

## Social Psychological and Personality Science

### Perceiving Ethnic Diversity on Campus: Group Differences in Attention to Hierarchical Representation

Journal:	<i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	SPPS-11-0585.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Racial Identity, Intergroup Relations, Intergroup processes, Applied Social Psychology, Political Psychology, Educational Psychology
Abstract:	<p>A field study tested whether Asian and White students use different criteria when judging the racial and ethnic diversity of their university. The university under study had roughly equal numbers of Asians and Whites, but Asians were heavily concentrated in the student body and had relatively low numbers in high status university positions (the faculty and administration). Results showed that, as long as the student body was deemed diverse, the status asymmetry did not prevent Whites from regarding their university as diverse or from opposing efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity on campus. Asians, by contrast, were attentive to the status asymmetry: they incorporated faculty/administrative diversity into their judgments of the university and saw diversity in the student body as a reason to increase diversity in high status positions. The results suggest that people perceive and support diversity in ways that align with the interests of their ethnic ingroups.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Abstract

A field study tested whether Asian and White students use different criteria when judging the racial and ethnic diversity of their university. The university under study had roughly equal numbers of Asians and Whites, but Asians were heavily concentrated in the student body and had relatively low numbers in high status university positions (the faculty and administration). Results showed that, as long as the student body was deemed diverse, the status asymmetry did not prevent Whites from regarding their university as diverse or from opposing efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity on campus. Asians, by contrast, were attentive to the status asymmetry: they incorporated faculty/administrative diversity into their judgments of the university and saw diversity in the student body as a reason to increase diversity in high status positions. The results suggest that people perceive and support diversity in ways that align with the interests of their ethnic ingroups.

**Keywords:** social identity, diversity initiatives, affirmative action, organizational hierarchy, faculty of color

## Perceiving Ethnic Diversity on Campus:

## Group Differences in Attention to Hierarchical Representation

Although much research has investigated the benefits and consequences of diversity on university campuses (e.g., Gottfredson, Panter, Daye, Allen, Wightman, & Deo, 2008, Hagedorn, Chi, Cepeda, & McLain, 2007; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Diltmann, & Crosby, 2008; Sidanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sears, 2008; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008), surprisingly little research has investigated what criteria people use when determining whether a campus or organization is diverse (see Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011; Unzueta & Binning, 2010). Popular consensus seems to hold that diversity reflects a high proportional representation of members of traditionally underrepresented groups, but numerical diversity is only one source of information that can actually shape judgments of ethnic and racial diversity (see Unzueta & Binning, 2012; Unzueta, Knowles, & Ho, 2012). In the present research we address the question of how students within a given university construct their racial and ethnic diversity perceptions. What criteria do they use to determine whether their campus has attained diversity? And how are these perceptions linked to desires to see more (or less) diversity on campus?

The present research builds on recent insights into the bases of low and high status group members' diversity judgments (Unzueta & Binning, 2012). This work begins with assumption that diversity and efforts to achieve it involve competition over both concrete and symbolic resources (in the present case, the status and prestige of university membership). Furthermore, we argue that although numerical representation factors heavily into diversity judgments, hierarchical representation – or the representation of minority group members across an organizational structure – is also an important dimension of diversity. In pursuit of a positive

1  
2  
3 social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), we suggest that minority group members generally want  
4 more members of their ingroup in an organization (numerical representation). However,  
5  
6 minority group members may also desire for these ingroup members to be represented in the  
7  
8 upper levels of the organizations (hierarchical representation) – the reason for this being that  
9  
10 minority group members may strive to achieve higher status for their group as a whole by enhancing the  
11  
12 number of their own group members at higher status positions within organizations. Specifically, the  
13  
14 achievement of both numerical and hierarchical representation may confer concrete benefits like  
15  
16 higher rank, wealth, and social position (Bobo, 1988), and symbolic benefits of higher respect  
17  
18 and perceived value to the organization (for a review see Binning & Huo, 2012).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 A critical difference between Whites and minorities in the United States (e.g., African  
27  
28 Americans, Asians, and Latinos), however, is that Whites already disproportionately hold high  
29  
30 status positions in valued social organizations across the country (e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).  
31  
32 From a group-interest perspective, Whites should be adopting strategies to help maintain their  
33  
34 group status, whereas minority group members should be adopting strategies to help move up in  
35  
36 social status. Recent research illustrates how these strategies might manifest in people's  
37  
38 perceptions of diversity (Unzueta & Binning, 2012). When deciding whether or not an  
39  
40 organization was diverse, Whites did not require that “diverse” organizations be diverse at all levels.  
41  
42 For instance, they deemed an organization equally diverse that concentrated minorities in the  
43  
44 lower ranks as one that concentrated minorities in the higher ranks of the organization. By  
45  
46 perceiving and endorsing diversity whenever it was present, Whites may be less inclined to  
47  
48 support further diversity efforts (i.e., because it has already been achieved; Unzueta, Knowles, &  
49  
50 Ho, 2012). Minorities, by contrast, were closely attuned to hierarchical position, as they only saw  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the organization as diverse when minorities had high numerical representation across the hierarchical  
4  
5 structure.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Such findings are consistent with the idea that when minority group members (e.g.,  
12 African Americans, Asians, and Latinos) are under-represented in high status positions, they are  
13 relatively attuned to, and psychologically affected by, the status afforded their ethnic subgroups  
14 by the broader organization (Huo, Binning, Molina, Danbold, & Yee, 2012; Huo, Molina,  
15 Binning, & Funge, 2010). An important implication is that if minorities have more specific  
16 conceptions of diversity than Whites (Unzueta & Binning, 2012), then there may be more  
17 circumstances in which minorities but not Whites believe that actions directed toward achieving  
18 diversity (however they define it) are necessary (or simply desired).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The present research sought to extend these insights to understand students' perceptions  
32 of, and attitudes toward, diversity at their university. By examining the bases of diversity  
33 judgments within a single, real-world organization, we aim for an in-depth understanding of how  
34 people incorporate hierarchal representation into their diversity judgments. The university in  
35 focus - a large, urban, public university in California - presents a compelling venue in which to  
36 study how hierarchical representation shapes diversity judgments. At the university White and  
37 Asian students have a similar numerical representation, thus allowing us to treat numerical  
38 representation as a constant. In the year the present data were collected, the student body  
39 (undergraduates and graduates) was composed of 36,000 students, and approximately 40% of the  
40 student body was of Asian descent, 36% was White, 15% was Latino, and 3% was African  
41 American.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Although Asians slightly outnumber Whites in the student body, this is far from the case  
4  
5 as one looks up the university hierarchy. Echoing national trends at the time of this study  
6  
7 (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 2007-2008), publically available data indicate that the  
8  
9 university's faculty, administrators, and senior managers are disproportionately White: 76% of  
10  
11 the faculty was White, 14% was Asian, 6% was Hispanic, and 3% was African American.  
12  
13 Eighty-four percent of the senior managers among the career staff was White, as was at least  
14  
15 75% of the University Board of Regents (based on an analysis of their website). The campus  
16  
17 president, chancellor, and executive vice chancellor in the current year were all White. Thus,  
18  
19 although Asians and Whites are roughly equal in terms of numerical representation at the student  
20  
21 level, they are vastly unequal in terms of hierarchical representation.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Following Unzueta and Binning (2012), we expected that because the campus has a high  
29  
30 level of numerical diversity in the student body, Whites may be especially inclined to rely on this  
31  
32 information when evaluating whether the university is diverse. We tested the idea that Whites'  
33  
34 diversity judgments would be informed by where diversity is present (the student body), but they  
35  
36 would essentially ignore where it is absent (the faculty and administration). We expected Asians,  
37  
38 by contrast, to incorporate where diversity is absent into their overall assessment of the  
39  
40 university's level of diversity. For Asians, the lack of hierarchical representation on campus may  
41  
42 not go unnoticed and may factor into their diversity judgments. Asians' perceptions and diversity  
43  
44 preferences should reflect their attention to hierarchical representation, and their diversity policy  
45  
46 preferences may seek to remedy their low hierarchical representation. Below we report the  
47  
48 results of a study testing the hypotheses that 1) Asians but not Whites incorporate hierarchical  
49  
50 representation into their judgments of diversity and 2) their beliefs about when diversity is  
51  
52 needed and not needed should correspondingly differ.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants were 197 students (134 women and 63 men;  $M_{\text{Age}} = 21.34$  years,  $SD = 4.66$ ) recruited from a university-maintained listserv and compensated with a \$5 dollar gift card to an online retailer. The sample was composed of members of the campus community (primarily undergraduates and graduates) who had signed up to participate in a paid research pool. The ethnic composition of the sample closely resembled the ethnic composition of the student body as a whole, as 46% of the sample was Asian/Asian American, 35% was White, 11% was Latino, 4% was African American, and 5% was from other categories. This distribution did not differ significantly from the distribution of the student body as reflected in publically available university data,  $Pearson \chi^2(16) = 2.00, p = .220$ . Twenty-four percent of the sample was not born in the United States. Because only Whites and Asians had samples large enough to analyze reliably, and because these two groups hold a similar amount of numerical status in the student body, we limited our analyses below to students from these two ethnic groups.

### *Procedure*

Participants were introduced to a university-sponsored study of campus impressions and university campus climate. They completed measures assessing the diversity of various campus groups, a measure assessing the diversity of the campus as a whole, and measures assessing whether they thought more diversity was needed among the student body, faculty/administration, and campus as a whole.

### *Predictor Variables*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Ethnic Diversity of the Student Body.* Participants were asked to complete four items to assess the perceived racial and ethnic diversity of the student body, each of which was anchored with 1 (*Strongly disagree*) and 7 (*Strongly agree*). Two of these items assessed the diversity of undergraduates “The undergraduate population at [campus name]...” “Has a high level of racial/ethnic diversity” and “Is not ethnically/racially diverse” (reverse scored). Two parallel items assessed the diversity of “The graduate student population at [campus name]...”

*Ethnic Diversity of the Faculty/Administration.* Analogously to the items that assessed diversity of the student body, participants completed four items that assessed diversity of the faculty/administration (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 7 = *Strongly agree*), “The faculty (e.g., professors) at [campus name]...” “Have a high level of ethnic/racial diversity,” and “Are not ethnically/racially diverse” (reverse scored). Two parallel items assessed the diversity of the administration, “The administration (e.g., deans, chancellors, presidents) at [campus name]...”

All eight of these measures were presented on the page simultaneously, in a random order, to help prevent order effects in the measurement of our main independent variables.

*Factor analysis.* We sought to determine whether participants made meaningful distinctions between the student and faculty/administrative levels. A principal components analysis with oblique rotation on all eight items found that the items separated into two factors with eigenvalues greater than one. One factor contained the four items assessing diversity of the student body (graduate and undergraduate students), and the other factor contained the four items assessing the diversity of the faculty/administration. The four student body items had rotated loadings of .88, .87, .87, and .85 on Factor 1 and explained 57% of the total item variance (eigenvalue = 4.60). The four faculty/administration items had rotated loadings of .91, .89, .74,



1  
2  
3 and .73 on Factor 2 and explained 16% of the total item variance (eigenvalue = 1.28). For all  
4  
5 eight items, in no case did an item load on a second factor with a loading greater than |.15|, thus  
6  
7 revealing a simple two-factor structure. We therefore calculated measures of student and  
8  
9 faculty/administrative diversity as the mean of each set of items (see Table 1 for means, standard  
10  
11 deviations, and Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for all constructs investigated).  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 Finally, we examined the mean differences in these independent variables between  
17  
18 Asians and Whites. We conducted a 2(Asian vs. White) x 2(Faculty diversity vs. Student  
19  
20 diversity) analysis of variance, with repeated measures on diversity perceptions. The analysis  
21  
22 confirmed there was a significant difference in levels of student diversity ( $M = 4.78$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ )  
23  
24 and faculty diversity ( $M = 4.19$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ),  $F(1,161) = 34.36$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = .50$ .  
25  
26 However, there was no main effect of participant ethnicity,  $F < 1.0$ ,  $p = .705$ , nor was there a  
27  
28 two-way interaction,  $F < 1.0$ ,  $p = .500$ . The results suggest that Whites and Asians generally  
29  
30 agreed on the size of the diversity advantage for students over faculty. Our analyses below  
31  
32 examine whether Whites and Asians draw different conclusions from these same representational  
33  
34 data, particularly with regard to their university as a whole and whether (and where) diversity  
35  
36 should be promoted on campus.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 *Outcome Variables*

44  
45  
46 *Perceived Ethnic Diversity of Campus as a Whole.* Participants responded to four items  
47  
48 assessing campus-wide diversity, "In your opinion, how diverse is [campus name] as a whole?"  
49  
50 (1 = *Not diverse at all*; 7 = *Very diverse*), "When it comes down to it, [campus name] is really  
51  
52 not that diverse at all" (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 7 = *Strongly agree*; reverse scored), "Overall,  
53  
54 [campus name] has a high level of ethnic/racial diversity" (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 7 = *Strongly*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 agree), and, “Overall, [campus name] is not ethnically/racially diverse” (1 = *Strongly disagree*;  
4  
5 7 = *Strongly agree*; reverse scored).  
6  
7

8  
9 *Remedial Diversity of Student Body.* Participants responded to two items that measured  
10 whether they thought the student body should be more diverse than it currently is, (1 = *Strongly*  
11 *disagree*; 7 = *Strongly agree*): “At [campus name], efforts should be undertaken to increase the  
12 diversity of the graduate students,” “At [campus name], efforts should be undertaken to increase  
13 the diversity of the undergraduate students.”  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 *Remedial Diversity of Faculty/Administration.* Two items were used to measure whether  
22 more diversity was needed among the faculty and administration (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 7 =  
23 *Strongly agree*): “At [campus name], efforts should be undertaken to increase the diversity of the  
24 administration (e.g., Deans, Presidents, Chancellors),” “At [campus name], efforts should be  
25 undertaken to increase the diversity of the faculty (e.g., professors, instructors).”  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 *Remedial Diversity of Campus as a Whole.* Support for increasing diversity on campus  
35 was assessed with one item (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 7 = *Strongly agree*): “At [campus name],  
36 efforts should be undertaken to increase the diversity of the university as a whole.”  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 *Results*

43  
44  
45 *Perceived Ethnic Diversity on Campus.* We subjected participants’ perceptions of the  
46 current level of campus diversity to a *Ethnicity x Student Diversity x Faculty Diversity* multiple  
47 regression analysis, following the procedures recommended by Aiken and West (1992). This  
48 testing procedure was repeated for each of the four outcome variables reported below, and all  
49 reported analyses were conducted using a two-tailed alpha level of .05. On Step 1, to control for  
50 background differences that might affect the specific diversity judgments under study, we  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 entered demographic controls for male gender (Female = 0, Male = 1) and foreign birth (US born  
4 = 0; Foreign born = 1). On Step 2, we entered main effect terms for participant ethnicity (0 =  
5 Asian, 1 = White), perceived student diversity (centered at its mean), and perceived faculty  
6 diversity (centered at its mean). On Step 3, we entered the three two-way interaction terms  
7 (*Ethnicity x Student Diversity*; *Ethnicity x Faculty Diversity*; *Student Diversity x Faculty*  
8 *Diversity*), and on Step 4, we entered the three-way interaction term (*Ethnicity x Student*  
9 *Diversity x Faculty Diversity*). In this and all subsequent analyses, the three-way interaction term  
10 did not reach significance and thus we focus our attention on Step 3. The unstandardized  
11 coefficients, standard errors, and standardized coefficients from Step 3 are presented in Table 2.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 The analysis on diversity perceptions revealed a significant main effect of gender, such  
26 that women reported significantly more campus diversity than did men ( $B = -.30$ ,  $SE = .13$ ,  $\beta = -$   
27  $.14$ ,  $p = .02$ ). There were also significant main effects for perceived student diversity and  
28 perceived faculty diversity. However, consistent with the hypothesis that Whites and Asians use  
29 different criteria to judge diversity, these main effects were each qualified by participant race  
30 (see Figure 1). Simple slopes analyses of the *Ethnicity x Student Diversity* interaction ( $B = .37$ ,  
31  $SE = .11$ ,  $\beta = .28$ ,  $p < .001$ ) revealed that Whites relied heavily on diversity at the student level to  
32 judge diversity of the campus as a whole, as the relationship between student and campus  
33 diversity was significantly stronger among Whites ( $B = .63$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $\beta = .74$ ,  $p < .001$ ) than it  
34 was among Asians ( $B = .27$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $\beta = .31$ ,  $p < .001$ ).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Simple slopes analyses of the *Ethnicity x Faculty Diversity* interaction ( $B = -.25$ ,  $SE =$   
51  $.11$ ,  $\beta = -.19$ ,  $p = .03$ ) revealed that only Asians used the diversity at the faculty/administrative  
52 level as a basis for their judgments of campus diversity ( $B = .36$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $\beta = .40$ ,  $p < .001$ ).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Whites' judgments of campus diversity were unrelated to diversity at the faculty/administrative level ( $B = .11$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $\beta = .12$ ,  $ns$ ).

In sum, although both Asians and Whites relied on student diversity to form their judgments of the university's diversity, this tendency was significantly stronger among Whites. Moreover, Asians but not Whites incorporated the diversity at the faculty level to inform their judgments of campus diversity. These findings are consistent with the idea that Whites' assessments of diversity relied on where diversity is present (the student level) whereas Asians also incorporated where diversity was absent (the faculty and administration level).

*Remedial Diversity of Student Body.* We next sought to understand the implications of participants' diversity perceptions for their attitudes toward increasing diversity on campus. Following the same testing procedure as above, we subjected participants' preferences for increased diversity of the student body to a *Ethnicity x Student Diversity x Faculty Diversity* regression analysis. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 2. A main effect of participant ethnicity was revealed, indicating that Whites were more opposed to increased diversity of the student-body than were Asians ( $B = -.67$ ,  $SE = .19$ ,  $\beta = -.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No other main effects were significant, however, there was a significant *Ethnicity x Student Diversity* interaction ( $B = -.52$ ,  $SE = .17$ ,  $\beta = -.32$ ,  $p = .003$ ). Simple slopes analyses revealed that among Whites, opposition to increased student diversity was particularly strong when student diversity was already deemed high ( $B = -.61$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $\beta = -.57$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Among Asians, by contrast, support for enhanced student diversity was unrelated to the current level of perceived student diversity ( $B = -.09$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $\beta = -.08$ ,  $ns$ ). We return to the interpretation of this finding below.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

*Remedial Diversity of Faculty/Administration.* Following the procedure above, we also tested how perceived diversity of the student body and faculty shaped preferences for increased diversity at the faculty/administrative level. The analysis yielded two significant main effects. There was a main effect for ethnicity ( $B = -.69$ ,  $SE = .18$ ,  $\beta = -.28$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that Whites were significantly more opposed to increasing faculty diversity than were Asians. There was also a main effect for perceived faculty diversity, indicating that as perceived faculty diversity increased, support for more faculty diversity decreased ( $B = -.44$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $\beta = -.41$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This main effect was not moderated by participant ethnicity, indicating that Whites and Asians used faculty diversity to roughly the same degree to determine whether more faculty diversity was needed. There was, however, a significant *Ethnicity x Student Diversity* interaction ( $B = -.32$ ,  $SE = .16$ ,  $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p = .05$ ; see Figure 2). Simple slopes analyses revealed that for Whites there was no connection between student diversity and the need for more diversity at the faculty level ( $B = -.12$ ,  $SE = .11$ ,  $-.11$ , *ns*). For Asians, however, perceived student diversity was positively associated with support for faculty diversity, and this relationship approached significance ( $B = .20$ ,  $SE = .11$ ,  $\beta = .20$ ,  $p = .07$ ). This indicates that the more diversity Asians perceived at the student level, the more they endorsed increased diversity at the faculty level.

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Remedial Diversity of Campus as a Whole.* Finally, regression analyses examined participants' support for increased campus-wide diversity. The results largely replicated the results for remedial student diversity. Once again, there was a significant main effect of ethnicity, such that Whites were generally more opposed to increased campus diversity than were Asians ( $B = -.70$ ,  $SE = .20$ ,  $\beta = -.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ). There was also a significant main effect for perceived faculty diversity, such that the more faculty diversity was perceived, the lower the need for campus diversity ( $B = -.34$ ,  $SE = .14$ ,  $\beta = -.29$ ,  $p = .05$ ). However, the ethnicity main

1  
2  
3 effect was qualified by a significant *Ethnicity x Student Diversity* interaction ( $B = -.67$ ,  $SE = .18$ ,  
4  
5  $\beta = -.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ; see Figure 3). Simple slopes analyses revealed that among Whites, higher  
6  
7 perceived student diversity was associated with opposition to increased campus diversity ( $B = -$   
8  
9  $.62$ ,  $SE = .13$ ,  $\beta = .54$ ,  $p = .001$ ). Among Asians, by contrast, current levels of student diversity  
10  
11 were unrelated to preferences for increased campus diversity ( $B = .05$ ,  $SE = .13$ ,  $\beta = .05$ , *ns*).  
12  
13 Thus it appeared that Whites were generally more opposed to diversification of the campus,  
14  
15 particularly when the student body was already deemed diverse.  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 General Discussion

22  
23 Although ethnic diversity in higher education continues to attract considerable attention  
24  
25 in policy debates and academic research, very little is currently understood about how people  
26  
27 actually go about determining whether a university, or any other organization, has attained  
28  
29 diversity. In the present research we investigated people's perceptions of ethnic diversity at their  
30  
31 university, which most outsiders regard as diverse but whose diversity is unequally distributed  
32  
33 across the organizational hierarchy. Although Whites and Asians are close in numbers on  
34  
35 campus, Whites have a far greater representation among the upper ranks, the faculty and  
36  
37 administration. Our results suggest that when Asians and Whites look at the diversity of their  
38  
39 university, they understand this student-faculty discrepancy in different ways and, as a result,  
40  
41 draw different conclusions about what makes a university diverse.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Whites' diversity judgments were closely dependent on the perceived diversity of the  
50  
51 student body. As seen in Unzueta and Binning (2012), Whites seemed to believe that to be  
52  
53 considered "diverse" organizations need not be racially/ethnically diverse across their entire  
54  
55 hierarchy. To this end, Whites did not incorporate faculty diversity into their judgments of the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 university, and when it came to supporting ethnic diversity, they withheld support if they judged  
4  
5 the student body as already diverse. Asians, by contrast, gave significant weight to diversity at  
6  
7 the faculty/administrative level. They were more supportive of diversity overall, and, rather than  
8  
9 using student diversity as a reason to oppose diversity, they seemed to regard it as reason for  
10  
11 supporting *more* diversity at the faculty/administrative level. As such, Asians attended to where  
12  
13 diversity was absent and where it was present, and its presence in the student body was  
14  
15 associated with support for more diversity at the faculty level. Taken together, these findings  
16  
17 support the hypothesis that, despite the fact that Asians and Whites had roughly equivalent  
18  
19 numbers on campus, they each perceived and promoted diversity in ways that may serve to  
20  
21 protect and enhance the status of their respective ingroups (e.g., their positive social identity and  
22  
23 material standing in the organization).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 *Exploring Alternatives*

31  
32  
33 Although the findings are consistent with the idea that diversity attitudes are shaped by  
34  
35 symbolic and material group interest, alternative explanations should be explored. One  
36  
37 possibility is that because Whites and Asians have different cultural backgrounds and social  
38  
39 orientations, they attended to different features of their social context (e.g., Nisbett, Peng, Choi,  
40  
41 & Norenzayan, 2001). For instance, Whites' perceptual field may have been dominated by the  
42  
43 exceptionally high level of student diversity, whereas Asians' perceptual field may have been  
44  
45 more holistic and focused on the broader university community. While not ruling out this  
46  
47 possibility, previous research suggests the important role of group interest on diversity  
48  
49 perceptions, regardless of one's cultural background. In research that examined conditions under  
50  
51 which organizations are deemed diverse, Whites who identified weakly with their racial ingroup  
52  
53 and African Americans who identified strongly with their racial ingroup both tended to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 incorporate hierarchical representation into their judgments of diversity (whereas their low  
4 identification counterparts did not; Unzueta & Binning, 2012). Thus, attention to hierarchical  
5 representation is not limited to those with an Asian cultural background and, instead, seems to be  
6 partly driven by identification with one's racial group.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13 Another alternative explanation gets at a hidden assumption of the present research.  
14 Namely, it is possible that group interest is not so important and the critical variable is, instead,  
15 where in the organization one's subgroup is a numerical minority. Whites were a minority  
16 among the student body but a majority among the faculty and administration. Asians, as a  
17 member of a coalition of traditional "minority" groups (see Unzueta & Binning, 2010), can be  
18 construed as a majority in the student body, but they are clear minorities among the  
19 faculty/administration. An alternative explanation is that people's diversity judgments rely on  
20 areas where they happen to be minorities, so Whites use the student body and Asians use the  
21 faculty administration.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Although this explanation does not contradict the present findings, we stress that it is  
36 necessary to consider the present results with regard to the status and power differences that exist  
37 in the social context. Asians were a minority in high status positions, whereas Whites were a  
38 minority in low status positions. We found that Asians were more supportive of all efforts to  
39 increase campus diversity, and this was true regardless of how diverse they perceived the student  
40 body to be. This pattern fits with our previous research showing that "diversity" is not applied  
41 equally across groups: all participants, Whites included, understood diversity to be relevant to  
42 African Americans, Latinos, and Asians, but not to Whites (Unzueta & Binning, 2010). Thus  
43 even if participants are attuned to areas where they are minorities, the implications of this  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 attention play out with respect to what diversity means and whether achieving it is a good or bad  
4  
5 thing for the status of the ingroup.  
6  
7

8 Finally, the survey methodology we employed should be considered. In the study, all  
9  
10 participants were first asked about the diversity in segments of their university, they were then  
11  
12 asked about the diversity of the campus as a whole, and at the end of the study, they were asked  
13  
14 what they would like to see done about the levels of diversity on campus. Viewing the survey as  
15  
16 a conversation (Schwarz, 1996), it can be assumed that as the survey (conversation) progressed,  
17  
18 participants answered new questions with knowledge that their previous answers were “given” in  
19  
20 the conversational context (Clark & Schober, 1992). The important implication is that if the  
21  
22 survey had been given in another order – say, for example, in the exact opposite order – then  
23  
24 participants may have answered differently because different information would be “given”  
25  
26 when new questions were asked. Nevertheless, this critique would still point to the conclusion –  
27  
28 supported by the moderating role of ethnicity reported above – that Whites and Asians  
29  
30 understood the diversity conversation differently. They attended to and emphasized different  
31  
32 aspects of the university when judging the whole, and they proceeded to come to different  
33  
34 conclusions about when and where diversity was needed. Experimental studies that orthogonally  
35  
36 manipulate dimensions of diversity (e.g., Unzueta & Binning, 2012; Unzueta et al., 2012), while  
37  
38 offering precise scientific control of the conversation, may lack the richness of investigating how  
39  
40 people think, and converse, about meaningful organizations to which they belong.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 *Conclusion*

49  
50  
51 Although many universities officially have a favorable disposition toward diversity and  
52  
53 continue to strive for it, all people may not share the same understanding about what constitutes  
54  
55 a diverse university. As student bodies and workforces continue to become more ethnically  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 diverse, it is important to recognize that an increase in simple numerical diversity does not carry  
4  
5 the same implications for all the ethnic groups involved. Failing to recognize that different  
6  
7 groups use different criteria for judging diversity can lead to disagreement and disharmony  
8  
9 instead of the unity and understanding that diversity initiatives may seek to achieve.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Aiken, L. S., and West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*.  
7  
8 Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.  
9  
10 Binning, K. R., & Huo, Y. J. (in press). Understanding status as a social resource. To appear in  
11  
12 K. Y. Törnblom and A. Kazemi (Eds.), *Handbook of social resource theory*. New York:  
13  
14 Springer.  
15  
16  
17 Bobo, L. (1998). Race, interests, and beliefs about affirmative action. *American Behavioral*  
18  
19 *Scientist, 41*, 985-1003.  
20  
21  
22 Gottfredson, N. C., Panter, A. T., Daye, C. E., Allen, W. A., Wightman, L. F., & Deo, M. A.  
23  
24 (2008). Does diversity at undergraduate institutions influence student outcomes? *Journal of*  
25  
26 *Diversity in Higher Education, 1*, 80-94.  
27  
28  
29 Hagedorn, L. S., Chi, W., Cepeda, R. M., & McLain, M. (2007). An investigation of critical  
30  
31 mass: The role of Latino representation in the success of urban community college  
32  
33 students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*, 73-91.  
34  
35  
36 Huo, Y. J., Binning, K. R., & Molina, L. E. (2010). Testing an integrative model of respect:  
37  
38 Implications for social engagement and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology*  
39  
40 *Bulletin, 36*, 200-212.  
41  
42  
43 Huo, Y. J., Binning, K. R., Molina, L. E., Danbold, F., & Yee, C. (2012). Do you value me or  
44  
45 mine? Contextual moderators of personal and subgroup respect. *Unpublished manuscript*.  
46  
47  
48 Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Binning, K. R., & Funge, S. (2010). Subgroup respect, social  
49  
50 engagement, and well-being: A field study of an ethnically diverse high school. *Cultural*  
51  
52 *Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*, 427-436.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought:  
4  
5 Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review*, *108*, 291-310.  
6  
7  
8 Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among institutional diversity, informal peer  
9  
10 interactions, and perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*,  
11  
12 *29*, 425-450.  
13  
14  
15 Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social  
16  
17 identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in  
18  
19 mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 615-630.  
20  
21  
22 Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?"  
23  
24 Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality*  
25  
26 *and Social Psychology*, *101*, 337-353.  
27  
28  
29 Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2008). *The diversity challenge: Social*  
30  
31 *identity and intergroup relations on the college campus*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Russell  
32  
33 Sage.  
34  
35  
36 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin  
37  
38 & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47).  
39  
40 Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.  
41  
42  
43 Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20  
44  
45 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*, 139-168.  
46  
47  
48 Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2010). Which racial groups are associated with diversity?  
49  
50 *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*, 443-446.  
51  
52  
53 Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2012). Diversity is in the eye of the beholder: How concern  
54  
55 for the ingroup affects perceptions of organizational diversity. *Personality and Social*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 26-38.

Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Ho, G. C. (in press). Diversity is what you want it to be: How social dominance motives affect diversity construals. *Psychological Science*.

Table 1. Correlations, means, standard deviations, and alpha reliabilities for the constructs under study.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Student diversity	--					
2. Faculty diversity	.41***	--				
3. Campus diversity	.64***	.46***	--			
4. Remedial student div.	-.35***	-.15°	-.55***	--		
5. Remedial faculty div.	-.11	-.37***	-.39***	.60***	--	
6. Remedial campus div.	-.30***	-.22***	-.57***	.78***	.60***	--
<i>M</i>	4.78	4.19	4.10	4.29	4.58	4.73
<i>SD</i>	1.21	1.16	1.05	1.29	1.23	1.40
$\alpha$	.87	.80	.90	.84	.77	--

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ , ° $p < .10$

Table 2. Unstandardized regression coefficients, standard errors (in parentheses), and standardized regression coefficients from Step 3 of multiple regression analyses on each outcome variable.

	Perceived Campus Diversity			Remedial Student Diversity			Remedial Faculty Diversity			Remedial Campus Diversity		
	Std.		Beta	Std.		Beta	Std.		Beta	Std.		Beta
	B	Error		B	Error		B	Error		B	Error	
(Constant)	4.50	(.29)		5.06	(.46)		4.55	(.43)		5.12	(.50)	
Female (0) vs. Male (1)	-.30	(.13)	-.14*	-.03	(.20)	-.01	.11	(.18)	.04	.09	(.21)	.03
US born (0) vs. Foreign born (1)	.06	(.15)	.03	-.36	(.23)	-.12	.09	(.22)	.03	-.19	(.25)	-.06
Asian (0) vs. White (1)	.08	(.12)	.04	-.67	(.19)	-.26***	-.69	(.18)	-.28***	-.70	(.20)	-.25***
Perceived student diversity	.27	(.08)	.31***	-.09	(.12)	-.08	.20	(.11)	.20°	.05	(.13)	.05
Perceived faculty diversity	.36	(.08)	.40***	-.16	(.13)	-.15	-.44	(.12)	-.41***	-.34	(.14)	-.29*
Ethnicity x Student diversity	.37	(.11)	.28***	-.52	(.17)	-.32**	-.32	(.16)	-.21*	-.67	(.18)	-.39***
Ethnicity x Faculty diversity	-.25	(.11)	-.19*	.23	(.18)	.14	-.03	(.17)	-.02	.30	(.19)	.17
Student diversity x Faculty diversity	-.01	(.04)	-.02	.00	(.06)	.00	.06	(.06)	.08	-.01	(.06)	-.01

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ , ° $p < .10$

## Diversity on Campus 22

Figure 1. Perceptions of campus diversity as functions of participant ethnicity and perceived student diversity (top) and of participant ethnicity and perceived faculty diversity (bottom).

Figures are plotted at  $\pm 1$  SD of perceived student and faculty diversity means.






Figure 2. Support for increased faculty diversity as a function of participant ethnicity and perceived student diversity. Figures are plotted at +/-1 SD of perceived student diversity mean.



Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Diversity on Campus 24

Figure 3. Support for increased campus diversity as a function of participant ethnicity and perceived student diversity. Figures are plotted at  $\pm 1$  SD of perceived student diversity mean.

