Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Studies
ISSN 2642-2336 (Print) ISSN 2642-2328 (Online)
Vol. 4, No. 4, 2022
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/jetss

Original Paper

Non-Majority Faculty Perceptions of Diversity and Inclusion at a Predominately White and Historically Black University

Gloria Campbell-Whatley[1], Shaqwana Freeman-Green[2], Christopher O'Brien[3] & Ting Sun[4]

[1] PhD, University of North Carolina Charlotte, Charlotte College of Education, Special Education and Child Development, Charlotte NC 28223, United States

[2] PhD, University of North Florida, United States

[3] PhD, University of North Carolina Charlotte, United States

[4] University of North Carolina Charlotte, United States

Correspondence: Dr. Gloria D. Campbell-Whatley, Professor, University of North Carolina, Charlotte College of Education, Special Education and Child Development, Charlotte NC 28223, 704-807-8506

Received: September 19, 2022 Accepted: October 15, 2022 Online Published: October 26, 2022

doi:10.22158/jetss.v4n4p17 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jetss.v4n4p17

Abstract

In this study, we conducted survey research to examine perceptions of diversity and inclusion among majority and non-majority faculty at a Predominately White University (PWI) and a Historically Black University (HBCU), as these public institutions have distinct historical foundations regarding orientation to cultural diversity and inclusion. The study is rooted in the current national efforts to establish Inclusive Excellence (Williams et al., 2005) on university campuses. Unique in this study was an effort to examine perceptions of inclusion and diversity based on identity relative to race, gender, and sexuality given patterns historical marginalization in the context of the majority culture. T-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine if there are differences in faculty experiences. Results indicated significant differences between the groups and universities in perceptions and experiences of diversity and inclusion.

1. Non-Majority Faculty Perceptions of Diversity and Inclusion at a Predominately White and Historically Black University

There is a growing focus on diversity and inclusion in higher education (Bias, 2010; Ross & Edwards, 2016; Strothers, 2014). Although there have been increases in non-majority faculty populations over the last three decades, research continues to show disparities related to hiring practices, promotion, and salary increases for women, culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD), and LGBTQ faculty.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2018), there were increases of CLD faculty and women at degree-granting postsecondary institutions. Faculty at these institutions were 77% White, while 10% were from Asian descent, 5% were Black or African American, and 2% were Latin* (Note 1).

Disparities in sex/gender representation were evident as 42% were White males, 35% were White females, while there are only 6% Asian males, 4% Asian females, 3% African American males and females, and 2% Latino/a males and females. Among full-time professors, there are disparities among women and CLD faculty. For example, 56% are White males, while there are only 27% White females, 7% Asian males, 2% Asian females, 2% African American males and females, and 2% Latino/a males and females. Data from the NCES (2013), revealed that 56 percent of full-time faculty members across 99 HBCUs were Black, 25 percent were White, 2 percent Latin, and 10 percent Asian.

Disparities are also evident relevant to Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) faculty given only 2% of faculty self-identify as LGBTQ (Flaherty, 2016). According to the Human Rights Campaign (2011), universities have made strides in developing policies for LGBTQ faculty. Data on self-identification reflect an increasing trend of faculty "coming out" at colleges and universities, yet research continues to indicate that LGBTQ faculty deal with feelings of being minoritized and unwelcomed leading many to hide their identity, particularly during the tenure process (Blumenfeld et al., 2016).

Both Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) make it a goal to increase the diversity of students and faculty. Having non-majority faculty in either setting provides varied perspectives, research foci, teaching methods, approaches and experiences (Strothers, 2014). The Association of American Colleges and Universities called for Inclusive Excellence at our postsecondary institutions as a methodology for helping colleges and universities recognize the benefits of both diversity and inclusion and their positive impact on institutional quality (Williams et al., 2005). Inclusive Excellence sets goals of creating a welcoming or inclusive campus community and attending to the cultural differences that learners bring to the educational experience while enriching the campus community (Williams et al., 2005).

Given the goals of Inclusive Excellence (Williams et al., 2005), the purpose of this study was to examine the varying views and perceptions of diversity and inclusion of majority and non-majority faculty from both an HBCU and a PWI with a particular emphasis on their own experiences in higher education. The following research questions guided our study: 1) Is there a significant difference in the responses of non-majority faculty to majority faculty (based on race, gender, and sexuality) at the PWI related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion? 2) Is there a significant difference in the responses of non-majority faculty to majority faculty (based on race, gender, and sexuality) at the HBCU related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion? 3) Are there differences in patterns of responses of the non-majority faculty between the PWI and HBCU related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion?

2. Related Literature for Majority and Non-Majority Experiences

2.1 Non-African American Faculty at HBCUs

Faculty members at HBCUs are considerably more diverse than the faculty at PWIs. Studies show that a significant number of culturally and linguistically diverse faculty exist in HBCUs and double the number of diverse faculty at PWIs (Foster, 2001; Slater, 1993). For example, 2018 data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), revealed that 56% percent of full-time faculty members across 99 HBCUs were African American. By comparison, on the national level only 20% non-White faculty are employed at PWIs, although, the Asian and Hispanic population has increased at these institutions (NCES, 2018).

Despite the overall diversity, there are more White faculty members at HBCUs than other non-Black or African American populations (Ahmed, 2012; Cabrera, Franklin & Watson 2016; Foster, 2001; Morris, 2015; Slater, 1993). For example, White faculty comprise 40% of the population at Xavier University and Tennessee State University, which is radically different than the 20% of non-majority faculty at PWIs (NCES, 2018). Historically, White mission societies originated, and staffed many of the HBCUs and therefore have had a White presence there from the beginning and their presence continued for a quarter of a century after founding (Morris, 2015). Into the 20th Century, Slater (1993) found that HBCUs were dependent on Whites for operational funds. Since many benefactors for HBCUs were White, that population tends to be comfortable at HBCUs (Ahmed, 2012).

There are several studies on White faculty adjustment to HBCUs (Helms, 1995; Jablin,1992; Thompson 1973; Warnat, 1976). Collectively, these articles provided several stages that White faculty encounter as they adjust to the environment at an HBCU. These stages that White faculty encounter are: a) learning about the society into which they are now immersed, b) feelings of conflict regarding their own biases, and c) becoming aware of their biases. Many times, White faculty at HBCUs are also described as being paternalistic. In a recent study by Dawson-Smith (2004), White faculty members were found to adjust from a majority to minority status, thus understanding their position as *temporary minorities*. Bias (2010) interviewed 21 faculty regarding their feelings and perceptions on an HBCU campus. Results indicated that most faculty expressed nervousness, discomfort, or fear with their initial connections with an HBCU, however, they still perceived that the students would accept them. Hoskins (2015) found in her qualitative study that some faculty perceived discrimination, but most indicated a positive climate for White faculty. These studies suggest non-African American faculty are not negatively received by African American faculty and usually develop a positive sense of belonging at HBCUs.

2.2 Non-White Faculty at PWIs

Unlike White faculty members at HBCUs, there appears to be a larger body of research concerning non-White faculty members at PWIs (Lee, 2002). Studies show that non-White faculty at PWIs have several concerns that appear consistently in research such as; a) tenure and promotion, b) mentoring, c) social acceptance, d) collegiality, e) negative views of research choices, f) lack of participation

regarding decision making, g) lack of leadership, and h) a lowered sense of belonging (Bower, 2002; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Frazier, 2011; Lee, 2002; Louis, et al, 2016; Ross & Edwards, 2016; White, 2012). The list of concerns is interconnected in many instances because the non-White faculty members may be the only one in the department, school or college unit within a university, therefore, differences may be more pronounced (Ross & Edwards, 2014) and may outflow to student populations. Because of the negative perceptions experienced as the "Other, " Louis et al. (2016) emphasized in a qualitative study, that the majority group may not treat all non-White groups the same. For example, there is an assertion that faculty with a particular diversity status do not have the same knowledge, even though the credentials are the same as the majority population and students may begin to disrespect that faculty.

Bower's (2002) qualitative study mentioned forms of micro and macro aggressions from students suggesting that race may have a negative effect on the sense of belonging for non-White faculty at a PWI. Furthermore, other studies emphasized that students have rated non-White faculty low on teaching evaluations compared to White faculty, thereby impacting decisions about their career-related outcomes (e.g., tenure and promotion) (Smith & Anderson, 2005; Smith & Hawkingsm, 2011; White, 2012).

Frazier (2011) also pointed out in his research, cases of micro and macro aggressions (i.e., verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights that communicate negatively to marginalized people). For many non-White faculty members, issues arise around the lack of "like" senior faculty. For example, if non-White faculty are paired with someone different than their racial group, they are often silenced about acts of micro or macro aggression they have experienced at work and may not share these incidents with their mentors (Frazier, 2011; Lewis-Giggetts, 2015; Louis et al., 2016) so the situation is left unresolved. DeCuir-Gunby et al. (2019) found consistency of such experiences associated with institutional racism across both PWI and HBCU settings, but qualitative evidence suggests trends of microagressions and insults are greater at the PWIs.

2.3 Issues of Gender (Note 2) and Sexuality among Non-majority Faculty

In 2017, women outnumbered men in obtaining doctoral, masters, and bachelor's degrees; however, men were and continue to be promoted more often in higher education settings (Statista: The Statistical Portal, 2017). Conklin and Robbins-McNeish (2006) outline barriers for women in higher education. Barriers for women in higher education are embedded in patterns reflecting the surrounding culture and society and in policy and traditional practices that have been steadily maintained in higher education and are resistant to change. For example, more men are hired for tenure track positions because, search committees, usually made up of men, especially in STEM fields, hire people just like themselves and continue to use the axiom that there is no "pipeline or supply of qualified individuals." In addition, men also earn more money than women in higher education. For women, obtaining tenure, the hallmark of careers in higher education, the process is frequently ambiguous and not in favor of many females. Women have many of the same issues as non-White faculty with tenure and promotion and collegiality

(Cress & Hart, 2008; Pittman, 2012; Vaccaro, 2012).

In the last three decades, universities have made some strides in developing policies for LGBTQ faculty (The Human Rights Campaign, 2011) as evidenced by the 567 universities that offer protection against bias, provide health-care benefits to same sex partners, and offer family leave policies (Messinger, 2011). LGBTQ faculty have advocated for changes through faculty senates, university committees and informal outreach (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Jean-Francois, 2017). Although there have been changes, LGBTQ faculty members still have problems in higher education with a sense of belonging, tenure and promotion, and hiring (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Garvey & Rankin, 2018; Taylor & Raeburn, 1995) especially in rural or non-urban regions (i.e., areas outside of a town or city).

Some studies indicate that HBCUs are less encouraging about LGBTQ populations than PWI's (Bauer-Wolf, 2017; Shah, 2019). Williams (2018) found that there exist only three LGBTQ centers out of 100 HBCU campuses. However, there are several campuses that are making efforts to become more inclusive though. For example, Spellman, Fayetteville State, and North Carolina Central, just to name a few, have begun to offer courses related to queer Black history. Additionally, some HBCU campuses are accepting and advocating for LGBTQ students, thereby emphasizing a *queer-friendly* campus (Williams, 2018). Savage (2018) elaborated on 14 HBCUs convening at a summit to develop strategic ways to turn their campuses into safe or safer places for LGBTQ students. In addition, in 2017, scholarships were established for LGBTQ students and from 2011 to 2017 several summits were sponsored to address challenges LGBTQ people faces at HBCUs (Bauer-Wolf, 2017; Shah, 2019).

The Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network's (Kosciw et al., 2015) National School Climate survey, surveyed students 13-21 and found that schools do not feel physically and emotionally safe for LGBTQ students, faculty and staff. Blumenfeld et al. (2016) describe college campuses as ranging from unwelcoming actually hostile despite expectations of inclusive campus communities. Goode-Cross and Tager (2011) in a qualitative study explored factors contributing to LGBTQ students' persistence to continue at colleges and universities. Eight participants expressed hesitation in using resources provided by the college for fear of being singled-out. Many LGBTQ students attending HBCUs have reported feeling unsafe due to high rates of harassment, including verbal or physical abuse (McMurtrie, 2013). Students often identify the negative campus climate as a reason for either transferring or withdrawing from college (McMurtrie, 2013). While there is limited research that addresses these concerns for faculty, a report by Rankin et al. (2010) indicates patterns of hostile climate and discriminatory practices extend to the faculty level.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

Many scholars have observed that non-majority faculty on university campuses may experience a sense of being marginalized or objectified as the "diverse other" (Hurtado et al., 2015) or "the outsider within" (Fitzgerald, 2014; Jean-Marie, 2014). Like the students on university campuses who seek a "sense of belonging" (Booker, 2016; Hurtado & Carter, 1997), non-majority faculty experience appreciation for diversity and inclusion differently based on their identity within the larger campus community and

culture.

Bauman (2004) suggested that society sets the varied identities in opposition to each other. Thus, in social institutions, the majority or controlling group determines the norm and the "other" is set against it in comparison. Unique in this study is an attempt to explore perceptions of diversity and inclusion that would seem to promote a sense of belonging across participants who are in the non-majority according to race, gender, and sexuality at both PWIs and HBCUs. Further unique is the way race is situated as a majority construct at these two types of institutions. In the current study, we measure the differences in sense of belonging as represented by 1) appreciation of diversity to promote inclusion and 2) perceptions of inclusive campus climate for non-majority populations at a PWI and an HBCU in a specific university system.

For this study, *inclusion* is defined as conditions in the university that reflect practices and relationships that are in place to support a well-rounded student body, faculty, staff and administration that produce a state of being valued, respected, and supported. Essential to understanding the items participants considered is the focus on inclusion and inclusive conditions on the university campus as a way to structurally/organizationally value diversity, as opposed to attempts to increase diversity superficially without true efforts to enhance the climate to value that diversity. This perspective builds from a foundation of Hurtado and Carter's (1997) work on "sense of belonging" and the Hurtado et al. (2012) work on developing a model for diverse learning environments in which the authors establish that initiatives to create campus climates advancing diversity must consider not only the literal amount of diversity, but the psychological perceptions of individuals across social identities participating in intergroup experiences.

3. Methods

3.1 Context of the Study

Faculty members at two public universities in the same state university system completed the survey. The campuses confer over 43,686 degrees and are considered to be one of the top 10 university systems in American higher education (Wallace, 2015). These universities have a common credit policy and 75% of their students who attend live within the state. The PWI in the study enrolls over 18,000 undergraduate and graduate students with over 150 majors. Almost all of the 930 full-time faculty members have professional or terminal degrees. The student body is 15% non-white. The five-year graduation rate is 71%. The HBCU in the study enrolls over 10,000 students. The public university offers 177 undergraduate, 30 master, and 9 doctoral degrees through its two professional colleges and seven schools and awarded over 1,900 degrees annually. Approximately 16% of students are not Black or African American. Neither institution has an expressed religious affiliation.

At the PWI, non-majority students are defined as African American, Asian, Latin, and Native American as the category of non-White. In both settings, regardless of actual numbers, faculty identifying as female are perceived as non-majority in terms of cultural identity given the construction of the

American macroculture. For the HBCU in the system, diversity and inclusion will vary from the PWI in one category: race. For the purpose of this study, non-majority at the HBCU is defined as White, Asian, Native American, and Latin as the "diverse other" category of non-Black or African American.

The two selected universities were chosen due to their representative nature of institutional types in the historical context of state public universities where PWIs were originally established and intended to serve as Whites-only institutions. Similarly, the HBCU was established to exist in service of Black or African-American populations of the state. These institutions represent the institutional profiles being examined in this study to make comparisons.

3.2 Participants

Only surveys with 75% of the information completed was considered as usable for this study. At the PWI, 263 were usable surveys. There were 106 (40%) males and 154 (60%) females. The sample contained 234 (89%) majority faculty (i.e., White) and 29 (11%) non-White (African-American, Asian American, Latinx, Native American) faculty. The sample was largely heterosexual faculty, n=224 (85%), and n=35 LGBTQ faculty (15%) was represented.

At the HBCU, 228 were usable as surveys. There were 118 (52%) males and 105 (48%) females. The sample contained 132 (58%) majority faculty (African American) and 96 (42%) non-African American (Asian American, Latinx, Native American, White) faculty. The sample was largely heterosexual faculty representing 89% (n=203) and 11% LGBTQ (n=12) faculty.

3.3 Procedures

Over a six-week period in the spring semester, the survey was administered to both universities electronically through Qualtrics, a research software program used for survey administration. Researchers used Qualtrics and the email addresses of all faculty to periodically send out email reminders to non-responders (i.e., every seven days for a total of five times). No individual information was gathered on the survey. All participation was confidential.

3.4 Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study, developed by the researcher, had 15 (see Table 1) questions related to diversity concerns, and 13 demographic questions. Diversity and inclusion were defined at the beginning of the survey as conditions in the university that reflected practices and relationships that were in place to support a well-rounded student body, faculty, staff and administration that produce a state of being valued, respected, and supported. Respondents were asked to respond to a 4-point Likert Scale with higher scores indicating more favorable inclusive-related impact for most items: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, and Strongly Disagree = 1.

Cronbach's alpha reliability (1951) was computed using the survey scores of participants and the reliability coefficient was .88-.89 for the survey questions used in previous studies. The survey questions were sent to 10 faculty and staff members involved in inclusive services (e.g., Director of the Office of Disability Services) or research related topics. The final instrument used in this study incorporated their suggestions and resulted in two new questions being added to the survey. Ninety

percent of the questions on the survey have been used in surveys from other publications (e.g., Campbell-Whatley et al, 2016; Campbell-Whatley et al., 2015).

3.5 Design and Data Analysis

A quasi-experimental research design was employed to examine faculty sense of inclusion at a PWI compared to faculty at a HBCU. Results are analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Independent samples t-test are used to identify differences for each survey item, and Cohen's d is used to calculate effect size to determine the magnitude of the relationship (Cohen, 1988). A two-way Factor Analysis of Variance was used to assess the independent impact of each of the universities (i.e., PWI, HBCU) and the interaction of those two factors in their effect on the dependent variables (i.e., race, gender, sexuality). Partial Eta Squared was used as an effect size measure.

3.6 Limitations

Although the two universities were selected to be representative of PWIs and HBCUs, there remain potential limitations associated with the sample of only two universities. Further, there are some limitations in assertions to be made about majority versus non-majority culture, as the juxtaposition of non-majority is not entirely equivalent at both settings. In other words, White faculty are the majority at PWIs while a diverse group of faculty including Black faculty make up the non-majority; however, at the HBCU, Black faculty are the majority, while a diverse group of faculty including mostly White faculty represent the non-majority. This is not a methodological limitation, as our intention was to examine the perspectives of the "diverse other," but it can create some challenges in extending previous literature, which often focused on specific groups like White faculty at HBCUs or Black faculty at PWIs.

3.7 Results

Results are presented corresponding to the following research questions: 1) Is there a significant difference in the responses of non-majority faculty to majority faculty (based on race, gender, and sexuality) at the PWI related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion? 2) Is there a significant difference in the responses of non-majority faculty to majority faculty (based on race, gender, and sexuality) at the HBCU related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion? 3) Are there differences in patterns of responses of the non-majority faculty between the PWI and HBCU related to perceptions of diversity and inclusion?

3.8 Differences in Perceptions by Group at the PWI and HBCU

Independent samples *t* tests were performed to identify differences on faculty's perceptions of diversity and inclusion based on factors of race, gender, and sexuality. Only the questions found to be statistically significant are listed in Tables 2-8.

PWI. Statistically significant differences occurred between non-majority faculty and majority faculty (i.e., White) in two areas at the PWI (See Table 2). Majority faculty indicated a need for a diversified curriculum to prepare students for a diverse workforce, and efforts to increase inclusion were clearly evident on campus more so than non-majority faculty. There was a medium effect size for the latter item.

HBCU. At the HBCU there was a statistically significant difference in responses for majority faculty (i.e.,

African American) compared to the racial non-majority (i.e., non-Black faculty) on 5 items (See Table 2). Black, majority faculty in this instance were (a) more interested in attending inclusive related workshops, (b) indicated efforts to increase inclusion was evident, and (c) students, faculty, and administrators were well represented on campus. Responses to perceptions indicating interest in inclusion related activities or campus workshops had a medium effect size.

PWI. There was a statistically significant difference between female faculty as compared to male faculty at the PWI for 8 questions (See Table 3). Notably, females had higher mean scores for responses related to valuing inclusion. Females also demonstrated higher mean scores for responses that were critical of the campus climate. There were four questions with a medium effect size. Specifically, the larger effect sizes were found related to academics (i.e., curriculum, syllabi and daily work, and inclusive activities), and being harassed on campus.

HBCU. There were no significant differences between males and females on any items at the HBCU (See Table 3). Responses related to diversity and inclusion for females and males were relatively similar at the HBCU.

PWI. Based on the factor of sexuality, there were statistically significant differences on four items at the PWI (See Table 4). Notably, LGBTQ faculty responses had lower mean responses related to their campus's inclusive climate. Additionally, LGBTQ populations indicated more experiences with harassment.

At the HBCU, there were statistically significant differences on three items between LGBTQ and heterosexual faculty. Heterosexual faculty had higher mean scores for perceptions related to faculty and administrators from varied cultural background being well represented on campus compared to their LGBTQ peers. LGBTQ faculty generally rated items lower than their peers related to whether the campus was appropriately sensitive to inclusive activities. All significant items had large negative effect sizes.

3.9 Comparing Response Differences of Non-majority Groups between Universities

To test for differences between the HBCU and PWI as a group, a two-way ANOVA was conducted. The primary purpose of the two-way ANOVA was to understand if there was an interaction between the faculty perceptions at the two universities based on race, gender, and sexuality.

The first two by two analysis between-subjects ANOVA with university (HBCU, PWI) and White faculty or Black or African American Faculty and non-White and non-African American faculty as independent variables and faculty's perceptions of inclusion as the dependent variable was conducted. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was satisfactorily met, Levene Statistic F (1, 489) = 2.737, p = .099. The assumption of normality was approximately satisfied. There were univariate outliers and the assumption of no outliers was not met.

There was not a statistically significant interaction effect between university and race (p = .52). There was a significant main effect of majority variable, F (1, 487) = 7.743, p = .006, partial η^2=. 016, suggesting that majority faculty (M = 2.73, SD = 0.37) were more satisfied with inclusion than faculty from minority

groups (*M* = 2.68, *SD* = 0.38), with a small to medium effect size. This analysis also revealed a significant main effect of the university variable, *F* (1, 487) = 18.706, *p* <.001, partial η^2= .037, such that faculty at the HBCU (*M* = 2.80, *SD* = 0.39) were more agreeable to diversity and inclusion efforts than faculty at the PWI (*M* = 2.64, *SD* = 0.34), with a small to medium effect (See Table 6).

The second two-way ANOVAs was conducted on faculty's perceptions of inclusion as a function of the university (HBCU, PWI) and gender (Male, Female). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was satisfied. Levene Statistic *F* (1, 481) = 2.218, *p* = .137. The assumption of normality was approximately met. However, the assumption of no outliers was not met.

There was no significant interaction effect of the universities among faculty on their perceptions of inclusion related to gender, *F* (1, 479) = 0.079, *p* = .779, partial η^2< .001 (see Table 7). In other words, the male and female faculty at the HBCU perceptions did not differ significantly from the males and females at the PWI in their perception of inclusion as it relates to gender. There was no significant difference on the perceptions of inclusion among faculty across gender either, *F* (1, 479) = 1.437, *p* =.231, partial η^2= .003. Regarding differences of the two universities, results revealed a significant difference between PWI and HBCU, *F* (1, 479) = 25.100, *p* <.001, partial η^2= .050 with a medium effect size. Faculty at the HBCU (*M* = 2.81, *SD* = 0.39) were more agreeable with diversity efforts than faculty at the PWI (*M* = 2.65, *SD* = 0.35).

The third two-way ANOVA was performed on faculty's perceptions of inclusion as a function of university (HBCU, PWI) and LGBTQ/heterosexual. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was satisfied. Levene Statistic *F* (1, 472) = 2.150, *p* = .143. The assumption of normality was met. There were univariate outliers and the assumption of no outliers was not met.

This two-way ANOVA revealed no main effect of university (Table 8), *F* (1, 470) = 1.735, *p* =.188, partial η^2=.004. There is no main effect of LGBTQ/heterosexual, *F* (1, 470) = 2.448, *p* =. 118, partial η^2=.005, nor was there significant university × LGBTQ/heterosexual interaction, *F* (1, 470) = 1.247, *p* = .265, partial η^2=.003. Results indicate that both universities had the same patterns of perceptions of diversity and inclusion.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this article was to examine the varying views and perceptions of majority and non-majority faculty from an HBCU and a PWI observing diversity and inclusion with a particular emphasis on their experiences in higher education. Unique in this study was an attempt to look at perceptions of majority and non-majority faculty in both traditional "majority culture" university institutions (i.e., PWIs) and those in which the non-majority population actually dominates (i.e., HBCUs). This latter element was particularly notable given that a significant body of research indicates that culturally and linguistically diverse faculty and other underrepresented groups have concerns about inclusion and accessibility at PWIs (Bower, 2002; Frazier, 2011; Lee, 2002; Louis et al., 2016; Conklin

& Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Ross & Edwards, 2016; White, 2012), whereas White faculty at HBCUs experience a status akin to being a "temporary minority" (Foster, 2001; Foster et al., 1999; Wei & Hendrix 2016).

This study examined differences of perceptions and views of faculty based on the status of race, gender, and sexuality. In reviewing the findings of this study, certain inferences can be discussed based on the significant results of the *t* test on items. Perhaps most notable was the pattern of responses from LGBTQ faculty. At the PWIs faculty who identify as LGBTQ indicated a lesser inclusive environment with less inclusive activities included in academic work and less diversity among leadership along with greater likelihood that they might experience harassment. LGBTQ faculty at HBCUs responded similarly reported with large effect sizes regarding a campus that was inappropriately sensitive to inclusive activities (Bauer-Wolf, 2017; Shah, 2019). Further, there were medium to large effect sizes indicating faculty perceived faculty and administrators were not sufficiently diverse. This concurs with Dawson-Smith's (2004) research that leadership usually goes to African Americans at HBCUs.

With regards to the study's purpose of examining differences in responses based on gender, consistent with previous research (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Cress & Hart, 2008; Pittman, 2012; Vaccaro, 2012) women at the PWI reported concerns about accessibility, inclusiveness, and respectful work environment including experiences of harassment. Notably, in contrast, there were no significant differences at the HBCU between males and females, potentially indicating a more inclusive environment for females there.

With regards to the study's purpose of examining differences in responses based on race, findings must be reviewed a bit more carefully due to the contrasting nature of majority and non-majority population status at the PWI and HBCU. White faculty at the PWI were generally somewhat more satisfied with diversity and inclusion efforts. What is most notable, is that this was inconsistent with reported perceptions of African American faculty in the majority at the HBCU. Again, interpretation of these findings must be done with nuance. Despite being the majority, in this case, African American faculty still wanted more; a) inclusive activities for students (e.g., readings, assignments); b) inclusive workshops; c) faculty and administrators from different cultural backgrounds; and d) respect on campus.

Although the non-African American faculty at the HBCU were not entirely a White population, some cautious inferences can be made that this study's finding indicate a pattern consistent with previous research on the experiences of White faculty in the role of non-majority faculty. African American faculty at the HBCU appear to place higher value on activities and representation on the campus that promote greater inclusiveness as compared to the non-majority group (most of whom were White) even when they are in the majority, which could lead to an interpretation that White faculty carry with them the privilege of the majority American culture even when positioned as the non-majority at the HBCU. The parallel inference can be made that even when Black/African-American faculty are in the majority, they retain a greater perception of the need for valuing diversity and promoting inclusion.

Finally, the two by two ANOVA provided more in-depth analysis of findings allowed some general inferences about the differences between the PWI, and the HBCU on a combination of variables. The primary purpose of the two-way ANOVA was to understand if there was an interaction between the faculty at the two universities based on race, gender, and sexuality. There did not appear to be notable differences in perception of the inclusive environment based on gender or sexuality between the two universities, given that patterns seemed to demonstrate comparability in lower ratings on survey items associated with diversity and inclusion. Next, although, certainly not large measured effects, findings indicated that faculty at the PWI were more *satisfied* with diversity and inclusion efforts overall than faculty at the HBCU overall, as indicated by higher scores; whereas the HBCU faculty indicated more need to promote for diversity and inclusion efforts on campus. Reflecting on this finding, an inference can be made that although PWI faculty are more satisfied, given the lower ratings of non-majority groups, the macro level data might represent a level of over-confidence in perceptions of the status of inclusion on their campus.

5. Conclusions and Implications for Practice

Diverse faculty appear more interested in diversity and inclusion activities regardless of campus setting. Non-White, female, and LGBTQ faculty indicated more interest in the infusion of inclusionary principles in academic instruction (e.g., syllabi, and curriculum) and wanted more representation of diverse faculty and administration.

Although research indicates that males progress further in university settings than females, the men and women at the HBCU indicated no significant difference on the survey while the men and women faculty at the PWI exhibited differences in perceptions. The HBCU and PWI Universities both displayed differences between faculty with regards to identity based on sexuality; nevertheless, the HBCU displayed large and medium effect sizes among differences.

Perhaps most notable in examining these findings is the manner in which these reported perceptions can potentially impact practice on university campuses. Findings of this current study clearly confirm a need for continued vigilance regarding the creation of inclusive, respectful, and accessible campus culture. Consistent with previous research, it appears that non-majority faculty in terms of race, gender, and sexuality at PWIs perceive a need for improvement in efforts toward inclusivity and the creation of a more respectful and inclusive work environment. This work should extend to the level of the curriculum experienced by students as well.

Further it is notable that groups existing as the "diverse other," specifically female faculty and faculty identifying as LGBTQ, in this study expressed continued experiences of harassment on university campuses. Clearly, despite the illusion of university campuses existing as liberal, safe-spaces, institutions must remain on guard to prevent both systemic bias and overt harassment via the creation of clear anti-harassment policies. In the case of faculty identifying as LGBTQ, there seems to the clearest need for improvement. Despite a trend of improvement, the Human Rights Campaign (Messinger, 2011)

identifies a relatively small percentage of universities that have explicit protections against bias. Specific to HBCUs, less than 10% of institutions (Williams, 2018) provide overt support for faculty and students identifying as LGBTQ in the form of an official office or center. Systemic equity in partnership recognition (equivalent to what is experienced by heterosexual partners), creation of support centers and offices, and the creation of explicit anti-harassment policies would be steps toward the goals of inclusion. Leadership and faculty peers must be aware of lingering issues of unequal treatment and a need for a culture of inclusion on the campuses of PWIs which most certainly dominate the landscape of higher education and provide more equity to the "diverse other." Much like the discussions of a post-racial society, university communities must maintain their consciousness and advocacy for non-majority groups. Chief Diversity Officers and/or Directors of Advancement for Inclusion and Diversity will need to continue efforts in the form of trainings to enhance the sensitivity of leadership and peers with regards to reduction of unconscious biases, diversity in the hiring processes, and in the level of support and mentoring provided to non-majority faculty in both HBCU and PWIs alike. As established in their Model of Diverse Learning Environments, Hurtado et al. (2012) clarify that inclusion is impacted by an institutional climate that stakeholders perceive as equitable and fair. In order to establish this institutional climate, universities must have clearly stated policies for addressing issues of harassment and/or discrimination, as well as explicitly defined processes for resolving issues that include oversight by a diverse constituency that includes both students and faculty. Ultimately, the goals of Inclusive Excellence clarify that inclusion requires "active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity" that will "increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding" impacting the university culture and interpersonal engagement by faculty (AAC&U, 2021).

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. London, England: Duke University Press.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2021). *Making excellence inclusive*. Retrieved from https:///www.aacu.org/making-excellence-inclusive

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2017). *A work in progress*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/07/20/historically-black-colleges-universities-still-need-work-lgbtq-issues

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Bias, S. K. (2010). *The contact zone of temporary minorities: White faculty at a historically black university* (Order No. 3400892). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; Social Science Premium Collection. (89188806).

Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2009). "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal, 21*, 85-103.

Blumenfeld, W. J., Weber, G. N., & Rankin, S. (2016). In our own voice: Campus climate as a mediating factor in the persistence of LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education. In P. Chamness Miller, & E. Mikulec (Eds.), *Queering classrooms: Personal narratives and educational practices to support LGBTQ youth in schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Booker, K. (2016). Connection and commitment: How sense of belonging and classroom community influence degree persistence for African American undergraduate women. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *28*, 218-229.

Bower, B. L. (2002). Campus life for faculty of color: Still strangers after all these years? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2002*(118), 79-88. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.66

Campbell-Whatley, G., Merriweather, L., Lee, J., & Toms, O. (2016). Evaluation of diversity and multicultural integration training in higher education. *Journal of Applied Educational and Policy*, *2*(2), 1-14.

Campbell-Whatley, G., Wang, C., Toms. O., & Williams, N. (2015). Factors affecting campus climate: Creating a welcoming environment. *New Waves Educational Research and Development*, *18*(20), 40-52.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Conklin, W., & Robbins-McNeish, N. (2006). Four barriers to faculty diversity. *Diversity Factor* (Online), *14*(4), 26-33.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 297-334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Dawson-Smith, K. (2006). *White faculty at historically Black colleges and universities* (Unpublished Dissertation). University of New Orleans.

DeCuir-Gunby, J. Johnson, O., Edwards, C. W., McCoy, W., & White, A. (2019). *African American professionals in higher education: experiencing and coping with racial microaggressions*. Race, Ethnicity, and Education.

Flaherty, C. (January 26, 2016). Are academics disproportionately gay? *Inside Higher Education*.

Foster, L. (2001). The not-so-invisible professors: White faculty at the black college. *Urban Education*, *36*(5), 611-629. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901365006

Foster, L., Guyden, J., & Miller, A. (1999). *Affirmed action: Essays on the academic and social lives of white faculty members at historically black colleges and universities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Frazier, K. N. (2011). Academic bullying: A barrier to tenure and promotion for African American faculty. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *5*(1), 1-13.

Garvey, J. C., & Rankin, S. (2018). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher*

Education, *11*(1), 67-81. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000035

Goode-Cross, D., & Tager, D. (2011). Negotiating multiple identities: How African-American gay and bisexual men persist at a predominantly White institution. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*, 1235-1254. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.605736

Hart, J. L., & Cress, C. M. (2008). Are women faculty just "worrywarts?" Accounting for gender differences in self-reported stress. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1-2), 175-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911350802171120

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.1037/t47453-000

Hoskins, S. D. (2015). *White faculty at HBCUs: Perceptions of racial climate*. Berkley, California: Ubiquitous Press.

Human Rights Campaign. (2011). *Employer database*. Retrieved from https://www.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/CorporateEqualityIndex_2011.pdf

Hurtado S., Alvarez C. L., Guillermo-Wann C., Cuellar M., & Arellano L. (2012) A model for diverse learning environments. In J. Smart, & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 27). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2950-6_2

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, *70*, 324-345. https://doi.org/10.2307/2673270

Jablin, F. M. (1982). Formal structural characteristics of organizations and superior-subordinate communication. *Human Communication Research*, *8*, 338-347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1982.tb00672.x

Jean-Francois, E. (2017). Exploring the perceptions of campus climate and integration strategies used by international students in a US university campus. *Studies in Higher Education*, *6*(44), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1416461

Jean-Marie, G., & Tickles, V. (2017). *Black Women at the Helm in HBCUs: Paradox of Gender and Leadership* (M. Brown, & T. Dancy, Eds.). Black Colleges Across the Diaspora: Global Perspectives on Race and Stratification in Postsecondary Education (Advances in Education in Diverse Communities, Vol. 14), Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 101-124. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-358X20160000014006

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Giga, N. M., Villenas, C., & Danischewski, D. J. (2015). *Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network's National School Climate Survey (2015)*. Retrieved from https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/GLSEN%202015%20National%20School%20Climate%20Survey%20%28NSCS%29%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf

Lee, W. (2002). Culture and institutional climate: Influences on diversity in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*, 359-358. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0014

Lewis-Giggetts, T. M. (2015, February 12). What if you knew I was Black? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://chroniclevitae.com/ news/903-what-if-you-knew-i-was-black

Louis, D., Rawls, G., Jackson-Smith, D., Chambers, G., Phillips, L., & Louis, S. (2016). Listening to our voices: Experiences of black faculty at predominantly white research universities with microaggression. *Journal of Black Studies*, *47*(5), 454-474. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934716632983

McMurtrie, B. (2013). Spurred by activists, HBCUs expand their services for gay students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *60*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Spurredby-Activists-HBCUs/142559

Messinger, L. (2011) A Qualitative analysis of faculty advocacy on LGBT issues on campus. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*(9), 1281-1305. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.605740

Morris, C. (2019). White faculty deal with the challenges of teaching at HBCUs. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from: https://diverseeducation.com/article/71289/

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2018). *The condition of education*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018144.pdf

Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial micro-aggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominately white university. *The Journal of Negro Education, 8,* 82-92. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.81.1.0082

Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W. J., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 State of Higher Education for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People*. Campus Pride Q Research Institute in Higher Education.

Ross, H., & Edwards, W. (2016). African American faculty expressing concerns: Breaking the silence at predominantly white research oriented universities. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 19(*3), 461-479. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.969227

Salinas, C. (2020). The complexity of the "x" in Latinx: How Latinx/a/o students relate to, identify with, and understand the term Latinx. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 19*(2), 149-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192719900382

Savage, G. (2018). *HBCU Leaders aim to make campuses more LGBTQ inclusive*. Retrieved from http://diverseeducation.com/article/99252/

Shah, K. (2019). *There is change happening': Historically black colleges tackle LGBTQ rights*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/apr/21/there-is-change-happening-historically-black-colleges-tackle-lgbtq-rights

Slater, R. B. (1993). White professors at black colleges. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1*(1), 67-70. https://doi.org/10.2307/2962515

Smith, B., & Hawkins, B. (2011). Examining student evaluations of Black college faculty: Does race matter*? The Journal of Negro Education*, *80*(2), 149-162.

Smith, G., & Anderson, K. (2005). Students' ratings of professors: The teaching style contingency for Latino/a professors. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *4*(2), 115-136. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532771xjle0402_4

Statista: The Statistical Portal. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/184272/educational-attainment-of-college-diploma-or-higher-by-gender/

Strothers, A. (2014) White faces in black places: HBCUs and the white faculty experience. In M. Gasman, & F. Commodore (Eds.), *Opportunities and Challenges at Historically Black Colleges and Universities*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Taylor, V., & Raeburn, N. C. (1995). Identity politics as high-risk activism: Career consequences for lesbian, gay, and bisexual sociologists. *Social Problems*, *42*(2), 252-273. https://doi.org/10.2307/3096904

Thompson, D. C. (1973). Black college faculty and students: The nature of their interaction. In C. E. Willie, & R. R. Edmonds (Eds.), *Black colleges in America* (pp. 180-194). New York, London: Teachers College Press.

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs, Research, and Practice*, *49*(4), 429-446. https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6473

Wallace, N. (2016). *The top states for higher education in 2015*. Retrieved from https://smartasset.com/student-loans/top-states-higher-education

Warnat, W. I. (1976). The role of White faculty on the Black college campus. *Journal of Negro Education*, *45*(3), 334-338. https://doi.org/10.2307/2966910

Wei, F. F., & Hendrix, K. G. (2016). Minority and majority faculty members in a historically black college/university: Redefining professors' teacher credibility and classroom management. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, *17*(1), 102-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2016.1220419

White, S. B. (2012). 'Talking back': The danger of silence and the risk of speaking in Black and White. *Women & Language*, *35*(2), 95-98.

Williams, D. A., Berger, J. B., & McClendon, S. A. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Williams, S. (2018). *It's time for HBCUs to address homophobia and transphobia on their campuses.* Higher Education. Retrieved from https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/time-hbcus-address-homophobia-transphobia-campuses/

Notes

Note 1. The authors chosen to follow the guidance of Salinas (2020) regarding the use of Latin* as a gender expansive and inclusive term that considers the fluidity of social identities. Latin* includes Latina, Latino, Latinx, Latine, Latini, or Latinu to name individuals of Latin American origin and descent. The authors use Latina to refer to females, Latino for males, and Latinx for gender nonconforming.

Note 2. The authors are aware that contemporary understandings of gender identity versus sex assigned at birth reflect a complicated spectrum of identities, as society becomes more understanding of trans rights and individuals who may identify as non-binary. For the purposes of this study, as the authors are citing literature using the binary contrast of men versus women, this study does not fully explore expressed identity beyond traditional notions of sex/gender equivalence.