developed the working document as data was reviewed. In the earlier portions of analysis, any quote that demonstrated a new factor was included in the working document. The purpose was to use the quotes to enhance and illustrate the understanding of each theme.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Overview

Overall the campus climate at WMU was reported by respondents to be more positive than negative. Average ratings on the campus climate variables for (a) diversity climate, (b) general climate, and (c) equity climate were above the mid-point on the rating scales used to measure these variables. Nearly 92% of respondents positively endorsed (i.e., “somewhat agree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree”) the item, “Overall, diversity and inclusion are respected and appreciated at WMU.” A smaller but still sizable percentage (80.5%) of respondents positively endorsed the item, “I believe that the leadership at the university-level supports diversity and inclusion on campus.”

In contrast, a large percentage of the survey participants reported “personal experiences of discrimination” based on endorsement of one or more of the four items used to measure this variable. Furthermore, among respondents who indicated that they had experienced unfair or inequitable treatment, less than one-third indicated that they made an official complaint regarding one or more of those incidents. In addition, among respondents who rated the outcomes of complaints, only 20% indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and less than 10% indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Thus, whereas the survey findings were generally positive regarding *overall* perceptions of “diversity climate,” “general climate,” and “equity climate” based on ratings from the entire sample, there were a number of negative findings specific to experiences of discrimination and issues related to reporting unfair and inequitable treatment. Moreover, focus group findings broadly highlighted concerns regarding personal experiences of discrimination and issues in reporting unfair or inequitable treatment.

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

Reviewing the findings for Diversity Climate in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between faculty and the other three groups (students, staff, administrators; Cohen’s $d = .39, .23$, and $.20$, respectively). Thus, whereas students, staff and administrators were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Diversity Climate, faculty consistently rated the Diversity Climate at WMU lower than the other three groups. In addition, within the student group, there was a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen’s $d = .30$) for the significant difference between graduate students ($M = 5.02$, $SD = .96$) and undergraduate students ($M = 5.30$, $SD = .88$) for Diversity Climate.

There were significant and meaningful differences between White only participants and various other racial-ethnic groups on ratings of Diversity Climate across all status groups (students, faculty, staff and administrators). First, among students there were small but meaningful effect sizes for differences between White only participants ($M = 5.30$, $SD = .86$) and Asian only ($M = 5.03$, $SD = .89$; Cohen's $d = .31$), Black/African American only ($M = 4.99$, $SD = 1.10$; Cohen's $d = .31$), and multi-racial ($M = 5.06$, $SD = .93$; Cohen's $d = .27$) participants. Among staff, effect sizes ranged from small to large for differences between White only participants ($M = 5.17$, $SD = .89$) and Asian only ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.05$; Cohen's $d = .27$), Black/African American only ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.27$; Cohen's $d = .81$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 1.11$; Cohen's $d = .59$) participants. Similarly, among faculty there were small to medium effect sizes for differences between White only participants ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.11$) and Black/African American only ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.64$; Cohen's $d = .73$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 1.46$; Cohen's $d = .23$) participants. Finally, due to the small number of administrators of color, all racial-ethnic minority administrators were collapsed into a single group ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 1.34$) and compared to White only ($M = 5.18$, $SD = .88$) administrators with a moderate effect size (Cohen's $d = .68$).

Significant and meaningful differences were found on the basis of disability status for student and faculty participants. Students with a disability ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.14$) differed from students without a disability ($M = 5.27$, $SD = .88$) with a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .31$). Faculty members with a disability ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.47$) differed from faculty without a disability ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.16$) with a small effect size (Cohen's $d = .39$).

There were also significant and meaningful differences on the basis of religious/spiritual identification for faculty, in which non-Christian religious minorities ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.19$) rated the Diversity Climate less positively than Christians ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.11$; Cohen's $d = .35$), as well as between men ($M = 5.24$, $SD = .95$) and women ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.03$; Cohen's $d = .39$) administrators.

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Diversity Climate among students (Table 6), staff (Table 18), faculty (Table 32) and administrators (Table 46), racial-ethnic status was the only consistent demographic variable (for students, staff, and faculty). In addition, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Diversity Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 23.3 – 33.4 percent of the variance in this variable. Zero Tolerance Climate and Diversity Engagement Climate were positive predictors of Diversity Climate for students, staff, faculty, and administrators.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the Diversity Climate at WMU

There were mixed reactions in the focus group interviews to the relatively positive findings for perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU ($M = 5.18$, $SD = .96$ on a scale from 1 to 6.75). Most participants were pleased about the generally positive direction of the findings and also expressed some level of surprise that the findings were more positive than anticipated.

Focus group discussions tended to reflect efforts to make sense of these survey findings that went against their expectations.

A number of focus group participants expressed concern that the more positive findings could be promoted in a way that overshadows or supplants efforts to address other more problematic issues apparent in the findings.

It's not surprising that perceptions of climate are more positive than negative because people who belong to a community and stay here are more likely to be positive than, for example, people who choose not to come or those that have chosen to leave.

When I heard that it's positive, [I was thinking] "Not in my world." You know my experience is different. The students that I serve are different. I'm not saying that ... that there isn't positive. But, again, my initial reaction was, "Oh my gosh." And even being part of the focus group, ... I'm [thinking], "Is this really going to move in the way that we need to move as an institution?" Because, again, coming back to what [she] was saying is that everybody here, we are vested into this university. I just celebrated [a large number of] years. ... So we are vested into this institution so and we've been here for a while and we've seen that and I know [a particular person in the focus group] you've been here longer than others and others have been here longer, and you've seen that in people come, people go, but it kind of stays the same. So my hope is as a result of this that we really take action towards making that change. It's my hope and I've had the hope for a long time. So I hope that it's just not another thing we did. It's not another report. You put it away, and you know, 5, 10 years we do another report. You know, I really, really hope, I really hope [we take action on this research].

It is not surprising to hear that faculty are reporting being unhappy—they seem unhappy. I was happy as an undergrad here but things shifted when I became a grad student, so the results make sense.

We do a lot here. I'm very proud of that fact. But it doesn't reach a lot of people. It's a daily conversation. We really support this. But there are people or groups out there who feel there are barriers, discrimination, that make them feel this isn't a good place.

I hope, my hope, is that the fact that we were more positive than not does not, somehow give us permission not to address all of what we're talking about here because I think it's taken us a long time to get to a point where we've even been able [or] willing to do a study on our campus, which speaks to the veneer, I think. And so I'm really hoping that the work that you're doing and the richness of these conversations does not get lost so that we really are serious about looking at what we need to do to address it.

Despite the fact that overall the climate responses were predominately positive, I am still concerned about the voices on the negative side—even though they are a smaller group in the overall survey, those voices and their experiences are important.

Efforts on the part of the researcher to identify themes of positive commentary regarding the findings related to the Diversity Climate at WMU were unsuccessful. Any positive comments, as in one example above, were couched within broader concerns that the favorable findings from the survey would potentially overshadow important challenges in the climate for members of some identity groups.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that campus is welcoming and affirming?

Reviewing the findings for General Campus Climate in Table 4 (p. 27), there were meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between students and two of the other three groups (staff and faculty; Cohen's $d = .50$ and $.39$, respectively). Thus, whereas administrators were statistically equivalent to the other three groups on their ratings of General Campus Climate, students consistently rated the General Campus Climate at WMU higher than faculty and staff. There were no significant differences between graduate students and undergraduate students for General Climate.

There were significant and meaningful differences between White only participants and various other racial-ethnic groups on ratings of General Campus Climate for three of the four status groups (students, staff and administrators). First, among students there were small but meaningful effect sizes for differences between White only participants ($M = 4.73$, $SD = .63$) and Asian only ($M = 4.51$, $SD = .69$; Cohen's $d = .33$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.56$, $SD = .70$; Cohen's $d = .26$) participants. Among staff, effect sizes ranged from small to medium for differences between White only participants ($M = 4.73$, $SD = .63$) and Latino/a only ($M = 4.60$, $SD = .63$; Cohen's $d = .26$), Asian only ($M = 4.51$, $SD = .69$; Cohen's $d = .43$), Black/African American only ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .65$; Cohen's $d = .60$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.56$, $SD = .70$; Cohen's $d = .58$) participants. Finally, due to the small number of administrators of color, all racial-ethnic minority administrators were collapsed into a single group ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 1.21$) and compared to White only ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .82$) administrators with a moderate effect size (Cohen's $d = .47$).

For students, there was a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .49$) for the difference between people with disabilities ($M = 4.38$, $SD = .75$) and people without disabilities ($M = 4.72$, $SD = .64$). For faculty, the only significant effect size (Cohen's $d = .27$) was on the basis of religious identification, with non-Christian religious minorities ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .93$) and Christians ($M = 4.57$, $SD = .95$).

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of General Campus Climate among students (Table 8), staff (Table 20), faculty (Table 34) and administrators (Table 48), there were no consistently significant demographic variables across status groups; although the student data indicated significant predictors for all five demographic variables, they accounted for very small proportions of the variance and thus were not meaningfully significant predictors. However, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of General Campus Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 31.3 – 40.2 percent of the variance in this variable. Diversity Engagement Climate was a positive predictor of General Campus Climate for students, staff, faculty, but not administrators. Kalamazoo Climate was a positive predictor for students, staff and administrators.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the General Campus Climate at WMU

Similar to the responses regarding Diversity Climate, focus group participants tended to engage discussions about the General Campus Climate in ways that attempted to make sense of findings they felt were counter to their experiences on campus and their expectations about how the survey findings would turn out. There were frequent attempts to provide counter-examples to the positive outcomes of the survey findings for General Campus Climate.

Faculty see the day-in, day-out stuff. I see that as the explanation for the difference between faculty responses and the administrative responses because the administration wants to see smooth, clear waters. We are in the muck. We see the day-in, day-out in the hiring practices, we see what the administration provides faculty, we see what the administration doesn't provide faculty, and it's becoming more and more difficult for faculty to do their job because the administration is moving into a business model and expecting the faculty to stay in an academic model.

In addition, broad issues regarding the general campus climate (e.g., not directly related to diversity, equity, or inclusion) were identified as undermining the morale among employees (especially staff and faculty occupying lower levels of the hierarchy), and ultimately contributing to problems in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusion by increasing the likelihood of incivility, bullying, harassment, and intimidation that is channeled through the equity and discrimination complaint processes. In the following examples, different staff and faculty members describe their perceptions of the general climate reflecting concerns about safety, hierarchy and institutional politics:

One of the things I thought about when I considered whether or not to come [to the focus group], I had to think about who was going to be in the room—from a political standpoint. I have to interact with anybody from students ... to a [senior administrator]. If a department director was going to be in the room, then I would have been very reluctant to speak my mind and share my opinion especially if I had a different opinion from someone higher up.

Something about higher ed, we've perfected bullying and harassment in the workplace where it's actually coded in intelligence and really pretty words. And so you've experienced these things and you feel funny. This is how you know it's discrimination or it's some kind of bullying or harassment. You feel funny, but you always question, did that just happen? ... As a staff person, I felt a lot of [tension] with faculty. And then there's also multiple divisions in each group. And so there is no safety. And then we have processes in place that have no teeth, like every three months, six months, I sit down with my supervisor. She makes it very developmental. But we go through this whole goal-setting process, but it's not to promote, it's not to give you a raise, and the ineffective and inefficient people with low-scale ineptitudes are still able to stay as well. So you got the people who get moved around because they actually stand up and say things, but then you also have the ineffective people who move around and they kind of wreak havoc through every department that they go through as well. So we're not getting rid of the people who need to be gotten rid of, and we're not promoting and actually rewarding people financially that are actually doing things. So it kind of creates bitterness and like this kind of I'm going to smile in your face and stab you in the back at the same time mentality.

One of the problems that we have in [my] department is that our management team, and even the upper level, the highest you go, does nothing about any complaints for anything. Whether its race, religion, bullying, you know, they do nothing. They ignore the whole situation. You know, and there's one [place] here that everybody is bullied by several people that, I mean, over the last several years the turnover because of these [specific number of] people is constant because nobody wants to work with them because they are so mean. You know, and they intimidate them, they bully them, and, you know, management does nothing about it. The union does nothing about it, so we're like, we are paying union dues ... Then why do we have the upper level that knows this and does nothing about it? ... Going to management, management's, "Well if they do it again, let us know." Well, the management still doesn't do anything. Then you go as high as you can go, and still nothing gets done. So, you know, what's the purpose of all this, you know?

But they're in a comfort zone, and, you know, to them, why fix something that isn't broken? But it's not broken for them, but it is for other people. And they put blinders on, they don't want to see because they're in that comfort zone. They've been here for 30-some years, you know, I've never said anything and I'm just going to sit here, take my little naps and punch out when it's time, and everything is rosy. Well, wait a minute, you know, it isn't all that rosy here. And we can pretend, but it's not.

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

Experiencing and Reporting Unfair and Inequitable Treatment

For two sets of items on the survey, respondents were asked to indicate whether they reported one or more of the unfair or inequitable incidents they experienced or witnessed. In addition, participants who indicated that they reported incidents were also asked whether they believed their complaints were (a) handled with fairness, and (b) resolved to their satisfaction.

Among the 367 individuals who indicated that they had experienced unfair or inequitable treatment, only 111 (30.2%) indicated that they reported one or more of those incidents. In addition, among the 104 individuals offering a response to the items regarding the outcomes of those reports, only 21 (20.2%) indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and only 10 (9.6%) indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Similarly, among the 399 individuals who indicated that they believed others received unfair or inequitable treatment, only 21 (5.3%) indicated that they reported one or more of those incidents. In addition, only 1 indicated that they believed the report was handled with fairness, and only 1 indicated that the complaint was resolved to their satisfaction.

Equity Climate

Reviewing the findings for Equity Climate in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between faculty and the other three groups (students, staff, administrators; Cohen's $d = .39$, $.16$, and $.30$, respectively). Thus, whereas students, staff and administrators were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Equity Climate, faculty consistently rated the Equity Climate at WMU lower than the other three groups. In addition, within the student group, there was a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .18$) for the significant difference between graduate students ($M = 4.42$, $SD = .83$) and undergraduate students ($M = 4.56$, $SD = .72$) for Equity Climate.

In addition, there were small but meaningful effect sizes for differences between people with and without disabilities among students ($M = 4.22$, $SD = .99$; $M = 4.55$, $SD = .73$; Cohen's $d = .39$) and faculty ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.17$; $M = 4.23$, $SD = .97$; Cohen's $d = .46$) on ratings of Equity Climate, in which people with disabilities rated the Equity Climate lower. For staff, there were significant effect sizes for the differences between White only staff ($M = 4.38$, $SD = .83$) as compared to Asian only staff ($M = 3.74$, $SD = .91$; Cohen's $d = .73$), Black/African American staff ($M = 4.05$, $SD = .86$; Cohen's $d = .39$), and Latino/a only staff ($M = 4.12$, $SD =$

.99; Cohen's $d = .28$). Among administrators, there was a significant effect size difference on the gender binary between men ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .74$) and women ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .92$; Cohen's $d = .43$). There were no meaningful significant differences on Equity Climate between demographic groups based on sexual minority status (which includes gender non-conforming participants with LGBTQ participants), religious minority status, or veteran status.

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Equity Climate among students (Table 10), staff (Table 22), faculty (Table 36) and administrators (Table 50), none of the demographic variables were significant predictors in the final models for any of the WMU status groups. However, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Equity Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 23.3 – 30.0 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort, Zero Tolerance Climate, and Diversity Engagement Climate were strong positive predictors of Equity Climate for students, staff and faculty, but not for administrators. Although Campus Safety was a positive predictor across all four groups, it was not a strong predictor of this variable.

Fear of Reporting Inequity (Employees Only)

Reviewing the findings for Fear of Reporting Inequity in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between administrators and the other two employee groups (staff and faculty; Cohen's $d = .42$ and $.33$, respectively). Whereas staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Fear of Reporting Inequity, administrators consistently rated Fear of Reporting Inequity at WMU lower than the other two groups.

There were no meaningful statistical differences between demographic groups based on gender race/ethnicity, sexual minority status, religious minority status, veteran status, or disability status on Fear of Reporting Inequity.

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Fear of Reporting Inequity among staff (Table 24), faculty (Table 38) and administrators (Table 52), none of the demographic variables were significant predictors for any of the WMU status groups. However, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Fear of Reporting Inequity consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 34.6 – 38.3 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort was the only other strong positive predictor of Fear of Reporting Inequity for faculty, staff and administrators.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the Equity Climate at WMU

Without question the most prominent theme in the qualitative data was with respect to Equity Climate at WMU, in part because the most striking findings in the preliminary report for the survey results were about experiences and reporting unfair and inequitable treatment (as reported at the outset of the section on page 34). Overwhelmingly, focus

group participants reported that they were disappointed (hurt, angry, embarrassed, etc.) about the findings and that it would be important for the campus to address these findings. In addition, a substantial number of faculty, staff, students and administrators indicated that they were “not surprised,” although a small minority expressed shock and surprise over these findings. This theme was demonstrated in the comments of several participants representing students, staff, faculty and administrators:

As we are talking, though, about the numbers of people who said that they did not report, I'm not surprised at that. I think in the experiences that I've had over the years being here that it's obvious that you should not necessarily report, because either you're going to receive some negative repercussions if you do, or nothing's going to happen if you do, or you will in some way have to be the one to move out of that experience. It's not as if ... you're having a problem with your supervisor, it's not as if your supervisor's going to get in any trouble. It's really going to be the onus is on you to figure out a way that you're going to move out of that or figure out a way to navigate through it. So I'm not surprised that people don't report, because I think our campus is like that. That you don't ... there's no reason to report, because nothing's going to happen.

I think I agree with the statement over here that when a lot of times when a student would come to me to report if they had an incident with an instructor, either they're feeling like they were not treated fairly, it was easier for me to say well, let's assign a different professor to put you in that class that's going to treat you fairly because it's going to be more difficult to deal with that instructor than to just, it'll be easier just to move you. And a lot of times the student would rather do that, too, because then they think that instructor has their grade in their hand, and if they report them, then they're going to have retaliation of getting a bad grade.

I agree, too, that people don't know the process to report because they don't always understand even who the official is or what the action should be. And so I do think that's a portion of it.

I didn't find it shocking; I found it disappointing. There are some outlets for students to talk with other students but the outcomes of the official process are not good. I know some students rely heavily on certain staff members or faculty they know well and know they can trust, but those are unofficial ways of talking about incidents that never get reported, or if they do the student never hears back what actually happened so how can they be satisfied?

I consistently hear stories of women, in particular, ... in classrooms experiencing harassment and having it not dealt with, experiencing sexual assault and the campus not responding. So I've seen, I mean, I'm part of that number of who's seen these things happen and not being handled well. And part of my perception of that ... is there's a desire to provide equal weight to,

equal protection to each [of the] people involved in the claim. Right? But if I'm already disadvantaged because I'm being harassed, stalked, intimidated, I'm in a one down position. So when you give equal weight to the person who's doing it and the person who it's being done to, the person who's doing it is always going to come out on top. The person who's doing it is always going to escape because while it's an educational opportunity, we have to make an educational intervention, and quite frankly, educational interventions aren't enough not to convey the severity of the problem and not to redress or make whole the person who was victimized. You know, and that's part of, I think, what we're seeing in these numbers.

Me and a friend made a report of a potential stalker [numerous times]. He was definitely not a freshman living in the Valleys. Nobody seemed to take it seriously. They just kept saying, "Oh yeah, that happens all the time. We hear that sort of thing every year. Just ignore it."

Part of the discussion of these findings turned to how the policy structure and culture of the institution interact in ways that make people reluctant to make reports or feel unsatisfied with outcomes of complaints. A variety of observations were made with speculations about how to correct the underlying issues:

Let me make a point about the partnership between the complainant and the recipient of the complaint. To what extent do we know whether the recipient of the complaint sees his or her follow-up either up the chain of command or laterally as futile? So that the futility exists in both parties, and they together either reinforce their dissatisfaction with the futility or the person says, you know, it's such an administrative headache for me to take this any further. I'm going to find any way I can to avoid having to carry it forward, because I may end up in hours and hours and hours of depositions or ... whatever it might be. So the process of resolution, I think, may need to be associated with the willingness to move toward resolution. I think at times people just say this is a huge bureaucracy with homeostasis being a governing value. I'm tired of butting my head against it, sorry. And I'm wondering if that sort of, I'm going to call it negativity, but I don't know, futility may be a better word, starts to become infectious such that the complainant stops because he or she believes that the boss in this case is also frustrated and is frustrated. I think there is some evidence in my own experience which would suggest that you stop trying because it's just too much of an effort. And I'm not saying so much in the race area, but I think of equity, pay equity, for example, that may be the case. Or the ability to distinguish a high performer from a less than good performer in meaningful ways, you just say I know you're working harder than most. Can't do anything about it.

I would think that the administration or those in charge or whatever would have to begin to address it or at least have some progressive action as far as what their status with the university. It's just so hard with so many reports

being announced that I think that's really, you know, there's either some social norming that happens of this is what, you know, if its harassment or discrimination or whatever, there's some social norming that would educate everybody because maybe the, maybe, I don't know if I would excuse it, the individual is being offensive maybe doesn't know, like I was just joking or kidding. Like well, it's oppressive and it's hurtful so, you know, maybe offer that to be an opportunity for everybody to be educated that that's creating a hostile work environment or something like that.

A number of participants described the processes and outcomes related to complaints as widely inconsistent:

One of the concerns that I have as we discuss this is really the inconsistency that may come out. So sometimes you may not want to take it up the chain of command; sometimes you might. Do you resolve it or don't you? And I think that's where some, whether it's a student or it's based on gender or it's based on race, there seems to me to be an inconsistency of what's done. Sometimes you work hard to work at it; sometimes you don't. And so that inconsistency makes, I think, people believe that, you know, what's the point of either getting involved or saying anything. Because for one person you will, but for me you won't. So I think the level of inconsistency, you know, if I take it to HR, sometimes they might help me; sometimes they might not. It depends. We do for what we want to do, who we want to do for, what we want to do for.

Some participants gave specific examples regarding unfair and inequitable treatment they had personally experienced or witnessed happen to someone else:

I talked to the union and they said, "You can file a grievance" but what they told me was, "Are you really sure you want to do that?" because it's going to take forever and the university's tendency is to affirm what the department or college has affirmed. So I met with an administrator in my college and they said, "Well here are some things we can do," but it was all about how I needed to cope with the situation and nothing about how to address the problem caused by [the other person].

A substantial number of focus group participants expressed concerns about how these findings were going to be addressed, and in particular whether meaningful change be implemented on the basis of the study:

The campus climate issue is a big issue. My biggest concern is that no matter what comes out of this study, it is going to be brushed under the rug and nobody is going to pay any attention to it.

One of the things that I am hoping will come out of the data also is that we can parse what I consider to be the very overt, the very extreme individual

incidences of inequity. Because my personal perception is that there's a low tolerance for those kinds of things on campus. But in contrast, I think we have a lot of systemic inequities that are not blatant or extreme or necessarily public. So my concern is mostly about what we do with these findings now that we know how pervasive the problems are, that they are systemic and not just isolated cases of extreme inequality. And I'm really hoping that the work you are doing and the richness of these conversations does not get lost so that we are really serious about looking at what we do to address it.

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

Classroom Climate (Students Only)

There was no difference between undergraduate and graduate students on ratings of Classroom Climate. On average, students rated the classroom climate in the positive direction ($M = 4.92$, $SD = .65$) on a scale from 1 to 6.

There was a medium effect size for the difference between people with and without disabilities among students on this variable ($M = 4.55$, $SD = .87$; $M = 4.93$, $SD = .63$; Cohen's $d = .50$). There were no other significant differences between demographic groups on this variable.

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Classroom Climate for students (Table 12), there were numerous significant predictors. Although two demographic variables were significant in the final model, they accounted for small percentages of the variance in this variable. Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Classroom Climate, uniquely accounting for 23.7 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort, Zero Tolerance Climate, and Diversity Engagement Climate also were strong positive predictors of Classroom Climate.

Work Valued Climate (Employees Only)

Reviewing the findings for Work Valued Climate in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between all of the employee groups (administrators, staff and faculty; Cohen's $d = .59$ for administrators and staff, $.34$ for administrators and faculty, and $.21$ for staff and faculty). Administrators consistently rated Work Valued Climate higher than the other two groups, whereas staff rated Work Valued Climate consistently lower than the other two employee groups.

In addition, there was a medium effect size for the difference between people with and without disabilities among faculty ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.13$; $M = 4.26$, $SD = .92$; Cohen's $d = .64$).

Among administrators, there was a small but meaningful effect size for the difference on this variable between men ($M = 4.61$, $SD = .84$) and women ($M = 4.39$, $SD = .85$; Cohen's $d = .26$).

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Work Valued Climate among staff (Table 26), faculty (Table 40) and administrators (Table 54), only the faculty data produced demographic variables that were significant predictors in the final model (gender binary and disability status). However, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Work Valued Climate consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 25.2 – 31.7 percent of the variance in this variable. Race Talk Comfort also was a strong positive predictor of Work Valued Climate for staff, faculty, and administrators.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the Classroom and Work Valued Climate

Focus group interviews produced extensive data related to Work Valued Climate but not for Classroom Climate. In particular, faculty expressed concerns about the tenure and promotion process, specifically in terms of examples of inequities they had observed or experienced. In addition, term faculty expressed concerns about feeling devalued as members of the faculty at WMU. Staff focused on power differentials and bullying based on hierarchy, along with numerous examples of harassment, incivility, and insensitivity related to a wide range of identity characteristics.

Programs and initiatives for diversity hiring and inclusion are important, but we cannot continue to hire talented and skilled people, bring them in here and basically set them up to fail and let them circle the drain. They wash out.

An administrator actually said to me once, because my [scholarship] is a little outside the norm for our [department], he said, "Oh, that diversity is going to be the bane of me." That was an administrator's words.

[Non-tenured] tenure-track faculty are afraid to say anything to anybody because they are afraid of retaliation.

[A number] of years ago, [a very large number] faculty went up for tenure at Western—[a very small number] did not get tenure. ... One of them was a brilliant researcher, a [person belonging to two underrepresented groups]. [This person] went through the entire appeals process, went all the way up to [the highest level of appeal] and ... [defended the case very effectively]. And the university chose not to [award] tenure because it was easier.

People are not getting trained on specific issues of diversity. There are places on this campus where no training is taking place. Some areas might be receiving training and others are not. Some of the supervisors are not getting training and subordinates are suffering as a result.

I think there are a lot of policies to foster diversity but when it comes to how you feel, it's different. Faculty would not tell me directly that they have different expectations of me but you know it when you experience it.

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

Reviewing the findings for Satisfaction with Diversity in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between students and the three employee groups (administrators, staff and faculty; Cohen's $d = .29, .19$, and $.43$, respectively). Whereas administrators, staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Satisfaction with Diversity, students consistently rated this variable higher than the other three groups.

There were significant and meaningful differences between White only participants and various other racial-ethnic groups on ratings of Satisfaction with Diversity across all status groups (students, faculty, staff and administrators). First, among students there were small to medium effect sizes for differences between White only participants ($M = 5.07$, $SD = .69$) and Asian only ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .78$; Cohen's $d = .58$), Black/African American only ($M = 4.75$, $SD = .88$; Cohen's $d = .39$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.85$, $SD = .83$; Cohen's $d = .28$) participants. Among staff, effect sizes ranged from medium to large for differences between White only participants ($M = 4.94$, $SD = .78$) and Asian only ($M = 4.25$, $SD = .89$; Cohen's $d = .83$), Black/African American only ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.03$; Cohen's $d = .88$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.34$; Cohen's $d = .61$) participants. Due to the small number of faculty of color in this analysis, racial-ethnic minority faculty were collapsed in a single group ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.20$) and compared to White only faculty ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.03$), resulting in a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .32$). Similarly, due to the small number of administrators of color, all racial-ethnic minority administrators were collapsed into a single group ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.14$) and compared to White only ($M = 4.81$, $SD = .95$) administrators, resulting in a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .40$).

In addition, among students there was a significant difference between people with disabilities ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.05$) and people without disabilities ($M = 5.03$, $SD = .71$), resulting in a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .44$). Among faculty, there was a significant difference between non-Christian religious minorities ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 1.06$) and Christians ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 1.05$), resulting in a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .29$). Among staff, there was a significant difference between members of sexual minority groups (LGBTQ) ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .84$) and heterosexual participants ($M = 4.88$, $SD = .84$), resulting in a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = .50$). Among administrators there was a significant difference between men ($M = 4.97$, $SD = .87$) and women ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.02$), resulting in a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's $d = .44$).

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Satisfaction with Diversity among students (Table 14), staff (Table 28), faculty (Table 42) and administrators (Table 56), only the student and staff data produced demographic variables that were significant predictors in the final model (race binary for both). Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was a strong negative predictor of Satisfaction with Diversity consistently across all status groups, uniquely accounting for 25.1 – 33.6 percent of the variance in this variable. In addition, the variable Personal Diversity Engagement was a significant negative predictor of Satisfaction with Diversity for staff, faculty, and administrators, meaning that individuals who indicated that they were deeply engaged in the work of diversity were less likely to be satisfied. Positive perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate were also predictive of Satisfaction with Diversity for all four groups, suggesting that experiences with the city of Kalamazoo are a significant contributor to satisfaction with diversity at WMU.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the Satisfaction with Diversity

Focus group interviews generated a substantial amount of discussion about the ongoing efforts to advance the climate for diversity, and ways WMU has made efforts to improve its image with respect to diversity. In addition, focus group participants offered numerous examples of areas that need improvement where dissatisfaction exists, including a perceived lack of progress in areas identified in the DMAP. Particular attention was focused on faculty and student recruitment and retention efforts to increase the compositional (numerical) diversity on campus.

I think one of the concerns I have about campus is we are not diverse enough, especially in the student body but also in the faculty, staff, and administration. I think that's a real problem we have. And one of the things I wondered when you were presenting data is if we have a positive feeling because we all look a lot like each other. So it's easy to have positive feelings when you look around the room and everybody looks like you do. And I hope that that's another thing that will come out of the survey is that we can figure out if that's one of the issues we have.

As student enrollments rise for women and minorities in my college, it is important that we recruit more faculty [from underrepresented groups.]

In my department we have hired [a number of] years [over time]. We've had a pretty diverse pool but we haven't seen much diversity in terms of hiring.

One of the excuses I keep coming across in different departments is that faculty members will say, "You know we are recruiting to these particular [minority-serving] organizations trying to get a diverse candidate pool but the area that we need for teaching and research happen to be areas in which minorities tend not to specialize. At some point that can't be the same excuse. Maybe you need to diversify your teaching and research needs for your department. You can write a posting to capture a larger audience.

And I think part of it is because we've been singled out as friendly to LGBT, we have more transgendered folks on our campus, and we have not done a good job educating ourselves about what their needs are and what kinds of services and facilities and special concerns they have. I think that's a piece of it. I think we are attracting more LGBT people to our community. But I don't know that we have educated ourselves as to, you know, the services and being prepared to appropriately involve and engage them into the community. So my guess is that's where that's coming from.

My perception about the way diversity is discussed on this campus is that "diversity" is for people of color. There is a need for broader participation and a willingness for other people to be included in the conversation about diversity.

And we have a Diversity Multicultural Action Plan on this campus. And to me, you know, if we really took that up and really adopted what's in there, then that speaks to our students and how we serve our students. It speaks to how we serve each other to me. It speaks to faculty and staff and the roles that we need to play to really begin to affect change. But if you talk to or if you ask people what the DMAP is, you're going to have a lot of folks who may tell you, I'm not sure. I've never even heard of those acronyms. Or even if you say Diversity Multicultural Action Plan. Because I really think that, I won't say it could be a bible for us, but it really, if we really get deep into it, and really begin to enact some of those things, I think we can begin to see some changes on this campus. So I think those are the types of things that need to happen in terms of the environment, and I think we need to.

It's my hope that we don't try to come up with something new. That we have policies, the DMAP was mentioned, to take the stuff that we've done off the shelf and implement what we've done. You know, we've done report after report about, say academic advising on this campus. And we do all of this and we sit it on the shelf. And so for me it would be to not reinvent the wheel and come up with another report, put together another committee, and try to do something, but actually do something out of the reports that we've already done.

I assume that we have policies in place that such that they can positively impact the environment. We have systems in place that can do the same. I think that the issue is not policy or systems, which basically allow a transaction, I think where it stands right now we need some sort of inspiration, transformational leadership that can impact this climate ... in such a way that it inspires all of us to aspire to do the right thing ... I've been here [a large number of] years, and we need, I think we thirst for that kind of inspiration of transformational leadership that would have the kind of impact we need to address some of these issues.

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do faculty, staff, and students express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school?

Reviewing the findings for Kalamazoo Climate in Table 4 (p. 27), there were small but meaningful effect sizes for the significant differences between all but two groups. Whereas staff and faculty were statistically equivalent on their ratings of Kalamazoo Climate, students consistently rated this variable lower than the other three groups, and administrators consistently rated this variable higher than the other three groups. Effect sizes for these differences ranged from small (Cohen's $d = .23$ for faculty and students) to large (Cohen's $d = .80$ for administrators and students).

Only staff had significant demographic differences between groups on the basis of race/ethnicity and sexual minority status. White only participants ($M = 4.94$, $SD = .78$) differed from Asian only ($M = 4.25$, $SD = .89$; Cohen's $d = .85$), Black African American only ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.03$; Cohen's $d = .88$), and multi-racial ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.34$; Cohen's $d = .61$). Heterosexual staff ($M = 4.88$, $SD = .84$) rated the Kalamazoo Climate significantly more positively than members of sexual minority groups (on the basis of gender identity and sexual orientation) ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .84$; Cohen's $d = .49$).

When using hierarchical multiple regression to identify predictors of Kalamazoo Climate among students (Table 16), staff (Table 30), faculty (Table 44) and administrators (Table 58), none of the demographic variables became strong or consistent predictors. In addition, with the exception of the student sample, Personal Experiences of Discrimination was not a significant predictor of Kalamazoo Climate. Instead, the variable Campus Safety became a strong positive predictor across all four groups, accounting for 21.9 – 41.7 percent of the variance in this variable. Among administrators, Campus Safety was the only significant variable uniquely predicting a significant proportion of the variance in Kalamazoo Climate.

Qualitative Findings Regarding the Kalamazoo Climate

Focus groups discussions regarding the Kalamazoo Climate focused extensively on the extent to which Kalamazoo is a safe place to live, work and attend college. For students in particular, there were strong themes related to discomfort going to specific parts of town and fear related to people from the community coming to campus who are not affiliated with WMU.

Students have a mistrust of campus police and the level of reporting incidents of violence. Nobody was willing to talk about a very violent incident just off campus a few months ago. There were lots of rumors flying around and there was no official explanation of what really happened ... That sort of thing just makes the campus feel less safe ... because ... nobody really knows the truth.

Some parts of Kalamazoo are nice. But recently there were armed robberies at 1 PM during the day and the sororities were all protected by armed guards. One of the people did come from Western but most people trust people who go here but not people who come here from off campus. We don't know them or why they are here.

Some students, faculty and administrators discounted fears they had heard about Kalamazoo as a potentially unsafe place, and attributed fear among others as a form of racial bias.

Well, I think there are a lot of people, particularly some faculty and administrators, who are, you know, have overly fearful perspectives on the safety of Kalamazoo. In particular, certain [African American] neighborhoods in Kalamazoo, which I just find amusing and sad at the same time. And, you know, I don't think this would carry over to administrators to their perceptions of campus climate, but, you know, I'm sure that there are many students who would be kind of conditioned to perceive the campus to be unsafe. I personally find it to be very safe.

Additional Important Findings

Personal Experiences of Discrimination was the strongest and most consistent predictor of for seven of the eight dependent variables used to measure the constructs described in the research questions. As such, it was important to further evaluate the characteristics of this variable to increase our understanding of its importance in predicting campus climate at WMU. Participants were given scores regarding whether they had endorsed one or more items to indicate experiences of discrimination. This allowed comparisons between groups for those participants endorsing one or more discrimination items versus those who did not endorse any. The new variable was called Discrimination Binary, which provided the frequency of participants endorsing one or more items reflecting discrimination. Note that 1600 participants (28.5%) in the WMU Campus Climate Study reported one or more incidents of discrimination. Findings reported in Table 59 indicate that women and men were similar in percentages of reporting discrimination but that transgender and those identifying as "other" reported experiences in much higher percentages. Participants who identified as White only tended to report experiences of discrimination at lower rates than people of color. Heterosexual and those who identified as asexual reported experiences of discrimination at lower rates than people who identified as members of sexual minority groups. People with disabilities also reported experiences of discrimination at higher rates than people who did not identify as having a disability.

Table 59: Experiences of Discrimination by Demographic Group

| DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP | DISCRIMINATION | |
|---------------------------|----------------|------|
| | YES | % |
| Gender | | |
| Women | 965 | 27.7 |
| Men | 613 | 29.3 |
| Transgender | 10 | 76.9 |
| Other | 7 | 58.3 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | |
| Latino only | 76 | 31.1 |
| AIANPI only | 11 | 39.3 |
| Asian only | 57 | 32.9 |
| AA/Black only | 148 | 34.7 |
| Multi-racial | 84 | 35.6 |
| White only | 1203 | 27.9 |
| Decline to state | 21 | 34.4 |
| Sexual Orientation | | |
| Bisexual | 57 | 30.8 |
| Gay or Lesbian | 49 | 39.3 |
| Heterosexual | 1382 | 28.6 |
| Queer | 24 | 52.2 |
| Questioning | 22 | 41.5 |
| Same-gender Loving | 15 | 48.4 |
| Asexual | 14 | 24.1 |
| Same-sex Attractional | 26 | 38.8 |
| Pan-sexual | 19 | 35.2 |
| Disability | | |
| Yes | 104 | 43.0 |
| No | 1492 | 28.6 |
| Veteran | | |
| Yes | 67 | 31.5 |
| No | 1524 | 29.2 |

Table 60 provides additional information about the types of bias reported by participants. For this analysis, all items (n = 31) on the WMU campus climate survey that provided participants an opportunity to indicate that they had been targeted for some form of bias on the basis of specific identity characteristics were combined into a composite for each type of identity bias (i.e., age, nationality, disability, employee, religious, family, gender, marital, political, race-ethnicity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, veteran, student, none of the above, and other). The figures in **boldface** type in Table 60 provide the number and percentages within the total sample and subsamples (students, faculty, staff, administrators) who reported experiences of bias on at least one of the 31 items. Note, in most cases, if a participant indicated experiences of one type of bias on one item, then the participant was likely to report that type of bias experience on additional items, so in order to avoid a redundancy effect, instead of summing all of the 31 items, participants received a

Table 60: Bias Experiences by Demographic Group and Student/Employee Status

| | Student | | Faculty | | Staff | | Administrator | | Total | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Target of Bias | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Age | 1238 | 30.4 | 125 | 25.4 | 285 | 30.8 | 28 | 22.2 | 1676 | 29.8 |
| Nationality | 299 | 7.3 | 53 | 10.8 | 40 | 4.3 | 10 | 7.9 | 402 | 7.2 |
| Disability | 217 | 5.3 | 21 | 4.3 | 47 | 5.1 | 11 | 8.7 | 306 | 5.4 |
| Yes | 88 | 46.1 | 6 | 28.6 | 15 | 46.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 109 | 44.3 |
| No | 128 | 3.3 | 25 | 5.3 | 32 | 3.6 | 11 | 8.9 | 196 | 3.7 |
| Employee | 363 | 8.9 | 189 | 38.3 | 493 | 53.4 | 40 | 31.7 | 1085 | 19.3 |
| Religious | 387 | 9.5 | 58 | 11.8 | 76 | 8.2 | 12 | 9.5 | 533 | 9.5 |
| Christian | 197 | 11.0 | 27 | 12.8 | 40 | 7.0 | 7 | 10.4 | 271 | 10.2 |
| Non-Christian | 105 | 15.0 | 17 | 12.1 | 24 | 15.9 | 1 | 3.8 | 147 | 14.4 |
| Family | 430 | 10.6 | 73 | 14.8 | 103 | 11.1 | 12 | 9.5 | 618 | 11.0 |
| Gender | 948 | 23.3 | 153 | 31.0 | 227 | 24.6 | 33 | 26.2 | 1361 | 24.2 |
| Women | 2536 | 62.3 | 107 | 41.6 | 185 | 29.2 | 24 | 23.6 | 1083 | 31.1 |
| Men | 1503 | 36.9 | 44 | 18.9 | 38 | 13.3 | 9 | 12.9 | 259 | 12.4 |
| Transgender | 11 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 46.2 |
| Other | 8 | 0.2 | 1 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 66.7 |
| Marital | 231 | 5.7 | 52 | 10.5 | 59 | 6.4 | 7 | 5.6 | 349 | 6.2 |
| Political | 367 | 9.0 | 70 | 14.2 | 77 | 8.3 | 8 | 6.3 | 522 | 9.3 |
| Conservative | 113 | 19.1 | 15 | 31.9 | 19 | 10.4 | 2 | 8.7 | 149 | 17.6 |
| Middle | 38 | 7.2 | 8 | 15.4 | 11 | 5.9 | 2 | 6.5 | 59 | 7.4 |
| Liberal | 139 | 11.1 | 37 | 13.2 | 33 | 9.5 | 3 | 4.9 | 212 | 10.9 |
| Other | 36 | 5.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 7.3 | 1 | 50.0 | 45 | 6.1 |
| Race/ethnicity | 705 | 17.3 | 97 | 19.7 | 173 | 18.7 | 25 | 19.8 | 1000 | 17.8 |
| Latino only | 48 | 22.4 | 4 | 21.1 | 4 | 30.8 | 1 | 25.0 | 57 | 22.8 |
| AIANPI only | 7 | 31.8 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 34.5 |
| Asian only | 54 | 39.1 | 10 | 43.5 | 7 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 40.1 |
| AA/Black only | 120 | 36.1 | 15 | 71.4 | 41 | 55.4 | 7 | 63.6 | 183 | 41.8 |
| Multi-racial | 60 | 28.4 | 6 | 100.0 | 11 | 47.8 | 1 | 50.0 | 78 | 31.5 |
| White only | 404 | 13.0 | 57 | 14.0 | 105 | 13.4 | 15 | 14.3 | 581 | 13.2 |
| Decline to state | 12 | 26.1 | 4 | 44.4 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 20 | 29.9 |
| Sexual Orient | 303 | 7.4 | 53 | 10.8 | 67 | 7.3 | 16 | 12.7 | 439 | 7.8 |
| Bisexual | 37 | 24.3 | 3 | 18.8 | 5 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 45 | 23.9 |
| Gay or Lesbian | 66 | 52.2 | 14 | 60.9 | 19 | 70.4 | 4 | 66.7 | 103 | 55.7 |
| Heterosexual | 178 | 5.0 | 32 | 7.4 | 44 | 5.3 | 11 | 9.6 | 265 | 5.3 |
| Queer | 21 | 58.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 3 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 60.9 |
| Questioning | 8 | 16.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 18.2 |
| Same-gender Loving | 14 | 53.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 46.9 |
| Asexual | 6 | 11.3 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 11.5 |
| Same-sex Attractional | 14 | 25.0 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 22.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 17 | 24.6 |
| Pan-sexual | 22 | 44.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 40.7 |
| SES | 610 | 15.0 | 44 | 8.9 | 107 | 11.6 | 9 | 7.1 | 770 | 13.7 |
| Veteran | 70 | 1.7 | 7 | 1.4 | 10 | 1.1 | 3 | 2.4 | 90 | 1.6 |
| Yes | 34 | 25.2 | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 | 17.6 |
| No | 36 | 0.9 | 6 | 1.3 | 7 | 0.8 | 3 | 2.6 | 52 | 1.0 |
| Student Status | 1258 | 30.9 | 21 | 4.3 | 59 | 6.4 | 5 | 4.0 | 1343 | 23.9 |
| None of Above | 1949 | 47.9 | 233 | 47.3 | 502 | 54.3 | 60 | 47.6 | 2744 | 48.9 |
| Other | 1186 | 29.1 | 186 | 37.7 | 330 | 35.7 | 41 | 32.5 | 1743 | 31.0 |

score on that target variable only once regardless of the number of times the participant indicated an experience of that type of bias. Note also, however, that participants could respond to these items by marking one or all of the 16 different types of bias, and participants who marked at least one also tended to mark others. What these data reveal, however, is that participants belonging to “targeted” identity groups (e.g., people of color, LGBTQ individuals, people with disabilities) tended to report high frequencies of bias incidents that were connected to their identities. It also reveals that large numbers (if not percentages) of people belonging to non-target groups (White only participants, heterosexual) also reported being targets of bias incidents (most often reported as “other”).

CONCLUSIONS

The WMU Campus Climate Study has produced an expansive amount of data from which a rich set of findings has been obtained. Overall, there are many positive findings, along with a number of focal issues of concern for members of the WMU community to address. Among the positive findings were the following:

1. Students, faculty staff and administrators tend to view the climate for diversity at WMU more positively than negatively.
2. Students in particular tend to have the most positive views of the climate for diversity and equity.
3. Some participants view the campus as making progress in some important areas of diversity and inclusion, and demonstrating a commitment to the work of continuous improvement related to diversity and inclusion.
4. Some of the strongest predictors of campus climate indices reflect positively on the ways WMU is promoting the diversity mission on campus (e.g., Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, Zero Tolerance Climate, Diversity Engagement Climate). These predictors of climate can help to serve as the foundation for efforts to improve campus climate at WMU.
5. The DMAP was identified in focus group discussions as a preexisting roadmap for advancing diversity, equity and inclusion at WMU that can be reaffirmed and implemented as one immediate step toward improving the climate at WMU.
6. Focus group discussions revealed that there are large numbers of campus stakeholders among students, faculty, staff, and administrators who are deeply invested in the success of WMU to advance the mission of diversity, equity and inclusion—who are committed to helping the campus take advantage of the findings from the comprehensive campus climate study through immediate and decisive action.

In addition to the positive findings, there were a host of issues raised in both the quantitative and qualitative data that indicate specific areas for improvement, especially regarding issues of equity climate at WMU. The most salient areas for improvement in the data include the following:

1. Personal experiences of discrimination were a powerful and consistent predictor of all of the dependent variables related to campus climate at WMU (except Kalamazoo Climate).
2. A large percentage (28.5%) of the survey participants reported Personal Experiences of Discrimination based on endorsement of one or more of the four items used to measure this variable.
3. There were significant differences between members of demographic identity groups on Personal Experiences of Discrimination, in which members of minority groups (e.g., people of color, LGBTQ individuals) were more likely to report discrimination as part of their experience at WMU. When examining experiences of bias based on a specific identity, members of the targeted identity groups tended to report substantially higher percentages of bias-related experiences.
4. Survey respondents who reported experiences of unfair or inequitable treatment reported a low incidence of reporting those experiences. Among those who made reports of unfair or inequitable treatment, very few indicated that they were satisfied with the outcome, and even fewer reported that the issue had been resolved to their satisfaction. Focus group participants overwhelmingly believe this set of findings is related to broad structural and cultural conditions at WMU that have existed for many years and have been resistant to change.
5. Broad issues regarding the general campus climate (e.g., not directly related to diversity, equity, or inclusion) were identified as undermining the morale among employees (especially staff and faculty occupying lower levels of the hierarchy), and ultimately contributing to problems in the areas of diversity, equity and inclusion by increasing the likelihood of incivility, bullying, harassment, and intimidation that is channeled through the equity and discrimination complaint processes.
6. Focus group discussions prominently portrayed the WMU campus as consistent with what Sue (1995) would describe as “nondiscriminatory” (e.g., a non-systemic, fragmented approach to diversity intended to meet legal standards for nondiscrimination and avoid lawsuits), despite its own best efforts, especially in recent years, to advance to the status of “multicultural” (e.g., actively valuing diversity in its many forms in a manner that permeates all aspects of the institution). That is, there are pervasive perceptions among focus group participants that diversity, inclusion and equity efforts at WMU lack sufficient administrative support and an integrated organizational structure to achieve a truly multicultural climate, and thus often are reduced to maintaining only a level of engagement necessary to achieve minimum compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If WMU is to become a more diverse, inclusive, equitable and multicultural institution, the entire campus community will need to actively engage in efforts to reduce personal experiences of discrimination on campus and improve the systemic processes that promote the development of a diverse, equitable inclusive campus. The following recommendations are intended to operate at individual and systemic levels towards those ends:

1. Develop a plan for the public distribution of findings from the WMU Campus Climate Study. Convene meetings of different types and sizes for a variety of different audiences, from town hall meetings to staff workshops to faculty meeting presentations to small group student dialogue sessions. Promote the positive aspects of the findings while at the same time openly addressing the areas that need improvement. Continue this process for 6-12 months with regular updates for the campus community about actions taken to enhance the climate at WMU.
2. Identify *immediate, short-term, and long-term* actions that will begin to shape and address the most salient findings of the WMU Campus Climate Study. Convene and charge a task force to develop an accountability plan for addressing the short-term and long-term actions, as well as developing any additional action steps needed along the way. Emphasize issues of *equity climate* in these efforts; attend particularly to reducing fears of reporting inequity.
3. Reaffirm the DMAP as the WMU diversity and multiculturalism action plan. Take steps to advance the work of diversity and multiculturalism at WMU as described in the DMAP. Identify specific actions included in the DMAP that have been achieved. Identify several specific actions from the DMAP that are yet to be completed, and initiate steps to achieve them among the immediate and short-term actions identified as part of Recommendation #2. Make appropriate updates and revisions to the DMAP on the basis of actions that have been achieved and those that are yet to be accomplished. Allocate adequate human, fiscal and physical resources
4. Work with senior campus leaders to develop division-level and unit-level plans to promote and advance positive morale and civility among employees as a means of increasing the general campus climate. Provide campus-wide trainings at all levels (including senior leadership) for promoting a positive working and learning environment that discourages discrimination, harassment, bullying, intimidation and incivility through educational workshops. Increase accountability of campus leaders for implementing or enforcing zero tolerance for discrimination, harassment, bullying, intimidation and incivility.
5. Identify and enhance existing multicultural programs and/or develop new programs that serve to advance the multicultural competencies encompassed within the prominent predictor variables from the WMU Campus Climate Study (e.g., Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, Social/Academic Engagement, Zero

Tolerance Climate, Diversity Engagement Climate). For example, an intergroup dialogue program or a difficult dialogues program would have the capacity to facilitate interactions across differences in ways that serve to decrease problematic behaviors (including intentional and unintentional discrimination) and increase positive awareness, attitudes, knowledge and culturally competent behaviors and skills.

REFERENCES

- antonio, a. l. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *Review of Higher Education*, 25, 63–89.
- Chang, M. J. (1996). Racial diversity in higher education: Does a racially mixed student population affect educational outcomes? (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Garcia, M., Hudgins, C. A., Musil, C. M., Nettles, M. T., Sedlacek, W. E., & Smith, D. G. (2001). *Assessing campus diversity initiatives: A guide for campus practitioners*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Grieger, I. (1996). A multicultural organizational development checklist for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 561–573.
- Gurin, P. (1999). The compelling need for diversity in education. Retrieved from http://www.umich.edu/_urel/admissions/legal/expert/gurintoc.html
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1, 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pederson, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21, 279–302.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187–203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Civil Rights Project.
- Hurtado, S. Carter, D. F., & Kardia, D. (1998). The climate for diversity: Key issues for institutional self-study. In *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 98, (pp. 53-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S., Griffin, K. A., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1, 204–221.
- Smith, D. G., & Associates (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Sue, D. W. (1995). Multicultural organizational development: Implications for the counseling profession. In J.G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 474-492). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Worthington, R. L. (2008). Measurement and assessment in campus climate research: A scientific imperative. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*, 201-203.
- Worthington, R. L. (2012). Advancing scholarship for the diversity imperative in higher education: An Editorial. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 5*, 1-12.

APPENDIX 1

WMU CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

**WMU Campus Climate Survey – Respondent Demographics
SPSS OUTPUT**

| WMU Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Administrator | 126 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | Staff | 924 | 16.5 | 18.7 |
| | Faculty | 493 | 8.8 | 27.5 |
| | Student | 4072 | 72.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Administrator Classification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Senior Leader | 38 | 30.2 | 30.2 |
| | Non-academic Leader | 49 | 38.9 | 69.0 |
| | Academic Leader | 39 | 31.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 126 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 5489 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Staff Classification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Bargaining Staff | 111 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| | Non-bargaining Staff | 698 | 76.1 | 88.2 |
| | Bargaining Staff Leader | 5 | .5 | 88.8 |
| | Non-bargaining Staff Leader | 42 | 4.6 | 93.3 |
| | Temporary Staff | 61 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 917 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 4698 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Faculty Classification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Tenured/Tenure Track | 356 | 72.2 | 72.2 |
| | Term | 30 | 6.1 | 78.3 |
| | Part-time Instructor | 107 | 21.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 493 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 5122 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Student Classification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Undergraduate | 3213 | 79.4 | 79.4 |
| | Graduate | 835 | 20.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4048 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1567 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| WMU Entry Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | A first year student | 2401 | 59.2 | 59.2 |
| | A transfer student | 1232 | 30.4 | 89.6 |
| | A re-entry student | 420 | 10.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4053 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1562 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Veteran Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Yes | 216 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| | No | 5360 | 96.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5576 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 39 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Gender Identification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Female | 3481 | 62.2 | 62.2 |
| | Male | 2092 | 37.4 | 99.6 |
| | Transgender | 13 | .2 | 99.8 |
| | Other | 12 | .2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5598 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 17 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Hispanic/Latino(a) | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Yes | 291 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| | No | 5227 | 93.3 | 98.5 |
| | I prefer not to answer | 85 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5603 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 12 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| American Indian or Alaska Native | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5473 | 97.5 | 97.5 |
| | 1 | 142 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Asian | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5381 | 95.8 | 95.8 |
| | 1 | 234 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Black or African American | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5066 | 90.2 | 90.2 |
| | 1 | 549 | 9.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5594 | 99.6 | 99.6 |
| | 1 | 21 | .4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| White | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 902 | 16.1 | 16.1 |
| | 1 | 4713 | 83.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Bisexual | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5427 | 96.7 | 96.7 |
| | 1 | 188 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Lesbian or Gay | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5430 | 96.7 | 96.7 |
| | 1 | 185 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Heterosexual | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 699 | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| | 1 | 4916 | 87.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Queer | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5569 | 99.2 | 99.2 |
| | 1 | 46 | .8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Questioning | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5560 | 99.0 | 99.0 |
| | 1 | 55 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Same Gender Loving | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5583 | 99.4 | 99.4 |
| | 1 | 32 | .6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| A-sexual | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5554 | 98.9 | 98.9 |
| | 1 | 61 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Same-sex attractional | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5546 | 98.8 | 98.8 |
| | 1 | 69 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Pan sexual | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5561 | 99.0 | 99.0 |
| | 1 | 54 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Other | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 0 | 5512 | 98.2 | 98.2 |
| | 1 | 103 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5615 | 100.0 | |

| Disability Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Yes | 246 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| | No | 5354 | 95.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5600 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 15 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Citizenship Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | U.S. Citizenship | 4113 | 93.3 | 93.3 |
| | Dual Citizenship | 46 | 1.0 | 94.4 |
| | Temporary Worker Visa | 6 | .1 | 94.5 |
| | Student Visa | 144 | 3.3 | 97.8 |
| | Permanent Resident | 87 | 2.0 | 99.8 |
| | Other | 10 | .2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4406 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1209 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Marital Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Married | 1383 | 31.5 | 31.5 |
| | Partnered | 479 | 10.9 | 42.4 |
| | Single | 2362 | 53.7 | 96.1 |
| | Other | 171 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4395 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1220 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Socio-Economic Status | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Lower Class | 286 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| | Lower Middle Class | 1003 | 23.0 | 29.6 |
| | Middle Class | 2247 | 51.5 | 81.1 |
| | Upper Middle Class | 779 | 17.9 | 99.0 |
| | Upper Class | 45 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4360 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1255 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Religious/Spiritual Identification | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Agnostic | 422 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| | Atheist | 343 | 7.9 | 17.6 |
| | Buddhist | 53 | 1.2 | 18.8 |
| | Christian/Catholic/Protestant | 2652 | 61.0 | 79.8 |
| | Hindu | 15 | .3 | 80.2 |
| | Muslim | 49 | 1.1 | 81.3 |
| | Conservative Judaism | 17 | .4 | 81.7 |
| | Reform Judaism | 18 | .4 | 82.1 |
| | Orthodox Judaism | 6 | .1 | 82.2 |
| | Native American Religions | 13 | .3 | 82.5 |
| | Scientologist | 3 | .1 | 82.6 |
| | Sikh | 3 | .1 | 82.7 |
| | Tao | 7 | .2 | 82.8 |
| | Universalist / Unitarian | 43 | 1.0 | 83.8 |
| | Wiccan | 28 | .6 | 84.5 |
| | Undecided | 390 | 9.0 | 93.4 |
| | Other | 286 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4348 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1267 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Class Year | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Freshman | 483 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| | Sophomore | 379 | 8.7 | 19.9 |
| | Junior | 664 | 15.3 | 35.2 |
| | Senior | 869 | 20.0 | 55.2 |
| | Graduate | 786 | 18.1 | 73.4 |
| | I am not a student | 1154 | 26.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4335 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1280 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

| Political Ideology | | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Conservative | 451 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| | Slightly Conservative | 394 | 9.1 | 19.5 |
| | Moderate | 799 | 18.5 | 38.0 |
| | Slightly Liberal | 616 | 14.2 | 52.3 |
| | Liberal | 1329 | 30.7 | 83.0 |
| | Undecided | 734 | 17.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 4323 | 100.0 | |
| | No Response | 1292 | | |
| Total | | 5615 | | |

APPENDIX 2

WMU CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

DATA REDUCTION VARIABLE LIST

DATA REDUCTION VARIABLE LIST

NOTE: (-) = reverse scored items

Research Question #1 Dependent Variable**DIVERSITY CLIMATE**

1. Overall, diversity and inclusion are respected and appreciated at WMU.
2. I believe that the Board of Trustees supports diversity and inclusion on campus.
3. I believe that the leadership at the university-level supports diversity and inclusion on campus.
4. WMU values the contributions of administrators, faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds.
5. My experience on campus is accurately portrayed in the way WMU publications depict the diversity of the student body (e.g., brochures, websites, etc.).

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .855 | 5 |

Research Question #2 Dependent Variable**GENERAL CAMPUS CLIMATE**

In general, how would you rate your overall experiences of the campus environment at WMU?

1. Supportive (+)
2. Hostile (-)
3. Fair (+)
4. Indifferent (-)
5. Welcoming (+)
6. Intimidating (-)
7. Respectful (+)
8. Oppressive (-)
9. Open (+)
10. Threatening (-)
11. Cold (-)
12. Inclusive (+)

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .885 | 12 |

Research Question #3 Dependent Variable

EQUITY CLIMATE

1. Campus policies provide a means for filing grievances related to discrimination or harassment when needed.
2. In my experience, WMU policies concerning hiring and compensation result in equitable treatment of individuals from underrepresented groups.
3. I am easily able to locate WMU policies and procedures meant to protect me from harassment and discrimination.
4. Overall, WMU policies are written in a way that promotes equity.
5. If I were to report a concern of unfair and inequitable treatment I believe it would be adequately addressed.
6. I feel comfortable reporting harassment or discrimination.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .810 | 6 |

FEAR REPORTING INEQUITY (EMPLOYEES ONLY)

1. I have a fear of losing my position if I were to report inequitable behavior.
2. I have a fear of receiving an undesirable workload if I were to report inequitable behavior.
3. I have a fear of being passed over for promotions if I were to report inequitable behavior.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .895 | 3 |

Research Question #4 Dependent Variable

CLASSROOM CLIMATE (STUDENTS ONLY)

1. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in my major/learning environment.
2. When I need assistance with course work, faculty members are willing to help me.
3. I am comfortable participating in class.
4. I believe that faculty have equal expectations of me compared to other students.
5. WMU adequately supports the learning environment for students with learning differences.
6. I have encouraged others to avoid taking a class from a faculty member on campus because I believed that the faculty member would treat the student unfairly. (REVERSE SCORED)

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .706 | 6 |

WORK VALUED CLIMATE (EMPLOYEES ONLY)

1. My participation in my department/unit is valued.
2. My participation in my college/division is valued.
3. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by the administration.
4. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by my colleagues.
5. Opportunities to be involved in leadership roles have been available to me.
6. Professional mentoring has been available to me.
7. Faculty or staff development resources are available to me.
8. I believe the options for promotion in my current job/position are limited or unavailable.
(REVERSE SCORED)

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .847 | 8 |

Research Question #5 Dependent Variable**SATISFACTION WITH DIVERSITY**

1. How satisfied are you with the level of commitment to diversity and inclusion on campus?
2. I would recommend WMU to family or friends as a good place to work or attend school.
3. I have considered seeking employment or attending school elsewhere due to the lack of progress with diversity and inclusion on campus. (REVERSE SCORED)

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .725 | 3 |

Research Question #6 Dependent Variable**KALAMAZOO CLIMATE**

1. I would recommend attending higher education in Kalamazoo to my friends and family.
2. I would recommend living in Kalamazoo to my friends and family.
3. Overall, Kalamazoo is a safe city in which to reside.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .752 | 3 |

Additional Variables

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES DISCRIMINATION

1. My experience at WMU has been free of harassment, bullying, and intimidation. (-)
2. Overall, I receive fair and equitable treatment on campus. (-)
3. On campus, I experience tokenism. (+)
4. The atmosphere of diversity and inclusion helps me to feel like I am a valued member of the campus community. (-)

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .710 | 4 |

CAMPUS SAFETY

1. WMU offers a sufficient amount of security on campus.
2. I feel safe on campus at night.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .796 | 2 |

DIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

The following groups engage in efforts to improve relations and understanding of diversity and inclusion on campus:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .800 | 4 |

ZERO TOLERANCE CLIMATE

In my experience at WMU, members of the following groups express zero tolerance for harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation on the WMU campus:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .879 | 4 |

SOCIAL ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT

How frequently have you experienced the following with people from racial groups different from your own:

1. Dined
2. Socialized
3. Attended an event sponsored by a cultural group different than my own
4. Attended a study session or collaborated on work

Indicate how often you have engaged in each of the following at WMU...

5. Made an effort to get to know people from backgrounds different from my own

For the following, how often have you had in-depth conversations...

6. With someone whose race is different than your own
7. With someone from a country other than your own
8. With someone whose religion is different from your own
9. With someone whose sexual orientation is different from your own
10. With someone whose socioeconomic class is different from your own

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .836 | 10 |

PERSONAL DIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

For the following, how often have you had in-depth conversations...

1. About racism, racial differences, or racial equity
2. About sexism, gender differences, or gender equity
3. About able-ism or disability issues

Indicate how often you have engaged in each of the following at WMU...

1. Challenged others on issues of discrimination
2. Become aware of the biases that affect my own thinking
3. Made an effort to educate others on diversity topics

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .845 | 6 |

RACE TALK COMFORT

I am comfortable stating my thoughts about racial/ethnic issues in:

1. My Department/Unit
2. My College/Division
3. Campus Wide Committees or Activities I participate in

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .935 | 3 |

HEAR DISCRIMINATORY COMMENTS

I hear discriminatory comments made by members of the following groups:

1. Administrators (Senior Leadership, Academic & Non-Academic Leaders)
2. Faculty
3. Staff
4. Students

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .736 | 4 |

TENSE GUARDED EXPERIENCES

How frequently have you experienced the following with people from racial groups different from your own:

1. Had guarded, cautious interactions
2. Had tense or somewhat hostile interactions

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .688 | 2 |

LGBTQQ CLIMATE

1. The environment at WMU is conducive to open expression of LBGTQQ identity.
2. The environment at WMU is conducive to open support of LBGTQQ individuals and issues.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .886 | 2 |

DISABILITY CLIMATE

1. How satisfied are you with the efforts to provide reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities on campus?
2. The campus is accessible to people with physical disabilities.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .762 | 2 |

APPENDIX 3

SUMMARIES AND TABLES FOR

ANALYSES

BY STUDENT, STAFF, FACULTY AND

ADMINISTRATOR STATUS

STUDENTS

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do students perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

The mean for the variable Diversity Climate ($M = 5.25$, $SD = .91$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the diversity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6.75). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on Diversity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 0.030 | .861 | .000 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 11.469 | .001 | .014 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 9.182 | .002 | .002 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 5.679 | .017 | .002 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.213 | .645 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 22.373 | .001 | .006 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only differed from Black/African American only, multi-racial, and Asian only participants by rating Diversity Climate more positively.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 6 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Climate for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 2.0% of the variance in perceptions of the WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2 = .022$; $F_{\text{change}} = 11.829$, df (5, 2680); $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 5.6% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .056$; $F_{\text{change}} = 54.223$, df (3, 2677); $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 26.9% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .269$; $F_{\text{change}} = 275.582$, df (4, 2673); $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 4.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .040$; $F_{\text{change}} = 87.441$, df (2, 2671); $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.322$, df (1, 2670); $p = .128$). The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 38.4% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .384$).

Gender, veteran status, and sexual minority status were not significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate, and neither were Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, or Kalamazoo Climate. The variables Disability Status, Race Talk Comfort, Social Academic Engagement, and Personal Diversity Engagement all entered the model as significant predictors but were not significant in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate: Race Binary (part $r = -.061$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.314$), Campus Safety (part $r = .034$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .064$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .176$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.614$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the climate for diversity at WMU more negatively. People of color also tend to perceive the Diversity Climate at WMU more negatively than White only participants. In contrast, perceptions that the campus is a safe place, that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with positive perceptions of the Diversity Climate at WMU.

Table 6: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Climate for Students (N = 2686)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.017 | .035 | -.009 | -.025 | .034 | -.014 | .004 | .030 | .002 | .020 | .029 | .011 | .021 | .029 | .012 |
| Race Binary | -.186 | .040 | -.089*** | -.202 | .039 | -.096*** | -.138 | .033 | -.066*** | -.132 | .032 | -.063*** | -.130 | .032 | -.062*** |
| Veteran Status | .059 | .096 | .012 | .075 | .093 | .015 | .069 | .079 | .014 | .062 | .076 | .013 | .063 | .076 | .013 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.082 | .054 | -.029 | -.096 | .053 | -.034 | -.078 | .045 | -.028 | -.077 | .043 | -.027 | -.078 | .043 | -.028 |
| Disability Status | .457 | .078 | .112*** | .387 | .076 | .095*** | .115 | .065 | .028 | .109 | .063 | .027 | .111 | .063 | .027 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .151 | .014 | .206*** | .020 | .013 | .027 | .003 | .012 | .004 | .002 | .012 | .003 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .155 | .027 | .128*** | .055 | .023 | .046* | .045 | .023 | .037* | .042 | .023 | .035 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.127 | .022 | -.130*** | .009 | .020 | .009 | .001 | .019 | .001 | .001 | .019 | .001 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.634 | .023 | -.535*** | -.515 | .024 | -.435*** | -.508 | .024 | -.429*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.004 | .026 | -.003 | .043 | .026 | .030 | .042 | .023 | .035 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .023 | .019 | .020 | .024 | .019 | .022 | .025 | .019 | .022 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .072 | .016 | .079*** | .043 | .015 | .048** | .036 | .016 | .040* |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .075 | .018 | .076*** | .075 | .018 | .076*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .213 | .018 | .208*** | .211 | .018 | .206*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .026 | .017 | .027 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do students believe the WMU campus is welcoming and affirming?

The mean for the variable General Campus Climate ($M = 4.70$, $SD = .64$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the general climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of General Campus Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on General Campus Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 15.406 | .001 | .004 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 6.058 | .001 | .007 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 5.824 | .016 | .002 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 1.716 | .190 | .001 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.771 | .380 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 53.783 | .001 | .013 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants differed from multi-racial and Asian only participants by rating General Campus Climate more positively.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of General Campus Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 8 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on General Campus Climate for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 2.7% of the variance in perceptions of the General Campus Climate ($R^2 = .027$; $F_{\text{change}} = 15.065$, $df (5, 2680)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 10.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .108$; $F_{\text{change}} = 111.728$, $df (3, 2677)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 35.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .350$; $F_{\text{change}} = 454.607$, $df (4, 2673)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 2.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .028$; $F_{\text{change}} = 77.703$, $df (2, 2671)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 0.8% of the variance in WMU General Campus Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .008$; $F_{\text{change}} = 42.949$, $df (1, 2670)$; $p = .001$). The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 51.9% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .519$).

In this analysis, only Hear Discriminatory Comments was not a significant predictor of General Campus Climate. Although the variable Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as a significant predictor, it was not a significant predictor in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU General Campus Climate: Gender (part $r = -.035$), Race Binary (part $r = -.031$), Veteran Status (part $r = -.030$), sexual minority status (part $r = -.030$), disability status (part $r = .043$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .047$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .044$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.313$), Tense Guarded Experiences (part $r = -.069$), Campus Safety (part $r = .083$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .077$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .129$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .088$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of General Campus Climate at WMU. The moderate negative correlation ($r = -.412$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the general campus climate at WMU more negatively. Women, people of color, veterans, sexual minorities, and people with disabilities also tend to perceive the general campus climate at WMU more negatively than their majority group counterparts. In contrast, students who are comfortable talking about race, engage in intergroup activities in social and academic spheres, have perceptions that the campus is a safe place, that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with positive perceptions of the General Campus Climate at WMU.

Table 8: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Campus Climate for Students (N = 2686)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.064 | .025 | -.050** | -.069 | .023 | -.054** | -.058 | .019 | -.045** | -.049 | .018 | -.038** | -.047 | .018 | -.037** |
| Race Binary | -.097 | .028 | -.065*** | -.111 | .027 | -.074*** | -.059 | .021 | -.039** | -.055 | .021 | -.037** | -.048 | .020 | -.032* |
| Veteran Status | -.130 | .068 | -.037 | -.112 | .064 | -.032 | -.109 | .050 | -.031* | -.110 | .048 | -.031* | -.109 | .048 | -.031* |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.054 | .038 | -.027 | -.073 | .036 | -.037* | -.061 | .028 | -.031* | -.057 | .027 | -.029* | -.061 | .027 | -.031* |
| Disability Status | .411 | .056 | .142*** | .345 | .053 | .119*** | .127 | .041 | .044** | .124 | .040 | .043** | .128 | .039 | .044*** |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .155 | .010 | .298*** | .041 | .008 | .078*** | .030 | .008 | .058*** | .027 | .008 | .052*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .135 | .019 | .157*** | .060 | .015 | .069*** | .053 | .014 | .062*** | .047 | .014 | .054*** |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.107 | .015 | -.154*** | .016 | .012 | .023 | .011 | .012 | .016 | .011 | .012 | .016 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.453 | .014 | -.538*** | -.380 | .015 | -.451*** | -.360 | .015 | -.427*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.025 | .016 | -.025 | .007 | .016 | .007 | .005 | .016 | .005 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.062 | .012 | -.078*** | -.062 | .012 | -.077*** | -.061 | .012 | -.076*** |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .099 | .010 | .155*** | .082 | .010 | .127** | .062 | .010 | .097*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .064 | .011 | .091*** | .064 | .011 | .091*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .116 | .011 | .160*** | .109 | .011 | .150*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .071 | .011 | .102*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do students perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

The mean for the variable Equity Climate ($M = 4.54$, $SD = .75$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the equity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Equity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on Equity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.795 | .180 | .001 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 2.363 | .038 | .004 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 2.843 | .092 | .001 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 1.506 | .220 | .001 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.408 | .523 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 28.688 | .001 | .009 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants differed from Asian only participants by rating Equity Climate more positively.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Equity Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 10 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Equity Climate for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 1.2% of the variance in perceptions of the Equity Climate ($R^2 = .012$; $F_{\text{change}} = 6.750$, $df (5, 2680)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 14.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .140$; $F_{\text{change}} = 146.807$, $df (3, 2677)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 31.3% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .313$; $F_{\text{change}} = 391.712$, $df (4, 2673)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 4.3% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .043$; $F_{\text{change}} = 117.878$, $df (2, 2671)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 0.2% of the variance in WMU Equity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .002$; $F_{\text{change}} = 13.640$, $df (1, 2670)$; $p = .001$). The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 50.8% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .508$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Equity Climate. Although the variable disability status entered the model as a significant predictor, it was not a significant predictor in the final model. Similarly, Social Academic Engagement, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Tense Guarded Experiences entered the model as significant predictors but dropped out of the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Equity Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .121$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.233$), Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = -.091$), Campus Safety (part $r = .121$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .179$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .075$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .050$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Equity Climate at WMU. The moderate negative correlation ($r = -.610$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the equity climate at WMU more negatively. In addition, students who report hearing discriminatory comments also tend to rate the equity climate more negatively. Demographics characteristics did not predict perceptions of equity climate at WMU. However, students who are comfortable talking about race, have perceptions that the campus is a safe place, that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with positive perceptions of the Equity Climate at WMU.

Table 10: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Equity Climate for Students (N = 2686)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.015 | .030 | -.010 | -.019 | .028 | -.013 | -.030 | .023 | -.019 | -.021 | .022 | -.014 | -.020 | .022 | -.013 |
| Race Binary | -.029 | .034 | -.016 | -.040 | .032 | -.022 | -.021 | .026 | -.012 | -.014 | .025 | -.008 | -.009 | .025 | -.005 |
| Veteran Status | -.111 | .082 | -.026 | -.084 | .076 | -.020 | -.060 | .061 | -.014 | -.048 | .058 | -.011 | -.048 | .058 | -.011 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.036 | .046 | -.015 | -.064 | .043 | -.027 | -.048 | .034 | -.020 | -.027 | .033 | -.011 | -.030 | .033 | -.013 |
| Disability Status | .375 | .067 | .108*** | .293 | .062 | .085*** | .054 | .050 | .016 | .049 | .048 | .014 | .052 | .048 | .015 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .225 | .012 | .362*** | .101 | .010 | .163*** | .087 | .009 | .140*** | .085 | .009 | .137*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .120 | .022 | .117*** | .037 | .018 | .036* | .027 | .017 | .026 | .023 | .017 | .022 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.112 | .018 | -.135*** | .031 | .015 | .038* | .024 | .015 | .029 | .024 | .014 | .029 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.437 | .018 | -.434*** | -.334 | .018 | -.331*** | -.320 | .019 | -.318*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.189 | .020 | -.156*** | -.130 | .020 | -.108*** | -.132 | .020 | -.109*** |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .022 | .015 | .023 | .021 | .014 | .022 | .022 | .014 | .023 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .148 | .012 | .194*** | .122 | .012 | .160*** | .109 | .012 | .142*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .178 | .014 | .212*** | .178 | .013 | .212*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .081 | .014 | .093*** | .076 | .014 | .088*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .048 | .013 | .058*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do students believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

The mean for the variable Classroom Climate ($M = 4.92$, $SD = .65$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the classroom climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Classroom Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on Classroom Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.562 | .211 | .001 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 3.382 | .005 | .005 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 1.077 | .299 | .000 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 7.528 | .006 | .003 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.000 | .989 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 51.097 | .001 | .017 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants differed from Asian only participants by rating Classroom Climate more positively. Students with disabilities rated the classroom climate significantly lower than their non-disabled counterparts.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Classroom Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 12 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Classroom Climate for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 1.9% of the variance in perceptions of the Classroom Climate ($R^2 = .092$; $F_{\text{change}} = 10.140$, $df (5, 2679)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 13.2% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .132$; $F_{\text{change}} = 138.100$, $df (3, 2676)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 29.6% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .296$; $F_{\text{change}} = 357.419$, $df (4, 2672)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 3.3% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .033$; $F_{\text{change}} = 84.167$, $df (2, 2670)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 1.1% of the variance in perceptions of Classroom Climate $R^2_{\text{change}} = .011$; $F_{\text{change}} = 59.115$, $df (1, 2669)$; $p = .001$. The variables in the final model accounted for 48.8% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .488$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Gender Binary, Veteran Status, and Sexual Minority Status were not unique predictors of Classroom Climate. Similarly, the variable Tense Guarded Experiences was not a unique predictor. Personal Diversity Engagement was not a significant predictor in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Classroom Climate: Race Binary (part $r = -.039$), Disability Status (part $r = .034$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .094$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .047$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.237$), Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = -.060$), Campus Safety (part $r = .097$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .120$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .107$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .106$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Classroom Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.606$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the classroom climate at WMU more negatively. In addition, racial-ethnic minority students, students with disabilities, and students who report hearing discriminatory comments also tend to rate the classroom climate more negatively. However, students who are comfortable talking about race, who are engaged with different others socially and academically, believe the campus is a safe place, that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with positive perceptions of the Classroom Climate at WMU.

Table 12: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Classroom Climate for Students (N = 2685)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.016 | .025 | -.012 | -.017 | .024 | -.013 | -.022 | .020 | -.016 | -.013 | .019 | -.010 | -.011 | .019 | -.008 |
| Race Binary | -.085 | .029 | -.056** | -.100 | .027 | -.066*** | -.075 | .022 | -.049*** | -.070 | .022 | -.046*** | -.061 | .022 | -.040** |
| Veteran Status | -.050 | .070 | -.014 | -.029 | .065 | -.008 | -.014 | .053 | -.004 | -.011 | .051 | -.003 | -.010 | .051 | -.003 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.016 | .039 | -.008 | -.046 | .037 | -.022 | -.032 | .030 | -.016 | -.023 | .029 | -.011 | -.028 | .029 | -.014 |
| Disability Status | .372 | .057 | .126*** | .302 | .053 | .102*** | .100 | .043 | .034* | .096 | .042 | .032* | .101 | .042 | .034* |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .177 | .010 | .332*** | .072 | .009 | .135*** | .060 | .008 | .113*** | .057 | .008 | .106*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .138 | .019 | .157*** | .067 | .016 | .076*** | .059 | .015 | .067*** | .051 | .015 | .058*** |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.093 | .016 | -.132*** | .024 | .013 | .034 | .019 | .013 | .026 | .018 | .013 | .026 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.386 | .015 | -.448*** | -.304 | .016 | -.353*** | -.279 | .016 | -.324*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.112 | .018 | -.108*** | -.072 | .017 | .070*** | -.075 | .017 | -.072*** |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.001 | .013 | -.001 | .000 | .012 | .000 | .001 | .012 | .002 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .119 | .010 | .182*** | .099 | .010 | .151*** | .075 | .011 | .114*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .102 | .012 | .137*** | .102 | .012 | .142*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .102 | .012 | .137*** | .094 | .012 | .126*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .088 | .011 | .124*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do students express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

The mean for the variable Diversity Satisfaction ($M = 5.01$, $SD = .73$) suggests that survey respondents on average expressed greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction with diversity experiences at WMU (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Satisfaction. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on Diversity Satisfaction*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 2.548 | .111 | .001 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 16.439 | .001 | .026 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 7.059 | .008 | .002 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 4.104 | .043 | .002 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 2.256 | .113 | .001 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 42.261 | .001 | .014 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants differed from Black/African American only, multi-racial, and Asian only participants by rating Satisfaction with Diversity more positively. Students with disabilities rated the Satisfaction with Diversity significantly lower than their non-disabled counterparts.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Satisfaction:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 14 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Satisfaction for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 3.6% of the variance in perceptions of the Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2 = .036$; $F_{\text{change}} = 20.303$, $df (5, 2680)$, $p < .001$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 9.4% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .094$; $F_{\text{change}} = 96.552$, $df (3, 2677)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 32.2% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .322$; $F_{\text{change}} = 392.375$, $df (4, 2673)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 2.5% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .025$; $F_{\text{change}} = 64.931$, $df (2, 2671)$; $p < .001$. The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 4.8% of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .048$; $F_{\text{change}} = 270.306$, $df (1, 2669)$; $p = .001$. The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 52.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .523$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Gender Binary and Veteran Status were not unique predictors of Diversity Satisfaction. Similarly, the variable Tense Guarded Experiences was not a unique predictor. Although the variables Personal Diversity Engagement and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of Satisfaction with Diversity at WMU: Race Binary (part $r = -.103$), Sexual Minority Status (part $r = -.040$), Disability Status (part $r = .029$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .033$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .031$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.290$), Campus Safety (part $r = .033$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .076$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .107$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .219$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Diversity Satisfaction at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.640$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. In addition, racial-ethnic minority students, sexual minority students, and students with disabilities also tend to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. However, students who are comfortable talking about race, who are engaged with different others socially and academically, believe the campus is a safe place, that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with satisfaction with diversity.

Table 14: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Satisfaction for Students (N = 2686)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.034 | .029 | | -.044 | .028 | -.030 | -.034 | .023 | -.023 | -.024 | .022 | -.016 | -.020 | .021 | -.013 |
| Race Binary | -.242 | .033 | -.139*** | -.257 | .032 | -.147*** | -.209 | .026 | -.120*** | -.205 | .025 | -.117*** | -.185 | .024 | -.106*** |
| Veteran Status | .071 | .079 | .017 | -.089 | .075 | .021 | .092 | .060 | .022 | .090 | .059 | .022 | .093 | .056 | .023 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.091 | .045 | -.039* | -.102 | .043 | -.044* | -.087 | .034 | -.037* | -.082 | .033 | -.035* | -.094 | .032 | -.040** |
| Disability Status | .414 | .065 | .122*** | .339 | .062 | .100*** | .092 | .049 | .027 | .088 | .048 | .026 | .100 | .046 | .029* |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .166 | .012 | .273*** | .043 | .010 | .070*** | .031 | .010 | .051*** | .022 | .009 | .037* |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .156 | .022 | .155*** | .066 | .018 | .066*** | .059 | .017 | .058*** | .039 | .017 | .039* |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.143 | .018 | -.176*** | -.012 | .015 | -.015 | -.017 | .015 | .021 | -.018 | .014 | -.022 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.531 | .017 | -.538*** | -.449 | .018 | -.455*** | -.391 | .018 | -.396*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.046 | .020 | -.039* | -.010 | .020 | -.008 | -.016 | .019 | -.013 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.004 | .015 | -.004 | .005 | .014 | .005 | .009 | .014 | .009 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .105 | .012 | .140*** | .086 | .012 | .114*** | .029 | .012 | .038* |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .074 | .014 | .022 | .074 | .013 | .089*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .128 | .014 | .150*** | .107 | .013 | .089*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .208 | .013 | .256*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do students express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school?

The mean for the variable Kalamazoo Climate ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .90$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the Kalamazoo community more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6); however, recall from an earlier analysis that students rated the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably than faculty, staff and administrators (see p. 27). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority students from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Kalamazoo Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 15.

Table 15: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Students on Kalamazoo Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.496 | .221 | .000 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 2.041 | .070 | .003 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 3.126 | .077 | .001 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 0.273 | .601 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.080 | .777 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 6.574 | .010 | .002 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Kalamazoo Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 16 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Kalamazoo Climate for the student sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 0.6% of the variance in perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate; $R^2 = .006$; $F_{\text{change}} = 3.058$, $df (5, 2680)$, $p < .001$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 6.6% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .066$; $F_{\text{change}} = 63.320$, $df (3, 2677)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 18.6% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .186$; $F_{\text{change}} = 167.669$, $df (4, 2673)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 0.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .007$; $F_{\text{change}} = 12.135$, $df (2, 2671)$; $p < .001$. The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 26.1% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .261$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Gender Binary, Veteran Status, and Sexual Minority Status were not unique predictors of Kalamazoo Climate. Similarly, the variables Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, and Zero Tolerance Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Disability Status and Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of Kalamazoo Climate: Race Binary (part $r = -.103$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .033$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .031$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.290$), Campus Safety (part $r = .264$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .107$).

In this model, perceptions of campus safety accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Kalamazoo Climate, suggesting that participants experience the Kalamazoo Climate as connected in some way to campus safety. The moderate positive correlation ($r = .410$) suggests that people who experience the WMU campus as a safe place also tend to perceive the climate of Kalamazoo more positively; or those who experience the campus as less safe tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably as well. In addition, racial-ethnic minority students and students who reported experiences of discrimination at WMU also tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate more negatively. However, students who are comfortable talking about race, who are engaged with different others socially and academically, and believe that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with positive perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 16: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Kalamazoo Climate for Students (N = 2686)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .048 | .036 | .026 | .050 | .035 | .027 | -.025 | .032 | -.014 | -.018 | .032 | -.010 |
| Race Binary | -.087 | .041 | -.040* | -.109 | .040 | -.051** | -.098 | .036 | -.046** | -.097 | .036 | -.045** |
| Veteran Status | -.033 | .099 | -.007 | -.015 | .096 | -.003 | .007 | .086 | -.001 | -.014 | .085 | -.003 |
| Sexual Minority Status | .095 | .056 | .033 | .060 | .054 | .021 | .062 | .049 | -.021 | .058 | .048 | .020 |
| Disability Status | .214 | .081 | .051* | .143 | .078 | .034 | -.056 | .071 | -.013 | -.058 | .070 | -.014 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .160 | .015 | .214*** | .049 | .014 | .066*** | .043 | .014 | .058** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .186 | .028 | .150*** | .096 | .026 | .078*** | .093 | .025 | .075*** |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.098 | .023 | -.098*** | -.007 | .021 | -.007 | -.004 | .021 | .004 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.321 | .025 | -.265*** | -.280 | .027 | -.231*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | .015 | .028 | .010 | .027 | .029 | .019 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.019 | .021 | -.016 | -.018 | .021 | -.016 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .282 | .017 | .306*** | .273 | .017 | .296*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.001 | .020 | -.001 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .099 | .020 | .094*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

STAFF

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do staff perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

The mean for the variable Diversity Climate ($M = 5.08$, $SD = .97$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the diversity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6.75). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Diversity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 5.424 | .020 | .006 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 13.820 | .001 | .071 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 3.122 | .078 | .004 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 1.131 | .288 | .002 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 4.316 | .038 | .005 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | .316 | .574 | .000 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that Black/African American only staff were less positive about the diversity climate than White only and Asian only participants.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 18 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Climate for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 5.4% of the variance in perceptions of the WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2 = .054$; $F_{\text{change}} = 8.529$, $df (5, 741)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 11.4% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .114$; $F_{\text{change}} = 33.557$, $df (3, 738)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 21.6% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .216$; $F_{\text{change}} = 64.198$, $df (4, 734)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 7.3% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .073$; $F_{\text{change}} = 49.111$, $df (2, 732)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .002$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.681$, $df (1, 731)$; $p = .102$). The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 44.7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .447$).

Sexual minority status and disability status were not significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate, and neither were Social Academic Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, Campus Safety, or Kalamazoo Climate. The variable Race Talk Comfort entered the model as a significant predictor but was not significant in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate: Gender Binary (part $r = .056$), Race Binary (part $r = -.081$), Veteran Status (part $r = -.054$), Personal Diversity Engagement (part $r = -.080$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.233$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .062$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .242$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination and Diversity Engagement Climate accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU. Staff who experience discrimination tend to perceive the climate for diversity at WMU more negatively, whereas those who believe the campus community is engaged in the work of diversity rate the climate more positively. People of color and women tend to perceive the Diversity Climate at WMU more negatively than Whites and men, respectively; but veterans tend to rate the climate more positively than non-veterans. Perceptions that administrators (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination also are associated with positive perceptions of the Diversity Climate at WMU.

Table 18: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Climate for Staff (N = 747)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .124 | .075 | .061 | .118 | .071 | .057 | .108 | .063 | .053 | .114 | .059 | .056 | .122 | .059 | .060* |
| Race Binary | -.548 | .101 | -.193*** | -.436 | .096 | -.154*** | -.317 | .086 | -.112*** | -.243 | .081 | -.086** | -.242 | .081 | -.085** |
| Veteran Status | -.316 | .165 | -.069 | -.274 | .156 | -.060 | -.279 | .134 | -.061 | -.244 | .126 | -.054 | -.252 | .126 | -.055* |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.251 | .130 | -.069 | -.078 | .124 | -.021 | .027 | .107 | .007 | -.020 | .101 | -.005 | -.016 | .101 | -.005 |
| Disability Status | .181 | .182 | .036 | .103 | .171 | .020 | -.067 | .149 | -.013 | -.032 | .140 | -.006 | -.011 | .140 | -.002 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .207 | .027 | .270*** | .062 | .025 | .081* | .030 | .024 | .039 | .026 | .024 | .033 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .050 | .051 | .039 | .053 | .044 | .040 | .024 | .042 | .018 | .018 | .042 | .013 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.318 | .047 | -.268*** | -.135 | .043 | -.114** | -.115 | .040 | -.097** | -.117 | .040 | -.099** |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.515 | .038 | -.494*** | -.351 | .040 | -.337*** | -.346 | .040 | -.333*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.079 | .049 | -.059 | .017 | .048 | .013 | .016 | .048 | .012 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .010 | .043 | .008 | .028 | .040 | .022 | .028 | .040 | .022 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | -.007 | .036 | -.006 | -.030 | .034 | -.026 | -.053 | .037 | -.045 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .087 | .037 | .086* | .085 | .037 | .084* |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .350 | .038 | .313*** | .344 | .039 | .307*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .069 | .042 | .052 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do staff believe the WMU campus is welcoming and affirming?

The mean for the variable General Campus Climate ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .79$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the general climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of General Campus Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 19.

Table 19: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on General Campus Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 3.304 | .069 | .004 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 8.084 | .001 | .043 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 2.590 | .108 | .003 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | .032 | .858 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 1.431 | .232 | .002 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 2.469 | .116 | .003 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that Black/African American only staff rated the General Campus Climate more negatively than White only participants.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of General Campus Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 20 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on General Campus Climate for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 3.6% of the variance in perceptions of the General Campus Climate ($R^2 = .036$; $F_{\text{change}} = 5.586$, $df (5, 740)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 16.6% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .166$; $F_{\text{change}} = 50.983$, $df (3, 737)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 42.6% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .426$; $F_{\text{change}} = 209.759$, $df (4, 733)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 3.5% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .035$; $F_{\text{change}} = 38.123$, $df (2, 731)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 0.4% of the variance in WMU General Campus Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .004$; $F_{\text{change}} = 8.469$, $df (1, 730)$; $p = .004$). The combination of variables in the final model accounted for 66.0% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .660$).

In this analysis, the following variables were not significant predictors: Gender Binary, Veteran Status, Sexual Minority Status, Disability Status, and Social Academic Engagement. The following variables entered the model as significant but dropped out of the final model: Race Binary, Personal Diversity Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experience, and Campus Safety.

In the final model, only the following variables were significant predictors of WMU General Campus Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .058$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.369$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .060$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .157$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .062$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of General Campus Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.767$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the general campus climate at WMU more negatively. In contrast, positive perceptions of the General Campus Climate at WMU were associated with participants who express comfort talking about race, view the campus community as having a zero tolerance for discrimination, believe members of the campus community are engaged in the work of diversity, and have positive perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 20: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Campus Climate for Staff (N = 746)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .047 | .063 | | .058 | .057 | .034 | .026 | .040 | .015 | .031 | .039 | .018 | .040 | .038 | -.024 |
| Race Binary | -.385 | .085 | -.164*** | -.297 | .078 | -.127*** | -.129 | .055 | -.055** | -.084 | .053 | -.036 | -.082 | .053 | -.035 |
| Veteran Status | -.214 | .138 | -.057 | -.155 | .126 | -.041 | -.153 | .087 | -.041 | -.132 | .082 | -.035 | -.141 | .082 | -.038 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.169 | .108 | -.056 | -.033 | .100 | -.011 | .091 | .069 | .030 | .066 | .066 | .022 | .070 | .065 | .023 |
| Disability Status | .176 | .152 | .042 | .080 | .139 | .019 | -.152 | .096 | -.036 | -.130 | .091 | -.031 | -.106 | .091 | .025 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .242 | .022 | .383*** | .066 | .016 | .104*** | .047 | .015 | .074** | .042 | .015 | .067** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .028 | .041 | .026 | .029 | .028 | .027 | .012 | .027 | .011 | .005 | .027 | .005 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.224 | .038 | -.228*** | -.002 | .027 | -.002 | .009 | .026 | .009 | .007 | .026 | .007 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.559 | .024 | -.648*** | -.460 | .026 | -.534*** | -.455 | .026 | -.528*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.106 | .031 | -.095*** | .045 | .031 | -.041 | -.047 | .031 | -.042 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.056 | .028 | -.053* | -.045 | .026 | -.042 | -.045 | .026 | -.042 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .066 | .023 | .068** | .051 | .022 | .053* | .025 | .024 | .026 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .070 | .024 | .083** | .068 | .024 | .080** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .193 | .025 | .207*** | .185 | .025 | .199*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .080 | .027 | .072** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do staff perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

For employees, this research question was evaluated using two dependent variables: (a) Equity Climate and (b) Fear of Reporting Inequity.

Equity Climate

The mean for the variable Equity Climate ($M = 4.34$, $SD = .84$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the equity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Equity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 21.

Table 21: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Equity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 3.123 | .078 | .004 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 3.781 | .002 | .022 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 2.530 | .112 | .003 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 2.183 | .140 | .003 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.697 | .404 | .001 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 1.620 | .203 | .002 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants rated the Equity Climate more positively than Black/African American only participants.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Equity Climate:

- (a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,
- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 22 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Equity Climate for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 2.4% of the variance in perceptions of the Equity Climate ($R^2 = .024$; $F_{\text{change}} = 3.570$, $df (5, 741)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 21.2% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .212$; $F_{\text{change}} = 68.106$, $df (3, 738)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 35.5% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .355$; $F_{\text{change}} = 159.136$, $df (4, 734)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 4.4% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .044$; $F_{\text{change}} = 43.678$, $df (2, 732)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Equity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.658$, $df (1, 731)$; $p = .103$). The variables in the final model accounted for 62.8% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .628$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Equity Climate. Although the variables Race Binary and Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Equity Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .134$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.257$), Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = -.086$), Campus Safety (part $r = .067$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .164$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .094$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Equity Climate at WMU. The high negative correlation ($r = -.711$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the equity climate at WMU more negatively. In addition, staff who report hearing discriminatory comments also tend to rate the equity climate more negatively. Demographics characteristics did not predict perceptions of equity climate at WMU. However, positive perceptions of the Equity Climate at WMU are associated with staff who are comfortable talking about race, have perceptions that the campus is a safe place, believe that the administration (and others)

have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and perceive that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity.

Table 22: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Equity Climate for Staff (N = 747)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .040 | .065 | .023 | .057 | .058 | .032 | -.002 | .044 | -.001 | .003 | .042 | .002 | .009 | .042 | .005 |
| Race Binary | -.303 | .089 | -.124*** | -.206 | .079 | -.084** | -.059 | .060 | -.024 | -.015 | .057 | -.006 | -.014 | .057 | -.006 |
| Veteran Status | -.001 | .144 | -.000 | .073 | .128 | .019 | .080 | .094 | .020 | .103 | .089 | .026 | .098 | .089 | .025 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.208 | .113 | -.067 | -.059 | .102 | -.019 | .071 | .075 | .023 | .055 | .071 | .018 | .057 | .071 | .018 |
| Disability Status | .251 | .159 | .058 | .138 | .141 | .032 | -.100 | .104 | .023 | -.059 | .099 | -.014 | -.045 | .099 | -.010 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .291 | .022 | .443*** | .121 | .018 | .183*** | .103 | .017 | .157*** | .101 | .017 | .153*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .003 | .042 | .003 | .004 | .031 | .003 | -.017 | .029 | -.015 | -.021 | .029 | -.019 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.236 | .038 | -.231*** | -.011 | .030 | -.011 | -.004 | .028 | -.004 | -.045 | .099 | -.010 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.456 | .027 | -.509*** | -.332 | .029 | -.371*** | -.329 | .029 | -.367*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.223 | .034 | -.193*** | -.130 | .034 | .113*** | -.131 | .034 | -.114*** |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.039 | .030 | -.036 | -.023 | .028 | -.021 | -.023 | .028 | -.021 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .114 | .026 | .114*** | .094 | .024 | .094*** | .078 | .026 | .078** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .194 | .026 | .223*** | .193 | .026 | .221*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .120 | .027 | .124*** | .115 | .027 | .119*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .049 | .030 | .042 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Fear of Reporting Inequity

The mean for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity ($M = 2.56$, $SD = .1.21$) suggests that staff on average expressed some reservations about reporting inequitable behavior in the workplace (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Fear of Reporting Inequity. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 23.

Table 23: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Fear of Reporting Inequity*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 3.082 | .080 | .004 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 1.170 | .332 | .007 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 1.332 | .249 | .002 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | .295 | .587 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.486 | .486 | .001 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.429 | .064 | .004 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Fear of Reporting Inequity:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

NOTE: Kalamazoo Climate was not used as a predictor in this analysis because there is no rationale for how fears of reporting inequity would be related to this variable.

Table 24 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Fear of Reporting Inequity for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant percentage of the variance for this variable ($R^2 = .011$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.661$, df (5, 740); $p = .142$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 17.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .177$; $F_{\text{change}} = 53.605$, df (3, 737); $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 25.2% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .252$; $F_{\text{change}} = 82.470$, df (4, 733); $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict a significant percentage of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = .504$, df (2, 731); $p = .605$). The variables in the final model accounted for 43.0% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .430$).

There were only three significant predictors for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = -.175$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = .348$), and Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = .058$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Fear of Reporting Inequity among staff at WMU. The high negative correlation ($r = -.711$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be more fearful of reporting inequity. In addition, staff who report hearing discriminatory comments also tend to report fear of reporting inequity. However, comfort talking about race is inversely associated with fears of reporting inequity, suggesting that people who report comfort talking about race are less likely to indicate that they are fearful for reporting inequity. Notably, none of the demographic characteristics were related to this variable, and perceptions of campus climate variables also were unrelated.

Table 24: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Reporting Inequity for Staff (N = 746)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.118 | .908 | -.045 | -.137 | .090 | .052 | -.114 | .077 | -.043 | -.115 | .077 | -.044 |
| Race Binary | .179 | .133 | .049 | .049 | .122 | .014 | -.129 | .105 | -.036 | -.139 | .106 | -.038 |
| Veteran Status | .058 | .217 | .010 | -.041 | .197 | -.007 | -.035 | .164 | .006 | -.040 | .165 | -.007 |
| Sexual Minority Status | .222 | .170 | .048 | .021 | .157 | .005 | -.131 | .131 | -.028 | -.126 | .131 | -.027 |
| Disability Status | -.409 | .238 | -.063 | -.249 | .217 | -.038 | .004 | .182 | .001 | -.003 | .182 | .000 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | -.401 | .034 | -.407*** | -.200 | .031 | -.203*** | -.196 | .031 | -.199*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | -.020 | .064 | -.012 | -.027 | .054 | -.016 | -.023 | .054 | -.014 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | .313 | .059 | .205*** | .052 | .052 | .034 | .049 | .052 | .033 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | .690 | .047 | .515*** | .666 | .053 | .496*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | .149 | .060 | .087* | .132 | .063 | .077* |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .011 | .052 | .007 | .008 | .052 | .005 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | -.004 | .045 | -.003 | .000 | .045 | .000 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.029 | .048 | -.022 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.035 | .050 | -.024 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do staff believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

The mean for the variable Work Valued Climate ($M = 4.02$, $SD = .84$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the work climate at WMU slightly more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Work Valued Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 25.

Table 25: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Work Valued Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 4.621 | .032 | .005 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .556 | .734 | .003 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | .217 | .642 | .000 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | .054 | .816 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.104 | .748 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 2.581 | .109 | .003 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Work Valued Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 26 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Work Valued Climate for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict significant variance in perceptions of the Work Valued Climate ($R^2 = .008$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.235$, $df (5, 741)$; $p = .291$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 19.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .197$; $F_{\text{change}} = 60.972$, $df (3, 738)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 23.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .237$; $F_{\text{change}} = 77.773$, $df (4, 734)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict additional variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .003$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.059$, $df (2, 732)$; $p = .128$). The variables in the final model accounted for 43.4% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .434$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Work Valued Climate. Similarly, the variables Tense Guarded Experiences, Zero Tolerance Climate, and Diversity Engagement Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Gender Binary, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Work Valued Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .181$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .090$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.312$), and Campus Safety (part $r = .064$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Work Valued Climate at WMU. The moderately high negative correlation ($r = -.596$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the workplace climate at WMU more negatively. However, staff who are comfortable talking about race, who are engaged with different others socially and academically, and who believe the campus is a safe place are more likely to report positive perceptions of the Work Valued Climate at WMU.

Table 26: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Work Valued Climate for Staff (N = 747)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .128 | .067 | .071 | .155 | .060 | .087** | .111 | .052 | .062* | .113 | .052 | .063 |
| Race Binary | -.040 | .091 | -.016 | .026 | .082 | .010 | .130 | .072 | .052 | .143 | .072 | .058 |
| Veteran Status | .016 | .148 | .004 | .093 | .133 | .023 | .090 | .112 | .023 | .096 | .112 | .024 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.081 | .116 | -.026 | .035 | .106 | .011 | .136 | .089 | .043 | .128 | .089 | .040 |
| Disability Status | .201 | .163 | .045 | .075 | .146 | .017 | -.101 | .124 | -.023 | -.093 | .124 | -.021 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .282 | .023 | .421*** | .146 | .021 | .218*** | .140 | .021 | .209*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .133 | .043 | .116** | .128 | .037 | .112*** | .123 | .037 | .107*** |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.191 | .040 | -.184*** | -.020 | .036 | -.019 | -.016 | .036 | -.016 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.440 | .032 | -.483*** | -.408 | .036 | -.447*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.100 | .041 | -.085* | -.079 | .043 | .067 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .017 | .036 | .015 | .021 | .036 | .018 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .075 | .030 | .074* | .070 | .030 | .069* |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .030 | .033 | .034 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .056 | .034 | .057 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do staff express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

The mean for the variable Diversity Satisfaction ($M = 4.85$, $SD = .85$) suggests that survey respondents on average expressed greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction with diversity experiences at WMU (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Satisfaction. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 27.

Table 27: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Diversity Satisfaction*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.276 | .259 | .002 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 15.519 | .001 | .084 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 13.360 | .001 | .016 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 3.337 | .068 | .005 |
| VETERAN STATUS | .263 | .608 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.194 | .074 | .004 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants rated their satisfaction with diversity significantly higher than Black/African American only participants. Heterosexual staff rated their satisfaction with diversity at WMU significantly higher than sexual minority participants.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Satisfaction:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 28 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Satisfaction for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 7.5% of the variance in perceptions of the Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2 = .075$; $F_{\text{change}} = 11.948$, $df (5, 741)$, $p < .001$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 17.4% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .174$; $F_{\text{change}} = 57.157$, $df (3, 738)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 31.3% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .313$; $F_{\text{change}} = 131.220$, $df (4, 734)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 1.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .010$; $F_{\text{change}} = 8.345$, $df (2, 732)$; $p < .001$. The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 2.3% of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .023$; $F_{\text{change}} = 40.965$, $df (1, 731)$; $p = .001$. The variables in the final model accounted for 58.6% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .586$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Gender Binary, Veteran Status and Disability Status were not unique predictors of Diversity Satisfaction. Similarly, the variable Tense Guarded Experiences was not a unique predictor. Although the variables Sexual Minority Status, Social Academic Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, and Campus Safety entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of Satisfaction with Diversity at WMU: Race Binary (part $r = -.120$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .070$), Personal Diversity Engagement (part $r = .110$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.336$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .052$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .053$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .151$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Diversity Satisfaction at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.705$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. In addition, racial-ethnic minority staff and staff engaged in the work of diversity also tended to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. However, staff who are comfortable talking about race, believe that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and perceive that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity are all associated with greater diversity satisfaction.

Table 28: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Satisfaction for Staff (N = 747)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .011 | .065 | .006 | .008 | .059 | .004 | -.049 | .047 | -.027 | -.046 | .046 | -.026 | -.022 | .045 | -.012 |
| Race Binary | -.580 | .088 | -.232*** | -.464 | .081 | -.186*** | -.343 | .039 | -.138*** | -.320 | .063 | -.128*** | -.314 | .062 | -.126*** |
| Veteran Status | -.123 | .144 | -.031 | -.075 | .130 | -.019 | -.079 | .100 | -.020 | -.067 | .099 | -.017 | -.090 | .096 | -.022 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.431 | .113 | -.135*** | -.248 | .104 | -.077* | -.133 | .080 | -.041 | -.144 | .079 | -.045 | -.134 | .077 | -.042 |
| Disability Status | .247 | .158 | .055 | .156 | .143 | .035 | -.048 | .110 | -.011 | -.032 | .109 | -.007 | .030 | .107 | .007 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .232 | .022 | .345*** | .076 | .019 | .112*** | .066 | .019 | .098*** | .054 | .018 | .080** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .076 | .042 | .066 | .068 | .033 | .059* | .058 | .032 | .050 | .040 | .032 | .035 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.336 | .039 | -.321*** | -.142 | .032 | -.136*** | -.137 | .031 | .131*** | -.142 | .031 | -.136*** |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.514 | .028 | -.560*** | -.453 | .032 | -.494*** | -.440 | .031 | -.480*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.092 | .036 | -.077* | -.051 | .038 | -.043 | -.054 | .037 | -.046 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.018 | .032 | -.016 | .026 | .032 | .023 | .027 | .031 | .024 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .105 | .027 | .103*** | .096 | .027 | .093*** | .029 | .028 | .028 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .069 | .029 | .077* | .062 | .028 | .070* |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .087 | .030 | .088** | .067 | .029 | .068* |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .206 | .032 | .176*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do staff express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school?

The mean for the variable Kalamazoo Climate ($M = 4.800$, $SD = .73$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the Kalamazoo community more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority staff from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Kalamazoo Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 29.

Table 29: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Staff on Kalamazoo Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.276 | .259 | .002 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 15.519 | .001 | .084 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 13.360 | .001 | .016 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 3.337 | .068 | .005 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.263 | .608 | .000 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.194 | .074 | .004 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY includes the racial-ethnic groups listed in Table 1 but excludes “declined to state” from this analysis; Games-Howell post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that White only participants rated their satisfaction with the Kalamazoo Climate significantly higher than Black/African American only participants.. Staff belonging to sexual minority groups perceived the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Kalamazoo Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 30 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Kalamazoo Climate for the staff sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate; $R^2 = .005$; $F_{\text{change}} = .785$, $df (5, 741)$, $p = .561$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 7.7% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .077$; $F_{\text{change}} = 20.667$, $df (3, 738)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 17.1% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .171$; $F_{\text{change}} = 41.944$, $df (4, 734)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 1.1% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .011$; $F_{\text{change}} = 5.267$, $df (2, 732)$; $p < .01$). The variables in the final model accounted for 25.0% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .250$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Race Binary, Veteran Status, and Sexual Minority Status were not unique predictors of Kalamazoo Climate. Similarly, the variables Personal Diversity Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, and Zero Tolerance Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variable Personal Experiences of Discrimination entered the model as a significant predictor, it was not a significant predictor in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of Kalamazoo Climate: Gender Binary (part $r = -.072$), Disability Status (part $r = -.078$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .089$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .076$), Campus Safety (part $r = .343$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .092$).

In this model, perceptions of campus safety accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Kalamazoo Climate, suggesting that participants experience the Kalamazoo Climate as connected in some way to campus safety. The moderate positive correlation ($r = .420$) suggests that people who experience the WMU campus as a safe place also tend to perceive the climate of Kalamazoo more positively; or those who experience the campus as less safe tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably as well. In addition, women and people with disabilities also tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate more negatively. However, positive perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate are associated with staff that are comfortable talking about race, who are engaged with diversity socially and academically, and believe that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity.

Table 30: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Kalamazoo Climate for Staff (N = 747)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.007 | .058 | -.004 | .015 | .056 | .010 | -.120 | .052 | -.078* | -.118 | .052 | -.077* |
| Race Binary | -.106 | .078 | -.050 | -.095 | .076 | -.045 | -.047 | .071 | -.022 | -.026 | .071 | -.012 |
| Veteran Status | .057 | .127 | .017 | .098 | .123 | .029 | .099 | .111 | .029 | .110 | .111 | .032 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.117 | .100 | -.043 | -.086 | .098 | -.032 | -.037 | .089 | -.014 | -.050 | .088 | -.018 |
| Disability Status | -.097 | .140 | .025 | -.168 | .135 | -.044 | -.312 | .123 | -.082* | -.300 | .122 | -.079* |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .137 | .021 | .237*** | .068 | .021 | .118*** | .059 | .021 | .102** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .127 | .040 | .129** | .096 | .036 | .097** | .087 | .036 | .088* |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.050 | .037 | -.056 | .020 | .035 | -.023 | .026 | .035 | .029 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.115 | .031 | -.147*** | -.067 | .035 | -.085 |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.012 | .040 | -.012 | .018 | .042 | .017 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.012 | .035 | -.013 | -.007 | .035 | -.007 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .332 | .030 | .380*** | .325 | .030 | .372*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.032 | .032 | -.042 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .097 | .034 | .115** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

FACULTY

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do faculty perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

The mean for the variable Diversity Climate ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 1.17$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the diversity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6.75). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 31.

Table 31: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Diversity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 2.131 | .145 | .004 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 5.361 | .021 | .011 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 3.373 | .067 | .007 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 10.354 | .001 | .029 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 2.594 | .108 | .005 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.896 | .049 | .008 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty. Faculty of color, non-Christian religious minorities and people with disabilities were less positive about the Diversity Climate.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 32 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Climate for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2 = .023$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.676$, $df (5, 349)$; $p = .140$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 26.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .268$; $F_{\text{change}} = 43.574$, $df (3, 346)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 30.5% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .305$; $F_{\text{change}} = 64.539$, $df (4, 342)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 2.9% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .029$; $F_{\text{change}} = 13.307$, $df (2, 340)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .002$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.567$, $df (1, 339)$; $p = .211$). The variables in the final model accounted for 61.1% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .611$).

None of the demographic variables were significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate, nor were Social Academic Engagement, Tense Guarded Experiences, or Kalamazoo Climate. The variables Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors but were not significant in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate: Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.334$), Campus Safety (part $r = -.117$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = -.075$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .163$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU. Faculty who experience discrimination tend to perceive the climate for diversity at WMU more negatively, whereas those who believe the campus community is engaged in the work of diversity rate the climate more positively. Counter-intuitively, faculty who rated the campus higher on Zero Tolerance Climate tended to rate the campus lower on Diversity Climate. Perceptions of campus safety also are associated with positive perceptions of the Diversity Climate at WMU among faculty.

Table 32: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Climate for Faculty (N = 355)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .184 | .127 | .079 | .025 | .112 | .011 | -.040 | .089 | -.017 | -.033 | .086 | -.014 | -.020 | .086 | .008 |
| Race Binary | -.261 | .173 | -.080 | -.222 | .148 | -.068 | -.111 | .116 | -.034 | -.087 | .112 | -.027 | -.081 | .112 | -.025 |
| Veteran Status | -.185 | .259 | -.039 | -.115 | .222 | -.024 | -.159 | .171 | -.034 | -.109 | .165 | -.023 | -.096 | .165 | -.020 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.324 | .208 | -.083 | -.214 | .180 | -.054 | -.067 | .138 | -.017 | -.029 | .134 | -.008 | -.032 | .113 | -.008 |
| Disability Status | .217 | .300 | .039 | -.031 | .259 | -.006 | -.215 | .197 | -.038 | -.231 | .192 | -.041 | -.234 | .192 | -.042 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .417 | .042 | .459*** | .091 | .039 | .101* | .074 | .038 | .082* | .065 | .038 | .072 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .146 | .099 | .077 | .028 | .076 | .015 | .008 | .074 | .004 | .065 | .038 | .072 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.441 | .078 | -.300*** | -.110 | .064 | -.075 | -.112 | .062 | -.083* | -.116 | .062 | -.079 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.628 | .052 | -.579*** | -.562 | .055 | -.517*** | -.556 | .055 | -.513*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.168 | .077 | -.093* | -.137 | .078 | .076 | .136 | .077 | .076 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .035 | .068 | .020 | .010 | .067 | .006 | .012 | .067 | .007 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .229 | .052 | .170*** | -.200 | .050 | .148*** | .184 | .052 | .136*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.095 | .044 | -.091* | -.099 | .044 | .094* |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .277 | .056 | .217*** | .275 | .056 | .215*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .068 | .054 | .048 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do faculty believe the WMU campus is welcoming and affirming?

The mean for the variable General Campus Climate ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .97$) suggests that on average survey respondents perceived the general climate at WMU to be somewhat more positive than negative (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of General Campus Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 33.

Table 33: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on General Campus Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .647 | .442 | .001 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .485 | .487 | .001 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | .405 | .525 | .001 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 5.878 | .016 | .017 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 1.269 | .261 | .003 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.290 | .070 | .007 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty. Religious minority participants rated the General Campus Climate more negatively.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of General Campus Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 34 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on General Campus Climate for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the General Campus Climate ($R^2 = .009$; $F_{\text{change}} = .611$, $df (5, 349)$; $p = .691$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 32.2% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .322$; $F_{\text{change}} = 54.876$, $df (3, 346)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 38.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .388$; $F_{\text{change}} = 116.738$, $df (4, 342)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 1.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .018$; $F_{\text{change}} = 11.799$, $df (2, 340)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in WMU General Campus Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = .751$, $df (1, 339)$; $p = .387$). The variables in the final model accounted for 72.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .723$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were significant unique predictors of General Campus Climate. In addition, Social Academic Engagement, Zero Tolerance Climate and Kalamazoo Climate were not unique predictors. The following variables entered the model as significant but dropped out of the final model: Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Campus Safety.

In the final model, only the following variables were significant predictors of WMU General Campus Climate: Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.391$), Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = -.061$), Tense Guarded Experiences (part $r = -.078$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .135$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of General Campus Climate at WMU. The very strong negative correlation ($r = -.827$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the general campus climate at WMU more negatively. Similarly, those who hear discriminatory comments and have tense guarded experiences under conditions of diversity also tend to rate the General Campus Climate more negatively. In contrast, positive perceptions of the General Campus Climate at WMU were associated with faculty who believe members of the campus community are engaged in the work of diversity.

Table 34: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Campus Climate for Faculty (N = 355)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .109 | .105 | .057 | -.019 | .089 | -.010 | -.014 | .061 | -.007 | -.013 | .059 | -.007 | -.007 | .060 | -.004 |
| Race Binary | -.077 | .143 | -.029 | -.041 | .119 | -.015 | .127 | .080 | .047 | .139 | .077 | .052 | .142 | .077 | .053 |
| Veteran Status | -.023 | .214 | -.006 | .053 | .178 | .014 | .022 | .117 | .006 | .054 | .114 | .014 | .060 | .114 | .015 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.090 | .172 | -.028 | -.003 | .143 | -.001 | .072 | .095 | .023 | .104 | .092 | .032 | .103 | .092 | .032 |
| Disability Status | .278 | .248 | .060 | .075 | .207 | .016 | -.104 | .136 | -.023 | -.092 | .132 | -.020 | -.094 | .132 | -.020 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .383 | .034 | .515*** | .066 | .027 | .089* | .051 | .026 | .069* | .047 | .027 | .063 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .139 | .079 | .090 | .040 | .052 | .026 | .024 | .051 | .015 | .024 | .051 | .016 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.355 | .062 | -.294*** | -.030 | .044 | -.025 | -.035 | .042 | -.029 | -.032 | .043 | .027 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.597 | .036 | -.671*** | -.537 | .038 | -.603*** | -.535 | .038 | -.600*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.160 | .053 | -.109** | -.117 | .054 | -.079* | -.117 | .054 | -.079* |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.121 | .047 | -.084* | -.129 | .046 | -.090** | -.128 | .046 | -.090** |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .081 | .036 | .073* | .059 | .035 | .053 | .051 | .036 | .046 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.015 | .030 | .018 | -.017 | .030 | -.020 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .188 | .039 | .179*** | .187 | .039 | .179*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .032 | .037 | .028 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do faculty perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

For employees, this research question was evaluated using two dependent variables: (a) Equity Climate and (b) Fear of Reporting Inequity.

Equity Climate

The mean for the variable Equity Climate ($M = 4.21$, $SD = .99$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the equity climate at WMU somewhat more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Equity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 35.

Table 35: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Equity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.021 | .313 | .002 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .369 | .544 | .001 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | .388 | .534 | .001 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 1.899 | .169 | .005 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.720 | .397 | .002 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 5.347 | .021 | .013 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty. People with disabilities rated the Equity Climate lower than faculty who do not have a disability.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Equity Climate:

- (a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,
- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 36 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Equity Climate for faculty. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the Equity Climate ($R^2 = .018$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.281$, $df (5, 349)$; $p < .001$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 35.9% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .359$; $F_{\text{change}} = 66.349$, $df (3, 346)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 31.1% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .311$; $F_{\text{change}} = 84.982$, $df (4, 342)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 2.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .028$; $F_{\text{change}} = 16.793$, $df (2, 340)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Equity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = .871$, $df (1, 339)$; $p = .351$). The variables in the final model accounted for 70.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .703$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Equity Climate. Similarly the variables Social Academic Engagement, Tense Guarded Experiences and Kalamazoo Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Personal Diversity Engagement and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Equity Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .129$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.300$), Campus Safety (part $r = .134$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .144$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .069$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination explained the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Equity Climate at WMU. The high negative correlation ($r = -.786$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the equity climate at WMU more negatively. Positive perceptions of the Equity Climate at WMU are associated with faculty who are comfortable talking about race, have perceptions that the campus is a safe place, believe that the administration (and others) have a zero tolerance for discrimination, and perceive that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity.

Table 36: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Equity Climate for Faculty (N = 355)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .144 | .106 | .074 | .011 | .087 | .006 | -.036 | .065 | -.019 | -.051 | .062 | -.026 | -.058 | .063 | -.030 |
| Race Binary | -.102 | .144 | -.038 | -.061 | .116 | -.022 | .076 | .085 | .028 | .068 | .081 | .025 | .064 | .081 | .024 |
| Veteran Status | -.047 | .216 | -.012 | .038 | .174 | .010 | .031 | .125 | .008 | .042 | .120 | .011 | .035 | .120 | .009 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.143 | .174 | -.044 | -.053 | .140 | -.016 | .054 | .101 | .016 | .090 | .097 | .028 | .091 | .097 | .028 |
| Disability Status | .435 | .250 | .093 | .225 | .202 | .048 | .070 | .144 | .015 | .152 | .139 | .032 | .154 | .139 | .033 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .416 | .033 | .552*** | .138 | .028 | .183*** | .119 | .027 | .158*** | .124 | .027 | .156*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .129 | .077 | .082 | .036 | .056 | .023 | .019 | .053 | .012 | .019 | .053 | .012 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.364 | .061 | -.298*** | -.070 | .047 | -.057 | -.063 | .045 | -.051 | -.066 | .045 | -.054 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.494 | .038 | -.547*** | -.414 | .040 | -.458*** | -.416 | .040 | -.461*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.165 | .056 | -.111** | -.068 | .056 | .046 | -.069 | .056 | -.046 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.097 | .050 | -.067 | -.071 | .048 | -.049 | -.072 | .048 | -.050 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .184 | .038 | .164*** | .166 | .037 | .148*** | .174 | .038 | .155*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .157 | .032 | .180*** | .159 | .032 | .182*** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .097 | .041 | .091* | .098 | .041 | .092* |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.037 | .039 | .031 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Fear of Reporting Inequity

The mean for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity ($M = 2.44$, $SD = .1.28$) suggests that faculty on average expressed some reservations about reporting inequitable behavior in the workplace (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Fear of Reporting Inequity. The results are presented in Table 37.

Table 37: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Fear of Reporting Inequity*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 1.183 | .277 | .003 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 1.289 | .257 | .003 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | .004 | .952 | .000 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | .001 | .982 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 0.846 | .358 | .002 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 1.351 | .246 | .003 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Fear of Reporting Inequity:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

NOTE: Kalamazoo Climate was not used as a predictor in this analysis because there is no rationale for how fears of reporting inequity would be related to this variable.

Table 38 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Fear of Reporting Inequity for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant percentage of the variance for this variable ($R^2 = .007$; $F_{\text{change}} = .489$, $df (5, 348)$; $p = .785$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 29.1% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .291$; $F_{\text{change}} = 47.735$, $df (3, 345)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 18.9% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .189$; $F_{\text{change}} = 31.489$, $df (4, 341)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 1.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .010$; $F_{\text{change}} = 3.506$, $df (2, 339)$; $p = .031$). The variables in the final model accounted for 47.7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .477$).

There were only three significant predictors for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = -.180$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = .346$), and Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .101$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Fear of Reporting Inequity among faculty at WMU. The strong positive correlation ($r = .667$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be more fearful of reporting inequity. Demographics characteristics did not predict fear of reporting inequity at WMU. However, comfort talking about race is inversely associated with fears of reporting inequity, suggesting that people who report comfort talking about race are less likely to indicate that they are fearful for reporting inequity. Notably, Zero Tolerance Climate was positively related to this variable among faculty, indicating that faculty tend to be more fearful if they perceive the campus community to have a zero tolerance for discrimination (which is counter-intuitive). Otherwise, other potential predictors were not significant in the final model.

Table 38: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Reporting Inequity for Faculty (N = 354)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.145 | .140 | -.057 | -.012 | .121 | .005 | -.018 | .109 | -.007 | -.032 | .108 | -.013 |
| Race Binary | .182 | .189 | .052 | .129 | .160 | .036 | -.003 | .141 | -.001 | -.019 | .141 | -.005 |
| Veteran Status | .090 | .283 | .018 | -.029 | .240 | -.006 | .033 | .209 | .006 | .020 | .207 | .004 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.021 | .228 | -.005 | -.108 | .194 | -.025 | -.177 | .168 | -.042 | -.166 | .168 | -.039 |
| Disability Status | -.108 | .328 | -.018 | .107 | .280 | .018 | .268 | .241 | .044 | .331 | .241 | .054 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | -.505 | .046 | -.513*** | -.215 | .047 | -.218*** | -.221 | .047 | -.225*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | -.103 | .107 | -.050 | -.002 | .093 | -.001 | -.006 | .093 | -.003 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | .362 | .084 | .227*** | .077 | .078 | .048 | .086 | .077 | .054 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | .596 | .064 | .506*** | .625 | .069 | .531*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | .074 | .094 | .038 | .128 | .097 | .066 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .043 | .084 | .023 | .070 | .084 | .037 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | -.065 | .063 | -.045 | -.066 | .063 | -.045 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.146 | .055 | -.128** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.044 | .070 | -.032 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do faculty believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

The mean for the variable Work Valued Climate ($M = 4.23$, $SD = .94$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the work climate at WMU somewhat more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Work Valued Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 39.

Table 39: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Work Valued Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .162 | .687 | .000 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .212 | .646 | .001 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | .074 | .786 | .000 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | .015 | .902 | .000 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 1.895 | .169 | .005 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 9.512 | .002 | .023 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty. Faculty with disabilities rated Work Valued Climate lower than faculty who do not have disabilities.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Work Valued Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 40 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Work Valued Climate for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict significant variance in perceptions of the Work Valued Climate ($R^2 = .024$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.726$, $df (5, 348)$; $p = .128$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 28.2% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .282$; $F_{\text{change}} = 46.702$, $df (3, 345)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 20.4% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .204$; $F_{\text{change}} = 35.558$, $df (4, 341)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict additional variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .007$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.358$, $df (2, 339)$; $p = .096$). The variables in the final model accounted for 49.7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .497$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Race Binary, Veteran Status, and Sexual Minority Status were not unique predictors of Work Valued Climate. Similarly, the variables Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, and Zero Tolerance Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Social Academic Engagement and Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Work Valued Climate: Gender Binary (part $r = -.119$), Disability Status (part $r = .076$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .150$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.317$), Campus Safety (part $r = .108$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .082$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Work Valued Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.658$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the workplace climate at WMU more negatively. In addition, women and people with disabilities rated Work Valued Climate lower. However, faculty who are comfortable talking about race, perceive the campus as a safe place, and believe the campus community is engaged in the work of diversity are more likely to report positive perceptions of the Work Valued Climate at WMU.

Table 40: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Work Valued Climate for Faculty (N = 354)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.117 | .101 | -.064 | -.195 | .088 | -.106* | -.242 | .077 | -.131** | -.242 | .077 | -.131** |
| Race Binary | .086 | .136 | .033 | .107 | .116 | .042 | .165 | .101 | .064 | .172 | .100 | .067 |
| Veteran Status | -.274 | .204 | -.073 | -.175 | .174 | -.047 | -.244 | .148 | .065 | -.226 | .148 | -.060 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.012 | .164 | -.004 | .037 | .140 | .012 | .126 | .120 | .041 | .145 | .120 | .047 |
| Disability Status | .591 | .236 | .133* | .449 | .202 | .101* | .340 | .171 | .076* | .348 | .172 | .078* |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .348 | .033 | .486*** | .143 | .034 | .200*** | .134 | .034 | .187*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .221 | .077 | .148** | .130 | .066 | .087 | .120 | .066 | .081 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.234 | .061 | .202*** | -.042 | .055 | -.036 | -.045 | .055 | -.039 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.452 | .046 | -.527*** | -.416 | .050 | -.485*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | .016 | .067 | .011 | .042 | .069 | .030 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .062 | .059 | .045 | .057 | .060 | .042 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .143 | .045 | .134** | .130 | .045 | .122** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.006 | .039 | -.008 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .109 | .050 | .108* |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do faculty express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

The mean for the variable Diversity Satisfaction ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.07$) suggests that survey respondents on average expressed greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction with diversity experiences at WMU (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Satisfaction. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 41.

Table 41: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Diversity Satisfaction*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 3.713 | .055 | .009 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 5.993 | .015 | .015 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 3.007 | .084 | .008 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 6.969 | .009 | .020 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 3.669 | .056 | .009 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | 3.703 | .055 | .009 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty. White only participants rated their satisfaction with diversity significantly higher than Faculty of Color participants. Non-Christian Religious Minority participants rated their satisfaction with diversity lower as well.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Satisfaction:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQ), and disability status,

- (b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),
- (c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety),
- (d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate), and
- (e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 42 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Satisfaction for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 3.4% of the variance in perceptions of the Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2 = .034$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.487$, $df (5, 349)$, $p < .05$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 32.4% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .324$; $F_{\text{change}} = 58.169$, $df (3, 346)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 30.5% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .305$; $F_{\text{change}} = 77.399$, $df (4, 342)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 2.0% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .020$; $F_{\text{change}} = 10.809$, $df (2, 340)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 3.4% of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .034$; $F_{\text{change}} = 40.452$, $df (1, 339)$; $p = .001$. The variables in the final model accounted for 70.4% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .704$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Diversity Satisfaction. Similarly, the variable Social Academic Engagement, Tense Guarded Experiences, and Zero Tolerance Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Race Talk Comfort, Hear Discriminatory Comments, and Campus Safety entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of Satisfaction with Diversity at WMU: Personal Diversity Engagement (part $r = -.084$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.335$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .137$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .184$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Diversity Satisfaction at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.782$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. In addition, faculty engaged in the work of diversity also tended to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. However, faculty who perceive that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity and rate the Kalamazoo Climate positively tend to express greater diversity satisfaction at WMU.

Table 42: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Satisfaction for Faculty (N = 355)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .177 | .115 | .083 | .007 | .097 | .003 | -.009 | .074 | -.004 | -.008 | .072 | -.004 | .044 | .068 | .021 |
| Race Binary | -.306 | .156 | -.103 | -.269 | .128 | -.091* | -.128 | .096 | -.043 | -.114 | .093 | -.039 | -.089 | .089 | -.030 |
| Veteran Status | -.273 | .234 | -.063 | -.214 | .192 | -.049 | -.258 | .142 | -.060 | -.220 | .138 | -.051 | -.169 | .131 | -.039 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.327 | .188 | -.092 | -.208 | .155 | -.058 | -.115 | .114 | -.032 | -.079 | .112 | -.022 | -.090 | .106 | -.025 |
| Disability Status | .246 | .271 | .048 | -.016 | .224 | -.003 | -.190 | .164 | -.037 | -.178 | .160 | -.035 | -.190 | .152 | -.037 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .407 | .037 | .494*** | .100 | .032 | .121** | .083 | .032 | .100** | .045 | .030 | .055 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .146 | .085 | .085 | .042 | .063 | .024 | .023 | .062 | .014 | .026 | .058 | .015 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.471 | .067 | -.353*** | -.160 | .053 | -.120** | -.166 | .051 | .125*** | -.141 | .049 | -.106** |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.597 | .044 | -.606*** | -.529 | .046 | -.536*** | -.508 | .044 | -.515*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.135 | .064 | -.083* | -.087 | .065 | -.054 | -.084 | .061 | -.051 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.054 | .057 | -.034 | -.064 | .056 | -.041 | -.059 | .053 | -.037 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .118 | .043 | .096** | .093 | .042 | .076* | .029 | .041 | .024 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.022 | .037 | -.023 | -.037 | .035 | -.039 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .218 | .047 | .188** | .211 | .044 | .181*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .272 | .043 | .211*** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do faculty express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school?

The mean for the variable Kalamazoo Climate ($M = 4.74$, $SD = .87$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the Kalamazoo community more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority faculty from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Kalamazoo Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 43.

Table 43: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Faculty on Kalamazoo Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .202 | .653 | .000 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 1.164 | .281 | .003 |
| SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS | 1.444 | .230 | .004 |
| RELIGIOUS MINORITY STATUS | 1.819 | .178 | .005 |
| VETERAN STATUS | 1.985 | .160 | .005 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | .689 | .407 | .002 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women. SEXUAL MINORITY STATUS includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Faculty of Color and White Faculty) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority faculty.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Kalamazoo Climate:

(a) participant demographics (gender as man or woman), veteran status, race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member), sexual minority status (heterosexual versus LGBTQQ), and disability status,

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement),

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety), and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 44 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Kalamazoo Climate for the faculty sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate; $R^2 = .013$; $F_{\text{change}} = .932$, $df (5, 349)$, $p = .460$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 14.2% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .142$; $F_{\text{change}} = 19.335$, $df (3, 346)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 8.5% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .085$; $F_{\text{change}} = 9.588$, $df (4, 342)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict an additional significant proportion of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .004$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.003$, $df (2, 340)$; $p = .368$). The variables in the final model accounted for 21.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .213$).

In this analysis, the demographic variables Race Binary, Veteran Status, and Sexual Minority Status and Disability Status were not unique predictors of Kalamazoo Climate. Similarly, the variables Social Academic Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, Zero Tolerance Climate and Diversity Engagement Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Personal Diversity Engagement and Personal Experiences of Discrimination entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, only the following variables were significant predictors of Kalamazoo Climate: Gender Binary (part $r = -.104$), Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .171$), and Campus Safety (part $r = .219$).

In this model, perceptions of campus safety accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Kalamazoo Climate, suggesting that participants experience the Kalamazoo Climate as connected in some way to campus safety. The moderate positive correlation ($r = .324$) suggests that people who experience the WMU campus as a safe place also tend to perceive the climate of Kalamazoo more positively; or those who experience the campus as less safe tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably as well. In addition, women also tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate more negatively. However, faculty who express comfort talking about race tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate more favorably.

Table 44: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Kalamazoo Climate for Faculty (N = 355)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.009 | .090 | -.006 | -.081 | .086 | -.049 | -.185 | .086 | -.112* | -.190 | .086 | -.115* |
| Race Binary | -.144 | .122 | -.063 | -.119 | .114 | -.052 | -.090 | .112 | -.039 | -.093 | .112 | -.041 |
| Veteran Status | -.254 | .183 | -.076 | -.210 | .171 | -.062 | -.187 | .165 | .056 | -.185 | .165 | -.055 |
| Sexual Minority Status | -.115 | .148 | -.042 | -.067 | .138 | -.024 | .028 | .133 | .010 | .039 | .134 | .014 |
| Disability Status | .167 | .212 | .042 | .056 | .200 | .014 | .018 | .191 | .005 | .046 | .192 | .012 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .224 | .033 | .350*** | .143 | .037 | .224*** | .137 | .038 | .214*** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .040 | .076 | .030 | -.003 | .074 | -.002 | -.008 | .074 | -.006 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.192 | .060 | -.185*** | -.095 | .062 | -.092 | -.093 | .062 | -.089 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.102 | .051 | -.134* | -.077 | .055 | -.100 |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.045 | .074 | -.036 | -.013 | .078 | -.010 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.029 | .066 | -.024 | -.020 | .067 | -.016 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .240 | .050 | .252*** | .234 | .051 | .246*** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .056 | .044 | .075 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .026 | .056 | .029 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. Sexual Minority Status includes participants who did not identify as cisgender (man or woman) along with participants who did not identify as heterosexual; participants who identified as asexual only were omitted from this analysis (see Appendix 1 for a breakdown for gender and sexual orientation identities). See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

ADMINISTRATORS

Research Question #1: To what extent and in what ways do administrators perceive that diversity on campus is recognized, honored, and appreciated?

The mean for the variable Diversity Climate ($M = 5.06$, $SD = 1.00$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the diversity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6.75). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 45.

Table 45: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Diversity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 4.763 | .031 | .037 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 10.407 | .002 | .079 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables. Women and administrators of color rated the diversity climate at WMU lower than administrators who identified as White only or male.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Climate:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety);

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement); and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 46 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Climate for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 9.8% of the variance in perceptions of the WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2 = .098$; $F_{\text{change}} = 5.628$, $df (2, 104)$; $p = .005$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 21.1% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .211$; $F_{\text{change}} = 10.277$, $df (3, 101)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 38.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .387$; $F_{\text{change}} = 30.786$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 5.8% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .058$; $F_{\text{change}} = 11.155$, $df (2, 95)$; $p < .001$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Diversity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .001$; $F_{\text{change}} = .414$, $df (1, 94)$; $p = .522$). The variables in the final model accounted for 72.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .723$).

The variables Tense Guarded Experiences, Campus Safety, and Kalamazoo Climate were not unique predictors of Diversity Climate for the administrator sample. The variables Gender Binary, Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors but were not significant in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Diversity Climate: Race Binary (part $r = -.113$), Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .102$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.243$), Zero Tolerance Climate (part $r = .141$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .192$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.781$) suggests that administrators who experience discrimination tend to perceive the climate for diversity at WMU more negatively, as do administrators of color. Those who are socially and academically engaged in activities across differences, along with those who perceive a zero tolerance climate for discrimination, and those who believe the campus community is engaged in the work of diversity rate the overall Diversity Climate more positively.

Table 46: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Climate for Administrators (N = 107)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .379 | .183 | .194* | .240 | .171 | .123 | .049 | .118 | .025 | .056 | .108 | .029 | .054 | .108 | .027 |
| Race Binary | -.651 | .258 | -.235* | -.608 | .229 | -.220** | -.349 | .171 | -.126* | -.353 | .155 | -.128* | -.347 | .156 | -.125* |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .418 | .087 | .452*** | .027 | .069 | .029 | -.033 | .064 | -.035 | -.034 | .064 | -.036 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .099 | .133 | .070 | .147 | .094 | .104 | .170 | .088 | .120 | .177 | .088 | .125* |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.486 | .129 | -.372*** | -.064 | .097 | -.049 | -.035 | .090 | -.027 | -.042 | .091 | -.032 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.597 | .071 | -.626*** | -.382 | .080 | -.401*** | -.383 | .081 | -.402*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.370 | .117 | -.232** | -.183 | .114 | -.115 | -.189 | .114 | -.118 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .105 | .091 | .076 | .072 | .083 | .052 | .076 | .084 | .055 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .139 | .103 | .097 | .140 | .093 | .098 | .155 | .096 | .108 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .216 | .078 | .222** | -.218 | .079 | .224** |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .275 | .074 | .240*** | .284 | .076 | .247*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.057 | .089 | -.038 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #2: To what extent and in what ways do administrators believe the WMU campus is welcoming and affirming?

The mean for the variable General Campus Climate ($M = 4.60$, $SD = .90$) suggests that on average survey respondents perceived the general climate at WMU to be more positive than negative (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of General Campus Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 47.

Table 47: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on General Campus Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .263 | .609 | .002 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 4.750 | .031 | .037 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables. Administrators of color rated the general campus climate at WMU lower than administrators who identified as White only.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of General Campus Climate:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety);

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement); and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 48 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on General Campus Climate for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the General Campus Climate ($R^2 = .023$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.203$, $df (2, 104)$; $p = .305$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 25.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .257$; $F_{\text{change}} = 12.017$, $df (3, 101)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 45.5% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .455$; $F_{\text{change}} = 41.553$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .009$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.668$, $df (2, 95)$; $p = .194$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 1.5% of the variance in WMU General Campus Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .015$; $F_{\text{change}} = 5.923$, $df (1, 94)$; $p = .017$). The variables in the final model accounted for 72.8% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .728$).

The variables Race Binary, Social Academic Engagement, Hear Discriminatory Comments, Tense Guarded Experiences, Zero Tolerance Climate and Diversity Engagement Climate were not unique predictors of General Campus Climate for the administrator sample. The variables Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement, and Campus Safety entered the model as significant predictors but were not significant in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU General Campus Climate: Gender Binary (part $r = -.129$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.402$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .123$).

Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of General Campus Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.814$) suggests that administrators who experience discrimination tend to perceive the general campus climate at WMU more negatively, as do women administrators. Those who perceive the Kalamazoo Climate to be positive also rate the overall General Campus Climate more positively.

Table 48: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Campus Climate for Administrators (N = 107)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .097 | .179 | .053 | -.046 | .164 | -.025 | -.265 | .104 | -.144* | -.263 | .103 | -.143* | -.255 | .101 | -.139* |
| Race Binary | -.358 | .252 | -.138 | -.312 | .220 | -.120 | .019 | .150 | .007 | .022 | .149 | .008 | -.002 | .145 | -.001 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .421 | .083 | .484*** | .018 | .060 | .021 | .013 | .084 | .098 | .017 | .060 | .019 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .141 | .128 | .106 | .145 | .083 | .109 | .130 | .084 | .098 | .106 | .082 | .080 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.518 | .124 | -.422*** | -.081 | .085 | -.066 | -.090 | .086 | -.073 | -.063 | .084 | -.052 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.632 | .062 | -.706*** | -.598 | .077 | -.668*** | -.596 | .075 | -.666*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.149 | .102 | -.099 | -.115 | .109 | -.076 | -.095 | .106 | -.063 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.100 | .080 | -.077 | -.104 | .080 | -.080 | -.119 | .078 | -.092 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .183 | .090 | .136* | .189 | .089 | .140* | .137 | .090 | .102 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.029 | .075 | -.032 | -.037 | .073 | -.040 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .128 | .071 | .119 | .100 | .070 | .093 |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .202 | .083 | .143* |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #3: To what extent and in what ways do administrators perceive that policies and institutional practices promote and/or hinder equity on campus?

For employees, this research question was evaluated using two dependent variables: (a) Equity Climate and (b) Fear of Reporting Inequity.

Equity Climate

The mean for the variable Equity Climate ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .84$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the equity climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Equity Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 49.

Table 49: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Equity Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 5.852 | .017 | .047 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .166 | .684 | .001 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables. Women administrators rated the Equity Climate at WMU lower than men.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Equity Climate:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety);

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement); and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 50 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Equity Climate for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the Equity Climate ($R^2 = .033$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.758$, $df (2, 104)$; $p = .178$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 22.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .227$; $F_{\text{change}} = 10.348$, $df (3, 101)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 38.1% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .381$; $F_{\text{change}} = 25.740$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .019$; $F_{\text{change}} = 2.655$, $df (2, 95)$; $p = .076$). The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, did not predict additional variance in WMU Equity Climate ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .005$; $F_{\text{change}} = 1.321$, $df (1, 94)$; $p = .253$). The variables in the final model accounted for 62.2% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .622$).

In this analysis, none of the demographic variables were unique predictors of Equity Climate. Similarly the variables Tense Guarded Experiences, Zero Tolerance Climate, Diversity Engagement Climate and Kalamazoo Climate were not unique predictors. Although the variables Race Talk Comfort, Personal Diversity Engagement and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors, they were not significant predictors in the final model.

In the final model, the following variables were significant predictors of WMU Equity Climate: Social Academic Engagement (part $r = .127$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.257$), and Campus Safety (part $r = .131$).

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Equity Climate at WMU. The high negative correlation ($r = -.714$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the equity climate at WMU more negatively. However, positive perceptions of the Equity Climate at WMU are associated with administrators who are engaged socially and academically in cross-cultural relationships, and have perceptions that the campus is a safe place.

Table 50: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Equity Climate for Administrators (N = 107)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .307 | .167 | .178 | .234 | .156 | .135 | .058 | .113 | .034 | .062 | .112 | .036 | .066 | .111 | .038 |
| Race Binary | -.063 | .236 | -.026 | -.023 | .209 | -.010 | .148 | .164 | .061 | .145 | .161 | .059 | .133 | .161 | .054 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .377 | .079 | .463*** | .036 | .066 | .044 | .003 | .066 | .004 | .005 | .066 | .006 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .173 | .122 | .138 | .188 | .090 | .150* | .206 | .091 | .165* | .194 | .091 | .155* |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.366 | .118 | -.317** | .004 | .093 | .004 | .025 | .093 | .021 | .039 | .093 | .034 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.472 | .068 | -.562*** | -.359 | .083 | -.427*** | -.358 | .083 | -.426*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.298 | .112 | -.211** | -.201 | .118 | .142 | -.191 | .118 | -.135 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .066 | .088 | .054 | .048 | .086 | .039 | .040 | .087 | .033 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .247 | .098 | .195* | .245 | .097 | .194* | .218 | .099 | .173* |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .136 | .081 | .158 | .132 | .081 | .153 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .116 | .077 | .115 | .101 | .078 | .100 |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .106 | .092 | .079 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Fear of Reporting Inequity

The mean for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity ($M = 2.06$, $SD = .1.18$) suggests that administrators on average expressed some reservations about reporting inequitable behavior in the workplace (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Fear of Reporting Inequity. The results are presented in Table 51.

Table 51: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Fear of Reporting Inequity*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .810 | .370 | .007 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 1.289 | .257 | .003 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Fear of Reporting Inequity:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety); and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement).

NOTE: Kalamazoo Climate was not used as a predictor in this analysis because there is no rationale for how fears of reporting inequity would be related to this variable.

Table 52 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Fear of Reporting Inequity for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant percentage of the variance for this variable ($R^2 = .005$; $F_{\text{change}} = .277$, $df (2, 104)$; $p = .759$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 32.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .327$; $F_{\text{change}} = 16.452$, $df (3, 101)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 28.7% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .287$; $F_{\text{change}} = 18.224$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .002$; $F_{\text{change}} = .224$, $df (2, 95)$; $p = .800$). The variables in the final model accounted for 57.6% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .576$).

There were only two significant predictors for the variable Fear of Reporting Inequity: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = -.192$) and Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = .383$). Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as a significant variable but was not a significant predictor in the final model.

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Fear of Reporting Inequity among faculty at WMU. The strong positive correlation ($r = .733$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be more fearful of reporting inequity. Demographics characteristics did not predict fear of reporting inequity at WMU. However, comfort talking about race is inversely associated with fears of reporting inequity, suggesting that people who report comfort talking about race are less likely to indicate that they are fearful for reporting inequity.

Table 52: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Reporting Inequity for Administrators (N = 107)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | -.125 | .239 | -.051 | -.025 | .210 | .010 | .210 | .165 | .086 | .210 | .167 | .086 |
| Race Binary | .169 | .338 | .049 | .126 | .282 | .037 | -.213 | .239 | -.062 | -.210 | .241 | -.061 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | -.722 | .106 | -.626*** | -.308 | .096 | -.267** | -.302 | .099 | -.262** |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .015 | .164 | .008 | -.008 | .132 | -.005 | -.025 | .136 | -.014 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | .441 | .158 | .271** | .032 | .136 | .020 | .020 | .139 | .012 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | .764 | .099 | .643*** | .754 | .125 | .634*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | .025 | .163 | .012 | .020 | .176 | .010 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | -.001 | .128 | -.001 | .002 | .129 | .001 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | -.065 | .143 | -.036 | -.060 | .145 | -.034 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.061 | .121 | -.050 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .054 | .115 | .038 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #4: To what extent and in what ways do administrators believe that the campus climate promotes their ability to achieve their full potential?

The mean for the variable Work Valued Climate ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .84$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the work climate at WMU more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Work Valued Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 53.

Table 53: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Work Valued Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 2.148 | .145 | .018 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .063 | .803 | .001 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Work Valued Climate:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety); and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement).

Table 54 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Work Valued Climate for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict significant variance in perceptions of the Work Valued Climate ($R^2 = .011$; $F_{\text{change}} = .588$, $df (2, 104)$; $p = .557$). The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted

an additional 20.6% of the variance ($R^2_{change} = .206$; $F_{change} = 8.848$, $df(3, 101)$; $p < .001$). The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 27.2% of the variance ($R^2_{change} = .272$; $F_{change} = 12.889$, $df(4, 97)$; $p < .001$). The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted 5.7% of the variance ($R^2_{change} = .057$; $F_{change} = 5.920$, $df(2, 95)$; $p < .01$). The variables in the final model accounted for 49.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .493$).

There were only four significant predictors for the variable Work Valued Climate: Race Talk Comfort (part $r = .173$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.252$), Hear Discriminatory Comments (part $r = -.153$), and Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = -.196$). Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as a significant variable but was not a significant predictor in the final model.

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in perceptions of Work Valued Climate at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.654$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to perceive the workplace climate at WMU more negatively. People who report hearing discriminatory comments were also more likely to negatively rate Work Valued Climate. However, administrators who are comfortable talking about race and believe the campus community is engaged in the work of diversity are more likely to report positive perceptions of the Work Valued Climate at WMU.

Table 54: Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Work Valued Climate for Administrators (N = 107)

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .168 | .163 | .100 | .083 | .155 | -.050 | -.049 | .131 | -.029 | -.055 | .125 | -.033 |
| Race Binary | .093 | .230 | .039 | .111 | .208 | .047 | .356 | .189 | .151 | .359 | .180 | .152 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .401 | .079 | .508*** | .138 | .076 | .175 | .186 | .074 | .236* |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | -.116 | .121 | .096 | -.054 | .104 | -.045 | -.070 | .101 | -.058 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.254 | .117 | .228* | .001 | .108 | .001 | -.021 | .104 | -.018 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.530 | .079 | -.652*** | -.707 | .093 | -.870*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.136 | .129 | -.100 | -.291 | .132 | -.214* |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .116 | .101 | .098 | .143 | .097 | .121 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | -.105 | .113 | -.086 | -.107 | .108 | -.088 |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.116 | .091 | -.199 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | -.244 | .086 | -.249** |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #5: To what extent and in what ways do administrators express satisfaction with their experiences in the university as it pertains to diversity?

The mean for the variable Diversity Satisfaction ($M = 4.76$, $SD = .98$) suggests that survey respondents on average expressed greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction with diversity experiences at WMU (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Diversity Satisfaction. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 55.

Table 55: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Diversity Satisfaction*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | 6.218 | .014 | .050 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | 2.722 | .102 | .023 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables. Women Administrators rated their satisfaction with diversity at WMU significantly lower than men did.

Five sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Diversity Satisfaction:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety); and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement), and

(e) perceptions of Kalamazoo Climate.

Table 56 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Diversity Satisfaction for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables predicted 7.9% of the variance in perceptions of the Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2 = .079$; $F_{\text{change}} = 4.433$, $df (2, 104)$, $p < .05$. The second block of diversity engagement variables predicted an additional 25.3% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .253$; $F_{\text{change}} = 12.730$, $df (3, 101)$, $p < .001$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 37.6% of the variance; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .376$; $F_{\text{change}} = 31.149$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .001$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables predicted an additional 3.9% of the variance ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .039$; $F_{\text{change}} = 7.264$, $df (2, 95)$; $p < .001$. The final variable, Kalamazoo Climate perceptions, predicted an additional 1.2% of the variance in perceptions of Diversity Satisfaction; $R^2_{\text{change}} = .012$; $F_{\text{change}} = 4.711$, $df (1, 94)$; $p < .05$. The variables in the final model accounted for 71.7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .717$).

There were five unique significant predictors in the final model for Diversity Satisfaction: Personal Diversity Engagement (part $r = -.130$), Personal Experiences of Discrimination (part $r = -.251$), Campus Safety (part $r = .152$), Diversity Engagement Climate (part $r = .172$), and Kalamazoo Climate (part $r = .110$). Although Gender Binary entered the model as a significant variable, it was not significant in the final model. Similarly, the variables Race Talk Comfort and Hear Discriminatory Comments entered the model as significant predictors but were not significant in the final model. Race Binary, Social Academic Engagement, Tense Guarded Experiences and Zero Tolerance Climate were not significant predictors.

Again, Personal Experiences of Discrimination accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Diversity Satisfaction at WMU. The strong negative correlation ($r = -.753$) suggests that people who experience discrimination tend to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. In addition, administrators engaged in the work of diversity also tended to be less satisfied with diversity at WMU. However, administrators who perceive that people on campus are actively engaged in the work of diversity, believe the campus to be a safe place, and rate the Kalamazoo Climate positively also tend to express greater diversity satisfaction at WMU.

Table 56: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Diversity Satisfaction for Administrators (N = 107)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .461 | .179 | .243* | .247 | .163 | .130 | .048 | .113 | .025 | .053 | .106 | .028 | .061 | .104 | .032 |
| Race Binary | -.344 | .253 | -.128 | -.295 | .219 | .110 | -.144 | .090 | .083 | -.142 | .153 | -.053 | -.164 | .150 | -.061 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .382 | .083 | .426*** | .009 | .065 | .010 | -.022 | .063 | -.024 | -.018 | .062 | -.020 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .110 | .127 | .080 | .114 | .090 | .083 | .103 | .086 | .075 | .080 | .085 | .059 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.644 | .123 | -.508*** | -.249 | .093 | -.196** | -.249 | .088 | .197** | -.224 | .087 | -.177* |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.513 | .068 | -.555*** | -.386 | .079 | -.418*** | -.385 | .078 | -.416*** |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.275 | .111 | -.177* | -.157 | .112 | -.101 | -.139 | .110 | -.090 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .084 | .087 | .062 | .066 | .082 | .049 | .052 | .081 | .039 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .319 | .098 | .230*** | .326 | .092 | .235*** | .279 | .093 | .201** |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .047 | .077 | .050 | .040 | .076 | .042 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .273 | .073 | .245** | .247 | .073 | .222*** |
| Kalamazoo Climate | | | | | | | | | | | | | .187 | .086 | .127* |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

Research Question #6: To what extent and in what ways do administrators express satisfaction with the greater Kalamazoo community as a place to live, work, and attend school?

The mean for the variable Kalamazoo Climate ($M = 5.13$, $SD = .62$) suggests that survey respondents on average perceived the Kalamazoo community substantially more positively than negatively (on a scale from 1 to 6). A series of ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether minority and majority administrators from a variety of identity groups differed on their ratings of Kalamazoo Climate. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 57.

Table 57: *Univariate ANOVAs for Majority and Minority Administrators on Kalamazoo Climate*

| Identity Status | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η^2 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| GENDER BINARY | .760 | .385 | .006 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | .439 | .509 | .004 |

Note. η^2 = partial eta squared. GENDER BINARY includes men and women only. RACE/ETHNICITY was dichotomized (Administrators of Color and White only Administrators) due to small numbers of racial-ethnic minority administrators. Small numbers of other groups based on gender identity, sexual orientation identity, religious/spiritual identity, disability status and veteran status prevented analyses for those variables.

Four sets of variables were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression analysis as predictors of Kalamazoo Climate:

(a) participant demographics: gender binary (man or woman), race binary (White versus racial-ethnic minority group member);

(b) personal diversity engagement variables (race-talk comfort, social/academic engagement, and personal diversity engagement);

(c) experiences at WMU (personal experiences of discrimination, hearing discriminatory comments, tense/guarded experiences, and perceived campus safety); and

(d) WMU climate perceptions (perceptions of zero-tolerance for discrimination, diversity engagement climate).

Table 58 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis on Kalamazoo Climate for the administrator sample. The first block of demographic variables did not predict a significant proportion of the variance in perceptions of the Kalamazoo Climate; $R^2 = .011$; $F_{\text{change}} = .572$, $df (2, 104)$, $p = .566$. The second block of diversity engagement

variables predicted an additional 8.3% of the variance; $R^2_{change} = .083$; $F_{change} = 3.100$, $df (3, 101)$, $p < .05$. The third block of discrimination experience variables predicted an additional 13.6% of the variance; $R^2_{change} = .136$; $F_{change} = 4.291$, $df (4, 97)$; $p < .01$. The fourth block of WMU climate perception variables did not predict an additional significant proportion of the variance ($R^2_{change} = .023$; $F_{change} = 1.480$, $df (2, 95)$; $p = .233$. The variables in the final model accounted for 16.7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .167$).

In the final model, only Campus Safety (part $r = .219$) was a significant unique predictor variable in the final model. Among the other variables, only Personal Diversity Engagement entered the model as a significant predictor, but it was not significant in the final model.

In this model, perceptions of campus safety accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in Kalamazoo Climate, suggesting that participants experience the Kalamazoo Climate as connected in some way to campus safety. The moderate positive correlation ($r = .417$) suggests that people who experience the WMU campus as a safe place also tend to perceive the climate of Kalamazoo more positively; or those who experience the campus as less safe tend to rate the Kalamazoo Climate less favorably as well.

Table 58: *Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Kalamazoo Climate for Administrators (N = 107)*

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE(B)</i> | β |
| Gender Binary | .090 | .127 | .069 | .019 | .130 | .015 | -.043 | .125 | -.033 | -.040 | .124 | -.031 |
| Race Binary | .150 | .179 | .082 | .174 | .174 | .095 | .116 | .180 | .063 | .117 | .179 | .064 |
| Race Talk Comfort | | | | .116 | .066 | .189 | -.001 | .072 | -.001 | -.018 | .074 | .030 |
| Social Academic Engagement | | | | .138 | .101 | .147 | .123 | .100 | .131 | .120 | .101 | .128 |
| Personal Diversity Engagement | | | | -.259 | .098 | -.299** | -.135 | .103 | -.156 | -.132 | .103 | -.153 |
| Personal Experiences Discrimination | | | | | | | -.081 | .075 | -.129 | -.132 | .103 | -.153 |
| Hear Discriminatory Comments | | | | | | | -.162 | .123 | -.153 | -.096 | .131 | -.091 |
| Tense Guarded Experiences | | | | | | | .087 | .096 | .095 | .077 | .096 | .084 |
| Campus Safety | | | | | | | .253 | .108 | .267* | .257 | .108 | .271* |
| Zero Tolerance Climate | | | | | | | | | | .037 | .090 | .058 |
| Diversity Engagement Climate | | | | | | | | | | .141 | .086 | .186 |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$. Gender Binary includes men and women. Race Binary includes Whites and Racial-ethnic minority group members. See Appendix 2 for composition of other predictor variables.

APPENDIX 4

WMU CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

INSTRUMENT

Western Michigan University Climate Survey

The purpose of this survey is to assess the current climate of Western Michigan University in regard to respect for diversity and inclusion of people from all backgrounds within the university.

Thank you for your willingness to participate. This survey should only take you 20 – 30 minutes to complete. Your responses are confidential. At the end of the survey, you will be asked if you wish to enter a prize drawing. If you wish to enter the drawing, you will be taken to a second website so that your name and contact information cannot be linked to your survey answers.

Diversity at WMU encompasses inclusion, acceptance, respect, and empowerment. This means understanding that each individual is unique and that our commonalities and differences make the contributions we have to offer all the more valuable. Diversity includes the dimensions of race, ethnicity, and national and regional origins; sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation; socioeconomic status, age, physical attributes, and abilities; as well as religious, political, cultural, and intellectual ideologies and practices.

SECTION A

This section of the survey will be answered by all respondents.

Please answer the following question. (Remember, your survey answers will be anonymous.)

1. Please indicate your primary relationship with WMU:

| | | | |
|---------------|-------|---------|---------|
| Administrator | Staff | Faculty | Student |
|---------------|-------|---------|---------|

a. If “Administrator” is selected, the following opens to the respondent:

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Senior Leader | Non-academic Leader | Academic Leader |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|

b. If “Staff” is selected, the following opens to the respondent:

| | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Bargaining Staff | Non-bargaining Staff | Bargaining Staff Leader | Non-bargaining Staff Leader | Temporary Staff |
|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|

c. If “Faculty” is selected, the following opens to the respondent:

| | | |
|----------------------|------|----------------------|
| Tenured/Tenure Track | Term | Part-time Instructor |
|----------------------|------|----------------------|

d. If “Student” is selected, the following opens to the respondent:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| Undergraduate | Graduate |
|---------------|----------|

e. If “Student” is selected, the following opens for the respondent:

I entered this institution as:

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| A first year student | A transfer student | A re-entry student |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|

2. I am a veteran:

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

3. I consider myself:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Female | Male | Transgender | Other - free form field |
|--------|------|-------------|-------------------------|

The following questions regarding race/ethnicity were obtained from the Office of Admissions and Human Resources based on categories students and employees provide for governmental reporting purposes.

4. Are you Hispanic or Latino/Latina?

| | | |
|-----|----|------------------------|
| Yes | No | I prefer not to answer |
|-----|----|------------------------|

5. What is your race? (Choose all that apply)

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | Asian | Black or African American | Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | White |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|

6. More specifically, I describe my racial/ethnic identity as:

| |
|-------------------------|
| Other - Free form field |
|-------------------------|

7. My sexual orientation is (*choose all that apply*):

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------|--------------|-------|-------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Bisexual | Lesbian or Gay | Heterosexual | Queer | Questioning | Same-gender loving | A-sexual | Same-sex attractational | Pan Sexual | Other - free form field |
|----------|----------------|--------------|-------|-------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|

8. I have a permanent disability, or other impairment, or documented conditions which limit function in the learning or working environment. *If answered 'yes,' the following question will open to the respondent.*

| | | |
|-----|----|------------------------|
| Yes | No | I prefer not to answer |
|-----|----|------------------------|

a. Please specify they type of permanent dis ability, or other impairment, or documented conditions.

| |
|-------------------------|
| Other - Free Form Field |
|-------------------------|

SECTION B

This section will be answered by all employees and students.

1. Overall, diversity and inclusion are respected and appreciated at WMU.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

2. I believe that the Board of Trustees supports diversity and inclusion on campus.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

3. I believe that the leadership at the university-level supports diversity and inclusion on campus.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

4. WMU values the contributions of administrators, faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

5. The atmosphere of diversity and inclusion helps me to feel like I am a valued member of the campus community. *If this question is answered negatively, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I feel that I am not valued at WMU due to my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

6. The campus atmosphere allows me to be productive.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

7. My experience on campus is accurately portrayed in the way WMU publications depict the diversity of the student body (e.g., brochures, websites, etc.).

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

8. I have participated in diversity-related programs as a job or academic requirement.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

9. I have voluntarily participated in diversity related programs within the last year.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

10. There are enough diversity related programs and events on campus.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

11. The campus environment supports my development as a multi-culturally competent individual.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

12. In general, how would you rate your overall experiences of the campus environment at WMU?

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Supportive | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Hostile | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Fair | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Indifferent | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Welcoming | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Intimidating | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Respectful | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Oppressive | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Open | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Threatening | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Cold | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Inclusive | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

13. The following groups engage in efforts to improve relations and understanding of diversity and inclusion on campus:

| Administrators (chairs, academic directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

14. How satisfied are you with the efforts to provide reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities on campus? *If this question is answered with somewhat unsatisfied, the following question will also open.*

| Very Unsatisfied | Unsatisfied | Somewhat Unsatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|

- a. I am not satisfied with the efforts to provide reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities on campus based on my experience with:

| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

15. The campus is accessible to people with physical disabilities.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

16. In my role on campus, I am involved in or engaged with one or more Registered Student Organization(s).

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
|-----|----|

17. Resources are distributed fairly to Registered Student Organizations. (Please choose all that apply) *If this question is answered in the negative the following question will also open:*

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I don't know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

- a. Resources are unfairly distributed to Registered Student Organizations based upon: (Please choose all that apply):

| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

18. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in social settings on campus. (For example: informal settings where people gather such as cafeterias, break rooms, locker rooms, networking events, after-work programs, athletic events, etc.).

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

19. I feel comfortable participating in extracurricular activities on campus. *If this question is answered negatively, the following question will also open.*

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I don't |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|---------|
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|---------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|--|--|-------------|
| | | Disagree | | | | participate |
|--|--|----------|--|--|--|-------------|

- a. I do not feel comfortable participating in extracurricular activities on campus because of my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

20. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in social settings off campus. (For example: restaurants, clubs, cultural and community events, etc.).

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

21. On campus, I experience loneliness. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I experience loneliness because of my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

22. On campus, I experience tokenism. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

(From Dictionary.com. Tokenism: Any legislation, admissions policy, hiring practice, etc., that demonstrates only minimal compliance with rules, laws, or public pressure.).

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I experience tokenism because of my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

23. Please do not provide a response to this item.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

24. How often are you the only person of your racial/ethnic group present during your work/education day?

| | | | | |
|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|

- a. Does this inhibit your productivity and/or contribution?

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Not at all | Very Little | Somewhat | Quite a bit | A great deal |
|------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------|

Comments

- b. Does this adversely affect your feelings of belonging and desire to be a part of WMU?

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Not at all | Very Little | Somewhat | Quite a bit | A great deal |
|------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------|

Comments

25. Appointments to important committees or special projects are available to people from underrepresented groups.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

26. At WMU, communication between diverse groups of people is productive.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

27. How frequently have you experienced the following with people from racial groups different from your own:

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| Dined or shared a meal | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Had guarded, cautious interactions | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Had tense or somewhat hostile interactions | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Socialized | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Attended an event sponsored by a cultural group different than my own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Attended a study session or collaborated on work | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |

28. Indicate how often you have engaged in each of the following at WMU...

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| Made an effort to get to know people from backgrounds different from my own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Challenged others on issues of discrimination | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Become aware of the biases that affect my own thinking | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Made an effort to educate others on diversity topics | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |

29. For the following, how often have you had in-depth conversations...

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| With someone from a country other than your own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| With someone whose race is different than your own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| With someone whose religion is different from your own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| With someone whose sexual orientation is different from your own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| With someone whose socioeconomic class is different from your own | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| About racism, racial differences, or racial equity | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| About sexism, gender differences, or gender equity | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| About able-ism or disability issues | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |

30. I am comfortable stating my thoughts about racial/ethnic issues in:

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| My College/Division | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| My Department/Unit | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Campus Wide Committees or Activities I participate in | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

31. The environment at WMU is conducive to open expression of LBGTQQ identity. *If this question is answered negatively with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. The environment at WMU is not conducive to open expression of LBGTQQ identity based upon my experiences with:

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Administrators (chairs, | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| directors, deans, & senior leadership) | | | | | | |
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

32. The environment at WMU is conducive to open support of LBGTQQ individuals and issues. *If this question is answered negatively with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- b. The environment at WMU is not conducive to open support of LBGTQQ individuals and issues based upon my experiences with:

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

33. I am sought out to contribute in my areas of expertise. *If this question is answered negatively with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. My expertise is overlooked due to my:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

34. Overall, I receive fair and equitable treatment on campus *If this question is answered negatively with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I have been treated in an unfair/inequitable manner based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

- b. *If the question '31' is answered in the negative with somewhat disagree and below, this question will open for respondent.* Did you report one or more of the incident(s)?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Comments

- c. *If question 'b' is answered "yes", this question along with the following question will open for respondent.* Was/Were your complaint(s) handled with fairness?

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Comments

- d. *If question 'b' is answered "yes," this question will open for respondent.* Was/Were the complaint(s) resolved to your satisfaction?

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Comments

35. I believe others receive fair and equitable treatment on campus. *If this question is answered negatively with somewhat disagree and below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I have witnessed others being treated in an unfair and inequitable manner based on their (Please choose all that apply):

| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

- b. *If the question '32' is answered negatively with somewhat disagree and below, this question will open for respondent.* Did you report one or more of the incident(s)?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Comments

- c. *If question 'b' is answered "yes," this question along with the following question will open for respondent.* Was/Were your complaint(s) handled with fairness?

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I don't know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

Comments

- d. *If question 'b' is answered "yes," this question will open for respondent.* Was/Were the complaint(s) resolved to your satisfaction?

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I don't know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

Comments

36. In my experience at WMU, members of the following groups express zero tolerance for harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation on the WMU campus from:

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

37. My experience at WMU has been free of harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I have experienced harassment, bullying, and/or intimidation at WMU based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

38. If I were to report a concern of unfair and inequitable treatment I believe it would be adequately addressed.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

39. Overall, WMU policies are written in a way that promotes equity. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

a. I feel WMU policies allow inequity related to (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

40. I am easily able to locate WMU policies and procedures meant to protect me from harassment and discrimination.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

41. In my experience, WMU policies concerning hiring and compensation result in equitable treatment of individuals from underrepresented groups.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

42. I know who to go to if I want to report a concern about unfair and inequitable treatment.

| | |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

43. Campus policies provide a means for filing grievances related to discrimination, bullying, and/or harassment when needed.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|

44. I know how to go about filing a grievance related to discrimination or harassment.

| | |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

45. I feel that the contributions of others are devalued. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I feel that the contributions of others are devalued because of their (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

46. I hear discriminatory comments made by members of the following groups:

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Faculty | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Staff | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| Students | Never | Seldom | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |

47. I feel comfortable reporting harassment, bullying, or discrimination. *If the respondent chooses somewhat disagree or below, the next question opens.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I am not comfortable reporting harassment, bullying, or discrimination that was performed by the following groups:

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

48. How satisfied are you with the level of commitment to diversity and inclusion on campus? *If this question is answered with somewhat unsatisfied or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Very Unsatisfied | Unsatisfied | Somewhat Unsatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|

- c. I am not satisfied with the level of diversity and inclusion on campus based on my experience with:

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Administrators (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Faculty | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Staff | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Students | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

49. Overall, Kalamazoo is a safe city in which to reside. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. The above answer is based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

50. I would recommend living in Kalamazoo to my friends and family. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. The above answer is based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

51. I would recommend attending higher education in Kalamazoo to my friends and family. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. The above answer is based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

52. WMU offers a sufficient amount of security on campus.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

53. I feel safe on campus at night. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I feel unsafe on campus based on my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

54. I have considered seeking employment or attending school elsewhere due to the lack of progress with diversity and inclusion on campus.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

55. I would recommend WMU to family or friends as a good place to work or attend school. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I would not recommend WMU to family or friends as a good place to work or attend school based upon:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

SECTION C

In addition to SECTION A & B, employees will respond to the following:

56. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by the administration (chairs, directors, deans, & senior leadership). *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that my contributions to the work of the university are not valued by the administration (chairs, directors, deans & senior leadership) based upon my: (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

57. My participation in my college/division is valued. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe my participation in my college/department is devalued based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

58. My participation in my department/unit is valued. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that my participation in my department/unit is devalued based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

59. My contributions to the work of the university are valued by my colleagues. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that my contributions to the work of the university are devalued by my colleagues based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

60. My colleagues are committed to providing an inclusive, anti-racist learning and working environment.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

61. The person I report to supports my involvement in diversity events and/or participation in diversity work.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

62. I feel comfortable discussing issues concerning the following:

| | In my College / Division | In my Department / Unit | In/at campus committees or Activities I Participate in |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Age | | | |
| Country of Origin | | | |
| Disability | | | |
| Employee Status (Employee Classification) | | | |
| Faith/Religion | | | |
| Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | | | |
| Gender | | | |
| Marital Status | | | |
| Political Ideology | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | |
| Socio-economic Status | | | |
| Status as a Veteran | | | |
| Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate) | | | |
| Other – free form field | | | |

63. Please do not provide a response to this item.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

64. I have a fear of losing my position if I were to report inequitable behavior. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that I will lose my position if I were to report inequitable behavior based upon my:
(Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

65. I have a fear of being passed over for promotions if I were to report inequitable behavior. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that if I were to report inequitable behavior I would be passed over for promotions based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

66. I have a fear of receiving an undesirable workload if I were to report inequitable behavior. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I believe I will receive an undesirable workload if I were to report inequitable behavior based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

67. I believe that promotions that options for promotion in my current job/position are limited or unavailable. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I believe that promotions are limited to me based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

68. Opportunities to be involved in leadership roles have been available to me. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I believe that opportunities to be involved in leadership roles have not been available to me based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

69. Professional mentoring has been available to me. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I believe that professional mentoring has not been available to me based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

70. Faculty or staff professional development resources are available to me. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I believe that professional development resources are not available to me based upon my
(Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

71. WMU adequately supports the work environment for employees with learning differences.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

SECTION D

In addition to SECTION A & B, students will respond to the following:

72. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in my major/learning environment:

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

73. When I need assistance with course work, faculty members are willing to help me. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. *If the above question is answered in the negative, this question will open for respondent.* I believe that when I need assistance with course work, faculty members are not willing to help me based upon my:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

74. I am comfortable participating in class. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

- a. I am uncomfortable participating in class based upon my: (Please choose all that apply)

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio - economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other - free form field |

75. I feel comfortable discussing the following issues in these specific contexts:

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Learning Environment | Student Organizations | Residence Hall | Public Events or Campus Activities | Campus Workplace |
| Age | | | | | |
| Country of Origin | | | | | |
| Disability | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Employee Status (Employee Classification) | | | | | |
| Religious / Spiritual Identification | | | | | |
| Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | | | | | |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| Political Ideology | | | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | | |
| Socio-economic Status | | | | | |
| Status as a Veteran | | | | | |
| Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate) | | | | | |
| Other – free form field | | | | | |

76. I believe that faculty have equal expectations of me compared to other students. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I believe that faculty do not have equal expectations of me compared to other students based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

77. I have a fear of receiving lower grades. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I have a fear of receiving lower grades based upon my: (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

78. I have encouraged others to avoid taking a class from a faculty member on campus because I believed that the faculty member would treat the student unfairly. *If this question is answered somewhat agree or above, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. I have encouraged others to avoid taking a class from a faculty member on campus because I believe that the faculty member would treat the student unfairly based upon their (Please choose all that apply):

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

79. Please do not provide a response to this item.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

80. Socioeconomic class differences among students sometimes create tension.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

81. WMU adequately supports the learning environment for students with learning differences.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

SECTION E

In addition to SECTION A, B, & C faculty members will respond to the following:

82. Diversity and inclusion are respected and valued in the learning environment.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

83. I am comfortable stating my thoughts about diversity issues in my learning environment:

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I do not teach or attend class in a classroom. |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--|

84. WMU adequately supports the learning environment for students with learning differences.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

85. My Instructor/Professor evaluations completed by students reflect my teaching abilities. *If this question is answered with somewhat disagree or below, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. My Instructor/Professor evaluations completed by students do not reflect my teaching abilities based upon my (Please choose all that apply):

| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

86. The Instructor/Professor evaluations completed by students for my colleagues reflect their teaching abilities. *If this question is answered somewhat disagree, the following question will also open.*

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

a. The Instructor/Professor evaluations completed by students for my colleagues do not reflect their teaching abilities based upon my colleagues' (Please choose all that apply):

| Age | Country of Origin | Disability | Employee Status (Employee Classification) | Religious / Spiritual Identification | Family Responsibilities (Family Status) | Gender | Marital Status |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Political Ideology | Race/ Ethnicity | Sexual Orientation | Socio – economic Status | Status as a Veteran | Student Status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) | None of the above | Other – free form field |

Section F

This section of the survey will be answered by all respondents.

Please answer the following demographic information. (Remember, your survey answers will be anonymous.)

1. My age is: *A drop down box will appear for respondents with the options of sixteen through one hundred years old.*

2. My citizenship status is:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| U.S citizenship | Dual citizenship | Temporary Worker Visa | Student Visa | Permanent Resident |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|

If the respondent answers the above question by choosing 'dual citizenship,' 'temporary worker visa,' 'student visa,' or 'permanent resident,' the following question will also open:

a. My nationality is:

| |
|-------------------------|
| Other - Free form field |
|-------------------------|

If the respondent answers the above question by choosing 'dual citizenship,' 'temporary worker visa,' 'student visa,' or 'permanent resident,' the following question will also open:

a. My country of origin is:

| |
|-------------------------|
| Other - Free form field |
|-------------------------|

3. My relationship status is:

| | | | |
|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------------|
| Married | Partnered | Single | Other - free form field |
|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------------|

4. My religious / spiritual identification is:

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|--------|---------------|
| Agnostic | Atheist | Buddhist | Christian | Hindu | Islamic | Jewish | Scientologist |
| Sikh | Tao | Universalist / Unitarian | Wiccan | Undecided | Free form field | | |

5. My social class is:

| | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Lower Class | Lower Middle Class | Middle Class | Upper Middle Class | Upper Class |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|

6. *If the respondent previously identified as a student, the following question opens. My student status is:*

| | | | | |
|----------|-----------|--------|--------|----------|
| Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Graduate |
|----------|-----------|--------|--------|----------|

7. My political ideology is can be characterized by the following:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|------------------|---------|-----------|
| Conservative | Slightly Conservative | Moderate | Slightly Liberal | Liberal | Undecided |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|------------------|---------|-----------|

8. I have attended or worked at Western Michigan University for ____ years: *A dropdown box will appear for respondents with the options of zero through seventy years.*

Closing

The following questions have not been answered. If you would like to answer them, please do so now; otherwise, click Submit. Thank you!

Thank you for taking time to help us assess the climate of Western Michigan University in regard to respect for diversity and inclusion of people from all backgrounds within the university. Your input is valued and will be used to continuously enhance the climate at Western Michigan University.

If you would like more information about diversity and inclusion at Western Michigan University, please visit the Office of Diversity and Inclusion website at: <http://www.wmich.edu/diversityandinclusion/>