

Report on the Department of Anthropology Diversity Audit, Phase 1

Survey of Student Views, 2000

Ellen Judd and Siobhan Kari

November 2001

Introduction

In the fall of 2000 the Department of Anthropology initiated a diversity audit as a strategy for assessing and strengthening our capacity to address diversity. Diversity audits implemented in other educational institutions in North America have commonly been conducted on a large institutional scale and have included a comprehensive review of policies and practices, employment equity and diversity, as well as a range of educational and campus life matters affecting students. Many of these relevant issues exceed the scope or are not under the control of an individual department, and are governed at the University of Manitoba by policies that apply to the entire university, such as the Human Rights Policy, the Sexual Harassment Policy, the Accessibility Policy, and the Policy on the Responsibilities of Academic Staff with Regard to Students.

Consequently, it was decided that the most fruitful approach would be to examine our curriculum and teaching practices. These are central to the work of the department and are areas over which we do have substantial responsibility and control. Further, we decided to open this process to student voices through the mechanism of a survey of student perceptions of our curriculum and teaching practices with respect to diversity (see Appendix A). The survey was designed to reach all students in class, so it was necessarily brief, and it was entirely anonymous in order to permit full expression of views without hindrance due to power relations in the academy.

The audit was designed and conducted by Ellen Judd (Head, Anthropology) and Rosalyn Howard, (Diversity Education Coordinator), with the advice and collaboration of colleagues (in and outside the department) and students. The survey instrument was approved by the Joint Faculty Ethics Review Board of the University of Manitoba. The Manitoba

Anthropology Students Association was consulted, and the audit and survey were brought before a meeting of the Anthropology Department Council on 3 November 2000, at which time Rosalyn Howard gave a presentation, "Toward a Diversity Strategy for the Department of Anthropology," and the audit and survey were discussed. Student members of Council asked that the survey also be provided to graduate students no longer taking courses and this was agreed.

The survey was administered in Anthropology classes in November 2000, by graduate student assistants in the absence of the course instructors. Procedures for administering the survey were the same as those in standard use for course evaluations, except that students were asked to respond only once. All students in Anthropology courses on the University of Manitoba campus in the fall of 2000 were provided with the opportunity to respond to the survey, provided they were in attendance at class, except students in a service course in another faculty. Students in classes taught by the one faculty member who did not cooperate with the audit were mailed a copy of the survey by Lynne Dalman, Anthropology Administrative Assistant, unless they were also enrolled in another class where the survey was administered. Post-coursework graduate students were also mailed a copy of the survey. Completed surveys were returned to Roxie Wilde, Anthropology Graduate Secretary, who maintained the security of the completed forms and merged all the forms so that none could be connected with any particular course or student.

A best estimate of students available to complete the survey (generated from class lists and a list of graduate students) is that there were 635 students enrolled in undergraduate Anthropology courses and 49 enrolled as graduate students in the fall of 2000. 389 surveys were completed or partially completed, for an overall response rate of 56.87%. 221 of the responding students were first-year students, 156 were upper-year or graduate students, and 12 did not indicate their enrolment status. Of these, 138 included at least some written comments for questions 46-49.

The machine-readable responses were processed by Academic Computing and analyzed by Siobhan Kari (MA student in Anthropology) and Mary Cheang (Biostatistical Consulting Unit). Ellen Judd "sanitized" the comments files of all personal names and identifying comments, as well as comments for which permission to quote had not been granted. Comments removed from the files have not been seen by anyone other than Roxie Wilde and Ellen Judd, but have been consulted in this study. The data analysis has been supported by a grant from the Employment Equity Fund. The senior author is solely responsible for this report.

Summary of Survey Results

A simple summary of the responses to questions 1 to 45 is presented in Appendix B. These data have been explored to determine student perceptions of teaching in the department and to identify issues of potential concern which we could constructively address. The quantitative data analysis has been extensive (see Appendix C) and only the highlights will be presented herein and in Appendices D and E.

The survey was completed by those students present in class on the day the survey was administered and who voluntarily chose to respond. Consequently the sample is non-random and susceptible to non-response bias. Although we have run some tests of statistical significance--on the hypothesis that the sample may not deviate very far from a random sample and in order to explore the data fully--they are not strictly appropriate. Nevertheless, the quantitative results are not meaningless. Most of the results in this survey, for any particular question, differ in the response frequency to such an extent that the chances of error are low. As such, the analysis of the survey can be managed through simple frequency tables and cross-tabulations. Also, tests for statistical significance are useful as an aid in the

In my experience, the curriculum of the Department of Anthropology includes attention to diversity in its treatment of humans in each of the following aspects (Questions 4-10):	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree/ Strongly Agree (%)
<i>Ancestry/Ethnicity (4)</i>	4.11	21.34	72.49
<i>Age (5)</i>	9.51	36.50	51.16
<i>Gender (6)</i>	8.48	23.91	65.30
<i>Sexual Orientation (7)</i>	20.57	37.53	39.07
<i>Disability (7)</i>	24.94	40.87	31.11
<i>Religious Belief (9)</i>	9.51	30.08	58.35
<i>Political Belief (10)</i>	13.37	37.02	46.79

Responses to the questions on the participation of students of different backgrounds (19) and on the environment for free and open expression of ideas (21) also show relatively low levels of agreement.

Table 2: Overall Frequencies, Questions 19 and 21

(Proportions do not add up to 100% because missing values are not included here)

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree/ Strongly Agree (%)
In my experience, students of different backgrounds participate equally in classroom discussion and learning (Question 19).	12.85	27.51	58.61
In my experience, the Department of Anthropology provides a good environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs (Question 21).	11.31	17.99	65.81

The responses to the question set on the teaching staff's respect of student diversity (11-17) were more favourable than the responses to the question set on curriculum, although the responses were again uneven.

Table 3: Overall Frequencies, Questions 11-17

(Proportions do not add up to 100% because missing values are not included here)

In my experience, teaching staff are respectful of all students regardless of differences in student backgrounds, including (Questions 11-17):	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree/ Strongly Agree (%)
<i>Ancestry/Ethnicity (11)</i>	0.51	9.51	89.46
<i>Age (12)</i>	1.80	11.31	86.12
<i>Gender (13)</i>	2.31	10.28	86.89
<i>Sexual Orientation (14)</i>	2.31	22.62	72.75
<i>Disability (15)</i>	1.29	18.77	78.41

<i>Religious Belief (16)</i>	3.86	14.65	80.21
<i>Political Belief (17)</i>	1.54	18.77	77.63

Responses to the questions on understanding of diversity (18) and access to help and advice from teaching staff (20) showed high levels of agreement.

Table 4: Overall Frequencies, Questions 18 and 20

(Proportions do not add up to 100% because missing values are not included here)

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree/ Strongly Agree (%)
My experiences in Anthropology courses have led me to become more understanding of diversity (Question 18).	4.63	16.20	78.15
In my experience, students of different backgrounds have the same access to help and advice from teaching staff (Question 20).	2.57	11.05	85.86

3. Aspects of Diversity. Student views of the department's performance on the various aspects of diversity included in this survey showed some differences, as indicated in Table 1 and Table 3 above.

Responses were substantively more positive with respect to ancestry/ethnicity than with respect to the other aspects examined. This is consistent with the written comments, which often identified this area as one in which diversity was addressed effectively:

Fortunately, we have been taught that the cultural ideology of "race" is but an illusion, that is to say, when speaking of DNA, there is no method by which we might concretely separate people into such separate categories.

The courses (particularly cultural anthropology) lead to a greater understanding of the differences and similarities between cultures. Although each culture has differences in language and behaviour, it was interesting to learn that no human behaviour is instinctual (particularly war and aggression) and that there is only 1 human race with varying traits among and between populations.

Not enough content from the perspectives of indigenous groups themselves.

I think just talking about different cultures and societies help[s] people understand and accept humans they knew little or nothing about.

My prof emphasises that we all come from a common ancestor which promotes respect for diversity.

More understanding for the greater majority student body of issues minority students have to face and the troubles associated with culture contact.

Religion appeared as a somewhat problematic area, especially for introductory students. (For a breakdown of responses from introductory and other students, see the tables in Section 4 below.) There were a number of written comments on this topic, and none of these referred to tensions between religious communities or to the targeting of a minority religion. The comments suggest that the concerns were related to the secular nature of anthropology as a science. None of the comments proposed a change in this secular character, but several called strongly for respect to be shown to those who hold religious convictions either in general, or specifically in the Judaeo-Christian tradition:

Out right mockery of religious beliefs outside of atheism including Catholicism, Christianity, and Judaism.

Always assuming the same beliefs in Christians, like they all think the world is 10000 years old, etc. Very big hindrances and amazing.

Diversity was promoted in my class through the separation of religion and science, where the professor made it clear that any and all religious beliefs were valid, but had no connection to what we were studying. This made it possible for students to learn without forsaking their beliefs.

Many courses imply disdain for religion in our western culture. Not in people we are studying but in ourselves.

One does not need to laugh at the ideas of religious groups. Ideas can be expressed in their opposition without this.

I think anyone who is offended by somewhat sceptical religious statements should be more open to express their own ideas. We are here to find out about knowledge of human origins. People should know what they are getting into when they take a course like this one. Don't take offense to it.

There was also concern evident with respect to sexual orientation. The curriculum question on sexual orientation (7) and the teaching staff's respect of students question on sexual orientation (14) both showed lower rates of agreement than did related questions. Other-than-introductory students showed lower rates of agreement and higher rates of disagreement on these questions than did introductory students. Written comments confirmed that this was a subject of marked concern, although these comments cannot be reproduced.

The curriculum question on disability (8) was also conspicuously low, but the teaching staff respect of students question on disability (15) was unexceptional.

4. Introductory and other students. Large proportions of the respondents were introductory students. This is consistent with the enrolment pattern in Anthropology, in which introductory course enrolments are high, but many introductory students proceed to programmes in other departments. We included introductory students in this survey, since they are an important segment of the student body we serve. However, they differ from students in upper year courses and graduate programmes in the extent of their knowledge of anthropology and of the Department of Anthropology, as well as in representing a different and broader segment of the student population. It has therefore seemed advisable to examine introductory students separately from other Anthropology students. The numbers in the other categories were not sufficient to warrant further distinctions. For a detailed tabular presentation of results broken down by enrolment, see appendix D.

Overall, there was very little disagreement between introductory and other (upper year and

graduate) Anthropology students in their responses to the survey. Other (which will consistently mean other-than-introductory) students generally responded somewhat more positively than introductory students did, although the differences were slight (within approximately 5 percent) where the two levels of students did not respond significantly differently. There was one exception: question 9, (the curriculum attends to religion) which, although not statistically significant ($X^2=3.7673$, $DF=1$, $p=0.0523$), does indicate that a smaller proportion of introductory students (55.3%) believe that the curriculum attends to religion than do other students (65.4%).

For the question set about teaching staff respecting students (questions 11 to 17), there were no significant differences in response frequencies between introductory and other students. There were slightly greater frequencies of agreement by introductory students for the issues of gender, sexual orientation, disability and political belief. Other students were slightly more positive than introductory students were for ethnicity, age, and religion. Responses for the issue of gender were similar for introductory and other students.

With respect to the statements about student participation in classroom discussion and learning (question 19) and the statement about the access students of different backgrounds have to help and advice from teaching staff, introductory and other students responded similarly.

With the exception of religion, (discussed above), introductory and other students responded similarly in their identification of themselves as possible subjects of discrimination on the basis of certain issues (questions 23-29). The highest proportion of self-identification was for gender (27.1% for introductory students and 30.7% for other students), followed by age (23.6% for introductory students and 20.7% for other students), religion (22.2% for introductory students and 10.0% for other students), ethnicity (16.5% for introductory students and 15.5% for other students), political belief (8.4% for introductory students and 7.4% for other students), other (6.3% for introductory students and 1.8% for other students), sexual orientation (5.6% for introductory students and 3.4% for other students), and disability (3.7% for introductory students and 2.7% for other students).

The frequencies of respondents who said that they had personally experienced discrimination in the Department of Anthropology were low and uneven (ranging from 0.5% to 5.3%). With the exception of gender (discussed below), these responses did not differ significantly between introductory and other students. Generally, a higher frequency of other students responded that they had personally experienced discrimination in the Department.

The responses to the statement about personally witnessing discrimination in the Department of Anthropology (questions 38 to 45) were somewhat more variable. The frequencies were low and only differed significantly between introductory and other students for age and gender (discussed below).

In seven instances, introductory and other students did respond with statistically significant differences. These instances are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Significant Differences Between Introductory and Other Students

Percentage who Agreed/Strongly Agreed, or, who Answered "Yes" to the Questions.

Q.	Introductory Students	Other Students	(X^2), df=1	P	Warning: at least one cell had an expected value <5

7	Curriculum includes attention to diversity - Sexual Orientation	45.3	32.0	6.5886	0.0103	
18	Increased Understanding of Diversity because of Anthropology courses	74.4	85.8	7.1176	0.0076	
21	Department provides a good environment for free and open expression of ideas, beliefs, opinions	64.4	76.2	5.6774	0.0172	
27	Considers self as possible victim of discrimination on the basis of Religious Belief	22.2	10.0	9.2799	0.0023	
32	Has personally experienced discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of Gender	0.9	5.3	6.4092	0.0114	x
38	Has personally witnessed discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of Age	1.0	4.6	4.8323	0.0279	x
40	Has personally witnessed discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of Gender	1.0	8.0	11.559	0.0007	x

5. Gender. There were more women (61%) than men (39%) responding to the survey, but there were no differences between females and males in their age category distribution. The following summarizes response frequencies where there are substantive differences by gender of respondent.

For the question set regarding curriculum (4-10), there were two instances of substantive differences between women and men in their responses. For religious belief, 64.1% of women respondents and 53.4% of men respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the curriculum attends to that aspect of diversity. For political belief, 54.8% of female respondents and 38.4% of male respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the curriculum attends to that aspect of diversity.

For the question set regarding teaching staff (11-17), although both women and men responded positively, women respondents gave greater frequencies of positive responses than men of approximately 10% across all questions in this set.

There were no differences in responses between women and men for the questions regarding the role of the department in their understanding of diversity (18), students of different backgrounds and their participation (19), and the departmental environment for the free and open expression of beliefs, ideas, and opinions (21). However, 90.6% of women respondents agreed that students of different backgrounds have the same access to teaching staff (20), whereas only 79.2% of men respondents agreed with this statement.

When asked to self-identify as a possible victim of discrimination on the basis of a particular diversity issue (22-29), both women and men answered with similar frequencies, except for the issue of gender, where 40.9% of women respondents and 10.2% of males respondents self-identified, and for the issue of religion, where 20.7% of women respondents and 12.9% of men respondents so identified themselves.

Differences in response frequencies and the counts between women and men respondents

with regard to whether they had personally experienced discrimination (30-37) or personally witnessed discrimination (38-45) are discussed below. Women respondents more frequently said that they had personally witnessed or experienced some form of discrimination within the department than did men respondents.

Fewer respondents indicated having experienced discrimination than witnessing it for any particular issue, which is what one would expect since an incident with one person could have more than one witness. For women respondents, slightly more indicated that they had personally experienced discrimination on the basis of age and gender and had personally witnessed discrimination on the basis of age, gender, and sexual orientation than for other issues. For men respondents, there was a slight increase in their reporting having personally witnessed discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, disability, and religious belief.

Table 6: Response Frequencies to Questions 22-45 by Gender.

Note: Does not include missing cases.

		Women					Men				
		Yes		No		Total	Yes		No		Total
		Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	
<i>Considers self as possible victim of discrimination on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry/Ethnicity	37	16.67	185	83.33	222	21	14.38	125	85.62	146
	Age	59	25.99	168	74.01	227	27	18.37	120	81.63	147
	Gender	92	40.89	133	59.11	225	15	10.20	132	89.80	147
	Sexual Orientation	8	3.54	218	96.46	226	10	6.80	137	93.20	147
	Disability	7	3.08	220	96.92	227	6	4.08	141	95.92	147
	Religious Belief	47	20.70	180	79.30	227	19	12.93	128	87.07	147
	Political Belief	17	7.56	208	92.44	225	12	8.22	134	91.78	146
	Other	6	3.53	164	96.47	170	8	6.61	113	93.39	121
<i>Has personally experienced discrimination on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry/Ethnicity	4	1.87	210	98.13	214	0	0.00	140	100.00	140
	Age	7	3.08	220	96.92	227	0	0.00	146	100.00	146
	Gender	9	3.96	218	96.04	227	1	0.68	145	99.32	146
	Sexual Orientation	4	1.75	224	98.25	228	0	0.00	145	100.00	145
	Disability	3	1.32	225	98.68	228	0	0.00	146	100.00	146
	Religious Belief	6	2.62	223	97.38	229	1	0.68	145	99.32	146
	Political Belief	4	1.76	223	98.24	227	1	0.68	145	99.32	146
	Other	4	2.20	178	97.80	182	1	0.79	126	99.21	127
<i>Has personally witnessed discrimination on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry/Ethnicity	4	1.83	215	98.17	219	1	0.69	143	99.31	144
	Age	7	3.18	213	96.82	220	2	1.39	142	98.61	144
	Gender	11	5.00	209	95.00	220	3	2.08	141	97.92	144
	Sexual Orientation	9	4.13	209	95.87	218	3	2.11	139	97.89	142
	Disability	3	1.37	216	98.63	219	4	2.82	138	97.18	142
	Religious Belief	6	2.74	213	97.26	219	5	3.52	137	96.48	142
	Political Belief	4	1.82	216	98.18	220	2	1.41	140	98.59	142
	Other	3	1.85	159	98.15	162	2	1.64	120	98.36	122

6. Sensitization. We considered whether there were differences between students associated with whether they had been sensitized to diversity issues. This was tested by correlating those who reported themselves as possible subjects of discrimination with related questions. The same correlations were also made with people who reported themselves as having personally experienced or personally witnessed discrimination. Six tables, organized by question (4-10, 11-17, 18, 19, 20, and 21), detailing the results of this analysis can be found in Appendix E. A summary of the important findings is presented in this section.

For this part of the survey analysis, respondents were subdivided into two groups based on whether they had answered "Yes" or "No" to questions 22 to 45. That is to say, those who responded that they might be subjects of discrimination, had personally experienced discrimination, and/or had witnessed discrimination on the basis of a particular diversity issue were compared to the respondents who answered no to the same questions. The two groups ("Yes" and "No") of respondents were compared with regard to their answers for all other questions. The purpose of this analysis was to investigate whether respondents who indicated that they had some personal experience with discrimination--and could be considered sensitized to discrimination--differed in their responses from those who had not so indicated.

Some of the sub-samples reported here are small in number and caution should be used when attaching import to any frequency derived from these small sub-samples. We tried collapsing the two groups "personally experienced discrimination" and "personally witnessed discrimination" into one group, but even this strategy did not relieve the analysis from the problem of small sub-sample size. Also, the Chi-squared test for association tends to break down when the expected numbers in any cell falls below 5. This warning is indicated on the tables where the problem occurs. This problem also was not alleviated when we collapsed the two groups "personally experienced discrimination" and "personally witnessed discrimination" into one group. In this case, Fisher's Exact Test is an appropriate test to use when the numbers in the expected cells fall below 5. This test was performed for all results, but there were no differences in which associations were found to be "statistically significant". For simplicity, and because the Chi-square test is more commonly understood, the Fisher's Exact Test results are not presented here.

Overall, ratings of agreement were lower if the respondent had personally witnessed discrimination or personally experienced discrimination in the Department of Anthropology. Self-identification as a possible victim of discrimination was sometimes associated with lower agreement, but not across all issues or questions. In some instances, the sub-population sample sizes were very low and are thus not necessarily appropriate for unequivocal interpretations.

For the question set on curriculum (4-10), those respondents who indicated that they had been sensitized to diversity issues (might be a subject of discrimination, experienced discrimination, or witnessed discrimination) were generally less positive about the curriculum's attention to the various issues than the other respondents. Ratings of agreement were highest for ancestry/ethnicity. Agreement from those who said that they had been exposed to discrimination was lowest for the issues of age and disability. Perhaps more instructive is the frequency of respondents who said that they disagreed with the statement. Again, for age and disability, the frequency of exposed respondents who disagreed was generally high. Disagreement was also high for sexual orientation, religious belief, and political belief.

For the question set on teaching staff respect of students (11-17), agreement was generally high. The frequency of disagreement from respondents who did not indicate exposure to discrimination was very low, ranging from 0.3% to 2.6%. However, the respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination more frequently disagreed with the statement for all issues except ancestry/ethnicity.

For the question on whether Anthropology courses led to more understanding of diversity (18), agreement to this statement was very high for both respondent groups. In most instances, the respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination more frequently agreed to the statement than the other group. As well, the frequency of neutral responses was lower than from the other respondent group. Disagreement with the statement was higher for those who indicated that they had been exposed to the diversity issues of religious belief, political belief, and other.

With respect to the question on classroom participation (19), for both respondent groups, the frequency of neutral responses was moderate to high and overall agreement to the statement was low. Across all issues, those who did not indicate that they had been exposed to discrimination disagreed with the statement with frequencies ranging from 10.8% to 13.2%. Disagreement from respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination was higher and variable. For these respondents, the frequency of disagreement with the statement across all diversity issues ranged from 13.2% to 66.7%, averaging approximately 30% disagreement. Although the respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination disagreed more frequently with the statement than the other respondent group, disagreement does not seem to be tied to any particular diversity issue.

For the question on teaching staff help and advice (20), disagreement with the statement was generally low for both respondent groups. With regard to the respondents who did not indicate that they had been exposed to discrimination, the rating of agreement to this statement was high, averaging approximately 87%, and the frequency of neutral responses were low, averaging approximately 10%, across all diversity issues. Disagreement was very low for this respondent group, averaging approximately 2.6%. For the group of respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination, the frequency of neutral responses was often high, and agreement to the statement was lower for some diversity issues. For the issues of age, gender, disability, and religious belief, those respondents who indicated that they had personally witnessed discrimination on the basis of these issues disagreed with the statement more frequently than other respondents, where the frequencies of disagreement to the statement were 11.1%, 21.4%, 14.2%, and 18.2% respectively.

For the question on environment (21), the frequency of neutral responses was moderately high and agreement was low for both respondent groups. With regard to the respondents who did not indicate that they had been exposed to discrimination, ratings of agreement were consistent across diversity issues, where agreement averaged approximately 70%, disagreement averaged approximately 12%, and the frequency of neutral responses averaged approximately 18%. For the respondents who indicated that they had been exposed to discrimination, frequencies were more variable, disagreement was higher across all issues, but no single issue had noticeably higher frequencies of disagreement when taking into account the very small sub-population sizes for some issues. Generally, those who responded that they might be subjects of discrimination responded more positively than did those who had personally experienced discrimination or had personally witnessed discrimination.

7. Personal Experience and Personal Witnessing of Discrimination. Although the student views of the department's attention to diversity is generally positive, the survey also indicates that there are students in the department who report that they have personally experienced or have personally witnessed discrimination. See Table 7.

Table 7: Response Frequencies of those who Answered "Yes" to Questions 22-45 by Enrolment.

Note: Does not include missing cases.

		Overall		Introductory Students		Other Students	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>I consider myself to be someone who might be the subject of discrimination on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry /Ethnicity	58	14.9	35	16.5	23	15.5
	Age	86	22.1	51	23.6	31	20.7
	Gender	107	27.5	58	27.1	46	29.3
	Sexual Orientation	18	4.6	12	5.6	5	3.4
	Disability	13	3.3	8	3.7	4	3.0
	Religious Belief	66	17.0	48	22.2	15	10.0
	Political Belief	29	7.5	18	8.4	11	7.0
	Other	14	3.6	11	6.3	2	2.0
<i>I have personally experienced discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry /Ethnicity	4	1.0	1	0.5	3	2.0
	Age	7	1.8	2	1.0	5	3.3
	Gender	10	2.6	2	1.0	8	5.3
	Sexual Orientation	4	1.0	1	0.5	3	2.0
	Disability	3	0.8	1	0.5	2	1.0
	Religious Belief	7	1.8	4	1.8	3	2.0
	Political Belief	5	1.3	3	1.4	2	1.0
	Other	5	1.3	3	1.6	2	2.0
<i>I have personally witnessed discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of:</i>	Ancestry /Ethnicity	5	1.3	3	1.4	2	1.0
	Age	9	2.3	2	1.0	7	5.0
	Gender	14	3.6	2	1.0	12	8.0
	Sexual Orientation	12	3.1	5	2.4	7	5.0
	Disability	7	1.8	2	1.0	5	3.0
	Religious Belief	11	2.8	7	3.4	4	3.0
	Political Belief	6	1.5	4	1.9	2	1.0
	Other	5	1.3	4	2.3	1	1.0

A considerable proportion (47.75%) of our students perceived themselves to be at risk of discrimination on one basis or another. There was little difference between introductory (47.71%) and other (48.08%) students who indicated that they perceived themselves to be at risk of discrimination for one or more areas of concern. A much smaller number report having personally experienced or witnessed discrimination in the Department of Anthropology. While it is evidently good that these numbers are low, it remains a source of concern that they are present at all.

Two of the areas where the numbers are high are ones that have been discussed above (religious belief and sexual orientation).

Age emerges as an area of concern here. For those who indicated that they might be subjects of discrimination on the basis of age, (22.11% overall), introductory and other students responded with similar frequencies. Both conventional university age students and mature students expressed concern on this subject (see Table 8). One category of older respondents (40-49) indicated they considered themselves at risk of discrimination on the basis of age at much higher frequency (60%), although no respondents in the 50 and over category indicated that they were at risk on this issue. However, both of these latter categories have very small sample numbers. Younger respondents (up to 22) comprised the bulk of the respondents who indicated that they had personally experienced or witnessed discrimination on the basis of age.

Table 8: Response Frequencies to Questions 22-45 by Age Categories.

Note: Does not include missing cases.

			Age					Total
			Up to 22	23-29	30-39	40-49	50 & Over	
<i>I consider myself to be someone who might be the subject of discrimination on the basis of Age</i>	No	Count	208	60	16	2	2	288
		%	76.50	81.10	76.20	40.00	100.00	
	Yes	Count	64	14	5	3	0	86
		%	23.50	18.90	23.80	60.00	0.00	
	Total	Count	272	74	21	5	2	374
<i>I have personally experienced discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of Age</i>	No	Count	264	74	22	4	2	366
		%	97.80	100.00	100.00	80.00	100.00	
	Yes	Count	6	0	0	1	0	7
		%	2.20	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	
	Total	Count	270	74	22	5	2	373
<i>I have personally witnessed discrimination in the Department of Anthropology on the basis of Age</i>	No	Count	254	73	21	5	2	355
		%	96.90	98.60	100.00	100.00	100.00	
	Yes	Count	8	1	0	0	0	9
		%	3.10	1.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Total	Count	262	74	21	5	2	364

Gender appears as a conspicuous concern. As Table 7 indicates, there were higher absolute numbers across all three questions (reporting being at risk, personally experiencing discrimination or personally witnessing it) on the basis of gender than upon the basis of any other aspect examined in this study. Further, there was an increase between introductory and other students, and it was predominantly women who reported these concerns. 27.1% of introductory students and 30.7% of other students considered themselves at risk of discrimination on the basis of gender. The number of students, and especially of other students who reported themselves at risk on the basis of gender were disproportionately women. Of the introductory students who indicated that they considered themselves at risk on the basis of gender 79.3% (n=46) were women and 20.7% (n=12) were men. Of the other

students who indicated that they considered themselves at risk on the basis of gender 93.5% (n=43) were women and 6.5% (n=3) were men. This is confirmed from a slightly different perspective: 35.6% (n=46) of introductory women reported themselves as at risk of discrimination on the basis of gender, but 46.7% of other women considered themselves at risk on this basis.

There was a similar increase with regard to personally experiencing or personally witnessing of discrimination on the basis of gender, and again this was concentrated among women. Gender discrimination was not conspicuously reported by introductory students, but represented the largest number of cases of discrimination both experienced (8 or 5.3%) and witnessed (12 or 8.0%) by other students. Of the introductory students who indicated that they had personally experienced or personally witnessed discrimination or on the basis of gender, 100% (n=2) were women in both cases. Of the other students who indicated that they had personally experienced discrimination on the basis of gender, 87.5% (n=7) were women and 12.5% (n=1) were men. Of the other students who indicated that they had personally witnessed discrimination on the basis of gender, 75% (n=9) were women and 25% (n=3) were men. Again from a different perspective, among introductory women students, 2 (1.6%) reported personally experiencing discrimination on the basis of gender, but among other women students 7 (7.5%) reported such a personal experience; among introductory women students, 2 (1.6%) reported personally witnessing discrimination on the basis of gender, but among other women students 9 (9.8%) reported such personal witnessing. Increased exposure to the Department of Anthropology is associated with increased experience of discrimination based on gender, and this has been noticed by men as well as women students.

It is evident that other students showed higher rates of experiencing or witnessing discrimination than introductory students did. One might observe that other students have simply had more time and opportunity. One might also observe that there ought not to have been this much opportunity. In the words of the students:

I find that professors can be unprofessional during class time by making derogatory and inappropriate comments to or about a fellow student.

The teachers have been extremely careful with students' rights to express their own perceptions and understandings on the subjects they are studying.

The prof is respectful to every student that walks into this classroom. He takes the time to help anyone who needs help, no matter what their race or beliefs.

Professor xx is a teacher who lacks all respect for students and is very condescending to us in his teaching methods. He treats females as if we are not in school for learning but other reasons. I cannot concentrate in his class and am constantly attacked without just cause. I had to quit the class on the basis that I had completely lost interest because of his arrogance.

I have had good teachers and I have had bad teachers. I have not seen any racial discrimination but there is certainly age and gender bias among most of them.

8. Student Comments. 138 respondents provided written comments that have been useful in interpreting the quantitative replies. Those which could be reproduced are contained in Appendix F, and readers are referred to that appendix in its entirety, and especially to the responses to question 47, which asked for suggestions.

Apart from the considerable number of encouraging responses, indicating that much of the work of the Department of Anthropology is effective with respect to diversity, there was

another, smaller cluster of comments presenting deeply felt expressions about lack of respect for persons. While both the quantitative and the qualitative responses indicate that such lack of respect is far from common in the department, it is evident that there are occurrences and that these are having an impact upon our students, especially upon those who are at risk of one of the recognized forms of discrimination in our society.

A few questions (among both those that could and those that could not be reproduced) can be interpreted as a cluster showing problems with access to processes or resources that could help in reducing barriers or resolving problems. For example:

The use of multiple-choice exams in introductory courses to the exclusion of all other forms of testing, represents a formidable barrier to the progress of some students with learning disabilities. Students that would normally excel if asked to produce written responses.

Discussions with the Disability Coordinator as soon as this comment was read indicated that the situation would depend upon the particular disability, and that the resources available through Disability Services (such as extra time) might not be known to this student. The Anthropology Undergraduate Programs Committee has been asked to reconsider the department's use of multiple-choice exams from the perspective of disability issues and as a pedagogical issue.

Or:

Allow students of the Department to write papers in either official language.

The Department does not have its own policy on this subject. The University requires English, but individual instructors can permit students to submit papers in French, and the Department does not prohibit this. While we cannot require this of instructors, since they are not required to be proficient in both official languages, there is a degree of flexibility.

It is also evident from the comments as a whole that students do not always find effective access to means of dealing with issues of lack of respect or of discrimination.

Observations

The survey reported here was very small-scale and limited in what it was able to explore. The summary of responses cannot be considered conclusive, but may be helpful in identifying where students view us as doing relatively well, and where we could and should examine our practices and strive to improve them.

University policies and the values most of us share require that we treat everyone in our diverse community with respect. The common humanity we share is something that cannot always be taken for granted, but must be achieved through understanding the specificities of everyone's particular life. Anthropology as a discipline can aid us in this understanding, but does not automatically or effortlessly create a community of dignity free of discrimination.

University policies point us toward respect for diversity, but are general statements and do not set standards to achieve. It is up to us to decide whether to be satisfied with the present level of performance or to ask ourselves to reach higher. The findings summarized here will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Department of Anthropology for consideration for individual and collective action. The senior author, for example, intends to take further steps toward an inclusive curriculum in her own courses in the coming year.

There are minimum practices of respect and conduct that we are required to observe in the

University. This survey has found that there are instances in which students state we have failed to meet these minimum levels. It is not possible for an anonymous survey to address individual problems, although the Head and several offices (such as Equity Services, Disability Services and Student Advocacy) are available in the University for this purpose. This survey does allow us to identify areas of concern and to take action to prevent or at least reduce instances of discrimination.

It is a year since this survey was conducted. Anthropology is not the same, and we all face a changed world that more urgently requires commitment to our shared humanity. We know and have recently been reminded of our strengths in respecting and caring for each other. Let us carry these strengths forward in the coming time.

To slightly paraphrase one of the survey comments:

I think that there is a respect for human diversity in the Department of Anthropology. How could a field that is interested in and all about other cultures and societies have any sort of disrespect for a human?

[Appendix A](#)

Survey of Student Perceptions

[Appendix B](#)

Overall Frequencies

[Appendix C](#)

Summary of Analyses and Statistical Tests

[Appendix D](#)

Frequencies by Enrollment

[Appendix E](#)

Sensitization

Appendix F

Questions 46-49