



PROJECT MUSE®

Factors Contributing to Faculty Incorporation of Diversity-Related Course Content

Mayhew, Matthew J.
Grunwald, Heidi E.

The Journal of Higher Education, Volume 77, Number 1, January/February 2006, pp. 148-168 (Article)

Published by The Ohio State University Press
DOI: 10.1353/jhe.2006.0005



➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jhe/summary/v077/77.1mayhew.html>

JE Matthew J. Mayhew
Heidi E. Grunwald

Factors Contributing to Faculty Incorporation of Diversity-Related Course Content

Institutions are increasingly recognizing the need for diversity in the classroom and its positive effects on student-learning outcomes (Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). As a result, many institutions have initiated curricular reforms to increase the extent to which classes include knowledge about diverse groups and issues of diversity (Gurin, 1999). To ensure the success of these curricular reform efforts, campus leaders have scrambled to procure and maintain the commitment of faculty—many times, to no avail (Gonzalez & Padilla, 1999; Harshbarger, 1989; Zemsky, 1997).

As the “primary resources in developing academic plans” (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 95), faculty control the curriculum (Finnegan, 1994; Stark & Lattuca, 1997). For an institution to be successful in communicating its commitments and priorities through curricular reform efforts, it needs to sustain support from faculty within the organization (Finnegan, 1994; Stark & Lattuca, 1997). Similarly, any institution that seeks to reflect its commitment to diversity through integrating diversity-related course materials into the curriculum needs to rally support from faculty (Hurtado & Dey, 1997). Despite research suggesting that diversity in the classroom positively affects learning outcomes (Astin, 1993; Gurin, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 2001; Maruyama, Moreno, Gudeman, & Marin 2000; Milem, 2001), many faculty members still do not integrate diversity-related materials into their course content (Maruyama et al., 2000). Diversity advocates want to know why.

Matthew J. Mayhew is Director of Student Life Assessment at the University of North Carolina Wilmington, Heidi E. Grunwald is Director of Research and Analyses in the College of Liberal Arts at Temple University.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 77, No. 1 (January/February 2006)
Copyright © 2006 by The Ohio State University

In their effort to understand why faculty resist institutional reform efforts, Gonzalez and Padilla (1999) observed that the extent to which faculty engaged in such efforts was due, in large part, to two factors: goal congruence and perceived viability of achieving change. That is, when the goals of the faculty and the institution were congruent and faculty had high expectations that the proposed innovations were feasible, they were willing to engage in reform efforts. When either one of these components was weak, faculty willingness to engage in reform efforts declined or they disengaged entirely. This idea of “congruency” is also supported by Harshbarger (1989), who identified congruence or incongruence of personal value and perceived institutional values as one of many factors that motivate faculty to engage in institutional reform efforts. When applied to diversity-related reform initiatives, the idea of congruency underscores the importance of understanding how faculty members’ beliefs about diversity align with their perceptions of their institutions’ commitment to diversity. Understanding the relationship between these beliefs and perceptions can provide critical insight into why certain faculty members are motivated to sustain institutional commitments to diversity while others are not.

The purpose of this research is to identify factors that affect 336 faculty decisions to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. We examine how demographic variables, professional characteristics, perceptions about departmental and institutional commitments toward diversity, personal beliefs about diversity, and participation in diversity-related workshops predict faculty’s use of diversity-related material in the classroom. The results of this study will contribute to the emerging literature on diverse teaching and learning environments and will help administrators involved in institutional planning and management motivate faculty to engage in institutional reform efforts related to diversity.

Literature Review

As educators we must address these basic challenges for American pluralism across the curriculum—in the classroom, in the co-curriculum, in the intersections between campus and community. In short, this diversity that is part of American society needs to be reflected in the student body, faculty and staff, approaches to teaching, and in the college curriculum. (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1995, p. 8)

Nowhere should an institution’s commitment to diversity be more evident than in the curriculum. Hurtado and Dey (1997) note the benefits of including diversity in the curriculum: “such curricular innovation

heightens student awareness and knowledge of particular groups in American society and increases criticism of the status quo, thereby establishing an avenue for critical thinking among students” (p. 413). Although faculty understand the positive effects of incorporating diversity into the college curriculum (Hurtado & Dey, 1993; Maruyama et al., 2000), many still show signs of resistance towards integrating diversity-related content into their course materials (Maruyama & Moreno, 2000).

In an effort to understand the factors that contribute to this resistance, a series of studies have investigated the effects of racial climate variables and faculty characteristics on the likelihood that faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials (Hurtado, 2001; Maruyama et al., 2000; Milem, 2001). For example, Hurtado (2001) analyzed data from the 1989–1990 Faculty Survey administered by UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute of over 16,000 faculty at 159 selective predominantly White institutions from across the country. Findings suggested that women were significantly more likely than men to require reading on racial/ethnic or gender issues in their courses. Additionally, African American faculty were the most likely to report having required readings on gender or race/ethnicity in their courses, while Asian American faculty were the least likely to have done so. Given the importance of race and gender in this area, we included both, as well as race by gender interaction terms, as variables for consideration in our model predicting faculty’s likelihood of incorporating diversity-related materials into their course content.

In a study designed to assess university faculty views on the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom, Maruyama and Moreno (2000) administered the Faculty Classroom Diversity Questionnaire to a representative national sample of 1,500 college and university faculty at Research I institutions. Results showed that the majority of faculty valued diversity in the classroom for its role in helping students to achieve the goals of a college education and in helping faculty members to develop new perspectives on their own teaching and research. However, the majority of these faculty members also reported making no changes in their classroom practices. In fact, although faculty reported being well-prepared and comfortable teaching diverse classes, only about one third of them actually raised issues of diversity in the classroom. These results differed as a function of the faculty’s professional characteristics and demographics: Senior faculty members (in terms of tenure and rank) were less positive about the value of diversity and less likely to address issues of diversity; faculty of color and female faculty viewed the climate for diversity as less positive, reported the benefits of diversity as more positive, felt better prepared to deal with diversity, and reported

that they were more likely to address issues of diversity. Findings from this study inform the current investigation in two ways. First, we included rank (in terms of tenure) for its potential in explaining whether faculty members incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. Second, we included items designed to measure faculty beliefs about the value of diversity on campus.

Milem (2001) completed the most comprehensive study of factors that contributed to faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content in their course materials. Using the 1992–93 HERI survey of 35,061 university faculty members, he examined how a series of demographic, professional, and perception-based factors affected faculty members' inclusion of readings on the experiences of racial and ethnic groups in the classroom. Results showed that only 14% of faculty reported incorporating diversity-related content into their courses. Overall, factors predicting curricular inclusion of diversity-related content included academic discipline, gender, race, two variables measuring perceived institutional commitment to diversity, and faculty interest in research and teaching. Similar to findings from studies by Hurtado (2001) and Maruyama and Moreno (2000), Milem's findings showed that faculty of color (with the exception of Asian American faculty) were at least twice as likely as White faculty to integrate diversity-related content into their courses. Women were also twice as likely as men to report that they incorporate reading on racial issues in their classes.

Milem (2001) also examined how these factors predicted faculty attendance at workshops on racial awareness and curriculum inclusion. He found that 33% of faculty reported attending a workshop on racial or cultural awareness and curricular inclusion, with Whites and Asian Americans being the least likely to have attended. Although he never directly analyzed how participation in these workshops affected faculty members' likelihood to incorporate diversity-related materials into the curriculum, Milem found that many factors predicted attendance at workshops, including race, gender, rank, institutional type, faculty perceptions of the institution's commitment to the value of student diversity, faculty perceptions of their institution's emphasis on civic responsibility, faculty perceptions of their institutions as student-centered, and faculty perceptions of their students' ability. Findings from Milem's study provided empirical support for including academic discipline, measures of faculty perceptions of their institution's commitment to diversity, and measures of faculty members' formal participation in workshops designed to increase racial or cultural awareness as variables.

Interestingly, none of the studies that have investigated the factors that affect faculty's incorporation of diversity-related content into their

course materials has examined faculty members' perceptions of their departments' commitment to diversity as potential determinants. This is somewhat surprising given research that has documented the powerful effects of the academic department on influencing faculty experiences, perceptions, and behaviors (Duryea, 1973; Lindholm, 2003; Peterson, 1976). As Peterson notes, "they [academic departments] are the basic organizational unit in which most faculty pursue their disciplinary and professional interests and at the same time perform most of the basic teaching, research, and service functions which colleges and universities encourage and reward to varying degrees" (1976, p. 21). For this reason, we included six variables that measure faculty members' impressions of their department's climate for diversity.

This study provides a unique contribution to research that considers how different factors influence faculty members' decisions to incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content. It is the first to investigate faculty's perceptions of their department's commitment for diversity as potential determinants of their decisions to incorporate diversity into their course content. Second, data for this study were recently collected in January 2002; although recently published, much of the data analyzed for existing research in this area was collected over 10 years ago. Finally, this study is grounded in the context of a single institution; therefore, we have the ability to use institutional figures to weight data so that the percentages of women, faculty of color, and rank (tenure) match those reported by the institution. In addition, by providing a description of the institution's context beyond institutional type and control, we have the ability to make more meaningful interpretations of our findings. Such a description provides insight into the "distinct racial contexts" (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999, p. 282) in which the faculty members teach. We turn now to this description.

University Context

This university is a predominantly White, public university in the Midwest. Historically, this university has struggled with creating an environment that welcomes and appreciates diversity. In an address to the campus community concerning the institution's struggle with issues related to diversity, the university president notes how there are those in the university who are "unable to enjoy a life free from hateful words and deeds" and those who "have been denied basic opportunities that others take for granted." He offers a challenge for the campus community to make certain that their own "house is in order" by facing up to these problems, dealing with them forthrightly, and having each member

of the campus community do his or her part to “make the great American dream a reality for all her peoples.”

In an effort to make certain that the “house was in order,” the university instituted a comprehensive plan for strengthening its diversification efforts. Distributed to faculty and staff in the fall of 1998, this plan institutionalized diversity initiatives, including the integration of diversity-related course learning into the existing curriculum, the creation of cocurricular programs and events designed to increase diversity awareness and sensitivity, and the recruitment of minority faculty and students.

A series of curricular and cocurricular diversity-related initiatives have been created as a result of the plan. Curricular initiatives include a new core requirement that mandates that students enroll in at least one course with a diversity focus, numerous other courses throughout the curriculum that focus on diversity, and a new major and minor in “Black World Studies.” Examples of cocurricular initiatives include a center for the study of Black culture and learning and the provision of financial and infrastructure support for new student organizations, ranging from an association of Latin and American students to a disability awareness club.

The university has also made significant strides in recruiting students and faculty of color. Over the past 6 years, diverse student enrollment has increased 26%. Diverse faculty recruitment efforts follow similar patterns: an increase from 61 minority faculty members in 1992 to 97 in 2002. Minority faculty members made up 21% (6 out of 28) of tenured or tenure-track faculty who joined the university in fall 2002. Although the university has not yet reached its goals with regard to increasing the structural diversity of the campus, it continues to brainstorm new programs and initiatives with the intention of creating a more welcoming and diverse campus community.

Research Questions

This brief description of the university provides a context for understanding some of the factors that contribute to faculty members’ decisions about whether to incorporate diversity-related material into their course content. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

How does faculty members’ likelihood to incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content differ as a function of their gender, race, gender by race interaction, rank, and department?

What role do faculty members’ perceptions of their institutions’ and departments’ commitments to diversity play in affecting their likelihood to integrate diversity-related material into their course content?

How do faculty members' beliefs about diversity influence their decisions to integrate diversity-related material into their courses?

How does faculty members' participation in workshops designed to increase awareness and sensitivity toward issues of diversity on campus facilitate their decisions to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials?

Data and Methodology

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 336 faculty at a large, Mid-western, predominantly White public university. All of the 833 faculty members at this institution were solicited for participation in the study. Of these, 336 returned useable surveys; this yielded a response rate of 40.3%. See Table 1 for a comparison of demographic information for this sample with that of the entire faculty as reported by the institution. We weighted the data by sex, race, and tenure status so that the sample percentages matched those reported by the institution. We chose sex, race, and tenure status as weighting criteria because the literature identifies them as significant predictors of faculty incorporation of diversity-related content into the curriculum.

Instrument

We adopted the survey instrument used for this study from a diversity climate survey developed at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at University of California at Los Angeles. HERI's survey was

TABLE 1
Demographic Breakdown of Sample of Faculty Compared to the Institutional Percentages

	Sample (%)	Institution (%)
Tenure Status		
Tenured	67	69
Tenure Track	16	24
Non-Tenure Track	17	7
Race		
White	86	90
Nonwhite	12	10
Gender		
Male	59	69
Female	38	31

adapted from a diversity climate survey previously developed at University of California at Berkeley. The survey questions have been tested over time, and they continue to demonstrate content validity. The survey measured a variety of different constructs relating to diversity (e.g., beliefs about diversity, perceptions of institution's commitment to diversity, etc.). For a complete list of variables used in this study, see Table 2.

In addition, we adapted the survey to reflect diversity-related concerns indigenous to this university. For example, we designed a series of items to measure the climate for diversity of the city in which the university is situated; faculty were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with statements like, "XXX is a diverse community," and "XXX is a safe (i.e., crime-free) community."

Moreover, in order to measure the different kinds of diversity represented on campus, we asked specific questions about racial/ethnic diversity, religious diversity, GLBT diversity, and gender diversity. In addition, this survey included some open-ended items. Some of the verbatim responses to these items are used to support conclusions in the discussion section of this paper.

Variables

The dependent variable used in this study was a dichotomous response (i.e., yes or no) to the question, "In the past year, have you incorporated content designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues into your courses?"

Table 2 describes independent variables eligible for entry into the model. These variables include faculty demographics and professional characteristics, perceptions of departmental and institutional commitment to diversity, beliefs about diversity, and participation in workshops¹ designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues. Certain demographic and professional characteristic variables were entered in the model as dummy variables. All other variables have been standardized so that they have mean 0 and standard deviation of 1.

Analysis

We performed descriptive and exploratory analyses of all variables for two reasons: to determine the relationship between each predicting variable and the criterion and to check for significant relationships between predicting variables. Table 3 includes frequencies of whether or not faculty incorporated diversity-related content into their curriculum by sex and race.

TABLE 2

Independent Variables Used in the Logistic Regression to Predict Whether or Not Faculty Incorporated Diversity-Related Content into the Classroom

<i>Theoretical Construct</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Levels of Independent Variables</i>
Demographics and Professional Characteristics	Race	White Faculty of color
	Gender	Male Female
	Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual GLBT
	Race by Gender Interaction	Race*Gender
	Time at Institution	1= 5 yrs. or less 2=5-15 3=15-25 4=25-35 35+
	Tenure Status	Tenure Status Not on tenure track Currently on tenure track Currently hold tenure
	Department	Arts and Sciences Education/Applied Profs Business /Administration Fine Arts Engin./Applied Science
Perception of department's commitment to diversity	Scarcity of qualified racial/ethnic minorities	3-point obstacle scale*
	Scarcity of qualified women	3-point obstacle scale
	My department emphasizes the importance of diversity in our field	4-point agreement scale**
	There is a need for more diversity in my department	4-point agreement scale
	My department is receptive to integrating racial/gender issues in courses	4-point agreement scale
Perception of institution's commitment to diversity	The Chair in my department should be committed to promoting respect for an understanding of group differences at this institution	4-point agreement scale
	Female faculty are treated fairly at this institution	4-point agreement scale
	Minority faculty are treated fairly at this institute	4-point agreement scale
	Diversity is good for this institution and should be actively promoted	4-point agreement scale
	Institution is placing too much emphasis on diversity at expense of its prestige	4-point agreement scale

TABLE 2 (Continued)
 Independent Variables Used in the Logistic Regression to Predict Whether or Not Faculty Incorporated Diversity-Related Content into the Classroom

<i>Theoretical Construct</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Levels of Independent Variables</i>	
Beliefs about diversity	Gay and lesbian faculty at his institution are accepted and respected committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at this institution	4-point agreement scale	
	Top campus administrators are genuinely	4-point agreement scale	
	Percentage of minority faculty should reflect the % of minority students	4-point agreement scale	
	This institution has achieved a positive climate for diversity	4-point agreement scale	
	The emphasis on Western Civilization and non-dominant cultures is balanced in the curriculum	4-point agreement scale	
	One problem with pursuing the goal of diversity is in the admission of too many under-prepared students	4-point agreement scale	
	Emphasizing diversity leads to campus disunity	4-point agreement scale	
	Affirmative action leads to the hiring of less qualified faculty and staff	4-point agreement scale	
	Formal participation in diversity-related activities	In the past year, have you participated in organized activities (conferences, workshops, etc.) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues?	Yes, No

*Obstacle scale (1 = not an obstacle, 2 = minor obstacle, 3 = major obstacle)

**Agreement scale (1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = agree somewhat, 4 = agree strongly)

***Frequency scale (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently)

A layered chi-square analysis for categorical variables, including race, gender, and the outcome (i.e., incorporating diversity), was performed. Results showed that the relationship between race and faculty likelihood to incorporate diversity-related material in their courses was statistically significant for males ($C^2 = 4.21, p = .03$), but not for females ($p = .29$). As a result, we computed an interaction variable between sex

and race and included it in the final model predicting faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related material into their courses.²

Because of the large number of potential predictors and our sample size of only 336 faculty members, we examined the univariate relationship between each predicting variable and the outcome to guide the process of variable selection for the logistic regression model. We excluded variables that did not significantly predict the outcome from consideration in the final model.

A pseudo- R^2 (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000; Menard, 1995) statistic was calculated using the relative change in deviance to assess the fit of the final model as compared to the null model. Note that the scale of this measure is not equivalent to a linear regression R^2 value and, as such, is simply a comparison for competing models using the same data set. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test was used for goodness of fit, and the cross-classification table was used as a measure of predictability of the model. In addition, in order to assess the relative strength of the predictors in the logistic regression models, we standardized continuous variables (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2002). Finally, we assessed the model diagnostics through residual plots.

Results

Results from descriptive analyses indicated that 69% of the faculty respondents in this study reported incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials; 31% did not.

The final model predicting faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content included 13 variables and had a valid sample size of 265. The classification table shows that the final

Table 3
Weighted Percentage of Faculty Who Incorporate Diversity-related Materials by Race and Sex

Variable	Incorporate Diversity	
	No (%)	Yes (%)
Males*		
White	44 (n = 87)	56 (n = 109)
Faculty of color	25 (n = 7)	75 (n = 21)
Females		
White	17 (n = 15)	83 (n = 71)
Faculty of color	11 (n = 1)**	89 (n = 8)

*The difference between whites and faculty of color is statistically significant for males ($p < .05$)

**Note the sparse cell count for female faculty of color who did not incorporate diversity-related content into her course curriculum.

model correctly classified 86% of the faculty in terms of whether or not they incorporated diversity-related content into their curriculum.³ Residual plot diagnostics indicated no extreme violations of the model and no outlying covariate patterns affecting the predicted probabilities.⁴ Table 4 includes the variables, coefficients, and odds ratios for the final model.

TABLE 4
Significant Predictors of Faculty Integration of Diversity-Related Content into Course Materials (N = 242)

Construct	Variable	β	SE(β)	OR = e^β
	Constant	-2.00	1.45	
Demographics and professional characteristics	Faculty of Color	8.96	2.70	7379**
	Female	1.14	0.59	3.11*
	Faculty of Color *Female Interaction	-4.55	1.77	.016**
	Education/Appl Profs (Others except Engineer)	-1.34	0.69	0.26*
	Engineering (Others except Education)	2.11	0.97	8.24*
Department commitment to diversity	There is a need for more diversity in my department	0.37	0.21	1.44^
	My department emphasizes the importance of diversity in our field	0.97	0.28	2.65**
	My department is receptive to integrating racial/gender issues in courses	0.87	0.24	2.38**
	The Chair should be committed to promoting respect for group differences	0.65	0.24	1.92**
	Scarcity of qualified women is an obstacle to increasing diversity in my department	-0.61	0.22	0.56**
Institution commitment to diversity	Top campus administrators are genuinely committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at this institution	-0.77	0.22	0.46**
Faculty beliefs about diversity	Affirmative Action leads to the hiring of less qualified faculty and staff	-0.75	0.30	0.47**
Formal participation in diversity-related activities	In the past year, have you participated in organized activities (conferences, workshops, etc.) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues? (No)	1.61	0.44	5.01**

Pseudo R-square = .58; Variables in () indicate the reference groups for categorical predictors; ^ = p<.10, * p < .05, ** p <.01.

Faculty Demographic and Professional Characteristics

There were significant main effects for race and sex as predictors of whether or not faculty members chose to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. In addition, the interaction term of race by sex reached statistical significance. This indicates that the relationship between race and likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content is dependent upon the sex of the faculty members. When all other variables are held constant, on average, male faculty members of color were much more likely than White male faculty members were to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. Female faculty members of color were also more likely to incorporate diversity-related content than White females were; however, the differences were much less pronounced.

Incorporation for faculty members in education and engineering significantly differed from that of faculty in all other departments. Faculty members in education were less likely to incorporate diversity-related content ($OR = .26, p < .05$) than were faculty from arts and sciences, business and administration, and fine arts. Inversely, engineering faculty were more likely to incorporate diversity-related content ($OR = 8.24, p < .05$) than were faculty from arts and sciences, business and administration, and fine arts. Tenure status, sexual orientation, and time at institution were not significant predictors.

Departmental Commitment

Of the six variables designed to measure the department's commitment to diversity, four reached statistical significance and one approached statistical significance. Faculty who were more likely to agree that their department emphasized the importance of diversity in their field were also more likely to incorporate diversity-related content ($OR = 2.65, p < .01$). Likewise, faculty who were more likely to agree that their department was receptive to integrating racial and gender issues in courses were more likely to incorporate diversity-related content ($OR = 2.38, p < .01$). Moreover, faculty who were more likely to agree that the department chair should be committed to promoting respect for group differences were more likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their classroom ($OR = 1.92, p < .01$). In addition, faculty who were more likely to believe that the "scarcity of qualified women was an obstacle to increasing diversity in their department" were less likely to incorporate diversity into their classroom ($OR = .56, p < .01$). Faculty belief that there was a need for more diversity in their department was marginally

significant ($OR = 1.44, p = .08$); faculty who were more likely to agree that their department needed more diversity were also more likely to incorporate diversity content into the curriculum.

Institutional Commitment

Only one variable from the set of nine institutional commitment variables significantly predicted faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials. Faculty members who were more likely to believe that "top campus administrators were genuinely committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at the institution" were less likely to incorporate diversity-related material into their classroom ($OR = .46, p < .01$). The remaining eight institutional commitment variables did not reach statistical significance.

Faculty Beliefs about Diversity

Of the three variables measuring faculty beliefs about diversity, one was a significant predictor. On average, faculty members who were more likely to agree that affirmative action leads to hiring of less qualified faculty and staff were less likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials ($OR = .47, p < .01$).

Formal Participation in Diversity-Related Activities

When we controlled for all other variables in the model, participation in activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues was the most powerful predictor of faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. Faculty members who participated in these organized activities were more likely to incorporate diversity related content than were those who did not participate ($OR = 5.01, p < .01$).

Limitations

Our small sample size limited the number of parameters that we could investigate at any given time. A larger sample may have resulted in higher cell counts for female faculty of color who did not incorporate diversity-related content into their classrooms and may have allowed us to further investigate the departmental effects and their interaction with other variables in the model.

Logistic regression, for all of its robust characteristics, is unable to address directional causal relationships. Neither the previous research in this area nor the wording of the questions used to measure workshop participation or incorporation of diversity-related materials were sufficient to make any causal inference about the nature and direction of the relationship between the workshops and the incorporation of diversity materials. As a result, we performed a non-causal model analysis that used incorporation of diversity-related materials as the outcome of interest. Future research that measures the influence of workshop participation on curricular inclusion or vice versa is needed to explore fully the relationship between these two variables.

Third, we did not have specific information concerning the nature of the courses that had diversity-related content to distinguish them from those that did not. For example, are these courses taught in a large lecture halls or small discussion classes? Do these courses tend to be service-learning courses or core courses in the major? Although we may be able to intuit the answers to some of these questions by accounting for department, we believe that these “curricular” factors may exert some influence over whether a faculty member would incorporate diversity-related materials in his or her course content.

Discussion

By accounting for personal demographics, professional characteristics, perceptions of institutional and department commitment to diversity, beliefs about diversity, and participation in diversity-related activities, the proposed model has an 86% success rate in predicting which faculty members chose to incorporate diversity-related material into their course content and which did not. It is important for institutional leaders to understand that the decision of a faculty member to engage in institutional reform efforts intended for the classroom involves the interplay between that faculty’s beliefs about diversity and his or her perception of the institution’s and department’s commitment to diversity. For classroom reform efforts, faculty members are the key for moving consensus to action. Their personal beliefs and perceptions of the department and the institution must be accounted for if the institutional reform effort is to be implemented successfully.

Interestingly, race is a much stronger determinant of whether or not faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into course materials for males than for females. The disparity between male faculty of color and White males is much greater than that between female faculty of color and White females. These findings echo those of previous research

that suggest that White male faculty members are the least likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses (Hurtado, 2001; Maruyama et al., 2000; Milem, 2001). Historically marginalized and underrepresented faculty, such as female faculty, faculty of color, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered faculty, may be more likely to share an expressed solidarity concerning the value of integrating diversity-related content into the classroom environment. Alternatively, White male faculty may be the least likely of all faculty groups to feel as though they have the expertise needed to communicate issues concerning diversity effectively and passionately to their students. These issues are provocative, important areas for future research. Exploratory investigation of the reasons why White male faculty appear to be the least likely of all groups to incorporate diversity-related material would be a fruitful venue for future research.

For institutional planners to be successful in procuring and maintaining faculty engagement in diversity-related curriculum reform efforts, they need to encourage faculty to participate in activities designed to promote diversity on campus. The findings from this study indicate that when we control for all other variables, participation in activities of this nature is one of the main determinants of faculty's incorporation of diversity-related materials in the classroom. In her discussion of effective strategies for procuring faculty support of institutional reform initiatives, Finnegan (1997) notes, "the appointment and reward system for faculty must support any transformation that is to occur" (p. 496). Perhaps administrators could negotiate release time, stipends, or honoraria for faculty who participate in diversity-related workshops and who incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content. Perhaps participation in activities of this nature could substitute for committee work.

Why does participation in these activities motivate faculty to incorporate diversity-related materials into their courses? Perhaps faculty members who attend these workshops are more likely to have positive interactions with diverse peers. Through these interactions, faculty may find a supportive network for expressing shared commitments to promoting diversity as an important educational outcome. Perhaps they learn about innovative pedagogies for incorporating diverse materials into the curriculum from the materials or testimonies presented at the workshop. Whatever the reason, it appears that faculty from this institution have mixed impressions of workshops designed to promote diversity education. Some think they are "invaluable" and should be "mandatory." Others feel as though these workshops are at best "cosmetic, with no real value."

Faculty decide to incorporate diversity-related material into their courses based on their perceptions of their departments' commitment to support diversity-related initiatives, not on their perceptions of the institutions' commitment to support these initiatives. Of the six variables designed to measure faculty members' perceptions of their departments' commitment to diversity, four reached statistical significance and one approached statistical significance. In contrast, of the nine variables measuring institutional commitment to diversity, only one significantly predicted faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials. Interestingly, this institutional variable shared a negative relationship with incorporation of diversity-related content; faculty who believe that their top administrators are genuinely committed to promoting respect for group differences at the institution are less likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses. Collectively, these findings suggest that faculty at this institution are more likely to be influenced by their departmental academic climate than by their broader academic environment. It appears as though the department climate is much more influential than the institutional climate as a means for communicating the importance of diversity-related issues and for subsequently affecting change in faculty behavior. This finding is consistent with organizational literature that underscores the importance of identifying departmental factors and accounting for their roles in influencing faculty perceptions and behaviors (Lindholm, 2003; Peterson, 1976) and has major implications for institutional managers and planners interested in procuring faculty involvement in promoting diversity-related initiatives on campus: Rally the support from the department, and the support from individual faculty members will follow.

Faculty's personal beliefs about diversity also influence their likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses. Results from this study indicate that faculty who were more likely to believe that affirmative action leads to the hiring of less qualified faculty and staff were less likely to incorporate diversity-related materials in the classroom. However, we know that this particular university is committed to increasing the structural diversity (Hurtado et al., 1999) of the campus by recruiting faculty and staff of color and by subsequently increasing the numerical and proportional representation of diverse groups on campus. Positioning this finding within the specific context of this university provides an example of the idea of personal and institutional "congruence" (Harshbarger, 1989; Gonzalez and Padilla, 1999) and an illustration of how it relates to faculty members' participation in institutional reform efforts. When the beliefs of the faculty members do not align

with those of the institution, the experienced incongruence impedes faculty's willingness to incorporate diversity-related material into their courses.

Implications and Future Research

The recent Supreme Court rulings about the role of affirmative action in college admissions have sparked a renewed national interest in how institutions express their commitments to diversity. One expression of this commitment is the degree to which the curriculum addresses issues related to diversity. Since faculty members are the “gatekeepers” of the curriculum, more studies examining how faculty members make decisions to incorporate diversity-related material into the curriculum are needed. Results from the current investigation suggest that workshops designed to promote diversity-awareness facilitate faculty members' incorporation of diversity-related content into their course materials. However, more research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of these workshops (or any other intervention) and to identify the salient features of the interventions that are successful in influencing faculty's decisions to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses.

Of course, the particular history of a campus and the beliefs that faculty bring with them to the campus are important contributors to institutional dynamics, suggesting the need for additional campus-based studies of this kind. Although restricted in terms of their ability to generalize to other populations, single-institution studies provide insight into the unique dynamics of an institution and into how these dynamics explain empirical findings. In addition, these types of studies enable researchers to weight data using institutional data—a process that increases the accuracy of the research findings. Future research may need to adopt a case study or ethnographic approach to investigating how the historical legacy of a university's position toward diversity interacts with other dimensions of the institution's climate for diversity and how these interactions influence faculty behaviors. This type of study would not only illuminate many issues concerning how the institutional climate for diversity of a particular campus affects faculty behavior, but would provide some insight into what elements of a particular campus dynamic are most influential in changing faculty members' beliefs about diversity-related issues.

Findings from this study suggest that a polarity exists between the faculty members' personal beliefs and those of the institution. This incongruence impedes faculty engagement with curricular reform efforts related to diversity. Administrators must make every effort to align the

goals of the faculty with those of the institution for a successful diversity-related curricular reform to take root. Hurtado and Dey (1997) offer suggestions towards this end, including assessing the campus's climate for diversity, creating commissions or committees charged with developing and implementing plans for constructive change, and encouraging faculty to engage in informal group discussions with diverse peers on campus. We recommend that these suggestions be resituated within the context of academic departments. In other words, departmental administrators and planners should assess how faculty members perceive their department's climate for diversity, and faculty committees concerned with issues related to diversity in the curriculum need to be convened at the department level.

Finally, future research should investigate those dimensions of departmental leadership that influence faculty adoption of diversity-related content into their courses. What are the characteristics and qualities of effective and ineffective department chairs in procuring faculty support in diversifying the curriculum? What means do these leaders employ to communicate institutional priorities? Addressing these questions might also yield a fruitful line of research.

Conclusion

For institutional planners to be successful in procuring and maintaining faculty engagement in diversity-related reform efforts intended for the classroom, they need to encourage faculty to participate in activities designed to promote diversity on campus. In addition, they need to obtain departmental support of institutional initiatives designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues. At the department level, department chairs should create more opportunities for faculty to have positive interactions with each other. Whatever the strategy, it is important for institutional managers to try all possible approaches to influence the faculty to engage in the important work of diversity-related curriculum reform. Taking these steps will help align the goals of the faculty with those of the institution and will ultimately lead to more diverse classrooms and more enriching learning environments for students.

Notes

¹The organized activities (conferences, workshops) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues were not mandatory. The purpose of these activities varied; however, all were designed to engage faculty in issues relating to diversity in an effort to create a welcoming environment for all people in the classroom and on campus. How people were invited also varied; sometimes it was a general invitation (e.g., to the whole

school of education and applied professions), and sometimes it was a targeted invitation to certain faculty from the Provost, who strongly encouraged attendance but never required it. Frequently, small honorariums (\$100) were offered as incentives for faculty participation. In general, the workshops ranged in size from 20–40.

²Note that one cell (female faculty of color) had a sample size less than 5. There was only 1 female faculty of color who did not incorporate diversity-related content into her curriculum. This may have biased the chi-square results for females as well as influenced the standard errors for the log odds ratios in the logistic regression model.

³A pseudo-R-square for the final model calculated from the change in -2LL was equal to .36 (Menard, 1995). The Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit test indicated that the model was a good fit for the data.

⁴Residual plots of the predicted probabilities versus the Pearson and deviance residuals and the leverage values showed no patterns and no outlier covariate patterns. The majority of the normalized residuals were less than 3, and the leverage values were all less than .4. Hosmer & Lemeshow (2002) indicate that leverage values should be less than 1.0.

References

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (1995). *American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Duryea E. D. (1990). Evolution of university organization. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White, T. H. (Eds.), *ASHE Reader on organization and governance in higher education* (4th ed., pp. 3–35). Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster. (Reprinted from the University as an Organization, 1973).
- Cohen, P., Cohen, J., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2002). *Applied multiple regression: Correlation analysis for the behavioral science* (3rd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Finnegan, D. E. (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. 479–501). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonzalez, K. P., & Padilla, R.V. (1999, Nov.). Faculty commitment and engagement in organizational reform. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.
- Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. In <AU: Provide editor info for this work> *The compelling need for diversity in higher education, Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75231 (E.D. Mich.) and Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich)* (pp.99–234). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on student outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330–366.
- Harshbarger, B. (1989). Faculty commitment to the university: Influences and issues. *The Review of Higher Education*, 13, 29–45.
- Hosmer D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2000). *Applied logistic regression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity*

- challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187–203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1993, May). Promoting general education outcomes. Paper presented at the annual forum at the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.
- 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: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S. Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R. & Allen, W. (1999). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education* 21(3), 279–302.
- Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(1), 125–149.
- Maruyama, G., & Moreno, J. F. (2000) University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. In G. Maruyama, J. F. Moreno, R. H. Gudeman, & P. Marin (Eds.), *Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms*. Retrieved August 1, 2002 from American Council on Education Web site: <http://www.acenet.edu>.
- Maruyama, G., Moreno, J. F., Gudeman, R. H., & Marin, P. (Eds.) (2000). *Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms*. Retrieved August 1, 2002 from American Council on Education Web site: <http://www.acenet.edu>.
- Menard, S. (1995). *Applied logistic regression analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milem, J. P. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affects student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 233–249). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Peterson, M. W. (1976). The academic department: Perspectives from theory and research. In F. N. Kerlinger & J. B. Carroll (Eds.), *Examining departmental management: New directions for institutional research* (Vol. 10, pp. 21–38). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Stark, J. S., & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Zemsky, R. (1997). Turning point. *Policy Perspectives*, 7, 1–10.