

Support Staff Perceptions of the Campus Climate at a Southern University

by

Demetriss L. Locke

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
May 14, 2010

Keywords: campus climate, work climate, diversity,
support staff, higher education, college personnel

Copyright © 2010 by Demetriss L. Locke

Approved by

Frances Kochan, Chair, Wayne T. Smith Professor of Educational Foundations,
Leadership and Technology

Marie Kraska, Mildred Cheshire Fraley Distinguished Professor of Educational
Foundations, Leadership and Technology

Ivan Watts, Associate Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology

David DiRamio, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and
Technology

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate university support staff members' perception of the campus climate at a Southern university. Differences among support staff members were examined by age, gender, level of education, and race and/or ethnicity. The data analyzed in the study were collected from a random sample of 600 non-exempt, full-time support staff members at the selected institution. The university offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in its 13 schools and colleges. In fall 2008, the institution enrolled 21,954 undergraduate students and 2,576 graduate or professional students. This study used quantitative and qualitative survey methods. The dependent variable was perception of campus climate as measured by participants' response to questions investigating perceptions of the psychological and behavioral climates on the Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS), the researcher-adapted instrument used to collect participant data. The independent variables were: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

The null hypotheses were tested using two one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures. No statistically significant differences were found at the .05 level of significance for any of the independent variables for the psychological climate. For the behavioral climate, the ANOVA revealed statistical significance for the independent variables of gender $F(1,50) = 4.21, p = .045$, level of education $F(5, 50) = 2.88, p = .023$, and ethnicity $F(4,50) = 2.89, p = .032$ and the interaction of gender and level of

education $F(2, 62) = 3.81, p = .028$.

This study contributed additional empirical evidence of staff perceptions of campus climate, which should advance the literature and possibly bring institutions of higher education one step closer to addressing the needs of diverse populations and fostering a campus climate that is inviting and welcoming for all students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I'd like to thank God. He has led me throughout the entire process and aligned me with people who had my best interest at heart. I would like to render thanks to my committee members Drs. Ivan Watts, and David DiRamio who guided me through this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Frances Kochan for agreeing to be my mentor and dissertation chair. You have blessed me in ways that only you and I know. You are the best leader that I've ever worked with, and I can only pray that I can be a positive, motivating force in the lives of others, just as you've been for me. I extended unabated indebtedness to Dr. Marie Kraska who guided me through the methods section. In my entire educational career I have never had a professor exhibit such passion and care towards students who are open to learning. I thank Dr. Alice Buchanan for being the outside reader for this research project. I also extend acknowledgment and indebtedness to Dr. Tonia Howard Baldwin, Dr. Devona L. Foster, Dr. Sheila Moore, LaTosha Ramsey, Kristen J. Reddick, and Dr. Rhonda Westry for providing me with unrelenting support, especially during those times when I couldn't see my way through. I thank Mrs. Ethel Gray, my spiritual mother, for blessing me with the spirit of discernment during this process. I also thank my parents, Patricia & Jenkins Earl Kimbrough for motivating me, providing me with financial support, and for believing in me even when I didn't believe in myself. Lastly, I thank my grandmother, Mrs. Hessie M. Locke, for watching over me from above. I wish you were here with me.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Lists of Tables.....	viii
List of Abbreviations.....	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Research.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	7
Limitations of the Study.....	8
Assumptions of the Study.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
Chapter 2. Review of Literature.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Campus Climate Framework.....	16
Structural Diversity.....	17
Psychological Dimension.....	19
Behavioral Dimension.....	20

Institution’s History and Legacy	21
Support Staffs’ Perceptions of Campus Climate	24
Comparing Faculty and Staff Perceptions	31
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate.....	42
Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate.....	51
Summary	60
Chapter 3. Methods of Study and Instrumentation	63
Introduction	63
Research Questions.....	65
Statement of the Hypothesis	65
Instrumentation.....	66
Background Information	68
Structural Diversity.....	68
Psychological Climate.....	68
Behavioral Climate	69
Sources of Data and Collection Procedures	69
Data Analysis.....	71
Chapter 4. Data Analysis and Results	73
Introduction	73
Data Preparation	74
Response Distribution and Demographic Characteristics.....	76
Results.....	79
Research Question 1.....	79

Research Question 2	80
Research Question 3.....	85
Qualitative Data.....	91
Summary.....	96
Chapter 5. Summary and Conclusion	99
Summary and Conclusion	99
Structural Diversity.....	100
Psychological Climate	104
Behavioral Climate	107
Implications	111
Recommendation	115
Institutional-Specific Research Questions	117
General Research Questions.....	119
References.....	122
Appendices	139
IRB Approval Letter	140
Support Staff Campus Climate Survey	142
Participant Information Letter	149
Permission to Use Survey.....	152

List of Tables

Table 1 Missing Cases for the Psychological and Behavioral Climates	75
Table 2 Frequencies and Percents of Support Staff Demographic Information	77
Table 3 Frequencies and Percents of Responses to Structural Diversity of Immediate Work Environment	80
Table 4 Frequencies and Percents of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values for Psychological Climate	81
Table 5 Mean and Standard Deviation for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases for the Psychological Variable	82
Table 6 Frequencies and Percents of Responses of Participants with Missing Values Replaced for Psychological Climate	83
Table 7 Mean and Standard Deviation for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced for the Psychological Variable	85
Table 8 Frequencies and Percents of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values for Behavioral Climate	86
Table 9 Mean and Standard Deviation for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases for the Behavioral Variable	87
Table 10 Results of ANOVA for Mean Scores for Gender, Level of Education, and Race/Ethnicity with Missing Cases on the Behavioral Climate	88
Table 11 Frequencies and Percents of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Cases Replaced for Behavioral Climate	90
Table 12 Mean and Standard Deviation for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced for the Behavioral Variable	90
Table 13 Results of ANOVA for Mean Scores for Level of Education, and the Interaction Effect of Gender and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced for the Behavioral Climate	91

List of Abbreviations

HERI	Higher Education Research Institute
HWCU	Historically White Colleges and Universities
IRB	Institutional Review Board
SSCCS	Support Staff Campus Climate Survey
UCLA	University of California Los Angeles

Chapter 1

Introduction

University graduates of today are competing for jobs in a global economy. Thus, the ability to work with, lead, and influence others from a diverse range of fields and cultures among the core competencies most graduates will need to be successful in their given fields (O'Hara, 2007). Acquiring these competences will require that students have experiences in their collegiate lives that will foster these abilities (Hurtado, 2006). It is therefore essential that institutions of higher education create environments that support diversity and foster relationships across all cultural contexts.

One of the most important factors in developing cultural competence is having a campus climate that embraces and fosters diversity. Campus climate is an organizational biopsy of members' perceptions of organizational life pertaining to specific elements or dimensions (Brown & VanWagoner, 1999). Among these dimensions are: institutional goals and functioning; governance and decision-making; teaching and learning processes; training and development; and workplace dynamics. It is a set of current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define institutions of higher education and its members (Peterson & Spencer, 1990) as it embraces the culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that comprise campus life (Green, 1989).

Creating diversity among students and faculty in higher education and creating a harmonious campus climate supportive of diversification has been sluggish (Brown, 2004). Diversity policies that are implemented often fail due to the disconnect between

institutional policy and the commitment from university employees (Brown, 2004). Despite this slow progress, diversity-related issues have transitioned from a peripheral position to becoming a primary focus for institutions of higher education. Policies have been changed and programs have been implemented aimed at increasing the number of people from diverse backgrounds and improving campus/departmental climates and cultures to sustain this diverse group (Ibarra, 2001; Kays, 2008). If these initiatives are to be successful, they must be supported by all affiliated members (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Such change requires corroboration and cooperation from students, faculty, administrators, and staff in order to assure a system-wide impact (Birnbaum, 1988).

Although often ignored and unappreciated, staff members not only undergird the higher education teaching and learning process, which includes the cultural climate in which it occurs, but they also reinforce many institutional and departmental policies and initiatives to ensure the quality of operations (Pitman, 2000). Support staff members, such as human resources professionals, financial operations, facilities, information technology professional, and non-academic staff, have a pivotal role at institutions of higher education as they control and oversee the day to day operations of the university (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). They are often the nucleus of the office, assisting in the creation and development of knowledge and innovation in higher education institutions (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001). Banata and Kuh (1998) state, “A faculty cannot by itself accomplish the [university’s] objectives for a student’s intellectual and personal development; it needs the cooperation of others who work with students where students spend the majority of their time” (p. 41). Despite the attempts to incorporate staff members in instituting system-wide initiatives, there remains a scarcity

of empirical studies that explore support staffs' perceptions of diversity-related issues on higher education campuses (Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006).

Need for the Study

In order for designs of campus climate assessment to be meaningful, multiple perspectives and perceptions among faculty, students and staff, which are essential in achieving a welcoming climate for all, need to be taken into account (Hurtado & Dey, 1997). Yet, the research on campus climate related to diversity is sparse. Most of the empirical evidence of academic climate investigates student (Allan & Madden, 2006; Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Hurtado, 1992; Oregon State Board of Higher Education, 1997; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Riordan, 1999) and faculty perceptions (American Council on Education, 2005; Clements, 2000; Conley & Hyer, 1999; Kossek & Zonia, 1993). Although support staff members comprise the nucleus of the institutional setting, few studies on campus climate include support staffs' perceptions (Brown & WanWagoner, 1999; California State Polytechnic University, 2002; Kelly & Fenner, 1996; Mattice, 1995; Mohammadi, 1995; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, & Der-Karabetian, 2000; Sheldon, 2001; Yang, 1992). There have been meager attempts to capture the role of support staff in constructing and preserving diversity programs and initiatives (Baker, 1999; Berkeley, 1997; Horton, 2000; Sanchez, 1995, Walters, 2002), and only three studies were found that focused totally on support staffs' perception of campus climate (Duggan, 2008; Mayhew et al., 2006; Ruchkall, 1997). Other sparse areas of research focusing on support staff include issues of quality service, stress, and burnout (Pitman, 2000).

While the research in this area is promising, more empirical evidence of staff perceptions of campus climate is needed to advance the literature and possibly to bring institutions of higher education one step closer to addressing the needs of diverse populations. A comprehensive assessment of campus climate as it relates to staff perceptions should also provide a different set of lenses through which to view diversity and provide information that may prove useful to institutions seeking to enhance the overall institutional culture.

Statement of the Problem

Although support staff are an integral part of an institution and are a vital part of its culture and climate, relatively little research has been conducted to determine support staffs' perceptions of the institutional climate for diversity. As previously stated, in order for campus climate assessments to be meaningful, multiple perspectives and perceptions must be taken into account, including support staff. The focus of this study investigates the perceptions of the campus climate as reported by university support staff of a land-grant university in the south.

Theoretical Framework

Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen (1998) developed a four-part framework that details the diversity climate for institutions of higher education. The four dimensions of the framework include: 1) the historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of certain ethnic/racial groups, 2) structural diversity, which is the actual number of diverse groups on campus, 3) the psychological climate of employees or the perceptions, attitudes, consciousness, and beliefs about diversity, and 4) the behavioral climate, which pertains to ways in which different racial and ethnic groups interact on campus. These

dimensions relate to perceptions of diverse groups relative to their level of comfort and sense of belonging within the work community. The historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion was excluded from this study since the elements of this dimension are oftentimes so insulated that a more extensive study of the campus culture, policies, traditions, and historical mission is warranted (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008). However, an overview of this historical dimension is included in this chapter under university context. Consequently, this study will focus on three of the four dimensions: 1) structural diversity, 2) the psychological climate, and 3) the behavioral climate. These three dimensions allowed the researcher to select variables to measure support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate for diversity in their given departments and the campus as a whole.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate at a land-grant university in the south. The researcher examined the extent to which there were differences in support staffs' perceptions when staff were grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, (d) and ethnicity. The purpose of the study is further delineated by the following research questions.

Research Questions

Research questions for this study address the extent to which there are differences in perceptions of the campus climate for diversity among university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education and (d) ethnicity.

Specifically, this study investigated the following research questions:

1. What is the structural diversity of support staffs' work units or departments?

2. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

3. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

This study also sought to explore issues that participants perceived as being necessary to improve the campus climate at the selected institution. These findings may add a more in-depth understanding of the psychological and behavioral context and also expand the researcher's understanding of the quantitative findings and aid in interpreting the findings.

Statement of the Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses were formulated to test for statistically significant differences:

H₀₁: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

H₀₂: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are used in this study.

1. Campus Climate- “a collage of the interpersonal and group dynamics that comprise the experience of participants in a collegiate setting” (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1992, p. 1).
2. Climate- a psychologically meaningful representation of the institutional environment (Pargament, Silverman, Johnson, Echemendia, & Snyder, 1983).
3. Culture- norms, rules, policies, customs, practices, values, history, and characteristics of an organization (Beebe, Mottet, & Roach, 2004; Schein, 1985)
4. Diversity- “differences in gender, racioethnicity, age, physical abilities, qualities, and sexual orientation, as well as differences in attitudes, perspectives and background” (Robinson & Dechant, 1997, p. 22).
5. Exempt status- employee’s pay status that reflects being paid based on a set salary (McConnell, 2003).
6. Faculty members - university employees who engage in teaching, research and outreach (Popovich & Abel, 2002).
7. Historically White Colleges and Universities (HWCUs) - colleges and universities that historically serve Caucasian American students (Vaughn, 1990).
8. Land-grant university- universities created by the Morrill Act of 1862 to “serve society by educating and training professionals, providing educational access to many, and working to improve the well-being and social status of farmers and industrial workers” (Aronson & Webster, 2007, p. 266).

9. Non-exempt status- employee's pay status that reflects being paid an hourly rate of pay (McConnell, 2003).
10. Perception of campus climate- feelings, attitudes, and discernment related to issues of diversity within the university setting (Mayhew, et al., 2006).
11. Support staff- employees at the university who perform work of a non-academic nature in support of academe (i.e. clerks, administrative assistants, technicians, library assistants) (Smerek & Peterson, 2007).

Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. This study focused on the perceptions of support staff at one land grant institution located in the Southeastern region of the United States.
2. The study employed a specific framework which may not include all aspects of the cultural and climate that may exist.
3. A random sample of the population was used to conduct the study rather than the entire population.
4. Support staff members who did not have university e-mail addresses were excluded from this study.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made in regard to this study:

1. The support staff members selected to participate in this study were representative of the population of staff members at the selected institution.
2. The participants answered the questionnaires honestly and consistently.

3. Staff professional characteristics varied depending on their educational level, classification of position, length of employment, and job affiliation.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study should be useful for general management purposes and to fulfill the climate recommendations outlined in the Fisher Report (2005). In addition, the study should be of assistance in informing other university personnel about the climate for support staff. The information garnered from this study should also assist upper-level administrators and policy makers in making changes that will benefit the institution as a whole. The study will also add to the literature in this area, which is sparse. It may also serve as a template for others to engage in similar research.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 presented an overview of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature on campus climate and the perceptions of faculty members, students and staff at historically white institutions of higher education. Chapter 3 describes the research methods, which includes the research design and approach, setting and sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 of this study consists of the analysis and results of the data. The study concludes with Chapter 5, which covers the discussion, implications, and recommendations for further study.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature to establish a framework for this study, which investigated university support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate. It begins with a general overview of diversity in higher education. This is followed by a discussion of two constructs that undergird this study: culture and climate. The next section presents a theoretical framework employed when conducting campus climate research. This section is followed by review of empirical research studies that investigated student, faculty, and staff perceptions of campus climate

Diversity in Higher Education

The number of persons from diverse backgrounds pursuing higher education at predominantly white institutions has gradually increased since the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the ruling in the U.S. Supreme Court case *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978)* (Cohen, 1998). As a result of these events, creating a climate that embraces and enhances diversity in historically white institutions, which is where this study was conducted, has been important to the core functions of institutions of higher education (Milem, 2001). Diversity has been defined as “differences in gender, race/ethnicity, age, physical abilities, qualities, and sexual orientation, as well as differences in attitudes, perspectives, and background” (Robinson & Dechant, 1997, p. 22). Diversity concerns have become a

central focus of institutions of higher education. This has resulted in the creation of policies and programs aimed at “(a) increasing the numbers of persons that represent diverse populations, and (b) improving the climate that would sustain this diverse population” (Brown, 2004, p. 21).

The challenge to adequately address diversity efforts is twofold. First, it requires a psychological and social adaptation of predominantly white, middle-class and male faculty and staff to increasingly diverse populations (Block, Roberson, & Neuger, 1995). Secondly, it requires adequate training and development opportunities for faculty and staff to work with diverse populations. Such training includes helping people to assume ownership for working with others and teaching in a way that shows a commitment to the organizational dogma of respect for all (Brown, 2004). While certain landmark court cases, mainly *Bakke*, *Hopwood*, *Gratz v. Bollinger*, and *Grutter v. Bollinger*, have increased the numerical representation of persons of color attending predominantly white institutions of higher education, fostering a campus climate that is welcoming for all is still difficult for many institutions (Hurtado, 1992). Although institutions of higher education have made progress increasing the number of underrepresented groups on campus, it is important to remember that race still matters on college campuses, which is evident by the expressions of racial antipathy and violence which often occur (Chang, 2000). Such incidents are less aggressive than they once were, but the consequences are still just as desecrating. Acts against people because of race or ethnicity have taken on new forms which may not leave lasting impressions, thus leading some to think that racial antipathy has been annihilated from the confines of higher education (Chang, 2000). These incidents are informed by the varying perceptions of racial diversity.

Although this is only one part of the many areas that fit under the diversity umbrella, it is the area that gets the most attention from people in the general public and on college campuses across the nation. Perceptions of the campus climate for diversity vary for students, staff, and faculty (Hurtado, 1992; King & Watts, 2004; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, Der-Karabetian, 2000; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006). One way to help create meaningful and effective change so that diversity can flourish is by examining the climate of institutions and organizations and using that information to foster a culture of acceptance.

Culture and Climate as Constructs

Culture and climate are important within organizations and institutions. They provide educational stakeholders with research models and approaches; however, they also offer a framework for understanding the complexities of operational management (Peterson & Spencer, 2000). These constructs provide members with a sense of purpose or meaning of their job and institution (Peterson & Spencer, 2000). From a human resources standpoint, culture and climate offer provisions for attracting, selecting, and socializing new employees. Although they are often confused by definition and use, there is a difference between climate and culture.

Organizational culture refers to the norms, rules, policies, customs, practices, values, history, and characteristics of an organization (Beebe, Mottet, & Roach, 2004; Schein, 1985). Spradley and McCurdy (1997) describe culture as being “acquired knowledge that people use to interpret, experience and to generate behavior” (p. 2). Ibarra (2001) define culture as values, traits, or lists of characteristics that are used to define people. Culture is combined with other powerful and conflicting organizational

subcultures and society's overarching culture that may invoke change regardless of communal values and beliefs (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983)

The values and beliefs within the culture contribute to shared meanings, understandings and expectations which are tacit, distinctive to a particular group of people, and transmitted to new members (Louis 1980). Values and beliefs can be implicit or explicit. They inform everyday operations within organizations and reflect the deep manifestation of the organization. Values and beliefs are part of its intellectual and subconscious substructure (Brown 1998), whereas symbols and artifacts, such as slogans and mission statements, are more superficial disclosures (Schein, 1985).

Schein (1985) described three cognitive levels of organizational culture. First, at the cursory level are those artifacts of organizational culture in both physical and social environment that can be observed, seen, felt, and heard by organizational members. At this level, attributes include visible awards and recognition and the way people interact with organizational members and outsiders. The second level represents espoused values about artifacts explored in the first level. "Espoused values are those which developed within a group when decisions are made by the group and found to succeed" (Frew, 1997, p. 178). At the second level, organizational members express their local and personal values regarding the organizational mission, creed, or slogan. Examples include the notion of shared decision making, the goal of higher education, and embracing diversity. The third level represents elements of culture that are beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and underlying shared convictions that guide symbolic interactions and behaviors. They are unseen and are not identified in daily interactions. At this level many unspoken rules

exist subconsciously. Organizational members become acclimated to the attributes of this level over time, thus reinforcing the invisibility of their existence (Schein, 1985).

The culture of organizations is directly linked to the people in the organization, who partake in the implementation and interpretations of rules and policies applicable to everyday situations. “Since members are not born or exist solely within their respective organization, they import a multitude of meanings from other ‘more or less significant’ spheres of social life” (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1999, p. 3). Members within organizations do not equally ascribe to and embrace a homogenous culture, as culture is strained with converse values, clashing action plans, and combative occupational interests (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1999). Culture is an important part of any organization; however, climate is also important as it informs the culture of an organization.

Organizational or campus climate is often defined as the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define institutions and its members within institutions of higher education (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). It is, in a sense, the pulse of the organization. Justiz, Wilson, & Bjork (1994) perceived organizational or campus climate as a “set of experiences and traditions that define the characteristics of a particular campus” (p. 12). Climate refers to the perceptions of the organization’s members on the social, political, and physical nature of their personal relationships affecting their ability to work within the organization (Denison, 1996). Edgert (1994) defined campus climate as “a collage of the interpersonal and group dynamics that comprise the experience of participants in a collegiate setting” (p. 53). Climate is also referred to as a psychologically meaningful representation of the institutional environment (Pargament, Silverman, Johnson, Echemendia, & Snyder, 1983).

Campus climate embraces the culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies comprise campus life (Green, 1989). It is “the formal and informal environment in which we learn, teach, work, and live in a post-secondary setting” (California State Polytechnic University 2000, p. 1). Owens (1995) states “culture refers to the behavioral norms, assumptions, and beliefs of an organization, whereas climate refers to the perceptions of persons in the organization that reflect those norms, assumptions, and beliefs (p. 82). Fostering a harmonious campus climate promotes efforts to diversify institutions of higher education (Edgert, 1994; Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998) as in such climate policies are often created and implemented to make campus environments more inclusive for all. Welcoming campus environments significantly influence students’ academic performance and graduation rates (Edgert, 1994; Hurtado et al., 1998) and are vital to their success (Hurtado, 1992; King & Watts, 2004; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, Der-Karabetian, 2000) and to increased productivity of faculty members through a re-conceptualization of scholarship in terms of research deemed important by minority faculty members (Austin, 1990).

There are internal and external aspects of campus climate. From an internal perspective, cultural links have been made to the following organizational outcomes and functions: personal performance and productivity (Akin & Hopelain, 1987; Sherwood, 1988; Fisher, 1989); strategic planning and implementation (Arogyaswamy & Byles, 1987; Schein, 1986; Schwartz & Davis, 1981); recruitment and selection (Gross & Schichman, 1987; Kays, 2008); self-selection (Soeters & Schreuder, 1988); socialization (Pascale, 1984); and innovation in new product development (Feldman, 1988). From an external perspective, the climate of an organization is gauged by the ability to compete

with other organizations (Roskin, 1986), the ability to change the environment (Akin & Hopelain, 1986) and the management of the cultural effects in relation to diversifying employees (Malekzadeh & Nahavandi, 1990). The climate of an organization distinguishes one organization from other organizations. Some of the elements of culture and climate similar; however, there is a difference.

Culture is one dimension of climate. There are three other dimensions: (1) ecology- the physical or material factors found within organizations; (2) organization- the organizational and administrative structure; (3) milieu- the characteristics of individuals within institutional structures (Owens, 1995). From this point of view, climate is defined as “the characteristics of the total environment of an educational institution” (Flint, 2000, p. 6). Owens (1995) further posits that the contemporary concepts have positioned culture as the prime dimension in defining the organizational climate.

Campus Climate Framework

Although the elements of the campus environment are complex and difficult to conceive, Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen (1999) created a framework to provide “a conceptual handle for understanding” (p. 17) the various elements of campus climate. The framework, which consists of four dimensions, was created from concrete observations of institutions and individuals and, more importantly, it denotes programmatic solutions. This framework was initially introduced in a study conducted on Latino/a students (Hurtado, 1994); however, it evolved into a framework for practitioners and researchers to use to study and improve the campus climate for diversity at various institutions.

These four constructs are internal and are governed by institutions of higher education. The dimensions are: (1) compositional or structural diversity- the numerical delineation of underrepresented groups; (2) the psychological dimension- perceptions and the degree of trust and hostility among varying groups; (3) the behavioral dimension- relations among different groups; and (4) the institution's history and legacy of inclusion or exclusion of diverse groups (Hurtado, 1994; Hurtado et al., 1998; 1999; Hurtado Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008). "The institutional climate for diversity is conceptualized as a product of these various elements and their dynamics" (Hurtado, et al., 1999, pg. 20). The four dimensions are discussed in the following section.

Structural Diversity

Compositional or structural diversity is the actual presence of underrepresented diverse groups within the infrastructure of institutions (Hurtado et al., 1999). It is deemed paramount when studying campus climate, as scholars have found a link between minority students' perceptions of the campus climate, adjusting to the institutional culture and race-based experiences on campus (Hurtado et al., 2008). This construct is a focus when upper-level management and institutional leaders implement diversity-related programs and/or policies aimed at increasing the number of minority students, faculty, administrators, and staff at a given institution.

Most institutions of higher education have reviewed the actual number of women and minorities as a way to meet slated diversity goals, but the mere increased presence of women and ethnic/racial minorities "has allowed some campuses to claim progress when, in fact, little has been done to transform the culture and climate of the institution" (Hurtado, et al., 2008, p.7). The presence of individuals from diverse backgrounds allows

for cross-cultural interactions, especially when such opportunities are immersed throughout the curriculum. This helps create a more comprehensive approach for opportunities for intergroup dialogue, social interaction, and meaningful discourse (Hurtado et al., 2008). Such interactions can positively affect student learning outcomes over an extended period of time (Engberg, 2007; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Pike & Kuh, 2006). These elements are needed to ignite motivational forces of change.

Institutions of higher education have begun to use equity indicators to explore components of an institution's structural diversity, such as the equity scorecard (Bensimon, 2004). Employing factual numbers to impel equity, such as salary equity studies, as well as the portrayal of diverse groups, like the equity score card, informs other dimensions of the campus climate, mainly the psychological climate and intergroup associations (Hurtado et al., 2008). Institutions have begun to address issues of structural equity in a few areas:

- (1) access to an institution's programs and resources;
- (2) retention rates by academic program, completion of basic skill course, and degree attainments;
- (3) institutional receptivity in the form of representation at all levels of the campus;
- and (4) excellence in terms of the racial/ethnic representation of students in courses or majors that lead to advanced study, high levels of student achievement, and the pool of students eligible for graduate study (Hurtado et al., 2008, p. 8).

Issues of equity in higher education, which are examined through the structural diversity construct, are typically not deemed applicable to climate research; however, underrepresentation of any group tends to reinforce conventional ideas pertaining to the success (Thompson & Sekaquaptewa, 2002) and/or failure of marginalized groups.

Although important and necessary, increasing the number of diverse groups does not adequately address and improve the overall campus climate at institutions of higher education (Milem, Chang & Antonio, 2005; Hurtado et al., 1998; 1999). Moreover, increasing the number of diverse groups on campus without fostering a welcoming climate can result in conflicts and contention amongst groups (Hurtado et al., 1998; 1999). The structural diversity dimension is one way to fathom campus climate since structural diversity must exist in order to impact perceptions and behaviors (Hurtado et al., 2008).

Psychological Dimension

Accounting for the actual number of diverse groups at a given institution is only the first step in assessing the overall campus climate. The psychological climate, the second dimension of the framework, measures the extent to which persons perceive racial turmoil and intolerance (Hurtado, 1992), the support and commitment for diversity from the institution (Hurtado et al., 1999), the singling out of individuals because of their background or gender (Nora & Cabrera, 1996) (Hurtado et al., 2008), intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 1996) and attitudes towards those from different ethnic backgrounds (Hurtado, et al., 1998). It also measures the extent to which there are perceived gender inequities and discrimination (Hurtado et al., 2008). It is critical to examine this dimension to truly understand the climate since perceptions are informed by the campus environment and are a “potential determinate of future interactions and outcomes” (Hurtado, et al., 1999, pg. 37). Perceptions of the psychological climate may vary within ethnic groups depending on their sense of ethnic identity.

Racially and ethnically diverse students, faculty, and staff tend to view the campus climate differently, due to past experiences in fluctuating climate conditions and background characteristics (Hurtado, 1992; Loo and Rolison, 1986; Cabera and Nora, 1994; Nettles, 1988; Mayhew et al., 2006; Smith, 2004). In addition, an individual's power and position within the structure of the institution, as well as his or her social rank as an 'insider' or 'outsider' may lead to varying viewpoints surrounding climate issues (Hurtado et al., 1999). Cultural levels and past experiences within racial and ethnic groups have also been found to cause varying perceptions of the campus climate can occur (Hurtado et al., 1998). All of these factors must be considered when addressing the psychological dimension.

Behavioral Dimension

The behavioral dimension of the campus climate attempts to measure authentic reports of overall social interaction; the level of engagement and interaction of differing racial and/or ethnic groups; and the essence of intergroup relations (Hurtado, et al., 1998; 1999). This assessment of the behavioral dimension of campus climate analyzes encounters between and among varying racial groups (Hurtado et al., 2008).

This dimension has been examined from two crucial junctures: campus-facilitated interactions (Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado, 2005) and the essence of positive and negative social interactions (Gurin et al., 2002; Sáenz, 2005; Sáenz, Ngai & Hurtado, 2007) in various social situations (Hurtado et al., 2008). "Campus-facilitated experiences intended to improve student engagement with diversity, disrupt stereotypical attitudes and behaviors, and enhance student learning" (Hurtado et al., 2008, p. 16). These events (specific programs, seminars, curricula) provide opportunities for students to interact

across racial lines, but the quality or essence of those cross-cultural interactions usually depend on their cultural interactions prior to coming to college (Sáenz, 2005; Sáenz et al., 2007). As the racial composition of colleges and universities continue to increase, it is critical to examine existing interventions that foster interactions (Hurtado et al., 2008) and the essence of those interactions (Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2005).

Institution's History and Legacy of Inclusion or Exclusion

Although this dimension was excluded from this research study, it warrants a place in this review of literature. It informs the other dimensions and current climate conditions are linked to the historical vestiges of schools and colleges that were once racially segregated (Hurtado et. al, 2008).

Most predominately white institutions have a history of minimal access for students of color (Thelin, 1985). These students have historically turned to minority serving institutions of higher education e.g. American Indian Colleges (AICs); Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs); or Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). These institutions provided them with social and psychological support by fostering educational environments that support their students' intellectual development (Pascarella, Whitt, Nora, Edison, Hagedorn, Terenzini, 1996), which increases academic persistence and degree completion (Allen, 1992; Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991).

The historical dimension of inclusion or exclusion is directly linked to a long history of resistance to desegregation in American higher education and also informs the current climate and influence practices (Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado et. al, 1998). Past struggles of inequities and inequalities regarding the needs of diverse groups have been partly addressed through legal pressures and prolonged litigation to require

predominately White institutions to level the playing field for students from diverse or underrepresented backgrounds. The need for these extreme measures may have imparted a message of institutional resistance that has lead to blunt belligerence toward people from diverse or underrepresented backgrounds (Hurtado et. al, 1998).

Campus Climate Research Studies

The climate of organizations and institutions can influence an individual's behavior (Baker, 1992). It also informs managing communications, which is important when dealing with conflict resolution (Pettitt & Ayers, 2002). The climate of an organization can alienate certain members of the institution. Moreover, the organizational climate has been linked to workplace satisfaction (Allen, 2001; Duggan, 2008; Luthans & Youssef, 2007) as well as to institutional effectiveness (Brown & VanWagoner, 1999; Luthans & Youssef, 2007). Climate influences student retention, attrition, academic performance, and graduation rates (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998). The success or failure of faculty members is also strongly affected by the campus climate of an institution (Hurtado, 1992; King & Watts, 2004; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, Der-Karabetian, 2000). Campus climates that are inclusive at their core allow for broader conceptualizations of scholarship for all faculty members (Austin, 1990), which in turn impacts student learning outcomes (Hurtado, 1994; 2006).

Most of the scholarly research on campus climate in higher education has examined perceptions of students and faculty. The research tends to link back to the teaching and research mission of post-secondary education as faculty members usually focus on areas that concern them the most (Rothmann, & Essenko, 2007). There is sparse research on support staffs' role in post-secondary education. Research investigating

support staffs' perception of campus climate for diversity is even more scant. Before reviewing the empirical studies examining support staffs' perceptions of campus climate, an understanding of their role in higher education is warranted.

Role of Support Staff

The main characteristic of an institution of higher education as a work organization is its two distinct social structures: academic staff, and non-academic administrative and support staff (Davis, 1996). Support staff refers to all non-academic staff employed within the higher education sector. Academic staff and non-academic staff have different jobs and supervisory reporting structures, which could result in different employee problems and concerns. Although their jobs are different, there is one common thread that exists for most of them, the student.

Staff members play a pivotal role at institutions of higher education as they control and oversee the day to day operations of the university such as human resources, financial operations, facilities, information technology professional, non-academic staff support (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Support staff members are responsible for numerous tasks such as: organizing meetings, scheduling appointments, making travel arrangements, processing reimbursement for travel, assisting faculty and upper-level administrators, campus safety, and addressing student concerns (S. E. Davis, personal communication, June 05, 2008). Support staff members serve as financial managers as they review and analyze monthly financial reports, coordinate grants and contracts, and reconcile general and subsidiary ledgers. They are often the nucleus of the office, assisting in the creation and development of knowledge and innovation in higher education institutions (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001). These

members also plan, organize and direct administrative services including human resources, payroll, data processing, and purchasing. Much of their day is consumed with maintaining internal policies and procedures for administrative activities (S. E. Davis, personal communication, June 05, 2008).

Research on support staff, although scant, offers several key factors related to stress and burnout among staff. These are work overload, time constraints, lack of promotion opportunities, inadequate recognition, inadequate salaries, changing job roles, inadequate management, inadequate resources and funding, and overwhelming student needs (Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrman, & Wergin, 1987; Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, & Blix, 1994; Gillespie et al., 2001; Winefield & Jarrett, 2001). These difficulties undermine the quality, productivity, and creativity of employees' work, in addition to employees' health, well-being, and morale (Calabrese, Kling, and Gold, 1987; Everly, 1990). The stress of support staff is escalated when dealing with faculty members, and researchers have noted the relationship between academic and administrative staff as being an area of potential conflict (Reid, 1998; Bladerston, 1995). The contention may be due to faculty value systems, which are focused on research, teaching, and outreach, that normally exclude support staff members, even those at professional and senior levels (Bladerston, 1995). To make matters worse, support staff members are also the victims of academic snobbery and academic contempt for bureaucracy (Bladerston, 1995).

Support Staffs' Perceptions of Campus Climate

Support staff members in institutions of higher education have been largely overlooked in the literature, especially regarding research designed to capture their perceptions of campus climate. Research that has been done investigating support staffs'

perceptions of the campus climate revealed staff discrimination based on race, age, gender, physical disability, sexual orientation, level of education, and job affiliation (Mayhew et al., 2006; Ruckall, 1997). Organizational climate has also been linked to workplace satisfaction (Duggan, 2008) as well as to institutional effectiveness (Brown & VanWagoner, 1999). While support staff members perceptions of the campus climate has been largely overlooked in the literature, their role in creating and sustaining diversity-related programs and initiatives has been captured.

Baker (1999) examined the role of faculty and staff in supporting a diversity and tolerance program at Hood College. The program was implemented to foster faculty and staff collaboration and cooperation to support minority students (e.g. "international students, domestic students of color, sexual minorities and disabled students") (p.2) in need of extra support. Research has indicated that effective diversity training programs foster changes in perceptions of individuals or groups who may be marginalized or underrepresented (Baker, 1999). In this program, faculty and staff were trained to be mentors to this special population. The diversity training program addressed racial, gender, and sexual orientation attitudes through self-inquiry, observation of the environment, sharing of thoughts and ideas, and solution-finding orientation. Students were asked to provide a list of their needs from faculty and staff, which was deemed one of the most valuable components of the program. Addressing these needs provided stakeholders with empathetic lenses from which to view marginalized groups of students. While it is important to include staff in the implementation of diversity training programs, it is also imperative that their perceptions of the climate for diversity be explored.

Ruckall (1997) investigated the climate for support staff members at a Canadian institution of higher education (Ruckall, 1997, pg.1). The selected institution had approximately 31,000 students, with 22 schools and colleges, including schools of dentistry and medicine. The goal of the study was two-fold. First, the researcher sought to determine the number of male and female support staff members and their affiliated job level at selected institution; secondly, the researcher examined staffs' perceptions of the climate at the institution based on issues and concerns revealed in the literature on women in academe, which were made germane to support staff. Chilly climate refers to "the ways in which men and women are treated differently by faculty, administrators, advisors, and others, both in the classroom and in outside learning experiences" (Sandler, 1986, pg. 6). Sandler (1986) held that women were subject to behaviors known as micro-inequities. This behavior refers "to ways in which individuals are singled out, overlooked, ignored, or discounted because of factors like sex, race, or age" (Ruckall, 1997, pg. 1). Sandler (1986) argued that some people were not viewed for their individual status, but placed in identifiable groups for which preconceived notions overshadowed their skills and abilities to perform on the job, while undermining their self-confidence and damaging morale.

The researcher tallied the number of full-time support staff members at the selected institution by job type and level (Ruckall, 1997). There were 1,737 full-time support staff members, with 1,031 (59%) women and 706 (41%) men. Support staff members at the selected institution were affiliated with one of seven employee groups. This affiliation with an employee group was dependent upon their job function (Ruckall, 1997). For example, members of the Association of Employees Supporting Education

Services (AESES) were administrative assistants, technicians, computer programmers, and library assistants. Staff members who were physical plant workers, power engineers, and food service workers belonged to Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) employee group. The researcher found that many of the employee groups were segregated in terms of gender (Ruckall, 1997). For example, the CAW employee group was 81% male; however, the AESES employee group was comprised of only women (100%).

The researcher randomly selected 518 support staff members to participate in the survey questionnaire to gather perceptions about the campus climate at the selected institution (Ruckall, 1997). Participants were asked to respond to a series of Likert-type questions developed after reviewing relevant literature. Of those surveyed, 269 (52%) useable surveys were returned. Many of the responses (55%) came from the AESES, which consisted of 100% women. Most of the respondents were women (67%) with a response rate of 61.6%, while men represented 33% of respondents with a response rate of 39.3%. As far as support staffs' educational background, 35% of women had a high school diploma or less; 34% had technical or vocational training, and 31% held bachelor degrees. On the other hand, 19.3% of men respondents had a high school diploma or less; 40% had technical or vocational training, while 41% held bachelor's degrees. Most of the respondents (58% of women; 59.8% of men) were 45 years of age or younger. Men (42.5%) reported having 14 or more years of service within their departments and at the University, while only 20% of women reported such seniority.

The results revealed that some staff felt discriminated against because of their race, age, gender discrimination, physical disability, or sexual orientation (Ruckall, 1997). Moreover, women and younger support staff reported being discriminated against

based on family responsibilities. They also reported not having a sense of belonging at the institution. Support staff, most of whom were women, reported feeling as though their opinions were not valued in their given work units and posited being treated rudely by faculty members (Ruckall, 1997). Also, younger staff reported having a heavier workload, felt as though the institution was not committed to employment equity, and criticized the lack of communication from upper level administrators (Ruckall, 1997).

Another study examined support staffs' perception of campus climate for diversity at a Mid-Western historically white institution of higher education (Mayhew, Grunwald, and Dey, 2006). The study focused on three of the four dimensions of the framework: structural dimension, psychological dimension, and the behavioral dimension of campus climate. The purpose of the study was to determine "what factors influence staff perceptions of their campus community as having achieved a positive climate for diversity" (Mayhew et al., 2006, p. 65). The researchers sought to determine the psychological climate by surveying staffs' perception of the climate and perceived departmental and institutional commitment to diversity. They explored the behavioral dimension by indentifying staffs' diversity-related experiences on campus, which included their interaction with diverse groups (Hurtado et al., 1998).

The sample size consisted of 1029 staff members who were randomly sampled from a population of 2202. The response rate was 42.5% as 437 usable surveys were returned. Males represented 45% of the participants, while females represented 65% of the sample. Eighty-three percent of the respondents were White, 17% were staff of color (African American = 10.7%; Asian/Pacific = 2.8%; Hispanic/Latino/a = 0.5%; and Native American = 2.3%; Other = 1.7%). Twenty-one percent of the respondents had

been employed at the institution between 6 and 10 years; twenty-six percent had earned a Master's degree. Most respondents (56%) held unclassified positions, with 30% having classified positions. Classified employees are regularly scheduled to work 40 hours. Their responsibilities and duties may include administrative, professional, para-professional and technical, office and clerical, skilled crafts, and service positions. These positions are expected to be active for more than 6 months or may be on a flexible-year appointment. The majority (56%) worked in academic affairs; 29% worked in business affairs; 22% worked in student affairs, while 8% worked in university advancement. Eighty-five percent of the surveyed staff worked in a department or work unit consisting of predominantly white employees, while 88% of staff members worked with White supervisors, in which 60% were male. Only 46% of the respondents reported working in predominantly female departments or work units, 16% indicated predominantly male work units or departments, while 38% reported having gender balance in their departments or work units.

The results indicated that males and staff with higher levels of education were more likely than females and those with lower levels of education to perceive the climate for diversity positively (Mayhew et al., 2006). Non-White staff members were less likely to perceive a positive campus climate for diversity than their White counterparts. Also, staff members that were older were more likely than younger staff members to perceive the campus climate for diversity as being positive (Mayhew et al., 2006). Finally, staff members who worked in diverse friendly environments were more likely than staff who worked in non-friendly diverse environments to perceive the climate for diversity as being positive manor (Mayhew et al., 2006).

Duggan (2008) explored staff perceptions of the campus climate at the community college level. Staff were defined as all noninstructional staff who serve in various roles at community colleges. This study surveyed noninstructional staff perceptions of the overall campus climate, but also included the impact of gender on staff interactions with students and faculty and their perception of workplace satisfaction. In this study, Duggan's (2008) sampled population included support staff perceptions as well as other professional positions (executive, administrative, or managerial positions) within selected community colleges.

Participants were asked to select their level of agreement with sixty Likert type items which explored the following factors pertaining to their work environment: "organizational, peer, and supervisory support; task interdependence; faculty-student interactions; job satisfaction; and organizational commitment" (Duggan, 2008, p. 50). E-mail invitations (4,020) were sent to all noninstructional staff at seventy-five randomly selected public and private two-year institutions of higher education situated in one accrediting region spanning across six states. One-hundred and sixty-two e-mails were returned, resulting in a low (12%) response rate (Duggan, 2008). Most of the respondents (75% were female) held jobs classified as being other professional (46.5%), followed by clerical and secretarial positions (23.9%), service and maintenance (6.6%), and lastly skilled workers (1.3%) (Duggan, 2008). Respondents who held executive positions (28% women; 28.9% men) reported having an annual salary between \$66,000 and \$74,999. Those respondents who held other professional (31% women; 30.4% men) reported an annual salary between \$41,000 and \$50,999. Clerical and secretarial staff (59% women;

40% men) reported an annual salary between \$31,000 and \$40,999; however, data were distorted due to the low response rate of men in this work group (Duggan, 2008).

Overall, respondents (two-thirds of both men and women) were satisfied with their jobs and reported a good fit regarding skill level and job responsibilities (Duggan, 2008). Women were more likely than men to report that their institution's values and culture provided a good fit with their values. Most of the male and female executives were satisfied with their job fit, however, less than one-third of females and two-thirds of male service and maintenance staff were as satisfied with their job fit as others. Moreover, higher levels of job satisfaction were reported for women who had been in their positions for ten or more years. Results indicated that more women than men were committed to the institution, had a sense of belonging at the institution, and enjoyed working for the institution (Duggan, 2008). Female executive staff had the highest ratings of the organizational climate, while male service and maintenance staff maintained low ratings. Service and maintenance staff rated the organizational climate related to peer group support lower than those who worked in executive, administrative, or managerial positions.

Comparing Faculty and Staff Perceptions

A small group of studies have examined faculty and staff perceptions of the climate within an organization. Sheldon (2001) examined faculty and staff perceptions of the campus climate at Cypress College in 2001. The survey examined participants' general perception of the campus climate, job satisfaction, ethnic diversity, and perceptions of students and programs (Sheldon, 2001). The faculty-staff campus climate instrument was distributed to 1,000 faculty, staff, and administrators on campus in fall

2000. Three hundred and thirty-one surveys were returned, which yielded a return rate of 33%. Most of the respondents (57%) were males, the majority (85%) of them were 35 years of age or older, 23% were between the ages of 45 to 54, and 20% were 55 or older (Sheldon, 2001). The greater percentage (71%) of the participants were Caucasian, while 9% were Latino/a, 7% Asian, 3% African American, 10% reported they were other ethnicities, and less than 1% were Native American. The majority (72%) of the survey participants were full-time employees, most of whom were faculty members (62%), while the minority of workers indicated they were administrators (8%), and non-faculty employees (6%) (Sheldon, 2001).

Results indicated that more than half of participants (51%) perceived the general college atmosphere as being positive. Many of them (70%) contended that the campus was friendly, 67% reported that it was comfortable, while 66% indicated that the campus had a climate of respect. Sheldon (2001) reported that just over half (51%) were satisfied with the ethnic diversity of its faculty members, 26% were neutral regarding the matter while 23% expressed dismay with the ethnic diversity of faculty members. Less than half (49%) were dissatisfied with the ethnic diversity of staff and administrators, 27% of the participants were neutral, while 24% were dissatisfied with ethnic diversity amount staff and administrators. Most of the participants rated prejudice as being non-problematic as most (76%) felt that ethnic minorities and women were afforded equal opportunities for advancement, appreciation, and progression. Finally, over half of the participants believed that the college was adequately responsive to the needs of its diverse population of students, faculty, and staff (Sheldon, 2001).

California State Polytechnic University (2002) conducted a study on the Pomona Campus to investigate staff and administrator's perceptions of the general campus climate and to examine the extent to which diversity was perceived and manifested on campus. A survey was developed after reviewing the literature on campus climate and existing campus climate instruments. The survey gathered participant's perceptions of the campus climate (institutional climate and departmental climate), experiences and interpretations of sensitivity levels on campus, intergroup relationships, job satisfaction and fairness in the work environment, and a sense of belonging within the institution.

In the fall of 2000 surveys were mailed to staff and administrators. Four hundred and seventy-one surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 34.3%. Results indicated positive perceptions of the overall institutional and departmental climate. Staff and administrators rated their immediate work environment as being more positive than the overall institutional climate. However, when data were analyzed by background characteristics, gay, lesbian, or bisexual staff and administrators viewed the campus climate as being homophobic (California State Polytechnic University, 2002). Staff and administrators who were racial/ethnic minorities considered the campus climate to be somewhat racist. Although staff and administrators reported infrequent experiences regarding disparaging and negative comments or actions; a small percentage (11%) of participants reported hearing negative comments about gay, lesbian, or bisexual people, while 9.9% reported hearing negative comments about people who spoke with an accent. Participants also reported being harassed because of their gender (17.4%), ethnic/racial identity (15.5%), and political views (10.8%). Some staff and administrators (42.3%) reported feeling uncomfortable discussing topics deemed racially insensitive, while

25.1% revealed feelings of awkwardness when they were the only person present of their own racial/ethnic group. Racial/ethnic staff and administrators indicated the need to change personal characteristics (e.g. appearance, name, language) in order to conform to social norms.

Kelly and Fenner (1996) conducted an overall assessment of campus climate at Villanova University. This study is significant not only because support staff perceptions were included in the assessment, but also because the researcher demonstrated how the institution used survey results to make specific improvements in the organizational climate. The survey asked participants to respond to Likert-type questions pertaining to job satisfaction, communication within departments or work units, collegial decision making, satisfaction with leadership (department supervision and senior university officials), level of trust and respect at the institution (departmental and university-wide), and recognition for job accomplishments.

The final version of the survey, which yielded 702 responses (45%), was disseminated to over 1800 faculty and staff members. The researchers did not report the actual results of the study, yet they detailed the process of utilizing the research to improve climate conditions at the institution under study. Results were presented to senior level administrators to discuss the strategy to “initiate action-oriented enhancements” (Kelly & Fenner, 1996, pg. 12). Senior level administrators met with department heads and deans of the colleges and schools to report survey data. These mid-level administrators reviewed results to expound on topics of concern. The authors offered an example of how the financial affairs unit transformed “information to

judgment to action” (Keller & Fenner, 1996, pg. 13). A summary of the series of steps are as follows:

An executive summary of campus climate survey was distributed to administrators in each academic and administrative department at the institution. Results indicated ten areas of concern, in which teams were created to address the most adverse areas. Transformational goals were reviewed and approved by stakeholders. The first organizational transformational goal and the action steps are listed below:

Goal: To create and foster a climate that values the contribution of all employees, rewards for good performance and provides opportunities for personal and professional development.

Action Steps:

- Faculty/staff adopted ten leadership styles from senior level manager
- Sensitivity and motivational training were held for unit managers and supervisors
- Greater time investments by all employees and improved communication from the top down
- Increased training and development for faculty and staff
- Cyclical visits from the Vice President to assess the quality commitment climate
- Created recognition and incentive programs to encourage quality service

Keller & Fenner (1996) demonstrated how campus climate survey results were incorporated into ongoing assessment efforts at the institution of study. Campus climate studies are guided by assumption that embracing and understanding the role of climate

leads to better work environments, which in turn leads to institutional effectiveness (Schein, 1985; Tierney, 1990).

In a similar study (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1990) perceptions of campus climate were examined at a comprehensive community college to investigate the linkage between climate and institutional effectiveness. In this study, Brown & VanWaggoner (1990) postulated that organizational climate is a major indicator of an institutions focus on interrelationships between members' perceptions, behaviors, and social communications and institutional effectiveness regarding its ability to successfully fulfill the slated goals. The researchers were interested in measuring the extent to which full-time employee ($n = 215$) perceptions of the climate fostered a positive campus climate in which the organization could be more effective (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1990). The Institutional Climate Survey (ICS) measured group members' perceptions of the organizational climate using four climate indicators: general college and department; job satisfaction; training and professional development; and institutional integrity.

Overall, most participants rated the college positively on fulfilling stated institutional goals and mission, which added value in the community at large. Many agreed that their work units supported novel ideas, rational decision making was used, which indicated that they felt valued in the planning process (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1990). On the contrary, faculty and staff negatively rated the institution's use of effective teamwork. Faculty, classified, and technical professional staff negatively rated training and development citing scheduling conflicts and added workload responsibilities as the main reason (Brown & VanWaggoner, 1990). Moreover, most faculty and staff rated their associations with the institution positively and believed their peers demonstrated

plausible integrity. Paradoxically, classified staff rated their fit and association within their work units negatively. Despite the unfavorable work associations for staff, most respondents positively rated the institutional commitment to diversity and reported being infrequent victims of discriminatory injustices (Brown & VanWagoner, 1990).

In response to physical violence due to a racial incident, Yang (1992) conducted a qualitative study at South Central University to understand White faculty, staff, and undergraduate student's perceptions and feelings of the racial campus climate. Using Helm's White Racial Identity Attitude scale (1990), Yang (1992) created 10 semi-structured interview questions to gain an "understanding of how white people in the United States come to terms with their whiteness and their connection with a racist society" (Yang, 1992, pg. 2). Helms (1990) White Racial Identity Attitude Scale stages are as follow: (1) contact, unaware of racism and acceptance of status quo, (2) disintegration, racial moral dilemmas cause disorientation and confusion, (3) reintegration, distortion of information resulting in idealization of Whiteness and denigration of other groups, (4) pseudo-independence, racial information is interpreted differently resulting in a liberal outlook, (5) immersion-emersion, redefining whiteness in search of personal standards, and (6) autonomy, nonracist standards are prevalent and internalized. According to Helms (1990), "the dynamic cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes that govern a person's interpretation of racial information" (p. 184) occurs through the evolving of the aforementioned racial identity statuses and are conveyed depending on the presence of dominance in the individual's personality disposition (Helms, 1995).

Thirteen students, faculty, and staff members ranging from 19 to 61 years of age ($n = 39$) were selected to participate in the semi-structured interviews (Yang, 1992). “The participants were selected by the interviewers on the basis of availability” (Yang, 1992, p. 3). Half of the faculty held terminal degrees, while half of the staff members held college degrees. Many of the interviewees reported coming from rural, middle class areas (Yang, 1992). Participants were interviewed by 13 Master’s level counseling trainees. The interviews were taped and ranged from 30 minutes to one and a half hours in length.

The results indicated that faculty interviewees were at Pseudo-independent stage of racial identity attitudes, in which racial information is interpreted differently resulting in a liberal outlook (Yang, 1992). Conversely, staff and student interviewees were at the lower end of the racial identity scale, Contact and Disintegration stages, which indicates an unawareness of racism and acceptance of the status quo. The amount of racism witnessed by respondents and their level of commitment towards fighting racism varied (Yang, 1992). Some interviewees were uncomfortable discussing racism, while others were relaxed and willing to communicate openly and honestly. Most interviewees displayed two contradictory and opposing racial attitudes, one intellectual and the other empathic, and the other ethnocentric and hostile (Yang, 1992).

Another study (Pashiardis, 1996) included support staff perceptions of the campus climate, as well as faculty and professional staff perceptions. The researcher investigated perceptions of the climate in an effort to improve and promote effective communication and collaboration among department/work units and university leadership and to improve the overall institutional climate. The various levels of management styles were used to show the connection between production and job satisfaction. Four systems of

management styles adapted by the researcher were used to measure perceptions of the composite climate at the institution. The four systems used were: (a) System 1, *Exploitative Authoritative System*, in which motivation is characterized by threats, poor communication, no teamwork and highly authoritative management style; (b) System 2, *Benevolent Authoritative*, where motivation is delineated by rewards, use of effective communicative techniques and little teamwork; (c) System 3, *Consultative System*, in which the motivation to perform is rewards coupled with some involvement, increased communication throughout the organizational structure, and increased use of teamwork; (d) System 4, *Participative Group System*, where leadership displays confidence in subordinates, motivation is based on economic rewards associated with stated goals, open communication, and palpable amounts of teamwork (Likert, 1967).

Two instruments, one for staff and one for faculty, were developed to measure perceptions of climate in six categories: formal influence, communication, collaboration, organizational structure, job satisfaction, and student focus (Pashiardis, 1996). The content areas of the instrument were the indistinguishable, while the actual survey items were worded differently to fit the role of faculty and staff. Participants were instructed to rate items in these six categories on a five-point scale, with one being the lowest. There were two scales for each item; one for what 'is' or the current situation being experienced by participants and one for what 'should be' or the way things should have been (Pashiardis, 1996). Needed improvements were made evident by the gap between what 'is' and what 'should be,' which were ranked in order of priority.

Support staff made up 25% of the population, professional staff 23%, and faculty 53% (Pashiardis, 1996). Most university personnel rated the composite climate at the

institution in between Benevolent Authoritative (System 2) and Consultative (System 3), which suggests that the university had a low to medium levels of job satisfaction and productivity. Results indicated that staff perceived the overall climate (formal influence, collaboration, organizational structure, and student focus) as being more positive than their faculty counterparts (Pashiardis, 1996). Faculty perceived the climate as being worse as their years of service increased, while the exact opposite was true for administrative staff. They reported increased collaboration and cooperation among other staff members as years of university service increased (Pashiardis, 1996).

Although campus climate research is typically investigated using quantitative research methods, a research team used focus groups to investigate student, faculty, staff, and senior level administrator attitudes and perceptions of the campus diversity climate at a midsize private liberal arts university (Morrow, Burris-Kitchen & Der-Karabetian, 2000). The institution previously collected quantitative data surveying perceptions and attitudes of the campus climate for diversity. Results of the quantitative data revealed differences in satisfaction with racial harmony between ethnic groups. African Americans were more likely to negatively rate racial consonance than were Latino/a and White students. African Americans and Latino/ Americans perceived more unfair treatment in class due to race or ethnicity than did their White counterparts.

To gain insight about the diversity climate, focus groups were used to collect qualitative data from students, faculty, staff, and upper level administrators (Morrow et al., 2000). After conducting a pilot study, the researchers decided to collect data from one heterogeneous group consisting of adult students and four homogeneous focus groups for the following four ethnic groups: Latino, Latina, African American women and African

American men. Data were also collected from focus groups consisting of faculty, staff and senior administrators (Morrow et al., 2000). Data were collected from 61 focus group participants (28 men and 33 women) varying in racial/ethnic backgrounds. The open-ended questions asked participants to expound on the quality of interactions between students, faculty and staff, give positive and negative aspects of diversity on campus, and offer suggestions for improving campus diversity (Morrow et al., 2000).

The qualitative data from the focus groups revealed similar findings. Participants revealed positive and negative aspects of diversity on campus. Most participants commented on the lack of diversity among faculty, staff, and administrators, although many posited a diverse student body and a strong commitment to diversity from the institution (Morrow et al., 2000). African American students, students who lived on campus, and faculty noted the prevalence of negative interactions among groups. Also, staff and faculty postulated the need to have diversity addressed systematically during the hiring of faculty and staff members. Staff also reported conflict when working and communicating with staff from other work units (Morrow et al., 2000).

Faculty, staff, and administrator perceptions of the campus climate for diversity were investigated at College of the Canyons (COC) (Mattice, 1995). One-hundred and twenty one useable surveys were returned, resulting in a 31.8 rate of response. The survey consisted of three sections: attitudes, experiences at COC, and possible solutions. Overall, there was not general consensus among participants that diversity should be valued at COC and that it should be actively supported or proposed. While all administrators and most of the faculty (90%) supported diversity and its role in the academic community, only 84% of staff reported the same. However, half of faculty and

58% of staff surmised that promoting diversity would result in an over abundance of underprepared [minority] students (Mattice, 1995). Most faculty (86%), administrators (88%), and staff (80%) indicated that the institution had achieved a positive climate for diversity. Eighty-five percent of administrators, 64% of staff, and 60% of faculty disagreed that affirmative action leads to hiring less qualified faculty and staff. Furthermore, staff contended that the institution overly emphasized the need to diversify, compared to 31% of faculty. Support staff members (63%) had no meaningful diversity-related experiences (i.e. diversity training or diversity discussions). Forty-four percent of faculty and 83% of administrators reported participating in a diversity-related activity in the past year. Twenty two percent of faculty, 16% of administrators, and 3% of staff reported the lack of qualified minority candidates as a barrier to increasing diversity. Staff also reported feeling ignored and omitted from many decision-making processes (Mattice, 1995).

Student Perceptions of Campus Climate

Post-secondary education has been given the task of educating, training, and preparing future leaders for many segments of society. Many college students have their first experience with other racial groups when they arrive at college (Rankin & Reason, 2005) as campuses across the nation have become more racially and ethnically diverse. Students interact with others during formal and informal opportunities. Some minority students at historically white institutions feel that they are not respected by faculty members and that the university is not fully committed to diversity (Brown, 2004). Furthermore, these students often feel as though they are not a good fit at the institution, or the extent to which a student feels that she or he belongs at the institution (Bean and

Bradely, 1986). Increasing the number of racial and/or ethnic minorities on campus without appropriate education about potential racial issues may result in adverse interactions and consequences (Gurin, 1999). These interactions inform the campus climate from the perceptions of students on three levels: 1) the general campus climate, 2) the racial campus climate, and 3) the academic climate.

Campus climate is gauged by aggregated evaluations made about the environment at different levels: general campus climate, racial campus climate, and academic climate (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). The academic campus climate (ACC) embodies students' observations about their academic experience. This includes treatment by faculty, peers, academic advisors, mentors and being perceived as serious students regarding their educational endeavors (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). The general campus climate (GCC) relates to one's perception of the overall climate of an institution. Research indicates that students of color enrolled in historically white colleges and universities (HWCU) perceive the general campus climate as being hostile when compared to their Caucasian peers (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado, 1994; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Riordan, 1999). The racial campus climate (RCC) consists of observations as a racial minority on campus, which includes experiences with racism to the belief that the university is not doing enough to support diversity (Hurtado, 1992; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). Minority students' perception of the racial campus climate is often more negative than those of the majority as this group is often subject to racial discrimination and prejudice on campus (Hurtado, 1992; Nora & Cabrera, 1996; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Riordan, 1999). Research has also linked academic success or failure of nontraditional students- those

from racial or cultural groups other than White, middle class, young and heterosexual to campus climate at institutions of higher education (Astin, 1993; Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Sedlacek, 1996). Campus climate research also delves into issues faced by women, especially those in male-dominated academic disciplines at institutions of higher education (Hall & Sandler, 1982; Allan & Madden, 2006). Experiences with discrimination and prejudice on campus inform women and minority students' perceptions that their institution is not implementing policies and practices to foster diversity (Allan & Madden, 2006; Hall & Sandler, 1982; Hurtado, 1992).

Reid and Radhakrishnan (2003) investigated the extent to which student perceptions of racial and academic climate arbitrate the relationship between students' racial/ethnic background and their perception of the general campus climate. This study examined undergraduate and graduate students' perceptions of the general campus climate (GCC), the racial campus climate (RCC) and the academic campus climate (ACC). Using the stratified sampling technique to secure data from all racial groups, minority students were selected from a comprehensive list provided by the Office of Minority Student Affairs at the selected institution (Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003).

Results suggested that undergraduate minority students (53%), especially African Americans (13%), perceived the general campus climate as being more negative than White students. African American graduate students also perceived the general climate more harshly than any other racial/ethnic groups. Asian American students reported that the institution could be doing more show a commitment to racial diversity (Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003). African American students viewed the academic climate as being

more negative than any other racial/ethnic group (Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003).

Furthermore, African American undergraduate and graduate students negatively perceived the racial climate when compared to Asian and Latino/a students who, conversely, perceived the racial climate as being more negative than White students.

Riordan (1999) gauged climate as perceived by students based on two aggregated evaluations: classroom climate and climate outside of the classroom. Classroom climate pertains to the way in which minorities perceive the climate within the classroom setting (Riordan, 1999). Results of the study revealed that some minority students hesitated to approach professors because they questioned the amount of support they received, while other minorities felt that faculty had lower academic expectations for them and perceived them as having lower abilities. Some students reported that faculty members were unwilling to answer their questions in class and assumed that professors did not have the confidence that minority students could understand the material with a quick explanation (Riordan, 1999). Some students also reported feeling conspicuous and isolated being the only minority in a classroom setting. Outside of the classroom issues of racial polarization and the realities of feeling different arose for some minority students. With respect to campus programming and student organizations, many minorities complained that efforts were not made to target the interests of the minority community.

Research shows that campus climate of institutions of higher education has a great deal to do with the success or failure of nontraditional students- those from racial or cultural groups other than White, middle class, young and heterosexual (Astin, 1993; Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Sedlacek, 1996). Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr (2000) compared the experiences and

perceptions of the campus cultural climate for Asian American, Latino/a, African American, and White students by their different racial/ethnic group. The Cultural Attitudes and Climate Questionnaire (CACQ) was mailed to 964 freshman and junior students at a mid-Atlantic university. The survey was comprised of 100 Likert-type statements regarding the campus climate. Most (40%) of the participants were White, 25% were African American, 22% Asian American and 13% Latino/a. Initially only 30% of the surveys were returned, however, phone calls and follow-up letters resulted in 60% overall return rate (Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr, 2000).

African American students experienced and perceived significantly more interracial tension in residence halls when compared to White peers. African Americans also experienced more racial conflict and turmoil and racial separation when compared to Asian American and White students. Moreover, White students rated the overall climate as being satisfactory when compared to African American and Asian students. Personal experiences of campus racism were reported by Latino/a and African Americans students as these groups were more likely to feel pressures from the majority culture to “conform to racial and ethnic stereotypes regarding their academic performance and behavior...in order to be accepted” (Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr, 2000, p. 182). When asked about treatment by faculty, teaching assistants, and students, White students reported significantly fairer treatment when compared to Asian American and African American students. Finally, higher levels of comfort when interacting with similar and dissimilar racial/ethnic groups were reported for African American and Latino/a students, while White students expressed lower levels of comfort when interacting with non-Whites.

Ten campuses across the United States were selected to participate in a campus climate study designed to assess conditions for underserved and underrepresented populations (Rankin & Reason, 2005). Surveys were sent to eight public and two private institutions of higher education that were sporadically situated throughout the United States. The survey gathered student perceptions of the institution's commitment to diversity related issues and concerns, personal experiences with harassment, and perceptions of the overall campus climate. While some campuses solicited all students, faculty, and staff to participate, other employed purposeful and snowball sampling techniques to ensure a sufficient participation from each racial/ethnic group. African Americans, Asian Americans, Middle Easterners, American Indian or Latinos/a were collapsed into 'students of color.' Although faculty and staff were included in the sample, only student perceptions of the campus climate were reported.

Students of color (33%) experienced more harassment, mostly (84%) through derogatory comments, than did White students (22%). Male and female students of color significantly experienced more harassment than did White students. More students of color (49%) reported that they had observed offensive and intimidating environments, while 39% of White students reported witnessing such actions. In terms of the overall campus climate, students of color rated the climate as being "racist, hostile, and disrespectful as compared to White students" (Rankin & Reason, 2005, p. 52) who rated the campus climate as being friendly and respectful. Moreover, students of color perceived both classroom and workplace climates as not being tolerant or accepting of those from underrepresented groups, while White students felt that the climate was welcoming and supportive of those from diverse backgrounds. White students positively

rated their institution's support for diversity, while students of colors posited that administrators failed to foster diversity.

High-achieving Latino/a students were selected to participate in a study that investigated the extent to which "student background characteristics, college structural characteristics, general climate measures, and student behaviors" (Hurtado, 1994, p. 9) influenced perceptions of the campus racial climate. Sophomores and juniors, 386 Chicanos, 198 Puerto Ricans, and 275 other Latino/a group ($n = 859$), were chosen from various institutions around the United States and Puerto Rico. Students' demographic information, structural characteristics of the college, measures of campus climate, and student inter- and intra-group behaviors were gathered from the proposed instrument. Participants indicated high levels of social interactions with other racial/ethnic groups, yet they perceived racial conflict and minimal overall support, cooperation, and collaboration from campus administrators. Not only did Latino/a students report dismal support from administrators, but many believed that faculty discriminated against them because of their racial/ethnic background "despite their strong achievement characteristics upon college entry" (Hurtado, 1994, p. 13). Conversely, students who perceived institutional support for diversity were less likely to report being victims of racial discrimination or racial/ethnic tension. Students who attended large college campuses were more likely to report racial/ethnic discomfort, while students who attended institutions with high enrollments of Hispanic students were less likely to report racial/ethnic conflict. Finally, students who interacted across racial/ethnic groups were not significantly more likely to perceive a hostile campus climate (Hurtado, 1994).

Some studies included gender as a factor when investigated perceptions of campus climate. In one of the earliest reports on campus climate, Hall and Sandler (1982) noted subtle differences in the way male and female students were treated in the learning environment, which impacted students' intellectual growth and capacity. Researchers (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001; Solorzano, Ceja, and Yosso, 2000) refer to these subtle differences in treatment as microaggressions- conscious, unconscious, verbal and nonverbal, and visual forms of insults directed toward women and minorities. These actions are pervasive, covert, innocuous, and nebulous and thus are difficult to investigate (Howard-Hamilton, 2003). This creates high levels of anxiety for victims of this type of abuse. Although women have made significant gains regarding access to higher education, but even when they have attended the same institutions and adhered to the same curricula as men, the educational experience for women was considerably different (Hall and Sandler, 1982). This difference can be attributed to the different level of expectations that faculty exhibit towards male and female students. Inconspicuous biases in the way teachers or faculty communicate with students may be judged as being the norm, so that when expressed they often go unnoticed (Hall & Sandler, 1982). Moreover, the biased expressions from faculty may "communicate to their students limiting preconceptions about appropriate and expected behaviors, abilities, career directions, and personal goals which are based on sex rather than on individual interest and ability" (Hall & Sandler, 1982, p 2). For women, the lower expectation may bring forth disparaging feelings and emotions regarding their academic and career ambitions (Hall & Sandler, 1982).

Allan & Madden (2006) gathered perceptions of what they labeled as the chilly climate for undergraduate women at a northeastern research university. The researchers investigated whether quantitative and qualitative research methods could explain the varying conclusions reached investigating classroom climates for women. Quantitative data were gathered from randomly selected female juniors and seniors in fields of study which comprised mostly of men (e.g. business and engineering), those comprised mostly of women (e.g. elementary education and journalism), and those in which both women and men were equally represented (e.g. physical education and kinesiology).

Survey results depicted a “complex picture of the classroom climate” (Allan & Madden, 2006, p.692). There were no significant differences in sexually offensive behaviors or silencing behaviors based on gender enrollment patterns across all majors. Nevertheless, male behaviors contributed to the climate chilling factors when respondents were enrolled in male-dominated areas of study. “However, it is possible that male behaviors were identified as occurring more frequently in male-majority fields simply because there were more men in these classrooms” (Allan & Madden, 2006, p. 693). Perceptions of differential treatment from faculty based on gender enrollment patterns were not significantly different, yet significant differences were found on scales that measured “behaviors related to stereotyping women and dismissing and demeaning” (Allan & Madden, 2006, p. 693). Overall, women rated the classroom as being supportive to somewhat supportive, with no significant differences reported between groups. On the contrary, the qualitative data revealed disturbing behaviors relating to the chilly climate regardless of enrollment patterns. The primary themes were as follow: “discouragement, invisibility, time and space, questioning women’s competence, and defining women by

their sexuality” (Allan & Madden, 2006, p. 694). The same participants also reported feeling “comfortable” and “equal” in their classrooms (Allan & Madden, 2006, p. 694).

Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate

Antidiscrimination legislation and affirmation action has not aided in increasing the number of racial and/or ethnic minorities in full-time faculty positions at institutions of higher education (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009). Nationally, faculty of color make up 16% of full-time professoriate, African Americans (6%), Latina/os (4%), Asian Americans (6%), and American Indians (0.5%) (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2008). People from diverse backgrounds are underrepresented on faculties in higher education due to pipeline impasse, market stress, and campus climate (Turners, Myers, and Creswell, 1999). The first two factors are relative to the economic elements of supply and demand and are acquainted to external forces. The third factor, campus climate, is an institutional determinant (Turner et al., 1999). These factors may also account for the lack of full professors in higher education as only 5.3% are African American, Latino/a, or Native American (Ryu, 2008). The American Council on Education (ACE) (2005) found that, “From 1991 to 2001 college enrollment of minorities rose nearly 1.5 million students (52 percent) to more than 43 million” (p. 11). With this large increase of minority student representation, the numbers of faculty of color in the academic workplace has lagged far behind (Antonio, 2003). Most (80-90%) of the faculty and staff in many colleges and universities are still White (Kays, 2008), although research studies have shown that having a heterogeneous faculty yields outcomes beneficial to students’ overall educational experience (Institute for the Study of Social Change, 1991; Smith, Wolf & Busenberg, 1996). Research conducted on issues that

affect retention, promotion and tenure, and job performance of underrepresented minority faculty identified the following issues as factors: racism, sexism, homophobia, climate, isolation, salary issues, coping strategies, lack of mentoring, occupational stress, devaluation of minority-focused research, bias in hiring, and institutional ethos (Jackson, 2001; Jayakumar et al., 2009; James & Farmer, 1993; Kolodny, 2002; Turner et al., 1999).

Turners, Myers, and Creswell (1999) qualitatively explored minority underrepresentation at seven institutions in the Midwestern Higher Education Commission (MHEC). Sixty-four faculty members of color, many of whom were administrators, who were either tenured or tenure-track were interviewed. Faculty members were from the social sciences, humanities, biological and physical science, and education. The researchers found the continued underrepresentation of minority faculty members, as well as unwelcoming and unsupportive work climates caused by pervasive racial and ethnic bias. A few respondents, 5%, reported not having encountered racial and/or ethnic discrimination; however, 95% reported handicaps of isolation, being denied tenure or overlooked for promotion, gender bias, language barriers, lack of mentoring and lack of support from senior level administrators. Faculty also reported being expected to handle minority affairs and being held to standards higher than those for White faculty, both of which contributed to the negative climate in their departments. Turner et al.'s work also identified factors that positively contribute to faculty persistence: (1) satisfaction with teaching, (2) support from administrative leadership, (3) positive mentoring relationship, (4) a sense of accomplishment, (5) collegiality, and (6) meaningful relationships with other faculty of color.

Similar to research conducted by Turner et al. (1999), Thomas and Hollenshead (2001) examined the quality of work-life of faculty using quantitative and qualitative research methods. The researchers compared the experiences of women of color with White women based on their responses to Faculty Work-Life Study (FWLS). Among the women who responded, 14% were women of color of which 5% were African American/Black women, 2.5% were Latina, 6% were Asian American, and 0.6% were Native American. Themes from individual interviews with ten African Americans, 5 Latinas, 3 Asian American, and 1 was Native American were identified and coded.

The researchers identified themes that represented critical factors that influence career satisfaction and retention. These themes consisted of the following: “organizational barriers, nonsupportive and unwelcoming institutional and organizational climates, the lack of respect from colleagues for their scholarship and research agendas, the unwritten rules by which they are expected to govern themselves in the academy, and the lack of mentoring they received during their academic careers” (Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001, p. 175). Results further indicated that White women found it easier to learn and comply with the unwritten rules than women of color. Mentorship support is another aspect lacking for women of color. An overwhelming majority of the participants, including women of color, White women, men of color and White men indicated they have a male mentor whereas only 25% of women of color, 90% of White women, 29% of men of color and 86% of White men reported having a mentor of their race/ethnicity.

An unfriendly institutional and organizational environment is one major theme identified. Women of color reported a less positive experience at the institution of study

than did the members of the other groups. They reported receiving less recognition and experienced a lack of respect from colleagues. Women of color were least likely to report that they believed their research was valued by their colleagues, that their colleagues solicited their opinions about research ideas, and that colleagues generally used appropriate criteria to assess their work when compared to White women. In fact, several of the women of color respondents reported feeling pressure to “change their research agendas to fit in with those in their units” (Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001, p. 171). Women of color also reported feeling as though their peers had lower expectations of them and that they had to work very hard to be perceived as legitimate scholars. One of these women reported the following regarding the institutional climate:

The University does not want outsiders. That's why I think that even though there are these policies for minorities and for women and for women of color, that when you get down to operationalizing it and dealing with the person who brings a different set of values and aspirations, that the climate doesn't change because you are the outsider. And you do have to be the person who's always confronting, who says something that no one agrees with. Sometimes you get really exhausted by that role (p. 170).

Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han (2009) not only explored the influences of institutional and environmental factors, but they linked the factors to the retention of racial and/or ethnically diverse faculty in the academy. Existing data collected as part of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) were used in this study. The survey was administered at 416 colleges and

universities in the United States, which included two- and four-year institutions. The main analyses were conducted on a subsample of all faculty of color within the sample, which represented 11% of the total population ($n = 33,451$). Within the subsample of faculty of color, 942 were African American/Black, 1,097 were Latino/a, and 1,630 were Asian/Asian American.

Results revealed that more faculty of color who perceived a negative climate (44%) indicated a strong desire to leave compared to those who perceived a mild (30%) or a welcoming climate (27%). Of those faculty members who reported high levels of job satisfaction, more than half (70%) had not considered leaving their academic positions, which may suggest that retention rates may be improved by increasing overall job satisfaction. Disaggregating the data for faculty of color revealed that American Indians (44%) more often reported intentions to leave their positions, followed by African Americans (39%), Latino/a (36%) and Asian American faculty members (27%). Results from aggregated data for faculty of color indicated a positive association between the racial climate and retention if they perceived their scholarship to be appreciated and valued, or if they are given autonomy and independence. Disaggregated data indicated a lasting negative impact of a negative racial climate on job satisfaction for African American and Latino/a faculty members that extends beyond autonomy, appreciation for research, and the promotion process; however, this was not the case for Asian American faculty members (Jayakumar et al., 2009). Both aggregated and disaggregated data identified perceptions of the campus racial climate, autonomy and independence, review and promotion process, and having one's research valued by colleagues in the department as being the complex factors which contributes to satisfaction and retention for faculty of

color. These differences show the substantial variation between varying racial and/or ethnic groups, and purports the need to study these groups individually.

Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh and Bonous-Hammarth (2000) examined the status of African American/Black faculty members in the U.S professorate at six predominantly White Midwestern college campuses, as well as this group's access and success. The study compared the characteristics, experiences, and achievements of African American/Black faculty to those of their White counterparts. Questionnaires were received from 1,189 faculty members from the six colleges and universities situated throughout the country. The sample included 35 African Americans, 130 Asian Americans, and 1,024 White American participants. The questionnaire examined: "(a) background factors, (b) intervening factors, and (c) outcome factors" (Allen, et al. 2000, p. 116).

The researchers compared African American faculty members' tenure status, academic rank, years at institution, teaching workload, administrative workload, student relations and overall satisfaction to their White counterparts. Results indicated that African Americans were significantly disadvantaged on all measures when compared to their Whites counterparts. These disadvantages can result in serious, persistent obstacles to the recruitment, retention, and success of African American faculty members. Findings further indicated workload and satisfaction variances between the groups may have been a result of institutional contexts and norms found in faculty departments. Such practices may lead to inequities by creating norms and holding that constant for African American faculty members. The authors conclude that "the system of White supremacy, operating

in the guise of individual and institutional racism vigorously resists yielding access to the professorate to African Americans...” (p. 126).

Conley& Hyer (1999) reported the results of a “multi-faceted assessment effort for diversity” (p. 4) at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech). The researchers noted four dimensions reflected in this multi-facet assessment: (1) the history of segregation and slow desegregation process, (2) a status report of the minority faculty, staff, students, and women, (3) conducting a campus climate survey of faculty, staff and students and (4) interviews with constituencies and visits with other institutions. Given the dimensions, the researchers decided to focus on the survey results of the faculty members.

The survey attempted to measure affirmative action attitudes, level of commitment to diversity efforts by institutional leaders, departmental and institutional climate, and incidents with discrimination and harassment (Conley& Hyer, 1999). The instrument also surveyed participant’s knowledge and zeal to attend various diversity-related programs and services offered at the institution. Participants were also asked to respond to questions pertaining to demographic and employment characteristics, which included work location, years of university service, sex, age, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability status, and citizenship status.

Since the selected institution is a land-grant university, one-fifth of the participants were housed off-campus at cooperative extension units, branch campuses and experimental stations. Most of the on-campus participants (63%) were tenured or tenure-track faculty, while 21% were administrative or professional faculty; 16% were research or non-tenure track faculty. Women constituted one-third of the participants. More men

(63%) held tenured faculty positions when compared to women (25%). Men were also older and had more years of university service than women participants (Conley& Hyer, 1999).

The results indicated a significant difference in perceptions of the campus climate for diversity when grouped by gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Thus, variable perceptions were informed by individual experiences and viewpoints, which depict the lack of homogeneity when understanding campus climate (Conley& Hyer, 1999). For instance, women faculty perceived the campus climate for diversity more negatively as they were frequently subjected to discrimination or harassment when compared to their male colleagues. Moreover, African American faculty housed on-campus perceived the campus climate for diversity as being hostile and were pessimistic about the university's commitment to diversity and the success of ethnic minorities serving in faculty positions. Asian American faculty members reported encountering unfair treatment based on their enunciation; however, their perception of the campus climate for diversity did not significantly differ from their white counterparts (Conley& Hyer, 1999). While more than half of the faculty members with disabilities perceived support and accessibility in their departments positively, more than 60% felt as though they were not socially accepted. Lastly, while gay, lesbian, and bisexual faculty members reported positive treatment and acceptance as professionals in their given departments and subject areas, they did not feel socially affirmed within the university community. They further purported that non-heterosexuals were the least likely group to be supported when compared to other underrepresented groups on campus (Conley& Hyer, 1999).

Shultz, Montoya, & Briere (1992) surveyed the institutional climate for faculty members from Kutztown University in an effort to determine perceived support and obstacles to career elevation, mostly for women. The study addressed perceived aspirations and barriers for advancement and perceived family and institutional support. Results indicated that the institutional climate was immersed with male domineering attributes. Men were more likely to receive top levels administrative positions when compared to their female counterparts. Women reported feeling burdened with the strains and pressures of family involvement, while men reported far fewer personal stresses. Men felt as though women were afforded equal opportunities to ingress and egress through their academic departments especially with the onset of Affirmative Action; however, women felt that men held all the advantages in this given area. Results further revealed that men perceived themselves as being receptive and tolerant of women as men and women were supported equally as far as general advancement were concerned. Women reported the prevalence of the “good old boy network in place that precludes gender equity” (Shultz et al., 1992, pg. 5).

Kossek & Zonia (1993) gathered faculty perceptions of the diversity climate at a large Mid-Western public university, which had a two-fold objective: “(1) What is the current organizational climate regarding diversity and pluralism, and (2) how successful has the administration been in fostering a climate that places a high value on diversity” (p. 68). Upper level administrators at the selected institution purported making advances in fostering the necessary campus climate favorable to the recruitment and retention of women and racial/ethnic minority faculty. Several task forces were established to monitor recruitment and retention efforts. Surveys were sent to all White female and racial/ethnic

minority faculty members at the selected institution. White male participants were randomly selected since this group was comparatively large. A total of 1529 surveys were sent to faculty, while 51% (775) were returned (Kossek & Zonia, 1993).

Overall results indicated faculty who were White women and racial/ethnic minorities embraced diversity efforts more than White males. Racial/ethnic faculty members rated the importance of diversity to the institution higher than their White counterparts. Racial/ethnic minorities also rated the qualifications of other racial/ethnic faculty higher than white participants (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). Men rated the qualifications of women lower than women rated themselves; however, White women rated women as being more qualified than men faculty. Racial/ethnic minority faculty members reported receiving less departmental resource allocation when compared to support received from White faculty. Conversely, White women were more likely to believe that racial/ethnic minority faculty members had a lower chance than Whites to receive departmental support.

Summary

Research investigating the perceptions of the campus climate for diversity has been conducted on students, faculty, and administrators as this area has been deemed paramount by those conducting the research (Rothmann & Essenko, 2007). Climate research has investigated perceptions of students (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado, 1994; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Riordan, 1999) and faculty (American Council on Education, 2005; Conley & Hyer, 1999; Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Shultz et al., 1992). In general, White faculty, students,

and staff perceived the campus climate for diversity more positive than faculty, students, and staff of color.

Research studies investigating student perceptions of the campus climate shows that nontraditional students- those from racial or cultural groups other than White, middle class, young, and heterosexual perceived the campus climate as being negative (Astin, 1993; Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Sedlacek, 1996). The success or failure of faculty members is also strongly affected by the campus climate of an institution (Hurtado, 1992; King & Watts, 2004; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, Der-Karabetian, 2000). Minority faculty members and women often experience racism, sexism, homophobia, climate, isolation, salary issues, coping strategies, lack of mentoring, occupational stress, dilapidation of minority-focused research, bias in hiring, and institutional ethos (Jackson, 2001; James & Farmer, 1993; Kolodny, 2002; Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999).

In order for designs of campus climate assessment to be meaningful, multiple perspectives and perceptions among faculty, students, staff, and administrators which are paramount to achieve a climate that is welcoming for all, need to be taken into account (Hurtado & Dey, 1997). Research studies that investigated support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate revealed that staff felt discriminated against because of their race, age, gender discrimination, physical disability, or sexual orientation (Ruckall, 1997). Female support staff members, those with lower levels of education and racial/ethnic minorities were less likely to perceive the climate for diversity in a positive manner (Mayhew et al., 2006). Also, those staff members who worked lower level positions, for instance service and maintenance staff, rated the organizational climate related to peer

group support lower than those who worked in executive, administrative, or managerial positions (Duggan, 2008).

Although previous research has identified faculty and staff's perceptions of campus climate, a comprehensive assessment of climate as it relates to staff will provide a different set of lenses from which to view diversity, which will provide information which may prove vital to improving the overall institutional culture. This assessment has the potential to positively impact student learning outcomes for minority students, assist in breaking down the barriers faced by faculty members of color, and improve overall institutional effectiveness.

Chapter 3

Methods of Study and Instrumentation

This chapter provides the methods used to conduct the study. It describes the purposes, significance, research questions, design and approach, setting and sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis.

University Context

The university selected for this study was a historically white university in the Southeastern region of the United States of America. The institution is widely regarded as having strong academic programs, extensive public service outreach, and comprehensive research and development activities. The university offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in its 13 schools and colleges. The institution served only white students until 1964. In 1980, the institution enrolled 18,603 students, of which 58% of the population were male and 5% students of color. In 1990, 21,537 students were enrolled at the institution, of which 56% were male, while 9% were students of color. At the end of 2000, 21,860 students were enrolled, of which 52% were male and 14% were students of color. During the fall 2008 semester, the institution enrolled 21,954 undergraduate students and 2,576 graduate or professional students, with student/faculty ratio of 18:1. There were 12,525 male students and 12,005 female students enrolled. The student ethnic/racial breakdown for the fall 2008 semester was as follow: 20,265 or 83% were White/Caucasian, 2,017 or 8% were Black/African American, 934 or 3.8% were Non-Resident Alien/International, 467 or 2% were Latino/a, 264 or 1% were Unknown,

439 or 1.7% were Asian/Asian American, and 144 or .5% were Native American/American Indian.

Ninety-four percent of faculty held terminal degrees, with 1,139 being full-time. Most faculty members were male (817 or 72%), while there were 322 (28%) female faculty. Most of the faculty were White/Caucasian (967 or 85%), 122 or 11% were Asian/Asian American, 50 or 4% were Black/African American, 31 or 3% were Hispanic/Latino/a, 4 or .3% were Native American/American Indian, and 1 or .09% were Unknown. The majority of the executive administrators employed at the selected institution were males, 213 or 64%, while 122 (36%) were females. Most of the executive administrators (313 or 93%) were White, 15 or (4%) were African American. Also, Asian Americans represented 4(1%) of the executive administrative team, Hispanic/Latinos/a represented 1(.2%), and Native Americans/American Indians represented 1(.2%), while 2(.5%) administrators reported their race as being Unknown. Most of the support staff members were White (67%), while 30% were African American/Black, 1% Asian/Asian American, .6% were Hispanic/Latino/a, and .4% Native American/American Indian. Males represented 34% of the support staff population, while females represented 66%.

In years past, the university has contended with various race-base incidences, which could indicate a lack of racial tolerance and cultural insensitivity throughout the institution. In response to these incidences, in 2005 the university developed a comprehensive diversity plan. The plan had several goals, mainly the institutionalized commitment to increase the recruitment, retention, and representation of diverse groups, such as ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities. In addition, in November 2005 the Fisher Report, a review of the general conditions at the selected university, was

submitted to the institution. This report was completed by a team of higher education professionals not affiliated with the institution. Along with other suggestions, this report recommended that the institution refine its institutional diversity plan, conduct exit interviews with employees, especially women and persons of color, and mandate diversity training for campus administrators. The institution conducted diversity training for its administrators in 2006.

Research Questions

Research questions for this study addressed the extent to which there are differences in perceptions of the campus climate among university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education and (d) ethnicity.

Specifically, this study investigated the following research questions:

1. What is the structural diversity of support staffs' departments when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education and (d) ethnicity?
2. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.
3. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

Statement of the Null Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses were formulated to test for statistically significant differences:

H₀₁: There are no statistically significant differences .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity at the.

H₀₂: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

Qualitative data were also collected to explore issues that participants perceived as being necessary to improve the campus climate at the selected institution. The data were coded and grouped to identify major themes involving ways to improve the campus climate as well as specific views or issues important to support staff members.

Design of the Study

Instrumentation

The Miami University Campus Climate Survey instrument developed at the University of California at Los Angeles' (UCLA) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) was adapted and used for data collection. The survey questions had been tested over time and continued to hold content validity (Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006). Cronbach's alpha was used as a measure of reliability which ranged from 0.60 to 0.94, while internal validity was moderate to high (Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006). The researcher obtained permission to use and adapt the instrument (Appendix 4).

The researcher-adapted and renamed instrument originally developed to examine the climate at a specific institution titled, the Miami University Campus Climate Survey Instrument. Since the instrument was being used to look at the climate at Miami

University, it contained questions specific to that institution and to the surrounding community. It also included items that appeared to be gathering information that would lend itself to some follow-up studies at the institution. The original instrument was eight pages long, arduous, and cumbersome. The researcher used the questions that were built around research related to campus climate in general. The condensed version of the original instrument included questions pertaining to professional treatment and social acceptance in given work units, the climate of the institution as a whole, attitudes about ethnic groups, the level of commitment as seen by institutional leaders, and experiences with discrimination and harassment. The adapted instrument, renamed the Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS) was six pages in length, included 53 items and four sections: 1) background information such as gender, race, age, and level of education, 2) structural diversity, 3) psychological climate, and 4) behavioral climate (Appendix 2). Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the adapted instrument were conducted in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Cronbach reliabilities ranged from .80 to .92. These high reliability coefficients indicate that the scores are reliable for the randomly sampled population who completed the survey.

The instrument had consistency in measuring perceptions of the psychological campus climate and behavioral campus climate. Three of the four sections listed on the SSCCS addressed Hurtado's (1998) framework pertaining to campus climate. For this study, the historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion was excluded as this dimension involves a more extensive study of norms that may be ingrained in campus culture, policies, traditions, and historical mission. Following is a description of each of the four

sections. Qualitative data were collected at the end of survey through two open-ended questions. The full instrument is contained in Appendix 2.

Background Information

The first section of the instrument collected information about the participants' background. Items one through eight gathered demographic information about participants' gender, race, age, education, marital status, years of total employment, years of university employment, and job affiliation. These data will also be used to partially describe the nature of structural diversity along with the data described below.

Structural Diversity

The second section of the instrument collected information about the structural diversity of the participants' departments or work units. Questions nine through 12 specifically address racial and gender composition of staffs' work environment. Staff demographic data were also collected, but were not included in the structural diversity section.

Psychological Climate

The third section of the survey instrument gathered information about the psychological climate (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, consciousness, and beliefs about diversity). This section has 25 Likert-type questions and is scored on a 1 to 4 scale that includes the following response: 4 = Strongly agree; 3 = Somewhat agree; 2 = Somewhat disagree; and 1 = Strongly disagree. Higher scores indicate more positive perceptions of psychological climate.

Behavioral climate

The last section of the instrument, questions 38 through 51, surveyed the behavioral climate (i.e., how different racial and ethnic groups interact on campus). Participants were asked to rate the frequency of certain experiences such as harassment and discrimination by faculty and students using Likert-type questions, which are scored on a 0 to 4 point scale that includes the following response: 0 = N/A; 1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; and 4 = Frequently. Lower scores indicate a more positive behavioral climate.

Questions 52 and 53, which were on the initial instrument, were open-ended questions. Participants were asked: 1) In your opinion, what would improve the campus climate? 2) Do you have any other views or issues that you'd like to share with us?

Sources of Data and Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct this study and access e-mail addresses for support staff members were obtained through the institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB). A copy of the approval letter to conduct the study is included in appendix 1. Employee groups within institutions of higher education fit into two distinct structures: academic staff, and non-academic administrative and support staff (Davis, 1996). The population for this study was support staff members with e-mail addresses at the institution of study. Support staff members who did not have e-mail addresses were excluded from this study. Support staff refers to all non-academic staff employed within the higher education sector, including staff in academic support, administrative support and technical areas.

The human resources office provided the researcher with e-mail addresses and departmental affiliation for full-time, non-exempt support staff members. A random

sample of 300 support staff members' e-mail addresses were selected from a population of 1265 to participate in this study. Random numbers were generated through an online program that uses a JavaScript to generate sets of random numbers. The random numbers were used to identify e-mail addresses, which were formatted in Microsoft Excel. On Wednesday, January 21, 2009, the hyperlink to the Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS) was embedded within the information letter (See Appendix 2) that was sent via e-mail to the selected support staff members. The first reminder e-mail was sent on Wednesday, February 4, 2009, with subsequent reminders sent on Tuesday, February 10, Monday, March 2, and Tuesday, March 9, 2009. The rate of return was low, which prompted the random selection of 300 additional participants ($n = 600$). The second random sample of participants were sent e-mail invitations on Monday, March 19, 2009, with one reminder e-mail sent on Tuesday, March 24, 2009. Upon completion of the second mail-out and reminder, the researcher ceased attempts to gather additional data. The response rate was adequate to conduct the analysis and it was believed that additional attempts to garner more responses would not be effective.

Privacy and Confidentiality of Support Staff Data Collected

Data obtained from the surveys were not shared with others and the findings revealed in the study were aggregated by group. There were no foreseeable risks or discomforts associated with this study. The data were recorded electronically via SurveyMonkey.com. Only the researcher had access to the data as the database was password protected. The researcher's user ID and password were confidential and locked in a cabinet in the researcher's office.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were collected and coded for input into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. Descriptive data such as mean scores, maximum and minimum scores and frequency distributions were calculated for data obtained from the Background Information and Structural Diversity sections of the survey instrument. The null hypotheses were tested using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure. ANOVA is a research design “by which variations associated with different factors or defined source[s] may be isolated and estimated” (Sahai & Ageel, 2000, p. 1). A one-way ANOVA was computed for the Psychological Climate and a second one-way ANOVA was conducted on the Behavioral Climate sections to ascertain differences in perceptions of the campus climate of support staff based on staff demographic characteristics. The Psychological Climate section was scored on a 1 to 4 scale, (4 = Strongly agree; 3 = Somewhat agree; 2 = Somewhat disagree; and 1 = Strongly disagree). Higher scores indicated more positive perceptions of psychological climate. The Behavioral Climate section was scored on a 0 to 4 scale (0 = N/A; 1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Frequently), in which low scores indicated a more positive behavioral climate.

Qualitative data were collected from two open ended questions as previously noted. 1) In your opinion, what would improve the campus climate? 2) Do you have any other views or issues that you'd like to share with us?

Conclusion

This study used a quantitative and qualitative survey research design to capture the trends and details of situations, such as the convoluted issues that persist in support

staff work units and/or departments. Survey research is non-experimental research which seeks to understand characteristics of a population through gathering and analyzing data from questionnaires or interviews (Johnson & Christen, 2004). Using a mixed methods approach helps provide a more complete examination of a research problem than using a singular methodological approach (Johnson and Turner, 2003).

The Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS) was used to collect the quantitative data. A random sample of 600 full-time support staff members were selected to participate in this study. Staff members were sent e-mail invitations, in which there was an embedded link to access the online survey via [surveymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com). The dependent variable was the perception of campus climate as measured by participant responses to the Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS). The SSCCS included 53 items and four sections: (1) background information such as gender, race, age, and level of education, (2) structural diversity, (3) psychological climate, and (4) behavioral climate. The independent variables were: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

This chapter provided the methods used to conduct this research study. It described the purposes, significance, research questions, instrumentation, design and approach, setting and sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis. Results of both quantitative and qualitative data are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis and Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which support staff members' perceptions of campus climate differ when grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity. This chapter presents the results of study by presenting the answers to the research questions used to guide the study.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What is the structural diversity of support staffs' work units or departments?
2. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.
3. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

Sources of Data and Collection Procedures

The population of the study was the support staff at a land-grant university in the South. The institution is located in a small college town in the Southeastern region of the United States. It has slightly over 24,000 undergraduate and graduate students and thirteen degree-granting schools. The human resources office of the institution provided the researcher with e-mail addresses and departmental affiliation for all full-time, non-

exempt support staff members. Staff members without emails were not included in the population. A random sample of 300 support staff members' e-mail addresses were selected from a population of 1265 to participate in this study. Random numbers were generated through an online program that uses a JavaScript to generate sets of random numbers. The random numbers were used to identify e-mail addresses, which were formatted in Microsoft Excel. On Wednesday, January 21, 2009, the hyperlink to the Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS) was embedded within the information letter (See Appendix 2) that was sent via e-mail to the selected support staff members. The first reminder e-mail was sent on Wednesday, February 4, 2009, with subsequent reminders sent on Tuesday, February 10, Monday, March 2, and Tuesday, March 9, 2009. The rate of return was low, which prompted the random selection of 300 additional participants ($n = 600$). The second random sample of participants were sent e-mail invitations on Monday, March 19, 2009, with one reminder e-mail sent on Tuesday, March 24, 2009. Upon completion of the second mail-out and reminder, the researcher ceased attempts to gather additional responses. The response rate was adequate to conduct the analysis and it was believed that additional attempts to garner more responses would not be effective.

Data Preparation

Several values were missing from the data set. Missing cases were replaced with the series mean for each of the dependent variables. One case was deleted because no responses were reported on all of the items that related to the behavioral and psychological climates. Thirteen cases, or (11%) were missing for variables measuring the psychological climate, and 20 cases were missing for variables measuring the

behavioral climate. Table 1 shows the number of missing cases for the psychological and behavioral climates

Table 1

Missing Cases for the Psychological and Behavioral Climates

Variable	Valid	Missing	Percent Missing	N
<u>Psychological Climate</u>	103	13	11	116
<u>Behavioral Climate</u>	96	20	16.9	116

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was statistically significant for the variables measuring the psychological climate (.019), indicating that the data were non normally distributed for that variable. To correct for normality for the psychological climate, the square root transformation was performed; however, no improvement to normality resulted. The natural log transformation was also performed; however, normality did not improve. Consequently, the variable for the psychological climate was analyzed in its original form. The variables measuring the behavioral climate were normally distributed with a probability level of .20 for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic. With the missing values replaced, linearity between the variables was low ($r = -.136$). Linearity without replacing missing values was $r = -.157$. The original and transformed data were used for the analysis. The results of the analysis are reported in the following section.

Data Analysis

Descriptive data such as frequencies and percents were summarized for age, gender, level of education, and ethnicity. The descriptive data were used to determine the demographic profile of the participants and to partially answer the first research question, which addressed the structural diversity of support staffs' immediate work unit. Structural

diversity refers to the actual presence of underrepresented diverse groups within the infrastructure of institutions (Hurtado et al., 1999).

Research questions two and three were answered by testing the null hypotheses using two one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures. Findings are presented for the original data with missing values, and for the data with missing values replaced with the series mean. This study also sought to explore issues that participants perceived as being necessary to improve the campus climate. The findings added a more in-depth understanding of the psychological and behavioral context and also expanded the researcher's understanding of the quantitative findings and aided in interpreting the findings. The data were coded and grouped to identify major themes involving ways to improve the campus climate as well as specific views or issues important to support staff members.

Response Distribution

Surveys were distributed to three hundred randomly selected participants via surveymonkey.com. The rate of return was low, which prompted the random selection of 300 additional participants ($n = 600$). A total of 117 surveys were returned; however, one case was deleted ($n = 116$) because no responses were reported for either dependent variable, thus resulting in an overall return rate of 19%. The researcher proceeded with the study after many attempts to enhance the rate of return.

Demographic Characteristics

Most of the sampled population (39.7%) were age 45 – 54, while 15.5% were 24 to 34 years of age. Ninety-one, or 80.5%, of the participating support staff members were female. There was a small percent of participants who held only a high school or GED

degree (8.6). Most of the participants (91.4%) had educational experiences beyond a high school degree with 53.4% holding at least a two-year degree. A little more than thirty-six percent held at least a four-year degree. A small percent of them (8.6) had earned a Master's degree. Only one person held a doctoral degree.

Seventy-one percent of the support staff members were White/Caucasian, while twenty-four, or 20.9%, of the support staff were African American/Black. A very small percent of the respondents (7.8) reported themselves as something other than African American/Black or White.

Thirty-six percent of those responding had been employed at the institution from one to five years, while almost half had been employed for over 10 years. Most of the support staff members were married (64.7%), while 14.7% reported being single, never married. Thirteen percent of the sampled population had less than 10 years of total work experience, while 67% had worked for twenty years. Most of the staff members (38.5%) reported being affiliated with finance and university service, while 33.7%, reported being affiliated with academic affairs. Table 2 shows the frequencies and percents of the demographic information for all support staff members.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percents of Support Staff Demographic Information

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<u>Age</u>		
24 to 34	18	15.5
35 to 44	30	25.9
45 to 54	46	39.7
55 to 65 or older	22	18.9

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	91	80.5
Male	22	19.5
<u>Level of Education</u>		
High school diploma or GED	10	8.6
Some college, but no degree	43	37.1
2-year college degree	20	17.2
4-year college degree	31	26.7
Some graduate work, no Degree	1	0.9
Master's degree	10	8.6
Doctorate or professional degree	1	0.9
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	24	20.9
Asian/Asian American	3	2.6
Hispanic/Latino/a	0	0
Native American/American Indian	1	0.9
White/Caucasian	82	71.3
Other	5	4.3
<u>Years Employed at Institution</u>		
1-2 years	13	11.2
3-5 years	29	25
6-10 years	15	12.9
11-15 years	20	17.2
16-20 years	10	8.6
More than 20 years	27	23.3
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single, never married	17	14.7
Married	75	64.7
Living with someone	3	2.6
Separated	0	0
Divorce	19	16.4
Widowed	2	1.7
<u>Total Years of Employment</u>		

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	0	0
1-2 years	1	0.9
3-5 years	9	7.8
6-10 years	6	5.2
11-15 years	7	6.1
16-20 years	15	13
More than 20 years	77	67
<u>Job Affiliation</u>		
Academic affairs	35	33.7
Student affairs	20	19.2
University relations	9	8.7
Finance and university Service	40	38.5

Results for research questions two and three and their corresponding hypotheses are reported in the following section. The first research question was:

1. What is the structural diversity of support staffs' departments or immediate work units?

These data were collected the structural diversity section of the instrument. Staff demographic data were also collected, but were not included in the structural diversity section. A large percent of the support staff members rated their department or work units as predominately white (68.4%), only 7.9% rated their immediate work environment as predominately racial and/or ethnic minorities, while 23.7% rated their work surroundings as racially balanced. The gender of staffs' supervisor almost balances out for women (43.9%) and men (56.1%); however, the percent of racial and/or ethnic minorities serving in such positions was extremely low. Table 3 shows the frequencies and percents of the structural diversity of support staffs' immediate work environment.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percents of Responses to Structural Diversity of Immediate Work

Environment

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<u>Racial Composition</u>		
Predominantly white	78	68.4
Predominantly racial/ethnic minorities	9	7.9
Racially/ethnically balanced	27	23.7
<u>Gender Composition</u>		
Predominantly male	32	27.8
Predominantly female	51	44.3
Gender balanced	32	27.8
<u>Gender of Immediate Supervisor</u>		
Male	64	56.1
Predominantly female	50	43.9
<u>Racial/Ethnic Background of Supervisor</u>		
African American/Black	9	8.0
Asian/Asian American	2	1.8
Hispanic/Latino/a	2	1.8
Native American/American Indian	0	0
White/Caucasian	100	88.5

The second research question was:

2. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity?

The following null hypothesis was formulated to answer the second research question:

H₀₁: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff

when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

The null hypothesis was tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure at the .05 level of significance. The one-way ANOVA was conducted with the data with missing cases reported for the psychological climate variable. Thirteen cases, or (11%), were missing for variables measuring the psychological climate. Levene's test indicated equal variances on the dependent variable for all groups ($p = .06$). The ANOVA revealed no statistical significance at the .05 level of significance for the independent variables of age $F(4,55) = .803, p = .53$, gender $F(1,55) = .983, p = .33$, level of education $F(5, 55) = .793, p = .56$, and ethnicity $F(4,55) = .509, p = .73$. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity was retained. Table 4 displays the number and percent of response for each level of the independent variables. The mean and standard deviation for each level of the independent variables measuring perceptions of the psychological climate are presented in Table 5.

Table 4

Frequency and Percent of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values for Psychological Climate

Characteristic	N	Percent
<u>Age group</u>		
24 to 34	14	14.1
35 to 44	27	27.2

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Characteristic	N	Percent
45 to 54	41	41.4
55 or older	17	17.1
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	79	79.7
Male	20	20.2
<u>Level of education</u>		
High school diploma or GED	10	10.1
Some college, but no degree	31	31.3
2-year college degree	18	18.1
4-year college degree	29	29.2
Some grad work, but no degree	1	1.01
Master's degree	9	9.09
Doctorate or professional degree	1	1.01
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	18	18.1
Asian/Asian American	3	3.03
Hispanic/Latino/a	0	0
Native American/American Indian	1	1.01
White/Caucasian	73	73.7
Other	4	4.0

Table 5

Mean and SD for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases for the Psychological Variable

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
<u>Age group</u>			
24 to 34	68.77	9.44	14
35 to 44	65.11	11.80	27
45 to 54	66.32	8.32	41
55 or older	73.13	6.27	17
<u>Level of education</u>			

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
High school diploma or GED	69.60	8.79	10
Some college, but no degree	69.10	8.54	31
2-year degree	67.50	7.82	18
4-year degree	65.03	11.77	29
Some graduate work, but no Degree	67.00	-	1
Master's degree	66.56	9.02	9
Doctorate or professional degree	74.00	-	1

The first null hypothesis was tested again with the missing values replaced with the series mean. Thirteen, or 11%, were missing for the psychological variable. The first null hypothesis was:

H₀₁: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

The null hypothesis was tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure at the .05 level of significance. One case was deleted because no responses were reported for the dependent variable. The ANOVA revealed no statistical significance for the independent variables of age $F(4,62) = .323, p = .86$, gender $F(1,62) = 1.388, p = .24$, level of education $F(5, 62) = .772, p = .57$, and ethnicity $F(5,55) = .321, p = .89$. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity was retained. Table 6 displays the descriptive information for each level of the independent

variable with missing values replaced with the series mean. The mean and standard deviation for each level of the independent variables measuring perceptions of the psychological climate are presented in Table 7.

Table 6

Frequency and Percent of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values Replaced for Psychological Climate

Characteristic	N	Percent
<u>Age group</u>		
24 to 34	18	16.2
35 to 44	30	27.0
45 to 54	43	38.7
55 to 65 or older	20	18.0
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	88	79.2
Male	23	20.7
<u>Level of education</u>		
High school diploma or GED	10	9.0
Some college, but no degree	39	35.1
2-year college degree	20	18.0
4-year college degree	31	27.9
Some grad work, but no degree	1	.9
Master's degree	9	8.10
Doctorate or professional degree	1	.9
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	22	19.8
Asian/Asian American	3	2.70
Hispanic/Latino/a	0	
Native American/American Indian	1	.9
White/Caucasian	79	71.1
Other	6	5.40

Table 7

Mean and SD for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced for the Psychological Variable

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
<u>Age group</u>			
24 to 34	68.47	8.19	18
35 to 44	65.35	11.20	30
45 to 54	66.37	8.13	43
55 to 65 or older	72.19	6.08	20
<u>Level of education</u>			
High school diploma or GED	69.60	8.79	10
Some college, but no degree	69.10	8.54	39
2-year degree	67.50	7.81	20
4-year degree	65.03	11.76	31
Some graduate work, but no degree	67.00	-	1
Master's degree	66.56	9.01	9
Doctorate or professional degree	74.00	-	1

The third research question was:

3. To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity?

The following null hypothesis was formulated to answer the third research question:

H₀₂: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

The null hypothesis was tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure at the .05 level of significance. The one-way ANOVA was conducted with the data with missing cases reported for the behavioral climate variable. Twenty cases, or 16.9%, were missing for the variable measuring the behavioral climate. Levene's test indicated unequal variances on the dependent variable for all groups ($p = .000$). The ANOVA revealed statistical significance for the independent variables of gender $F(1,50) = 4.21, p = .045$, level of education $F(5, 50) = 2.88, p = .023$, and ethnicity $F(4,50) = 2.89, p = .032$. None of the interaction effects was statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity at the .05 level of significance was not retained. Table 8 displays the frequencies and percents of responses for each level of the independent variables. The mean and standard deviation for each level of the independent variables measuring perceptions of the behavioral climate are presented in Table 9. Results of the one-way ANOVA for perceptions of the behavioral climate are presented in Table 10.

Table 8

Frequency and Percent of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values for Behavioral Climate

Characteristic	N	Percent
<u>Age group</u>		
24 to 34	12	13.0
35 to 44	24	26.0

(table continues)

Table (continued)

Characteristic	N	Percent
45 to 54	40	43.4
55 to 65 or older	16	17.3
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	75	81.5
Male	17	18.5
<u>Level of education</u>		
High school diploma or GED	10	10.9
Some college, but no degree	28	30.4
2-year college degree	18	19.5
4-year college degree	25	27.1
Some grad work, but no degree	1	1.1
Master's degree	9	9.8
Doctorate or professional degree	1	1.1
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	17	18.4
Asian/Asian American	3	3.2
Hispanic/Latino/a	0	0
Native American/American Indian	1	1.1
White/Caucasian	67	72.8
Other	4	4.3

Table 9

Mean and SD for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases for the Behavioral Variable

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
<u>Age group</u>			
24 to 34	127.18	15.32	12
35 to 44	135.88	29.51	24
45 to 54	136.18	20.34	40

(table continues)

Table 9 (continued)

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
55 or older	127.93	19.09	16
<u>Level of education</u>			
High school diploma or GED	113.70	16.95	10
Some college, but no degree	139.71	22.08	28
2-year degree	133.61	21.23	18
4-year degree	129.72	21.99	25
Some graduate work, but no degree	119.00	-	1
Master's degree	149.22	19.65	9
Doctorate or professional degree	133.00	-	1

Table 10

Results of ANOVA for Mean Scores for Gender, Level of Education, and Race/Ethnicity with Missing Cases on the Behavioral Climate

Variable	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p-value
<u>Gender</u>					
Between subjects	1	1619.353	1619.353	4.21	.045*
<u>Level of Education</u>					
Between subjects	5	5541.983	1108.397	2.88	.023*
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>					
Between subjects	4	4440.032	1110.008	2.89	.032*

The second null hypothesis was tested again with the missing values replaced with the series mean. Twenty cases, or 16.9%, were missing for variables measuring the psychological climate. The first null hypothesis was:

H₀₂: There are no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

The null hypothesis was tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure at the .05 level of significance. One case was deleted because no responses were reported for the dependent variable. The ANOVA revealed statistical significance for the independent variable level of education $F(5,62) = 2.56, p = .034$ and the interaction of gender and level of education $F(2, 62) = 3.81, p = .028$. The null hypothesis testing differences in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by level of education was not retained. The null hypothesis testing for differences among age groups on the behavioral climate was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained. The null hypothesis testing for differences between genders was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was retained. The null hypothesis testing differences among racial/ethnic groups was not statistically significant. This null hypothesis was retained. Table 11 displays the descriptive information for each level of the independent variable with missing values replaced with the series mean. The mean and standard deviation for each level of the independent variables measuring perceptions of the behavioral climate are presented in Table 12. Results of the one-way ANOVA for perceptions of the behavioral climate are presented in Table 13.

Table 11

Frequency and Percent of Responses of Participants for Independent Variables with Missing Values Replaced for Behavioral Climate

Characteristic	N	Percent
<u>Age group</u>		
24 to 34	18	16.2
35 to 44	30	27.0
45 to 54	43	38.7
55 to 65 or older	20	18.0
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	88	79.3
Male	23	20.7
<u>Level of education</u>		
High school diploma or GED	10	9.0
Some college, but no degree	39	35.1
2-year college degree	20	18.0
4-year college degree	31	27.9
Some grad work, but no degree	1	0.9
Master's degree	9	8.1
Doctorate or professional degree	1	0.9
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	22	19.8
Asian/Asian American	3	2.7
Hispanic/Latino/a	0	0
Native American/American Indian	1	0.9
White/Caucasian	79	71.2
Other	6	5.4

Table 12

Mean and SD for Age Group and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced for the Behavioral Variable

Characteristic	Mean	SD	N
<u>Age group</u>			
24 to 34	129.06	12.39	18
35 to 44	135.20	26.32	30
45 to 54	135.92	19.63	43
55 or older	128.95	16.81	20
<u>Level of education</u>			
High school diploma or GED	113.70	16.95	10
Some college, but no degree	137.68	18.90	39
2-year degree	133.50	20.08	20
4-year degree	130.26	19.71	31
Some graduate work, but no Degree	119.00	-	1
Master's degree	149.22	19.65	9
Doctorate or professional degree	133.00	-	1

Table 13

Results of ANOVA for Mean Scores for Level of Education, and the Interaction Effect of Gender and Level of Education with Missing Cases Replaced on the Behavioral Climate

Variable	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p-value
<u>Level of Education</u>					
Between subjects	5	4229.746	845.949	2.60	.034*
<u>Gender * Level of Education</u>					
Between subjects	2	1239.976	1239.976	3.81	.028*

Qualitative Data

The data were collected from the sampled population to inform the quantitative data, which included responses to two open-ended questions: (1) In your opinion, what

would improve the campus climate? (2) Do you have any other views or issues that you'd like to share with us? Responses to the open-ended questions were optional. Forty-seven (40.5%) of the participants expressed their opinions in response to the first question, while thirty-two (27.5%) candidly indicated their views pertaining to other issues. The data collection took place at the same time as quantitative data collection. Qualitative data were collected to explore issues that participants perceived as being necessary to improve the campus climate at the selected institution.

Steps in the qualitative analysis included: (1) preliminary exploration of the data by reading through the written responses; (2) arranging the data into manageable units; (3) coding the data by segmenting and labeling the text; (4) using codes to develop themes by aggregating similar codes together; and (5) constructing a framework for sharing what the data reveal (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Major themes involving ways to improve the campus climate as well as specific views or issues important to support staff members were coded and put into categories.

After reading through the written responses the open-ended questions were coded and common themes were reviewed. Coding is the process of organizing data into categories or chunks before adding meaning to those categories (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). In order to categorize significant findings, the responses to the open-ended questions were organized into chunks by dissecting the results to categories and labeling them with a description. This process results in the emergence of themes for analysis.

Four themes emerged from the responses to the open ended questions (staff treatment, parking inequities, overall diversity efforts, and racial and/or ethnic and gender diversity efforts). These themes were categorized in accordance with support staffs'

concerns (employee equity factors and diversity-related factors). The comments that follow reflect factors that would improve the overall campus climate as reported by support staff members who participated in this study. Support staff also expressed other issues that are germane to their ability or inability to work in positive work environments. Crass and insensitive comments were not reported as responses. The comments conveyed a range of responses rather than the norm.

Employee Equity Factors

Theme 1 – Treatment of Support Staff

The qualitative data collected from the open-ended questions indicated a strong need for respect for work duties performed by support staff. Staff members reported feeling a lack of appreciation by faculty and administrators. They further believed that their opinions were not considered in decision-making processes. The following comments capture the essence of this theme.

“Staff tend to be treated negatively, stupid, or unworthy by faculty and administrations. I have a college degree from this institution and get treated as if I am a second class citizen.”

“I think all in all this school is a great place to work. But like all institution the staff receive the lowest amount of pay, and they do all the leg work for everyone else. I know that professor or people with degrees have gone to school and done their part to earn their pay, but the staff is what keep them going and we don't get pay for all we do.”

“University staff, especially secretarial/clerical and those who perform physical labor do not get the respect or understanding of their job duties that they deserve

from Human Resources or from higher administration. This filters down in the way these workers are classified and compensated."

"In my opinion, only when equal opportunities are given to everybody in the true sense of the word will the campus climate improve. I think there's a need for evaluation of the heads of departments by the people under them as well to create an atmosphere of fairness."

Theme 2 – Parking

The qualitative derived during the open-ended questions also implied that support staff members stressed unfairness regarding the distribution of parking decals. Some felt that the professional staff and administrators have access to better parking. The following comments were offered regarding the distribution of parking decals:

"Parking.....this is a very simple issue yet very discriminating. I don't understand why the people that have been hired for a position considered ""professional"" are given a yellow tag soon as they start work yet, the ones that are considered ""rank and file"" have to earn this yellow tag that has more and better spots, 10 years. It's not like it's free, there's a fee for this. What it does is just show off who's making more money and I know a lot of people resent this ""rule"". What happened to whoever comes first, gets the better spot? After all, we're all here to work and parking should be fair to everybody."

"Parking tickets - I have a big issue with this rule.....I don't understand why the people that are considered ""professionals"" are given better and more parking areas than the rank and files. We are all here to work, so why do they have ""special"" treatment?"

Diversity Related Factors

Theme 3- Overall Diversity Efforts

The first common thread that emerged pertaining to diversity has to do with overall comments related to diversity. The qualitative data collected indicated that support staff members felt as though diversity in the workplace was either overly stressed or not stressed enough. Some staff believed that the institution should do more to support diversity efforts and multiculturalism. The following comments were made on the surveys:

“We need to spend more time being one instead of working to be different.

Special Interest groups should be replaced with ALL interest groups. We are ONE America, One Alabama, and ONE CAMPUS!”

“Integration of diversity and multiculturalism in almost every class by focusing on understanding people from all types of socio-economic, educational, race/ethnic, religious, etc. background. So faculty, staff, administrators and students can learn to acknowledge and respect the differences among each other.”

“More diversity, meaning lots of different cultures.”

Theme 4- Racial and/or Ethnic and Gender Diversity Efforts

The second theme that emerged from the qualitative data specifically addressed racial/ethnicity and gender diversity as reported by support staff members. Some staff believed that some racial/ethnic minorities obtained and retained their positions solely because of their race or ethnicity. Others posited the poor representation of racial/ethnic minorities in faculty and executive administrative positions at the institution. Staff also

believed that discussions on gender issues should be at the forefront of diversity efforts.

The following comments pertaining to racial diversity were reported:

"Stop petting on people because they are a minority and hire/fire people because of their performance and not their race/gender. Stop always threatening people to use the race/gender card as a way of getting what they want."

"Have programs where people of all ethnicity and gender can attend and participate. Make the staff members feel like they are a vital part of Auburn. Hire and retain African American faculty members."

"To make all races feel inclusive, whether it's regarding research (because there are negatives among ALL races) or class discussions. Making an effort to understand and eventually embracing diversity."

"Work towards a color blind and gender neutral environment where there are no more ""Black"" this organization or ""Women's"" that club. If we are ever going to become homogenized, we have got to stop putting ourselves into boxes."

"I believe you are missing out on men being discriminated against in certain situations. You enter an office situation that is dominated by females and the supervisor or main faculty member in charge of the unit is also female, and you can get some very misandrist discrimination."

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which support staffs' perception of the campus differed when staff were grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity. This chapter discussed the results of the data analysis. Descriptive data presented in this chapter summarized the demographic

characteristics of the support staff members who participated in this study. This chapter provided descriptive data gathered to ascertain the structural diversity of support staffs' immediate work units or departments. The chapter also provided the results of the one-way ANOVAs to ascertain differences in support staffs' perceptions of the psychological and behavioral climates. The results of the ANOVAs revealed no statistically significant differences on the psychological climate variable with missing cases and with missing cases replaced. The results of the ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences on the behavioral climate variable with missing cases and with missing cases replaced. The results from the ANOVA were statistically significant for gender, level of education, and ethnicity with missing cases on the behavioral climate variable. The results from the ANOVA were statistically significant on the level of education and the interaction effect of gender and level of education with missing cases replaced on the behavioral climate variable.

Qualitative findings revealed positive and negative aspects of the campus climate, from which four themes emerged, treatment of support staff, parking, racial and/or ethnic and gender diversity efforts. The first common threads suggested that staff members do not feel appreciated or respected. Issues pertaining to unfair treatment from faculty and administrators emerged, along expressions of inequities of the parking decal policy. The second thread suggested differences in opinions pertaining to diversity and diversity efforts at the selected institution. Themes pertaining to the lack of racial and gender diversity among faculty, staff, and administrators were extracted. Common threads, as reported by staff, revealed the need to have diversity addressed systematically during the hiring of faculty, staff and administrators. Other threads showed that some staff felt as

though diversity was over exaggerated on campus. A summary of this study, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter concludes the study. It includes a summary of results, implications, and recommendations for further study.

The study has both practical and theoretical applications. In practical terms, the results of the study may be of assistance in informing other university personnel about the climate for support staff in their immediate work environment and their holistic perceptions of the institutional climate. Results of this study may also assist upper-level administrators and policy makers in maintaining positive climates and in making changes that are beneficial to support staff members, which avails the institution as a whole. This study also will add to the sparse literature investigating support staffs' perceptions of campus climate research. In addition, this study may provide future researchers with a template to conduct similar research studies.

Three research questions guided this study: (1) What is the structural diversity of support staffs' work units or departments? (2) To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity. (3) To what extent are there differences at the .05 level of significance in perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff are grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity.

Structural Diversity

Most of the respondents reported the gender composition of their immediate work environment as being predominantly female. This was to be expected since women represented 80.5% of the support staff members randomly selected to participate in this study. In addition, according to university data, 66% of staff positions in the institutions are filled by women. Previous research has also reported that there are more women than men in support staff positions within institutions of higher education (Duggan, 2008; Mayhew et al., 2006; Ruckall, 1997).

It is interesting to note that although 80.5% of the study participants were females, more than one quarter of the respondents said that their environment was balanced and more than one quarter stated their environment was predominantly male. It may be that in some situations, there was a balance between genders. It could also be that staff rated their work environments as such because they were thinking of the gender composition of the institution as a whole instead of their given departments or work units. It appears also that there are some departments which have more males than females. Additional research should be conducted to determine where these gender balanced work units are and whether or not there are differences in staff members' perceptions of the campus climate when compared to predominantly male or female work environments. Research should also be done to determine why one-fourth of the respondents said their environments were male dominated to discover if this is the result of gender bias in hiring.

The under-representation of men in support staff positions may be a national and perhaps international phenomenon, but it is difficult to determine why due to the scarcity of research studies that focuses on support staff members as the primary population of study at institutions of higher education. Some of the studies that were conducted on support staff also noted the absence of men in support staff positions in the United States (Duggan, 2008; Mayhew et al., 2006) and Canada (Ruckall, 1997). This may be related to the low salaries often associated with many support staff positions. It may also be related to the perception that many of these are “women’s jobs”. This perception may also lead to gender bias in the hiring process. Further research should be conducted in this area to address this issue and determine the reasons for it.

In this study, although most of the respondents were White females, over half of them were supervised by White men. This may be related to staff level of education as slightly more men (35%) than women (28%) had four year degrees. There were an almost equal percent with master’s degrees (9% of women and 10% men), while 1% of women had doctoral and/or professional degrees. Thirty-two percent of women and 30% of men had attended college, but held no degree. More Women (46%) were 45-54 years of age, while men were younger (41% were 35-44 years old). This finding may imply that women encounter barriers and may have to work longer to obtain supervisory positions. The institution should examine this finding to determine if gender is a determinant to promotion to supervision or whether there are other reasons for the disparity in the percent of female supervisors relative to their presence in the total population.

Most of the support staff members rated their immediate work units as being predominantly White. This would be expected since the percent of Whites in the total

population was large. However, 23.7% of respondents rated their immediate work environment as being racially and/or ethnically balanced. This may imply that some departments or work units may have higher percents of racial and/or ethnic minorities than others. It may also mean that some staff members are interpreting having a small percent of minorities as being racially balanced, since this balance is similar to what they have in their local environments, or within the university. Nearly 8% of support staff members rated their departments or work units as being predominantly racial and/or ethnic minorities. This appears to imply that some departments or work units may consist mostly of racial minorities. The institution may want to explore the racial and/or ethnic breakdown of these departments to see if some work units are overly representative of racial minorities, and if so why.

While some White women (43%) have been successful in obtaining supervisory positions, few racial and/or ethnic minority respondents hold such positions. While almost 24 percent (23.7) of the respondents were minorities, most of who were African American/Black (20.9%), only nine respondents, or 8.0%, reported the race/ethnic background of their supervisor as being African American/Black. Only 3.6% of the participants reported that their supervisor were from Hispanic/Latino/a and Asian/Asian American racial/ethnic backgrounds. Similar scarcities of persons from these racial and/or ethnic backgrounds can also be found in the student and faculty population and middle and senior level administrative positions at the institution of study. The dearth of racial and/or ethnic minorities in supervisory positions (11.6%) may be attributed to the fact that nearly a quarter of them were young (24-34 years of age) and only 16.6% of

racial and/or ethnic minorities held four year degrees; 29% of White staff members held four-year degrees required to obtain such positions.

Although there is also the possibility the lack of racial and/or ethnic minority staff members in supervisory positions may be attributed to educational attainment and years of work experience, there may be other reasons that persons from minority ethnic and/or racial groups are not being considered or prepared for supervisory positions. It will be important for the institution to monitor whether younger minorities are kept in their jobs over time and whether they rise to the level of supervisor in the years ahead, and if not why. It may also be of value for the institution to assure that all employees are receiving mentoring, professional development experiences and degree obtainment that will equip them to move into supervisory positions.

In 2008, the median resident age of the surrounding community was 27.5, with males and females being equally represented. Most of the county's population were White/Caucasian (73.2%), while 22.7% were African American/Black, 1.4% were Hispanic/Latino/a, .6% American Indian/Native American, and .5% Asian/Asian American. Most of the support staff members employed at the selected institution were White (67%), while 30% were African American/Black, .6% were Hispanic/Latino/a, .4% were American Indian/ Native American Indian and 1% were Asian/Asian American. The racial and/or ethnic profile of support staff members at the institution of study are similar to the racial/and or ethnic profile of the county where the institution is located. This may imply that the institution recruits support staff members primarily from the surrounding communities. African Americans/Blacks represented 30% of the support staff population at the selected institution, which is higher than the percentages found for

students (8%), faculty (3%), and senior-level administrative (4%) positions. This may be a positive finding but it will be important to determine whether these minorities are primarily situated in only one or two departments or in a particular type of position to determine if diversity is being threaded throughout the university staff.

Employing a national search when recruiting racially and/or ethnically diverse support staff members, with an increased focus on attracting Hispanic/Latino/a, American Indian/Native American, and Asian/Asian American may increase the number staff members from diverse ethnic and/or racial backgrounds. Furthermore, the university may need to consider hiring more ethnic and/or racial minorities in supervisory positions in order to create a more diverse working environment in the staff area. It may also be of value to examine recruitment and advertisement activities to seek to broaden the applicant pool in terms of increasing diversity in the staff, and administrative ranks. Also, creating programs and policies that enhance intergroup relations through formal and informal opportunities may provide opportunities for mentorship and a climate more conducive to enhancing diversity.

The Psychological Climate

Question two investigated perceptions of the psychological climate of university support staff when staff were grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity. The psychological climate measures perceptions of attitudes towards those from different ethnic backgrounds (Hurtado, et al., 1998), perceived support and commitment for diversity from the institution (Hurtado et al., 1999), perceptions of racial disquiet, sensitivity and intolerance (Hurtado, 1992), and the singling out of individuals because of their background (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). There were no statistically

significant differences between groups for the psychological climate variable at the .05 level of significance. This finding suggests that psychological climate was positive. Based on the questions asked in the survey, this indicates that staff members' attitudes toward and interactions with others groups were positive, they felt as though the institution supported diversity and was committed to diversity efforts, and the perception of racial turmoil and intolerance was low.

The lack of statistical significance is not consistent with findings in another study that investigated support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate. Mayhew et al. (2006) found statistically significance in the perceptions of the institution as having achieved a positive climate for diversity for females, staff with lower levels of education, and staff members of color. Statistical significance is also consistent with the other populations that are more commonly studied by diversity researchers (e.g., faculty and students), indicating a degree of comparability (Dey, 1993; Hurtado et al., 1998; Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, & Der-Karabetian, 2000; Nora & Cabrera, 1996).

It is possible that no differences were found because the psychological climate is in fact positive. Nearly a quarter of the support staff members have been in there positions for more than 10 years (23%), which may imply that they are satisfied with the positive psychological dimension of the campus climate. Although staff remain in their given positions, it is also possible that there is something going on in the workplace that is encouraging people to be inclusive within this organizational climate.

Another reason for the discrepancy between this study and others may be the age of the respondents. In this study, only 15.5% of the sampled participants were in the 24 to 34 age range. Mayhew et al. (2006) found that older were more likely than younger

staff members to perceive the campus climate for diversity as being positive. Also, Ruckall (1997) reported that younger staff felt as though the institution was not committed to employment equity, and criticized the lack of communication from upper level administrators. The absence of younger support staff members may account for the lack of statistical significance for perceptions of the psychological climate.

The lack of significance may also have to do with the nature of the division that exists in teaching staff and non-teaching staff. There is a clear divide between the two in terms of participation in quantitative and qualitative research activities and opportunities. People in non-teaching employee groups are treated as operational implementers and very rarely contribute (or allowed to contribute) in research activities in which their opinions are valued and appreciated. This lack of participation in survey research may be attributed to staff not honestly answering questions pertaining to the psychological dimension. There may have been fears of losing their job for being honest regarding their perceptions of the psychological climate, which may also account for the low rate of return (19%).

Future research should use focus groups or interviews to ascertain why respondents believe the psychological climate is positive. This research may provide educational researchers with additional data, which may help to assure that the positive factors are supported, to improve and enhance the environments in units where it is not positive, and to improve the climate at other institutions of higher education. Further research should also seek to ascertain differences in the psychological dimension of the campus climate for younger and older support staff members using qualitative research methods.

Some of the qualitative data suggest that some staff were satisfied with the campus climate and the institutional efforts to promote and understand diversity, which supports the quantitative findings. However, other staff expressed the need for more formal and informal diversity-related activities and more representation of racial and/or ethnic minorities in faculty and administrative positions. Support staff members also reported being disrespected and expressed a lack of appreciation from faculty and administrators for work performed. Although this study did not investigate support staff job satisfaction, future studies should delve deeper into employee equity factors that may inform the psychological dimension of the campus climate. Qualitative data also suggests that some men may be dealing with discrimination when working in predominantly female departments or work units. Future research should also use purposeful sampling to gather men's perceptions of the campus climate as they were not vastly represented in this sample.

Behavioral Climate

Question three investigated perceptions of the behavioral climate of university support staff when staff were grouped by (a) age, (b) gender, (c) level of education, and (d) ethnicity. The behavioral dimension measures reports of overall social interactions, the essence of intergroup relations, and the level of engagement and interchange between and among different racial and/or ethnic groups (Hurtado, et al., 1998; 1999). There were statistically significant differences for the behavioral climate variable at the .05 level of significance when staff were grouped by gender, level of education, and ethnicity.

This finding suggests that support staffs' perceptions of encounters between and among varying racial groups, overall social interactions, and the essence of intergroup

relations differed significantly for women and men, those with varying levels of education, and between African American/Black and White/Caucasian staff members. This is somewhat puzzling because there were no significant differences in found between these groups when dealing with the psychological climate. One reason for this is that the questions in the psychological climate section of the instrument tend to be more general in nature and germane to the university at large, while questions in the behavioral section of the instrument are more personal in nature as they investigate perceptions of personal experiences between and among varying groups on campus. This difference requires further examination.

Women perceived the behavioral campus climate more negatively than men. Previous climate studies also found that women were more likely to men to perceive the institutional climate as being negative and also reported feeling as though their opinions were not valued in their given work units and posited being treated rudely by faculty members (Mayhew et al., 2006; Ruckall, 1997). A possible explanation for the findings of this study may be that although men represented a small percentage of the sampled population, many of them served in supervisory roles, which may inform and influence their perceptions of the behavioral climate. Likewise, it is possible that in this institution, the power and positionality of male supervisors may create an unwelcoming climate for support staff members, most of whom are female (Hurtado et al., 2008). Qualitative data revealed that some men expressed feeling discriminated against and the need for gender equity in female dominated departments or work units at the selected institution.

Although this study did not examine what factors caused women to view the behavioral climate more negatively than men, it does provide researchers with findings

that may guide future studies designed to investigate the extent to which there are differences in the way men and women perceive the campus climate. Additional studies should be conducted to determine the nature of the differences in this environment. To thoroughly understand why differences in the perception of the behavioral climate persist future studies should use two-way focus groups or interviews with women and men. Also, using a longitudinal approach to collect both quantitative and qualitative data may provide institutional leaders with developmental trends, which may offer a more holistic picture of how the climate is perceived and experienced and help create an effective model to accurately identify factors that contribute to a welcoming campus climate.

Statistical significance was also found for the independent variable ethnicity. This finding is interesting because the sample consisted mostly of White participants. Racial and/or ethnic minorities represented 20% of the sampled population. According to the data, women and racial and/or ethnic minorities were supervised by White men. Thus, minority perceptions of the behavioral climate at the selected institution may be attributed to power and positionality (Hurtado et al., 1998), which are associated with gender and race. Hurtado et al. (1998) also asserts that “racially and ethnically diverse administrators, students, and faculty tend to view the campus climate differently” (p. 289). This finding is also consistent with studies investigating students’ perceptions of the campus climate (Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr, 2000; Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003; Riordan, 1999), as well as faculty perceptions (Conley & Hyer, 1994; Kossek & Zonia, 1993) and support staff members (Mayhew et al., 2006). Employing a national search when recruiting racially and/or ethnically diverse support staff members may increase the number staff from diverse backgrounds, while implementing departmental diversity and

sensitivity training may aid in creating a welcoming campus climate for current and future employees. Through the qualitative data findings, staff members suggested the need to have more diversity-related programs and opportunities for staff to share experiences, and discuss best practices. Creating formal and informal opportunities for mentoring relationship may increase the number of women and racial and/or ethnic minorities in supervisory and mid-level management positions.

The independent variable level of education and the interaction of gender and level of education were also statistically significant was at the .05 level. Most of the female support staff members had attended college, but did not persist to degree completion, while slightly fewer had four-year college degrees. Most of the male participants had four-year college degrees, while slightly fewer had some college, but no degree. Although the sample consisted mostly of female participants, their perception of the behavioral climate differed significantly when compared to males. This finding may further signify that participants who had attended college, but did not complete a degree perceived the behavioral climate significantly different than those with four-year college degrees. This finding is consistent with a previous study (Mayhew et al., 2006) that investigated support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate. Mayhew et al. (2006) supported this finding by asserting that staff with higher levels of education may have exhibited a heightened awareness of diversity-related issues on campus than those with less education. Support staff positions may be more appealing if there were university and departmental support for more opportunities for training and professional development, which is needed since most of the sampled participants (37.1%) had earned some college credits, but did not complete either a two-year or four-year degree. The

institution's human resources office may want to build intrinsic and extrinsic rewards into job descriptions and job performance plans for support staff members who continue their education.

Implications

The results of this study suggest several implications. Findings related to support staff members' perceptions of the behavioral climate can be used to foster institutional action by informing senior and mid-level managers and administrators of staffs' perception of the campus climate and their perceptions of the climate of their immediate work units or departments. The positive results of the psychological climate could also be shared to foster a continued desire to maintain this environment. In addition, although the psychological climate was rated as positive, by all groups, qualitative data results showed that some staff felt discriminated against and felt as though they were not appreciated in their given departments or work units. Informing departmental and institutional leadership of staffs' perceptions of their work environment may lead to the creation of policies, programs, and seminars that inform and embrace the importance of positive group interactions and racial and/or ethnic tolerance. Institutional leaders may want to implement routine diversity awareness training during convenient times for greater participation for faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Institutional leaders may also want to thoroughly investigate the psychological climate, which was positive, to determine why support staff members perceive this dimension as being welcoming. The institution may also want to examine why the behavioral climate was negative. Increasing more integration among group through structured and unstructured multicultural activities on campus may improve behavioral interactions.

The human resources skills of immediate supervisors or department heads are critical in creating a welcoming and positive climate for career development through the enhancement of support staffs' skills, performance appraisal, and peer support. Supervisors are the role models and oftentimes relay information about both the institution and climate. Poor communication skills or supervisors who communicate with any gender biases could negatively affect staff members' workplace satisfaction and work climate. Encouraging institutional leaders to be advocates for diversity may bolster staff attendance of multicultural activities during and after work hours. This may be accomplished by distributing information on harassment policies and various multicultural activities on an ongoing basis and encouraging open communication about issues on campus, which should be focused on ways to improve the campus climate. Providing adequate training and education to supervisors on workplace satisfaction, the gendered aspects of communication and how to foster a supportive campus climate are necessary when striving to improve the climate for all.

This study may serve as a model for this institution and others to engage in climate assessments in order to gain an understanding of the relationships between staff and faculty and staff and students and make adjustments where needed to improve the overall climate. The institution of study should conduct this assessment, or similar assessments, every two years, which was recommended in the Fisher Report (2005), a review of the general conditions at the selected university, was submitted to the institution. This report was completed by a team of higher education professionals not affiliated with the institution. The institution should also consider incorporating diversity assessments in hiring application materials for prospective employees and by conducting

similar assessments at exit interviews when staff members leave the institution. It may be wise to examine departmental as well as university-wide assessments to aid individual departments to set goals and improve employee working relationships, which may positively impact the climate. The university would have to assure respondents that the surveys were confidential and anonymous and develop strategies to encourage involvement. If staff began to see that their feedback was being used in meaningful ways, their participation might be enhanced.

The results of this study can also inform policies. This campus climate assessment can be used to revise the strategic diversity plan for the institution, while making diversity training a mandatory condition for employment for faculty, staff, and administrators at the selected institution. It may also aid the institution's human resource office with restructuring jobs held by support staff members to make them more attractive to men, minorities and younger potential staff. The redefinition of the jobs held by support staff should also include some type of professional development or continuing education that enhances the skills and abilities of staff. Departments and work units should also create regular opportunities for staff to come together to discuss diversity-related issues and concerns. The quality of interactions among racial groups, noted as problematic in the quantitative and qualitative findings, may be improved if the institution implemented diversity-related activities to enhance group synergy and improved intercommunication with varying groups on campus.

The institution may also want to use the results of this study to address job satisfaction of support staff members. Post-secondary institutions that want to reduce employee turnover, strengthen organizational commitment, and improve morale, should

seek to understand their employees' satisfaction with their jobs, as well as colleges' climate to help inform actions to maintain satisfaction and to aggressively recruit and hire more minority faculty, staff, and administrators. Human resources may also want use the results of this study to engage in recruiting more men and racial and/or ethnic minorities to support staff positions especially those from Asian/Asian Americans, Native American/American Indian and Hispanic/Latino/a racial and/or ethnic groups. This could be done by creating collaborative relationships with the university's Staff Council and faculty and administrators in various schools and colleges. The collaborative team can assist in identifying students, undergraduate and graduate, who may have an interest in working in higher education. Students who have not declared majors and have student jobs in various academic or work units on campus may be viable candidates to aid in creating a pipeline of talent to replace those staff members who are nearing retirement. More specifically, creating partnerships with the School of Business may increase the number of men and racial and/or ethnic minorities in support staff positions in finance and university services. The collaborative team may also target graduate students in the College of Education's higher education administration programs in an effort to create intern- and externship opportunities, especially within the division of student affairs and academic affairs, which may prove vital in fostering a campus climate that respects differences and encourages inclusiveness.

Human resources may also want to implement a comprehensive career development/succession planning program to allow all support staff members, especially women, ethnic and/or racial minorities, people with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups the opportunity to grow through broad leadership experiences,

as recommended in the institution's diversity plan. Executive and departmental managers should also include diversity as a performance dimension within employee performance appraisals and assessments for university support staff members, with a reward and incentive program for staff who have contributed to the advancement of diversity at the institution. The results of this campus climate research study may also lead to implementation of a plausible and comprehensive system of training and mentorship with an increased focus on increasing the number of racial and/or ethnic minorities in leadership positions.

Recommendations for Future Research

The research for this study focused support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate at a Southern university. This study should be replicated not only at peer institutions, but should also be conducted at two-year colleges, and minority serving institutions of higher education i.e. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The study should also be replicated at institutions in different regions of the United States to examine cross-regional perceptions of campus climate.

The population used for this study consisted of non-exempt, full-time support staff members. Future research could expand the population of support staff members to include exempt, part-time, and temporary support staff members. This study was conducted using support staffs' e-mail addresses and the internet. The response rate for this study was low. It is possible that this occurred because staff may have been hesitant to use electronic means to respond. It is also possible that the low response rate was the result of hesitancy to give honest feedback or a lack of experience with survey research. In order to overcome such elements future researchers should use paper surveys to collect

quantitative data. Data collected through focus groups or interviews may also aid in understanding the quantitative findings. Future researchers should also consider meeting with department heads and supervisors to rally staff participation in research opportunities as well as offer some type of incentive.

Racial and/or ethnic minorities were poorly represented in the sample of participants. Future research studies should use purposeful sampling to explore in greater depth the perceptions of the campus climate for not only Whites and African Americans, but also specifically focus on Asian Americans, Native American/American Indians, and Hispanics/Latinos/a. This deeper exploration would provide greater insight into climate concerns for staff members from all racial and/or ethnic backgrounds.

The response rate of 19% was low despite numerous attempts to solicit responses from support staff members as described in chapter 3. This low response rate may have been a result of the fact that staff members are rarely afforded to participate in research activities in which their opinions are valued and appreciated. This lack of participation may have been fears of losing their job for being honest regarding their perceptions of the campus climate, which may also account for the low rate of return (19%). The Support Staff Campus Climate Survey (SSCCS) was distributed via e-mail. Future studies at the institution should use hardcopy and electronic surveys to ascertain whether or not more staff members will participate, especially those staff members who do not have e-mail addresses. The institutions should consider conducting focus groups or interviews to try to get to the reasons. The institution may also want to offer incentives to participate in research activities in the future. Institutional leaders can be agents of change by supporting future research endeavors by encouraging staff members to participate in

research activities by showing staff that their views and opinions matter and may lead to practical change.

Regular climate assessments for students, faculty, and administrators should also be conducted to gain awareness of perceptions and experiences on campus, their level of equivocalness, and the levels of interaction between all groups. Below is a summary of the research studies or questions that should be considered to follow-up and gain more insights at the institution at which the research study was conducted and ideas for general research studies aimed at fostering growth in understanding the campus climate for support staff members and further the research in this important area.

Institutional-Specific Research Studies or Questions

1. Conduct a qualitative analysis to ascertain how staffs' personal experiences with prejudice and unfairness inform their perceptions of the climate in their departments or work units and the institutional commitment to diversity and how these perceptions inform the overall campus climate.

2. Utilize a mixed-method approach to determine where gender balanced departments or work units are and whether or not there are differences in staff members' perceptions of the campus climate when compared to predominantly male or female work environments.

3. Use qualitative research methods to ascertain differences in the psychological and behavioral dimensions of the campus climate for younger and older support staff members.

4. Incorporate employee equity factors into campus climate research studies to determine if these factors inform both the psychological and behavioral dimensions of the campus climate.

5. Employ the purposeful sampling technique to gather the perceptions of behavioral and psychological climates from the male's perspective, especially in female dominated departments and/or work units.

6. Design longitudinal studies to determine the impact of support staffs' perceptions of the institutional and departmental commitment to diversity-related efforts and how the commitment to diversity informs the overall campus climate.

7. Exercise purposeful or snowball sampling to explore in greater depth the perceptions of the campus climate for not only Whites and African Americans, but also specifically focus on Asian Americans, Native American/American Indians, and Hispanics/Latinos/a, which may provide a more holistic picture of how the climate is perceived and experienced.

8. Engage in iterative, ongoing, process-oriented campus climate assessments in reasonable intervals to assess the changing temperament of the institution due to the transforming population and efforts to improve climate conditions.

9. Issue climate assessments to support staff members who leave the institutions in an effort to ascertain whether or not climate conditions may have impacted their decision to leave the institution.

10. Properly utilize the findings of iterative campus climate assessments to justify increasing structural diversity in support staffs' work units and/or departments and to

create a basis upon which data-driven decisions can be made about climate concerns and social justice issues.

11. Examine the impact that gender has on promotion to supervisory or management positions within support staffs' work units or departments.

12. Engage students in ongoing climate assessments efforts, which may offer them adequate experiences in their collegiate lives that will foster their abilities to work with, lead, and influence others from a diverse range of fields and cultures.

General Research Studies or Questions

In addition to research specific questions which should be addressed, there are many other types of research studies or questions that could be examined beyond this institution. Among them are:

1. Conduct studies to determine to what extent there are differences in support staff members' perceptions of the campus climate at minority serving institutions and historically white institutions.

2. Conduct studies to determine to what extent there are differences in support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate at two- and four-year institutions of higher education.

3. Employ quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct climate assessments and make findings transparent for the campus community and stakeholders and use the data to inform institutional and departmental policies as was recommended for this institution.

4. Compare support staffs' perceptions across various regions of the United States. For example, compare perceptions from institutions of higher education in the Eastern regions with similar institutions in the Western regions of the United States.
5. Employ robust sampling techniques to obtain adequate sample sizes for subgroups (e.g. various racial groups, gay, lesbian, bi-sexual and transgendered) to identify and explain any differences in depth.
6. Determine what effect support staffs' perceptions of campus climate has on the institutional effectiveness and efficiency.
7. Properly utilize plausible campus climate frameworks like Hurtado, et al. (1998) to inform and improve data collection, which may standardized climate assessments and provide a mechanism for institutional leaders to compare findings between campuses and facilitate large scale change throughout higher education.

Conclusion

Climate assessments that engage students, faculty, and staff allow for meaningful and multiple perspectives and perceptions, which are needed to create an overall welcoming environment. Support staff members interact with students, faculty, and administrators on a daily basis. Understanding support staffs' perceptions of the campus climate allows for the possibility of improved cooperation and collaboration between all racial and/or ethnic groups. One of the most important factors in encouraging the development of cultural competences is having a campus climate that embraces and fosters diversity. While institutional transformation is a sluggish and difficult process, the alternatives of failing to understand factors that contribute to a welcoming campus climate that embraces diversity are far more detrimental. Understanding and embracing

these factors which are involved in broaching such change is the first step in achieving a positive climate in our institutions of higher education, and in our society. It is hope that this study has enhanced that understanding and will foster additional research to do the same.

References

- Allan, E. J. & Madden, M. (2006). Chilly classrooms for female undergraduate students: A question of method? *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 684-711.
- Allen, T. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
- Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African American college student outcomes at predominantly white and historically black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 26-44.
- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 112–127.
- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., & Haniff, N. Z. (1991). *College in Black and White: African American students in predominantly White and in historically Black public universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- American Council on Education (ACE) report: Minority college enrollment climbs, but gaps persist. (2005). *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 22(2), 11.
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., Mohr, J. J. (Spring, 2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78, 180-185.
- Antonio, A. L. (2003). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe*, 6, 14–17.
- Akin, G., & Hopelain, D. (1987). Finding the culture of productivity. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19-32.

- Armour, R. A., Cafferella, R. S., Fuhrmann, B. S., & Wergin, J. F. (1987). Academic burnout: Faculty responsibility and institutional climate. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 29, 3-11.
- Arogyaswamy, B., & Byles, C. M. (1987). Organizational culture: Internal and external fits. *Journal of Management*, 13(4), 647-659.
- Aronson, K. R. & Webster, N. (2007). A model of creating engaged land-grant universities: Penn State's engagement ladder model. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(5), 265-277.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures* (pp. 61-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baker, G. A. (1992). *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.
- Baker, T. L. (1999). Safe harbor: Helping faculty and staff become allies to students who need support. *ERIC Digest*, ED435870.
- Banata, T. W. & Kuh, D. K. (1998). A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academics and student affairs professionals. *Change*, 40-46.
- Bean, J. P. & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(4), 393-412.
- Beebe, S. A., Mottet, T. P., & Roach, K. D. (2004). *Training and development: Enhancing communication and leadership skills*. Boston: Pearson.

- Bensimon, E. M. (2004). The diversity scorecard: A learning approach to institutional change. *Change*, (January/February), 45-52.
- Berkeley, T. R. (1997). A focus on diversity and change: Professional development, partnership, and commitment. *ERIC Digest*, ED405339.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybergenetics of academic organization and leadership. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Bladerston, F. E. (1995). *Managing today's universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Blix, A. G., Cruise, R. J., Mitchell, B. M. & Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research*, 36(2), 158-169.
- Block, C. J., Roberson, L., & Neuger, D. A. (1995). White racial identity theory: A framework for understanding reactions toward interracial situations in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46, 71-78.
- Bolman, L. G., and Deal, T. E (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership, (2nd Ed.) Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Brown, A. (1998). *Organizational Culture*. London, Financial Times Pitman Publishing.
- Brown, J. D. & VanWagoner, R. J. (1999, May). *The overlooked dimension of institutional effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Seattle, WA.
- Brown, L. (2004, March). Diversity: The challenge for higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 7(1), 21-34.

- Brown, R. D, Clark, B., Gortmaker, V., Robinson-Keilig, R. (2004). Assessing the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) students using a multiple perspectives approach. *College Student Journal*, 45(1), 8-26.
- Cabrera, A. F., & Nora, A. (1994). College student perceptions of prejudice and discrimination and their feelings of alienation: A construct validation approach. *Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 16(3-4), 387-409.
- Calabrese, J., Kling, M., and Gold, P. (1987). Alterations in immunocompetence during stress, bereavement, and depression. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 144, 1124-1134.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (1992, August). *Resource Guide for Assessing Campus Climate*. (Report No. 92-24). Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Office of Diversity and Compliance Programs (2000, February). *Campus climate survey project*. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA.
- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Office of Diversity and Compliance Programs (2002, October). *Campus Climate at Cal Poly Pomona: Staff and Administrator Perceptions*. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA.
- Clements, E. (2000). Creating a campus climate in which diversity is truly valued. *New Directions for Community College*, 112, 63-72.
- Chang, M. J. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 153-175.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conley, V. M. & Hyer, P. B. (1999, November). *A faculty assessment of the campus climate for diversity*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the

- Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.
- Davis, A. J. (1996). Employee assistance provision in higher education. *Employee Counselling Today: The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 8(5), 4-12.
- Delgado, R., and Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619-654.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Dey, E. L. (1993). Perceptions of the college environment: An analysis of student and faculty differences. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.
- DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Duggan, M. H. (2008). Noninstructional staff perceptions of the college climate. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 142, 47-56.
- Edgert, P. (1994, Spring). Assessing campus climate: Implications for diversity. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 81, 51-62.
- Engberg, M. E. (2007). Educating the workforce for the 21st century: A cross-disciplinary analysis of the impact of the undergraduate experience on students' development of pluralistic orientation. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(3), 49-77.
- Everly, G. S. (1990). *A clinical guide to the treatment of the human stress response*.

- New York: Plenum Press.
- Feldman, S. P. (1988). How organizational culture can affect innovation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 57-68.
- Fisher, K. K. (1989). Managing in the high-commitment workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31-49.
- Flint, N. (2000). Culture club: An investigation of organizational culture. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia.
- Frew, B. (1997). Leadership challenges in the newly structured NSW TAFE commission. Change, challenge and creative leadership: International perspectives on research and practice. *Australian Council for Educational Administration Inc.* (7).
- Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M., Winefield, A. H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & Stress*, 15, 53-72.
- Gratz v. Bollinger*. 2003. 539 U.S. 244.
- Green, M. F. (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Gross, W., & Schichman, S. (1987). How to grow organizational culture. *Personnel*, 52-56.
- Grutter v. Bollinger*. 2003. 539 U.S. 306.
- Gurin, P. (1999). "Expert report of Patricia Gurin." *The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education. Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.

- 1999) *Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich. 1999). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity in higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-367.
- Hall, R. M. & Sandler, B. R. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? *Eric Digest*, ED215628.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. New York, NY, England: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update on Helm's White and people of color racial identity model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hopwood v. Texas*. 1996. 78 F .3d 932.
- Horton, H. W. (2000). Perspectives on the current status of the racial climate relative to students, staff, and faculty of color at predominantly white colleges and universities in America. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 33(3), 35-37.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2003). Theoretical frameworks for African American women. *New Directions for Student Services*, 104, 19-27.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The racial campus climate. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.
- Hurtado, S. (1994). The institutional climate for talented Latino/a students. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(1), 21-41.

- Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, (61)3, pg. 595-610.
- Hurtado, S. (2006). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, (30)2, pg. 185-196.
- Hurtado, S. & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. In M. Peterson., D. Dill, and Associates (Eds.), *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment* (405-431).San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S., Griffin, K., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 204-221.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279–302.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., Allen, W. R. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *Eric Digest*, ED430514.
- Ibarra, R. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Institute for the Study of Social Change. (1991). *The diversity project: Final report*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Jackson, J. F. (2001). A new test for diversity: Retaining african american administrators at predominantly white institutions. In L. Jones (Eds.), *Retaining African Americas in Higher Education: Challenging Paradigms for*

- Retaining Students, Faculty, and Administrators*. Sterling, VA.: Stylus.
- James, J., and Farmer, R. (1993). *Spirit, space and survival: African American women in (White) academe*. New York: Routledge.
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538-563.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Boston: Pearson.
- Johnson, B., and Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook on Mixed Methods in the Behavioral and Social Sciences.*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Justiz, M., Wilson, R., & Bjork, L. (1994). *Minorities in higher education*. American Council on Education.
- Kays, P.E. (2008). New paradigms for diversifying faculty and staff in higher education: Uncovering cultural biases in the search and hiring process. *Multicultural Education*, 14(2), 65.
- King, K. L., & Watts, I. (2004). Assertiveness of the drive to succeed?: Surviving at a predominantly white university. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students* (pp. 110-119). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kelly, J. M. & Fenner, G. B. (1996, May). Using campus climate results to improve institutional quality. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Albuquerque, NM.

- King, K. L., & Watts, I. (2004). Assertiveness of the drive to succeed?: Surviving at predominantly White university. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students* (pp. 110–119). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kolodny, A. (2002). Raising standards while lowering anxieties: Rethinking the promotion and tenure process. In S. G. Lim and M. Herrera-Sobek (eds.), *Power, Race, and Gender in Academe*. New York: Modern Language Association of American.
- Kossek, E. E. & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(1), 61-81.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Loo, C. M. & Rolison, G. (1986). A study of Native American students in a predominantly White college. *Journal of Higher Education, 32*(6), 651-668.
- Louis, M.R. (1980). Organizations as culture bearing milieux. In L.R. Pondy (Eds) *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich Conn, Organizational Symbolism JAI.
- Luthans, F. & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 321-349.
- Malekzadeh, A. R. & Nahavandi, A. (1990). Making mergers work by managing cultures. *Journal of Business Strategy, 11*(3), 55-57.
- Mattice, N. J. (1995). *Campus climate faculty/staff/administrator survey*. Santa Clarita, CA: College of the Canyons.

- Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive campus climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(1), 63-88.
- McConnell, C. R. (2003). A department manager's guide to wage and hours law and the control of overtime. *The Healthcare Manager*, 22(3), 282-292.
- Milem, J. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affect student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Eds.) *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, (p. 233-249). Cambridge, Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Mohammadi, J. (1995). Climate study. *ERIC Digest*, ED382259.
- Morrow, P. M., Burris-Kitchen, D., & Der-Karabetian, A. (2000). Assessing campus climate of cultural diversity: A focus on focus groups. *College Student Journal*, 34(4), 589-603.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2008). *Digest of educational statistics 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Nora, A. & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions in prejudice and discrimination and the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 119-148.
- Nettles, M. (1988). *Toward Black undergraduate student equality in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- O'Hara, M. (2007). Strangers in a strange land: Knowing, learning and education for the global knowledge society. *Futures*, 39(8), 930-941.
- Oregon State System of Higher Education, Portland, Office of Academic Affairs. (1997, June). *Valuing diversity: Student perceptions of campus climate in the Oregon state system of higher education*.
- Owens, R. G. (1995). *Organizational behavior in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pargament, K. I., Silverman, W., Johnson, S., Echemendia, R., & Snyder, S. (1983). The psychosocial climate of religious congregations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11, 351-381.
- Pascale, R. (1984). Fitting new employees into the company culture. *Fortune*, 28-40.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., Whitt, E. J., Nora, A., Edison, M., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). What have we learned from the first year of the national study of student learning? *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 182-192.
- Pashiardis, P. (1996, May). *Towards effectiveness: Campus climate at the university of Cyprus*. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research Albuquerque, NM.
- Peterson, M. W. & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In W. G. Tierney, (Eds.), *Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures*, (pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pettitt, J. M. & Ayers, D. F. (2002). Understanding conflict and climate in a community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 105-120.

- Pike, G. R. & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions and perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 43-61.
- Pitman, T. (2000). Perceptions of academics and students as customers: A survey of administrative staff in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22(2), 165-175.
- Popovich, N. G. & Abel, S. R. (2002). The need for a broadened definition of faculty scholars creativity. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 66, 59-69.
- Rankin, S. R. & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and White students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43-71.
- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*. 1978. 438 U.S. 312.
- Reid, L. (1998). *Higher education or education for hire?: Language and values in Australian universities*. Brisbane: Queensland Central Publishing Service.
- Reid, L. A. & Radhakrishnan, P. (2003). Race matters: The relation between race and general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 9(3), 263-275.
- Riordan, C. A. (1999). A study of campus climate: Methodology and results. In J. Q. Adams and J. R. Welsch, (Eds.), *Cultural Diversity: Curriculum, Classroom, and Climate*. Illinois Staff and Curriculum Development.
- Robinson, G. & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11(3), 21-31.
- Roskin, R. (1986). Corporate culture revolution: The management development

- imperative. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 1(2), 3-9.
- Rossmann, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rothmann, S. & Essenko, N. (2007). Job characteristics, optimism, burnout, and ill health of support staff in a higher education institution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(1), 135-152.
- Ruchkall, B. (1997). *The campus climate: A chilly one for support staff at the University of Manitoba*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, British Columbia, Canada.
- Ryu, M. (2008). *Minorities in higher education 2008: 23rd status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Sáenz, V. B. (2005). *Breaking the cycle of segregation: The effects of pre-college racial environments on students' diversity experience in college*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Sáenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(1), 1-38.
- Sahai, H. & Ageel, M. (2000). *The analysis of variance: Fixed, random, and mixed models*. Birkhauser: Boston, MA.
- Sanchez, W. (1995). Working with diverse learners and school staff in a multicultural society. ERIC Digest, ED390018.

- Sandler, B. (1986). *The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1986). Are you corporate culture. *Personnel Journal*, 83-96.
- Schwartz, H. & Davis, S. M. (1981). Matching corporate culture and business strategy. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5-26.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (1996). An empirical method of determining nontraditional group status. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 28, 200-210.
- Sheldon, C. (2001). *Campus climate survey: Faculty and staff opinions of the campus environment*. Research report. Cypress College, CA: Cypress College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 482 194)
- Sherwood, J. J. (1988). Creating work cultures with competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5-26.
- Shultz, E. L., Montoya, A. L., & Briere, P. M. (1992). Perceptions of institutional climate. *ERIC Digest*, ED353234.
- Smerek, R. E. & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving jobs satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250.
- Smith, W. A. (2004). Black faculty coping with racial battle fatigue: The campus racial climate in a post-civil rights era. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *Broken silence: Conversations about race by African Americans at predominately White institutions* (pp. 171-190). New York: Peter Lang.

- Smith, D. G., Wolf, L. E. & Busenberg, B. E. (1996). *Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Soeters, J., & Schreuder, H. (1988). The interaction between national and organization cultures in accounting firms. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 13(1), 75-85.
- Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., and Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race and theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1-2), 60-73.
- Spradley, J. P. & McCurdy, D. W. (1997). *Anthropology: The cultural perspective*. New York: Wiley.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). Predicting prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 409-426.
- Thelin, J. (1985). Beyond the background music: Historical research on admissions and access in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Eds.), *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 1. (pp. 349-380). New York: Agathon.
- Thomas, G., & Hollenshead, C. (2001, Summer). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of Black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 166–175.
- Thompson, M. & Sekaquaptewa, D. (2002). When being different is detrimental: Solo status and the performance of women and racial minorities. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2, 183-203.

- Tierney, W. (1990). *Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Turner, C.S., Myers, S.L., & Creswell, J.W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(1), 27-59.
- Vaughn, L. A. (1990). *Black student satisfaction with the campus environment: A study of two universities in Alabama*. Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.
- Walters, E. (2002). Commitment to diversity and multiculturalism through institutional transformation: A case study of Olivet College. *Journal of College Student Retention* 3(4), 333--350.
- Winefield, A. H., & Jarrett, R. J. (2001). Occupational stress in university staff. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8, 285-298.
- Yang, J. (1992). Chilly campus climate: A qualitative study on White racial identity development attitudes. *ERIC Digest*, ED352576.

Appendices

Appendix 1

IRB Approval Letter



Office of Human Subjects Research
307 Samford Hall
Auburn University, AL 36849

Telephone: 334-844-5966
Fax: 334-844-4391
hsubjec@auburn.edu

December 15, 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: Demetriss Locke
Education Foundation Leadership Technology

PROTOCOL TITLE: "Support Staffs' Perceptions of Campus Climate for Diversity"

IRB AUTHORIZATION NO: 08-285 EP 0812

APPROVAL DATE: December 3, 2008
EXPIRATION DATE: December 2, 2009

The above referenced protocol was approved by IRB Expedited procedure under 45 CFR 46.110 (Category #7):

"Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

You should report to the IRB any proposed changes in the protocol or procedures and any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or others. Please reference the above authorization number in any future correspondence regarding this project.

If you will be unable to file a Final Report on your project before December 2, 2009, you must submit a request for an extension of approval to the IRB no later than November 15, 2009. If your IRB authorization expires and/or you have not received written notice that a request for an extension has been approved prior to December 2, 2009, you must suspend the project immediately and contact the Office of Human Subjects Research for assistance.

A Final Report will be required to close your IRB project file. You are reminded that you must use the stamped, IRB-approved information letter when you consent your participants.

If you have any questions concerning this Board action, please contact the Office of Human Subjects Research at 844-5966.

Sincerely,

Kathy Jo Ellison, RN, DSN, CIP
Chair of the Institutional Review Board
for the Use of Human Subjects in Research

cc: Dr. Jose Llanes
Dr. Frances K. Kochan

Appendix 2

Support Staff Campus Climate Survey

Support Staff Campus Climate Survey

This survey is part of a dissertation research that will help us better understand our campus climate as well as suggest ways for improving it. Responses are strictly anonymous; no names can be connected to individual responses and only group information will be reported. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important effort.

Background Information

Please check only one response.

1. What is your current age?

- 24 or under 35 to 44 55 to 64
 25 to 34 45 to 54 65 or older

2. What is your gender? Female Male

3. What is your highest level of formal education?

- Did not complete high school
 High school diploma or GED
 Some college, but no degree
 2-year college degree
 4-year college degree
 Some graduate work, but no graduate degree
 Master's degree
 Doctorate or professional degree

4. How do you identify yourself in terms of race/ethnicity?

- African American/Black
 Asian/Asian American
 Hispanic/Latino
 Native American/American Indian
 White/Caucasian
 Other

5. How long have you been employed at ***** University? (Circle one)

- Less than six months
 More than six months but less than 1 year
 1-2 years
 3-5 years
 6-10 years
 11-15 years
 16-20 years
 More than 20 years

6. What is your current marital status? (Circle one)

- Single, never married
 Married
 Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship
 Separated
 Divorce
 Widowed

7. How many years have you been employed, including university service?

- Less than six months
- More than six months but less than 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- More than 20 years

8. Is your job affiliated with: (Circle one)

- Academic Affairs
- Student Affairs
- University Relations
- Finance and University Services

Structural Diversity

Please check only one response.

9. Would you describe the racial composition of your immediate work unit as: (Circle one)

- Predominantly White
- Predominantly racial/ethnic minorities
- Racially/ethnically balanced

10. I would describe the gender composition of my immediate work unit as: (Circle one)

- Predominantly male
- Predominantly female
- Gender balanced

11. What is the gender of your immediate supervisor? (Circle one)

- Male
- Female

12. What is the racial/ethnic background of your supervisor? (Circle one)

- African American/Black
- Asian/Asian American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American/American Indian
- White/Caucasian
- Other

Psychological Climate:

Below are 25 statements about ***** University. Circle your response to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

Scale:

Strongly disagree 4	Somewhat disagree 3	Somewhat agree 2	Strongly agree 1
------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....13. There is a sense of community at **. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....14. ** is becoming a more enjoyable place to work. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....15. Faculty treat staff with respect. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....16. People here don't treat each other with enough respect. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....17. There is little trust between staff members and campus administrators. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....18. There is little respect between faculty and staff. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....19. Faculty are interested in staff members' professional development. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....20. Staff members are treated fairly here regardless of their racial/ethnic or socioeconomic background. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....21. Women staff are treated fairly here. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....22. Administrators act in good faith. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....23. Most students here know very little about my culture. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....24. Many minority students feel like they do not "fit in" on this campus. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....25. Campus administrators care little about what happens to staff members. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....26. There are many opportunities for faculty and staff to socialize with one another. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....27. In my unit, there is no fear of punishment when staff members speak their mind. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....28. Staff members in my unit have good working relationships with one another. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....29. My unit has good working relationships with other University units. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....30. Staff members are asked for their input and ideas when important decisions are being made. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....31. Staff members in my unit are encouraged to work closely with one another. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....32. In my unit, staff members support and care about one another. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....33. Staff members in my unit have the necessary resources to do their job. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....34. All members in my unit are treated with dignity and respect. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....35. Communication across levels within my unit is good or improving. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....36. Communication with other units is good or improving. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1.....37. Cooperation with other units is good or improving. |

Behavioral Climate

How many times since coming to ***** University have you experienced the following? (Circle one for each).
If not applicable, please circle 0.

Scale:

N/A	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
0	1	2	3	4

38. Been treated rudely by *** University:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students

39. Been discriminated against because of my:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Race/ethnicity
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gender
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Sexual orientation
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Physical disability

40. Been discriminated against by:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students

- 0 1 2 3 4..... Felt pressure from members of my own racial/ethnic group not to socialize with members of other racial/ethnic groups.
- 0 1 2 3 4..... Felt ostracized by my own racial/ethnic group because I chose not to participate in university activities related to my own group.

41. Been harassed or threatened because of my:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Race/ethnicity
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gender
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Sexual orientation
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Physical disability

42. Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about racial/ethnic minorities by:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students

43. Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about women by:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students

44. Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about gays and lesbians by:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students

45. Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about people with disabilities by:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Faculty
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Staff
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Administrators
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Students
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Seen racist, anti-gay/lesbian, or sexist graffiti in campus facilities (i.e., bathroom walls, kiosks, buildings)

46. Been present at ***-affiliated events where the following groups were portrayed in a positive manner:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Racial/ethnic minorities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Women
- 0 1 2 3 4.....People with disabilities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gays and lesbians
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Whites/Caucasians

47. Been present at ***-affiliated events where the following groups were portrayed in a negative manner:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Racial/ethnic minorities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Women
- 0 1 2 3 4.....People with disabilities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gays and lesbians
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Whites/Caucasians

48. Seen/read material in campus publications which was offensive to:

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Racial/ethnic minorities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Women
- 0 1 2 3 4.....People with disabilities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gays and lesbians
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Whites/Caucasians

**49. Seen/read material in campus publications
which increased my understanding of:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Racial/ethnic minorities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Women
- 0 1 2 3 4.....People with disabilities
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Gays and lesbians
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Whites/Caucasians

**50. Had a discussion about racism with someone from another
racial/ethnic group which affected me in a:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Negative manner
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Positive manner
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Had no effect

**51. Had a discussion about sexism with someone from
the opposite gender which affected me in a:**

- 0 1 2 3 4.....Negative manner
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Positive manner
- 0 1 2 3 4.....Had no effect

52. In your opinion, what would improve the campus climate at *** University?**

53. Do you have any other views or issues that you'd like to share with us?

Appendix 3

Participant Information Letter

The Auburn University
Institutional Review Board
has approved this document for use
from 12/3/08 to 12/3/09
Protocol # 08-285 E P 0812

**INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
“Support Staffs’ Perceptions of Campus Climate for Diversity”**

Dear Support Staff Member:

You are invited to participate in a research study to investigate support staffs’ perceptions of campus climate for diversity. The study is being conducted by Demetriss Locke, Doctoral Candidate in the College of Education, under the direction of Dr. Frances Kochan, Dean of the College of Education & Professor in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology (EFLT). You were selected as a possible participant because you are full-time, non-exempt support staff member at Auburn University and are age 19 or older.

If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete the online survey instrument, which is accessible via SurveyMoneky.com. Your total time commitment will be approximately 25 minutes.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts associated with this study. There are no realistic benefits for participants to expect or anticipate as a result of participating in this study. However, the results of this study should assist upper-level administrators and policy makers in making changes that will benefit the institution as a whole. There will be no compensation for your participation in this study. There will be no costs to you for your participation.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time by closing your web browser. Your participation is completely voluntary, and the confidentiality of your responses is assured. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology (EFLT), or any other department or unit with which you are affiliated.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. The data will be recorded electronically via SurveyMonkey.com. Only the researcher will have access to the data as the database will be password protected. The researcher's user ID and password are confidential and locked in a cabinet in the researcher's office (Haley Center, 3305). Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill the educational requirement for the Doctor of Education degree, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Demetriss Locke at 844-5797 lockedl@auburn.edu or Dr. Frances Kochan, kochafr@auburn.edu at 844-4446.

Page 1 of 2

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

Investigator's signature Date

Print Name

↑
add printed
name or
electronic
signature

The Auburn University
Institutional Review Board
has approved this document for use
from 12/3/08 to 12/2/09
Protocol # 08-285 EPO812

↑
Add this info,
in sentence
format, to your
electronic
letter

Appendix 4

Permission to Use Survey

Demetriss Locke wrote:

Dr. Dey,

My name is Demetriss Locke. I'm a doctoral student in the College of Education at Auburn University with a focus in Higher Education Administration. I read the article that you co-authored entitled Breaking the Silence: Achieving a Positive Campus Climate for Diversity from the Staff Perspective, which opened the door for my dissertation topic.

I'm looking for Campus Climate Survey Instruments that can be used for staff and was hoping that you would be willing to provide information on the instrument used to conduct your study or at least point me in the right direction. I tried to e-mail Dr. Mayhew to no avail. If you have any up to date contact information for him I'll direct this request to him.

Thanks for your time.

Regards,

Hello:

I believe that Prof. Mayhew may be traveling through Asia at present, and may not be on email as a result. I will dig up a copy of that specific instrument off of my archival server this evening, but a related instrument is available online right now:

http://www.surveymk.com/s.aspx?sm=2fqTxy0rNPSBXoL8H0P3GJQ_3d_3d

Good luck with your work!

Eric

Demetriss Locke wrote:

Dr. Dey,

I hope you're well and that you received my personal thank you card. My chair and my statistician has reviewed the instrument you so graciously sent a few weeks ago and we would like to adapt the instrument and use it to collect data for my study. I noticed from the article that the instrument was adapted from a survey that was developed at the HERI at UCLA. Can you provide me with a little guidance in terms of who to contact to obtain a letter permitting my use of the survey for my study?

Thanks,

Hello:

You are free to adapt the material I sent, and while it would be nice to acknowledge the UCLA contributions there is no need to seek formal permission. Copyright protections are for the entirety of an instrument, not portions of them that were adapted from earlier works. The UCLA

work, for example, was adapted from an effort undertaken at Berkeley, and I doubt they started at ground zero either.

You are, of course, welcome to contact the UCLA author Alexander Astin (aastin@gseis.ucla.edu) if you'd like.

Good luck!

Eric