

Tacoma Community College
Tacoma, Washington

PACE Racial Diversity Report
PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

Lead Researchers
Daniel R. West & Emily R. VanZoest

Conducted
February and March 2022

Research Team

Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.

Executive Director

Kaitlin S. Newhouse, Ph.D.

Senior Research Associate

Greyson A. B. Norcross

Research Associate

Daniel R. West

Research Associate

Emily R. VanZoest

Research Associate

Additional Report Editors

Kara Reddish

Research Assistant

Phone

(919)515-8567

Web

pace.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University

Belk Center for Community College

Leadership and Research

706 Hillsborough Street

Raleigh, NC 27603

Fax

(919)515-6305

Email

pace_survey@ncsu.edu

Suggested Citation: Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges Racial Diversity Report, by West, D. R. & VanZoest, E. R. Raleigh, NC: 2022.

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

Racial Diversity Literature Review

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

The Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research (The Belk Center) 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, Belk Center researchers created a racial diversity question set 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). The Belk Center 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 question set provides an opportunity to effectively address the latter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: Beginning fall 2021, the Racial Diversity Question Set will utilize an agreement response scale rather than a satisfaction response scale. Though this change does impact the ability to provide a direct comparison to previous data, responses from your previous administration are likely similar to your current administration's data (i.e. high satisfaction correlates to high agreement). Please note this change as you are making comparisons of Racial Diversity Question Set data over time.

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?* 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

TCC compared with:

Institutional Structure	Response Option	TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
1 My institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	Strongly disagree	12	4%	404	2%	135	3%
	Disagree	22	7%	894	5%	295	6%
	Neither	41	13%	2817	15%	838	18%
	Agree	103	33%	7353	40%	1914	40%
	Strongly Agree	131	42%	6786	37%	1546	33%
	Total		309	100%	18254	100%	4728
2 My institution values racial/ethnic diversity	Strongly disagree	8	3%	390	2%	129	3%
	Disagree	14	5%	752	4%	249	5%
	Neither	33	11%	2327	13%	665	14%
	Agree	112	36%	7471	41%	1973	42%
	Strongly Agree	143	46%	7335	40%	1719	36%
	Total		310	100%	18275	100%	4735
3 My institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	9	3%	303	2%	97	2%
	Disagree	11	4%	614	3%	205	4%
	Neither	32	10%	2050	11%	589	12%
	Agree	122	39%	7493	41%	1982	42%
	Strongly Agree	135	44%	7835	43%	1863	39%
	Total		309	100%	18295	100%	4736
4 Employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	Strongly disagree	9	3%	305	2%	113	2%
	Disagree	26	9%	644	4%	208	5%
	Neither	72	24%	3031	17%	852	19%
	Agree	112	37%	7030	40%	1853	41%
	Strongly Agree	83	27%	6556	37%	1514	33%
	Total		302	100%	17566	100%	4540

TCC compared with:

Institutional Structure (continued)	Response Option	TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
5 People of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	Strongly disagree	32	11%	1002	6%	356	8%
	Disagree	57	19%	2243	13%	732	16%
	Neither	89	30%	3943	23%	1088	24%
	Agree	63	21%	5652	32%	1386	30%
	Strongly Agree	54	18%	4674	27%	997	22%
	Total		295	100%	17514	100%	4559
6 People of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, VP, Deans)	Strongly disagree	15	5%	1220	7%	522	11%
	Disagree	21	7%	1991	11%	714	16%
	Neither	60	20%	3893	22%	1075	23%
	Agree	114	37%	5493	31%	1236	27%
	Strongly Agree	96	31%	5101	29%	1043	23%
	Total		306	100%	17698	100%	4590
7 A racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	Strongly disagree	23	7%	669	4%	240	5%
	Disagree	26	8%	1426	8%	480	10%
	Neither	66	21%	4202	24%	1240	27%
	Agree	108	35%	6563	37%	1617	35%
	Strongly Agree	87	28%	4986	28%	1040	23%
	Total		310	100%	17846	100%	4617

Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions

TCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships	Response Option	TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
8 My supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	Strongly disagree	9	3%	567	3%	189	4%
	Disagree	4	1%	735	4%	223	5%
	Neither	28	9%	2457	14%	663	14%
	Agree	94	30%	6027	34%	1568	34%
	Strongly Agree	174	56%	8109	45%	1993	43%
	Total	309	100%	17895	100%	4636	100%
9 My supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	Strongly disagree	9	3%	409	2%	134	3%
	Disagree	7	2%	530	3%	189	4%
	Neither	29	10%	2340	13%	677	15%
	Agree	75	25%	5876	33%	1500	33%
	Strongly Agree	181	60%	8617	48%	2072	45%
	Total	301	100%	17772	100%	4572	100%
10 My supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	Strongly disagree	7	2%	321	2%	107	2%
	Disagree	4	1%	328	2%	112	2%
	Neither	24	8%	1926	11%	561	12%
	Agree	82	27%	5840	33%	1524	33%
	Strongly Agree	191	62%	9380	53%	2297	50%
	Total	308	100%	17795	100%	4601	100%
11 My supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	Strongly disagree	9	3%	391	2%	135	3%
	Disagree	9	3%	486	3%	131	3%
	Neither	39	14%	2337	14%	677	15%
	Agree	75	26%	5575	33%	1447	33%
	Strongly Agree	154	54%	8270	48%	1991	45%
	Total	286	100%	17059	100%	4381	100%

TCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships (continued)		TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
12 My supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	4	1%	242	1%	84	2%
	Disagree	5	2%	325	2%	104	2%
	Neither	25	8%	2030	12%	580	13%
	Agree	95	32%	5882	34%	1564	35%
	Strongly Agree	172	57%	8671	51%	2122	48%
Total		301	100%	17150	100%	4454	100%

Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions

TCC compared with:

Teamwork	Response Option	TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
13 Racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	Strongly disagree	4	1%	299	2%	108	3%
	Disagree	13	4%	497	3%	158	4%
	Neither	90	31%	4349	27%	1185	29%
	Agree	80	28%	5438	34%	1364	33%
	Strongly Agree	102	35%	5452	34%	1283	31%
	Total		289	100%	16035	100%	4098
14 Racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	Strongly disagree	6	2%	258	2%	87	2%
	Disagree	7	2%	507	3%	159	4%
	Neither	59	20%	4219	26%	1139	28%
	Agree	102	35%	5555	35%	1434	35%
	Strongly Agree	120	41%	5462	34%	1289	31%
	Total		294	100%	16001	100%	4108
15 The racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	Strongly disagree	7	2%	270	2%	95	2%
	Disagree	6	2%	544	3%	174	4%
	Neither	47	16%	3804	24%	1049	26%
	Agree	105	35%	5675	36%	1460	36%
	Strongly Agree	131	44%	5583	35%	1322	32%
	Total		296	100%	15876	100%	4100

Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions

TCC compared with:

Student Focus	Response Option	TCC		PACE Normbase		Medium	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
16 Faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	9	3%	310	2%	87	2%
	Disagree	18	7%	825	6%	265	7%
	Neither	88	34%	4422	30%	1276	33%
	Agree	87	34%	5307	36%	1349	35%
	Strongly Agree	57	22%	4060	27%	923	24%
	Total	259	100%	14924	100%	3900	100%
17 Students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	Strongly disagree	6	2%	318	2%	104	3%
	Disagree	26	10%	983	7%	337	9%
	Neither	102	41%	5051	35%	1441	38%
	Agree	68	27%	4706	32%	1174	31%
	Strongly Agree	46	19%	3534	24%	742	20%
	Total	248	100%	14592	100%	3798	100%
18 My institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Strongly disagree	7	2%	302	2%	102	2%
	Disagree	19	7%	819	5%	263	6%
	Neither	73	26%	3562	21%	1057	24%
	Agree	106	37%	6902	41%	1792	41%
	Strongly Agree	80	28%	5315	31%	1161	27%
	Total	285	100%	16900	100%	4375	100%
19 Students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	Strongly disagree	3	1%	201	1%	75	2%
	Disagree	17	7%	591	4%	187	5%
	Neither	109	46%	4644	31%	1333	34%
	Agree	67	28%	5607	38%	1450	37%
	Strongly Agree	43	18%	3873	26%	840	22%
	Total	239	100%	14916	100%	3885	100%

Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons

TCC compared with:

Institutional Structure	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
1 My institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	309	4.032	4.053			3.939		
2 My institution values racial/ethnic diversity	310	4.187	4.128			4.036	**	.155
3 My institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	309	4.175	4.199			4.121		
4 Employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	302	3.775	4.075	***	-.326	3.980	***	-.211
5 People of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	295	3.169	3.614	***	-.379	3.425	***	-.210
6 People of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, Vice-President, Deans)	306	3.833	3.636	**	.164	3.341	***	.384
7 A racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	310	3.677	3.772			3.593		

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

Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons

TCC compared with:

Supervisory Relationships	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
8 My supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	309	4.359	4.139	***	.219	4.068	***	.276
9 My supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	301	4.369	4.225	**	.153	4.135	***	.233
10 My supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	308	4.448	4.328	*	.137	4.259	***	.205
11 My supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	286	4.245	4.222			4.148		
12 My supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	301	4.415	4.307	*	.127	4.243	**	.192

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

Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons

TCC compared with:

Teamwork	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
13 Racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	289	3.910	3.951			3.868		
14 Racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	294	4.099	3.966	*	.142	3.896	***	.211
15 The racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	296	4.172	3.993	**	.192	3.912	***	.268

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

Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons

TCC compared with:

Student Focus	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
16 Faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	259	3.637	3.803	**	-.171	3.707		
17 Students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	248	3.492	3.696	**	-.208	3.556		
18 My institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	285	3.818	3.953	*	-.145	3.834		
19 Students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	239	3.544	3.829	***	-.314	3.719	**	-.190

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

Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

TCC compared with:

What is your personnel classification?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
Faculty	119	3.886	4.018			3.892		
Administrator	93	4.059	3.920			3.862	*	.275
Staff	93	4.069	4.003			3.891	*	.248

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity

TCC compared with:

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
African American or Black	24	3.967	3.728			3.622		
Alaska Native or American Indian	1	--	3.909			3.765		
Asian	16	4.178	3.964			3.876		
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	12	3.803	3.876			3.762		
Middle Eastern or North African	2	--	3.899			4.234		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4	--	3.784			3.593		
White	194	4.022	4.053			3.936		
Two or more races	26	3.768	3.823			3.690		
Prefer to self-describe	23	3.795	3.736			3.691		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status

TCC compared with:

Your status at this institution is?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
Full-Time	237	3.899	3.943			3.842		
Part-Time	66	4.323	4.188			4.077	**	.340

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned

TCC compared with:

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	4	--	3.949			3.831		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	46	3.911	3.844			3.781		
Master's degree	120	3.921	3.972			3.851		
Bachelor's degree	82	4.080	4.061			3.915	*	.232
Associate's degree	37	4.149	4.096			4.055		
Certificate	3	--	4.098			3.998		
High School diploma or GED	11	4.252	4.105			4.032		
No diploma or degree	1	--	4.014			4.153		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity

TCC compared with:

What is your gender identity?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
Man	97	3.877	4.055	*	-.241	3.944		
Woman	185	4.093	4.015			3.897	***	.271
Trans Man	1	--	3.537			--		
Trans Woman	0	∅	--			--		
Gender Queer	5	--	3.546			3.492		
Prefer to self-describe	14	3.480	3.536			3.654		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution

TCC compared with:

How many years have you worked at this institution?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
5 years or less	119	4.170	4.113			4.000	*	.232
6-10 years	81	3.980	3.961			3.839		
11-15 years	30	3.702	3.938			3.847		
16-20 years	30	3.705	3.952			3.806		
21-25 years	21	3.950	3.950			3.840		
26 years or more	10	4.004	3.964			3.804		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education

TCC compared with:

How many years have you worked in higher education?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
5 years or less	79	4.240	4.170			4.048	*	.264
6-10 years	63	4.142	4.014			3.915	*	.310
11-15 years	48	3.919	3.965			3.844		
16-20 years	37	3.742	3.936			3.833		
21-25 years	35	3.748	3.929			3.827		
26 years or more	34	3.859	3.933			3.806		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age

TCC compared with:

What is your age?	TCC		PACE Normbase			Medium		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	313	3.991	3.996			3.885	*	.141
29 or younger	21	4.438	4.129			3.932	**	.645
30 - 39	41	3.971	4.032			3.947		
40 - 49	75	4.077	4.008			3.867	*	.299
50 - 59	70	3.889	4.030			3.923		
60 or older	54	3.964	4.047			3.919		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses