



NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP
& INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

Barton County Community College

Great Bend, Kansas

PACE Racial Diversity Subscale Report

PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

Lead Researchers

Emily R. VanZoest &
Greyson A. B. Norcross

Conducted

September & October 2020



NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Research Team

Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Andrea L. DeSantis
Assistant Director of Research

Greyson A. B. Norcross
Research Associate

Daniel R. West
Research Associate

Emily R. VanZoest
Research Associate

Additional Report Editors

Renee Barger
Research Associate

Monique Colclough, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Melissa Whatley, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Phone
(919)515-8567

Web
nilie.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University
706 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

Fax
(919)515-6305

Email
pace_survey@ncsu.edu

Suggested Citation: National Initiative for Leadership & Institutional Effectiveness, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges Racial Diversity Subscale Report, by VanZoest, E. R., & Norcross, G. A. B. Raleigh, NC: 2020.

Table of Contents	Page
Racial Diversity Literature Review	1
Table 1. Institutional Structure Frequency Distributions	4
Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions	6
Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions	8
Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions	9
Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons	10
Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons	11
Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons	12
Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons	13
Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	14
Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity	15
Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status	16
Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned	17
Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity	18
Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution	19
Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education	20
Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age	21

Racial Diversity Literature Review

While college campuses are more diverse than they were twenty years ago, concerns of “chilly” racial climates continue to exist and institutional leaders must remain engaged in a concerted effort to ensure that faculty, staff, administrators, and students of all races and ethnicities are comfortable on campus (Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2006). Much of the literature about campus racial climates employs Hurtado’s (1992) framework; however, scholars have typically focused on the experiences of students (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). When assessing the campus climate, acknowledging the experiences of campus employees is equally important (Hurtado & Dey, 1997; Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2006).

The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) recognizes the need to address the campus racial and ethnic climate for administrators, faculty, and staff, and provides a tool that institutional leaders can use to better understand racial and ethnic diversity on their campuses. Using Hurtado’s (1992) model as a framework, NILIE researchers created a racial diversity subscale to assist campus leaders in their efforts to improve the climate on their campuses.

Much of what is observed and experienced on college campuses is influenced by both social and institutional contexts (Hurtado, 1992). Racial conflicts, specifically overt encounters, are not isolated cases. Rather, these encounters are the result of “unresolved racial issues in college environments and in society at large” (p. 540). NILIE recognizes the need to better equip colleges to understand and address their particular campus racial climates within both the social and institutional contexts, and our diversity subscale provides an opportunity to effectively address the latter.

Various factors influence the racial climate of a campus including its structural make-up, psychological climate, and behavioral climate (Hurtado et al., 1998; Umbach & Kuh, 2006). It is important to note that these dimensions are not mutually exclusive (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). A high level of exposure to these dimensions has been found to positively impact one’s racial and ethnic views, while limited exposure can have the opposite effect (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

Structural diversity refers to the racial and ethnic makeup of the campus population (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Structural diversity plays a pivotal role in improving campus climate by increasing racial and ethnic diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998). A racially and ethnically diverse campus environment provides more opportunity for cross-racial interactions (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999).

While Hurtado and associates (1998) recommend that campus leaders examine institutional policies and practices to increase the number of racial and ethnic minority students, similar steps could be taken to increase underrepresented minority employees (American Psychological Association [APA], 1996; Evans & Chun, 2007). For example, the American Association of Community Colleges (2012) reports that White, non-Hispanic employees make up nearly 80 percent of both full- and part-time community college personnel (NCES, 2004). When examining institutional hiring practices and policies, it is beneficial for campus leaders to consider applicants that may not have followed traditional career paths (APA, 1996; Evans & Chun, 2007). This allows more underrepresented minorities to be included in the hiring pool and increases the probability of a campus employing individuals who have diverse, yet valuable, backgrounds and experiences (APA,

1996). At the same time, when recruiting and hiring more racial and ethnic minority employees, it is important that these employees are not tokenized. Rather, they should be afforded opportunities to contribute to the institution in areas beyond diversity (Park & Denson, 2009).

The psychological dimension of diversity refers to one's attitude toward other racial and ethnic groups, perception of the racial climate on campus, and views on the manner in which the institution responds to diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998). As stated by Hurtado et al., "racially and ethnically diverse administrators, students, and faculty tend to view the campus climate differently" (p. 289). Campus leaders should develop educational initiatives to identify and address concerns that create a chilly campus climate (Hurtado et al., 1998). Such initiatives should be aimed at recognizing and addressing stereotypes and preconceived beliefs people may have about racial and ethnic groups. When individuals are involved in educational diversity-related activities, they are more likely to support an institution's diversity efforts and have a more positive attitude toward other racial and ethnic groups on campus (Hurtado et al., 1998; Park & Denson, 2009).

The behavioral dimension refers to within- and between-group interactions, as well as the quantity and nature of diversity-related activities an institution provides. These may include diversity workshops, cultural centers, and required diversity courses (Hurtado et al., 1998; Umbach & Kuh, 2006). Increased interactions with members of different racial and ethnic groups can lead to increased exposure to diverse experiences and opinions (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). Such interactions enhance active thinking processes (Gurin, 1999) and create a climate that supports constructive challenges and thoughtful responses (Umbach & Kuh). Campuses that lack structural diversity could use diversity-related activities to provide opportunities for the campus community to be engaged and learn more about racial and diverse groups (Kuh et al., 2005). When an institution makes a commitment to racial and ethnic diversity by sponsoring structured activities, it sends a positive message to all members of the campus community that cross-racial interactions are valued (Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado et al., 1998).

References

American Psychological Association Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention and Training in Psychology (1996). *How to recruit and hire ethnic minority faculty*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. In *The compelling need for diversity in higher education*, Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al, No. 97-75237 (E. D. Mich.) and Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75928 (E. D. Mich.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.

Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. In M. Peterson, D. Dill, L. Mets, & Associates (Eds.), *Planning and management for a changing environment* (pp. 405-431). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.

Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. Wilds (Ed.), *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report* (pp. 39-67). Washington, DC: American.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) fall staff survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 119-148.

Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2009). Attitudes and advocacy: Understanding faculty views on racial/ethnic diversity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 415-438.

Smith, D., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2005). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 169-192.

Table 1. Institutional Structure Frequency Distributions

BCCC compared with:

Institutional Structure	Response Option	BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
1 my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	Very dissatisfied	1	0%	204	2%	15	2%
	Dissatisfied	11	5%	478	5%	36	5%
	Neither	40	17%	1628	15%	142	18%
	Satisfied	86	37%	4413	42%	338	43%
	Very satisfied	96	41%	3879	37%	259	33%
	Total	234	100%	10602	100%	790	100%
2 my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	Very dissatisfied	3	1%	195	2%	14	2%
	Dissatisfied	8	3%	403	4%	27	3%
	Neither	34	15%	1325	12%	124	16%
	Satisfied	89	38%	4467	42%	338	43%
	Very satisfied	98	42%	4225	40%	290	37%
	Total	232	100%	10615	100%	793	100%
3 my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	2	1%	156	1%	11	1%
	Dissatisfied	5	2%	325	3%	22	3%
	Neither	29	12%	1189	11%	111	14%
	Satisfied	91	39%	4471	42%	350	44%
	Very satisfied	108	46%	4479	42%	304	38%
	Total	235	100%	10620	100%	798	100%
4 employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	Very dissatisfied	0	0%	179	2%	14	2%
	Dissatisfied	2	1%	353	3%	17	2%
	Neither	35	17%	1670	16%	141	19%
	Satisfied	87	41%	4062	40%	290	38%
	Very satisfied	87	41%	3940	39%	299	39%
	Total	211	100%	10204	100%	761	100%

BCCC compared with:

Institutional Structure (continued)	Response Option	BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
5 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	Very dissatisfied	12	5%	470	5%	41	5%
	Dissatisfied	32	14%	1153	11%	105	14%
	Neither	46	21%	2288	22%	201	26%
	Satisfied	64	29%	3518	35%	242	31%
	Very satisfied	67	30%	2761	27%	184	24%
	Total	221	100%	10190	100%	773	100%
6 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, VP, Deans)	Very dissatisfied	26	12%	616	6%	48	6%
	Dissatisfied	34	16%	971	9%	64	8%
	Neither	70	32%	2211	22%	175	23%
	Satisfied	47	22%	3200	31%	220	29%
	Very satisfied	41	19%	3261	32%	259	34%
	Total	218	100%	10259	100%	766	100%
7 a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	Very dissatisfied	9	4%	390	4%	25	3%
	Dissatisfied	16	7%	904	9%	65	8%
	Neither	47	21%	2424	23%	205	26%
	Satisfied	85	38%	3825	37%	288	37%
	Very satisfied	64	29%	2787	27%	198	25%
	Total	221	100%	10330	100%	781	100%

Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions

BCCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships	Response Option	BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
8 my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	Very dissatisfied	3	1%	426	4%	24	3%
	Dissatisfied	0	0%	597	6%	30	4%
	Neither	30	13%	1722	17%	136	18%
	Satisfied	73	32%	3572	35%	279	36%
	Very satisfied	120	53%	4020	39%	299	39%
	Total		226	100%	10337	100%	768
9 my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	Very dissatisfied	2	1%	265	3%	17	2%
	Dissatisfied	1	0%	400	4%	27	4%
	Neither	27	12%	1614	16%	144	19%
	Satisfied	74	33%	3634	35%	281	37%
	Very satisfied	123	54%	4404	43%	298	39%
	Total		227	100%	10317	100%	767
10 my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	2	1%	185	2%	13	2%
	Dissatisfied	1	0%	230	2%	10	1%
	Neither	28	12%	1225	12%	104	14%
	Satisfied	77	34%	3554	35%	280	37%
	Very satisfied	119	52%	5106	50%	360	47%
	Total		227	100%	10300	100%	767
11 my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	Very dissatisfied	3	1%	243	2%	11	1%
	Dissatisfied	1	0%	330	3%	20	3%
	Neither	28	13%	1458	15%	117	16%
	Satisfied	69	32%	3375	34%	268	36%
	Very satisfied	115	53%	4504	45%	319	43%
	Total		216	100%	9910	100%	735

BCCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships (continued)		BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
12 my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	0	0%	146	1%	9	1%
	Dissatisfied	2	1%	212	2%	11	1%
	Neither	25	11%	1298	13%	112	15%
	Satisfied	81	36%	3588	36%	289	38%
	Very satisfied	114	51%	4657	47%	330	44%
Total		222	100%	9901	100%	751	100%

Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions

BCCC compared with:

Teamwork	Response Option	BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
13 racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	Very dissatisfied	1	1%	179	2%	10	2%
	Dissatisfied	1	1%	324	3%	33	5%
	Neither	56	29%	2650	29%	212	33%
	Satisfied	58	30%	3188	34%	211	32%
	Very satisfied	78	40%	2922	32%	185	28%
	Total	194	100%	9263	100%	651	100%
14 racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	Very dissatisfied	0	0%	152	2%	8	1%
	Dissatisfied	4	2%	312	3%	28	4%
	Neither	57	30%	2589	28%	226	35%
	Satisfied	57	30%	3280	36%	206	32%
	Very satisfied	71	38%	2866	31%	172	27%
	Total	189	100%	9199	100%	640	100%
15 the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	Very dissatisfied	1	1%	162	2%	11	2%
	Dissatisfied	5	3%	331	4%	27	4%
	Neither	52	28%	2344	26%	202	32%
	Satisfied	58	31%	3354	37%	224	35%
	Very satisfied	70	38%	2956	32%	174	27%
	Total	186	100%	9147	100%	638	100%

Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions

BCCC compared with:

Student Focus	Response Option	BCCC		NILIE Normbase		Small 2-year	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
16 faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	2	1%	172	2%	10	2%
	Dissatisfied	7	4%	480	6%	32	5%
	Neither	56	29%	2633	30%	232	36%
	Satisfied	74	38%	3143	36%	222	34%
	Very satisfied	57	29%	2222	26%	154	24%
	Total	196	100%	8650	100%	650	100%
17 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	Very dissatisfied	4	2%	158	2%	12	2%
	Dissatisfied	8	4%	552	6%	31	5%
	Neither	58	31%	2965	35%	243	38%
	Satisfied	57	31%	2898	34%	221	34%
	Very satisfied	59	32%	1953	23%	141	22%
	Total	186	100%	8526	100%	648	100%
18 my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	1	0%	177	2%	10	1%
	Dissatisfied	2	1%	440	4%	22	3%
	Neither	41	20%	2098	21%	172	24%
	Satisfied	89	43%	4133	42%	293	41%
	Very satisfied	76	36%	2942	30%	218	30%
	Total	209	100%	9790	100%	715	100%
19 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	Very dissatisfied	2	1%	112	1%	4	1%
	Dissatisfied	3	2%	309	4%	17	3%
	Neither	55	28%	2709	31%	217	33%
	Satisfied	71	36%	3436	39%	267	40%
	Very satisfied	66	34%	2142	25%	162	24%
	Total	197	100%	8708	100%	667	100%

Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons

BCCC compared with:

Institutional Structure	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
1 my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	234	4.132	4.064			4.000		
2 my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	232	4.168	4.142			4.088		
3 my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	235	4.268	4.205			4.145		
4 employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	211	4.227	4.101	*	.139	4.108		
5 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	221	3.643	3.682			3.547		
6 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, Vice-President, Deans)	218	3.197	3.733	***	-.455	3.755	***	-.464
7 a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	221	3.810	3.747			3.729		

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons

BCCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships		BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
		N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
8	my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	226	4.358	3.983	***	.350	4.040	***	.331
9	my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	227	4.388	4.116	***	.279	4.064	***	.352
10	my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	227	4.366	4.278			4.257		
11	my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	216	4.352	4.167	**	.192	4.176	*	.200
12	my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	222	4.383	4.252	*	.151	4.225	*	.194

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons

BCCC compared with:

Teamwork		BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
		N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
13	racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	194	4.088	3.901	**	.196	3.811	***	.295
14	racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	189	4.032	3.913			3.791	**	.263
15	the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	186	4.027	3.941			3.820	**	.222

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons

BCCC compared with:

Student Focus	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
16 faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	196	3.903	3.782			3.735	*	.182
17 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	186	3.855	3.696	*	.166	3.691	*	.174
18 my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	209	4.134	3.942	**	.208	3.961	*	.199
19 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	197	3.995	3.825	**	.192	3.849	*	.173

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

BCCC compared with:

What is your personnel classification?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
Faculty	88	4.162	3.972	*	.248	3.936	*	.303
Administrator	16	4.140	3.958			3.850		
Staff	129	3.998	3.993			3.967		

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity

BCCC compared with:

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
African American or Black	5	--	3.666			3.597		
Alaska Native or American Indian	1	--	3.890			4.341		
Asian	3	--	3.874			--		
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	7	4.271	3.809			3.884		
Middle Eastern or North African	0	--	3.363			--		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	--	3.769			--		
White	197	4.073	4.032			3.952	*	.170
Two or more races	9	4.039	3.776			4.316		
Prefer to self-describe	9	3.553	3.862			--		

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status

BCCC compared with:

Your status at this institution is?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
Full-Time	177	3.980	3.920			3.891		
Part-Time	57	4.321	4.171			4.246		

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned

BCCC compared with:

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	1	--	3.893			--		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	8	4.547	3.786	**	.925	3.752	*	.994
Master's degree	92	3.936	3.969			3.908		
Bachelor's degree	77	4.094	4.037			4.039		
Associate's degree	35	4.076	4.037			3.941		
Certificate	9	4.111	4.035			--		
High School diploma or GED	11	4.343	4.095			4.027		
No diploma or degree	1	--	3.934			--		

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity

BCCC compared with:

What is your gender identity?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
Man	69	4.198	4.029			3.995	*	.294
Woman	158	4.048	4.014			4.002		
Trans Man	1	--	--			--		
Trans Woman	0	--	--			--		
Gender Queer	2	--	3.573			--		
Prefer to self-describe	2	--	3.607			--		

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution

BCCC compared with:

How many years have you worked at this institution?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
5 years or less	91	4.117	4.128			4.112		
6-10 years	61	4.147	3.926	*	.308	3.980		
11-15 years	24	3.877	3.888			3.824		
16-20 years	17	3.996	3.915			3.936		
21-25 years	9	4.088	3.899			3.908		
26 years or more	18	4.131	3.938			3.794	*	.540

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education

BCCC compared with:

How many years have you worked in higher education?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
5 years or less	74	4.194	4.181			4.184		
6-10 years	49	4.220	3.993	*	.322	3.989		
11-15 years	32	4.073	3.933			3.890		
16-20 years	34	3.690	3.926			3.885		
21-25 years	10	4.059	3.870			3.881		
26 years or more	22	4.126	3.876			3.811		

* p <.05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age

BCCC compared with:

What is your age?	BCCC		NILIE Normbase			Small 2-year		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	238	4.067	3.975			3.936	*	.179
29 or younger	12	4.211	4.176			4.208		
30 - 39	42	4.232	4.039			4.090		
40 - 49	43	3.818	4.007			4.042		
50 - 59	43	4.231	3.992	*	.334	3.992	*	.364
60 or older	57	4.093	3.993			3.817	*	.374

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001