

# **The University of Rhode Island**

**Robert L. Carothers, Ph.D., President**

---

## **Diversity Climate Assessment Spring 2007**

---

**DRAFT – January, 2008**



**SQOLAS**

**Student Quality of Life and Satisfaction**

**The Division of Student Affairs  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, Rhode Island  
02881**

The report on the 2007 Diversity Climate Assessment at the University of Rhode Island is not yet complete, but will be forthcoming shortly. The study follows similar studies conducted in 2001 and 2004, all using a single instrument and methodology to examine the diversity climate on the URI campus.

In the meantime, we are making the analyses of the data available because of their relevance to diversity issues being discussed on the campus. For a full description of the purpose and instrument used in the study, as well as a summary of the procedure used in the 2004 survey for recruitment of participants (similar to the one used in 2007), please consult the SQOLAS report “Diversity Climate Assessment, Spring 2004,” available on the Student Affairs assessment website as well as on ADVANCE’s climate change web pages.

Overall, the 2007 study found that students’ attitudes regarding diversity issues on campus and their perceptions of diversity-related behaviors on campus were much the same as in the 2004 study. Both studies indicated some significant improvements in campus diversity climate in comparison to the data that were gathered in 2001. However, as in both of the previous studies, racial and ethnic minority students felt less strongly than non-minority students that the campus succeeds in creating a diversity friendly environment.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	.....
<b>1. Introduction</b>	.....
1.1. Purpose	.....
1.2. Recruitment of Participants	.....
1.3. Instrument Used	.....
<b>2. General Description of the Sample</b>	.....
2.1. Racial Background	.....
2.2. Religious Background	.....
2.3. Disability Status	.....
2.4. Sexual Orientation	.....
2.5. Class Standing	.....
2.6. Employment	.....
2.7. Living Arrangements	.....
<b>3. Description of the 2007 Results</b>	.....
3.1. General Overview	.....
3.2. Differences According to Minority Status	.....
3.3. Differences According to Class Standing	.....
3.4. Differences According to Gender	.....
<b>4. Direct Comparison of the 2007, 2004, and 2001 Results</b>	.....
4.1. Direct Overall Differences between 2007, 2004, and 2001 Results	.....
4.2. Minority Student Comparisons	.....
4.3. Majority Student Comparisons	.....
<b>5. Qualitative Data</b>	.....
5.1. Perceived Advantages of Diversity	.....
5.2. Perceived Disadvantages of Diversity	.....
<b>6. References</b>	.....

## **Executive Summary**

The Diversity Climate Assessment 2007 is the third installment of University of Rhode Island's student-centered evaluation of the campus climate towards diversity. For this assessment, a total of 284 URI students (65% female, mean age: 22.2, 55% living on campus) were recruited via phone. Minority students were intentionally over-sampled (52% minority students).

The age range was from 18 to 66 years old, with more than three quarters (78.9%) of the participants falling at or below the age of 22. Given that the mean age of the sample is greater than almost 79% of the participants, this indicates that the age of the sample is skewed by the inclusion of older adults.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Purpose

### 1.2. Recruitment of Participants

### 1.3. Instrument Used

## 2. General Description of the Sample

### 2.1. Racial Background

For the Diversity Climate Assessment 2007, as in the 2004 assessment, minority students were intentionally oversampled. Thus, the resulting racial distribution of the obtained sample, summarized in Table 1, is not representative of the URI student body.

*Table 1.* Participants' racial background by gender.

Racial Background	Gender			
	Female		Male	
	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
American Indian / Alaskan Native	3	1.6	0	0.0
Black / African American	36	19.6	22	22.7
Hispanic / Latino/a	27	14.7	16	16.5
White / Caucasian	86	46.7	49	50.5
Asian American / Pacific Islander	20	10.9	6	6.2
Other	12	6.5	3	3.1
Did not answer	0	0.0	1	1.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>184</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>100.0</i>

As can be seen in Table 1, the racial distribution of the sample according to gender is very similar, and the difference in racial distribution by gender is not statistically significant. In general, the final sample consisted of more female students ( $n = 184$ ) than male students ( $n = 97$ ), which is not uncommon for phone recruitments. Furthermore, a higher percentage of female minority students (53.3%) was recruited than of male minority students (49.5%). Only 1 participant did not specify a racial background. Of the 15 participants who described their racial background as “other”, 2 specified Armenian and 1 each specified African/Caucasian, Black/White, Cape Verdean, Cape Verdean/Japanese/Russian, Indian, Mexican/Irish, Middle Eastern, West Indies, White/Pacific Islander, and White/Native American. Three declined to further specify.

### 2.2. Religious Background

To determine the participants' racial background, participants were asked to describe themselves in terms of *a priori* determined racial categories. No such *a priori* groupings were defined regarding participants' religion. Instead, participants were asked to name their religion, if any. In Table 2, the participants' responses are summarized through the use of broad terms for the most commonly named religion or category of religious background.

Table 2. Participants' religious background by racial background.

Religion	Racial Background					
	Minority		Non-minority		Total	
	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
Catholic	36	24.8	50	37.1	86	30.7
Christian (non-Catholic)	66	45.5	40	29.6	106	37.9
Eastern (e.g., Hindu, Buddhist)	11	7.6	0	0.0	11	3.9
Jewish	0	0.0	3	2.2	3	1.1
Other <sup>1</sup>	4	2.7	2	1.5	6	2.1
Non-religious	13	9.0	20	14.8	33	11.8
Atheist or Agnostic	2	1.4	12	8.9	14	5.0
Refused	13	9.0	8	5.9	21	7.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>280<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>100.0</b>

The differences between the religious backgrounds reported by minority and non-minority students were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). Minorities were less likely to be Catholic and less likely to be an atheist or agnostic. Minorities were more likely report their religion as Christian as well as more likely to decline to answer the question.

### 2.3. Disability Status

A total of 7 participants (2.5%) described themselves as having a disability, including a larger percentage of males (4.1%) than females (1.6%). Two described their disabilities as ADD/ADHD, one as communication, one as "waist", one as disabled veteran, and two did not describe their disabilities.

### 2.4. Sexual Orientation

The sample was almost entirely heterosexual (97.2%). None of the participants described themselves as homosexual. A total of 7 participants described themselves as bisexual or transgender, consisting of 3 females (1.6%) and 4 males (4.1%). Approximately the same percentage

<sup>1</sup> "Other" consisted of 1 each of "I don't know", Latter Day Saint/Mormon, "non-specified", "other", Universalist, and "unsure".

<sup>2</sup> 4 respondents did not answer the question of race and could not be identified as either minority or non-minority, and were therefore excluded from this analysis.

of minority and non-minority students described themselves as bisexual or transgender (3.4% vs. 1.5%, respectively).

## 2.5. Class Standing

Participants' class standings are summarized in Table 3 in regards to gender. Participants identified themselves most commonly as being of freshman class standing (38.4%), and the final sample consisted predominantly of students of lower class standing (58.8%). Males were more likely than females to be of lower class standing (56.8% vs. 62.6%), and females were much more likely than males to be seniors (22.7% vs. 18.2%). The differences between genders in class standing was not significant.

*Table 3.* Class standing of Diversity Climate Assessment 2007 participants according to gender.

Class standing	Gender					
	Female		Male		Total	
	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
Freshman	61	33.0	48	48.5	109	38.4
Sophomore	44	23.8	14	14.1	58	20.4
Junior	34	18.4	18	18.2	52	18.3
Senior	42	22.7	18	18.2	60	21.1
Grad student	4	2.1	1	1.0	5	1.8
<i>Total</i>	<i>185</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>99</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>284</i>	<i>100.0</i>

## 2.6. Employment

Table 4 presents the mean number of hours worked per week according to gender and enrollment status.

*Table 4.* Employment commitment and enrollment status by gender.

Gender	Enrollment status	Average number of hours worked per week		
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>
Female	Full-time student	11.5	11.0	161
	Part-time student	28.9	15.5	24
	<i>Total</i>	<i>13.7</i>	<i>13.0</i>	<i>185</i>
Male	Full-time student	9.9	11.3	92
	Part-time student	32.5	16.0	6
	<i>Total</i>	<i>11.2</i>	<i>12.7</i>	<i>98</i>
Total sample	Full-time student	10.9	11.1	253
	Part-time student	29.6	15.4	30
	<i>Total</i>	<i>12.9</i>	<i>12.9</i>	<i>283<sup>3</sup></i>

<sup>3</sup> One respondent declined to answer this question.

Female full-time students worked more hours per week (mean = 11.5,  $SD = 11.0$ ), on average, than male full-time students (mean = 9.9,  $SD = 11.3$ ), but the opposite was true of part-time students (female: mean = 28.9,  $SD = 15.5$ ; male: mean = 32.5,  $SD = 16.0$ ). For both genders, part-time students worked approximately 3 times as many hours per week than full-time students.

## 2.7. Living Arrangements

A total of 157 participants (55.3%) reported living on campus. A larger percentage of males (62.6%) than females (51.4%) were living on campus, though this difference was not statistically significant. However, significant differences were found according to the participants' race. The on-campus students were more likely to be Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino/Latina, and they were less likely to be White/Caucasian or Asian American/Pacific Islander.

*Table 5.* Participants' racial background by living status.

Racial Background	Living status			
	On-campus		Off-campus	
	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0	0.0	3	2.4
Black / African American	41	26.3	17	13.6
Hispanic / Latino/a	28	18.0	15	12.0
White / Caucasian	67	43.0	68	54.4
Asian American / Pacific Islander	13	8.3	13	10.4
Other	6	3.8	9	7.2
Did not answer	1	0.6	0	0.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>156</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>100.0</i>

## 3. Description of the 2007 Results

### 3.1. General Overview

The diversity climate assessment tool spanned a total of 34 items. 23 of the 34 items were taken directly from the CDQ-R (Landrum et al., 2000), with slight rewordings on six items (i.e., items 4, 5, 9, 13, 15, and 21, as explained in section 1.3.) The remaining 11 items were added items to address disability and sexual orientation issues. All 34 items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral/uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Tables 6 – 8 summarize the responses of the participants of the Diversity Climate Assessment 2007 to these 34 items. In these tables, the items, the average responses of the 2007 participants, and the standard deviations per average are given. The items are sorted in order of descending strength of agreement. Thus, items that the respondents agreed with most strongly are listed first, and items that participants disagreed with most strongly are listed last. The numerical value per item can be

interpreted by using the Likert scale outlined above. That is, an average response of above 3 reflects agreement with a statement, and an average response below 3 reflects disagreement with a statement.

Table 6 summarizes the URI student responses to the ‘original’ CDQ-R (Landrum et al., 2000) items. Of these 23 items, URI students agreed with 15 items, were neutral/uncertain about 1 item, and disagreed with 7 items. As in 2004, participants generally agreed that diversity has an inherently positive value (e.g., it strengthens communities and the workplace, enriches educational experience), and that this university provides a good environment for diversity (e.g., the university actively promotes diversity; faculty, staff, and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus). Participants tended to disagree with statements that they had encountered racial discrimination on the campus, or that minorities felt uncomfortable at the university. Generally, participants agreed most strongly with statements enumerating the advantages of diversity, and disagreed most strongly with statements that negated the value of diversity. As in 2004, participants were not aware of the university’s diversity plan. The 4 statements that respondents in 2007 agreed most strongly with were also the ones with which the 2004 respondents most strongly agreed. All statements that participants disagreed with in 2007 were also disagreed with by the 2004 respondents.

Tables 7 and 8 summarize the 2007 participants’ responses to the items regarding disability and sexual orientation issues. Participants agreed with all statements that reflected a positive assessment of this campus towards disability and sexual orientation issues. Furthermore, they disagreed that they had encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities or against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.

*Table 6.* URI 2007 student responses to the ‘original’ CDQ-R items.

<b>‘Original’ CDQ-R Items</b>		URI 2007 ( <i>N</i> = 284)	
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	4.17	0.73
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	4.13	0.67
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.96	0.77
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.92	0.81
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.84	0.96
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.80	1.01
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.80	0.86
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.78	0.81

3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.74	1.05
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.73	0.85
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.56	1.01
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.54	0.85
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.47	0.90
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	3.42	1.01
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.27	0.92
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.05	0.84
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	2.90	1.09
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.73	0.97
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.68	1.13
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.65	1.05
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.30	1.25
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.11	0.90
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.86	0.75

Table 7. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding disability issues.

Items regarding Disability Issues		URI 2007 (N = 284)	
No.	Statement	Mean	SD
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.27	0.72
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.86	0.75
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.63	0.75
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.60	0.69
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.40	0.98
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.02	0.92

Table 8. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		URI 2007 (N = 284)	
No.	Statement	Mean	SD
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	4.18	0.80
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.64	0.68
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.50	0.69
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.33	0.80

SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.50	1.09
-----	---	------	------

### 3.2. Differences According to Minority Status

Table 9. URI 2007 student responses to the 'original' CDQ-R items, minority vs. non-minority.

<b>'Original' CDQ-R items</b>		Minority ( <i>n</i> = 148)		Non-minority ( <i>n</i> = 136)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	3.15	1.03	3.71	0.90	<.0001
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.92	1.10	2.35	0.92	<.0001
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.58	0.83	4.00	0.73	<.0001
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.49	0.86	3.99	0.75	<.0001
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.58	1.28	2.00	1.14	<.0001
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.95	0.99	2.49	0.88	<.0001
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.29	0.94	3.74	0.76	<.0001
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.31	0.86	3.79	0.77	<.0001
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.65	1.03	4.06	0.84	.0003
3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.53	1.07	3.97	0.99	.0004
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.63	0.94	3.99	0.72	.0004
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	4.08	0.72	3.82	0.81	.0049
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.72	1.00	3.39	1.00	.0064
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.65	1.02	3.97	0.98	.0071
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	4.27	0.66	4.05	0.79	.0115
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.80	1.13	2.54	2.22	.0453
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.01	0.86	2.21	0.93	.0716
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.33	1.01	3.20	0.81	.2244
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.00	0.82	3.10	0.86	.3373
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	4.16	0.67	4.10	0.68	.4611
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.83	0.73	1.89	0.77	.5104
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity	2.87	1.07	2.93	1.11	.6719

	plan.					
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.91	0.81	3.93	0.81	.8273

Table 10. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding disability issues, minority vs. non-minority.

Items regarding Disability Issues		Minority (n = 148)		Non-minority (n = 136)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.41	0.69	3.80	0.64	<.0001
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.49	0.76	3.78	0.71	.0009
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.74	0.81	4.00	0.66	.0030
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.08	0.90	1.96	0.95	.2830
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.26	0.74	4.29	0.71	.6650
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.41	0.99	3.39	0.97	.8743

Table 11. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, minority vs. non-minority.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		Minority (n = 148)		Non-minority (n = 136)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.49	0.69	3.80	0.63	.0001
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.37	0.63	3.65	0.72	.0006
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	4.10	0.77	4.26	0.82	.0989
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.29	0.77	3.36	0.83	.4448
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.50	1.08	2.50	1.10	>.999

### 3.3. Differences According to Class Standing

In this section, the differences in opinions found in the 2007 assessment between students of lower class standing (freshmen and sophomores) and students of higher class standing (juniors and seniors)<sup>4</sup> are presented, starting with the differences found in regards to the ‘original’ CDQ-R (Landrum et al., 2000) items, followed by items regarding disability and sexual orientation issues.

*Table 12.* URI 2007 student responses to the ‘original’ CDQ-R items, undergraduates of lower-class standing vs. upper-class standing.

<b>‘Original’ CDQ-R items</b>		Freshmen and Sophomores ( <i>n</i> = 167)		Juniors and Seniors ( <i>n</i> = 112)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	3.00	1.05	2.73	1.12	.0404
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.64	1.00	2.88	0.92	.0447
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	3.49	0.97	3.29	1.06	.1116
3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.82	1.07	3.63	1.01	.1260
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.92	0.75	1.79	0.74	.1527
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.11	0.82	2.96	0.87	.1617
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.16	0.86	2.03	0.93	.2382
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.31	0.94	3.19	0.89	.2723
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	4.09	0.68	4.18	0.67	.2824
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.83	0.87	3.72	0.84	.2896
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.87	0.83	3.97	0.78	.2900
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	4.13	0.69	4.22	0.76	.2973
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.24	1.20	2.38	1.29	.3406
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.77	0.96	3.88	1.07	.3777
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.51	0.98	3.61	1.05	.4128
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.81	0.97	3.88	0.94	.5608
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.70	1.04	2.64	1.23	.6738
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.78	0.78	3.76	0.86	.7984
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.94	0.77	3.96	0.78	.7992

<sup>4</sup> Graduate students (*n* = 5) were excluded from this comparison.

4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.63	1.03	2.66	1.12	.8417
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.47	0.90	3.45	0.90	.8508
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.73	0.81	3.72	0.89	.9434
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.53	0.86	3.53	0.83	.9988

Table 13. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding disability issues, undergraduates of lower-class standing vs. upper-class standing.

Items regarding Disability Issues		Freshmen and Sophomores ( <i>n</i> = 167)		Juniors and Seniors ( <i>n</i> = 112)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.46	0.94	3.26	1.02	.0858
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.87	0.71	3.81	0.80	.5002
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.63	0.73	3.59	0.77	.6180
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.04	0.90	2.00	0.95	.7096
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.59	0.66	3.61	0.73	.8092
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.27	0.73	4.27	0.72	.9856

Table 14. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, undergraduate of lower-class standing vs. upper-class standing.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		Freshmen and Sophomores ( <i>n</i> = 167)		Juniors and Seniors ( <i>n</i> = 112)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.38	0.76	3.24	0.83	.1486
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.58	1.13	2.42	1.03	.2262
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.68	0.66	3.59	0.71	.2748
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.53	0.66	3.47	0.70	.4903
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other	4.16	0.76	4.21	0.81	.5801

	campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Only two of the CDQ-R statements showed significant differences based on class standing. For Question No. 8 “I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan”, juniors and seniors had a significantly lower average score than freshmen and sophomores. The opposite was true for Question No. 13, “This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity”, as juniors and seniors had a higher average score. None of the items regarding disability or sexual orientation issues showed significant differences based on class standing.

### 3.4. Differences According to Gender

In this section, the differences in opinions found in the 2007 assessment between females and males are presented, starting with the differences found in regards to the ‘original’ CDQ-R (Landrum et al., 2000) items, followed by items regarding disability and sexual orientation issues.

*Table 15.* URI 2007 student responses to the ‘original’ CDQ-R items, females vs. males.

<b>‘Original’ CDQ-R items</b>		Females ( <i>n</i> =185)		Males ( <i>n</i> = 99)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.66	1.06	4.07	0.85	.0010
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.68	1.00	3.34	1.00	.0082
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	4.24	0.69	4.02	0.78	.0140
3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.83	0.95	3.57	1.21	.0420
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.81	0.72	1.96	0.79	.0979
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.85	0.85	3.70	0.86	.1441
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.78	0.79	3.64	0.93	.1776
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.06	0.92	2.19	0.87	.2375
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.95	0.84	3.85	0.76	.3090
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	4.16	0.67	4.08	0.68	.3339
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	3.46	1.01	3.34	1.00	.3559
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.26	1.20	2.38	1.34	.4241
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.98	0.74	3.91	0.83	.4393

16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.50	0.90	3.42	0.89	.5132
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.62	1.05	2.70	1.07	.5671
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.03	0.86	3.08	0.81	.6052
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.52	0.87	3.57	0.81	.6970
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.26	0.86	3.29	1.02	.7536
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	2.91	1.10	2.88	1.08	.8620
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.84	0.94	3.86	1.01	.8728
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.74	0.94	2.72	1.01	.9132
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.68	1.13	2.67	1.12	.9183
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.78	0.78	3.78	0.87	.9527

Table 16. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding disability issues, females vs. males.

Items regarding Disability Issues		Females ( <i>n</i> = 185)		Males ( <i>n</i> = 99)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.34	1.03	5.51	0.87	.1442
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.57	0.72	3.65	0.64	.3624
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.89	0.74	3.80	0.77	.3711
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.64	0.77	3.60	0.71	.6127
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.01	0.90	2.05	0.96	.7303
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.26	0.71	4.29	0.76	.7564

Table 17. URI 2007 student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, females vs. males.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		Females ( <i>n</i> = 185)		Males ( <i>n</i> = 99)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	4.23	0.76	4.07	0.86	.1028
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or	3.38	0.79	3.22	0.80	.1103

	bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.					
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.43	1.09	2.63	1.04	.1529
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.65	0.69	3.61	0.65	.6219
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.51	0.69	3.48	0.68	.7615

#### 4. Direct Comparison of the 2007, 2004, and 2001 Results

##### 4.1. Direct Overall Differences between 2007, 2004, and 2001 Results

The main purpose of the Diversity Climate Assessment 2007 was to assess whether or not there were observable differences in the attitudes and experiences of students regarding diversity issues between the years 2007, 2004, and 2001. Tables 18 – 20 summarize the responses given by participants in 2001, 2004, and 2007, starting with the differences found in regards to the ‘original’ CDQ-R (Landrum et al., 2000) items, and followed by items regarding disability and sexual orientation issues. The tables present the average response rating given by 2001, 2004, and 2007 participants per item, the standard deviation, and the statistical significance<sup>5</sup> of the differences between the groups per item. As usual, the items are presented in the order of ascending *p*-values; that is, items to which 2001, 2004, and 2007 participants responded most differently are listed first, and items to which their responses were essentially the same are listed last. For items that showed significant differences between the years, follow-up tests involving comparisons of each year to every other year were done to see specifically for which pairs of years the responses differed. This is different than in the 2004 report due to the increased number of years (3) included in the analyses in 2007.

Table 18. URI student responses to the ‘original’ CDQ-R items, 2007 vs. previous years.

<b>‘Original’ CDQ-R items</b>		URI 2001 ( <i>n</i> = 148)		URI 2004 ( <i>n</i> = 515)		URI 2007 ( <i>n</i> = 284)		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	2.91	1.02	3.29	1.00	4.42	1.01	<.0001

<sup>5</sup> ‘Statistical significance’ of the group differences is denoted by a *p*-value of less than 0.05. Also note, however, that in the case of many comparisons, such as in this case, a more stringent interpretation of the *p*-value is oftentimes used, as the likelihood of chance differences increases with the number of comparisons performed.

20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	3.86	0.85	4.18	0.72	4.13	0.67	<.0001
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	3.99	0.56	4.26	0.66	4.17	0.73	<.0001
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.43	0.93	3.67	0.78	3.54	0.85	.0034
3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.51	1.01	3.81	0.91	3.74	1.05	.0048
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.34	0.91	2.09	0.95	2.11	0.90	.0142
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.68	0.92	2.50	0.96	2.65	1.05	.0463
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.56	0.81	3.76	0.87	3.73	0.85	.0468
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.73	0.84	3.91	0.85	3.92	0.81	.0492
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.93	0.75	1.77	0.77	1.86	0.75	.0516
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.68	0.93	3.87	0.88	3.80	0.86	.0594
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.80	0.75	3.97	0.82	3.96	0.77	.0734
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.68	0.83	3.82	0.77	3.78	0.81	.1508
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.19	0.70	3.11	0.74	3.05	0.84	.1706
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.41	0.86	3.54	0.88	3.47	0.90	.2575
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.86	0.94	2.77	0.94	2.73	0.97	.3828
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	2.95	0.97	2.85	1.11	2.90	1.09	.5424
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.71	0.93	3.79	1.07	3.80	1.01	.6389
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.76	0.86	3.79	0.95	3.84	0.96	.6451
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.48	0.93	3.50	1.07	3.56	1.01	.6658
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.76	1.06	2.70	1.14	2.67	1.13	.7452
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.39	1.10	2.36	1.24	2.30	1.25	.7596
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.30	0.79	3.31	0.94	3.27	0.92	.8213

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other:

1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0001$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1998$ )
3. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0031$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.0564$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.5892$ )

4. all NS: 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.1322$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.9581$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1018$ )  
7. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0369$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1268$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.8974$ )  
9. 2004<2001 ( $p=.0119$ ), 2007-2001 ( $p=.0373$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9695$ )  
17. all NS: 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.0503$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.0732$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9988$ )  
19. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0056$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.4123$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.0768$ )  
20. 2004>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0008$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.6821$ )  
22. 2004>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0220$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1432$ )

Table 19. URI student responses to the items regarding disability issues, 2007 vs. previous years.

Items regarding Disability Issues		URI 2001 ( $n = 148$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 515$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 284$ )		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	$p$
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.41	0.93	2.18	0.96	2.02	0.92	.0004
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.11	0.64	4.33	0.66	4.27	0.73	.0016
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.65	0.76	3.75	0.82	3.86	0.72	.0219
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.56	0.96	3.50	0.84	3.63	0.75	.1324
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.51	0.77	3.49	0.74	3.60	0.69	.1523
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.30	1.05	3.25	1.02	3.40	0.98	.1544

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other

25. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0010$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0400$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.4520$ )  
26. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.3607$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0216$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1308$ )  
28. 2004<2001 ( $p=.0303$ ), 2007<2001 ( $p=.0002$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.0666$ )

Table 20. URI student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, 2007 vs. previous years.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		URI 2001 ( $n = 148$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 515$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 284$ )		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	$p$
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.32	0.77	3.60	0.77	3.64	0.68	<.0001
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	3.97	0.71	4.23	0.72	4.18	0.80	.0007
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.26	0.84	3.37	0.77	3.50	0.69	.0054
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient	3.07	0.92	3.16	0.90	3.33	0.79	.0074

	sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.							
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.66	1.09	2.39	1.14	2.50	1.09	.0727

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other:

SO1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0004$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0149$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.5703$ )

SO2. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0002$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.7446$ )

SO3. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.5328$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0131$ ), 2007>2004 ( $p=.0309$ )

SO5. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.2851$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0059$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.0528$ )

## 4.2. Minority Student Comparisons

The samples of 2001, 2004, and 2007 had significantly different racial compositions. In all cases, minority students were intentionally over-sampled. In 2007, this oversampling was conducted with the greatest success (compare the 2001 and 2004 minority recruitment rates of 27.7% and 41.7%, respectively, to the 2007 minority recruitment rate of 52.1%), resulting in the most diverse sample to date.

*Table 21. Participants' racial background by year of assessment.*

Race	2001		2004		2007	
	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>%</i>
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0	0.0	3	0.6	3	1.1
Black / African American	12	8.1	56	10.9	58	20.4
Hispanic / Latino/a	15	10.1	69	13.4	43	15.1
White / Caucasian	107	72.3	299	58.0	135	47.5
Asian American / Pacific Islander	8	5.4	51	9.9	26	9.2
Other	4	2.7	32	6.2	15	5.3
Did not answer	2	1.4	5	1.0	4	1.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>515</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>284</i>	<i>100.0</i>

*Note: The difference in racial composition between years is statistically significant,  $\chi^2(12) = 35.90, p=.0003$ .*

*Table 22. URI student responses to the 'original' CDQ-R items, 2007 vs. previous years, minority students only.*

'Original' CDQ-R items		URI 2001 ( $n = 39$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 211$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 145$ )		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	2.41	1.02	3.05	1.05	3.20	1.08	.0002
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	3.82	0.91	4.25	0.65	4.14	0.70	.0021
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	3.97	0.49	4.32	0.67	4.21	0.72	.0096

3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.08	1.09	3.57	0.98	3.53	1.11	.0246
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.87	0.70	3.84	0.94	3.65	1.00	.1351
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	3.28	0.97	3.01	1.01	2.94	1.01	.1686
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	3.13	0.89	2.79	1.09	2.85	1.08	.1961
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	2.03	0.67	1.80	0.81	1.88	0.77	.2019
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.36	1.11	3.61	0.87	3.63	0.85	.2222
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.77	0.90	3.98	0.86	3.87	0.79	.2337
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and Administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.31	0.89	3.47	0.93	3.57	0.87	.2675
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.21	0.83	3.10	0.65	3.02	0.82	.3234
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.36	0.87	2.16	0.99	2.11	0.94	.3587
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.85	1.25	2.70	1.32	2.54	1.33	.3611
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.44	1.02	3.64	1.00	3.69	1.03	.3828
14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.38	1.19	3.57	1.16	3.66	1.04	.3940
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.95	0.72	4.10	0.80	4.06	0.73	.4984
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.87	1.03	2.72	1.09	2.83	1.09	.5291
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.49	1.19	3.65	0.99	3.60	0.94	.6127
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.97	1.02	2.82	1.13	2.81	1.11	.6951
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.18	0.85	3.30	0.93	3.27	0.92	.7407
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.38	0.91	3.41	0.89	3.34	0.86	.7630
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.36	0.87	3.39	1.01	3.33	1.01	.8592

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for minority respondents only:

1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0018$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0001$ ), 2007>2004 NS ( $p=.3766$ )
3. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0191$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0423$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9398$ )
20. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0015$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0279$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.3685$ )
22. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0089$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1203$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.2945$ )

Table 23. URI student responses to the items regarding disability issues, 2007 vs. previous years, minority students only.

Items regarding Disability Issues		URI 2001 ( <i>n</i> = 39)		URI 2004 ( <i>n</i> = 211)		URI 2007 ( <i>n</i> = 145)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.00	0.76	4.32	0.71	4.24	0.79	.0490
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.44	0.79	3.57	0.85	3.72	0.82	.0861
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.38	0.88	2.20	0.96	2.08	0.94	.1558
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.28	1.15	3.23	1.04	3.42	0.95	.2058
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.44	0.82	3.35	0.77	3.43	0.69	.5418
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.44	0.99	3.38	0.88	3.47	0.76	.6461

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for minority respondents only:

25. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0399$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1731$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.6114$ )

Table 24. URI student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, 2007 vs. previous years, minority students only.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		URI 2001 ( <i>n</i> = 39)		URI 2004 ( <i>n</i> = 211)		URI 2007 ( <i>n</i> = 145)		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i>
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	3.69	0.95	4.20	0.74	4.05	0.80	.0008
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.05	0.89	3.23	0.80	3.39	0.66	.0260
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.18	0.88	3.45	0.74	3.52	0.70	.0426
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	2.97	0.95	3.14	0.90	2.20	0.77	.0611
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.95	1.05	2.60	1.07	2.49	1.09	.0622

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for minority respondents only:

SO1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0007$ ), 2007-2001 ( $p=.0325$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1762$ )

SO2. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.0928$ ), 2007-2001 ( $p=.0323$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.6806$ )

SO5. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.3815$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0387$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1239$ )

### 4.3. Majority Student Comparisons

Table 25. URI student responses to the 'original' CDQ-R items, 2007 vs. previous years, non-minority students only.

<b>'Original' CDQ-R items</b>		URI 2001 ( $n = 107$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 299$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 135$ )		Sig.
<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
1	The campus environment is free from racial conflict.	3.07	0.96	3.47	0.91	4.03	0.87	<.0001
19	The faculty at this institution is sensitive to diversity issues.	3.47	0.93	3.88	0.59	3.77	0.78	<.0001
7	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the multicultural needs of the campus.	3.65	0.77	3.98	0.73	3.94	0.75	.0005
18	I am satisfied with my educational institution.	3.74	0.82	4.04	0.73	4.01	0.69	.0013
22	Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace.	3.99	0.59	4.14	0.62	4.09	0.74	.0032
3	This university actively promotes diversity.	3.69	0.94	3.98	0.79	3.97	0.95	.0089
20	Diversity enriches the educational experience.	3.90	0.81	4.04	0.74	4.10	0.65	.0129
9	Taking classes that emphasize multicultural diversity would not enhance my education.	2.34	0.92	2.04	0.93	2.13	0.85	.0153
16	Where appropriate, professors address multicultural issues in the classroom.	3.50	0.85	3.73	0.77	3.70	0.79	.0403
4	As far as I know, minorities feel uncomfortable at this university.	2.58	0.85	2.34	0.82	2.43	0.97	.0444
6	In general, the relationship between minority and majority students is a friendly one.	3.80	0.65	3.97	0.63	3.96	0.74	.0785
21	Diversity does not promote personal growth and a healthy society.	1.91	0.78	3.88	0.72	1.85	0.73	.0931
17	Diversity on campus improves the quality of my education.	3.73	0.81	3.89	0.82	3.94	0.83	.1176
12	I think that the core curriculum should require courses in multicultural diversity.	3.34	0.95	3.25	1.10	3.44	1.01	.2313
13	This university does not provide a new student orientation that adequately addresses multicultural diversity.	2.69	0.86	2.58	0.83	2.50	0.88	.2341
23	Diversity enhances America's economic competitiveness.	3.75	0.77	1.74	0.80	3.83	0.80	.2802
2	Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests than by race.	3.87	0.77	3.92	0.88	3.66	0.84	.3292
11	I have encountered racial discrimination on this campus.	2.21	0.99	2.12	1.12	2.02	1.10	.4246

14	I feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend.	3.84	0.79	3.96	0.97	2.99	0.95	.4460
5	My education on this campus has not included exposure to the history and culture of minority groups.	2.70	1.00	2.62	1.14	2.53	1.10	.4962
15	Hiring practices at this university do not indicate that racial/ethnic barriers are gradually eroding.	3.19	0.66	3.12	0.78	3.09	0.86	.6190
8	I am aware of the content of my university's diversity plan.	2.91	1.00	2.90	1.12	2.98	1.07	.7650
10	Recruitment of minority students is an institutional priority.	3.29	0.75	3.26	0.88	3.22	0.82	.7905

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for non-minority respondents only:

1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0003$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1180$ )
3. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0080$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0346$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9886$ )
4. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0357$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.3742$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.5617$ )
7. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0004$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0082$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.8875$ )
9. 2004<2001 ( $p=.0109$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1952$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.5832$ )
16. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0322$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1477$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9156$ )
18. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0011$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0114$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9559$ )
19. 2004>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0035$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.3124$ )
20. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0096$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.0771$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.8796$ )
22. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0040$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.4678$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1081$ )

Table 26. URI student responses to the items regarding disability issues, 2007 vs. previous years, non-minority students only.

Items regarding Disability Issues		URI 2001 ( $n = 107$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 299$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 135$ )		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	$p$
28	I have encountered discrimination against persons with disabilities on this campus.	2.42	0.97	2.16	0.96	1.97	0.91	.0013
29	As far as I know, persons with disabilities feel comfortable at this university.	3.53	0.76	3.60	0.70	3.79	0.64	.0102
26	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.73	0.75	3.89	0.77	4.01	0.63	.0111
25	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity together with persons with disabilities.	4.17	0.56	4.34	0.62	4.31	0.65	.0422
27	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of the disabled population on campus.	3.61	0.95	3.60	0.79	3.79	0.69	.0568
24	In general, buildings on this campus are accessible to individuals with disabilities.	3.31	1.02	3.28	1.00	3.36	1.00	.7341

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for non-minority respondents only:

25. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0329$ ), 2007-2001 NS ( $p=.1720$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.8767$ )  
 26. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.1383$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0076$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.2097$ )  
 28. 2004<2001 ( $p=.0408$ ), 2007<2001 ( $p=.0008$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1286$ )  
 29. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.6512$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0146$ ), 2007>2004 ( $p=.0308$ )

Table 27. URI student responses to the items regarding sexual orientation issues, 2007 vs. previous years, non-minority students only.

Items regarding Sexual Orientation Issues		URI 2001 ( $n = 107$ )		URI 2004 ( $n = 299$ )		URI 2007 ( $n = 135$ )		Sig.
No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	$p$
SO2	I believe that the faculty, staff and administration exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.37	0.73	3.70	0.78	3.79	0.63	<.0001
SO5	As far as I know, persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation feel comfortable at this university.	3.34	0.82	3.47	0.74	3.62	0.70	.0126
SO1	I feel comfortable attending classes and any other campus activity regardless of the sexual orientation of those who attend.	4.07	0.59	4.28	0.68	4.30	0.77	.0138
SO4	I have encountered discrimination against persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation on this campus.	2.56	1.09	2.75	1.17	2.50	1.09	.0760
SO3	I believe that the students exhibit sufficient sensitivity to the needs of persons of a gay/lesbian or bisexual/transgender sexual orientation.	3.11	0.91	3.17	0.91	3.35	0.83	.0785

Follow-up Tukey tests to determine which years were significantly different from each other for non-minority respondents only:

- SO1. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0187$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0257$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.9525$ )  
 SO2. 2004>2001 ( $p=.0003$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p<.0001$ ), 2007-2004 ( $p=.4697$ )  
 SO5. 2004-2001 NS ( $p=.2464$ ), 2007>2001 ( $p=.0094$ ), 2007-2004 NS ( $p=.1289$ )

## 5. Qualitative Data

### 5.1. Perceived Advantages of Diversity

Table 28. Summary of URI 2007 student responses to the open-ended question: benefits of diversity.

Category		Theme		Sample Statements
Name	%	Name	%	
		Educational Benefit	12.7	
More		Raised Awareness, Sensitivity	2.9	

Educated, Well-rounded	21.4	Increased Exposure, Experience	5.8
Growth of Self & Society	28.3	Broadened Horizons, Open- mindedness	18.8
		Personal & Societal Growth	9.8
Assuaging Differences	14.5	Overcoming Differences	1.1
		Enhanced Understanding	8.3
		Increased Tolerance, Acceptance	2.5
		Social Justice, Fairness	2.2
Social Benefit, More Inclusive	11.2	Social Benefit, More Inclusive	9.1
		Comfort	2.2
Preparation for 'Real World'	8.3	Preparation for 'Real World'	8.3
None, do not know	7.6	None	3.6
		Don't Know, Not Sure	4.0
		URI Programming Issues	5.4

Miscellaneous 8.7

Miscellaneous 3.3

Table 29. URI 2007 student responses in expressing benefits of diversity, minority vs. non-minority.

Perceived Benefit	Minority		Non-minority	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
More educated, well-rounded	33	23.7	25	18.8
Growth of self and society	36	25.9	39	29.3
Assuaging differences	20	14.4	20	15.0
Preparation for real world	7	5.0	16	12.0
Social benefit, more inclusive	20	14.4	11	8.3
None, do not know	16	11.5	5	3.8
Miscellaneous	7	5.0	17	12.8
<i>Total</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>100.0</i>

*Note: The difference between minorities and non-minorities is statistically significant,  $\chi^2(6) = 17.16, p=.0087$ .  
N=272 because 12 respondents did not provide an answer.*

## 5.2. Perceived Disadvantages of Diversity

Table 30. Summary of URI 2007 student responses to the open-ended question: disadvantages of diversity.

Category		Theme		Sample Statements
<i>Name</i>	%	<i>Name</i>	%	
Negative Consequences	11.3	Increased Potential for Conflict, Tension	4.9	
		Discomfort	4.6	
		Creates and/or Increases Rifts & Barriers	1.1	
		Communication Difficulties	0.7	
		Discrimination	1.4	
		Ignorant, Closed-	7.8	

		minded People	
Negative Associations	16.2	Reverse Discrimination, Affirmative Action	2.8
		Racism & Racial Tension	1.8
		Stereotyping	1.8
		Prejudice	0.7
Implementation	2.5	Too much	1.4
		Educational	0.7
		URI Programming Issues	0.4
Other	70.1	None	59.2
		Don't Know	4.2
		Miscellaneous	3.9
		No comment	2.8

## 6. References

- Höppner, B. B., Dougan, T. R., & Campbell, J. F. (2004). *Diversity Climate Assessment 2004* (Tech. Rep.). Kingston: University of Rhode Island, Division of Student Affairs, Student Quality of Life and Satisfaction Research Project. Available at:  
[http://www.uri.edu/student\\_affairs/sqolas/repartindex.html](http://www.uri.edu/student_affairs/sqolas/repartindex.html).
- Höppner, B. B., Dougan, T. R., & Campbell, J. F. (2001). *Diversity Climate Assessment 2001* (Tech. Rep.). Kingston: University of Rhode Island, Division of Student Affairs, Student Quality of Life and Satisfaction Research Project. Available at:  
[http://www.uri.edu/student\\_affairs/sqolas/repartindex.html](http://www.uri.edu/student_affairs/sqolas/repartindex.html)
- Landrum, R. E., Dillinger, R. J., & Vandernoot, E. A. (2000). Assessment of cultural diversity at

metropolitan universities. *Metropolitan Universities*, 10, 43-52.