



NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

---

# NILIE Technical College Raleigh, North Carolina

## Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Racial Diversity Subscale Report

by

Katie Ratterree & Alessandra Dinin

The National Initiative for Leadership  
& Institutional Effectiveness

North Carolina State University

September 2016



National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness

Audrey Jaeger, PhD, Executive Director  
Dawn Crotty, Executive Assistant  
Alessandra Dinin, Director of Research  
Katie Ratterree, Assistant Director of Research  
Greg King, Researcher  
Laura Garland, Researcher

Phone: 919-515-8567  
919-515-6289  
Fax: 919-515-6305  
Web: <http://ced.ncsu.edu/ahe/nilie>

College of Education  
North Carolina State University  
300 Poe Hall, Box 7801  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7801

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

## Racial Diversity Literature Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## References

- American Psychological Association Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention and Training in Psychology (1996). *How to recruit and hire ethnic minority faculty*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. In *The compelling need for diversity in higher education*, Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al, No. 97-75237 (E. D. Mich.) and Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75928 (E. D. Mich.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.
- Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. In M. Peterson, D. Dill, L. Mets, & Associates (Eds.), *Planning and management for a changing environment* (pp. 405-431). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.
- Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. Wilds (Ed.), *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report* (pp. 39-67). Washington, DC: American.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) fall staff survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 119-148.
- Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2009). Attitudes and advocacy: Understanding faculty views on racial/ethnic diversity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 415-438.
- Smith, D., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2005). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 169-192.

**Table 1. Institutional Structure Frequency Distributions**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Institutional Structure	Response Option	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>1</b> my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	Strongly disagree	8	3%	94	2%
	Disagree somewhat	19	7%	213	5%
	Neither	39	15%	692	16%
	Agree somewhat	105	40%	1925	44%
	Strongly agree	91	35%	1465	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4389</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>2</b> my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	Strongly disagree	1	0%	82	2%
	Disagree somewhat	5	2%	171	4%
	Neither	14	5%	577	13%
	Agree somewhat	90	35%	1967	45%
	Strongly agree	150	58%	1575	36%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4372</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>3</b> my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	11	4%	68	2%
	Disagree somewhat	18	7%	147	3%
	Neither	18	7%	551	13%
	Agree somewhat	71	27%	1972	45%
	Strongly agree	143	55%	1643	38%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4381</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>4</b> employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	Strongly disagree	33	12%	77	2%
	Disagree somewhat	65	25%	226	5%
	Neither	54	20%	1015	24%
	Agree somewhat	75	28%	1873	44%
	Strongly agree	38	14%	1023	24%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4214</b>	<b>100%</b>

*NILIE Tech*  
*compared with:*

<b>Institutional Structure (continued)</b>	Response Option	<b>NILIE Tech</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>5</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	Strongly disagree	5	2%	334	8%
	Disagree somewhat	39	16%	810	19%
	Neither	73	30%	1112	26%
	Agree somewhat	88	37%	1318	31%
	Strongly agree	35	15%	667	16%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4241</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>6</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, VP, Deans)	Strongly disagree	7	3%	490	12%
	Disagree somewhat	30	11%	804	19%
	Neither	48	18%	1207	28%
	Agree somewhat	112	42%	1110	26%
	Strongly agree	67	25%	627	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4238</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>7</b> a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	Strongly disagree	6	2%	150	4%
	Disagree somewhat	19	8%	325	8%
	Neither	59	24%	1187	28%
	Agree somewhat	119	49%	1705	40%
	Strongly agree	41	17%	908	21%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4275</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Supervisory Relationships	Response Option	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>8</b> my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	Strongly disagree	9	4%	86	2%
	Disagree somewhat	11	4%	131	3%
	Neither	32	13%	639	15%
	Agree somewhat	118	47%	1690	40%
	Strongly agree	81	32%	1729	40%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4275</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>9</b> my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	Strongly disagree	26	11%	100	2%
	Disagree somewhat	36	15%	115	3%
	Neither	72	30%	679	16%
	Agree somewhat	74	31%	1559	37%
	Strongly agree	34	14%	1718	41%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4171</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>10</b> my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	Strongly disagree	22	8%	73	2%
	Disagree somewhat	57	22%	101	2%
	Neither	61	23%	620	15%
	Agree somewhat	80	30%	1610	38%
	Strongly agree	43	16%	1797	43%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4201</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>11</b> my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	Strongly disagree	1	0%	111	3%
	Disagree somewhat	17	7%	145	4%
	Neither	56	23%	723	18%
	Agree somewhat	114	46%	1510	37%
	Strongly agree	60	24%	1602	39%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4091</b>	<b>100%</b>

NILIE Tech  
compared with:

Supervisory Relationships (continued)		NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>12</b> my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	8	3%	77	2%
	Disagree somewhat	7	3%	131	3%
	Neither	43	16%	686	17%
	Agree somewhat	115	44%	1530	37%
	Strongly agree	89	34%	1682	41%
<b>Total</b>		<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4106</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Teamwork	Response Option	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>13</b> racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	Strongly disagree	6	2%	73	2%
	Disagree somewhat	12	5%	174	5%
	Neither	50	20%	1269	34%
	Agree somewhat	120	48%	1243	33%
	Strongly agree	62	25%	1004	27%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3763</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>14</b> racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	Strongly disagree	12	5%	72	2%
	Disagree somewhat	27	10%	149	4%
	Neither	49	19%	1203	32%
	Agree somewhat	97	37%	1307	35%
	Strongly agree	76	29%	1015	27%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3746</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>15</b> the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	Strongly disagree	11	4%	85	2%
	Disagree somewhat	23	9%	158	4%
	Neither	47	18%	1050	28%
	Agree somewhat	109	41%	1363	36%
	Strongly agree	74	28%	1094	29%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3750</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Student Focus	Response Option	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>16</b> faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	21	8%	71	2%
	Disagree somewhat	41	16%	256	7%
	Neither	63	24%	1297	35%
	Agree somewhat	80	30%	1392	37%
	Strongly agree	58	22%	714	19%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3730</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>17</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	Strongly disagree	2	1%	76	2%
	Disagree somewhat	16	6%	301	8%
	Neither	47	18%	1542	42%
	Agree somewhat	121	47%	1160	32%
	Strongly agree	69	27%	569	16%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3648</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>18</b> my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	7	3%	68	2%
	Disagree somewhat	22	9%	211	5%
	Neither	36	14%	1043	26%
	Agree somewhat	99	38%	1815	45%
	Strongly agree	94	36%	933	23%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4070</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>19</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	Strongly disagree	21	8%	48	1%
	Disagree somewhat	57	21%	157	4%
	Neither	60	23%	1464	39%
	Agree somewhat	73	27%	1411	38%
	Strongly agree	55	21%	638	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3718</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Institutional Structure	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>1</b> my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	262	3.962	4.015		
<b>2</b> my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	260	4.473	4.094	***	.426
<b>3</b> my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	261	4.215	4.136		
<b>4</b> employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	265	3.075	3.840	***	-.814
<b>5</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	240	3.454	3.277	*	.153
<b>6</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, Vice-President, Deans)	264	3.765	3.137	***	.519
<b>7</b> a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	244	3.697	3.677		

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

**Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Supervisory Relationships	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>8</b> my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	251	4.000	4.133	*	-.145
<b>9</b> my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	242	3.223	4.122	***	-.940
<b>10</b> my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	263	3.247	4.180	***	-1.021
<b>11</b> my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	248	3.867	4.063	**	-.202
<b>12</b> my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	262	4.031	4.123		

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

**Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Teamwork	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>13</b> racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	250	3.880	3.779		
<b>14</b> racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	261	3.759	3.813		
<b>15</b> the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	264	3.803	3.859		

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

**Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Student Focus	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>					
<b>16</b> faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	263	3.430	3.649	***	-.231
<b>17</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	255	3.937	3.506	***	.469
<b>18</b> my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	258	3.973	3.819	**	.169
<b>19</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	266	3.316	3.655	***	-.382

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



**Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

What is your personnel classification?	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
Faculty	75	3.917	3.879		
Administrator	41	3.706	3.958	*	-.380
Staff	147	3.666	3.857	**	-.284

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you:	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
Hispanic or Latino, of any race	60	3.960	3.625	**	.418
American Indian or Alaska Native, not Hispanic or Latino	0	--			
Asian, not Hispanic or Latino	4	--			
Black, not Hispanic or Latino	31	3.791	3.815		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, not Hispanic or Latino	0	--			
White, not Hispanic or Latino	146	3.663	3.909	***	-.370
Two or more races, not Hispanic or Latino	14	3.581	3.658		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

<b>Your status at this institution is:</b>	<b>NILIE Tech</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
Full-Time	222	3.701	3.817	*	-.166
Part-Time	41	3.983	3.958		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Degree Earned**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

<b>What is the highest degree you have earned?</b>	<b>NILIE Tech</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	2	--			
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	14	3.787	3.753		
Master's degree	105	3.829	3.833		
Bachelor's degree	61	3.769	3.873		
Associate's degree	52	3.586	3.965	***	-.579
High School diploma or GED	23	3.644	3.888		
No diploma or degree	1	--			

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

<b>What gender are you:</b>	<b>NILIE Tech</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
Man	48	3.772	3.874		
Woman	199	3.719	3.883	**	-.235
Another gender identity	0	--			
I prefer not to respond	1	--			

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

<b>How many years have you worked at this institution?</b>	<b>NILIE Tech</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
5 years or less	110	3.861	3.943		
6-10 years	53	3.736	3.838		
11-15 years	39	3.629	3.801		
16-20 years	19	3.739	3.785		
21-25 years	16	3.723	3.773		
26 years or more	14	3.369	3.896	**	-.829

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

How many years have you worked in higher education?	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
5 years or less	91	3.941	3.999		
6-10 years	59	3.701	3.865		
11-15 years	35	3.499	3.828	**	-.471
16-20 years	26	3.891	3.781		
21-25 years	20	3.770	3.753		
26 years or more	16	3.368	3.803	*	-.627

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

**Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age**

*NILIE Tech  
compared with:*

What is your age?	NILIE Tech		NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	266	3.738	3.850	*	-.159
29 or younger	5	--			
30 - 39	43	3.838	3.863		
40 - 49	59	3.966	3.848		
50 - 59	61	3.649	3.879	*	-.329
60 or older	65	3.645	3.911	**	-.404

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality