Report on the 2012 WKU Faculty and Staff Campus Diversity Survey

Prepared by

Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

May 10, 2012

Report on the 2012 WKU Faculty and Staff Campus Diversity Survey
Executive Summary

The WKU Campus Diversity Survey was developed specifically to gather data relevant to the campus diversity climate; attitudes with respect to fairness, openness, equality, and sensitivity; and beliefs and attitudes about diversity on campus. The WKU Diversity Enhancement Committee approved the items to be included on the final survey. WKU faculty and staff were contacted via email by the WKU Chief Diversity Officer and were asked to complete the WKU Campus Diversity Survey. A total of 1,117 individuals (570 full-time staff, 456 full-time faculty, 76 part-time employees, and 15 Other) responded to the Campus Diversity Survey.

The survey included items that addressed the overall campus diversity climate, satisfaction with diversity and diversity efforts at WKU, and items regarding specific diversity groups. The diversity characteristics included on the survey and represented by the composites included the characteristics that define protected groups under Equal Employment Opportunity law and characteristics that were identified in a review of diversity instruments and research. Composites were created to incorporate responses to items reflecting each of these diversity characteristics. Each composites was analyzed across all respondents, for full-time staff and full-time faculty, for Division and College, and for the subgroups represented by the characteristics in the survey demographic items, that is, Sex, Race, Disability, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age.

Perceptions of diversity across all survey respondents ranged from somewhat favorable for the Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite to favorable for the Gender, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES Composites. Thus, general perceptions of campus diversity as reflected by the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite were less favorable than were perceptions of specific facets of campus diversity as reflected by the composites for Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES.

There were significant differences between full-time faculty and full-time staff on only two composite measures, the Satisfaction Composite and the Religion Composite; staff perceived diversity more favorably than did faculty on both composites. Despite the statistical significance of these two differences, faculty or staff status explained little of the variance (i.e., less than 2%) in the composite measures. Thus, although statistically significant, practically speaking, there is not a meaningful difference in perceptions of faculty and staff on these two composite measures (or on any of the composite measures).

There were significant differences between Divisions on all of the composite measures. For each composite measure, Public Affairs perceived diversity to be more favorable than did the other divisions. On some composites, Public Affairs was joined by other divisions in their favorable perceptions. Student Affairs consistently had the least favorable perceptions of campus diversity on each of the composite measures.

There were significant differences between colleges on two of the composite measures, the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. Participants from Potter College of Arts and Letters reported significantly less favorable perceptions of campus religion diversity than did participants from the other five colleges. For the Sexual Orientation Composite there was a trend in the data such that the Ogden College of Science and Engineering reported the most favorable perceptions, followed by the Gordon Ford College of Business Administration, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Health and Human Services, University College, and the Potter College of Arts and Letters.

There were statistically significant differences between demographic groups for each of the diversity composites; most of these effects explained little of the variance in the composites. Effects that explain less than 5% of the variance in a composite have little practical significance despite being statistically significant. Although the differences are reliable, they reflect relatively small differences in perceptions between groups and, as such, they lack meaning in practical terms. Race and Religion were the only demographic characteristic that explained meaningful differences in perceptions of diversity represented in the composite measures.

Consistently, on the composites where there were race differences (i.e., Campus Composite, Satisfaction Composite, and Race Composite), Black faculty and staff perceived diversity less favorably than did White faculty and staff. These results are consistent with other reports on campus diversity (e.g., Park & Denson, 2009) that found faculty of color have a higher threshold for perceiving campus diversity as satisfactory.

Religion explained significant variance in the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. On the Sexual Orientation Composite, Christians perceived campus diversity for sexual orientation to be more favorable than did those with other religious beliefs. Across all of the analyses conducted with data from the WKU Faculty Staff Diversity Survey, the effect of Religion on the Religion Composite was the largest, explaining 21% of the variance. Thus, it was of interest to further explore differences in perceptions of diversity based on religion. This closer look at religion differences is also merited by the fact that WKU touts itself as having "International Reach" and many countries other than the U.S. have religions other than Christianity as their predominant religion. Accordingly, is desirable for the campus diversity climate at WKU to be hospitable to those with religions other than Christianity. Survey results indicated that Christians consistently perceived religion diversity as more favorable than did those who identified religious beliefs other than Christian. A simple step to address this discrepancy might be to ensure that, if prayers are included at events on campus, those prayers are interfaith rather than Christian. Survey participants with religious beliefs other than Christian agreed significantly more than did Christians that prayers on campus ending with a reference to Jesus made them uncomfortable.

A section of the Diversity Survey inquired how often participants heard insensitive or disparaging remarks by various entities on campus (i.e., students, faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants) about individuals belonging to various diversity groups on campus (i.e., persons who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual; non-native English speaking persons; persons of particular economic backgrounds; persons with a disability; persons of particular racial/ethnic backgrounds; women; and older persons). Across all sources of comments, the frequency with which faculty and staff reported hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus about individuals from various diversity groups was very low; that is, on average, only once or twice a year by students, and almost never by faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants. Likewise, faculty and staff reported almost never being at a campus event where individuals from various diversity groups were not welcome.

Some 303 of the survey respondents provided 375 comments. These comments were categorized into nine categories: Personal Philosophy of Diversity; Diversity at WKU – Positive; Diversity at WKU – Negative; WKU Administration, Policy, & Practice; Recruitment & Retention; Suggestions for Diversity at WKU; The Diversity Survey; and Miscellaneous. The vast majority of the comments provided by survey participants were negative. Actual comments are in the final appendix.

The results of the 2012 WKU Campus Diversity Survey provide data that may be used to inform further diversity efforts on campus.

Report on the 2012 WKU Faculty and Staff Campus Diversity Survey

Table of Contents

CONTENTS **PAGE**

Report on the 2012 WKU Faculty and Staff Campus Diversity Survey

The WKU Diversity Enhancement Committee developed the WKU Diversity Plan, which was approved by the WKU Board of Regents in July 2011. The WKU Diversity Plan was formally approved by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education in September 2011. The WKU Campus Diversity Survey was administered to WKU faculty and staff in January 2012 to provide data to assist the Diversity Enhancement Committee in its efforts to structure initiatives to support WKU diversity values and goals to enhance diversity in the recruitment, retention, and advancement of students, faculty, and staff.

Campus diversity can have many benefits including creating an enriched environment that enables increased understanding and acceptance/tolerance for other cultures and experiences (Gurin, 2002). Diversity programs can impact attitudes about many different aspects of diversity and can expose individuals to opportunities to interact with people from different backgrounds (Beckham, 2000). The primary focus of research on campus diversity has been the underrepresentation of faculty of color (e.g., Cole & Barber, 2003; Turner & Myers, 2000). Relatively few studies on campus diversity have been conducted from the faculty point of view.

WKU Campus Diversity Survey Instrument

The WKU Campus Diversity Survey was developed specifically to gather data relevant to the campus diversity climate; attitudes with respect to fairness, openness, equality, and sensitivity; and beliefs and attitudes about diversity on campus. The WKU Campus Diversity Climate Survey instrument may be found in Appendix A.

The survey instrument contained four sections: demographic information, campus experience, discrimination and harassment, and beliefs about diversity on campus. An 8-point frequency scale was used for the campus experience section. The eight anchors on the scale were Almost Never, Once or Twice a Year, Several Times a Semester, Monthly, Several Times a Month, Weekly, Several Times a Week, and Daily. Participants were instructed to use this scale to indicate how often they heard negative comments about individuals from various diversity groups or attended events where individuals from various diversity groups would feel unwelcome. The discrimination and harassment section asked the participant's to report any personal experience with discrimination and harassment on campus. The results of the discrimination and harassment section of the WKU Campus Diversity Survey are not addressed in this report. The final section of the survey used a 5-point scale to examine the extent faculty and staff agreed or disagreed with statements describing various aspects of the campus diversity climate. The five anchors of this scale were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Unsure, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Participants were instructed to give their honest opinion and that there were no correct or incorrect answers. The survey contained some items that were adapted, with permission, from the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania (AICUP) Campus Diversity Survey. The WKU Diversity Enhancement Committee approved the items to be included on the final survey. WKU Institutional Review Board approved the survey and data collection process at the exempt level. Participants were informed that the survey was confidential and anonymous. The introduction to the survey stated that responses would be presented only at the aggregate level and no individual responses would be reported.

Respondent Demographics

WKU faculty and staff were contacted via email by the WKU Chief Diversity Officer and were asked to complete the WKU Campus Diversity Survey. The survey required approximately ten to twelve minutes to complete. Participants who completed the survey were given the option to receive an incentive of a $5 credit for WKU Dining Dollars award. A total of 1,117 individuals responded to the Campus Diversity Survey. The number of respondents by demographic characteristics follows.

Employment Status. As seen in Table 1, 570 full-time staff and 456 full-time faculty responded as did 27 part-time staff and 49 part-time faculty. Fifteen individuals indicated they had another employment status including: administrator with faculty status (5), transitional retiree (4), part-time faculty and staff (3), faculty partner program (1), graduate assistant (1), and not identified (1).

Table 1. Respondent Employment Status

Employment Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Full-Time Staff	570	51.0	51.0
Full-Time Faculty	456	40.8	40.8
Part-Time Staff	27	2.4	2.4
Part-Time Faculty	49	4.4	4.4
Other: (Please specify)	15	1.3	1.3
Total	1117	100.0	100.0

Sex. Of the 1,117 respondents, 683 identified themselves as females and 380 identified as males. Fifty-four individuals did not identify a sex. Respondent sex by employment status is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Respondent Sex by Employment Status

Survey Items: What is your employment status? What is your sex?				
		Sex		
		Female	Male	Total
Employment Status	Full-Time Staff	407	147	554
	Full-Time Faculty	226	198	424
	Part-Time Staff	15	10	25
	Part-Time Faculty	26	21	47
	Other: (Please specify)	9	4	13
Total		683	380	1063

Age. The median respondent age was 44.5 years; 119 respondents declined to provide their age. The reported ages ranged from 0 to 84 years of age. Ages of 0, 8, 15, and 19 were the youngest ages reported. As WKU does not employ infants, children, and adolescents, it is likely that at least the youngest three (and perhaps four) ages reported were done so in error or in jest.

Years Working at WKU. The median number of years working at WKU reported by respondents was 6 to 10 years. The frequency of length of employment at WKU for respondents is reported in Table 3.

Table 3. Years Working at WKU

Survey item: How many years have you worked at WKU?				
Years at WKU	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 1	100	9.0	9.3	9.3
1-5	341	30.5	31.7	40.9
6-10	254	22.7	23.6	64.5
11-15	169	15.1	15.7	80.2
16-20	82	7.3	7.6	87.8
21 or more	131	11.7	12.2	100.0
Total	1077	96.4	100.0	
Missing	40	3.6		
Total	1117	100.0		

Participation by Staff Divisions and Faculty College. Tables 4 and 5 contain the survey participation rates by division for staff members and by college for faculty. These data include those who identified themselves as part-time, full-time, or other. Academic Affairs accounted for 42.4% of the staff that participated in the survey. The division with the next largest staff participation rate (16.3%) was Other which includes the Office of the Chief Diversity Officer, the President's Office, and others.

Potter College represented 29.6% of faculty participants, which was the largest faculty group participating in the survey. This was followed by Health and Human Services which represented 21.2% of the faculty participants and Ogden College which represented 20.8% of faculty respondents. WKU Human Resources provided data that indicated the number of men and women faculty in each department and the number of non-White faculty in each department. These data were collapsed within college to derive the percent female and the percent non-White for each college. These data are reported in Table 5.

Table 4. Staff Participants by Division

		N	Percent Staff	Percent All Participants
Division	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	255	42.4	22.8
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	12	2.0	1.1
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	61	10.1	5.5
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	17	2.8	1.5
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	55	9.1	4.9
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	39	6.5	3.5
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	59	9.8	5.3
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	6	1.0	.5
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	98	16.3	8.8
	Total	602	100.0	53.9
	Missing (Includes Faculty)	515		46.1
Total		1117		100.0

Table 5. Faculty Participants by College

		N	Percent Faculty	Percent All Participants	% Non-White[a]	% Female[a]
College	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	67	14.4	6.0	13.3	65.5
	College of Health and Human Services	99	21.2	8.9	16.8	77.0
	Gordon Ford College of Business Administration	29	6.2	2.6	16.6	28.4
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	97	20.8	8.7	17.8	33.14
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	138	29.6	12.4	17.4	52.5
	University College	36	7.7	3.2	13.6	67.3
	Total	466	100.0	41.7		
	Missing (Includes Staff)	651		58.3		
Total		1117		100.0		

[a]These data were provided by WKU Human Resources Department and are not based on survey responses.

In 2005, women represented 41% of faculty in the United States (Gill, 2012). In comparison to this statistic, WKU has good gender representation in faculty ranks. Only the Gordon Ford College of Business Administration and Ogden College of Science and Engineering have fewer than 50% female faculty. However, it is important to determine if women are appropriately represented at all faculty ranks or if they are disproportionately clustered at the lower ranks. In 2007, only 17% of full-time faculty at colleges and universities in the U.S. were people of color (Grasman & Kim, 2012); this figure includes historically Black colleges and universities and colleges, tribal colleges

and universities, and Hispanic serving university and colleges. WKU's percentage of full-time faculty who are people of color very closely mirrors the national rate. As with gender, it is important to determine if faculty of color are appropriately represented across all faculty ranks or if they are over-represented at the lower ranks.

Participation by Race. The Diversity Survey provided seven response options and "other" for race. Some 45 participants failed to respond to this item. White/Caucasian represented the largest number of participants (83%) of those who identified their race, followed by African American/Black (10.1%). The largest group of those identifying as Other was Eastern European (.4%); eight individuals marked Other but declined to identify their race. Table 6 contains participation rates by Race.

Table 6. Participants by Race

Survey Item: Please indicate the primary racial or ethnic group with which you identify.				
Race		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
	African American/Black	99	9.6	10.1
	American Indian/Alaskan Native/Aleut	4	.4	.4
	Asian	24	2.3	2.4
	Hispanic/Chicano/Latino	13	1.3	1.3
	Middle Eastern	6	.6	.6
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3	.3	.3
	White/Caucasian	814	79.3	83.0
	Other: (Please specify)	18	1.8	1.8
	Total	981	95.6	100.0
	Missing	45	4.4	
Total		1026	100.0	

Participation by Religion. The Diversity Survey presented eight choices for religion identification and an "Other" option. The largest group of participants identified themselves as Christian (73.7%), followed by Spiritual but no religion (7.3%), Agnostic (5.2%), No religion (4.2%), and Atheist (4.1%). Of those who selected Other, five did not identify a religion. Thirteen others identified religions commonly believed to be Christian (e.g., Baptist, Catholic, Methodist, Lutheran, and Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints); four identified as Buddhist and two identified as Unitarian. Table 7 contains participation rates by Religion.

Table 7. Participation by Religion

Survey Item: Which best describes your religious beliefs?				
Religion		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
	Atheist	40	3.9	4.1
	Agnostic	51	5.0	5.2
	Christian	727	70.9	73.7
	Hindu	5	.5	.5
	Jewish	9	.9	.9
	Muslim	6	.6	.6
	Spiritual, but no religion	72	7.0	7.3
	No religion	41	4.0	4.2
	Other: (Please specify)	36	3.5	3.6
	Total	987	96.2	100.0
	Missing	39	3.8	
Total		1026	100.0	

Disability. As seen in Table 8, the majority of participants (955 or 93.1%) indicated no disability; 37 (3.6%) of the participants reported a disability; 34 (3.3%) participants declined to respond to this item.

Table 8. Participants by Reported Disability Status

Survey Item: Do you currently have a disability that substantially limits a major life activity?			
Response		Frequency	Percent
	Yes	37	3.6
	No	955	93.1
	Total	992	96.7
	Missing	34	3.3
Total		1026	100.0

Sexual Orientation. As seen in Table 9, the majority of the participants reported they were heterosexual (924 or 90.1%); 23 (2.2%) reported being bisexual; 14 (1.4%) reported being Gay Male; 14 (1.4%) reported being lesbian; and 51 (5%) declined to respond to this item.

Table 9. Participants by Reported Sexual Orientation

Survey Item: Sexual orientation refers to an enduring pattern of attraction, behavior, emotion, and identity. What is your sexual orientation?			
Sexual Orientation		**Frequency**	**Percent**
	Bisexual	23	2.2
	Gay Male	14	1.4
	Lesbian	14	1.4
	Heterosexual	924	90.1
	Total	975	95.0
	Missing	51	5.0
Total		1026	100.0

Survey Response Rate

The WKU Human Resources Department indicated that there are 796 full-time faculty and 1,520 full-time staff at WKU in Spring 2012. As reported in Table 2, 554 full-time staff participated in the survey for a 36.45% response rate; 424 full-time faculty participated in the survey for a 55.14% response rate. For both Faculty and Staff, the response rate was higher for female employees (49.4% overall) than for male employees (33.3% overall). To the extent that those choosing to participate in the survey fail to represent those who did not participate, the results of the survey are limited in generalizing to all full-time employees at WKU.

Table 10. Survey Response Rate by Faculty/Staff Status and Sex

Employment Status		**Sex**		
		Female	**Male**	**Total**
	FT Staff Participating	407	147	554
	FT Staff Employed[a]	895	625	1520
	FT Staff % Participating	45.47%	23.52%	36.45%
	FT Faculty Participating	226	198	424
	FT Faculty Employed[a]	386	410	796
	FT Faculty % Participating	58.55%	48.29%	55.14%
TOTAL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATING		633 (49.4%)	345 (33.3%)	978 (42.2%)

[a] Provided by WKU Human Resources Department

Overall Results

Diversity Composite Measures

The survey included items that addressed the overall campus diversity climate, satisfaction with diversity and diversity efforts at WKU, and items regarding specific diversity groups. The overall means and standard deviations for individual survey items may be found in Appendix B.

Composites were created for items reflecting each of these diversity characteristics. The diversity characteristics included on the survey and represented by the composites include the characteristics that define protected groups under Equal Employment Opportunity law and characteristics that were identified in a review of diversity instruments and research. The specific items that formed each composite are identified in Appendix C. All items were scored such that a higher value reflected a positive response. Accordingly, negative items were reverse-scored. All responses that were not made on a 5-point scale were converted to values equivalent to values on a 5-point scale. For each composite, the sum of the item values was divided by the number of items, resulting in a value range of 1 to 5 for each composite, where a higher value reflects more favorable perceptions of campus diversity. The algorithms for computing each composite are contained in Appendix C.

Campus Composite. The overall Campus Diversity Climate Composite (Campus Composite) consisted of 28 items. The specific items included in the composite and the algorithm for computing the composite may be found in Appendix C. The items included in this composite address the diversity climate on campus including leadership, fair treatment of employees representing diverse groups on campus, social acceptance of diverse individuals, respect for diverse individuals, and development of an appreciation of diversity on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 28 items in the Campus Composite was $\alpha = .96$.

Satisfaction Composite. The Satisfaction with Campus Diversity Composite (Satisfaction Composite) consisted of 17 items regarding satisfaction with different aspects of diversity on campus. The specific items included in the composite and the algorithm for computing the composite may be found in Appendix C. Cronbach's alpha for the 17 items in the Satisfaction Composite was $\alpha = .95$.

Race Composite. The Race Composite consisted of 12 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning race, satisfaction with different aspects of racial diversity on campus, fair treatment of those of different races, and acceptance of individuals of different races in various campus events. Cronbach's alpha for the 12 items in the Race Composite was $\alpha = .79$.

Gender Composite. The Gender Composite consisted of 7 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning women and fair treatment of women on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 7 items in the Gender Composite was $\alpha = .75$.

Religion Composite. The Religion Composite consisted of 12 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning different religions, satisfaction with the needs of diverse religions on campus, fair treatment of those of different religions, and acceptance of individuals

with different religions on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 12 items in the Religion Composite was $\alpha = .81$.

Sexual Orientation Composite. The Sexual Orientation Composite consisted of 9 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals; satisfaction with campus services addressing the needs of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals; and fair treatment of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 9 items in the Sexual Orientation Composite was $\alpha = .82$.

Age Composite. The Age Composite consisted of 7 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning older persons and fair treatment of older persons on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 7 items in the Age Composite was $\alpha = .66$.

Disability Composite. The Disability Composite consisted of 12 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning persons with a disability, satisfaction with different campus services addressing the needs of disabled individuals on campus, fair treatment of those with a disability, and acceptance of individuals with a disability in various campus events. Cronbach's alpha for the 12 items in the Disability Composite was $\alpha = .81$.

Non-English Speaking Composite. The Non-English Speaking Composite consisted of 12 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning persons that are non-native English speaking, satisfaction with different campus services addressing the needs of non-native English speaking individuals on campus, fair treatment of those who are non-Native English speaking, and acceptance of individuals who are non-native English speaking in various campus events. Cronbach's alpha for the 12 items in the Non-English Speaking Composite was $\alpha = .69$.

SES Composite. The Socio-Economic Status Composite (SES Composite) consisted of 7 items addressing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus concerning persons of particular economic backgrounds and the acceptance of persons of particular economic status at events on campus. Cronbach's alpha for the 7 items in the SES Composite was $\alpha = .72$.

Correlation Matrix for Diversity Composites. The correlation matrix for the diversity composites may be found in Appendix D. The diversity composites are significantly correlated with each other. This is not unexpected as some items are contained in more than one composite (e.g., the Campus Composite contains the items relating to fair treatment of each diversity group; each of these items pertaining to a specific group is contained in the composite for that group).

Overall Results for Composite Measures

Each of the specific diversity composites was analyzed across all respondents, for full-time staff and full-time faculty, and for the subgroups represented by the characteristics represented in the survey demographic items. Table 11 reports the overall mean and standard deviation for each composite across all respondents. A value of 5.0 would reflect a very favorable perception of diversity and a value of 1.0 would reflect a very unfavorable perception of diversity. The values in Table 11 reflect perceptions of diversity across all survey respondents and range from somewhat favorable for the Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite to favorable for the Gender, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES Composites. It might be noted that general perceptions of campus diversity as reflected by the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite are less favorable than are perceptions of specific facets of campus diversity as reflected by the composites for Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES. These composites for the specific diversity groups each contain five items assessing how often disparaging remarks by various campus entities are heard. As described in a later section of this report (see page 41), disparaging remarks were reported to be heard very infrequently, likely explaining the fact that perceptions of the campus climate for specific diversity groups is more favorable than for the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite. That is, because of the low reported frequency of negative remarks (i.e., a favorable condition), the specific composites means are higher than they would be if they did not contain these items (i.e., they only contained the "Agree" items) as the Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite do. Means for each item may be found in Appendix B.

Table 11. Overall Composite Means

N = 926	Number of Items in Composite	Mean	Std. Deviation
Campus Composite	28	3.63	.65
Satisfaction Composite	17	3.60	.73
Gender Composite	7	4.56	.42
Race Composite	12	4.22	.45
Religion Composite	12	4.10	.52
Sexual Orientation Comp	9	4.31	.46
Age Composite	7	4.63	.31
Disability Composite	11	4.28	.41
Non-English Speaking Composite	12	4.14	.34
SES Composite	7	4.61	.35

Comparisons of Results by Various Campus Diversity Groups

It is of interest to determine if perceptions of campus diversity differ across campus by various demographic characteristics. For example, it might be of interest to determine if men and women differ in their perceptions of campus diversity for both the Campus and Satisfaction composites and for the composites representing different facets of campus diversity. The sample size for the WKU Campus Diversity Survey is fairly large. Because of the large sample size, small differences in mean responses may be statistically significant (i.e., there is an actual and reliable difference) but may be small enough that the difference has no practical significance (i.e., even though the difference is a reliable difference it is too small to be meaningful in a practical context). For example, with a large sample, a mean of 4.25 on a 5-point rating scale may be statistically significantly greater than a mean of 4.0; however, both of these means represent about the 4th point on the rating scale and should be interpreted as meaning essentially the same rating. Accordingly, only when the difference between groups is both statistically significant and the group characteristic explains at least 5% of the variance in the measure under consideration, will differences be considered to be practically significant.

Comparison of Full-Time Faculty and Full-time Staff on Composite Measures

Responses from participants who identified themselves as full-time faculty or full-time staff were compared on each of the composite measures. The means for Full-Time Staff and Full-Time Faculty on Diversity Composite Measures are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Means for Full-Time Staff and Full-Time Faculty on Diversity Composite Measures

Measure	Employment Status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Campus Composite	Full-Time Staff	3.68	.62	466
	Full-Time Faculty	3.57	.68	383
	Total	3.63	.65	849
Satisfaction Composite*	Full-Time Staff	3.68	.71	466
	Full-Time Faculty	3.53	.74	383
	Total	3.61	.73	849
Race Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.23	.44	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.21	.46	383
	Total	4.22	.45	849
Gender Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.56	.42	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.55	.43	383
	Total	4.56	.42	849
Religion Composite*	Full-Time Staff	4.18	.49	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.02	.54	383
	Total	4.11	.52	849
Sexual Orientation Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.33	.47	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.30	.44	383
	Total	4.32	.46	849
Age Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.63	.33	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.65	.30	383
	Total	4.64	.31	849
Disability Composite*	Full-Time Staff	4.32	.38	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.24	.43	383
	Total	4.28	.41	849
Non-English Speaking Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.13	.34	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.14	.34	383
	Total	4.14	.34	849
SES Composite	Full-Time Staff	4.62	.35	466
	Full-Time Faculty	4.60	.35	383
	Total	4.61	.35	849

Note: * indicates a statistically significant difference between means; employment status explains little variability in the means and, as such, these differences have no practical significance.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were differences in composite scores as a function of faculty or staff status. Because multiple comparisons were made on the survey data, a Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. The MANOVA indicated there were significant differences between full-time faculty and full-time staff on two composite measures, the Satisfaction Composite and the Religion Composite. As seen in Table 13, on both of these composites, staff perceive diversity more favorably than do faculty. Despite the statistical significance of these two differences, examination of the Eta Squared indicates no practical significance. That is, faculty or staff status explains little of the variance (i.e., less than 2%) in the composite measures. Thus, although these two differences are statistically significant, practically speaking, there is not a meaningful difference in perceptions between faculty and staff on these two composite measures (or on any of the composite measures).

Table 13. Selected Results of the MANOVA between Full-time Staff and Full-Time Faculty on the Diversity Composite Measures

Dependent Variable	df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Campus Composite	1	5.46	.020	.006
Satisfaction Composite	1	9.01	.003	.011
Race Composite	1	.41	.521	.000
Gender Composite	1	.08	.780	.000
Religion Composite	1	13.95	.000	.016
Sexual Orientation Composite	1	.44	.507	.001
Age Composite	1	.56	.455	.001
Disability Composite	1	7.11	.008	.008
Non-English Speaking Composite	1	.07	.789	.000
SES Composite	1	.60	.437	.001

Comparison of Results for Composite Measures by Division

Responses from participants who identified themselves as full-time staff and who identified themselves as from a specific division were compared by division on each of the composite measures. The means for Full-Time Staff by Division on the diversity composite measures are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Composite Means by Division

	Division	Mean	SD	N
Campus Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	3.62	.58	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	3.79	.51	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	3.87	.52	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	3.65	.51	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	3.85	.57	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	3.79	.63	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.33	.67	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.38	.41	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	3.71	.75	70
	Total	**3.68**	.62	466
Satisfaction Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	3.64	.68	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	3.80	.66	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	3.88	.51	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	3.65	.87	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	3.90	.53	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	3.78	.63	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.20	.82	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.38	.58	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	3.68	.82	70
	Total	**3.68**	.71	466
Race Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.20	.41	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.22	.51	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.35	.32	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.35	.26	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.37	.31	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.36	.38	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.88	.63	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.63	.26	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.22	.49	70
	Total	**4.23**	.44	466

Table 14. Composite Means by Division - Continued

	Division	Mean	SD	N
Gender Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.55	.41	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.38	.58	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.64	.31	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.70	.17	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.73	.21	45
	Information Technoiogy (Bob Owen)	4.65	.32	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	4.29	.63	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.79	.22	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.54	.42	70
	Total	**4.56**	.42	466
Religion Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.12	.45	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.31	.28	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.27	.45	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.40	.20	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.35	.37	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.30	.41	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.88	.61	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.68	.15	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.19	.59	70
	Total	**4.18**	.49	466
Sex Orientation Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.31	.39	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.25	.38	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.40	.40	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.44	.21	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.51	.28	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.48	.37	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.90	.77	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.76	.19	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.35	.51	70
	Total	**4.33**	.47	466
Age Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.61	.33	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.59	.31	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.70	.30	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.64	.15	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.75	.22	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.72	.23	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	4.48	.43	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.86	.12	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.60	.34	70
	Total	**4.63**	.32	466

Table 14. Composite Means by Division - Continued

	Division	Mean	SD	N
Disability Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.29	.35	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.46	.28	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.44	.28	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.27	.31	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.44	.37	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.32	.46	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	4.02	.54	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.77	.20	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.34	.35	70
	Total	**4.32**	.38	466
Non-English Speaking Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.12	.31	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.13	.37	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.17	.27	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.15	.28	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.27	.22	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.25	.26	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	3.93	.51	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.51	.13	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.11	.37	70
	Total	**4.13**	.34	466
SES Composite	Academic Affairs (Gordon Emslie)	4.61	.32	199
	Athletic Department (Ross Bjork)	4.60	.31	11
	Campus Services/Facilities (John Osborne)	4.68	.23	51
	Development and Alumni (Kathryn Costello)	4.74	.11	14
	Finance and Administration (Ann Mead)	4.74	.21	45
	Information Technology (Bob Owen)	4.64	.31	27
	Student Affairs (Howard Bailey)	4.36	.63	43
	Public Affairs (Robbin Taylor)	4.90	.12	6
	Other (Office of Chief Diversity Officer, President's Office, etc)	4.62	.32	70
	Total	**4.62**	.35	466

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were differences in composite scores as a function of Division. Because multiple comparisons were made on the survey data, a Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. Significant effects were further explored with Tukey's-B post hoc tests. The MANOVA indicated there were significant differences between Divisions on all of the composite measures. These results are presented in Table 15 and are described below for each composite measure. For each composite measure, Public Affairs (which had a small sample size of 6) perceived diversity to be more favorable than did the other divisions. On some composites, Public Affairs was joined by other divisions in their favorable perceptions. Student Affairs consistently had the least favorable perceptions of campus diversity on each of the composite measures.

Table 15. Selected Results of the MANOVA by Division on the Diversity Composite Measures

IV = Division	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
	Campus Composite	8	4.211	.000	.07
	Satisfaction Composite	8	4.625	.000	.07
	Race Composite	8	6.044	.000	.10
	Gender Composite	8	4.467	.000	.07
	Religion Composite	8	5.021	.000	.08
	Sexual Orientation Composite	8	7.485	.000	.12
	Age Composite	8	3.114	.002	.05
	Disability Composite	8	6.357	.000	.10
	Non-English Composite	8	4.704	.000	.08
	SES Composite	8	4.826	.000	.08

Campus Composite. The results indicated that participants from Public Affairs (M = 4.38, SD = .41) perceived the Campus Composite more favorably than did participants from the other eight divisions. Division explained 7% of the variance in the Campus Composite measure.

Satisfaction Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.38, SD = .58) reported significantly more satisfaction with campus diversity efforts than did Other (M = 3.68, SD = .82), Development and Alumni Relations (M = 3.65, SD = .87), Academic Affairs (M = 3.64, SD = .68), and Student Affairs (M = 3.20, SD = .82). Finance and Administration (M = 3.90, SD =), Campus Services/Facilities (M = 3.88, SD = .51), the Athletic Department (M = 3.80, SD = .66), and Information Technology (M = 3.78, SD = .63) reported being significantly more satisfied with campus diversity efforts than did Student Affairs, but reported satisfaction that was equivalent to the satisfaction levels of the other seven divisions. Division explained 7.5% of the variance in the Satisfaction Composite measure.

Race Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.63, SD = .26), Finance and Administration (M = 4.37, SD = .30), Information Technology (M = 4.36, SD = .38), Campus Services/Facilities (M = 4.35, SD = .32), and Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.35, SD = .26) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus race diversity than did Student Affairs (M = 3.87, SD = .63). Academic Affairs (M = 4.20, SD = .41), the Athletic Department (M = 4.22, SD = .51), and Other (M = 4.22, SD = .49) reported significantly lower perceptions of race diversity than did Public Affairs, but did not differ from the other seven divisions in their perceptions of campus race diversity. Division explained 10% of the variance in the Race Composite measure.

Gender Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.79, SD = .22) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus gender diversity than did the Athletic Department (M = 4.38, SD = .58) and Student Affairs (M = 4.29, SD = .63). Finance and Administration (M = 4.73, SD = .21) and Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.70, SD = .17) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of gender diversity than did Student Affairs. The other four divisions did not differ significantly from the other divisions in their perceptions of campus gender diversity. Division explained 7% of the variance in the Gender Composite.

Religion Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.68, SD = .15) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus religion diversity than did Student Affairs (M = 3.88, SD = .61), Academic Affairs (M = 4.11, SD = .45), and Other (M = 4.19, SD = .59). Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.40., SD = .20) and Finance and Administration (M = 4.34, SD = .37) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus religion diversity than did Student Affairs. The other five divisions did not differ from the other divisions in their perceptions of religion diversity. Division explained 8% of the variance in the Religion Composite.

Sexual Orientation Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.76, SD = .19) reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus sexual orientation diversity than did Student Affairs (M = 3.90, SD = .77), the Athletic Department (M = 4.25, SD = .38), and Academic Affairs (M = 4.31, SD = .39). Finance and Administration (M = 4.51, SD = .28), Information Technology (M = 4.48, SD = .37), Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.44, SD = .21), Campus Services/Facilities (M = 4.40, SD = .40), Other (M = 4.35, SD = .51), and Academic Affairs (M = 4.31, SD = .39) also reported significantly more favorable perceptions of campus sexual orientation diversity than did Student Affairs. Division explained 11.6% of the variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite.

Age Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.86, SD = .12) perceived campus age diversity more favorably than did Student Affairs (M = 4.48, SD = .43). The other seven divisions did not differ significantly from other divisions in their perceptions of campus age diversity. Division explained 5% of the variability in perceptions of campus age diversity.

Disability Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.77, SD = .19) perceived campus disability diversity significantly more favorably than did Student Affairs (M = 4.02, SD = .54), Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.27, SD = .31), Academic Affairs (M = 4.29, SD = .35), and Information Technology (M = 4.32, SD = .46). The Athletic Department (M = 4.46, SD = .28), Campus Services/Facilities (M = 4.44, SD = .28), Finance and Administration (M = 4.44, SD = .37) had significantly more favorable perceptions of campus disability diversity than did Student Affairs. Division explained 10% of the variability in perceptions of campus disability diversity.

Non-English Speaking Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.51, SD = .37) perceived campus non-English speaking diversity significantly more favorably than did Student Affairs (M = 3.93, SD = .51), Other (M = 4.11, SD = .37), Academic Affairs (M = 4.12, SD = .31), the Athletic Department (M = 4.13, SD = .37), Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.15, SD = .28), and Campus Services/Facilities (M = 4.17, SD = .27). Finance and Administration (M = 4.27, SD = .22) and Information Technology (M = 4.25, SD = .26) also perceived campus non-English speaking diversity more favorably than did Student Affairs. Division explained 7.6% of the variability in perceptions of the Non-English Speaking Composite.

SES Composite. Public Affairs (M = 4.90, SD = .12), Development and Alumni Relations (M = 4.74, SD = .11), and Finance and Administration (M = 4.74, SD = .21) perceived campus SES diversity significantly more favorably than did Student Affairs (M = 4.36, SD = .63). The other five divisions did not differ significantly from other divisions in their perceptions of campus SES diversity. Division explained 7.8% of the variance in the perceptions of campus SES diversity.

Comparison of Results for Composite Measures by College

Responses from participants who identified themselves as full-time faculty and from a specific department were compared on each of the composite measures. Because the sample sizes were too small from some departments to provide meaningful analyses, responses from full-time faculty were analyzed at the college level rather than the department level. The means for Full-Time Faculty by College on the diversity composite measures are presented in Table 16.

Table 16. Composite Means by College

	College	Mean	SD	N
Campus Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	3.69	.74	51
	College of Health and Human Services	3.63	.69	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	3.64	.77	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	3.67	.55	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	3.43	.69	101
	University College	3.46	.72	30
	Total	**3.58**	.68	372
Satisfaction Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	3.64	.77	51
	College of Health and Human Services	3.65	.75	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	3.45	.89	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	3.61	.63	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	3.37	.74	101
	University College	3.42	.71	30
	Total	**3.53**	.74	372
Race Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.28	.45	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.24	.48	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.26	.40	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.28	.37	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.12	.45	101
	University College	4.06	.61	30
	Total	**4.21**	.46	372
Gender Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.54	.46	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.61	.41	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.73	.24	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.62	.33	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.43	.46	101
	University College	4.47	.61	30
	Total	**4.55**	.43	372

Table 16. Composite Means by College - Continued

	College	Mean	SD	N
Religion Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.10	.55	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.19	.50	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.15	.51	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.07	.47	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	3.76	.56	101
	University College	4.04	.52	30
	Total	**4.02**	.54	372
Sexual Orientation Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.39	.41	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.35	.44	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.39	.39	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.40	.37	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.15	.46	101
	University College	4.20	.55	30
	Total	**4.30**	.44	372
Age Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.64	.34	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.62	.34	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.71	.26	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.69	.29	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.63	.30	101
	University College	4.65	.25	30
	Total	**4.65**	.31	372
Disability Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.23	.51	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.21	.57	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.26	.39	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.33	.30	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.21	.39	101
	University College	4.23	.36	30
	Total	**4.24**	.43	372
Non-English Speaking Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.20	.33	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.16	.39	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.15	.29	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.17	.31	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.08	.32	101
	University College	4.11	.37	30
	Total	**4.14**	.34	372
SES Composite	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	4.55	.41	51
	College of Health and Human Services	4.60	.39	83
	Gordon College of Business Administration	4.73	.24	23
	Ogden College of Science and Engineering	4.70	.23	84
	Potter College of Arts and Letters	4.55	.34	101
	University College	4.48	.50	30
	Total	**4.60**	.36	372

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were differences in composite scores as a function of College. Because multiple comparisons were made on the survey data, a Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. Significant effects were further explored with Tukey's-B post hoc tests. The MANOVA indicated there were significant differences between colleges on two of the composite measures, the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. These results are described below for each composite measure. Selected results for the MANOVA by College on the campus diversity composite measures may be found in Table 17.

Table 17. Selected Results of the MANOVA by College on the Diversity Composite Measures

IV = College	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
	Campus Composite	5	1.85	.102	.02
	Satisfaction Composite	5	1.98	.081	.03
	Race Composite	5	2.08	.067	.03
	Gender Composite	5	3.31	.006	.04
	Religion Composite	5	7.48	.000	.10
	Sexual Orientation Composite	5	4.45	.001	.06
	Age Composite	5	.64	.670	.01
	Disability Composite	5	.86	.508	.01
	Non-English Speaking Composite	5	1.12	.351	.01
	SES Composite	5	3.15	.008	.04

Religion Composite. Participants from Potter College of Arts and Letters ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .15$) reported significantly less favorable perceptions of campus religion diversity than did participants from the other five colleges. That is, the College of Health and Human Services ($M = 4.19$, $SD = .50$), the Gordon Ford College of Business ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .51$), the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .55$), the Ogden College of Science and Engineering ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .47$), and University College ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .52$) all reported more favorable perceptions of campus religious diversity than did Potter College. College explained 10% of the variance in the Religion Composite.

Sexual Orientation Composite. Although the MANOVA results indicated a significant effect for College on perceptions of campus sexual orientation diversity, none of the means for any college were significantly different from the means of any other college. However, there is a trend in the data such that the Ogden College of Science and Engineering reported the most favorable perceptions ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .37$), followed by the Gordon Ford College of Business Administration ($M=4.39$, $SD = .39$), the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences ($M = 4.39$, $SD = .41$), the College of Health and Human Services ($M = 4.35$, $SD = .44$), University College ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .55$), and the Potter College of Arts and Letters ($M =4.15$, $SD = .46$). College explained 6% of the variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite.

Analyses by Specific Diversity Characteristics

Collapsing Demographic Data

Several of the demographic variables contained too many response options with too few respondents selecting those options to perform meaningful analyses. Accordingly, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age were collapsed for use in further analyses. Sex and Disability were already characterized as dichotomous variables.

Race. White/Caucasian represented the largest number of participants (83%) of those who identified their race, followed by African American/Black (10.1%), and Asian (2.4%). Each of the other races represented comprised less than 2% of the sample. Accordingly, Race was collapsed into three categories: White, Black, and Other.

Religion. The largest group of participants identified themselves as Christian (73.7%), followed by Spiritual but no religion (7.3%), Agnostic (5.2%), No Religion (4.2%), and Atheist (4.1%). Religion was collapsed into four categories: Christian, Other Religions (i.e., Bahia, Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, and Unitarian), No Religion, and Agnostic and Atheist. As indicated above, participants identifying as "Other" were composed of mostly Christians and individuals who did not indicate any religious identification; these individuals were not included in further analyses.

Sexual Orientation. Sexual Orientation was dichotomized into those who identified as Heterosexual and those who identified as either Bisexual, Gay Male, or Lesbian.

Age. Age was collapsed into the EEO defined categories of "Under 40 Years of Age" and "40 and Over Years of Age."

Analyses for Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite

The Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite are the most comprehensive composite measures, dealing with perceptions of campus diversity and satisfaction with campus diversity efforts. A MANOVA was run to determine if the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. Because multiple comparisons were made on the survey data, a Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. There were significant effects for Sex, Race, and Religion. Effects with more than two levels were explored with Tukey's-B post hoc tests to determine the nature of the significant differences. The results of the MANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 18. The significant main effects are described below.

Sex. The results indicated a significant effect for Sex on the Campus Composite; male respondents ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .65$) perceived the Campus Diversity Climate as more favorable than did female respondents ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .64$). However, although this difference is statistically significant, Sex accounted for only 1% of the variance in perceptions of Campus Diversity Climate indicating that it has no practical significance.

Although the differences in perceptions of diversity by sex were small, it is consistent with Hyer, Conley, and McLaughlin (1999) who found that female faculty were more aware of problems related to race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and other aspects of diversity; were more critical of the diversity efforts of the university; and were more willing to participate in diversity-related programming. Hyer (1999) found that men were more likely to have a lower threshold for perceiving campus diversity as satisfactory.

Table 18. Selected Results for the MANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite

Source	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Sex	Campus Composite*	1	8.77	.003	.01
	Satisfaction Composite	1	3.62	.057	.00
Race	Campus Composite*	2	20.00	.000	.05
	Satisfaction Composite*	2	26.88	.000	.07
Disability	Campus Composite	1	3.08	.080	.00
	Satisfaction Composite	1	1.49	.222	.00
Religion	Campus Composite*	3	16.98	.000	.06
	Satisfaction Composite*	3	21.24	.000	.08
Sexual Orientation	Campus Composite	1	3.19	.075	.00
	Satisfaction Composite	1	.77	.379	.00
Age	Campus Composite	1	.01	.938	.00
	Satisfaction Composite	1	1.07	.302	.00
Error	Campus Composite	748			
	Satisfaction Composite	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The MANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for both the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite. Black respondents (M = 3.26, SD = .72) perceived Campus Diversity less favorably than did White (3.68, SD = .63) and Other (M = 3.66, SD = .65) respondents. Race accounted for 5% of the variance in Campus Composite. This again is consistent with Hyer et al. (1999) who found that White faculty and students, regardless of gender, reported the diversity climate on campus was better than that reported by faculty and students of color.

Likewise, Black respondents (M = 3.18, SD = .86) reported being less satisfied with campus diversity efforts than did Other respondents (M = 3.39, SD = .75) who were less satisfied with campus diversity than were White respondents (M = 3.69, SD = .68). Race accounted for 7% of the variance in the Satisfaction Composite. These results are consistent with Park and Denson (2009) who found minority groups were more likely to have a higher threshold for perceiving campus diversity efforts as satisfactory.

Religion. The MANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for both the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite. Those with religions other than Christianity (M = 3.24, SD = .69) and Agnostics and Atheists (M = 3.32, SD = .64) perceived the Campus Diversity Climate significantly less favorably than do Christians (M = 3.71, SD = .64) and those with no religion (M = 3.58, SD = .58). Religion accounted for 6% of the variance in the Campus Composite.

Likewise, those with religions other than Christianity (M = 2.99, SD = .67) and Agnostics and Atheists (M = 3.22, SD = .73) are less satisfied with the diversity efforts on campus than are Christians (M = 3.71, SD = .70) and those with no religion (M = 3.55, SD = .64). Religion accounted for 8% of the variability in the Satisfaction Composite.

There are few if any reports of diversity climate surveys that included religion in the analyses. Thus, there is no basis for comparison to other campuses. However, these results are consistent with the general finding that those in the minority, regardless of the specific demographic, perceive the diversity climate less favorably and are less satisfied with diversity efforts than are those in the majority.

Analyses for Diversity Characteristic Composites

The Race Composite, Gender Composite, Religion Composite, Sexual Orientation, Age Composite, Disability Composite, Non-English Speaking Composite, and SES Composite were explored using Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). ANOVAs were run to determine if the composite measures differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. Because multiple comparisons were made, a Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. Effects with more than two levels were explored with Tukey's-B post hoc tests to determine the nature of the significant differences.

Race Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Race Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 19. There were significant effects for Race, Religion, and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 19. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Race Composite

Dependent Variable = Race Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	.003	.960	.00
Sex	1	1.91	.167	.00
Race*	2	29.92	.000	.07
Disability	1	4.13	.042	.00
Religion*	3	9.71	.000	.04
Sexual Orientation*	1	10.17	.001	.01
Age	1	.02	.883	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the Race Composite. Black respondents (M = 3.90, SD = .62) perceived race diversity less favorably than did White (4.26, SD = .40) and Other respondents (M = 4.18, SD = .51). Race accounted for 7% of the variance in the Race Composite. This finding again is consistent with Hyer et al., (1999) who found that White faculty and students, regardless of gender, reported the diversity climate on campus was better than that reported by faculty and students of color.

Religion. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for the Race Composite. Agnostics and Atheists (M = 4.07, SD = .45) perceived race diversity significantly less favorably than did Christians (M = 4.26, SD = .44). Those with no religion (M = 4.16, SD = .43) and those with religions other than Christianity (M = 4.03, SD = .49) did not differ in their perception of race

diversity from either Christians or Agnostics and Atheists. Religion accounted for 4% of the variance in the Race Composite.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the Race Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 3.97, SD = .52) perceived Race Diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.23, SD = .44). Sexual Orientation accounted for 1% of the variance in the Race Composite. Thus, although this effect is statistically significant, it has no practical significance.

Gender Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Gender Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 20. There were significant effects for Sex, Race, and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 20. Selected Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Gender Composite

Dependent Variable = Gender Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	.02	.893	.00
Sex*	1	9.92	.002	.01
Race*	2	10.06	.000	.03
Disability	1	3.30	.070	.00
Religion	3	3.41	.017	.01
Sexual Orientation*	1	13.58	.000	.02
Age	1	.22	.638	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Sex. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sex for the Gender Composite. Male respondents (M = 4.61, SD = .42) perceived gender diversity more favorably than did Female respondents (4.53, SD = .42). Sex accounted for 1% of the variance in the Gender Composite. Thus, although this effect is statistically significant, it has no practical significance.

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the Gender Composite. Black respondents (M = 4.39, SD = .50) perceived gender diversity less favorably than did White (4.59, SD = .40) respondents. Other respondents (M = 4.49, SD = .49) did not differ from either Black respondents or White respondents. Race accounted for 3% of the variance in the Gender Composite.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the Gender Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 4.30, SD = .52) perceived gender diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.57, SD = .41). Sexual Orientation accounted for 2% of the variance in the Gender Composite.

Religion Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Religion Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 21. There were significant effects for Religion and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 21. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Religion Composite

Dependent Variable = Religion Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	4.99	.026	.01
Sex	1	1.84	.175	.00
Race	2	2.74	.065	.01
Disability	1	.64	.425	.00
Religion*	3	66.68	.000	.21
Sexual Orientation*	1	13.23	.000	.02
Age	1	2.27	.132	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Religion. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for the Religion Composite. Christians (M= 4.25, SD = .41) perceived religion diversity more favorably than those with all other religious beliefs. Those with No Religion (M = 3.83, SD = .56) and those with religious beliefs other than Christian (M = 3.72, SD = .62) perceived religion diversity less favorably than did Christians. Agnostics and Atheists (M = 4.46, SD = .49) and those with religions other than Christian perceived Religious Diversity least favorably. Religion accounted for 21% of the variance in the Religion Composite. Thus, the effect for religion has practical significance as well as statistical significance. That is, there are meaningful differences in how one perceives the campus climate for religion based on one's religious beliefs.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the Religion Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 3.67, SD = .64) perceived religion diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.13, SD = .50). Sexual Orientation accounted for 2% of the variance in the Religion Composite.

Sexual Orientation Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Sexual Orientation Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 22. There were significant effects for Race, Religion, and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 22. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Sexual Orientation Composite

Dependent Variable = Sexual Orientation Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	.03	.872	.00
Sex	1	3.36	.067	.00
Race*	2	12.71	.000	.03
Disability	1	1.52	.219	.00
Religion*	3	21.33	.000	.08
Sexual Orientation*	1	25.99	.000	.03
Age	1	5.62	.018	.01
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the Sexual Orientation Composite. Black respondents (M = 4.16, SD = .53) perceived sexual orientation diversity less favorably than did White (4.34, SD = .44) respondents. Other respondents (M = 4.27, SD = .53) did not differ from either Black respondents or White respondents in their perceptions of sexual orientation diversity. Race accounted for 3% of the variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite.

Religion. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for the Sexual Orientation Composite. Christians (M = 4.39, SD = .40) and those with religions other than Christian (M = 4.24, SD = 40) perceived sexual orientation diversity more favorably than did those with No religion (M = 4.19, SD = .48) and Agnostics and Atheists (M = 4.00, SD = .55). Those with no religion and those with religions other than Christian did not differ in their perceptions of sexual orientation diversity. Religion accounted for 8% of the variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the Sexual Orientation Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 3.87, SD = .67) perceived sexual orientation diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.34, SD = .43). Sexual Orientation accounted for 3% of the variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite.

Age Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Age Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 23. The only significant effect was for Disability. Those who have a disability (M = 4.39, SD = .51) perceived age diversity less favorably than did those who do not have a disability (M = 4.65, SD = .30). Disability accounted for 3% of the variance in the Age Composite.

Table 23. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Age Composite

Dependent Variable = Age Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	1.71	.191	.00
Sex	1	1.09	.297	.00
Race	2	2.51	.082	.01
Disability*	1	20.78	.000	.03
Religion	3	1.34	.261	.00
Sexual Orientation	1	4.26	.039	.01
Age	1	.50	.481	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Disability Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Disability Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 24. There were significant effects for Race, Disability, and Religion. These significant effects are described below.

Table 24. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Disability Composite

Dependent Variable = Disability Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	1.99	.159	.00
Sex	1	4.54	.033	.01
Race*	2	7.05	.001	.02
Disability*	1	20.11	.000	.03
Religion*	3	7.31	.000	.03
Sexual Orientation	1	.65	.420	.00
Age	1	.00	.963	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the Disability Composite. Black respondents (M = 4.17, SD = .41) perceived disability diversity less favorably than did White respondents (4.31, SD = .40) and Other respondents (M = 4.31, SD = .41). Race accounted for 2% of the variance in the Disability Composite.

Disability. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Disability for the Disability Composite. Disabled respondents (M = 3.89, SD = .62) perceived disability diversity less favorably than did respondents who are not disabled (M = 4.30, SD = .39). Disability accounted for 3% of the variance in the Disability Composite.

Religion. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for the Diversity Composite. Christians (M = 4.31, SD = 41) perceived disability diversity more favorably than did those with Religions other than Christian (M = 4.10, SD = .36). Those with No Religion (M = 4.24, SD = .36) and Agnostics and Atheists (M = 4.18, SD = .36) did not differ significantly from Christians and those with religions other than Christian. Religion accounted for 3% of the variance in the Disability Composite.

Non-English Speaking Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the Non-English Speaking Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 25. There were significant effects for Race, Religion, and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 25. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Non-English Speaking Composite

Dependent Variable = Non-English Speaking Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	1.17	.280	.00
Sex	1	4.88	.028	.01
Race*	2	19.61	.000	.05
Disability	1	5.25	.022	.01
Religion*	3	8.03	.000	.03
Sexual Orientation*	1	17.09	.000	.02
Age	1	.11	.740	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the Non-English Speaking Composite. Black respondents (M = 3.98, SD = .42) and Other respondents (M = 4.02, SD = .41) perceived non-English speaking diversity less favorably than did White respondents (4.17, SD = .31) respondents. Race accounted for 5% of the variance in the Non-English Speaking Composite.

Religion. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Religion for the Non-English Speaking Composite. Christians (M = 4.12, SD = .33) perceived non-English speaking diversity more favorably than did Agnostics and Atheists (M = 4.00, SD = .35). Those with no religion (M = 4.04, SD = .30) and those with religions other than Christian (M = 4.04, SD - .32) did not differ in their perceptions of non-English speaking diversity from Christians and Agnostics and Atheists. Religion accounted for 3% of the variance in the Non-English Speaking Composite.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the Non-English Speaking Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 3.89, SD = .43) perceived non-English speaking diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.15, SD = .33). Sexual Orientation accounted for 2% of the variance in the Non-English Speaking Composite.

SES Composite

An ANOVA was run to determine if the SES Composite differed based on the demographic characteristics of Sex, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age. The results of the ANOVA for the main effect of each diversity characteristic may be found in Table 26. There were significant effects for Race and Sexual Orientation. These significant effects are described below.

Table 26. Results for the ANOVA for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on SES Composite

Dependent Variable = SES Composite				
Source	**Df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Employment Status	1	.00	.989	.00
Sex	1	1.21	.271	.00
Race*	2	15.87	.000	.04
Disability	1	6.83	.009	.01
Religion	3	3.42	.017	.01
Sexual Orientation*	1	14.20	.000	.02
Age	1	.03	.855	.00
Error	748			

* Indicates statistically significant difference

Race. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Race for the SES Composite. Black respondents (M = 4.43, SD = .47) perceived SES diversity less favorably than did White respondents (4.64, SD = .32) and Other respondents (M = 4.59, SD = .40). Race accounted for 4% of the variance in the SES Composite.

Sexual Orientation. The ANOVA revealed a significant effect for Sexual Orientation for the SES Composite. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual respondents (M = 4.45, SD = .54) perceived SES diversity significantly less favorably than did Heterosexual respondents (M = 4.62, SD = .34). Sexual Orientation accounted for 2% of the variance in the SES Composite.

Implications of Analyses on Composite Measures

Although there were statistically significant differences between demographic groups for each of the composites, most of these effects explained little of the variance in the composites. Effects that explain less than 5% of the variance in a composite have little practical significance despite being statistically significant. That is, although the differences are reliable, they reflect relatively small differences in perceptions between groups and as such that they lack meaning in practical terms. A summary of the differences across all composites that explained at least 5% of the variance in the composite is presented in Table 27. Race and Religion were the only demographic characteristics that explained meaningful differences.

Table 27. Practically Significant Results for Main Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Diversity Composites

Composite	Source of the Difference	Partial Eta Squared
Campus Composite	Race	.05
Campus Composite	Religion	.06
Satisfaction Composite	Race	.07
Satisfaction Composite	Religion	.08
Race Composite	Race	.07
Religion Composite	Religion	.21
Sexual Orientation Composite	Religion	.08

Race Differences

Consistently, on the composites where there were race differences (i.e., Campus Composite, Satisfaction Composite, and Race Composite), Black faculty and staff perceived diversity less favorably than did White faculty and staff. These results are consistent with other reports on campus diversity (e.g., Park & Denson, 2009) that found that faculty of color have a higher threshold for perceiving campus diversity as satisfactory. In the present study, this is a likely explanation for the race differences on the diversity composites. A Black faculty or staff member who looks at his/her department sees virtually all White colleagues and perceives this as a lack of satisfactory diversity. A White faculty or staff member in the same department will see one or two non-Whites and perceive this as satisfactory diversity. It is likely White faculty and staff have less exposure to diverse colleagues. The only item on the survey that provides data to inform this is the item asking if most of the other students in the respondent's high school were of the same racial and ethnic background. Some 75.5% of White Faculty and Staff agreed or strongly agreed with this item; only 27.4% of Black faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed; 49.1% of Other faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed. Although high school was some time ago for many faculty and staff, it reflects a lack of diversity experience at that time for many faculty and staff.

Perkins, Thomas, and Taylor (2000) found that Blacks who viewed job advertisements that included 50% Black and 50% White "employees" found the organization more attractive and thought they would experience better fit in the organization than did Blacks who viewed advertisements with proportionately fewer Black "employees." Avery, Hernandez, and Hebl (2004) found similar results

for both Black and Hispanic individuals. In both studies, the attitudes of Whites were not affected by the proportion of minorities represented. Although these studies involved perceptions based on advertisements, they do indicate that perceptions of minorities are favorably influenced by increased minority representation.

Religion Differences

Religion explained significant variance in the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. The results for each composite are discussed below.

Sexual Orientation Composite. The only demographic characteristic that explained significant variance in the Sexual Orientation Composite was religion. Christians perceived campus diversity for sexual orientation to be more favorable than did those with other religions. This difference may reflect sincerely held religious beliefs by some Christians (such as those openly shared in political dogma that indicates conservatives and those in the "Religious Right" believe that relationships other than heterosexual are inappropriate). WKU policies such as the opportunity for benefits for other qualified dependents may incline conservative faculty and staff to believe that the diversity climate for sexual orientation on campus is more favorable than do individuals in other religion groups.

Religion Composite. Across all of the analyses conducted for the WKU Faculty Staff Diversity Survey, the effect of Religion on the Religion Composite was the largest, explaining 21% of the variance. As such, it was of interest to further explore differences in perceptions of diversity based on religion. This closer look at religion differences is also merited by the fact that WKU touts itself as having "International Reach" and many countries other than the U.S. have religions other than Christianity as their predominant religion. Accordingly, it might be especially desirable for the diversity climate at WKU to be hospitable to those with religions other than Christianity. The mean responses by Religion for each of the six Diversity Survey Items addressing Religion that were responded to on the 5-point Agree scale (Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)) are presented in Table 28.

A MANOVA was run to determine if responses to the six survey "Agree" items dealing with religion diversity differed as a function of Religion. A Bonferroni correction was used such that only results with a probability value of $p < .005$ were considered to be significant. There were significant effects for Religion on all six items. These effects were explored with Tukey's-B post hoc tests to determine the nature of the significant differences. The results of the MANOVA for Religion on the six survey items may be found in Table 29. The significant main effects are described below. Consistently, Christians reported that religion diversity is more favorable than did those who identified religious beliefs other than Christian.

Table 28. Mean Responses to Religion Survey "Agree" Items by Religion

Survey Item: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with . . .	Religion Recoded	Mean	SD	N
I am satisfied with WKU services addressing the needs of individuals with diverse religions.	Atheist/Agnostic	2.92	1.12	79
	No Religion	3.31	1.07	97
	Other Religions	2.52	.99	23
	Christian	3.73	.89	620
	Total	**3.57**	.99	819
I feel the need to hide some of the characteristics of my religion to fit in on campus.	Atheist/Agnostic	3.65	1.29	79
	No Religion	2.98	1.46	97
	Other Religions	3.00	1.48	23
	Christian	2.12	1.17	620
	Total	**2.40**	1.33	819
Individuals on this campus are treated fairly regardless of their religion.	Atheist/Agnostic	2.95	1.08	79
	No Religion	3.24	1.03	97
	Other Religions	3.00	1.17	23
	Christian	3.58	.88	620
	Total	**3.46**	.95	819
I feel uncomfortable when prayers on campus are closed with comments referring to "Jesus."	Atheist/Agnostic	4.15	1.25	79
	No Religion	3.71	1.28	97
	Other Religions	3.61	1.59	23
	Christian	2.12	1.36	620
	Total	**2.55**	1.55	819
People with different religious beliefs are accepted socially at WKU.	Atheist/Agnostic	2.84	1.01	79
	No Religion	3.32	.98	97
	Other Religions	2.91	1.12	23
	Christian	3.67	.84	620
	Total	**3.53**	.93	819
People on campus feel free to express their individual spirituality at WKU.	Atheist/Agnostic	2.71	1.002	79
	No Religion	3.11	1.059	97
	Other Religions	2.87	1.058	23
	Christian	3.53	.861	620
	Total	**3.38**	.945	819

Table 29. Selected Results from the MANOVA by Religion on the "Agree" Items from the Religion Composite

	Dependent Variable	df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Please indicate the extent to which you Agree or Disagree with each of the following statements.	I am satisfied with WKU services addressing the needs of individuals with diverse religions.	3	29.91	.000	.099
	I feel the need to hide some of the characteristics of my religion to fit in on campus.	3	46.45	.000	.146
	Individuals on this campus are treated fairly regardless of their religion.	3	15.30	.000	.053
	I feel uncomfortable when prayers on campus are closed with comments referring to "Jesus."	3	86.82	.000	.242
	People with different religious beliefs are accepted socially at WKU.	3	26.86	.000	.090
	People on campus feel free to express their individual spirituality at WKU.	3	25.03	.000	.084

I am satisfied with the WKU services addressing the needs of individuals with diverse religions. Christian agreement with this item (M = 3.73, SD = .89) was significantly greater than agreement by those with all other religions. Atheist and Agnostics (M = 2.92, SD = 1.12) and those with No Religion (M = 3.31, SD =1.07) agreed significantly less than did Christians and significantly more with this item than did those with Other Religions (M = 2.52, SD = 1.07). Religion accounted for 9.9% of the variance in responses to the survey item addressing satisfaction with WKU services for diverse religions.

I feel the need to hide some of the characteristics of my religion to fit in on campus. Atheist and Agnostic participants (M = 3.65, SD = 1.29) agreed significantly more with this item than did those with all other religions. Those with Other Religions (M = 3.00, SD = 1.48) and those with No Religion (M = 2.98, SD = 1.46) agreed with this item less than Atheist and Agnostics, but more than Christians (M = 2.12, SD =1.17), who agreed least with this item. Religion accounted for 14.6% of the variance in responses to the item asking if the participant needed to hide some characteristics of his/her religion to fit in on campus.

Individuals on this campus are treated fairly regardless of their religion. Christians (M = 3.58, SD = .88) agreed significantly more with this item than did those with Other Religions (M= 3.00, SD = 1.17) and Atheist and Agnostics (M = 2.95, SD = 1.08). Those with No Religion (M = 3.24, SD = 1.03) did not differ in their level of agreement from the other three groups. Religion accounted for 5.3% of the variance in responses to the item asking if individuals on campus are treated fairly regardless of their religion.

I feel uncomfortable when prayers on campus are closed with comments referring to "Jesus." Those with Other Religions (M = 3.61, SD = 1.59), those with No Religion (M = 3.71, SD = 1.28), and Atheist and Agnostics (M= 4.15, SD = 1.25) agreed significantly more with this item than did Christians (M = 2.12, SD = 1.36). Religion explained 24.2% of the variance in responses to the item that prayers closing with a reference to Jesus made the respondent feel uncomfortable. A simple step in the direction of improving the campus religion diversity climate might be to ensure that, if prayers are included at events on campus, those prayers are interfaith rather than Christian.

People with different religious beliefs are accepted socially at WKU. Christians (M = 3.67, SD = 84) and those with No Religion (M = 3.32, SD = .98) agreed significantly more with this item than did those with Other Religions (M = 2.91, SD = 1.12) and Atheist and Agnostics (M = 2.84, SD = 1.01). Religion explained 9% of the variance in responses to the item that people with different religious beliefs are accepted socially at WKU.

People on campus feel free to express their individual spirituality at WKU. Christians (M = 3.53, SD = .86) agreed more with this item than did those with No Religion (M = 3.11, SD = 1.06), those with Other Religions (M = 2.87, SD = 1.06), and Atheist and Agnostics (M = 2.71, SD = 1.00). Religion explained 8.4% of the variance in responses to the item that people on campus are free to express their individual spirituality.

Frequency of Insensitive and Disparaging Remarks by Campus Entities

One section of the Diversity Survey asked respondents to indicate how often they heard insensitive or disparaging remarks by various entities on campus (i.e., students, faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants) about individuals belonging to various diversity groups on campus (i.e., gay, lesbian, or bisexual persons; non-native English speaking persons; persons of particular economic backgrounds; persons with a disability; persons of particular racial/ethnic backgrounds; women; and older persons). This section of the survey also included items asking how often the respondent had attended an event on campus were individuals from the same diversity groups would not feel welcome. Responses to items in this section were made on an 8-point frequency scale which included the anchors of Almost Never, Once or Twice a Year, Several Times a Semester, Monthly, Several Times a Month, Weekly, Several Times a Week, and Daily. Although these items were included in appropriate composites (as described previously; see Appendix C), it was of interest to examine these items clustered by the source of the comments. Accordingly, these items were averaged across subsection representing difference sources of potential negative comments. The means are presented in Table 30.

Table 30. Mean Responses of Frequencies of Potential Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks by Source

Source of Comments	Employment Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Student Comments	Full-Time Staff	520	2.16	1.69
	Full-Time Faculty	406	2.05	1.46
	Total	926	2.11	1.60
Faculty Comments	Full-Time Staff	520	1.32	.65
	Full-Time Faculty	406	1.37	.62
	Total	926	1.34	.64
Staff Comments*	Full-Time Staff	520	1.48	.74
	Full-Time Faculty	406	1.26	.55
	Total	926	1.38	.67
Administrator Comments	Full-Time Staff	520	1.17	.59
	Full-Time Faculty	406	1.19	.67
	Total	926	1.18	.63
GA Comments	Full-Time Staff	520	1.15	.49
	Full-Time Faculty	406	1.10	.37
	Total	926	1.13	.44
Event Where Unwelcome	Full-Time Staff	520	1.32	.75
	Full-Time Faculty	406	1.33	.66
	Total	926	1.33	.71

* Denotes significant difference between Full-time Faculty and Staff perceptions ($t_{922} = 5.28$, $p < .000$)

First, it should be noted that across all sources of comments, the frequency with which faculty and staff report hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus about individuals from various diversity groups is very low. That is, faculty and staff reported hearing negative remarks by students, on average, only once or twice a year. Faculty and staff reported almost never hearing negative remarks by faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants. Likewise, faculty and staff reported almost never being at an event on campus where individuals from various diversity groups were not welcome. Faculty and staff were very consistent in their perceptions of the frequency of negative remarks. The only source of remarks on which there was a significant difference between faculty and staff perceptions was for comments made by staff. Staff reported a significantly higher rate of negative comments made by staff than did faculty. However, there is no practical difference in the frequency in which faculty and staff perceive negative comments by staff as both groups report, on average, that such comments are made almost never.

Survey Comments

The WKU Campus Diversity Survey instrument included one open-ended item that requested respondents to write any comments they had on diversity at WKU. Some 303 of the 1,117 total respondents provided 375 comments. These comments were categorized into nine categories: Personal Philosophy of Diversity; Diversity at WKU – Positive; Diversity at WKU – Negative; WKU Administration, Policy, & Practice; Recruitment & Retention; Suggestions for Diversity at WKU; The Diversity Survey; and Miscellaneous. Some comments addressed several categories; these comments were placed in the category the best represented the comment. A complete listing of comments (grouped into these categories) may be found in Appendix E. A summary of the number of comments by category may be found in Table 31.

When reading the comments there are several reasons one needs to exercise caution in the weight given to the comments. First, most people tend to feel more comfortable interpreting narrative comments than interpreting numbers and figures. Consequently, there is something of a natural tendency to focus on written comments rather than the more objective and reliable statistics. Fewer than one-third of the respondents wrote comments; thus, approximately two-thirds of the respondents provided no comments. Although these comments represent the opinions of the 303 individuals who provided them, they may or may not reflect the opinion of the majority who provided no comments. In survey research, it is common for those with strong feelings, either positive or negative, to write comments.

Table 31. Number of Comments by Category

Comment Category	Number of Comments
Personal Philosophy of Diversity	41
Diversity at WKU - Positive	41
Diversity at WKU - Negative	130
WKU Administration, Policy, & Practice	55
Recruitment & Retention	15
Suggestions for Diversity at WKU	32
The Diversity Survey	51
Miscellaneous	10
Total Number of Comments	**375**

Inspection of Table 31 indicates that by far the most frequent comment was a negative observation of diversity at WKU (130 comments); more than one-third of the comments fell into this category. The category with the next highest number of comments was WKU Administration, Policy, and Practice with 55 comments; virtually all of these comments were negative. The Diversity Survey received 51 comments; again almost all of these comments were negative. There were 41 comments in which individuals expressed their personal beliefs about diversity. There were 41 positive comments about diversity at WKU and 32 comments that provided suggestions for campus diversity. Fifteen comments specifically addressed recruitment and retention with regard to campus diversity. Finally, there were 10 comments that did not fall into any of the categories in the Miscellaneous category.

Conclusions

The WKU Campus Diversity Survey included items that addressed the overall campus diversity climate, satisfaction with diversity and diversity efforts at WKU, and items regarding specific diversity groups. The diversity characteristics included on the survey and represented by the composites include the characteristics that define protected groups under Equal Employment Opportunity law and characteristics that were identified in a review of diversity instruments and research. Composites were created to reflect responses to items reflecting each of these diversity characteristics. Each composite was analyzed across all respondents, for full-time staff and full-time faculty, for Division and College, and for the subgroups represented by the characteristics represented in the survey demographic items, that is, Sex, Race, Disability, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Age.

Perceptions of diversity across all survey respondents ranged from somewhat favorable for the Campus Composite and Satisfaction Composite to favorable for the Gender, Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES Composites. General perceptions of campus diversity as reflected by the Campus Composite and the Satisfaction Composite were less favorable than were perceptions of specific facets of campus diversity as reflected by the composites for Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Age, Disability, Non-English Speaking, and SES.

There was agreement between full-time faculty and full-time staff in their perceptions of diversity on campus. Statistically significant differences were found between faculty and staff on two composites, however, these differences explained little variance and are not practically meaningful. There were significant differences among Divisions on all of the composite measures. For each composite measure, Public Affairs perceived diversity to be more favorable than did the other divisions. On some composites, Public Affairs was joined by other divisions in their favorable perceptions. Student Affairs consistently had the least favorable perceptions of campus diversity on each of the composite measures.

There were significant differences between colleges on two of the composite measures, the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. Participants from Potter College of Arts and Letters reported significantly less favorable perceptions of campus religion diversity than did participants from the other five colleges. For the Sexual Orientation Composite there was a trend in the data such that the Ogden College of Science and Engineering reported the most favorable perceptions, followed by the Gordon Ford College of Business Administration, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Health and Human Services, University College, and the Potter College of Arts and Letters.

There were statistically significant differences between demographic groups for each of the composites; most of these effects explained little of the variance in the composites. Thus, although the differences are reliable, they reflect relatively small differences in perceptions between groups and, as such, lack meaning in practical terms. In general, the pattern of results across the composites specific to diversity groups suggests that individuals who belong to a group they perceive to have a less favorable diversity climate may generalize this perception to the diversity climate for other minority groups on campus. Another interpretation is that those who are in the minority of a diversity characteristic are more sensitive to diversity issues involving other diversity groups.

Race and Religion were the only demographic characteristic that explained meaningful differences in perceptions of diversity represented in the composite measures. Consistently, on the composites where there were race differences (i.e., Campus Composite, Satisfaction Composite, and Race Composite), Black faculty and staff perceived diversity less favorably than did White faculty and staff. These results are consistent with other reports on campus diversity (e.g., Park & Denson, 2009) that found faculty of color have a higher threshold for perceiving campus diversity as satisfactory.

Religion explained significant variance in the Religion Composite and the Sexual Orientation Composite. On the Sexual Orientation Composite, Christians perceived campus diversity for sexual orientation to be more favorable than did those with other religious beliefs. Across all of the analyses conducted on data from the WKU Faculty Staff Diversity Survey, the effect of Religion on the Religion Composite was the largest, explaining 21% of the variance. Thus, it was of interest to further explore differences in perceptions of diversity based on religion. This closer look at religion differences is also merited by the fact that WKU touts itself as having "International Reach" and many countries other than the U.S. have religions other than Christianity as their predominant religion. Accordingly, it might be especially desirable for the diversity climate at WKU to be hospitable to those with religions other than Christianity. Survey results indicated that Christians consistently reported religion diversity as more favorable than did those who identified religious beliefs other than Christian. A simple step to address this discrepancy might be to ensure that, if prayers are included at events on campus, those prayers are interfaith rather than Christian. Survey participants with religious beliefs other than Christian agreed significantly more than did Christians that prayers on campus ending with a reference to Jesus made them uncomfortable.

A section of the Diversity Survey asked respondents to indicate how often they heard insensitive or disparaging remarks by various entities on campus (i.e., students, faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants) about individuals belonging to various diversity groups on campus (i.e., gay, lesbian, or bisexual persons; non-native English speaking persons; persons of particular economic backgrounds; persons with a disability; persons of particular racial/ethnic backgrounds; women; and older persons). Across all sources of comments, the frequency with which faculty and staff reported hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus about individuals from various diversity groups was very low; that is, on average, only once or twice a year by students, and almost never by faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate assistants. Likewise, faculty and staff reported almost never being at an event on campus where individuals from various diversity groups were not welcome.

Some 303 of the survey respondents provided 375 comments. These comments were categorized into nine categories: Personal Philosophy of Diversity; Diversity at WKU – Positive; Diversity at WKU – Negative; WKU Administration, Policy, & Practice; Recruitment & Retention; Suggestions for Diversity at WKU; The Diversity Survey; and Miscellaneous. The vast majority of the comments provided by survey participants were negative. Actual comments are in Appendix E.

Although somewhat general, the results of the 2012 WKU Campus Diversity Survey provide data that may be used to inform further diversity efforts on campus. These efforts may target more specific diversity issues in greater depth than those targeted by the WKU Campus Diversity Survey.

References

Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania.(2010). The AICUP Campus Diversity Survey, Retrieved June 17, 2011 from http://www.marywood.edu/instresearch/informational-documents.html

Avery, D. R., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2004). Who watching the race? Racial salience in recruitment advertising. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 146-161.

Beckham, E.D. (2000). *Diversity, democracy, and higher education: A view from three nations.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Cole, S., & Braber, E. (2003). *Increasing faculty diversity: The occupational choices of high-achieving minority students*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gasman, M. & Kim, J. K. (2012). Successfully recruiting faculty of color. Retrieved from the web April 2012: http://www.insightintodiversity.com/diversity-issues/past-articles/61-past-articles/756-successfully-recruiting-faculty-of-color-by-marybeth-gasman-and-jessica-k-kim-university-of-pennsylvania.html

Gill, K. (2012). Women in academia and the sciences. Retrieved from the web April 2012: http://uspolitics.about.com/od/electionissues/a/women_science.htm

Gurin, P. (2002) Expert report of Patricia Gurin: conceptual model of the impact of diversity. Available online at: www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/model.html.

Hyer, P., Conley, V., & McLaughlin, G. (1999). *The campus climate for diversity: student perceptions*. Blacksburg, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2009). Attitudes and Advocacy: Understanding Faculty Views on Racial/Ethnic Diversity. *Journal of Higher Education, 80,* 415-438.

Perkins, L. A., Thomas, K. M., & Taylor, G. A. (2000). Advertising and recruitment: Marketing to minorities. *Psychology and Marketing, 17*, 235-255.

Turner, C.S., & Myers, S.L. Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.