Student and Faculty Perspectives on the Emphasis of Inclusive and Culturally Engaging Coursework

Samantha Silberstein

Allison BrckaLorenz

Indiana University Bloomington

Paper presented at the 2018 annual meeting of American Education Research Association (AERA),

New York, NY

Abstract

Higher education provides opportunities for students from homogenous backgrounds to be introduced to new concepts and experiences, and it has the potential to create environments that engage and include students from marginalized backgrounds. It is not enough to strive for structural diversity; institutions should intentionally create formal diversity experiences, such as coursework focused on inclusive and culturally engaging activities. This large-scale, multi-institution study of undergraduate and faculty perceptions of inclusive and culturally engaging coursework gives insight into the ways faculty create supportive environments in their classrooms and what students are participating in these activities. This paper focuses on areas in which campuses are succeeding in creating more inclusive and culturally engaging classroom environments and which areas need improvement.

Student and Faculty Perspectives on the Emphasis of Inclusive and Culturally Engaging Coursework

As our educational system becomes more segregated in K-12 schools (Orfield & Lee, 2011), institutions of higher learning become one of the first opportunities for students to be exposed to issues of inclusion and diversity. Not only does college provide opportunities for students from homogenous backgrounds to be introduced to new concepts and experiences, but it has the potential to create environments that engage and include students from more marginalized backgrounds (Museus, 2014). As institutions become more diverse regarding identity and culture, it is imperative that they find ways to include and support all students on campus.

Students can be introduced to diversity in one of three ways: structural diversity, formal diversity experiences, and informal diversity experiences (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). It is not enough to strive for structural diversity by increasing diverse representation on campus. Institutions should be intentional in creating formal diversity experiences, such as coursework focused on inclusive and culturally engaging activities. When measuring these types of initiatives, previous studies have focused on quantity of diversity classes as opposed to content across the curriculum (e.g.; Bowman, 2012; Bowman, Brandenberger, Hill, & Lapsley, 2011; Gurin et al, 2002; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). Nelson Laird (2011) argues that creating more comprehensive models of measurement allows institutions to better understand which courses are participating in this work beyond just those labeled as such. Although the effects were not as strong as informal interactions, Gurin et al. (2002) found that diversity courses increased both learning and democracy-related outcomes although the significance varied for students by race. Nelson Laird (2005) found that students who had taken diversity courses scored higher on academic self-confidence, social agency, and critical thinking. Bowman (2012) found that diversity experiences, including coursework, in the first year of college lead to increased diversity experiences in the senior year and Bowman et al. (2011) found that diversity experiences, including coursework, have long term effects on students even after graduation.

The benefits of participation in diversity-related courses have been widely studied (e.g.; Bowman, 2011; Bowman et al., 2011, Gurin et al. 2002; Nelson Laird, 2005) and include such things as higher academic self-confidence, social agency, and critical thinking with long term effects that last well beyond graduation. Thus, creating and sustaining these opportunities are crucial. When faculty say they incorporate diversity into their coursework, students report that they engage more in these activities (Kuh, Nelson Laird, & Umbach, 2004). Not all students experience positive outcomes when it comes to taking courses that incorporate diversity content. Bowman (2012) found that students of color were more likely than White students to have negativity diversity interactions when taking more diversity coursework and Gurin et al. (2002) found that White students benefited more from diversity courses. Faculty who are intentional with their activities in the classroom have students who are more likely to gain expertise in that area. Thus, it is important to know which faculty are including these types of initiatives in their work and how this aligns with students' perceptions.

Faculty and students participate in diversity initiatives to varying degrees depending on several factors. Studies looking at who participates in diversity coursework typically include simple measures of gender and race and are complicated by small sample sizes (e.g.; Bowman, 2012; Gurin et al., 2002; Kuh et al., 2004; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Nelson Laird, 2005). Some studies have additionally looked at faculty department (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Nelson Laird, 2011) or students' major (Bowman, 2012). This study expands on previous studies by including a larger number of demographic variables related to race (including Indigenous students, Latino/a students, and multiracial), gender (including genders outside the binary spectrum), as well as other variables such as sexual orientation. In addition to major, other characteristics were included such as the format of courses offered as well as the social class of students and division of faculty.

Studies looking at who participates in diversity coursework typically include gender and race, although gender is reported as a dichotomous variable and studies are often limited in their ability to report nuanced results for race due to small sample sizes (e.g.; Bowman, 2012; Gurin et al., 2002; Kuh, Nelson Laird, & Umbach, 2004; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Nelson Laird, 2005). In studies looking at faculty incorporation of diversity work, consistently female faculty and faculty of color have been more likely to create these experiences for students (Kuh et al., 2004; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006). Similarly, Nelson Laird (2005) found that female students were more likely to take a diversity-related course but did not find significance for the other demographic variables measured including race which used a dichotomous variable of White students and students of color. On the departmental level, Mayhew & Grunwald (2006) found significance for only education and engineering with faculty members in education less likely to incorporate diversity and faculty members in engineering more likely to incorporate diversity. Bowman (2012) did look at the role of students' major in participation in diversity-focused courses, creating dummy variables for whether students were arts/humanities majors or social science majors.

Framework

For our study, we use the Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) model as our framework (Museus, 2014). The CECE model posits that to create a more inclusive campus and to support the success of a diverse student body, it is necessary for institutions to create environments which engage the cultures and identities of marginalized students. The CECE model identifies nine indicators which measure a campus's environment as it relates to students' identities, cultural communities, and backgrounds. The current study addresses three of the nine indicators (see Table 1) through carefully developed survey questions on inclusivity and culturally engaging activities in the classroom. In addition to the direct connection to three of the indicators, this study indirectly supports the other indicators by creating supportive environments for students through faculty who intentionally

engage in culturally relevant activities. By determining which faculty are creating culturally engaging environments in their classrooms and which students are participating in these activities, we can begin to understand which areas on campus are succeeding and which areas need improvement. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. From the student perspective, how much does student coursework emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities?
2. From the faculty perspective, how much do faculty emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities in their courses?
3. For both perspectives, how does the emphasis vary by select student and faculty characteristics?

Methods

Data Source

The data for this study are from the 2017 administration of both the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). NSSE and FSSE are complementary surveys measuring college students' engagement. NSSE, administered to college students, asks questions pertaining to their curricular and co-curricular experiences on campus. FSSE, administered to faculty, asks questions pertaining to interactions with students and educational practices related to student engagement. In addition to the core NSSE and FSSE survey, institutions had the opportunity to opt into additional question sets known as modules. In 2017, 132 institutions chose to use the *Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity* (IECD) module for NSSE, and 30 institutions chose to use the IECD module for FSSE, yielding 55,289 student responses and 24418 faculty responses. IECD measures the environments, experiences, and engagement of students and faculty around cultural diversity. The focus of this study is the first set of items in the IECD module. These items

ask students how much their coursework has emphasized various aspects of cultural diversity and asks faculty how much their courses emphasize those same aspects. A listing of these items can be found in Tables 2 and 3.

Respondents

The student respondents in this study had a variety of majors with the largest proportions of students in Business (15.7%), Health Professions (13.6%), and Social Sciences (11.6%). Most were full-time enrolled (87.9%) with very few taking all of their courses online (5.3%). Around a quarter (27.5%) of students had transferred to their institution, and two in five (42.6%) were living on campus. A little over half of students identified as women (54.8%), and a little under half identified as men (42.8%). The majority of students identified as White (65.6%) with smaller proportions identifying as multiracial (7.6%), Asian (7.1%), and Hispanic or Latino (7.1%). The majority of students (83.4%) had not been diagnosed with a disability. Around two in five students were first-generation students, and most students identified as being Straight (heterosexual). More details on these demographics by student class standing can be found in Table 4.

A majority of faculty respondents where held positions in departments of Arts & Humanities (31.8%), Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Computer Sciences (19.6%), and Social Sciences (13.3%). A majority taught courses in-person on the main campus (86.3%) and slightly less than half taught courses as part of the general education curriculum (46.9%). Gender identity looked similar to the student population with a little under half of the faculty respondents identified as women (46.6%) and a little under half identified as men (46.3%). Racial and ethnic identity differed slightly from that of students with three in five faculty members identifying as White (74.7%) and smaller proportions identifying as Asian (5.2%) and multiracial (3.7%). More information on faculty demographics by division can be found in Table 5.

Measures

The primary variables of interest for students in this study are the IECD scale and component items. The question asked students how much, during the current school year, their coursework emphasized these activities. Some examples include learning about other cultures, discussing issues of equity or privilege, and recognizing your own cultural norms and biases. The scale's Cronbach's α reliability was .93 indicating a narrowly focused measure, and the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was .05 indicating that only 5% of the variation in the IECD scale was at the institution level. The scale was created by combining the items listed in Table 2. This table additionally includes descriptive information for both the items and scale. This scale and items measure the amount of inclusive and culturally engaging activities present in the students' coursework. Other student demographics and characteristics examined include those listed in Table 4.

Similarly, for faculty the primary variables of interest derived from the faculty-version of the IECD scale and component items. The question asks faculty to focus on a particular undergraduate course section they are teaching and to answer how much that class incorporates inclusivity and culturally engaging activities. Examples of topics include students sharing their perspectives and experiences, learning about other cultures, and respecting the expression of diverse ideas. The faculty scale's Cronbach's α reliability was .93 and the ICC was .03 indicating that only 3% of the variation in the faculty IECD scale was at the institution level. This scale was created by combining the items listed in Table 3. In addition, the table provides descriptive information for individual items and the scale. This scale and items measure the amount of inclusive and culturally engaging activities faculty incorporate into their coursework. Additional faculty demographics and characteristics include those listed in table 5.

Analysis

To answer the first and second research question, we examined descriptives of the IECD items. To answer our third research question about how these perspectives of emphasis vary by student and faculty demographics and characteristics, we examined a series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) linear regression models with the IECD scale as the dependent variable and student or faculty demographics and characteristics in Tables 4 and 5 as independent variables of interest. For students, these included Business majors, women, White students, no diagnosed disability, and a straight sexual orientation. For faculty these included upper division, Business faculty, women, White faculty, on-campus course format, Full Professor rank, and straight sexual orientation. All continuous measures were standardized before entry into models so that unstandardized coefficients can be interpreted as effect sizes. Reference groups were chosen in these models by group size; the largest subgroups were chosen as the reference (and are noted in Tables 6 and 7).

Results

From the student perspective, how much does student coursework emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities?

The items with the highest average score for students were *Sharing your own perspectives and experiences* (M: 2.78, SD: .903) and *Respecting the expression of diverse ideas* (M: 2.76, SD: .953). There wasn't a large difference between these means and the means of the lowest scoring items: *Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs* (M: 2.45, SD: 1.004) and *Discussing issues of equity or privilege* (M: 2.49, SD: 1.024). This suggests that all the activities examined here can be thought of as being emphasized in students' coursework at least *Some* but not *Quite a bit*. For more details about these individual items see Table 2.

From the faculty perspective, how much do faculty emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities in their courses?

The items with the highest average score for faculty mirrored that of students: *Respecting the expression of diverse ideas* (M: 2.87, SD: 1.12) and *Students sharing their perspectives and experiences* (M: 2.79, SD: 1.08). Faculty had similar lowest scoring items with only slightly larger differences in mean score: *Exploring students' backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs* (M: 2.22; SD: 1.15) and *Discussing issues of equity or privilege* (M: 2.31; SD: 1.17). As with student scores, results suggest that faculty emphasize inclusive and culturally engaging activities at least *Some* but not *Quite a bit*. For more details about these individual items see Table 3.

For both perspectives, how does the emphasis vary by select student and faculty characteristics?

Differences in coursework emphasis for both students and faculty were found for major/academic discipline, course format, gender identity, racial/ethnic identification, and sexual orientation. Similar trends for faculty and students were found across disciplines with the same groups of disciplines reporting more inclusive and culturally engaging activities for both students and faculty. For example, student and faculty in Education and Social Service Professions were engaged in more IECD activities, but students and faculty in Engineering and Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Computer Science were engaged in fewer. Students majoring in social services had the largest positive difference ($B = .330$, $p < .001$) comparing to faculty in Education ($B = .850$, $p < .001$). In contrast, students majoring in engineering report the lowest participation ($B= -.505$, $p< .001$) and faculty in the physical sciences, mathematics, & computer science report the lowest level of IECD activities in their classroom ($B= -.71$, $p< .01$). For gender identity, women students and faculty both report engaging in more inclusive and culturally engaging activities than men. For racial/ethnic identity, the largest differences, compared to White students, can be found for Black or African American students ($B = .274$, $p <.001$) and Asian students ($B = .262$, $p < .001$). For faculty, the largest difference compared to White faculty were for Indigenous faculty ($B = .42$, $p <.05$) and Asian faculty ($B = .42$, $p <.05$). Students and faculty differed in their responses to course format and inclusivity. Students who took their courses online participated in

more IECD-related activities (B = .108, p < .001) while faculty who taught online reported lower levels of these activities, although their results were not statistically significant. Additional details about student differences and faculty differences can be found in Table 6 and Table 7.

Limitations

Before analyzing the results, it is important to address a few of the limitations of this study. Institutions self-select to participate in both NSSE and FSSE and, although all first-year and senior students are invited to participate in NSSE, institutions can select which of their faculty to survey so there may be some selection bias. In addition, modules are added at the end of the survey so there is the chance that we lost potential participants. The wording of the question to create the scale is slightly different for students and faculty, whereas faculty are asked to respond in regard to one course taught and students are asked to respond in regard to their total course load. We also did not match students and faculty by classroom or institution so comparison data is not currently available. Lastly, as with some of the previous studies mentioned, response rates for certain groups of students and faculty were small. Some groups had to be collapsed which may hide variation. Although not all groups had to be collapsed, small groups should be interpreted with caution.

Discussion

Results of this study allow us to move beyond quantifying the number of diversity courses taken and begin to focus on what makes an inclusive classroom environment as well as which faculty are creating these environments and which students are participating. Similar to Kuh and colleagues (2004) we found that in the areas where faculty say they incorporate diversity, students report participating at higher rates. In order to create a more culturally engaging campus environment, institutions need to spend time cultivating IECD activities in majors such as biology, engineering, math, and computer science as both faculty and students are reporting lower levels of engagement in these areas. Gurin et

al. (2002) emphasized the need to support faculty in developing more culturally relevant pedagogy and the results of the current study are consistent with this finding. Mayhew and Grunwald (2006) found that faculty who had participated in professional development aimed and diversity-content in the curriculum were more likely to incorporate this type of content in their work. Since we know that diversity experiences are important to students' development and that faculty assist in this process, institutions should be intentional about creating and supporting opportunities for faculty to explore these concepts.

Studies looking at race found that White students benefited the most from these courses (Bowman, 2012; Guren et al., 2002). Results of the current study indicate that students and faculty who are in the majority population, i.e. White students and faculty and men, are participating or incorporating inclusivity into their courses at significantly lower rates. Considering that these are the students and faculty who are likely to gain the most from these courses, these results are concerning. Future research on understanding why faculty incorporate inclusivity into their work and why students participate can help to support more robust faculty development program as well as determine how to support and encourage students in their participation. Although this study looked at both the perspectives of students and faculty with some institutional overlap, future research should look at more direct connections with data that matches at the institution, or if possible, classroom level.

References

Bowman, N. A. (2012). Promoting sustained engagement with diversity: The reciprocal relationships between informal and formal college diversity experiences. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(1), 1-24.

Bowman, N. A., Brandenberger, J. W., Hill, P. L., & Lapsley, D. K. (2011). The long-term effects of college diversity experiences: Well-being and social concerns 13 years after graduation. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(6), 729-239.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330-366.

Kuh, G. D., Nelson Laird, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty activities and student behavior: Realizing the promise of greater expectations. *Liberal Education, 90*(4), 24-31.

Mayhew, M. J., & Grunwald, H. E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 148-168.

Museus, S. D. (2014). The culturally engaging campus environments (CECE) model: A new theory of success among racially diverse college student populations. In M. B. Paulsen (Ed.) *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (29th ed.) (189-227). Springer Netherlands

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(4), 365-387.

Nelson Laird, T. F. (2011). Measuring the diversity inclusivity of college courses. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(6), 572-588.

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2011). Brown at 50: King's dream or Plessy's nightmare? In R. Arum, I. Beattie, & K. Ford (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Readings in the sociology of education* (2nd ed.) (165-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Table 1. Cross-Comparison of IECD Questions and CECE Indicators

Culturally Engaging Campus Environment Indicators[a]	IECD Student Scale Questions[b]	IECD Faculty Scale Questions[b]
2. **Culturally Relevant Knowledge**: The degree to which students have opportunities for students to learn about their own cultural communities via culturally relevant curricular and co-curricular activities.	d. Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs	d. Exploring students' backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs
4. **Cross-Cultural Engagement**: Programs and practices that facilitate educationally meaningful cross-cultural interactions that focus on solving real social and political problems.	a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds e. Learning about other cultures	a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds e. Learning about other cultures
5. **Cultural Validation**: Campus cultures that validate the cultural backgrounds, knowledge, and identities of diverse students.	c. Sharing your own perspectives and experiences g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	c. Students sharing their perspectives and experiences g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas

[a]CECE Indicators are derived from Museus, S. D. (2014). The culturally engaging campus environments (CECE) model: A new theory of success among racially diverse college student populations. In M. B. Paulsen (Ed.) Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (29th ed.) (189-227). Springer Netherlands

[b]IECD Scale Questions are derived from the *Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity* Topical Modules of the National Survey of Student Engagement and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

Table 2. Select IECD Items and Scale Descriptives for Students

	Mean	SD	Factor Loading
During the current school year, how much has your *coursework* emphasized the following?			
4 = *Very much*, 3 = *Quite a bit*, 2 = *Some*, 1 = *Very little*			
a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds	2.62	.943	.783
b. Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases	2.61	.973	.869
c. Sharing your own perspectives and experiences	2.78	.903	.837
d. Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs	2.45	1.004	.823
e. Learning about other cultures	2.52	.989	.844
f. Discussing issues of equity or privilege	2.49	1.024	.839
g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	2.76	.953	.824
IECD scale	28.18	13.89	

Note: The individual IECD items were transformed to a 0-60 scale and then averaged together to create the IECD scale. Cronbach's α = .93. ICC = .05

Table 3. Select fIECD Items and Scale Descriptives for Faculty

	Mean	SD	Factor Loading
Earlier, you answered some questions based on one particular undergraduate course section that you are teaching or have taught during this academic year. Thinking again about that course, how much does it emphasize the following? 4 = *Very much*, 3 = *Quite a bit*, 2 = *Some*, 1 = *Very little*			
a. Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds	2.73	1.07	.812
b. Recognizing students' cultural norms and biases	2.54	1.14	.906
c. Students sharing their perspectives and experiences	2.79	1.08	.851
d. Exploring students' backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs	2.22	1.15	.802
e. Learning about other cultures	2.37	1.17	.843
f. Discussing issues of equity or privilege	2.31	1.17	.841
g. Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	2.87	1.12	.843
fIECD scale	30.93	19.02	

Note: The individual IECD items were transformed to a 0-60 scale and then averaged together to create the IECD scale. Cronbach's α = .93. ICC = .03

Table 4. Select Student Demographics and Characteristics

		First-year (%)	Senior (%)	Total (%)
Major Field	Arts & Humanities	9.7	9.8	9.7
	Bio. Sciences, Agric., & Natural Resources	12.8	9.9	11.1
	Physical Sciences, Math., & Computer Science	7.9	6.3	7.0
	Social Sciences	10.6	12.4	11.6
	Business	14.0	17.0	15.7
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	3.2	3.8	3.5
	Education	6.2	5.6	5.9
	Engineering	10.3	10.2	10.2
	Health Professions	13.8	13.5	13.6
	Social Service Professions	4.1	5.2	4.7
	All Other	4.0	6.1	5.2
	Undecided, undeclared	3.4	0.3	1.6
Full-time enrollment		95.6	82.0	87.9
Taking courses all online		1.8	7.9	5.3
Transfer student		7.4	42.7	27.5
Living on campus		76.2	18.0	42.6
First-generation student		38.4	43.0	41.0
Gender identity	Man	42.8	42.7	42.8
	Woman	54.9	54.7	54.8
	Another gender identity	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Prefer not to respond	1.0	1.4	1.3
Racial/ethnic identification	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7	0.6	0.7
	Asian	8.7	6.5	7.4
	Black or African American	6.8	6.4	6.5
	Hispanic or Latino	7.8	6.6	7.1
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.2	0.2	0.2
	White	63.2	67.3	65.6
	Other	1.2	1.5	1.4
	Multiracial	8.6	6.8	7.6
	I prefer not to respond	2.6	4.1	3.5
Diagnosed disability	No	84.0	83.0	83.4
	Yes	12.3	13.4	12.9
	I prefer not to respond	3.8	3.7	3.7
Sexual orientation	Straight (heterosexual)	85.0	85.3	85.2
	Bisexual	5.3	4.3	4.7
	Gay	1.3	2.1	1.7
	Lesbian	0.8	0.8	0.8
	Queer	0.8	1.0	0.9
	Questioning or unsure	1.7	0.9	1.3
	Another sexual orientation	1.8	1.4	1.6
	I prefer not to respond	3.4	4.1	3.8
Average age in years		19	25	23
Average estimated GPA		3.35	3.45	3.41

Table 5. Select Faculty Demographics and Characteristics

		Lower Division %	Upper Division %	Total%
Academic Discipline	Arts & Humanities	31.8	18.7	24.0
	Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	8.4	9.8	9.3
	Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Sciences	19.6	7.5	12.4
	Social Sciences	13.3	14.5	14.0
	Business	5.4	12.1	9.4
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	4.1	4.3	4.2
	Education	4.9	8.1	6.8
	Engineering	2.8	5.2	4.2
	Health Professions	4.1	10.9	8.2
	Social Service Professions	1.3	4.4	3.1
	Other disciplines (not reported)	4.2	4.6	4.4
General Education Course		70.0	31.5	46.9
Classroom Format	Classroom instruction on-campus	90.8	83.3	86.3
	Classroom instruction at an auxiliary location	1.0	3.1	2.3
	Distance education	2.6	4.8	3.9
	Combination of classroom instruction and distance education	5.6	8.8	7.5
Full-time Faculty		77.5	82.1	80.3
Academic Rank	Professor	23.0	28.4	26.2
	Associate Professor	20.1	21.6	21.0
	Assistant Professor	19.1	23.5	21.7
	Instructor	14.8	9.4	11.5
	Lecturer	13.6	10.7	11.9
	Graduate Teaching Assistant	3.2	0.8	1.8
	Other	6.3	5.6	5.9
Tenured		38.0	44.1	41.7
Gender identity	Man	46.6	46.1	46.3
	Woman	47.3	48.7	48.1
	Another gender identity	0.5	0.1	0.3
	I prefer not to respond	5.6	5.1	5.3
Racial/ethnic identification	Asian	4.4	5.8	5.2
	Black or African American	2.6	3.0	2.9
	Hispanic or Latino	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Indigenous	0.7	0.4	0.5
	White	74.4	74.9	74.7
	Other	1.9	1.4	1.6
	Multiracial	4.5	3.2	3.7
	I prefer not to respond	9.0	8.6	8.7
Sexual orientation	Straight (heterosexual)	81.7	83.6	82.8
	Bisexual	2.4	1.4	1.8
	Gay	2.3	1.8	2.0
	Lesbian	1.3	2.1	1.8
	Other	1.1	70.0	1.0
	I prefer not to respond	11.3	10.3	10.7
Years Teaching		16.6	17	16.8
Age		47.9	50.1	49.3

Table 6. OLS Regression Coefficients for IECD student scale.

	B	SE	Sig.
Constant	-.084	.022	***
Senior class	.001	.012	
Major field (Business as reference)			
Arts & Humanities	.183	.018	***
Bio. Sciences, Agric., & Natural Resources	-.203	.017	***
Physical Sciences, Math., & Computer Science	-.392	.020	***
Social Sciences	.228	.017	***
Communications, Media, & Public Relations	.225	.025	***
Education	.265	.021	***
Engineering	-.505	.018	***
Health Professions	.074	.016	***
Social Service Professions	.330	.022	***
All Other	.000	.022	
Undecided, undeclared	-.056	.038	
Full-time enrollment	.089	.015	***
Taking courses all online	.108	.022	***
Transfer student	.004	.012	
Living on campus	-.040	.011	***
First-generation student	.079	.009	***
Gender Identity (Woman as reference)			
Man	-.070	.010	***
Another gender identity	-.249	.044	***
I prefer not to respond	-.195	.045	***
Racial/Ethnic identification (White as reference)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	.196	.056	***
Asian	.262	.017	***
Black or African American	.274	.019	***
Hispanic or Latino	.232	.018	***
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	.172	.102	
Other	.111	.038	**
Multiracial	.080	.017	***
I prefer not to respond	-.079	.027	**
Diagnosed disability (No as reference)			
Yes	-.021	.013	
I prefer not to respond	-.091	.024	***
Sexual orientation (Straight as reference)			
Bisexual	.000	.021	
Gay	.120	.034	***
Lesbian	.102	.048	*
Queer	.090	.048	
Questioning or unsure	-.116	.041	**
Another sexual orientation	-.027	.037	
I prefer not to respond	-.131	.026	***
Estimated GPA	.089	.005	***
Age	-.005	.006	

Note: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. $R^2 = .10$. n = 47,711. Continuous variables were standardized before entry into the model.

Table 7. OLS Regression Coefficients for IECD faculty scale.

	B	SE	Sig.
Constant	-0.15	0.10	
Division (Upper as reference)			
Lower	-0.20	0.04	***
Other	-0.08	0.06	
Academic Discipline (Business as reference)			
Arts & Humanities	0.61	0.06	***
Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	-0.36	0.07	***
Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science	-0.71	0.07	***
Social Sciences	0.48	0.07	***
Communications, Media, & Public Relations	0.55	0.09	***
Education	0.85	0.08	***
Engineering	-0.49	0.09	***
Health Professions	0.26	0.07	***
Social Service Professions	0.71	0.10	***
All Other	0.46	0.09	***
General Education Course	0.28	0.03	***
Course Format (On-campus as reference)			
Auxiliary location	0.21	0.10	*
Distance education	-0.06	0.08	
Combination of classroom and distance format	0.13	0.06	*
Full-time	-0.18	0.09	*
Academic Rank (Full professor as reference)			
Associate Professors	0.03	0.04	
Assistant Professors	0.10	0.07	
Full-time Lecturers/Instructors	0.17	0.08	*
Part-time Lecturers/Instructors	-0.06	0.09	
Tenured	-0.06	0.06	
Gender identity (Woman as reference)			
Man	-0.18	0.03	***
Another gender identity	0.37	0.27	
I prefer not to respond	-0.14	0.10	
Racial/Ethnic identification (White as reference)			
Black or African American	0.27	0.09	***
Hispanic or Latino	0.16	0.09	
I prefer not to respond	0.14	0.08	
Indigenous	0.42	0.19	*
Asian	0.42	0.07	*
Other	0.23	0.12	
Multiracial	0.31	0.08	***
Sexual orientation (Straight as reference)			
Bisexual	0.10	0.11	
Gay	0.00	0.10	
Lesbian	0.14	0.11	
Other	0.40	0.15	**
I prefer not to respond	0.08	0.07	
Years Teaching	-0.05	0.02	*
Age	0.07	0.02	***

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. R2 = .10. n = 47,711. Continuous variables were standardized before entry into the model.