Understanding the Subjective Perceptions of Higher Education Diversity Practitioners on Effective Leadership Practices for Transformational Campus Diversity Culture Change

Bobbie R. Porter
UNDERSTANDING THE SUBJECTIVE PERCEPTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION DIVERSITY PRACTITIONERS ON EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES FOR TRANSFORMATIONAL CAMPUS DIVERSITY CULTURE CHANGE

by

Bobbie R. Porter

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Higher Education and Adult Education

The University of Memphis

May 2021
Dedication

For Mama. You paved the way and made me believe I could do anything.
Acknowledgments

I remember the day that I graduated with my Master’s degree. It was an incredible day where I felt a strong sense of accomplishment for completing a graduate program and receiving an advanced degree. However, that feeling is not what I remember most about that day. As the commencement crowd was dying down and the attendees were filing out to take pictures with their graduates, I noticed a group of adult children calling out their mother, who has just been conferred with her doctorate yelling loudly across the gymnasium, “Mama!” It was strange, but that was the moment that I knew I was going back to school for a doctoral degree. Not because I wanted someone to yell out for me, but because I could see myself in that woman. That woman remains anonymous to me, but she is the first that I want to acknowledge in my doctoral journey. That woman’s belief in herself and what she could accomplish inspired me to begin this journey, which has brought me to yet another milestone in my life. I also acknowledge that I could not have gotten here without the grace of God, who provided me with supernatural time management and focus along the way. I must also acknowledge that I could not have done this with the support of my life partner, Tony. Thank you for always encouraging my ambitions and believing in me even when I doubt myself. I want to acknowledge the support of my extended family and friends. Many of you did not know exactly what I was going through, but you claimed this for me, even when I had my doubts. Thank you for keeping me lifted. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my sons – Trey, Malcolm, and Mason – for being patient while I went on this journey. Know that every accomplishment that I make, I do it to be an example to you.
Abstract

Successfully leading transformative diversity culture change is one of the most significant challenges facing modern higher education. This study sought out campus diversity officers’ perceptions, shaped by their lived experiences as diversity practitioners, to identify and deeply understand diversity leadership practices that they perceived to be most effective in transforming diversity culture on higher education campuses. A Q-methodology was used to investigate the subjective perceptions of campus diversity officers with membership in the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education and who represented numerous institution types, including four-year public, four-year private, and community colleges. Using both quantitative and qualitative data, the Q-methodology research design provided for capturing these campus diversity officers’ beliefs and viewpoints regarding effective diversity leadership practices. Data analysis indicated three statistically significant factors that were named in the study: (1) All Hail the Chief Diversity Officer, (2) Change Takes All of Us, and (3) Minding the Politics of Diversity. In addition to the statistical analysis, post-sort interviews were conducted for each emergent factor, thus providing further insight into the diversity officers’ perceptions of effective diversity leadership practice and diversity culture change. The findings indicated that, while campus diversity officers perceived that there were three approaches to leadership for diversity culture change, leadership practices are dynamic and should be considered situationally to ensure their effectiveness. Further, the study’s findings revealed that allocating adequate institutional resources for change efforts was among the most effective practices. The findings from this study revealed recommendations for practice for higher education leaders seeking to advance diversity culture change on their campus and recommendations for continued study in this area.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The rapid pace of American social change has left higher education institutions scrambling in an increasingly complex educational terrain where the academic, belonging, and inclusion needs of the campus communities they serve are far more dynamic than they were in the culturally homogenous infancy of American higher education. The factors contributing to these social changes, including the diversifying American demography, the solidification of a globalized economy, and shifts in the political climate giving rise to a resurgence in activism, require a reframing of the fundamental concepts of institutional effectiveness and academic excellence (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013). However, achieving change has been elusive for campuses. Despite decades of efforts, institutions of higher education continue to struggle with integrating the concepts of diversity, equity, and inclusion into the core of their operations, keeping transformative diversity culture change, seemingly, perpetually elusive.

Although change has yet to be achieved, continued evolution in the nation’s social makeup is inevitable (Chun & Feagin, 2019). As the most multicultural and technologically savvy generation in American history, Generation Z, floods onto the grounds of higher education institutions at the anticipated highest rate of enrollment in decades (Williams, 2018), there is an urgency for transformative organizational culture change that supports the success of a pluralistic and multicultural student base.

At the center of stagnant diversity change efforts are higher education leaders who, as higher education research has found, are the catalyst for institutional change (Chun & Evans, 2018). This failure for higher education institutions to keep pace with society’s cultural diversification and change can prove to be disastrous for the future of America’s vitality. The transforming demography, the globalized and technologically accelerated economy, and the
increasingly turbulent political culture all drive the urgency of diversity, equity, and inclusion as one of the most influential issues facing higher education today (Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005). With so much time that has passed with diversity’s promise being unrealized for so many institutions, higher education practitioners must begin to understand the specific actions, behaviors, and strategies that leaders should employ to advance diversity on campuses.

**Background of the Study**

Simplicio (2012) provides an explanation for higher education’s difficulties in achieving sustainable organizational culture transformation, in that institutional culture directly ties to its history, and for institutions founded during a period of American history marred by egregious exclusion, breaking away from deep-rooted traditions of marginalization and inequity has proven to be an ongoing challenge.

In light of these impediments to change and the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education, scholars have been studying methods for leaders to employ to meet the need of the transforming higher education landscape. Studies have identified that, of the few institutions that have made progress in shifting their culture for diversity, the key to their success lies in the leader’s capacity (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Hurtado, et al., 1998). Bass and Avolio (1993) explain that leadership and organizational culture have a reciprocal relationship in that leaders are orchestrators of organizational change and culture, and culture drives leaders’ strategies. However, leadership alone cannot facilitate change. Sustainable organizational change also requires resources, commitment, long-term planning, and collaboration (Hurtado et al., 1998). Given this co-dependency between culture and leadership, the question then becomes what methods higher education leaders can use to facilitate change at their institutions in the midst of the ever-evolving society.
Problem Statement

As the scholarship on diversity culture change attempts to keep up with social demands, the role of campus-based diversity, equity, and inclusion experts known as diversity officers, provides an opportunity to expand our understanding of this topic. Of the few studies on diversity leadership and change in higher education, most have queried campus presidents as the primary informants on effective diversity leadership (Kezar, 2007; Kezar, 2008; Cole & Harper, 2017). As will be detailed in chapter 2, from these studies emerge models, best practices, and ongoing challenges to change. However, of the relatively limited scholarship on diversity leadership in practice, there are far fewer studies that have queried campus diversity officers to provide insight into effective diversity leadership for transformative diversity culture change.

Campus diversity officers, commonly referred to as Chief Diversity Officers, are a relatively new role in higher education that has emerged over the last fifteen years (Harvey, 2014). The authority and scope of these positions vary significantly from campus to campus, but there is the commonality across positions of the professionalization of diversity, equity, and inclusion practices carried out by individuals in these roles (Worthington, Stanley, & Lewis, 2014). While diversity officers have increasingly appeared in campus organizational charts in recent years, much of what we understand about leadership practices that change the organizational culture for diversity, equity, and inclusion has been learned from campus leadership other than diversity officers. Given the relative newness of the profession and variation of the scope of the position from campus to campus, it remains to be known whether these positions have any impact on diversification efforts on campuses, and recent studies have even challenged the value of these positions, finding that the role has no positive impact on campus diversity (Bradley, Law, & West, 2018). However, given the position’s focus on
diversity, equity, and inclusion matters and its growing popularity and tenure in higher education, diversity officers are ripe with information on diversity leadership, which is a major contribution to the study of higher education.

Higher education must shift its organizational culture for diversity so that institutions thrive in the changing multicultural and globalizing society. To adequately respond to this problem, the research and practice on leadership practices for higher education institutional culture change must expand. Diversity officers potentially hold valuable information to address the long-standing issue of diversity culture transformation in higher education.

**Purpose Statement**

This exploratory study used a semi-quantitative research design employing Q-methodology to identify and understand diversity officer perceptions of effective diversity leadership practices for substantive and sustainable organizational culture change. Q-methodology allows researchers to analyze individuals’ subjective perceptions that can illuminate overall points of view on a particular topic (Brown, 2004). There are two theories that provide the framework for this study: Schein’s cultural theory of organizational change (1985) and Transformational Leadership as developed by Burns (1978). These theories supply a means to understand how change processes occur in organizations and the characteristics of leadership involved in diversity culture change. As applied to this study, the theory of organizational culture change explains that culture is created, embedded, and evolves, which makes it malleable and subject to influence by leaders (Schein, 2010). Transformational Leadership provides a conceptual definition of leadership effectiveness. As Burns (1978) explains, leader effectiveness is based on the leader’s ability to guide change processes as a collective process for the betterment of society.
Campus diversity officer respondents in this study were tasked with ranking a list of diversity leadership practices on a range of ‘most effective’ to ‘least effective’ based on their lived experiences as diversity practitioners on college campuses. The study proved the researcher’s expectation that diversity officer perceptions of effective diversity leadership change practices and behavior differed from those of campus presidents. This is of particular importance because presidents have informed the preponderance of diversity change literature to date. A purposeful sampling method was utilized to recruit study participants according to categorization of their institutions as a predominantly white or minority-serving institution, and institution type (public, private, or community college). Utilizing a web-based Q-methodology platform to build the study instrument and collect data, the study was conducted electronically with careful attention to avoid busy higher education times such as graduation and the start of a semester.

**Research Questions**

1. What do higher education leaders and researchers consider as the most important leadership practices for advancing campus diversity culture?
2. What leadership practices do campus diversity officers perceive to be the most effective for advancing campus diversity culture?
3. Why do these campus diversity officers in this study identify the practices uncovered in the previous research question as most effective?

**Significance of the Study**

Few studies on higher education change exist, and even fewer can be found that examine institutional diversity culture change (Stanley et al., 2019). This study adds to the body of diversity leadership, higher education culture change, and diversity officer research at the point that these three bodies intersect – effective diversity leadership for institutional culture change.
Specifically, it expands on the limited research regarding campus practices for diversity leadership and culture change by querying diversity officers on the effectiveness of previously identified diversity leadership frameworks. “Indeed, all higher education leaders should embody and demonstrate the critical values of equity, diversity, and inclusion, and should enable entire campus communities to access and articulate the contributions of and the rewards gained from an inclusive learning and working environment” (Worthington, Stanley, & Lewis, 2014, p. 228).

With that framing, this study will argue that as subject matter experts, diversity officers are better situated to assess the accuracy of models that have been informed by campus presidents and other senior leaders, despite the expectation that all higher education leaders should understand how to shift campus diversity culture.

An ancillary purpose of this study is to add to the body of research on the effectiveness of diversity officers in higher education. The formal position of campus diversity officers has been around for approximately fifteen years, and the work’s professionalization continues to be established (Leon, 2014). Much of the research about campus diversity officers focuses on their campus portfolio, institutional positionality and authority, lack of resources for their expansive and diverse roles, and challenges of filling a chief diversity officer position (Worthington, Stanley, & Lewis, 2014). This study will shift away from the mechanics of the position itself, and instead, will examine the intrinsic expertise of those in the role to contribute to our understanding of effective diversity leadership and culture change.

A recent study on the impact of diversity officers questioned if the presence of these positions has improved diversification efforts on campuses. The study found that these positions had no significant impact on faculty diversity, among other indicators of change (Bradley et al., 2018). However, the study failed to appropriately define the indicators of impact within the
scope of the separate concepts of equity and inclusion, thus providing an incomplete depiction of the work of these positions. Since diversity matters are the daily focus of campus diversity officers, as a group, this study posited that they would offer another perception of effective leadership change strategies that would add to our understanding of diversity leadership practice.

Further, campus presidents are the most queried leader group to inform diversity leadership and culture change research (Adserias, Charleston, & Jackson, 2017); however, a recent study identified that this leader group has a blind spot related to this topic (Jaschik & Lederman, 2018). This study found that campus diversity officers have a refined perception of effective diversity culture change leadership practices than those of other campus leadership. Thus, this study provides another perception on the effectiveness of these positions beyond one-dimensional demographic representation and into a more complex inquiry and analysis based on their expertise of leadership practices for sustainable diversity change.

**Theoretical Framework**

Bess & Dee (2008) explain that organizational theory is useful to higher education practitioners for identifying patterns, engaging in reflection, thinking systemically, analyzing problems, and taking action effectively. With its subsets on culture, change, and learning, organizational theory has particular applicability in examining the leadership imperative for diversity, equity, and inclusion. Boyce (2003) suggested that for institutions to achieve sustainable culture change, leadership is the essential and deciding factor. While leadership strategies alone cannot guarantee diversity culture change for institutions of higher education, understanding the leadership practices which appear to be a necessary part of achieving transformative diversity culture change enriches our understanding of what institutions can enact in practice.
For this study, Schein’s (1985) organizational culture change and Burn’s (1978) transformational leadership theories provide the foundation for interpreting effective diversity leadership for organizational change. Figure 1 illustrates this theoretical frame.

![Theoretical Framework](image)

**Figure 1**
Theoretical Framework

**Limitations**

A limitation of this study is the per-campus variance in the work scope of the campus diversity officer position. The position is defined broadly without consistency in working titles and portfolio. Given this condition, members of the sample population may or may not be senior-level leaders on their campus, and they may not be in proximity to senior campus leadership. It certainly creates uncertainty in the equivalence of the experience of survey respondents. An example of this is a case where the campus diversity officer whose role is housed in a student affairs unit and who, subsequently, may have only limited knowledge of the effectiveness of leadership for faculty diversity efforts.

**Delimitations**

The study is delimited to the following:
1. Only diversity officers who are members of the National Association of Diversity Officers in higher education were included in the study.

2. The individuals in the pilot group for the study were required to have at least ten years of experience to increase the likelihood of multi-campus experience and exposure to leadership practices that contributed to or detracted from culture change.

**Definition of Terms**

**Diversity** – The discourse of individual differences (e.g., personality, prior knowledge, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability) and the complex ways these differences are understood and addressed within the context of institutional systems and the broader society. (adapted from Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d. and Chun & Evans, 2018).

**Campus Diversity Culture** – A culture of inclusion for members of all non-dominant groups, meaning groups who have held less societal power within institutional settings based on demographic characteristics that include race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, and disability status (adapted from Chun & Evans, 2018).

**Inclusion** – “The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions” (Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d., para 6).

**Equity** - Born from the perspective that injustice is an endemic condition that institutions reproduce systematically through routines and practices that are believed to be neutral, equity is the creation of opportunities for historically underserved populations to have equal access to and
participate in the benefits of an institution. (adapted from Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d. and Bensimon, 2018).

**Campus Diversity Officer** – a boundary-spanning administrative role responsible for developing and implementing strategies across a wide range of social identities within the groups of students, faculty and staff, which impact core areas such as recruitment, retention, campus climate, and curriculum and instruction (adapted from Williams and Wade-Golden, 2013 and Worthington, Stanley, & Lewis, 2014).

**Diversity Leadership** – an organizational tool for responding and adapting to changes in the environment from which institutions of higher education recruit members and participants. It has the potential to alter organizational culture by promoting leadership roles and practices from the perspective of diversity (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006, p. 41).

**Research Design**

This study employed a semi-quantitative research design using a Q-methodology to identify diversity officer perceptions of effective diversity leadership practices that result in transformative organizational culture change. Q-methodology was an appropriate means to capture these data because the methodology offers a clear and structured method for analyzing individual viewpoints on an issue (Zabala, Sandbrook, & Mukherjee, 2018). Campus diversity officers are in close proximity to the work of transforming campus diversity culture, and therefore serve as key informers of the effectiveness of this practice. Data were collected by distributing a Q-sorting instrument to the membership of a professional association for campus diversity officers. Using a purposeful sampling procedure, the study sought the methodologically suggested 30 – 50 participants for a Q-study (Brown, 2005). The responses were collected and analyzed using Q-method statistical software.
Study Overview

The following chapter presents a review of the literature on diversity culture change in higher education, specifically as it relates to the role of the leader in diversity culture change. To supplement that content, the review also presents the current status of research on higher education diversity challenges and its connection to the emergence of the campus diversity officer. Directly following in chapter three is a detailed description of the research design for this study, including an overview of the history and application of Q-methodology. Lastly are chapters four and five, which provide the study findings and implications for higher education research and practice.
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the primary goal of this study is to identify leadership practices that contribute to diversity culture change as perceived by campus diversity officers, this literature review will examine the connection between leadership, organizational culture, and organizational change, as well as provide a comprehensive inventory of diversity leadership strategies identified from the perceptions of other campus leaders outside of diversity officers and educational researchers. To achieve this goal, the following review will examine the literature on diversity in higher education and organizational culture change for diversity. It will also provide a conceptual definition of diversity culture change and discuss its imperative for institutions. This literature review will also provide a foundation for the study’s use of the theories of transformational leadership, diversity leadership, and their relationship to organizational culture change. Lastly, to provide a justification for their role in the research project, this review will explore the history of campus diversity officers and their suitability as respondents in a study on diversity leadership and culture change.

Diversity in Higher Education

What is Diversity?

Within the context of higher education, Owen (2009) provides two conceptual definitions for diversity that are useful to understanding its meaning: 1) diversity of difference in which valuing diversity equates to valuing difference; and 2) diversity of equity which builds on the former to include a concern for social justice where there is a recognition that “…some differences have a very real and material effect on one’s life chances, while other differences have little or no social meaning and material consequence” (p.187). Chun and Evans (2018) add to this conceptual definition by specifying that the differences which have the greatest effect are
those between social identity groups that historically have had less access to power in institutions based on their race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability status, and the intersections of these characteristics.

Even with a working understanding of the concept of diversity, overuse of the term, along with related words such as multiculturalism and minority, softens the language necessary to describe powerful issues related to social inequality. Further, overuse of the term steers institutions away from more descriptive terms such as racism, xenophobia, and sexism. As such, diversity practitioners and scholars are beginning to adopt the more exacting terminology of minoritized and non-dominant groups to describe groups who have historically had their access to power limited. As an example, Harper (2012) explains his rationale for using the term minoritized:

I use ‘minoritized’ instead of ‘minority’ throughout this article to signify the social construction of underrepresentation and subordination in U.S. social institutions, including colleges and universities. Persons are not born into a minority status nor are they minoritized in every social context (e.g., their families, racially homogeneous friendship groups, or places of worship). Instead, they are rendered minorities in particular situations and institutional environments that sustain an overrepresentation of Whiteness. (p. 11)

Expanding beyond diversity as racial difference, Chun and Evans (2018) provide alternate language to describe the effects of institutionalized marginalization and exclusion. The authors use the terms of dominant and non-dominant cultures. Dominant culture describes groups that dictate the value system that informs our significant systems such as government and education. Non-dominant culture describes groups that represent a lack of access or knowledge
of the norms of the dominant culture. These scholars’ exacting language and definitions provide examples of how the meaning of diversity is more sophisticated than it is commonly used. In higher education, it is important to both pan out and in when describing diversity so that the term does not become non-performative (Ahmed, 2012).

Further complicating what is meant by the term and how we are using it are the commonly conflated terms – equity and inclusion. Although related, each term has its own meaning and are not interchangeable. Equity can be understood as the creation of opportunities for historically underserved populations to have equal access to and participate in the benefits of an institution (Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d.; Bensimon, 2018). As it applies specifically to higher education, inclusion can be defined as tangible actions and practices “in which individuals are empowered to participate…in decision making, having a voice, and distributive justice or access to resources on an equitable basis” (Chun & Evans, 2018, p. 50-51).

To capture the concepts of diversity, equity, and inclusion in a comprehensive description, this study adopts the following as an encompassing definition of diversity: the discourse of individual differences and group/social differences and the complex ways these differences are understood and addressed within the context of institutional systems and the broader society. Henceforth in this study, all references to diversity also capture, in part, the concepts of equity and inclusion.

**The Imperative for Diversity in Higher Education**

Diversity is an indisputable force in American higher education today. According to a study on the five most salient issues facing modern higher education, campus presidents identified diversity as a matter that every college campus needs to address (McGovern, Foster, &
There are several recurring themes that emerged from the literature when examining the factors that have contributed to diversity becoming a focal issue in higher education today.

**Changing Demographics.**

The US Census Bureau predicts that individuals from racially and ethnically minoritized groups will represent 54% of the overall population by 2050, and already make up 39% of all college students (Hussar & Bailey, 2017). Changes in demographics such as these have resulted in an influx of individuals from historically marginalized groups gaining access to higher education at higher rates than they have in years passed (Hu DeHart, 2000; Kezar, 2007; Kezar, Gallant, & Lester, 2011). Specifically, Espinosa and colleagues (2019) predict that higher education enrollment growth will mainly be comprised of racially minoritized students who will make up almost half of all college students by the year 2025. In a seeming concatenation of events, increased racial and ethnic diversity also bring in more non-traditional, first generation, LGBTQ, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students (Chun & Evans, 2018). The students representing these social identities tend to also be from non-dominant racial groups, female-identified, and financially self-reliant – all which break from the norms of the traditional college student profile.

An increase in the diversity of the racial and ethnic demography is important to the effectiveness of the mission of higher education in that many institutions were structured from a Eurocentric perspective (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006). Aguirre and Martinez (2002) explain that higher education is an indicator of societal changes and must, therefore, deploy strategies that are responsive to the increase in racial and ethnic diversity in the population. Supporting this notion, Williams (2013) and Smith (2015) connect the changing American demography to the
role of higher education in the continuation of democracy in the country. With more racial and ethnic diversity among the individuals both enrolling in higher education institutions and seeking voice in the generation of knowledge unique to higher education, the need to be adaptable in this emerging reality is critical to the ongoing effectiveness and mission of higher education. This adaptability will be timely because as Generation Z – a generation that is approximately half white and half people of color (Black, Latinx\(^1\), Asian, Native Hawiaan/Pacific Islander, Native American, and multiracial) – continues to age into higher education, their arrival will have major implications for institutions, especially because they are entering higher education at a higher rate than the previous generation (Chun & Feagin, 2019; Williams, 2018).

**Global Economy.**

Technological changes have impacted nearly every aspect of higher education and have ushered in an era characterized by a global economy and the knowledge-based worker (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013). Advances in technology have decreased the number of physical labor jobs, and have created a workforce that is shifting toward the need for a worker educated beyond secondary education. In response to this need, more individuals from non-dominant and non-traditional groups, such as first-generation immigrants and older adult learners, are accessing higher education, creating a strain on institutional capability to keep pace with the increase in access (Williams, et al., 2005).

Apart from more individuals needing to access higher education in the new global economy, Williams (2013) explains that “America has the most racially and ethnically diverse

\(^1\) Commonly used as a gender inclusive term for people who self-identify as having racial and ethnic roots in Latin America, South America, Mexico, and parts of the Caribbean (Garcia, 2017).
higher education system in the world which gives us a competitive edge as diversity leads to improved creativity, problem-solving and critical thinking” (p.2). In addition to enhancing the learning outcomes of students (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005), creating access for racial, ethnic, and gender diversity will ultimately lead to a larger base of the American workforce who are equipped with the requisite skills to be successful in the knowledge-based economy (Williams, 2013).

**Political Climate and Resurgence of Activism.**

The national political climate and activism regarding social inequity are intrinsically linked. The Southern Poverty Law Center reported that in the six months following the 2016 presidential election, there were some 1,863 incidents of hate or bias reported across 330 college campuses (Chun & Feagin, 2019). Further, the U.S. Department of Education reported that between 2015 and 2016, there was a 25 percent increase in the number of hate crimes reported on campuses (Newkirk, 2019). This uptick in bias and hate based incidents has prompted a rebirth of social justice movements in higher education comparable to those of the 1970s (Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016).

Large scale social justice demonstrations have taken root on campuses with considerable national media attention. Student activists are calling attention to social injustices on their campuses, proposing correctives, and demanding action and accountability from leaders (Anderson, 2020). One example of this renewed student activism is the case at the University of Missouri. Following student demands, walk-outs, marches, and a hunger strike, key leaders left their positions following demands from students for their removal expressing outrage at the seeming inaction of those in leadership (Seltzer, 2018). Such circumstances call for an examination of the leader as a driver of the campus response to matters of diversity.
Diversity Leadership

With diversity’s increasing impact on higher education campus operations and effectiveness, studies on diversity leadership have begun to emerge in the past decade. Although there has been a marked increase in research on this topic, there remain considerable gaps in the literature and knowledge as a field of study. Higher education’s need for answers has outpaced the scholarship on the topic, resulting in the necessity to pull from separate bodies of literature to gain a complete understanding of the concept of diversity leadership in general, and specifically, as it relates to higher education. Further exacerbating the matter is the nature of constant change inherent in diversity matters in the larger society, leading to a limited shelf-life for earlier studies, rendering the validity of their findings questionable in light of the evolving social climate of the country (Adserias, et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the literature provides key findings on the role of the leader and transferable theories that can be examined to provide more context to this matter.

The Role of Leaders in Diversity Efforts

While the literature on practices that facilitate major, institution-wide change for diversity is limited (Kezar & Eckel, 2002), it is clear that a key aspect of organizational change is the role of the leader. Aguirre and Martinez (2002) posit that diversity and leadership are synergistic concepts that support each other. Diversity leadership is defined as “leadership that addresses diversity issues and concerns in higher education” (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006, p. 39). In that context, the literature on both diversity and leadership make this connection repeatedly. In a study on the role of presidents in institutionalizing diversity initiatives on higher education campuses, Kezar (2007) found that leadership was critical to advancing this work. Specifically, the study found that leaders create change by employing various strategies for which they are uniquely situated to use given their oversight of campus resources and position to set an
institutional vision. Other studies support this finding in that leadership is the impetus for defining and incorporating diversity in the organizational culture (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002; Kezar et al., 2008; Worthington, 2012). There is also a burgeoning branch of the literature that seeks to determine the role of a leader’s social identity in the effectiveness of their ability to effectively advance diversity practice in higher education (Owen, 2009).

**Transformational Leadership**

Originally developed by Burns and furthered by Bass, transformational leadership theory is one of the most popular leadership theories of the past several decades (Bess & Dee, 2008), in that it “appeals to the moral values of followers in an attempt to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and to mobilize their energy and resources to reform institutions” (Yukl, 2010, p. 261). Transformational leadership provides a frame for the role of the leader in actualizing positive change. Transformational leadership theory explains that the leader encourages followers to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the organization or society as a whole (Kezar, 2007). Further, it is a process for changing the status quo by identifying problems in an organization’s current systems, and provides a new vision of what the organization can be (Alatawi, 2017). As such, Transformational Leadership provides a vehicle for leaders and followers to become change agents working to reform the system, and as Bess & Dee (2008) describe, do so as opposed to making the current system work better which is a less effective approach.

Defined directly as a leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems (Roberts, 1985) Transformational Leadership is broken into four elements that a leader employs to transform and motivate followers. Bass and Riggio (2014) describe these elements as the Model of Transformational Leadership which include: Individualized Consideration,
Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, and Idealized Influence. Each is described in greater details in the sections that follow.

**Individualized Consideration**

With Individualized Consideration, the leader provides individualized care to followers, thus acting as a coach and mentor and providing special attention to meeting the needs of the individual in their achievement and growth. In diversity culture change, leadership practices that fall within this element become especially important when cultivating members of the campus community to lead diversity change efforts – a practice commonly found in the literature on diversity leadership practices (Kezar, 2008; Chun & Evans, 2018).

**Intellectual Stimulation**

Intellectual Stimulation is characterized by the leader engaging followers in the problem solving process and encouraging new approaches, innovation, and creativity in solutions to old problems. Diversity culture change has been said to be elusive due to the broken pattern of efforts that fail to challenge assumptions (Williams, 2013). That said, with leadership practices that fall within Intellectual Stimulation have great potential for diversity culture change as the element is rooted in leaders encouraging individuals to question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old situations in new ways.

**Inspirational Motivation**

Rooted in symbolism, shared meaning, and visioning, Inspirational Motivation also has implications for leadership practices for diversity culture change. Williams (2013) in his seminal text on strategic diversity leadership explains that transformational culture change for diversity does not occur without leaders setting a clear vision for diversity for the campus community and professing the leader’s commitment to seeing the change through. This participatory element of
Transformational Leadership also calls for leaders to engage followers in the process of setting the vision for the future.

**Idealized Influence**

The last element, Idealized Influence, is understood as the element of Transformation Leadership where the leader serves as a role model for high ethical behavior, instills a sense of pride in the leader among followers, gains the respect and trust of individuals. Through the leaders behaviors and the characteristics that followers attribute to leaders, the element of Idealized Influence compliment diversity culture change efforts in that it expects leaders to emphasize a collective sense of mission. When diversity is incorporated into the mission, this element supports leadership practices that inspire the campus community to strive toward this shared effort.

Transformational leadership theory is particularly useful in diversity in higher education research as modeled by a study on leadership styles that advance organizational change for diversity. In this study, Adserias and colleagues (2017) explained that, while elusive still, transformational organizational change was possible when leaders envision and facilitate the structures and processes necessary to engage members in learning. The authors state that “transformational approaches to leadership hold potential for both understanding and conceptualizing the transformative changes necessary to ameliorate systemic oppressions, such as those based on race, ethnicity, gender, and other identities that are socially marginalized” (Adserias et al., 2017, p.319). Transformational leadership theory’s moral and ethical grounding is ideal to motivate otherwise resistant faculty, staff and administrators to change their behavior in support of diversity in higher education, thus leading to a shift in diversity culture.
Bass and colleagues (1993, 2014) further describe the interconnectivity and complementary nature of Transformational Leadership and organizational culture. Specifically, Bass and Riggio (2014) describe that organizational culture and leadership interact in that leaders create and reinforce norms within the culture based on the manner in which leaders stress what is important, how the leader addresses crises and role models, and whom they attract to the organization. Further describing the reciprocal relationship between the two, the culture also drives the leader behaviors in reference to the rites, beliefs, values, and assumptions that are embedded in the organization. In reference to diversity culture change, through the combined lens of organizational culture and leadership, leaders should approach changing an existing organizational culture by investigating and understanding the culture first before they attempt to realign the culture to a new vision and goals for diversity. Bass and Avolio (1993) also describe the connection of organizational culture and Transformational Leadership in that “…the culture affects leadership as much as leadership affects culture” (p. 113). Further bringing the two concepts together, the authors assert that a transformational culture is a general sense of purpose for the organizational members and a feeling of being a family.

Taken as a whole, Transformational Leadership was the most cited theory found in the diversity and leadership literature. This frequent reference could be because leadership practices focused on transformation aim to enhance an institution’s recognition of diversity issues by engaging the campus community and culture in being responsive to matters of social justice and the increased racial and ethnic diversity in society (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006). The more formal studies in the literature consistently return to transformational leadership as a theoretical method to lead change for diversity and inclusion in higher education institutions (Adserias, et al., 2017; Aguirre & Martinez, 2002, 2006).
Leadership Practices for Advancing Diversity Culture Change

While research on diversity leadership can be traced back to the civil rights period and the origins of ethnic studies programs (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006), studies on the specific strategies that leaders can use to advance diversity in higher education are limited. Studies have been conducted on different variations of the question of which leadership styles, approaches, practices, and strategies best support diversity. This study heavily relied on the works of a small collection of scholars as foundational texts that displayed the breadth of knowledge that spans the literature and informs the current understanding of diversity leadership practices in higher education.

Foundational to the literature on diversity leadership is Aguirre and Martinez’s (2006) monograph on diversity leadership in higher education. In this text, the authors provide five characteristics of proficient diversity leadership which are listed in Table 1 (p. 85). In addition to these characteristics, they explain that in higher education, diversity leadership practices transform organizational culture to incorporate “social practices, values, and assumptions that foster diversity” (p.59).

Table 1
Table of Proficient Diversity Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Characteristics of Proficient Diversity Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Promoting personal awareness and recognition of cultural and social differences in leadership practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promoting leadership practices that encourage diversity as a challenge to traditional, static organizational structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developing leadership capacity in organizational members (staff, students, and faculty) who work effectively with diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying and exploring the use of leadership strategies to challenge the obstacles faced by diversity in the organizational culture and climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incorporating innovation in leadership practices that transform traditional leadership styles into ones that bring diversity from the periphery to the core of the institution’s mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From numerous studies on the relationship between senior leadership and diversity in higher education, Kezar can be regarded as one of the key scholars who has contributed to identifying specific leadership strategies for advancing diversity and inclusion. In a multi-year study on leadership strategies associated with leading diversity and inclusion efforts, Kezar and colleagues (2007) found that practices, such as mentoring faculty of color, interacting and learning from students, and obtaining board support had an impact on shifting campus diversity culture. In a similar study on the politics of leading diversity implementation, Kezar (2008) determined that developing coalitions and advocates, anticipating resistance, and creating public relations campaigns were all effective practices that leaders could deploy when faced with political conflict from serving as a diversity leader on their campus. From Kezar’s collective related work, diversity culture change has been found to involve enacting various strategies including altering the mission to include diversity, developing and implementing a diversity strategic plan, and aligning resources to fund diversity initiatives (Kezar, 2007).

When describing leadership for advancing diversity culture change, Williams (2013) provide the concept of strategic diversity leadership. Described as equal parts art and science, Williams defines strategic diversity leadership as “being able to move between nuanced and sensitive negotiation of ethnic, racial, gender, disability, and citizenship issues at the individual level to articulating the broader strategic and educational principles that guide institutional policies at the highest levels” (p. 13). He provides five key principles of strategic diversity leadership that are reflected in Table 2 (p. 14). Williams stresses that institutions can only realize the cultural transformation implied by these principles when various leaders at the institution address change at multiple institutional levels and systems.
Table 2

Principles of Strategic Diversity Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1</td>
<td>Redefine issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion as fundamental to the organizational bottom line of mission fulfillment and institutional excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2</td>
<td>Focus on creating systems that enable all students, faculty, and staff to thrive and achieve their maximum potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3</td>
<td>Achieve a more robust and integrated diversity approach that builds on prior diversity models and operates in a strategic, evidence-based, and data-driven manner, where accountability is paramount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 4</td>
<td>Focus diversity-related efforts to intentionally transform the institutional culture, not just to make tactical moves that lead to poorly integrated efforts and symbolic implementation alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 5</td>
<td>Lead with a high degree of cultural intelligence and awareness of different identities and their significance in higher education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notable in the diversity leadership literature is the lack of consistency in leadership practices across studies. Of the studies focusing on identifying leadership strategies associated with either diversity leadership or leading for diversity, there is little consistency in the findings across the literature. This could be attributed to a shift in phenomena between each study. An example is one study which sought to identify leadership practices that implement diversity in the organizational culture of higher education (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002), and another study which purpose was to identify the ideal leadership style for implementing diversity in higher education (Adserias, et al., 2017). While similar in the topic and purpose, there is enough nuance in the research questions that the resulting findings from the studies share little commonality, and therefore, leaves a gap in the literature on diversity leadership practices.

Diversity and Organizational Culture

While this study seeks to identify leadership practices, equally important is the phenomenon which is being measured – diversity culture change. This section explains the theories employed to understand culture change, and provides a conceptual definition for diversity culture change.
Cultural Theory of Organizational Change

Cultural theories of organizational change emphasize irrationality, thus allowing for change as a natural response to alterations in the human environment (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). Further, Martinez and Aguirre (2006) describe transformation as a process in organizational culture that can be used for “…developing adaptive strategies that respond to social and demographic changes in the environment without necessarily change the whole organization” (p. 56). More specifically, as theorized by Schein, “culture within an organization entails alteration to values, beliefs, myths, and rituals” (Kezar, 2002, p. 50). In regarding the role of the leader in change, cultural theories also focus on the ability of leaders to use symbolic action and explain the difficulty of transformative change.

What is Organizational Culture?

With the explosion of organizational culture studies since the 1980s, the literature is replete with definitions of organizational culture. Well known organizational culture theorist, Schein (2010) defines organizational culture as “…a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p.18). Rooted in the symbolic action approach, Schein’s theory of organizational culture suggests that leaders develop culture by recreating parts of the symbolic system and culture (Kezar, 2001). Cameron (2008) adds to the understanding of organizational culture in that it “refers to the taken-for-granted values, underlying assumptions, expectations, and definitions present which characterize organizations and their members” (p. 5). Further, Fralinger and Olson (2007) explain that culture at the university level is likened to the personality of an organization and is defined as “the
values and beliefs of university stakeholders (i.e., administrators, faculty, students, board members, and support staff), based on tradition and communicated verbally and nonverbally” (p. 86).

Organizational culture is also collective and shared, and critical change activities include “modifying the mission and vision, creating new myths and rituals, leaders performing symbolic actions, using metaphors, assessing the institutional culture, tapping into energy, developing enthusiasm, altering motivations of people through spirituality, and communicating values and beliefs” (Kezar, 2001, p.67). Because culture is shared beliefs, values, and meanings (Lakos & Phipps, 2004; Warrick, 2017) its connection with diversity begins to become apparent. When diversity becomes part of organizational culture, it fosters a sense of belonging for all because differences are respected and recognized (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006).

**Organizational Culture Change in Higher Education**

Organizational culture is, essentially, the core characteristic of an institution which makes effecting change particularly challenging. Kezar and Eckel (2002) offer that transformational change is unfamiliar to most higher education institutions because it “(1) alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; (2) is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution; (3) is intentional; and (4) occurs over time” (p.4). Further, due to the distributive and shared governance structures of higher education, institutional culture change must focus on the people in the organization to develop positive attitudes about information generation and communication (Fralinger & Olson, 2007).

There is also notable discussion in the literature about higher education’s inherent resistance to change. Culture is a powerful force because it occurs outside the organization’s
awareness. Understanding the dynamics of culture helps to explain seemingly irrational behavior of people in an organization and how to change it (Schein, 2010). Aguirre and Martinez (2006) attribute higher education’s reluctance to incorporate diversity into its culture to a perceived threat to the institution’s existing values and beliefs. Higher education is a conservative entity that will resist any forms of change, especially those that require a shift at the very core of the system, such as diversity (Karkouti, 2016; Owen, 2009; Smith, 2015).

**Diversity Culture Change**

Schein (2010) remarks on the newness of culture as a theoretical field of study and the need for scholar/practitioners to enhance the evolving field by adding their concepts based on their experiences. As such, the present study augments the culture discussion specific to diversity culture change. Using the encompassing definition of diversity provided in previous sections of this review and coupling it with the organizational culture literature, diversity culture is a culture of inclusion for members of all non-dominant groups. A diversity culture shift as described by Chun and Evans (2018) “involves bridging the gap between the espoused values of an institution and the predominant norms, assumptions, and traditions that undergird behaviors, actions, and practices” (p. 105). As such, this study adopts a working definition of diversity culture change as the process of examining and changing organizational assumptions, values, and processes that impede equal participation and full inclusion of individuals from non-dominant groups and increasing the institution’s capacity to effectively address diversity.

Culture change must be examined at the various levels, or degrees, in which the cultural phenomenon is recognizable to the observer. Williams and Clowney (2007) provide an explanation of these three levels in relation to diversity culture change where the easiest level of organizational culture to manipulate are the organizational artifacts of level one which are the
observed behaviors and visible processes of the institution. An example of this is adding images of people of color to the campus website or brochures. The second level tackles espoused beliefs and values and is depicted by incongruence between practice and message. In building on the previous example of level one change, adding images of people of color to the website but failing to consider where the university recruits for new students to include areas with high concentrations of racially minoritized communities is an example of second level changes. The last, and most complicated level of culture change, is in the basic, underlying assumptions embedded in the institutional culture. An example of diversity culture change at this third level would be challenging resistance to the belief that high standardized test scores are the only way to assess student readiness and quality (Williams & Clowney, 2007).

**Justification for Campus Diversity Officers in Current Study**

A marker of the increasing centrality of diversity issues in higher education is the growing presence of professionals who are commonly referred to in practice as chief diversity officers - senior leaders, charged with effectively incorporating diversity and inclusion into campus operations (National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education, n.d.). In their seminal text on the emergence, function, and potential of the chief diversity officer position, Williams and Wade-Golden (2013) define the role as “a boundary-spanning senior administrative role that prioritizes diversity-themed organizational change as a shared priority at the highest levels of leadership and governance” (p.31).

Similar to the evolution of diversity strategy and literature in higher education, the professionalization of diversity practice in higher education continues to evolve. As they appear in campus structures, chief diversity officer positions fall into three levels: low) dean or special assistant; mid) associate, assistant vice president/provost; and high) vice
president/provost/chancellor (Leon, 2014). Even with these categories outlined, the position and the work of diversity strategy and practice continues to expand. Appreciating the enormity of the task of shifting campus diversity culture, more campuses are developing unit-level and issue-focused diversity officers to either replace or compliment the portfolio of the chief diversity officer (Flaherty, 2019). As such, to capture the dynamic nature of the diversity officer role, this study expanded beyond the nomenclature of chief diversity officers and adopts the more encompassing term, campus diversity officer. As conceptualized for this study, campus diversity officers include diversity practitioners outside of the senior-most level positions and have responsibilities that fall within the scope of the chief diversity officer role.

Although there are a number of titles that can be applied to this group, campus diversity officers have been around for approximately 15 years and have followed the evolution of diversity matters in the larger society as well as within higher education (Harvey, 2014). Following the widespread social movements and activism of the 1960s and 1970s which resulted in the establishment of ethnic and women studies programs at institutions across the country, some campuses also began to install student cultural centers that were based on social identity. Offices of minority affairs and equal opportunity began to emerge alongside cultural centers and ethnic studies programs, and by the early 2000s, the work of developing strategy to incorporate the tenets of diversity into the campus culture began to be professionalized and diversity practices were recognized in the role of chief diversity officer (Harvey, 2014; Williams & Wade-Golden, 2013).

Despite variance in the role from campus to campus, in general, campus diversity officers are responsible for developing and implementing strategies across a wide range of social identities within the groups of students, faculty and staff, which impact core areas such as
recruitment, retention, campus climate, and curriculum and instruction (Worthington, Stanley, & Lewis, 2014). As such, campus diversity officers, through their daily internal and external work – particularly with campus leaders – are an appropriate group to inquire about their observations of leadership strategies that effect sustainable and transformational diversity culture change. Further, as leaders in their own right, both formally and informally on some campuses, diversity officers can also provide insight on their practices and strategies in carrying out their responsibilities that led to success in changing campus culture for diversity as well as lessons learned from failed efforts.

Further, when considering the value of campus diversity officer perceptions on diversity leadership and culture change, these professionals can support efforts to fill the current void in the knowledge on the topic of effective diversity leadership practice. The literature notes that diversity culture change will remain out of reach unless campus leaders can exercise effective leadership in navigating their institutional environments (Williams, 2013). However, the scholarship is silent or unsettled on a definition for what qualifies as effective diversity leadership. An exploration of the various leadership theories, including Transformational Leadership, found little indication or practical path to understanding how one effectively practices any form leadership. When pairing the concept of effective leadership with the scholarship on diversity, equity and inclusion in higher education, there is even less indication of how a leader achieves effectiveness in leading these issues in higher education. As such, diversity leadership scholars must consider both the body of literature on diversity, as well as the literature on leadership in higher education, to better understand how not only to define effectiveness but to understand how one practices it.
Schein (2010) lends his perspective on the necessity to bring scholarship and practice together to fill the gaps in any theory that needs further development. In his explanation of his approach to his contributions to the organizational culture change literature, Schein encourages the reader to follow his path in how he applied what he experienced as a practitioner and consultant helping organizations change their culture to understand and write about the interception of leadership and organizational culture change. Applying this logic to diversity leadership in higher education, campus diversity officers are best equipped to apply practical experience to bridge the gap in the scholarship on diversity leadership. With an absence in the literature on methods for leaders to effectively practice diversity leadership to change the culture of the institution to embrace diversity, equity, and inclusion, these professionals’ subjective experiences provide a path to better understanding.
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY

This study sought to identify and understand the leadership practices that campus diversity officers perceived as the most effective for advancing diversity culture on college and university campuses. To accomplish this goal, this study employed a semi-quantitative research design using a Q-methodology to reveal campus diversity officer viewpoints, perceptions, and beliefs about effective diversity leadership practices. Q-methodology is an ideal method as it allows researchers to analyze individuals’ subjective perceptions that can illuminate overall points of view on a particular topic (Brown, 2004).

Schein (2010) explains that for evolving fields of study where experience has yet to be fully explained by theory and research, such as diversity and organizational culture, the scholar/practitioner must develop their concepts. As a result, this study’s use of the perception revealing Q-methodology, which uses rank ordering to reveal the conscious and subconscious opinions and underlying beliefs of a participant group, is most appropriate. As explained in the previous sections, there are no higher education professionals closer to transforming campus diversity culture than campus diversity officers, which provides a rationale to learn their perceptions on the matter. Further, the Q-methodology is commonly used to explore complex concepts and subject matter from the point of view of those involved in the matter (Watts & Stenner, 2005) and was, thus, ideal for this study.

Higher education institutions are change-resistant, and incorporating diversity into the organization culture remains elusive for most institutions (Williams, 2013). Of the existing research on leadership practices to advance a diversity culture shift, little has been informed by the group of professionals charged with facilitating diversity efforts on campuses. To illuminate
the leadership practices existing in the field and build on those from the perceptions of campus diversity officers, the research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. What do higher education leaders and researchers consider as the most important leadership practices for advancing campus diversity culture?
2. What leadership practices do campus diversity officers perceive to be the most effective for advancing campus diversity culture?
3. Why do these campus diversity officers in this study identify the practices uncovered in the previous research question as most effective?

This chapter provides an overview of Q-methodology and its use in higher education diversity studies. It also includes a detailed explanation of the professional association that served as the primary population for recruiting participants for this study and the study’s research procedure, including the study materials, data collection methods, and final analysis.

**Overview of Q-Methodology**

Q-methodology was developed by psychologist/physicist William Stephenson in 1935 to provide a research method to study human subjectivity in nearly any circumstance (Brown, 2004; Brown, 1993). As a research method, Q-methodology is a set of procedures, theory, and philosophy that focuses on the study of subjectivity (Newman & Ramlo, 2010). The term *subjectivity*, a key concept in Q-methodology, can be defined as a person’s communication of their point of view (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The authors (1988) go on to explain that “Q-methodology would seem to hold special promise for those seeking to make more intelligible and rigorous the study of human subjectivity” (p. 3). Since its origins in psychology, Q-methodology has evolved into a cross-disciplinary research method used in studies conducted in health sciences, education, and other fields (Brown, 1993). Part of Q-method’s amenability to different
disciplines can be attributed to its core purpose of uncovering the opinion groupings of individuals on a particular topic. This information can prove useful in guiding the direction of future research, programmatic direction, and identifying consensus and contrasts in viewpoints (Donner, 2001; van Exel & de Graaf, 2005).

Using subjectivity as its guiding concept, the opinion-grouping characteristic of Q-studies makes the approach ideal for studies of human behavior – such as diversity and leadership. This is, in part, because Q-methodology brings together the richness of qualitative approaches with the standardization of quantitative approaches (Donner, 2001). Specifically, the quantitative characteristics of Q-methodology can be found in the inverted adaptation of factor analysis where the population of statements serves as the sample, and the variables are the people who rank-order these statements (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Qualitative methodological characteristics can be found throughout the Q-study process, including the thematic analysis used to group sample statements and interviews with participants (Newman & Ramlo, 2010). Blending these two approaches allows for the systematic examination of subjectivity that may reveal connections that would be missed using other techniques.

Another key concept in Q-methodology is concourse of communication. Brown (1993) explains that “…Q-methodology is comprised of procedures and a conceptual framework that provide the bases for the science of subjectivity, and its phenomena consist of the ordinary conversation, commentary, and discourse of everyday life” (p. 94). This everyday discourse or population of subjective ideas is referred to as the concourse of communication. These subjective ideas about a topic can be identified from, among other ways, journal articles, interviews with experts or other parties with a stake in the topic, or comments from online posts (Lee, 2017). This concourse of communication serves as the foundation of a Q-study (Watts & Stenner, 2012).
Apart from the Q-methodological specific definitions for subjectivity and conourse, several other core definitions and concepts are essential to understanding a Q-methodology application. For one, Q-methodology utilizes a sampling of the conourse of communication to develop a subset of statements that are selected for investigation in what is known as the Q-set (Brown, 1993; Paige & Morin, 2014). It is these statements within the Q-set that become the unit of analysis. Next, the Q-sort is the instrument that participants use to rank-order statements related to the topic of study – the Q-Set – on a scale of opposites based on their opinion on the question posed (Brown, 2004). Lastly, there is the resource given to participants to guide them on completing the Q-sort, which is called the condition of instruction.

**Q-Methodology Research Process**

Based on Watts and Stenner’s methodological research in their foundational text (2012), Q-methodology studies occur in five steps illustrated in Figure 2 and detailed in the following section.

**Step one – collect the concourse.** Q-methodology is primarily concerned with identifying groupings of people’s varying viewpoints as opposed to individual thoughts alone (Watts & Stenner, 2012). As a result, considerable time is devoted to gathering the range of commentary on a topic to develop the Q-Set. This process begins with conourse. As described above, conourse of communication is derived from every day, subjective comments that people utter in response to a given topic. To further explain the concept, McKeown & Thomas (2014)
state that “concourse refers to the volume of discussions about a topic, ranging from idle gossip to well-informed soliloquies about ordinary things” (p. 3). Depending on the topic, an exploration of these statements could yield hundreds of statements (Lee, 2017). As such, Q researchers must refine these subjective statements to develop the Q-Set.

**Step two – develop the Q-Set.** The volume of statements resulting from a concourse would likely be too cumbersome for participants to rank-order, so Q-researchers identify a representative subset of those statements to form the Q-Set (Brown, 1993). To offer participants a range of opinions on the topic, the standard number of statements is 40 to 80, although the final number of statements is dictated by the subject matter itself (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The authors (2012) explain that the statement sampling process to refine the concourse into the Q-set can be either structured or unstructured. Structured approaches use a theory or framework to select statements, while unstructured approaches are employed when there is no preexisting theory related to the research topic. Watts and Stenner (2012) stress that researchers should generate more items in the preliminary Q-set that can be refined through interviews with stakeholders for the topic of interest who can then help with clarifying statement wording, reduce duplication, generate new items, and ensure adequate coverage of the topic. Further, the shape of the Q-set has particular importance. As originally developed by Stephenson, he believed that when any person assigns value or importance to items, the distribution would fit the normal curve of error in the same way as it would when asking a group of people to assign value to a single item (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Thus, the Q set in Q-studies all follow this general shape, which evidently forces the bulk of items toward the midpoint and fewer at the peripheries.

**Step three – select participant group.** The participants completing the sort are called the Persons-set, or p-set, which “is a structured sample of respondents who are theoretically
relevant to the problem under consideration; for instance, persons who are expected to have a clear and distinct viewpoint regarding the problem and, in that quality, may define a factor” (van Exel & de Graaf, 2005, p. 6). Since Q-methodology assumes only so many patterns of viewpoints exist in a population and is uninterested in a specific size of the relationship between variables, Q studies do not require large participant groups (Lee, 2017). Further, Q-methodology requires only enough participants to establish that a viewpoint exists for the purpose of that viewpoint being compared to another (Brown, 1980). Q-methodology is primarily concerned with the exploration of meaning and quality, and therefore, has little interest in generalizing to a population how many people share that viewpoint, but rather, that it exists (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

Watts and Stenner (2012) explain that Q-methodologists use a strategic approach to participant recruitment in that they select participants believed to express a particularly interesting point of view on the topic that may, or may not, divide along clear demographic lines. In circumstances where demographics are not a clear indicator of perspective, researchers can rely on a potential participant’s experience with the topic and a sufficiently varied group as other distinguishing characteristics.

**Step four – administer the Q-Sort.** In the next step, the Q-sorting process, participants rank-order the statements making up the Q-set according to a condition of instruction that the researcher provides to guide the sorting process (McKeown & Thomas, 2014). A sample Q-sort ranking sheet, or Q-plot, is shown in *Figure 3*. 
The condition of instruction provided to participants can refer to closeness to their own beliefs (as pictured in Figure 3), agreement with items, importance, or acceptability with items placed in the same column receiving the same ranking score (Zabala et al., 2018). Researchers have the option to force participants to rank all statements or not (Watts & Stenner, 2012). These authors (2012) expressed the importance of conducting post-sort interviews with participants where “the main aim is to the explore each participant’s wider understanding of the issue, to discover why they have sorted the items the way they have and to get them to focus on the meaning and significance of particularly important and salient items” (p.81).

**Step five – run factor analysis and interpret the results.** With the Q sort completed, the final step is factor analysis and interpretation. As initially developed by Stephenson, “Q-methodology is an inversion of conventional factor analysis in the sense that Q correlates persons instead of tests” (van Exel & de Graaf, 2005, p.1). Given advances in the study over the last
several decades, the factor analysis is primarily conducted using free, specialized software for Q-methodology (Donner, 2001). However, Watts and Stenner (2012) warn that, even with Q-method software, the researcher is still responsible for deciding the best solution for factoring and interpreting meaning from the factor results. The factor interpretation and determining the core meanings from the Q-sort, McKeown & Thomas (2014) state that “rather than focusing on the placement of individual statements, an effort is made to examine the patterns of meaning within the broader contextual constellation provided by a given factor array, with attention given to the relevance of such patterns to existing or emerging theories and propositions” (p.6). Essentially, when interpreting the results of the statistical steps of the method, a factor identifies a group of people’s viewpoints based on their like-mindedness on the topic at hand.

**Research Design**

This Q-study adopted Watts and Stenner’s (2012) operationalization of Q-methodology using the previously described five-step process with the necessary design choices incorporated throughout (e.g., concourse sampling, participant selection, software). This process is illustrated in Figure 3.
**Figure 4**  
*Study Research Design Using Q Method*

**Concourse and Q-Set Development**

To achieve the rigor necessary to cover the spectrum of relevant content on the domain, Q-methodologists explain that Q-set development occurs as a part of the research process, taking up the bulk of the research process time equating, in some circumstances, to several months of work (Lee, 2017; Watts & Stenner, 2012). As a result, the present study began with an extensive review of the literature on diversity leadership and organizational culture change in higher education to identify the concourse of communication that served as the Q-set content. This review of the literature on higher education diversity leadership and culture change was limited to the last 15 years because, as Adserias and colleagues (2017) assert, diversity studies have a limited shelf life because the evolving nature of issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The

---

**Step 1 - Collect Concourse**
- Review the literature on leadership practices for advancing diversity culture change

**Step 2 - Develop the Q-Set**
- Group statements by likeness using the Four I’s of Transformational Leadership  
- Refine statements based on feedback from subject matter experts

**Step 3 - Select Participant Group**
- Identify participants from professional association of campus diversity officers membership who represent a range of institution types

**Step 4 - Issue the Q-Sort**
- Participants complete the rank-order process on the Q-set statements

**Step 5 - Conduct Data Analysis**
- Run factorial analysis using Q-method software  
- Analyze factor arrays to identify viewpoints and determine meaning for each  
- **Interviews** - Conduct post sort interviews with participants to clarify responses

Gather feedback from subject matter experts to review for accuracy, completeness, and clarity.
researcher used a two step, iterative approach to the review of the literature. The first step was to read foundational texts to help guide both a conceptual understanding of diversity leadership practices, and to inform which texts would be appropriate for review for said practices. Two texts served as foundational texts: *Diversity Leadership in Higher Education* by Aguirre and Martinez (2006), which provided a definition for diversity leadership; and Williams’ (2013) seminal text on diversity leadership in practice for culture change, *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education*. Williams provides a working definition of a leadership practice that was adopted for this study: a tactical building block of diversity strategy that includes programs, policies, resources, and other organizational elements that support the strategy (2013). This was important because a review of the literature identified unevenness in what was deemed as a leadership practice versus a strategy or behavior.

Applying the definitions of diversity leadership and practices from these two foundational texts, 20 texts were deemed to meet the criteria of providing specific diversity leadership practices. Notable from the search result was the recurrence of texts published from Kezar’s 2007 study of college and university presidents who were deemed to have successfully advance diversity on their campuses. This study and the subsequent texts from it, provided significant number of the diversity leadership practices, as identified by the presidents in the study, which were used to develop the Q-set. These texts also served as an indicator of the gap in the literature revealing that most of what is understood about diversity leadership practices to change campus culture are what remains from Kezar’s study.

From the 20 relevant articles, the researcher identified 226 diversity leadership practices that served as the concourse of communication for the study. These 226 practices were refined to the final Q-set in three steps. First, following this collection of leadership practices as they
appeared in the literature, each practice was organized into leadership practice statements. Williams (2013) explains that a diversity leadership practice is the tactical building block of diversity strategy where strategy focuses on developing a sustained vision for culture change and practices are the programs, policies, resources, and the like that support that effort. All but six practices met the definition of a practice and were, therefore, disqualified from further categorization. The practices were then analyzed for likeness, combining any duplicates. Then, like groups of practices were further refined into practice statements. The first round of refinement resulted in 106 total statements. With the goal to refine the statements according to Q-methodology’s suggested 40 – 60 statements, further synthesis was required. The researcher repeated the synthesizing and refining process a second time, looking for further likeness between the leadership practice statements. This second round of statement refinement resulted in a reduction to the goal window of 59 statements.

Further, Q-method scholars suggest collecting the concourse by using key themes identified in the literature and then continue to collect statements from stakeholders knowledgeable to the research topic (Watts & Stenner, 2005). As a result, to supplement the concourse, establish face validity, and to strengthen the reliability of the construct (Donner, 2001), the preliminary Q-Set statements were reviewed by three senior-ranking diversity officers with at least ten years of experience in the field of higher education diversity practice. The purpose of selecting individuals with such a profile was to increase the likelihood of the person having a variety of experience and exposure to diversity leadership practices and the impact of those practices on institutional diversity culture change. These individuals were identified based on the convenience of access gained through the researcher’s professional network and experience in the field. Although engaging a familiar colleague in a study is discouraged when
identifying persons for the broader participant group (Watts & Stenner, 2012), as a step in developing the Q-Set, this selection of convenience is acceptable (Brown, 1980).

As is commonly done in Q-studies (Lee, 2017), the three senior diversity officers were asked to provide their insight on the statements, address any confusing items, and identify any gaps in the content. For this statement review, the senior-ranking diversity officers were asked to consider the following four questions as they reviewed the statements:

1. Are the statements worded clearly, and are they understandable? If not, what changes would you suggest?
2. Are there any statements that are similar in nature and should be combined?
3. Are there any statements that you would remove from the list?
4. Are there any additional statements that you would add to the list?

The following summarizes the suggestions from the experts:

- Reference diversity, equity, and inclusion in each statement that references one of these terms;
- Add ‘commissioned by the president’ to statement 23 related to conducting climate surveys;
- Combine all practices that reference requesting support from external boards, groups, and legislators; and
- Other minor one-word edits for clarity on various statements.

The experts all agreed the list was comprehensive therefore no new practices were added. Feedback from respondents was used to refine the Q-set statements to a final number of 44 statements.
Participants

This section expands on the method used for selecting the research participants known as P-set. As a higher education diversity practitioner with over ten years of experience in the diversity field, this researcher relied on their professional experience in the field when determining the population for this study and how to access the group. The researcher has a working knowledge of campus diversity officers’, works as a member of the professional association described in the next paragraph, and has a professional network made up of the individuals with membership in the same association. This provided the researcher with first-hand knowledge of the association and the intricacies of its membership.

In recruiting participants for a Q-study, the focus is not on recruiting as large a number of participants as possible, rather, on securing enough participants to establish the existence of a viewpoint for purposes of comparing one viewpoint to another (Gravely-Stack, 2016). With that background established, this study’s population was higher education diversity officers who make up the over 200-person membership of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE). NADOHE is the leading professional association for college and university diversity officers in that it provides research on diversity initiatives, networking, professional development opportunities and shares exemplary practices (NADOHE Mission, n.d.). The NADOHE membership is made up of 200 institutional members and campus diversity officers most commonly referred to in practice as Chief Diversity Officers. These administrators are responsible for an institution’s efforts across a wide range of social identities, focal groups, as well as core areas across those focal groups and social identities, including recruitment and retention, campus climate, and curriculum and instruction (Worthington, Stanley & Lewis, 2014).
Relevant to this study, diversity officers who make up the NADOHE membership have the following qualifications:

- Deep expertise in community building and strategic planning in diversity and equity;
- ability to assist campuses in responding to bias incidents and hate crimes;
- management of compliance with anti-discrimination/harassments laws and regulations; and
- capability to inform institutional decision making through data analysis on opportunity gaps for underrepresented populations and campus climate. (NADOHE, n.d.)

Given these qualifications and professional work scope of diversity officers, the NADOHE members were the most appropriate population for providing their perceptions of leader effectiveness as needed to meet this study’s goals.

This study cross-referenced the literature on diversity leadership and organizational culture change for diversity. While there have been studies on leadership behaviors and styles for institutional change regarding diversity matters, the populations asked have minimally included the perceptions of higher education diversity officers (Adserias et al., 2017; Kezar et al., 2008). Further, in studies where campus diversity officers have been asked their opinions on similar topics, those studies have primarily centered on determining if diversity officers were properly resourced in their roles (Gravely-Stack, et al., 2016; Harvey, 2014). What results is an incomplete account of higher education leaders’ practices to further their campus efforts for diversity.

To best address this gap in the knowledge of effective leadership practices for diversity culture change, campus diversity officers with a combination of applicable experience are best suited for the p-set. The sample of respondents in Q-studies is typically a nonrandom selection,
and the sampling strategy is primarily purposeful, selected based on criteria other than randomness or observable characteristics (Zabalta et al., 2018). Specifically, the p-set was determined using a purposeful sampling of NADOHE member institutions, stratified by two institutional characteristics: 1) designation as private, public, and community college; and 2) categorization as either predominantly white or minority-serving institutions. The diversity of institutions was important as previous studies regarding diversity leadership practices and indicators suggest the need to ensure the diversity of institutional type as to enrich the data gathered on the perceptions of higher education diversity officers (Gravley-Stack, et al., 2016). This sampling process aimed to ensure the representation of various institution types rather than institutional type as a primary point of analysis. Watts and Stenner (2012) express that Q-methodologists use a strategic approach to participant recruitment in that they seek a blending of both interesting and pivoting viewpoints among the participants. By taking the varied institutional characteristics approach, this researcher achieved that balance.

As is common in Q-methodology, the sample size of participants was dictated by the total number of statements used to determine viewpoint in the Q-sort (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Intended for smaller participant groups, Q-methodology experts suggest approximately 25 to 50 participants to achieve optimum results (Brown, 2004). Accordingly, the goal of the study was to recruit 30 to 50 participants using a stratified sampling procedure by institutional characteristics.

This study did not seek socially identifiable demographics of research participants as the community of campus diversity officers is small, thus increasing the possibility of being identified by these characteristics. While demographics help with generalization of results to the general population in some types of studies, the critical aspect of results for a Q-study is that a viewpoint exists in the population, not the percentages of the population that shares them (van...
Exel & de Graaf, 2005). This approach of not collecting demographics has been taken with similar studies involving campus diversity officers (Gravley-Stack et al., 2016; Leon, 2014). As with these studies, requesting demographics can thwart participants’ concerns related to confidentiality.

Using the institutional membership list available from the NADOHE website, the researcher reviewed websites for 267 member institutions for the association. Qualifying institutions were public four-year, private four-year institutions, and two-year community colleges. Other institution types, including professional schools (i.e., medical and law schools) where disqualified from the list. The researcher reviewed the websites for the institutions remaining on the list for positions with the terms diversity, equity, or inclusion in the position title. For identified positions, the researcher captured their email address. Institutions with no positions meeting these parameters were disqualified from the list. This process yielded 202 potential participants for which study invitations (see Appendix C) were sent.

**Data Collection**

Administration of the Q-Sort, post-sort questionnaire, and follow up interviews serve as the data collection phase of the current study. The Q-sort was issued to the population of diversity officers at NADOHE member institutions via email invitations to participate in the study. Although the study goal was 30 completed Q-sorts, a total of 202 invitations were sent out to account for attrition and unresponsiveness. The invitation included an overview of the research project, the length of time expected to complete the Q sort, and sorting instructions asking participants to rank the order of the Q-Set statements from most to least effective based on their beliefs regarding effective diversity leadership (Zabala et al., 2018). Participants were not be offered an incentive to participate.
In the web-based study instrument, participants sorted the 44-item Q set based on the question: “What leadership practices do you perceive as the most effective for advancing diversity culture change in institutions of higher education?” The sorting process involved two steps: (a) sort the statements least indicative of effective diversity leadership practices into “Least Effective,” statements most indicative of effective diversity leadership practices into “Most Effective,” and “Neutral” for the rest, and (b) place the statements on the Q plot. Q-methodology pioneer, Brown (1980) suggests for Q-sets with items numbering 40 – 60 items, Q-plots should be an 11-point distribution. As such, the Q plot was composed of 11 columns arranged in normal distribution with assigned values ranging from “–5” on the far left column labeled, “Least Effective” and “5” on the far right column labeled, “Most Effective.”

As Watts and Stenner (2005) recommended, the researcher incorporated a post-sorting questionnaire to participants where they were directed to respond to open-ended questions regarding their interpretation of the statements, additional items they might have included, and other miscellaneous comments or reflections about the process. They were also asked their willingness to participate in a follow-up phone interview regarding their ranking responses.

As the final step in the data collection, the researcher conducted three interviews with three participants – one for each of the factors as is the practice in Q-methodology (Brown, 2004). Participants whose Qsorts significantly loaded on a factor and indicated on the post-sort questionnaire their willingness to be interviewed were contacted for interviews. As is common practice in Q studies, post-sort interview questions (see Appendix D) were developed to focus on identifying meaning for the statements placed at the extremes of the distribution (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Further, considering the third research question in the study in understanding why participants ranked certain practices higher than others, the researcher included a question
specifically asking such a question. As the qualitative data for the study, transcripts from participant interviews and comments from post-sort questionnaire comments were analyzed against the statement placement in the three factor arrays to further understand the meaning.

The survey window was four weeks to allow time for invitation, completion, follow-up, and additional solicitation. After seven days, a reminder email was sent to the participant list. A final reminder was sent seven days following the second reminder, notifying potential participants of the study closing within seven days. After four weeks of collecting, the survey was closed. By the end of the data collection process, a total of 21 respondents completed the Q-sort activity. This response rate was deemed acceptable as statistical reliability Q-studies has been found with as few as twelve completed Q Sorts (Gravely-Stack, et al., 2016).

**Data Analysis**

The first phase data analysis for the Q studies has been significantly automated using specialized, Q-method statistical software (Donner, 2001); however, the factor interpretation, apart from the statistical analysis, remains the most challenging stage of the method (McKeown & Thomas, 2013). The software that was used for this study was widely used Ken-Q Analysis, which is one of several statistical programs designed to meet the requirements of Q studies (Schmolck, 2018). Only these types of software programs provide the types of output reports required for interpretation of participants’ viewpoints (Newman & Ramlo, 2010). The software compares, groups, and summarizes the Q-sorts through multivariate data reduction techniques such as centroid factor analysis or principal components analysis, followed by varimax rotation (Zabalta et al., 2018). Even with the software, the researcher had the capability to dictate the types of factor analysis methods as well as rotation. These were determined once data were loaded into the system for analysis. This statistical calculation process produced a detailed report
with factor scores, factor loading, and discriminant statements needed to interpret the findings. The complimentary download Ken-Q Analysis was found at

The interpretation phase is the final step of data analysis for Q-studies and began with identifying the distinguishing statements, and high and low rankings between the composite Q-sorts based on the factor analysis findings. Distinguishing statements are statements found to be uniquely organized for each factor array (Gravley-Stack et al., 2016). Based on factor arrays identified from the factorial analyses of the first phase, the researcher grouped viewpoints based on key statements and rankings. With the groups of viewpoints clarified, finally, these distinguishing statements were further analyzed to identify meaning of the viewpoint. Lastly, the qualitative data from interviews with participants was used to expand understanding of the viewpoint and the quantitative data used to determine factor array meanings. Of the qualitative data from interviews,

**Reliability and Validity**

Reliability and validity are important to understand in Q-methodology as the nature of the method is both quantitative and qualitative. To address this, the method has been proven through test-retest studies, and found to produce consistent findings (Valenta & Wigger, 1997). Since its development, an essential idea behind Q-methodology is that only a limited number of distinct viewpoints exist on any topic. Moreover, as van Exel & de Graaf (2005) state, “any well-structured Q sample, containing the wide range of existing opinions on the topic, will reveal these perspectives” (p3). As such, Q-methodology’s small sample size and sorting techniques of subjective statements provide a path to reliability of its findings. Q-method’s most important type of reliability is replicability, more so than generalization. Since the purpose of Q studies is
to reveal these few points of view on a topic of study, the likelihood of replicating those same viewpoints – even when a different researcher develops the Q-Set – has been found to be high (McKeown & Thomas, 2014; van Exel & de Graaf, 2005; Watts & Stenner, 2012), thus rendering the method reliable.

As a quasi-quantitative and qualitative method, validity in Q-methodology is assessed differently than in wholly quantitative methods. Specifically, as Q-methodology seeks to identify the range of perceptions on a given topic, each participant’s complete Q sort is considered a valid expression of their opinion as there is no external criterion for which to assess a person’s perspectives (Valenta & Wigger, 1997). Further, Q-methodologists (van Exel & de Graaf, 2005) provide that thorough literature reviews and eliciting expert advice, while leaving statements pulled from these sources with little editing, adequately address content validity.

**Conclusion**

Based on the utility of Q-methodology across various disciplines and phenomena of study over the last 60 years, the literature is replete with evidence of appropriateness and reliability for measuring people’s perceptions. For this study, with the goal of identifying the perceptions of higher education diversity officers regarding effective leadership practices for institutional change, this research design, rooted in the Q-methodology, was best suited to meet these research goals.
CHAPTER 4 – FINDINGS

Introduction

This study focused on identifying campus diversity officers’ subjective perceptions of leadership practices that transform diversity culture on college and university campuses. To achieve this goal, this study employed a Q-methodology, which focuses on mapping people’s thoughts about a research topic, what ideas are important to them, and how those ideas are patterned (Lee, 2017). To identify campus diversity officer thoughts, or perceptions, on this topic, a 44-item Q-set was administered to diversity officers at campuses with institutional membership with the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. The Q-set asked respondents to sort diversity leadership practices according to their level of agreement with the effectiveness of each practice on a -5 to +5 scale.

In summary, this study found that among this representative population of diversity officers there are three viewpoints, or subjective perceptions, on effective leadership practices for diversity culture change. The three viewpoints revealed that these diversity officers believed that to change their diversity culture, campus leaders should employ leadership practices that: (a) leveraged the expertise and influence of a senior diversity administrator, (b) activated the entire campus community as participants in culture change efforts, or (c) addressed culture change as a political process influenced by internal and external stakeholders. The institution type where the respondent worked (private or public, four-year or two-year, and minority-serving or predominantly white institution) had minimal to no impact on these perceptions.

This chapter details the findings of the present study organized by the two overarching analytical processes used in Q-methodological studies. First, the statistical procedures used to reveal the viewpoints are described and their results are presented. Next, the qualitative data are
presented including data from interviews with viewpoint exemplars and responses from post-sort questionnaires. The data from these two processes then provide the naming conventions for the three viewpoints and their interpretations leading to the chapter conclusion. The findings of this study inform the literature on diversity leadership in higher education – a current gap that necessitates this study.

Data Analysis

Studies utilizing a Q methodology combine qualitative and quantitative research processes, which allow researchers to find shared viewpoints among a group of individuals (Brown, 2004). To reveal these viewpoints, Q methodology uses complex statistical analysis to maintain the relationship among themes within the data by minimizing the impact of the researcher’s frame of reference (Newman & Ramlo, 2010). Ken-Q Analysis statistical software, a web-based platform developed specifically for Q studies, was used to provide the quantitative analysis of the study data. As referenced in the previous chapter, this software is one of a small number of software designed specifically for Q studies and is commonly used for conducting such studies (Schmolck, 2018; Stenner & Watts, 2012). The software computed the statistical procedures necessary for Q studies: Correlation, factor analysis, and factor scores. Once all statistical procedures are completed, the resulting factors are interpreted to make meaning of the data, thus revealing the viewpoints on the effective diversity leadership in higher education as perceived by participating campus diversity officers.

Correlation

The first step in Q methodology data analysis is to generate a correlation matrix of the participants’ completed Q sorts. This correlation reveals the nature and extent of the relationship between any two Q sorts, which is an important point as Q methodology focuses on the Q sorts
as the population of interest, rather than the individuals completing the sort (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The raw data of the completed Q sorts begins to reveal commonalities between Q sorts. The participants’ sorts were correlated in a 21 X 21 correlation matrix, based on the number of participants in the study ($n = 21$) and demonstrated correlation coefficients ranging from -1.0 to +1.0 (perfectly opposing and perfectly aligned correlations respectively). Table 3 provides a representative sample of the complete correlation matrix.

The correlation matrix serves as a means to advance the factor analysis process rather than a primary analytic point in Q interpretation (Brown, 2004). However, these correlations begin to reveal alignment and misalignment in thought between the individual sorts. For example, with a correlation coefficient of .62, Participant Two and Participant Five show one of the strongest positive correlations in the matrix, meaning they share similarity in thought. Whereas Participant 3 and Participant 21 show the least amount of similarity in viewpoint in the study, with a negative correlation coefficient of -.22.

**Table 3**

*Representative Sample of Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Analysis

A factor is a grouping of correlated variables, which is used to reduce large data sets into smaller components that make for ease of analysis (Akhtar-Danesh, 2016). In Q studies, factors represent clusters of individuals whose viewpoints on the subject are similar. The factor analysis process began by conducting a centroid extraction to create an unrotated factor matrix based on the correlation between the factors. The factors were extracted using centroid as this is the widely accepted method of factor extraction in Q studies (McKeown & Thomas, 2014). The extraction process was conducted using the Ken-Q Analysis software and resulted in four factors. Table 4 provides the extracted factors and their values. Each factor extracted provided the first indication of participants who share similar perceptions and viewpoints on effective diversity leadership practices.

Since factors represent a grouping of like variables, extracting the appropriate number of factors is an important step in Q study analysis as the goal is to identify the full breadth of existing viewpoints on the research topic. There are several statistical procedures that a researcher can employ to come to a more concise determination of the total number of factors to extract for interpretation of the viewpoints represented in the target population (Brown, 1980). For the present study, the researcher used three statistical methods to make this determination: A scree test, Eigenvalue criterion, and factor loadings. These three methods were selected based on methodological standards as established by Watts and Stenner (2012) in their foundational text Doing Q Methodological Research: Theory, Method and Interpretation.

First, the researcher conducted a principal component analysis extraction of the factors to create a Scree Plot, which can be found in Figure 5. According to Q methodologists, as a partially subjective eye test, the point at which the Scree Plot slope noticeably changes is an
indicator of the appropriate number of factors that should be extracted and analyzed for meaning (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The Scree Plot in Figure 5 showed a change in slope at the second factor and again at the fourth factor, thus indicating that the study should result in a final solution somewhere between two and four factors. Although helpful as an indicator of the number of factors to extract, the subjectivity of this method further explains the need for numerous measures for assessing the number of factors to extract, which continue in the next step.

**Figure 5**

*Scree Plot*

Next, the factor Eigenvalues were analyzed for statistical significance. Q methodology employs the eigenvalue criterion, also referred to as the Kaiser-Guttman criterion, to determine the importance of a factor, which is estimated by the sum of its squared factor loadings (Thomas & McKeown, 2014; Watts & Stenner, 2012). Eigenvalues of at least 1.0 are used to determine the importance of an extracted factor as they indicate that the factor represents a common viewpoint among the participants. An Eigenvalue less than 1.0 signifies that the factor accounts for less
study variance than a single Q sort (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Of the four factors extracted by the 
software, three had Eigenvalues of at least 1.0. As shown in Table 4, Factors One, Two, and 
Three have Eigenvalues of 5.7814, 1.2497, and 1.4205, respectively. Each of these factors was 
considered statistically significant and acceptable to select for further analysis.

Table 4
Unrotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q-Sorts</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
<th>Factor Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6238*</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>0.1814</td>
<td>0.0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6515*</td>
<td>0.2074</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>-0.2572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2926</td>
<td>-0.3544</td>
<td>-0.5516*</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3232</td>
<td>-0.1546</td>
<td>-0.0691</td>
<td>-0.3673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6955*</td>
<td>0.0775</td>
<td>-0.0566</td>
<td>-0.2087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6628*</td>
<td>-0.0569</td>
<td>-0.0688</td>
<td>0.1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3532</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.489*</td>
<td>0.3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4312*</td>
<td>0.1444</td>
<td>-0.2682</td>
<td>-0.1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1971</td>
<td>0.3178</td>
<td>-0.1495</td>
<td>-0.0373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0367</td>
<td>-0.2817</td>
<td>-0.0196</td>
<td>0.1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6149*</td>
<td>-0.1708</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7132*</td>
<td>-0.1101</td>
<td>0.2368</td>
<td>-0.0341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3949</td>
<td>0.5521*</td>
<td>-0.2152</td>
<td>0.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7314*</td>
<td>0.4121*</td>
<td>-0.1213</td>
<td>0.2416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6586*</td>
<td>0.1446</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4365*</td>
<td>-0.1988</td>
<td>0.1676</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.659*</td>
<td>-0.2447</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>0.1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3532</td>
<td>0.1676</td>
<td>0.541*</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.7012*</td>
<td>-0.2235</td>
<td>0.2588</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2518</td>
<td>-0.2939</td>
<td>0.1854</td>
<td>-0.2636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.4334*</td>
<td>0.1847</td>
<td>0.4061*</td>
<td>0.1546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues  
5.7814 1.2497 1.4205 0.6808 
% Explained Variance  
28 6 7 3

*Note. Factor values flagged by * are significant at p < 0.01.

The third and final statistical method employed on the four factors was to analyze the 
significant factor loadings. Factor loadings refer to the value that expresses the extent to which 
each Q sort exemplifies, or is typical of, that factor (van Exel, 2005; Watts & Stenner, 2012). Q
methodology assumes that it is unlikely that someone will load completely on one factor and one factor alone, so factor loadings help to see to what extent a participant falls onto a factor (Brown, 2004).

Factors with two or more statistically significant factor loadings at the $p < 0.01$ level were kept for rotation and further analysis as is the rule of convention in Q methodology. A significant factor loading was calculated using the following equation used specifically in Q studies: $= 2.58 \times \left(1 / \sqrt{\text{no. of items in Q-set}}\right)$. There were 44 items in the Q-set for this study, resulting in a significance formula of $2.58 \times \left(1 / \sqrt{44}\right)$. When computed, this resulted in any value that was $\pm 0.39$ was statistically significant at the $p < 0.01$ level. Referring again to Table 4, the first three factors all had at least two Q sorts that loaded significantly. Factor Four had no Q sorts that loaded significantly. Thus, three factors were carried forward to the next phase of data analysis in Q methodology – factor score calculation.

Statistically speaking, the full range of meaning and variability present in the study is known as study variance. The basic function of factor analysis is to explain as much as we can about the relationships that exist in the factor matrix. Watts and Stenner (2012) state that an essential characteristic of the final set of factors is that they should account for as much of the variance in the original Q sorts as possible. The combination of both high Eigenvalues and variances indicates or confirms the appropriateness of the factor solution. The guidance in Q studies is that combined variance in the region of 35% – 40% or above is a sound solution (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 105). This study's three factors account for 40% of the total study variance, thus indicating the accuracy of a three-factor solution.
Factor Arrays and Score Calculation

The original set of factors is of little immediate interest to the researcher, and only provides the raw materials for examining the viewpoints from vantage points of interest in a Q study (Brown, 1980). This is because in Q studies, interpretations are based on factor scores and factor arrays that result from rotating the original factors to a position that highlights, or brings into focus, the connection between viewpoints. To calculate factor scores and create factor arrays, the researcher rotated the three factors using the Ken-Q Analysis software. There is an infinite number of ways to rotate factors, but the most common and acceptable method in Q studies is a varimax rotation (Watts & Stenner, 2012). As such, the three factors underwent a varimax rotation. The results of this process are represented in Table 5.

**Table 5**
*Rotated Factor Matrix with Defining Sorts Flagged*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part. No.</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4306</td>
<td>0.4048</td>
<td>0.2716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4663</td>
<td>0.4989*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1461</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.7016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2973</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
<td>0.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5251*</td>
<td>0.4382</td>
<td>0.1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.543*</td>
<td>0.3181</td>
<td>0.2264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1292</td>
<td>0.2542</td>
<td>0.5416*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.4222*</td>
<td>0.2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.0167</td>
<td>0.402*</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1273</td>
<td>-0.1992</td>
<td>0.1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6399*</td>
<td>0.1306</td>
<td>0.0766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7313*</td>
<td>0.2049</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.7114*</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4035</td>
<td>0.7435*</td>
<td>0.0621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5162*</td>
<td>0.4368</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.506*</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.0445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6659*</td>
<td>0.1237</td>
<td>0.1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4552</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>-0.4664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.7728*</td>
<td>0.1015</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of factor rotation is to maximize the purity of saturation of as many Q sorts as possible on one or the other of the extracted factors (McKeown & Thomas, 2014). In other words, the goal of rotating the factors is to achieve Q sorts with high loadings on one factor, with near-zero loadings on the other factors. Once rotated, the factor scores indicate the amount of adherence each Q sort has to each factor. Further, the factor scores tell the researcher the extent to which that particular sort aligns with the composite Q sort, or factor array, thus illuminating which of the participants most represent the viewpoint. This information was used to determine which participants to target for a follow-up interview and strengthen the factor interpretation.

As is depicted in Table 5, Q sorts that loaded significantly on one factor and one factor alone, meaning they could be relied upon as representing the viewpoint, were auto-flagged by the Ken-Q Analysis software as defining Q sorts. Defining sorts and the per-factor specifics are discussed in detail in the next section on factor array interpretation. However, for this phase of analysis, it should be noted that 17 Q sorts loaded significantly on one of the three factors. Q sorts that were confounded, meaning that they loaded significantly on more than one factor (i.e., had values ± 0.39), were Q sorts 1 and 18. These confounded Q sorts can be interpreted to mean that these participants’ views on diversity leadership practices were shared among two or more of the viewpoints. These participants’ Q sorts are not included in the final interpretation as they pollute the data used to understand the viewpoint. Lastly, Q sorts that did not load significantly to any of the factors were 4 and 10. For these two sorts, not loading significantly on a factor can be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part. No.</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3953*</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>0.0354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.4595*</td>
<td>0.2417</td>
<td>-0.3425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Explained Variance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Factor values flagged by * are significant at \( p < 0.01 \).
understood as the participants each had unique viewpoints on the topic that were not shared by the other participants.

Factor arrays constitute empirical generalizations of a subjective viewpoint shared by participants whose individual sorts load significantly on the same factor (McKeown & Thomas, 2014). Factor arrays are a composite Q sort that has been controlled for by the weight of each of the factor loadings. These factor arrays allow the researcher to identify the Q-set items that set viewpoints apart from the others. This information then sets the stage for the beginnings of an analysis of the pattern of thought that arises specifically to each of the three viewpoints or groupings.

As an additional level of verification, the researcher considered the intercorrelation between the rotated factors scores to indicate that the appropriate number of factor arrays were being carried forward for interpretation. These numbers are shown in the Factor Score Correlation matrix presented in Table 6. The table shows Factor One correlated to Factor Two at 0.5144; Factors One and Three at 0.2821, and Factors Two and Three at 0.2525. Since the correlation between Factors One and Two was notably higher than the correlation between the other factors, the researcher used the recommended measure from Watts and Stenner (2012) to rely on the combination of the Eigenvalues, factor significance, and combined variance to check for appropriateness of a three-factor solution. Since the three factors solution met three of the four measures for appropriateness, excluding intercorrelation, and would provide the greatest inclusion of Q sorts, and subsequently, viewpoints, the researcher kept the three factors solution for interpretation as this result is generally considered acceptable in Q studies (Watts & Stenner, 2012).
Table 6

*Factor Score Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5144</td>
<td>0.2821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>0.5144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>0.2821</td>
<td>0.2525</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the factor arrays (see Appendix B), the z-scores for each sort were transformed into the original Q plot rankings from -5 to +5. This conversion helps with understanding the meaning of each array. Since the z-scores represent how far and in what direction the statement deviates from the distribution mean, the numbers can be translated and understood on the continuum of “Most Effective” (+5) to “Least Effective” (-5). Taken as a whole, the composite Q sort shows where each statement falls under each factor.

The culmination of the statistical methods detailed in this section has essentially reduced 44 statements and 21 completed Q sorts into three factors. These factors represent the three distinct points of view about diversity leadership practices that transform campus diversity culture from the standpoint of campus diversity officers in higher education. The factor arrays represent an overall Q sort for the participants who, all combined, loaded on the factors (see Appendix B). These arrays illuminate the pattern of thoughts that arise specific to each of the factors and serve as the primary means for interpretation.

**Participant Interviews**

To enhance factor array interpretation, participants who were found to both (a) define a viewpoint based on the factor array and (b) indicated on their post-sort questionnaire that they were willing to be interviewed, were targeted for follow-up interviews. These interviewed participants are identified throughout the following section as Factor Exemplars. One interview was conducted for each factor. The interview format was semi-structured, thus allowing follow-
up questions according to the respondents’ answers to questions. Interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, and reviewed by respondents to confirm the accuracy of the transcript.

**Factor Array Interpretation**

With the factor analyses completed, the final phase of data analysis is making meaning of the factor arrays using the factor analysis results and incorporating the qualitative data collected. The data used for the qualitative analysis included (a) the rank order of each factor’s statements, (b) the consensus statements between the sorts, (c) comments from the post-sort questionnaire, and (d) the distinguishing statements for each factor. Distinguishing statements are particularly useful for qualitative analysis because they are statements that placed in a factor array in locations that are significantly different for that point of view from the other factor arrays (McKeown & Thomas, 2014).

**Factor One: All Hail the Chief Diversity Officer**

**Demographic Information**

A total of 10 participants loaded significantly on Factor One, representing 21% of the study variance. Seven of the respondents worked for predominantly white institutions, while three worked at minority serving institutions. Lastly, eight respondents indicated that they worked at public institutions, while two respondents who loaded significantly on Factor One worked at private institutions. The Factor One Exemplar interviewed worked at a public, four-year institution with a predominantly white student body.

**Factor One Highest and Lowest Rankings**

Figure 6 is the model factor array, or composite Q sort, for Factor One. A model factor array represents a Q sort if an ideal person whose viewpoints purely exemplify this factor were to complete a sorting activity. The Factor One array is a composite of the Q sorts from the ten
individuals who significantly loaded onto this factor, post-rotation. The lowest ranked diversity leadership practices can be found on the far left side of the array and is further described in Table 7. As displayed in the first row of Figure 6, Statements 14 and 37 ranked as the least and most effective practices, respectively. A review of Table 7 will show that these statements correspond with the highest and lowest z-scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6**

*Model Array for Factor One*

Table 7 provides a list of statements that ranked the highest and lowest for Factor One, focusing on those at the most extreme ends of the plot from -3 and +3, as these statements demonstrated the strongest and weakest level of agreement and disagreement for the factor, which in Q study interpretation, is the most useful for understanding the meaning of the
viewpoint (Brown, 2004). The highest agreement statements represent the practices that are most indicative of ensuring organizational structures, including positions, policies, and accountability measures, are in place to support diversity culture change. These rankings mean that the Factor One respondents perceived these practices to have the most impact on transformative diversity culture change. On the lower end of the rankings, which is consistent with the distinguishing statements and post-sort interview with the Factor One Exemplar, practices related to (a) diversity rhetoric, (b) reactive measures once diversity-related crises have erupted, and (c) external influence were the least effective in advancing transformative diversity culture change.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>Sort Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Create senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing DEI efforts.</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Require campus units to develop strategic plans that yield measurable progress on campus-DEI goals.</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make the required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives.</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Incorporate a framework for DEI progress into the strategic plan.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process.</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hire new people who have demonstrated commitment to DEI issues.</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Develop shared metrics and definitions for DEI and include as a goal for student learning and professional development.</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Communicate the synergistic relationship between DEI initiatives, programs, projects, and individual work throughout the campus.</td>
<td>-1.065</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Host town hall meetings to hold critical conversations between institutional actors.</td>
<td>-1.236</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Include diverse images and content in traditional events, publications, outreach materials, and other avenues that help demonstrate and make visible the success of campus DEI efforts.</td>
<td>-1.239</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas.</td>
<td>-1.276</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow.</td>
<td>-1.501</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants who share this viewpoint also regarded off-campus entities as being of little use for furthering campus-based diversity efforts (Statement 14: -5, Statement 28: -4). With a z score of -1.765, establishing an external diversity-related advisory council for every school and college was the lowest ranked leadership practice for this viewpoint. The interview with the Factor One Exemplar summed up this sentiment by emphasizing the necessity of leaders employing a “metric-driven strategic approach” to diversity culture change that begins with building the institution’s internal structure before addressing external matters (personal communication, 2020).

**Factor One Distinguishing Statements**

Table 8 shows the distinguishing statements for this factor. Distinguishing statements are those which place in significantly different locations along the opinion continuum for any two factors (McKeown and Thomas, 2014). As is indicated by the rankings at zero, this viewpoint was mostly neutral on practices related to words or messages about diversity, equity, and inclusion to advance campus diversity culture change. In fact, as indicated by negative rankings on Statements 27, 36, and 44, the viewpoint seems to reject more abstract forms of diversity work where there was an emphasis on the symbols, traditions, and rituals of institutions as the focal point of the change effort.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One Q-Sort Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hire new people who have demonstrated commitment to DEI issues.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Regularly conduct and respond to climate surveys that are commissioned by the president's office.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed, faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Create high-profile events for the campus community to celebrate DEI success.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Use speeches and activities to role model and clearly articulate personal vision and commitment to DEI change efforts.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Create a hybrid DEI division that integrates diversity with other core institutional responsibilities.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decentralize decision making so that people who bring diverse perspectives and have the greatest amount of information are involved in the process.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Communicate the synergistic relationship between DEI initiatives, programs, projects, and individual work throughout the campus.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish partnerships with local businesses for experiential learning for opportunities for students to support community and economic development goals.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor One’s strong disagreement with using student protest as learning opportunities (Statement 28: -4) indicates that the viewpoint regards leadership practices that are reactive measures as least effective. In their interview, the Factor One Exemplar expressed that they have experienced these protests to be exploitive of student energy and placed undue emotional tax and burden on students to change the campus culture. Another participant commented that the diversity practice was regressive for change in that, in their experience, protests often lead to division instead of understanding.

The practices that fell among the least effective indicated that external influence was not necessary or helpful for transforming diversity culture (Statements 39, -3; 24, -4; 14, -5). Further, reactive measures and rhetoric were not particularly important to this viewpoint for culture change. This is indicative of Transformational Leadership’s emphasis on the leader to set the tone with their actions, particularly the component of Idealized Influence, where the leader models the desired transformational behavior as a means to change the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Relying on outside entities to advance culture change impacts a leader’s ability to demonstrate their commitment to the change rather than someone or something outside of the institution leading that effort. Further clarifying this point, Factor One Exemplar commented that outside influence helps, but the leader has to do the work internally first, meaning that outside comes in later after the leader has built the internal foundation for the work.

**Factor Defining Interpretation**

As a viewpoint on leadership practices for transformative diversity culture change, the set of leadership practices that define Factor One, as explained below, add up to the need for leaders to appoint a senior diversity officer and provide them the resources to lead change efforts. From a holistic analysis of the rankings, comments, interview, and statistical output, three main
characteristics emerged as representing the viewpoint. First, leaders should establish a senior diversity officer position and give them proper authority to carry out the functions of the role (Statement 37: +5) while ensuring the role is adequately funded with an operating budget for efforts (Statement 12: +4). This emphasis on the senior diversity officer position was seen throughout the post-sort questionnaire responses and highlighted further in the interview with Factor One Exemplar who stated

I think we are even seeing in this moment now that there are so many [leaders] that say they’re committed to doing this work at an institutional level. Say that they have a strong social justice hand. Say they're committed to racial equity. But because it’s a collateral responsibility, until they’ve actually identified a point person that this is their sole responsibility to help lead, collaboratively, these efforts – that are basically being paid to think about this 24 seven, it’s very rare in my experience that you see the progress that people want, and I think that’s why we see so many more CDO positions popping up. (personal communication, 2020)

Applying the factor analysis and data from Table 7, with a $z$ score of 2.046, creating senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing diversity efforts was the highest ranked leadership practice for people who share this viewpoint. However, beyond the senior diversity officer role, this viewpoint highly ranked the effectiveness of practices where positions and personnel transactions could be leveraged to advance culture change. This included adding diversity objectives to performance evaluations (Statement 17: +3) and hiring new people based on their commitment to diversity issues (Statement 18: +3).
The second characteristic of the viewpoint was that leaders should build an infrastructure to support diversity culture change work. Incorporating diversity related goals into student learning and professional development was among the most effective practices for culture change, and building said infrastructure (Statement 29, +3). Keeping with this practice of setting goals as a means to advance change, it was important to incorporate a framework for diversity, equity, and inclusion into the campus strategic plan (Statement 35: +3). As one participant confirmed, practices that had a strategic component were “…the most important in driving institutional change” (personal communication, 2020).

The third characteristic of Factor One was that leaders should ensure campus policies include accountability structures for advancing diversity change efforts and goals. Among the most effective practices was requiring unit-level strategic plans that connect back to the campus diversity, equity, and inclusion goals (Statement 2: +4). Several participants ranked this diversity leadership practice as the most effective, commenting in the post-sort questionnaire that campuses are driven by data, so creating measurable goals that result in concrete data provides a tangible target for the campus to work toward. Other accountability structures such as (a) climate surveys (Statement 23: +2), (b) offices and positions for members of non-dominant groups to access resources and report issues (Statement 26: +1), and (c) a president’s commission on diversity, equity, and inclusion (Statement 42: +1), were all deemed important leadership practices for advancing diversity culture change.

One ranking that seems to depart from the factor’s strong agreement with support for the diversity officer role was the low ranking on Statement 40 (-2), which provides diversity officers with an expanding portfolio of campus responsibilities. In comparison, Factor One placed this statement lower than the other two factors. Factor One Exemplar clarified this placement,
explaining that they perceived that varying the diversity officer’s portfolio has been known to weaken their effectiveness because the work is too siloed and differentiated to have an impact.

Factor Two: Change Takes All of Us

Demographics

A total of five participants loaded significantly on Factor Two, representing 12% of the study variance. Two of the respondents worked for predominantly white institutions, while three worked at minority serving institutions. Further, two participants were community colleges. Of particular interest, three of the 21 study participants identified as working at a community college. With two of the three community college diversity officers loading to this factor indicates a possible connection between institutional type and viewpoint on diversity culture change. The remaining three participants worked at four-year institutions – two were at public institutions, and one at a private institution. Factor Two Exemplar interviewed worked at a predominantly white community college.

Distinguishing Statements

Table 9 shows the distinguishing statements for this factor. In line with the high and low rankings, the practices that this viewpoint scored notably higher and lower than the other two viewpoints showed an emphasis on a distributed leadership model of diversity culture change. For example, Factor Two was the only viewpoint that highly ranked diversity leadership practices that related to collaborative approaches to these efforts, including practices that involved any committee work. With a ranking of +4 in the array, Factor Two ranked the leadership practice of engaging faculty in a committee to review inclusive teaching and learning practices among the most effective for transformational diversity culture change. Factors One and Three ranked this same practice at 0 and -3, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor2 Q-Sort Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Engage in a diversity mapping project to map curricular and co-curricular DEI efforts to determine the extent to which diversity is embedded within the institution.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop a shared DEI vision statement that receives input from multiple stakeholders and is based on a shared understanding of where the institution should be going and why that direction is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Create a hybrid DEI division that integrates diversity with other core institutional responsibilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop venues (i.e., learning communities, networks, cross-functional teams) for collaborative dialogue among academic and administrative stakeholders to cultivate inclusive learning climates.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Create senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing DEI efforts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Work with campus constituent groups to fashion helpful hiring procedures for recruiting people of color in faculty ranks and upper administration positions.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish partnerships with local businesses for experiential learning for opportunities for students to support community and economic development goals.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enlist senior leaders to learn practices at peer institutions for creating more responsive environments for students from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actively engage and learn the campus culture by meeting with faculty, staff, and students.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also distinguishing the Factor Two viewpoint from the others is the expectation placed on the senior diversity officer role. While the other viewpoints ranked hiring a senior diversity officer as an effective leadership practice, for Factor Two participants, this practice was deemed neither effective nor ineffective. In analyzing this neutral stance on the practice of appointing a senior diversity officer while ranking highly practices that involve numerous campus actors in diversity efforts, this neutrality was interpreted as the viewpoint emphasizes sharing the work among many rather than an individual. This interpretation was confirmed by the Factor Two Exemplar in their interview, expressing that everyone on the campus has a responsibility in the diversity change effort. Specifically, they stated

I think the role of the [diversity and inclusion] lead who, whether that’s a vice president, whether it’s a Chief Diversity Officer, whoever it is, is to help build [diversity efforts] out. Right? What does that look like on the campus? What does that mean for these different entities across campus and helping them think about that differently, and use that lens and develop those strategies? You might need to develop some of [the strategies] for them because they don’t know how to yet and that’s okay. But it can’t be the work of a singular person, or even a singular office.

(personal communication, 2020)

**Factor Two Highest and Lowest Rankings**

Figure 7 is the model array for Factor Two. It was characterized by high rankings on practices that required investment of campus resources into diversity learning and professional development. These high rankings could be explained by the preference for distributed leadership of the work in that if more institutional actors are responsible for change efforts beyond diversity officers, this requires more people to have the skill set and understanding of the
work. This reliance on a broad range of organizational members is supported in the culture change literature in that it requires the buy-in and support of organizational members, especially those entrenched, such as long-term faculty and staff who have been on campus for decades, to be willing to engage in a new way of operating that supports the change effort (Simplicio, 2012).

Yet another indicator of the factor’s reliance on shared work and distributed leadership of diversity change efforts is this viewpoint’s high rankings on practices that incentivized individuals and units that engage in change efforts. The combination of the high rankings on practices related to collaborative efforts, professional development, and incentives could reasonably be interpreted as support for a shared work approach to culture change. In the post-sort questionnaire, one participant stated

When senior leaders are required to regularly report out on their [diversity, equity and inclusion] efforts, it keeps DEI at the top of their priority list which means it is also at the top of the list for their teams. Everyone knows that even if they do not value DEI, the campus does and therefore resources (time, effort, planning, strategy, action, measures) are devoted to it. No one can say, ‘Oh this is someone else’s job.’ It makes DEI the work of everyone in every area. (personal communication, 2020)
Figure 7
Model Array for Factor Two

Factor Two had weak disagreement, ranging from 0 to -2, with diversity leadership practices that placed more emphasis on changing campus diversity-related artifacts such as climate surveys, brochures, mission statements, or diversity-related policies, such as hiring policies, governance structures, or policy review studies. This sentiment was echoed in the post-sort interview questionnaire, where a participant provided further explanation on the perceived inaction of such practices. Explaining their ranking on Statement Five, the participant commented that, “I think vision statements are symbolic, but if the action doesn’t match the rhetoric, they remain just words. They have value, but very little when compared to metrics and resources” (personal communication, 2020).
Table 10 provides a list of the statements that were ranked the highest and lowest for Factor Two, highlighting the statements at the most extreme ends of the plot from -3 and +3 through each end. These statements were used because they demonstrate the strongest and weakest level of agreement and disagreement for the factor, as is common in Q methodology factor interpretation (Brown, 2004).

**Table 10**

*Highest and Lowest Ranked Statements for Factor Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>Sort Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Require campus units to develop strategic plans that yield measurable progress on campus-DEI goals.</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make the required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives.</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed, faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Realign data collection efforts to measure student success disaggregated by race, gender, social class, and other relevant characteristics.</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Invest in systematic and sustained diversity education and organizational learning activities for students, administrators, faculty and staff.</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals.</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Require senior leaders to regularly report out on their efforts to address ongoing DEI concerns.</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enlist senior leaders to learn practices at peer institutions for creating more responsive environments for students from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Establish an external DEI advisory council for every school and college.</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Create high-profile events for the campus community to celebrate DEI success.</td>
<td>-1.283</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Host town hall meetings to hold critical conversations between institutional actors.</td>
<td>-1.359</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Include diverse images and content in traditional events, publications, outreach materials, and other avenues that help demonstrate and make visible the success of campus DEI efforts.</td>
<td>-1.432</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actively engage and learn the campus culture by meeting with faculty, staff, and students.</td>
<td>-1.874</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A general observation of this viewpoint was the emphasis on the classroom and student experience. One participant stated in the post-sort questionnaire that practices they believed were missing from the options were those related to leaders listening and implementing changes based on the student perception. This emphasis is supported by the additional high ranking practices that focused on classroom change, inclusive learning resources, and listening to students. This emphasis on the student experience was reinforced by Factor Two Exemplar who stated, “To me, this is about creating an environment where our students can actually feel empowered in their learning and feel that they are reflected in our learning. So it is ensuring that there is, in fact, diversity and inclusion in their curriculum” (personal communication, 2020).

As can be found in Table 10, with a z-score of 2.301, requiring campus units to develop diversity strategic plans in relation to campus diversity related goals was the highest ranked leadership practice among participants who share this viewpoint. This statement's high ranking is characteristic of the viewpoint and the preference for practices that support change efforts as a shared responsibility across the campus. As such, requiring divisions, colleges, and departments to create plans, various individuals are involved in, and held accountable to, campus culture change.

Also found in Table 10, with a z-score of -1.882, the practice of using speeches and activities role modeling and communicating commitment to change efforts was the lowest ranked, or least effective, leadership practice for this viewpoint. When asked to explain their perception of this leadership practice, the Factor Two Exemplar stated that it is important for
leaders to vocalize their commitment to diversity culture change to set the tone, especially from the campus president, but it is not effective in changing diversity culture. They explained that role-modeling is good, but without the leader understanding how other people on the campus perceive the work, then role modeling is only performative. Ineffectiveness of role-modeling and leader rhetoric was a common theme for the viewpoint.

**Factor Defining Interpretation**

The diversity officers who defined Factor Two perceived effective diversity leadership practices as those where diversity efforts were distributed among various campus actors to achieve the desired culture change. Based on a holistic analysis of the data collected for this factor, three main characteristics emerged as important leadership practices of the viewpoint. The first was that the campus should distribute leadership for diversity culture change efforts across the campus. It takes the whole of the campus community to advance the diversity agenda. Practices involving diversity education for students, administrators, faculty, and staff (Statement 7, +3) and forming committees to determine the path forward for diversity culture change (Statement 21, +4) collectively fell among the highest ranked for the factor.

The second characteristic is that leadership practices related to changing the campus artifacts to reflect diversity culture change goals are not effective. Organizational culture change scholars (Schein, 2010; Williams & Clowney, 2007) caution against culture change efforts that call for alterations to organization artifacts, expressing that these efforts fail to penetrate the organization’s normative behavior. As these authors explain, changing campus artifacts, but failing to interrupt the logic that fueled the existence of said artifacts (i.e., brochures, websites, mission statements), will only lead to temporary change. Among the lowest ranked leadership practices in Factor Two were those related to changing the mission statement (Statement 32, -1),
reviewing policies (Statements 31, -1; 25, -2; 23, -2), and including diverse images in campus marketing materials (Statement 11, -4).

The factor was also characterized by an aversion to rhetoric and establishing new campus entities in response to diversity change efforts. Most practices that were dialogue heavy or resulted in gathering people to discuss diversity, equity, and inclusion issues, such as town halls and listening tours, were all ranked among the least effective practices. Specifically, practices that called for leaders to engage campus groups to discuss diversity, equity, and inclusion issues (Statements 15, -3; 27, -3; 3, -4; 36, -5) were deemed the least effective practices for culture change. Post-sort questionnaire comments revealed that participants found such practices to be negatively political in such a way the perpetuates sameness, rather than valuing diversity. One participant commented regarding Statement Three (-3) where leaders sit with different campus constituencies to learn campus culture from their perspective, “learning the current campus culture, which is likely already embedded with structural inequity, does not support a change in culture. Rather, it assumes that everyone need to assimilate to the culture as it exists. It is a continuation of ‘well, that’s how we do it here’” (personal communication, 2020).

**Factor Three: Minding the Politics of Diversity**

**Demographics**

Two participants loaded significantly on Factor Three, representing seven percent of the study variance. Although a small number, Q methodologists deemed it acceptable and expected that a smaller number of participants would load on any factors beyond one (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Both respondents worked for predominantly white institutions. One worked at a public institution, the other at a private institution. Factor Three Exemplar worked at a private, predominately white institution.
**Distinguishing Statements**

Table 11 shows the distinguishing statements for Factor Three. Three of the statistically significant distinguishing statements for Factor Three (Statements 39, 24, and 14) demonstrate the factor’s value for practices that leverage external stakeholders to advance diversity culture. Unique to this factor, leadership practices that related to engaging external bodies were ranked among the highest as the most effective practices. The interview with Factor Three Exemplar revealed that, from their experience, when external stakeholders are paying attention to a campus issue, those issues tend to get the resources and effort put into them from the campus community. They further shared that one cannot separate politics from people. As such, all diversity culture change work, because it is people centered, must be political. Leaders trying to be apolitical is not realistic because they are people with opinions who should use their power and influence, internally and externally, to advance culture change.

**Table 11**  
*Distinguishing Statements for Factor Three*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Three Q-Sort Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Incorporate DEI in the formal mission statement of the institution.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Actively engage in campus governance structures and constituencies including faculty, staff, and student senates.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhance mentoring opportunities and processes for students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented groups.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Create a hybrid DEI division that integrates diversity with other core institutional responsibilities.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Review policies and scholarships to ensure alignment with DEI values.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish partnerships with local businesses for experiential learning for opportunities for students to support community and economic development goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Establish an external DEI advisory council for every school and college.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinguishing this viewpoint from the others, there were negative rankings on accountability measures, including performance evaluations (17, -2) and incentivizing engagement with the diversity change efforts (20, -2). A participant provided an explanation of the perception on these types of leadership practices from their campus experience, “Many people have no desire to get involved in DEI as it is not their passion, therefore, holding them accountable for something they may not be vested in has not proven to change commitment to DEI, enhance it, embed it, etc.”

**Factor Three Highest and Lowest Rankings**

Table 12 provides the highest and lowest ranked practices for Factor Three. With a z score of 1.965 as can be found in Table 12, incorporating diversity, equity, and inclusion in the institution's formal mission statement was ranked as the most effective diversity leadership practice from the perception of the viewpoint. As reflected in the characteristics for this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Three Q-Sort Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Require campus units to develop strategic plans that yield measurable progress on campus-DEI goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Develop shared metrics and definitions for DEI and include as a goal for student learning and professional development.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed, faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Include Inclusive Excellence and DEI in other prominent speeches, events, and initiatives that are not directly focused on diversity.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
viewpoint, leveraging the mission statement, which is a formal structure of the institution, is aligned with the viewpoint’s tendency highly to regard leadership practices that use existing campus structures to advance change. A participant confirmed this perception in their post-sort questionnaire stating, “This gives anyone working on DEI efforts more strategic and political power because it is a part of the very life of the University. It is usually vetted by the Board and Senior Administration before adopted. Therefore, when the University is not fully realizing its mission, the DEI person can use this politically” (personal communication, 2020).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>Sort Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Incorporate DEI in the formal mission statement of the institution.</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Publicly and adequately respond to racial and hate-based incidents.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Actively engage in campus governance structures and constituencies including faculty, staff,</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and student senates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Create senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing DEI efforts.</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make the required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives.</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhance mentoring opportunities and processes for students, staff, and faculty from</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>underrepresented groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Require senior leaders to regularly report out on their efforts to address ongoing DEI</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop venues (i.e., learning communities, networks, cross-functional teams) for</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaborative dialogue among academic and administrative stakeholders to cultivate inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning climates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed, faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Include Inclusive Excellence and DEI in other prominent speeches, events, and initiatives</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that are not directly focused on diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Publicly acknowledge individuals who are actively engaged and support diversity across the</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Z-score</td>
<td>Sort Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Use speeches and activities to role model and clearly articulate personal vision and commitment to DEI change efforts.</td>
<td>-1.644</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution.</td>
<td>-1.822</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Create high-profile events for the campus community to celebrate DEI success.</td>
<td>-1.857</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the opposite end of the rankings show in Table 12, with a z score of -1.857, creating high profile events for the campus community to celebrate diversity, equity, and inclusion success was ranked as the least effective diversity leadership practice for this viewpoint.

Comments from the post-sort questionnaire revealed that these types of recognition events were deemed to be the lowest form of diversity work, describing these events as “usually a ‘one off’ type of event where everyone gets to taste a new food or see people in colorful costumes. They learn nothing about valuing people for who they are and what differences they bring to the table” (personal communication, 2020).

Figure 8 is the model array, or composite Q sort, for Factor Three. Collectively, the highest ranking practices, as indicated by their placement on the right side of the Factor Three array in Figure 8, related to using existing institutional structures, mentorship, and budgetary resources to advance culture change. The Factor Three Exemplar regarded these practices as indicative of the campus’ identity in who the institution is and what it values. The Exemplar explained that an institution’s values are best demonstrated in how the institution allocates its resources, and when that allocation of resources went toward diversity culture change, the change efforts get done. Further, when describing their perception of the high rankings on leadership practices related to mentorship, the viewpoint Exemplar explained that institutions with leaders who are genuinely committed to diversity culture change also mind which
individuals are going into the leadership pipeline and ensure that the leaders have the right people in the room when making decisions (Statement 1, +3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8**
*Model Array for Factor Three*

The lowest ranked diversity leadership practices can be found on the far left side of the array and is further described in Table 13. These practices, which are perceived as the least effective according to this viewpoint, are comprised of practices related to establishing new diversity-related committees, infusing diversity, equity, and inclusion language into speeches, and hosting related events. Factor Three Exemplar expressed that these practices were “photo opportunities” for diversity work that do not get to the core of the work necessary for culture change. Described specifically in both the interview and post-sort questionnaire response as
“window dressings,” these practices were perceived as lacking the depth to achieve sustainable change in the diversity culture. While these practices include leaders expressing their desire to diversity culture change, these practices do not include the actions that will result in actualizing said change.

**Factor Defining Interpretation**

As the most politically leaning viewpoint of the three, the diversity officers whose perceptions defined this factor perceive that the politics of diversity require that leaders employ practices where they leverage internal relationships and external stakeholders to advance diversity culture change. Based on a comprehensive analysis of the data collected, three main characteristics of the viewpoint emerged. First, there was agreement on the effectiveness of practices that leveraged (a) campus budgetary and personnel resources (Statements 37, +4; 12, +3) and (b) engaging outside stakeholders to advance campus change efforts (Statements 4, +4; 39, +2).

Second, the factor was characterized by high agreement on the effectiveness of practices that relied on formal and existing institutional structures as the arena for decision making on change efforts. Statement 43, which suggested that leaders be involved in campus governance structures, was ranked among the most effective practice with a rank of +4. When combined with agreement on the effectiveness of other structure-based practices, including (a) regular reports to the campus on efforts (Statement 30, +3), (b) creating diversity, equity, and inclusion divisions (Statement 40, +2), and (c) reviewing policies and scholarships to ensure alignment with campus diversity values (Statement 31, +20), this viewpoint of effective diversity leadership practices leans toward using campus structures to advance change.
The third and final characteristic of Factor Three was leader investment in building relationships with various individuals and groups to advance change efforts. Kezar (2008) determined that developing coalitions and identifying advocates were found to be effective practices for transforming diversity culture. These collegial practices were consistently ranked among the most effective for the factor. Participants who defined this factor positively placed (a) coalition building efforts (Statement 8, +1), (b) sharing in decision making to bring in diverse perspectives (Statement 19, +1), and (c) working with campus groups to solve issues with compositional diversity in the workforce (Statement 25, +1). Building relationships and working with others were effective practices for advancing change within this viewpoint.

**Consensus Statements**

Consensus statements are statements for which all participants, regardless of their factor loading significance, agreed on their importance and ranked them similarly across the completed Q sorts. Of the 44 statements in the Q sort, eight were consensus statements, meaning that they did not distinguish between any pair of factors. Table 13 provides the consensus statements for this study. Among the statements with which all participants generally strongly disagreed or found to be least effective were those related to hosting celebratory diversity events. Williams (2013) speaks about the need for diversity change efforts to include an element of celebration to address the symbolic nature of culture change. With all participants regarding such practices as having little impact on sustainable culture change, they could be missing out on the symbolic aspect of campus change efforts.
### Table 13  
**Consensus Statements – Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Two Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stmt No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One Q-Sort Value</th>
<th>Factor Two Q-Sort Value</th>
<th>Factor Three Q-Sort Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Include diverse images and content in traditional events, publications, outreach materials, and other avenues that help demonstrate and make visible the success of campus DEI efforts.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make the required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Supplant legislatively prohibited race-based admissions processes with those that achieve DEI goals using other determining characteristics (i.e., admitting top percentage of in-state high school graduating classes).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>Establish a central ‘Strategic Diversity’ fund with annual budget carryover funds provided by campus units.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>Require senior leaders to regularly report out on their efforts to address ongoing DEI concerns.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>Host town hall meetings to hold critical conversations between institutional actors.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>Review policies to identify and address the issues that racialized minority faculty face.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Publicly acknowledge individuals who are actively engaged and support diversity across the campus.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All listed statements are non-significant at p > 0.01, and those flagged with an * are also non-significant at p > 0.05.

The statements that had the greatest positive consensus in their effectiveness were those related to allocating budgetary resources to fund diversity change efforts. Comments from post-sort questionnaire revealed that respondents stressed the importance of leaders providing institutional budgetary resources to see through change efforts. Transformational leaders change their culture by understanding it and then realigning the organization’s structures, assumptions, and values (Bass & Avolio, 1993). When engaging in a change effort, part of the realignment is reallocation of institutional resources, thus explaining participants’ agreement on the resource-based statements, ensuring that diversity change efforts are funded.
Lastly, participants universally placed Statement 16 regarding race-based admissions practices and its juxtaposition with the external environment as a neutral diversity leadership practice. Factor Two ranked the practice at one, while Factors One and Three each ranked the practice at zero. Collectively, this meant that participants found the practice neither effective nor ineffective. The neutral position on this practice is problematic as the practice represents a more complex relationship between the campus diversity environment and the outside higher education landscape in which the campus sits. The diversity culture change literature (Chun & Evans, 2019; Kezar, 2019; Williams, 2013) stresses that campuses are rarely unaffected by the happenings of the broader community and the environment surrounding it. As such, change efforts can be derailed by new legislation passed at the national or state levels. To achieve sustainable culture change, the literature states that campus leaders should also consider what is occurring off campus and plan change efforts with those factors in mind.

**Conclusion**

The findings of the study revealed that among campus diversity officers, there are three viewpoints on the types of practices that higher education leaders should use to transform diversity campus culture. These viewpoints include (a) a heavy reliance on a senior diversity officer to lead the effort, (b) a distributed leadership model where various campus actors shared in the work to advance diversity culture, and lastly, (c) a political approach to changing culture where external stakeholders drive change efforts. Each of these viewpoints is supported in the literature as the type of leadership practice that has the potential to advance diversity culture through a combination of transformational leadership practices and organizational culture shifts. While the change effort will be dependent on the individual needs of the campus, these findings
provide three distinct approaches that leaders can consider when deciding their strategy for diversity culture change.
CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify and understand the leadership practices that campus diversity practitioners perceive as the most effective for advancing diversity culture change in institutions of higher education. For the purpose of this study, diversity culture change is defined as the process of examining and changing organizational assumptions, values, and processes that impede equal participation and full inclusion of individuals from non-dominant groups and increasing the institution’s capacity to effectively address diversity. Further, diversity leadership can be understood as leadership that addresses diversity issues and concerns in higher education (Aguirre & Martinez, 2006). As the only professionals in higher education devoted to transforming diversity culture on campuses as an aspect of their daily practice, campus diversity practitioners referred to as campus diversity officers in this study served as the population of interest for this topic. The specific research questions that shaped this study were:

1. What do higher education leaders and researchers consider as the most important leadership practices for advancing campus diversity culture?

2. What leadership practices do campus diversity officers perceive to be the most effective for advancing campus diversity culture?

3. Why do these campus diversity officers in this study identify the practices uncovered in the previous research question as most effective?

Utilizing the semi-qualitative research method, Q Methodology, the study consisted of gathering the subjective perceptions from current diversity officers in higher education whose institutions were active members of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. These diversity officers were asked to rank order the effectiveness of diversity
leadership practices found in the current higher education diversity literature. From this ranking procedure and following a series of statistical analyses on those data, three viewpoints on effective diversity leadership practices emerged among the study participants:

- Appoint a senior diversity officer and provide them the resources to lead diversity culture change efforts;
- Diversity efforts should be distributed among various campus actors to achieve culture change;
- The politics of diversity require that leaders leverage relationships, resources, and external stakeholders to advance diversity culture change.

This chapter utilizes these viewpoints to address the research questions mentioned above, provide implications for higher education, and directions for future research.

**Research Question One**

*What do higher education leaders and researchers consider as the most important leadership practices for advancing campus diversity culture?*

This study found 106 unduplicated leadership practices across the diversity in higher education literature from the last 15 years. Many higher education researchers who study diversity leadership whose works were reviewed for the present study provided leadership approaches, described the characteristics of proficient diversity leadership in higher education, and explained the challenges for this work in higher education. Among the approaches to leadership that advance diversity culture was Transformational Leadership, which was the most referenced leadership theory found in the literature (Adserias et al., 2017) and comprised the theoretical framework for this study. Of the characteristics of proficient diversity leadership, Aguirre and Martinez (2006) found that such proficiency includes leadership practices that
promote personal awareness and challenge the status quo of the organizational structures. While these characteristics and approaches help to understand the challenges of advancing diversity culture, they fall short of the practical application that higher education leaders need to understand how to lead these efforts on their respective campuses effectively.

The researchers who provided the most substantive set of tangible practices as opposed to leadership theories primarily emerged from a single study that was conducted in the mid-2000s. For their study, Kezar and her collaborators searched higher education for the leaders who, at the time, had made noticeable progress in advancing issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion on their campuses. The population of leaders included in the study was limited to campus presidents. From this study, at least five publications that have been heavily referenced as mentor texts on the topic emerged and still serve as a critical source of specific diversity leadership practices. The practices identified by this population of leaders have been referenced throughout this study. Some of the most recurring practices included conducting an inventory of existing policies and campus practices to determine alignment with the campus’ stated values and creating a culture that continually examines data to challenge prevailing beliefs and set new directions (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). Other studies built from this work and focused on particular practices. In a more recent study, LePeau, Hurtado, and Williams (2019) examined presidents’ councils as a practice for advancing diversity agendas. Further, Chun and Evans (2018) described leadership practices pertaining to systematic diversity education as necessary for leading a diversity culture shift.

In the end, the present study found that higher education researchers were tapping into campus leaders to identify and understand leadership practices for advancing diversity culture change. From studying these groups, over 100 leadership practices emerged in the related
literature, dating back for the last 15 years, which serves as an estimated shelf-life for diversity studies as the work is ever-evolving. The majority of the practices found originated from a single study conducted where campus presidents were the primary population of interest. The list of practices varied across the texts but was often conflated with leadership approaches and leadership challenges.

**Research Question Two**

*What leadership practices do campus diversity officers perceive to be the most effective for advancing campus diversity culture?*

As described in this chapter summary, three viewpoints about effective leadership practices emerged among campus diversity officers. For each viewpoint, the 21 campus diversity officers who participated in this study identified a set of practices that were deemed most effective for advancing campus diversity culture. The most effective practices among these three viewpoints are described in the following sections, along with a comparison of the perceptions between campus presidents, who inform much of the existing literature, against the consensus on effective practices as identified by the campus diversity officers who participated in this study.

**Factor One – All Hail the Chief Diversity Officer**

Campus diversity officers that defined Factor One found practices related to developing the institutional structure for diversity, equity, and inclusion work, including developing diversity strategic plans, personnel actions, and policies to be the most effective for advancing diversity culture change. Of the 44 diversity leadership practices provided to the study participants to rank, Factor One participants found that the most effective practice that a leader can employ to advance diversity culture change on their campus was to create senior-level positions to oversee and implement diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. However, the study findings also showed
that, for this viewpoint, this practice should be coupled with other practices that would result in providing these positions with the resources necessary to lead these efforts. Specifically, these diversity officers also perceived practices that were heavy on accountability measures, such as tying efforts to the campus strategic plan and annual performance review processes, and budget-related, including funding change efforts, to be among the most effective.

As can be found throughout the organizational culture change literature, for change to be transformative, it has to be shared and executed at multiple points within the institution, moving organically in such a way that it touches everyone a substantial way (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Roberts, 1985; Schein, 2010; Williams, 2013). Therefore, the diversity officers’ perceptions that practices that relied on a senior diversity officer, accountability structures, and resources align with the literature regarding the most effective methods for diversity culture change.

**Factor Two – Change Takes All of Us**

The campus diversity officers who defined Factor Two found the most effective diversity leadership practices to be those that placed emphasis on engaging a broad range of institutional members, including faculty, administrators, staff, and students, in change efforts. These practices included receiving campus wide input on a shared diversity, equity, and inclusion vision statement, incentivizing individuals who contribute to change efforts, and investing in diversity education for all members of the campus community. The most effective leadership practice found by these campus diversity officers was to require campus units to develop diversity strategic plans. Diversity culture change literature supports this finding in that this practice not only requires broad engagement across the campus, it also creates a means to measure progress on change efforts and ensure it stays in place once implemented (Kezar 2019; Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013).
Keeping with this theme of advancing change through the collective efforts of the campus, these campus diversity officers also perceived the student and classroom experiences as focal points for change. For this viewpoint, effective leadership practices were those that fostered inclusive learning climates, revised curriculum to reflect diverse perspectives, invested in training and education for culturally responsive pedagogy, and assessed the extent that diversity, equity, and inclusion are embedded into the curricular and co-curricular student experiences.

As demonstrated in the findings for this factor, taking a collaborative approach to change efforts is the most effective approach. This finding is supported throughout the diversity leadership literature. Referencing the factor’s preference for leadership practices that include developing leadership skills in individuals in non-leadership roles, Aguirre and Martinez (2006) express that leadership practices that build the leadership capacity of individuals who effectively work with diversity-related issues are a prime means of advancing culture change. Therefore, Factor Two’s exaltation of leadership practices that incorporate the leadership of all campus constituencies aligns with the culture change literature.

Factor Three – Minding the Politics of Diversity

Campus diversity officers also found leadership practices that raised the visibility of diversity, equity, and inclusion change efforts and leveraged the influence of internal and external stakeholders to be the most effective for advancing culture change. The most effective practice was to incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion into the formal mission statement of the campus, placing change efforts in a highly visible place. Other practices that were found to be effective as perceived by the diversity officers who defined Factor Three, and further showed the preference for practices that raised the visibility of efforts included using public statements and forums to affirm the campus diversity values, creating a division for diversity efforts, and leader-
involvement in the campus governance structures. Each of these practices allows the leader to role model behavior and to saturate the campus messaging and events with diversity change efforts. Also found to be effective practices were those that were relationship-heavy, particularly those relationships with external entities. Practices included establishing partnerships with external stakeholders to leverage their influence on the campus change efforts.

Another leadership practice that was found to be effective was to enhance avenues for mentorship for individuals from underrepresented groups. The factor’s preference for this leadership practice where one builds leadership capacity in others is supported in the Transformational Leadership literature. Specifically, these practices describe the Individualized Consideration component of Transformational Leadership, where the leader acts as a coach and mentor to followers, paying particular attention to their needs for growth and creating new learning opportunities (Bass & Riggio, 2014). When taken together with transformational organization culture change, this viewpoint’s perception of mentorship as an effective leadership practice for diversity culture change was supported by the existing literature.

Further, organizational culture change posits that it is more effective when organizational culture fits the demands placed upon it (Bass & Riggio, 2014). When applying this theory to Factor Three’s reliance on external bodies, leveraging demands from external stakeholders to change the diversity culture can contribute to organizational effectiveness and positive change. The organizational change literature asserts that effective organizations require the combination of tactical and strategic thinking, along with culture building by leaders, to advance change (Bass & Avolio, 1993). This viewpoint’s use of political leadership practices balances other, more tactical, and strategic efforts so that change efforts stay front-of-mind for the campus community. This combination of leadership practices reflects this component of organizational change and is
furthered by diversity leadership practices that build the culture by advancing a combination of these tactical and strategic practices.

**Campus Presidents and Campus Diversity Officers**

The perception of effectiveness for diversity leadership practices among the campus diversity officers differed from that of campus presidents. As was identified in the literature primarily informed from the perception of campus presidents, conducting an inventory of diversity artifacts, such as policies, to assess for alignment with stated diversity values was one of the most frequently appearing practice to advance diversity culture, along with examining data. However, for campus diversity officers, the consensus among them was that the most effective practices are those related to allocating budgetary resources to fund diversity change efforts. Further, campus diversity officers perceived that practices which establish accountability structure to hold all campus leaders accountable for making progress on change efforts to be among the most effective. This difference between symbolic practices as perceived by campus presidents, and structural practices as perceived by campus diversity officers, could reasonably be attributed to the difference between presidents overseeing the vision for change efforts versus diversity (Kezar, 2006) officers who may be responsible for carrying out change efforts (Williams, 2013).

**Research Question Three**

*Why do these campus diversity officers in this study identify the practices uncovered in the previous research question as most effective?*

Comments from the post-sort questionnaire and interviews with the three factor exemplars provided context to why the campus diversity officers found the previously detailed
leadership practices as the most effective for advancing diversity culture change. The discussion of these findings follows in this section.

For Factor One, one participant commented that metric-driven approaches to diversity change, such as the structural practices that were the hallmark of the factor, allowed for the identification of areas of affirmation and areas of opportunity for change. These practices allow integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts into areas of organizational functioning and allow for viewing disaggregated data to understand what the data reveal about ongoing efforts. Of the senior diversity role as the most effective practice for the factor, the factor exemplar expressed that appointing a senior leader to oversee efforts is symbolic of a leader’s commitment to diversity work. Without the commitment of a person in the diversity officer role, giving them the resources, and being consistent in supporting that person’s role, change efforts will fail. This perception was shared by other diversity officers within the factor, who explained that these senior diversity leaders help institutions in their quest for diversity, equity, and inclusion at all levels of the organization.

Factor Two campus diversity officers perceived the collaborative approach to diversity change as the most effective for various reasons. One, helping campus units and individuals to build the skill and capacity for strategic diversity efforts that are tied to broader campus efforts is a vital tool for ensuring accountability and follow-through on change efforts. The effectiveness of practices related to diversity education and shared leadership were explained further by the factor exemplar, who shared that leaders must have clarity about the purpose behind change efforts. It sounds pleasant when leaders say that they want to diversify their faculty or student bodies, but if they are not clear on why doing so is important or understand their role in seeing that change through, then the effort is in vain. With proper education and a comprehensive
understanding of the diversity, equity, and inclusion issues, coupled with accountability structures to track progress on efforts, leaders can successfully change their campus diversity culture.

Campus diversity officers in Factor Three found politically leaning diversity practices as most effective because they regarded diversity, equity, inclusion work as highly relational that cannot be decoupled from people and politics. With a heavy emphasis on leveraging resources to get people on board with change efforts, these practices were found to be effective because when institutions spend money on an effort, they expect some sort of return on the investment in resources. Therefore, practices that allocated budget and people resources to campus diversity change efforts were effective for transformational change because, with the resources spent, the campus becomes more invested in seeing through on the change. The effectiveness of these practices was amplified when external stakeholders were aware of the campus diversity, equity, and inclusion goals and were brought in to hold the campus accountable. According to the factor exemplar, these types of practices are effective because campuses tend to hold external stakeholders (i.e., accrediting bodies, government agencies, boards) in high regard.

What Do These Findings Mean?

The findings of the study indicated that there is a broad range of diversity leadership practices that higher education leaders can employ to transform their campus diversity culture. First, of the hundreds of leadership practices that have emerged in the higher education literature over the last 15 years, when analyzed and combined to specific leadership practices, there are dozens of practices rather than hundreds. What this means for higher education leaders and practitioners overwhelmed by the enormity of the task of advancing their campus culture to be
more diverse, inclusive, and equitable, there are a reasonable number of specific practices they can refer to begin, or improve, change efforts.

Of these practices, there are three overarching points of view of how to best approach change efforts: structurally with the work lead by a senior ranking subject matter expert; collaboratively with many members of the campus community engaged in the work; and lastly, politically by leveraging relationships, resources, and external stakeholders. While each of these viewpoints provided a unique set of leadership practices that were deemed to be the most effective, they all shared in the importance of ensuring there are budgetary resources available to support diversity, equity, and inclusion change efforts. So, whether leaders decide to employ diversity change practices that build campus infrastructure to advance change, engage the entire campus community as leaders in the change, or rely on their influence and relationships to advance change, without adequate funding and resources for change efforts, transformational diversity culture change will remain elusive.

Limitations

The anonymity of the study limited the ability to understand the individual demographics of diversity officers had on the findings. Institutional demographics helped to understand that, regardless of the type of institution, it appeared that diversity officers had held perceptions regardless. However, without knowing race, gender, position, diversity officer portfolio, and other similar characteristics, there are unknown factors that could have influenced the findings of the study.

Implications for Higher Education

There are two main implications that this study had for higher education. First, there is no single set of practices that higher education practitioners can employ to transform diversity
culture. The findings of this study revealed that leadership practices are dynamic and should be considered situationally to ensure effectiveness within the parameters of the institution.

Throughout the literature on diversity in higher education and in the current headlines, leaders have asked for detailed instructions on what they should be doing to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion on their campuses. However, this study revealed that there is no single best way to take on these efforts. The only consistent practice that was universal for achieving substantial change in diversity culture was to allocate campus resources to supports efforts. However, if this practice is taken out of the campus context and unsupported by a comprehensive strategy, it could still fall short of the desired outcome. Higher education leaders seeking to transform their culture should employ leadership practices that fall within a broader strategy that touches on the importance of their individual campuses’ change efforts.

The other implication is that campus diversity officers hold value in understanding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education. However, these individuals are infrequently tapped for research on the practice of diversity in higher education. Instead, they are commonly studied to learn more about their campus roles and portfolios. While this information is useful for the future of diversity infrastructure for campuses, these professionals also provide insight into the practice of diversity, especially as it relates to diversity leadership, which has yet to be fully realized in diversity scholarship. In hard economic times, when campuses are cutting budgets and services due to shortfalls, more studies that show best practices for structuring these positions, but also leverage the expertise of campus diversity officers who inform the work, will support the permanency of the campus diversity officer in higher education administration.

Diversity officers as mainstays in higher education becomes critical for the future of American higher education, as the country is projected to continue its racial and ethnic diversification at a
rapid pace, along with advances in technology that will necessitate postsecondary education at unprecedented rates. To remain relevant and viable in this future state, higher education must leverage its experts to both inform practice and support ongoing change efforts.

**Directions for Future Research**

In the course of the study, the researcher discovered several diversity culture change models in the literature. Of particular note was Williams’ (2013) Strategic Diversity Leadership Frames, which provide specifics for the types of leadership practices that are necessary to transform campus culture. In his model, Williams (2013) highlights the necessity of five types of diversity leadership practices necessary to advance culture change: organizational learning which includes practices the break the cycle flawed diversity implementation efforts; political practices which address issues of competing interests among campus members; collegial practices where leaders focus on engage the entire campus in change efforts; structural practices where change is advance through strategy, structure, and resource alignment; and last, symbolic practices where leaders make meaning of the diversity agenda for stakeholders. He argues that without practices that fall within each of these frames, change efforts will be stagnant or superficial.

These view of multiple types of leadership practices was consistent with the findings of this study as evidenced by participant responses in the post-sort questionnaire regarding difficulty in placing certain statements. In responses to this question, several participants expressed that it was difficult to name any of the practices as least effective, as their perception and experiences taught them that leaders must employ many types of practices to advance culture change. Further exploration of Williams’ conceptual framework with current campus diversity officers could help to identify the frequency that leaders should employ the five types of practices in advancing change on campuses. Using a similar approach of pulling leadership
practices from the existing literature on diversity culture change, future research could apply models, including and similar to Williams’ model, to better illuminate the specific types of leadership practices that higher education leaders can employ to advance culture change on their campus.

Future studies would also benefit from gathering additional demographics about the campus diversity officers and their institutions to identify the differentiated approaches to diversity change according to institution type and diversity officer positionality. In a similar study of the perception of campus diversity officers, Gravely-Stack and colleagues (2016) noted the importance of gather more social identity information about diversity officers so that this particular field of study could begin to identify the impact that demographics have on diversity officer perceptions. The current study did not ask demographics of participants, as the profession is still evolving and with a relatively small number of practitioners in the field, participants may be identifiable when cross referencing both institutional type of social demographics. However, the current study’s findings would have been enriched by demographic details as points of analysis to determine if race, gender, so some other social characteristic had any impact on which of the three points of view on diversity leadership practices a person may fall.

**Conclusion**

This study sought to understand the subjective perceptions of campus diversity officers on the leadership practices that were most effective for transformational diversity culture change in higher education. Using a perception revealing, semi-quantitative methodology, Q-methodology, three points of view on the topic emerged from querying a population of campus diversity officers. The three viewpoint points were characterized by leadership practices that involved: 1) appointing a senior diversity officer and providing them the resources to lead
diversity culture change efforts; 2) distributing responsibility among various campus actors to achieve culture change; and 3) leveraging relationships, resources, and external stakeholders to advance diversity culture change. Each of these viewpoints perceived different leadership practices as the most effective for advancing change on campus, but they all agreed that allocating campus resources to change efforts was an effective practice, regardless of which of the three approaches a leader employed. These findings indicated that there is no single best set of diversity leadership practices that higher education leaders should employ to advance culture change on their campus. Rather, the findings indicate that leaders should take a dynamic, multifaceted approach to culture change that employs various leadership practices that are most appropriate for their campus change goals.
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Appendix B

Diversity Leadership Practices Q-Sort Statements

1. Actively engage in campus governance structures and constituencies including faculty, staff, and student senates (Chun & Evans, 2018).

2. Build strong coalitions across governing boards, external community, legislators, and campus groups to broaden support for diversity culture change initiatives. (Davis, 2002; Kezar, 2007, 2008; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Williams, 2013).

3. Establish partnerships with local businesses for experiential learning opportunities for students to support community and economic development goals (McNair, 2019).

4. Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas (Kezar, 2007; McNair, 2019).

5. Actively engage and learn the campus culture by meeting with faculty, staff, and students (Chun & Feagin, 2020; Kezar, 2007, 2019; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar & Fries-Britt, 2018; Williams, 2013).


7. Realign data collection efforts to measure student success disaggregated by race, gender, social class, and other important demographic characteristics (Kezar, 2007, 2008, 2019; Kezar, Glenn, Lester, & Nakamoto, 2008).

8. Create institutional structures that allow members of non-dominant groups to successfully access resources and report matters that negatively impact a climate of inclusion (Chun & Feagin, 2020; Warner, 2020).
9. Require senior leaders to regularly report out on their efforts to address ongoing DEI concerns (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013).

10. Require campus units to develop strategic plans that yield measurable progress on campus-DEI goals (Takayama, Kaplan, & Cook-Sather, 2017).

11. Establish an external DEI advisory council for every school and college (Kezar, 2007).

12. Invest in the systematic and sustained diversity education and organizational learning activities for students, administrators, faculty and staff (Chun & Evans, 2018; Chun & Feagin, 2020; Karkouti, 2016; Kezar, 2019).

13. Review policies and scholarships to ensure alignment with DEI values (Davis, 2002; Kezar, 2019; Warner, 2020).


15. Create senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing DEI efforts (Takayama, Kaplan & Cook-Sather, 2017; Williams, 2013).

16. Create a hybrid DEI division that integrates diversity with other core institutional responsibilities (Williams, 2013).

17. Review policies to identify and address the issues that racialized minority faculty face (Davis, 2002; Karkouti, 2016; Warner, 2020).

18. Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process (Kezar & Eckel, 2005, 2008; Williams, 2013).

19. Publicly acknowledge individuals who are actively engaged and support diversity across the campus (Kezar, 2007; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar, Glenn, Lester, & Nakamoto, 2008).
20. Enlist senior leaders to learn practices at peer institutions for creating more responsive environments for students from diverse backgrounds (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavin, and Quaye, 2007).

21. Enhance mentoring opportunities and processes for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups (; Kezar, 2019; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavin, and Quaye, 2007; McNair, 2019).

22. Hire new people who have demonstrated commitment to DEI issues (Kezar, 2007).

23. Make required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives (Kezar, 2007; Kezar & Eckel, 2005; Williams, 2013).

24. Engage in a diversity mapping project to map curricular and co-curricular DEI efforts to determine the extent to which diversity is embedded within the institution (LePeau, Hurtado, & Williams, 2019).

25. Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow (Kezar, 2008).

26. Establish cross-institutional collaborations with area institutions to provide an extended network of affinity programming for faculty of color (Williams, 2013).

27. Supplant legislatively prohibited race-based admissions processes with those that achieve DEI goals using other determining characteristics (i.e., admitting top percentage of in-state high school graduating classes) (Williams, 2013).

28. Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution (Kezar, 2019; Kezar & Eckel, 2005; Smith, 2015; Takayama, Kaplan, & Cook-Sather, 2017; Williams, 2013).
29. Establish a president-appointed faculty curriculum committee to examine all courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training (Kezar, 2007; Kezar, Glenn, Lester, & Nakamoto, 2008; Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

30. Communicate the synergistic relationship between DEI initiatives, programs, projects, and individual work throughout the campus (Kezar, 2007; Kezar & Eckel, 2005).

31. Publicly and adequately respond to racial and hate-based incidents (Kezar & Eckel, 2005).

32. Establish a central ‘Strategic Diversity’ fund using annual budget carryforward funds from campus units (Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Williams, 2013).

33. Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals (Chun & Evans, 2018; Kezar, 2007; Kezar & Eckel, 2005).

34. Develop a venues (i.e., learning communities, networks, cross-functional teams) for collaborative dialogue among academic and administrative stakeholders to cultivate inclusive learning climates (Chun & Evans, 2018; Kezar, 2019; Takayama, Kaplan & Cook-Sather, 2017).

35. Decentralize decision making so that people who bring diverse perspectives and have the greatest amount of information are involved in the process (Kezar, 2007, 2019; Kezar, Glenn, Lester, & Nakamato, 2008; Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013).


37. Regularly conduct and respond to climate surveys that are commissioned by the president’s office (Kezar, 2008; LePeau, Hurtado & Williams, 2019)
38. Work with campus constituent groups to fashion helpful hiring procedures recruiting people of color in faculty ranks and upper administration positions (Chun & Feagin, 2020; Davis, 2002; Warner, 2020).

39. Use speeches and activities to role-model and clearly articulate personal vision and commitment to DEI change efforts (Karkourti, 2016; Kezar, 2007; Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

40. Include Inclusive Excellence and DEI in other prominent speeches, events, and initiatives that are not directly focused on diversity (Kezar, 2019; Kezar & Eckel, 2005; Williams, 2013).

41. Include diverse images and content in traditional events, publications, outreach materials, and other avenues that help demonstrate and make visible the success of diversity efforts on campus (Kezar, 2008; Williams, 2013).

42. Create high profile events for the campus community to celebrate DEI successes (Takayama, Kaplan & Cook-Sather, 2017; Williams, 2013).

43. Develop a shared DEI vision statement that receives input from multiple stakeholders and is based on a shared understanding of where the institution should be going and why that direction is important (Kezar & Eckel, 2005; Williams, 2013).

44. Develop shared metrics and definitions for DEI and include as a goal for student learning and professional development (Chun & Evans, 2018; Kezar, 2019; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2016).
Appendix C

Participant Email Invitation

Dear <FIRST NAME>

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Memphis, conducting research regarding effective diversity leadership behavior based on the subjective experiences and perceptions of diversity officers in higher education. As a diversity officer at a current institutional member of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE), I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Participation in this study will involve about 20 minutes of your time as you follow the link below to an online instrument. If you so choose, there is an optional follow up interview that can take up to 45 minutes depending the length of your responses. The instrument to which you will be directed for the card sort activity might appear to be different from most online surveys; it may appear more like a game of solitaire that requires you to “click and drag” items rather than select a single best answer.

Upon giving your consent to participate in this study, you will be asked to sort a series of statements into three piles – those with which you agree, those with which you disagree, and those with which you have no strong opinions. After you have completed the sorting process, you will be instructed to place these statements along a matrix, depending upon how strongly you agree or disagree with the statements.

I hope that you will be willing to volunteer your time to complete this survey. Your feedback regarding your experiences and perceptions as a diversity officer will be extremely helpful to this research study. It is my hope that our improved understanding of the experiences of effective diversity leadership behaviors will inform higher education leaders on the ways in which we can better transform campus cultures to be more equitable and inclusive for the communities we serve.

Please click the link below to participate in this voluntary study.

[LINK]

Thank you in advance for your participation!

In Community,

Bobbie R. Porter
Appendix D

Post-Sort Follow-Up Interview Questions

Post-Sort Follow-Up Interview Questions

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this interview, which accounts for the second phase of the data collection process for the study.

This interview is a follow up to the Q-sorting activity in which you participated. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop your participation at any time during the interview without penalty. Please know that your identity will remain confidential and the information gathered during the interview will be maintained in a secure, locked location only accessible to the researcher. The interview will be recorded. The digital recording and data collected from the interview will be destroyed upon successful completion of the study.

1. Considering the model Q-sort and the additional factor rankings of interest, what important themes about effective diversity leadership practices emerge to you? What themes emerged as you completed the sorting activity?

2. Why are factors +4 and +5 so important to you concerning effective diversity leadership practices?

3. Why are factors -4 and -5 ones that you perceive as having less importance to effective diversity leadership practice?

4. What diversity leadership practices do you perceive to have the most impact on transformative diversity culture change in higher education?

5. Why do you identify these diversity leadership practices as most crucial and effective?
Appendix E

Factor Arrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhance mentoring opportunities and processes for students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented groups.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Require campus units to develop strategic plans that yield measurable progress on campus-DEI goals.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actively engage and learn the campus culture by meeting with faculty, staff, and students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Publicly and adequately respond to racial and hate-based incidents.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop a shared DEI vision statement that receives input from multiple stakeholders and is based on a shared understanding of where the institution should be going and why that direction is important.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop venues (i.e., learning communities, networks, cross-functional teams) for collaborative dialogue among academic and administrative stakeholders to cultivate inclusive learning climates.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Invest in systematic and sustained diversity education and organizational learning activities for students, administrators, faculty and staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Build strong coalitions across governing boards, the external community, legislators, and campus groups to broaden support for diversity culture change initiatives.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Engage in a diversity mapping project to map curricular and co-curricular DEI efforts to determine the extent to which diversity is embedded within the institution.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Establish cross-institutional collaborations with area institutions to provide an extended network of affinity programming for faculty of color.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Include diverse images and content in traditional events, publications, outreach materials, and other avenues that help demonstrate and make visible the success of campus DEI efforts.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make the required budgetary decisions that are necessary to support DEI change initiatives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Realign data collection efforts to measure student success disaggregated by race, gender, social class, and other relevant characteristics.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement No</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Establish an external DEI advisory council for every school and college.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enlist senior leaders to learn practices at peer institutions for creating more responsive environments for students from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Supplant legislatively prohibited race-based admissions processes with those that achieve DEI goals using other determining characteristics (i.e., admitting top percentage of in-state high school graduating classes).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Include DEI objectives as a part of the annual employee performance evaluation process.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hire new people who have demonstrated commitment to DEI issues.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decentralize decision making so that people who bring diverse perspectives and have the greatest amount of information are involved in the process.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provide rewards and incentives that recognize substantial contributions and progress toward DEI goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Establish a president-appointed, faculty curriculum committee to examine courses for cultural responsiveness and to develop a model for inclusive teaching and training.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Establish a central 'Strategic Diversity' fund with annual budget carryover funds provided by campus units.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Regularly conduct and respond to climate surveys that are commissioned by the president’s office.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Establish partnerships with local businesses for experiential learning for opportunities for students to support community and economic development goals.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Work with campus constituent groups to fashion helpful hiring procedures for recruiting people of color in faculty ranks and upper administration positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Create institutional structures that allow members of non-dominant groups to successfully access resources and report matters that negatively impact a climate of inclusion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Create high-profile events for the campus community to celebrate DEI success.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement No</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use student social justice protests and demonstrations as key opportunities for helping the campus to learn and grow.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Develop shared metrics and definitions for DEI and include as a goal for student learning and professional development.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Require senior leaders to regularly report out on their efforts to address ongoing DEI concerns.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Review policies and scholarships to ensure alignment with DEI values.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Incorporate DEI in the formal mission statement of the institution.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Host town hall meetings to hold critical conversations between institutional actors.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Review policies to identify and address the issues that racialized minority faculty face.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Incorporate a framework for DEI progress into the strategic plan.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Use speeches and activities to role model and clearly articulate personal vision and commitment to DEI change efforts.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Create senior level positions dedicated to overseeing and implementing DEI efforts.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Include Inclusive Excellence and DEI in other prominent speeches, events, and initiatives that are not directly focused on diversity.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Develop K-12 initiatives for increasing access to college for students in the surrounding areas.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Create a hybrid DEI division that integrates diversity with other core institutional responsibilities.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Publicly acknowledge individuals who are actively engaged and support diversity across the campus.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Establish a DEI steering council commissioned by the president of the institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Actively engage in campus governance structures and constituencies including faculty, staff, and student senates.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Communicate the synergistic relationship between DEI initiatives, programs, projects, and individual work throughout the campus.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>