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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the findings from Phases II - IV of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups.

Phase II of the MU Campus Climate Study obtained participation from 99 non-academic student service providers on campus (e.g., Student Health, Counseling Center, Success Center, Student Life, Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.), to evaluate the accessibility, suitability, and quality of their services to students from underrepresented groups, as well as the knowledge, awareness and competencies of the service providers in each unit.

Phase III of the MU Campus Climate Study obtained participation from 1134 students who use 34 non-academic services on campus to assess their perceptions of the accessibility, suitability, and quality of services to members of underrepresented groups.

Phase IV of the MU Campus Climate Study focused on students’ experiences of violence and harassment on campus. Data was collected from 1356 faculty, students and staff in order to assess the prevalence and types of violence and harassment experienced by members of the MU community.

All participants were recruited for participation via e-mail solicitation and completed online surveys.

Only 20 of the 34 student services units were represented among the participants in Phase II. The number of participants reached double digits in only 4 of the 34 campus units surveyed, and the modal number of participants per unit was 1.

Phase II data indicate that respondents overall tended to rate the quality of the services provided by their units on average as above “adequate” and below “extremely well” with respect to the issues addressed in the survey questionnaire.

Phase II respondents rated the quality of services rendered by their units lower on average for non-native English speakers, non-Christian individuals, persons with disabilities, and LGB students.

Among Phase II participants, average ratings for the “effectiveness of diversity trainings,” “staff knowledge,” and “availability of appropriate resources” tended to be lower than ratings on other items.

Many Phase II participants reported that they had received no training at MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups, and many others reported training that appears to have taken place outside the context of their current employment at MU. A small but significant proportion of respondents indicated that they had received training to address the needs of underrepresented groups as part of their employment at MU.

Concluding comments for Phase II participants reflected a wide range of attitudes reflecting pride, investment, support, and concern as well as disdain for issues regarding the treatment of underrepresented groups among student services units on campus at MU.
Phase III data was obtained for 33 student services units using a 36-item instrument designed to examine student perceptions of the accessibility, suitability, and quality of services to members of underrepresented groups.

Only those respondents in Phase III who indicated that they had received services from a particular unit on campus within the past year were allowed to complete a survey for that particular unit, and only responses obtained from members of the target groups were used in evaluating the responsiveness of a unit toward that group.

The vast majority of student service units evaluated in Phase III received average ratings from all six underrepresented group participants that were above a rating of “adequate” and below a rating of “extremely well,” with only a few exceptions.

Average ratings that were below “adequate” were obtained for a small number of student service units in Phase III with respect to LGBT and/or non-Christian religious minorities.

An expansive number of comments were provided by Phase III participants that reflected a wide range of attitudes reflecting pride, investment, support, and concern as well as disdain for issues regarding the treatment of underrepresented groups among student services units on campus at MU.

There were 224 Phase IV participants (16.5%) who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU.

Sexual harassment reported in Phase IV was primarily reported by women (n = 194) of European American descent (n = 199) and heterosexual orientation (n = 199).

The primary forms of sexual harassment reported in Phase IV were “unwanted contacts” (n = 97) and “uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes” (n = 134).

Sexual harassment reported in Phase IV was committed most often by work supervisors (n = 41), faculty/TAs (n = 60), peers (n = 80), and coworkers (n = 63).

Participants in Phase IV reported that they most often discussed the harassment with nobody (n = 54), family (n = 59), friends (n = 124), and significant others (71).

The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding sexual harassment did not perceive them to be effective.

Experiences of sexual harassment were associated with higher rates of depressive symptoms and fears for personal safety.

There were 33 Phase IV participants (2.4%) who reported being victims of hate crimes on campus at MU.
Hate crimes reported in Phase IV were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 8), race/ethnicity (n = 9), sexual orientation (n = 5), religion (n = 5) and other (n = 5).

The types of hate crimes reported by Phase IV participants included threats of violence (n = 7), threatening or harassing phone calls (n = 5), vandalism (n = 5), and other (n = 15).

Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate crimes with nobody (n = 6), family (n = 9), friends (n = 16), and significant others (n = 10).

The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate crime victimization did not perceive them to be effective.

Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher rates fears for personal safety.

There were 142 Phase IV participants (10.5%) who reported being victims of hate incidents on campus at MU.

Hate incidents reported in Phase IV were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 42), race/ethnicity (n = 57), sexual orientation (n = 37), religion (n = 52) and other (n = 10).

The types of hate incidents reported by Phase IV participants included offensive jokes or remarks (n = 122), offensive editorials, cartoons or news stories (n = 120), and public displays of objects, signs or symbols (n = 51).

Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate incidents with nobody (n = 26), faculty/TA (n = 21), family (n = 63), friends (n = 97), and significant others (n = 55).

The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate incident victimization did not perceive them to be effective.

Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms.

There were 95 Phase IV participants (7.0%) who reported witnessing hate crimes on campus at MU.

There were 340 Phase IV participants (25.1%) who reported witnessing hate incidents on campus at MU.
Throughout the past two centuries, colleges and universities in the United States have shifted from a predominantly affluent, Christian, heterosexual, White, male faculty and student body to include greater diversity in many different forms. In particular, over the past four decades there have been increasing numbers of women, people of color, people with disabilities, non-native English speaking international students and faculty, non-Christian religious minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) individuals on campuses around the country (Spitzberg & Thordike, 1992). The civil rights movement, the elimination in public school segregation, and a surge in minority enrollments raised the level of public consciousness regarding inequalities in the education of minority groups (Hurtado, 1992). Multicultural experts have contended that it is imperative for colleges and universities to impart the necessary skills and sensitivities for living successfully in a culturally pluralistic world (Grieger, 1996). Yet, despite a rapid increase in diversity, researchers have suggested that historically underrepresented group members tend to perceive the campus climate quite differently than their majority group peers—more often perceiving the environment as unwelcoming or unsupportive (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000).

The American Association of Colleges and Universities (1995) challenges higher education institutions to create and articulate a commitment to inclusion, fairness, and equality. It proposes that colleges and universities commit to developing inclusive environments in which all people are welcome, valued, and heard equally. The report suggests that in order to provide a framework within which a vital community of learning can be built, a primary mission of the academy must be to create an environment that ideally cultivates diversity and celebrates difference. In summary, the creation of a welcoming climate is conducive to fulfilling the missions of institutions of higher education, and members of the academic community both contribute to and are impacted by the campus environment (Rankin, 1998).

Historically, the prevailing view among higher education administrators held that minority group members were responsible for their own plight, and that in order to gain access to opportunities in the higher education system they would have to adapt and conform to the existing institutional structure, culture, and values. Cronbach (1957) said it this way:

Institutions, by demanding adaptation, serve as instruments of natural selection among men [sic] . . . The [educator’s] job, in this tradition, is to facilitate or anticipate natural selection. He seeks only to reduce its cruelty and wastage by predicting who will survive in schools and other institutions as they are. He takes the system for granted and tries to identify who will fit into it.

Sue (1995) has pointed out that multicultural organizational development (MOD) tends to progress in a stage-wise fashion, from “monocultural” (e.g., Eurocentric, androcentric, monolingual, heterosexist values, and a view of minorities as “tokens”) through “nondiscriminatory” (a nonsystemic, fragmented approach to diversity intended to meet legal standards for nondiscrimination) to “multicultural” (e.g., actively valuing diversity in its many forms in a manner that permeates all aspects of the institution). The philosophical premise underlying multicultural
Institutions is social justice—reflecting an organization that will not permit racism, sexism, homophobia or other forms of intolerance, and instead addresses issues of equal access, and embraces diversity as an asset (Grieger, 1996). Institutions of higher education that are multicultural (a) are composed of faculty, staff and students that are representative of the diversity found in the population; (b) express a valuing of diversity in public statements of commitment, vision, mission, processes, structures, policies, service delivery, and allocation of resources; and (c) values and rewards multicultural competencies, including diversity-positive attitudes, knowledge about salient aspects of diverse groups, and skills in interacting with and serving diverse groups effectively, sensitively, and respectfully (Grieger, 1996).

Increased diversity on university campuses can be understood from both social justice and economic health perspectives (Blimling, 2001). The consensus among educators over the past twenty years suggests that diversity on college campuses is associated with the following: (a) greater learning, (b) increased interpersonal competencies, (c) greater self-confidence among students, (d) fewer irrational prejudices, (e) greater gains in critical thinking, and (f) greater involvement in civic and community service (Beckham, 2000; Gudeman, 2000; Gurin, 1999; Pascarella, Palmer, Moye, & Pierson, 2001; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Milem, 1999; Smith, Gerbick, Figuroa, Watkins, Levitan et al., 1997; Sedlacek, 1987). Although it is impossible to produce research that provides a causal connection between these various outcomes and campus diversity, all of these outcomes are likely to positively affect the preparation of graduates to live and work in a diverse U.S. society as well as the global economic infrastructure (Blimling, 2001). The mandate to educate all students to live and work in a pluralistic society is so critical that it has been argued that producing multiculturally competent graduates should be the preeminent criterion for defining academic excellence in the 21st century (Grieger & Tolliver, 2001). However, numerical representations alone cannot determine whether minority students, faculty or staff are welcomed and supported by institutions of higher learning (Gloria, Hird, & Navarro, 2001). As such, colleges and universities have a responsibility to provide a campus climate that is equitable for all students. Blimling (2001) asserts that educators have a moral imperative to conduct research on individual college campuses nationwide in order to demonstrate how diversity can make education richer at their individual institutions.

Climate for People of Color

People of color represent over 31 percent of the population in the U.S. (approximately 90 million people), and include individuals of Hispanic/Latino (12.5%), African (12.3%), Asian (3.6%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (0.9%) and multiracial (2.4%) backgrounds (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a). This constitutes a substantial shift in a relatively short period of time, given that non-Hispanic Whites constituted over 75 percent of the population just ten years earlier (U. S. Census Bureau, 1990), and approximately 86 percent in 1980 (U. S. Census Bureau, 2000b). In the Pacific (Washington, California, Oregon, Alaska, and Hawaii) and West South Central (Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas) regions of the country, Whites hold only narrow margins of majority over people of color (53% and 58%, respectively), are on the verge of being outnumbered in Texas (52%), and are already numerical minorities in Hawaii, New Mexico, and California (23%, 45%, and 47%, respectively) as well as in many major metropolitan cities (e.g., Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, New York, Philadelphia, San Antonio, San Diego, San Francisco, St. Louis, Washington, D.C.). The Census Bureau has projected that people of color will be a numerical majority in the U.S. as a whole some time after 2050.
Unquestionably, in order for college graduates to be successful in the newly emerging plurality of racial-ethnic diversity in the U.S., exposure to diversity and competencies for responding to people of color will be essential.

High school completion rates in the U.S. (among individuals 25 years and older) have been steadily increasing for all racial-ethnic groups over the past 60 years (U.S. Census, 2003a), yet access to a university degree has continued to lag far behind. The most recent figures indicate that Hispanics continue to lag behind both Blacks and Whites, graduating high school at less than two-thirds of the rate for Whites, while African Americans’ graduation rates are approximately 90 percent of the rate for Whites (57.0, 79.2, and 88.7 percent, respectively). The high school graduation rate for Asian Americans was 86 percent in 2000. Although the latest census figures indicate that African Americans have narrowed the college graduation gap to nearly 60 percent of the rate for Whites (17.2 and 29.4 percent, respectively), Hispanics continue to lag behind at 11.1 percent, less than 40 percent of the rate for Whites. Asian Americans have the highest level of college graduation rates across all groups with 44 percent having a college degree or more education in 2000. Disparities in employment opportunities and income are the logical result of the continuing lack of educational parity for people of color. In 2001, the mean income for African American families (across all income groups) was only 59.7 percent of the average income for non-Hispanic White families; the corresponding figure for families of Hispanic origin was 61.5 percent of the average income for White families (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003b).

Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman (2001) pointed out that strong relationships among socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and occupational level have led to a continuous cycle of impoverished, poorly educated, and underemployed people of color (p. 249). For example, Whites are more likely than people of color to (a) attend schools with smaller class sizes, (b) have access to computers in public schools and at home during schooling, (c) graduate from a 4-year college or university, (d) earn higher incomes, (e) retain employment during a recession, (f) have health insurance and gain access to health care, (g) survive some life-threatening illnesses (e.g., cancer), (h) experience better housing conditions (e.g., less crowding, less crime, less litter and deterioration, and fewer problems with public services), (i) spend a smaller proportion of income on housing, (j) have greater access to home mortgage loans and home ownership, (k) invest in the stock market and retirement accounts, and (l) gain a substantial net worth (Neville et al., 2001). Recognition of the recurrent nature of these types of advantages based on racial group membership has produced efforts to engage in affirmative action as a method of change.

Affirmative action policies were first initiated in the early 1960s to correct many decades of racial discrimination in employment and education, with the first use of the term attributed to President John F. Kennedy in an executive order intended to reduce or eliminate racial discrimination in employment among government contractors. After only a decade of implementation of affirmative action policies, the first two major cases against it were presented to the U.S. Supreme Court (i.e., DeFunis v. Odegaard, and Regents of the University of California v. Bakke), which were followed by a series of additional cases over the course of twenty years. The Bakke case against the University of California resulted in a split decision that produced rulings both supporting and limiting affirmative action in educational admissions. More recently, hearing two cases against the University of Michigan simultaneously (Grutter v. Bollinger, and Gratz v. Bollinger), the U.S. Supreme Court issued yet another split decision. In the first decision, the Court upheld the policy of the University of Michigan Law School in giving consideration to increasing diversity within the law school and among those in the legal professions by using race as one factor
in determining admissions. In the second decision, the court ruled that the University of Michigan admissions policy that awarded points to people of color on the basis of race/ethnicity (along with points awarded for such things as children of alumni, athletes, and men enrolling in nursing programs) was unconstitutional. In writing the majority opinion for Grutter v. Bollinger, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said the Constitution “does not prohibit the … narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body ... In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry, it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity.” Although the University of Michigan cases were the most important rulings on affirmative action by the U.S. Supreme Court in a generation, there will likely be future cases that continue to test the limits of policies designed to correct longstanding inequities in education and employment for people of color.

Despite institutional efforts to promote diversity and manage racial tensions on campuses by attracting increased numbers of minority faculty and students, institutional assumptions regarding the relationship of quality to diversity often inappropriately place these two goals in conflict, thereby adding to the tension (Hurtado, 1992). Viewed from this perspective, arguments for quality can be used as a means of excluding minority group members’ enrollments, thus maintaining the status quo with respect to inclusion of members of minority groups and the impact their enrollment will have on the culture of the institution (Hurtado, 1992). Specifically, selective institutions tend to emphasize the requirement for students to demonstrate their achievement prior to enrollment (thereby maintaining institutional status and reputation), whereas open-enrollment institutions allow students to demonstrate their achievement during the course of enrollment (thereby contributing to the improvement of achievement among minority group members in the process). Hurtado (1992) has suggested that there is a paradox at selective institutions with respect to diversity, in that they tend to adopt a perspective that views diversity and quality in opposition to one another, yet they simultaneously foster progressive thought with respect to diversity which ultimately contradicts the institution’s own policies with respect to diversity. According to Hurtado (1992), “racial tension may be highest in these contradictory environments because institutional commitment to diversity is often ambivalent, mitigated by other institutional actions that exclude minorities and their perspectives” (p. 561). As such, admissions policies and models appear to have a great deal of influence on the campus climate for diversity, as well as the overall progress made on the elimination of historical inequities among groups.

Early studies indicated that institutional selectivity and campus size were related to racial tensions on campus (Hurtado, 1992), which can be explained in essentially two alternative ways: (a) highly selective campuses tend to attract protest-prone students and faculty, and (b) large campuses tend to be more impersonal and less concerned with individual students’ needs. Furthermore, under conditions of increasing cultural diversity the differences between groups become salient on an everyday basis and inter-group conflict can result. For the first time, many students must learn to interact with classmates and roommates who are different from them. For most students, whatever their group membership, college is the first occasion to have extensive contacts with individuals who differ from them in socially significant ways. Because of the pervasive racial and ethnic segregation that characterizes many communities, most students grow up going to school and residing among only “their own kind.” When they go off to college, they are likely to meet a broader range of humanity than they have ever encountered. Recent research suggests that higher rates of institutional spending per student on student services and student aid are associated with perceptions of more favorable campus climates for diversity, which can be explained by a higher
degree of real and perceived support for students (Hurtado, 1992). Furthermore, although campus administrators anticipated some of the different types of issues they might face as minority student enrollments increased, they frequently failed to anticipate corresponding problems with majority students in matters such as admissions (e.g., Supreme Court cases such as Bakke, Grutter, and Gratz), student organizations, and student publications (Hurtado, 1992).

Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr (2000) studied the campus cultural climate of a large mid-Atlantic university and found significant differences between racial-ethnic groups regarding perceptions of campus climate related to (a) racial-ethnic hostility, (b) pressure to conform to stereotypes, (c) inequitable treatment by faculty, staff, and teaching assistants, (d) residence hall tensions, (e) faculty racism, and (f) cross-cultural comfort. Whites consistently held more favorable views of the campus cultural climate than members of racial-ethnic minority groups (African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans), and there were occasional differences in perceptions among racial-ethnic group members. Gloria and colleagues (Gloria & Ho, 2003; Gloria & Robinson Kurpius; 2001; Gloria, Robinson Kurpius, Hamilton, & Willson, 1999) conducted a series of studies to examine the relation of social support, university comfort, and self-beliefs (i.e., consisted of measures of self-esteem and college-related self-efficacy) to the academic persistence decisions of three different racial ethnic groups: African American, Asian American, and American Indian undergraduates. Social support (perceived social support from family and friends; mentoring within the academic setting) was the strongest predictor of academic persistence for all three groups, and positive perceptions of the university environment were particularly important for African Americans and American Indians. Also, differences were found among Asian American subgroups regarding the importance of social support, university comfort, and self-beliefs in predicting academic persistence (Gloria & Ho, 2003). In a similar study, Tomlinson-Clarke (1994) followed a group of African American (60%), Hispanic (18%), and White (18%) college students over a three-year period to examine the relationships between academic comfort, occupational orientation, and academic persistence. Tomlinson-Clarke found that relationships between academic comfort and occupational orientation differed by racial group, but did not find a relationship between academic comfort and persistence for African American, Hispanic, or White students.

In a study of 716 undergraduates, White students reported more positive perceptions of the university environment, higher cultural congruity, and more positive help-seeking attitudes than racial and ethnic minority students did (Gloria et al., 2001). This indicates that the campus environment is more consistent with the cultural experiences and personal development of White students, which is likely to influence their perceptions of the quality of the environment and willingness to utilize non-academic student services. Constantine and Arorash (2001) found that among students utilizing counseling services, African American and Latino students desired counseling services that would be culturally appropriate. Further, Mau & Fernandes (2001) found that the effectiveness of career counseling services depends substantially on the degree to which the unique needs of diverse populations are recognized and addressed. These findings are likely to be relevant to other student services beyond counseling and career services, including health services, advising, disability services, and recreational services (Gloria & Rodriguez, 2000). As diversity increases on university campuses, university student services centers will need to address and integrate sociocultural context into their programming and implement interventions that are culturally appropriate to minority students.
Climate for Non-native English Speakers

Students and faculty from other countries represent a pool of potentially rich resources for campuses in their quest toward globalization and internationalization in education. U.S. institutions of higher learning have been able to attract students and scholars from other countries, with US colleges and universities enrolling more international students (nearly 500,000 on average) and hosting more international scholars (more than 70,000) than any other country (American Council on Education [ACE], 2000). International students often experience a number of different problems related to language proficiency, social isolation, financial complications, adapting to the laws and norms of a new country, culture shock and homesickness, and lack of familiar and necessary consumer goods and services (e.g., foods, religious articles). These potential problems of adjustment can result in a multitude of outcomes that reduce functioning in social, academic and physical domains. Furthermore, due to cultural differences in expectations and values regarding help seeking, international students and scholars may be less likely to pursue and receive help from campus units designed to provide assistance.

Lysgaard (1955) suggested that international “sojourners” progress through three discrete stages: (a) initial elation and optimism, (b) frustration and depression, and (c) confidence and satisfaction. Investigations of this model have received mixed results (e.g., clearly not all international scholars and students experience all three stages). Mischel (1968) introduced the notion that social support and the acquisition of social skills will facilitate adjustment to the host culture. Among the critical components of the social support model are the cultural learning opportunities afforded by cross-cultural friendships within the host institution. Unfortunately, there is little data about how well universities facilitate adjustment among international students and scholars, or how welcoming the climate is for members of these groups.

A potential critical hindrance of globalization and the internationalization of education is the U.S. trend toward monolingualism (ACE, 2000). According to the ACE, enrollment among U.S. college students in foreign language courses has dropped significantly over the past 4 decades, study abroad programs have failed to gain substantial popularity, and U.S. college students consistently perform poorly on global competency surveys. Furthermore, the rise of the nationwide English-only movement at all levels of education has probably had some impact on the quality of life for non-native English speakers on university campuses across the nation. For example, the State of Missouri passed legislation in 1986 that was designed to limit teaching activities by non-native English speakers, which prohibits international students from assistantships involving teaching during their first semester and in subsequent semesters until their English language proficiency has been established via testing. Thus, these students must be screened and receive training before they are approved for teaching or assisting with teaching in any way. Although the law was designed to address the concerns of student groups regarding the understandability of instructors in the college classroom, it places an additional level of responsibility and burden on international students at the university above and beyond their own struggles to engage in graduate study in a foreign language and their adjustment to the host culture.

ACE (2000) reported a lack of available data on the extent to which institutions involve international scholars in campus programs, the ways they are involved in such programs, or their breadth of participation. Although their survey indicated a high level of institutional commitment in rhetoric, they did not have data regarding how “a public commitment is translated into the
allocation of financial and human resources, recruitment and tenure decisions, scholarships, or other support for international programs.

Climate for LGBT Individuals

LGBT people on college campuses are becoming more visible and more vocal, and there has been a significant increase in the past 20 years in the numbers and levels of student, staff, and faculty activity (Berrill, 1990). Yet, because of powerful social conditions that continue to exist on and off campus, LGBT students, faculty and staff often experience an environment that is hostile toward them. Many LGBT individuals feel pressured to conceal their identities, which might result in social and emotional isolation, as well as subjective distress and a reduced sense of safety and psychological well-being. Those who are open with their identities often risk discrimination, verbal or physical harassment, or other subtler forms of heterosexist bias (Rankin, 2003). Heterosexism on university campuses is a form of bias that renders LGBT individuals invisible by inhibiting acknowledgement and expression of LGBT perspectives, and affecting curricular and research efforts—sometimes talented LGBT students, faculty and staff feel forced to leave the university, leaving students deprived of role models and academic growth (Rankin, 1998).

One of the most significant barriers faced by LGBT students, faculty, and staff on university campuses stem from homonegative attitudes (homophobia), which might be experienced as hostile remarks, harassment, and threats and/or acts of violence directed toward persons who are identified (correctly or incorrectly) as LGBT. Generally, men have more negative attitudes toward LGBT individuals than women, and people who know someone who is gay, lesbian, or bisexual tend to have more positive attitudes than those who do not. Research indicates that most heterosexual first-year college students arrive on campus with the belief that they do not know and have never come in contact with someone who is gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender, and the college environment often is a place where these students might report their first awareness of LGBT people in their daily lives (in the dorms, in classrooms, and elsewhere).

Rankin (2003) conducted a national survey of LGBT individuals from 14 different institutions from October 2000 to December 2001. The 1669 participants included 1000 students, 150 faculty, and 467 staff/administrators. Faculty, staff and students from MU participated in this national survey during Phase I of the MU Campus Climate Study. Rankin (2003) reported some of the following major findings from the 14-campus aggregate data:

More than one-third of LGBT undergraduate students, and 29 percent of all respondents, reported experiences of harassment during the previous one-year period.

Twenty percent of all respondents feared for their physical safety, and 51 percent concealed their identities in order to avoid harassment and intimidation.

Respondents felt that transgender individuals were somewhat more likely to be harassed on campus (71%) than gay men and lesbians (61%).

A large proportion of respondents felt that the overall campus climate was homophobic (43%), and similar numbers felt that their institution was not addressing issues
related to sexual orientation/gender identity (41%), and that the curriculum did not represent the contributions of LGBT people (43%).

Large percentages reported that their worksite or classrooms accepted them as LGBT people (64 percent) and that institutions provided them with resources on LGBT issues and concerns (72 percent).

Berrill (1990) has suggested that campus responses toward acts of bigotry are critical to facilitating an atmosphere of trust and safety for LGBT individuals. He recommends that administrators provide a specific policy concerning bias-related harassment and a campus-wide policy prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation with formal procedures for handling harassment that include appropriate disciplinary processes. Yet policies that address harassment must distinguish between speech that is merely objectionable and threats or sustained personal denigration (Berrill, 1990).

Even if the college or university has no legal right to ban certain forms of bigoted speech, it has a moral duty to vigorously condemn it. To remain silent merely because offensive remarks are legal is to suggest that they are also morally acceptable. Because hateful remarks cannot be censored, it is all the more important that they be censured (Berrill, 1990, p. 186).

Institutions vary widely in the extent to which they document harassment, violence, and discrimination against LGBT individuals. Furthermore, there are many institutions that do not explicitly protect LGBT individuals from discrimination in institutional nondiscrimination policies. Although the University of Missouri System recently approved the inclusion of sexual orientation in the nondiscrimination policy on all four UM campuses, there was significant dissatisfaction among the LGBT community with the lack of such a policy at the time of data collection. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF; 1996) reports that there are thousands of anti-gay incidents (including threats, vandalism, harassment, and assault) on university and college campuses nationwide every year, in which 3 to 5 percent of survey respondents were the target of anti-gay physical assaults, 16 – 20 percent were threatened with violence, and 40 – 76 percent were verbally harassed. Each of these episodes has the capacity to trigger feelings of alienation, isolation, fear, guilt, self-blame and rage (Berrill, 1990). Furthermore, the impact of bias-motivated incidents extends beyond the individual to all members of the targeted group (NGLTF, 1996), as well as members of the larger community (Rankin, 1998). It is well documented that hate crimes and hate incidents are underreported, which signifies the need for a comprehensive appraisal of these events.

Climate for People with Disabilities

People with disabilities face a range of different environmental issues that may interfere with their academic and professional functioning, including (a) issues related to accessibility in the physical plant of the institution and/or specific buildings or service units, (b) lack of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act regarding reasonable accommodations in the classroom or work environments, (c) lack of adequate services or competent service professionals available who can serve their needs (e.g., sign language interpreters, competently trained note-takers), and (d) attitudinal issues (e.g., stereotypes, fear, and disdain) (Hurtado, Carter, & Kardia, 1998). Further, definitions of “disability” vary widely within and among institutions, and although most might be
inclined to recognize and address issues related to mobility, vision, and hearing, other conditions of
disability might be more likely to be neglected, such as those related to speech, learning, medical, or
psychological conditions. Furthermore, a person’s disability status is not always readily apparent to
outside observers, and many people with disabilities might be “invisible,” and some individuals
might also prefer their disability to be unknown to others. These conditions make the exact number
of persons with disabilities difficult to determine on university campuses (Hurtado, Carter, &
Kardia, 1998).

Climate for Women

Women represent greater than 50 percent of the student body in most colleges and
universities, yet they are still considered an underrepresented group because (a) their numbers are
small in many male dominated professions and degree majors (particularly math and science), (b)
they have been particularly prone to victimization on college campuses due to sexual harassment
and sexual violence, and (c) many women belong to more than one minority group on campus,
including groups oppressed on the basis of race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, religion and
age. Women face issues on college campuses and in the real world that men generally do not have
to face, such as the chilly climate, which refers to subtle and overt behaviors on the part of faculty,
staff and students that affect women’s academic performance and preparation for entry into
graduate school or the world of work (Hall & Sandler, 1982). Sexual harassment is a common focus
of studies investigating the campus climate for women, and research has been generally consistent
in findings that (a) peers are the most common perpetrators of sexual harassment, (b) official
responses to reports of harassment are associated with the climate experienced by women, and (c)
campus police play a critical role in responding to harassment issues (Hurtado, Carter, & Kardia,
1998). However, much of the research is characterized by a lack of agreement regarding the
definition of sexual harassment.

MU policy defines sexual harassment as either: (1) unwelcome sexual advances or requests
for sexual activity by a University employee in a position of power or authority to a University
employee or a member of the student body, or (2) other unwelcome verbal or physical conduct of a
sexual nature by a University employee or a member of the student body to a University employee
or a member of the student body, when: (a) submission to or rejection of such conduct is used
explicitly or implicitly as a condition for academic or employment decisions; or (b) the purpose or
effect of such conduct is to interfere unreasonably with the work or academic performance of the
person being harassed; or (c) the purpose or effect of such conduct to a reasonable person is to
create an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment (MU Police Department, 2001).

In a report titled, “The Sexual Victimization of College Women,” the Justice Department's
National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner,
2000) estimated that 35 out of every 1000 female college students are victimized by rape or
attempted rape during any given year, or that approximately 5 percent of college women are
victimized in any given year. At an institution like MU, with a college student population of
approximately 26,000 (approximately 52% women), that means there could be as many as 473 to
675 incidents of attempted or completed rape every year. They further estimated that approximately
20-25% of college women might be victimized by attempted or completed rapes over the course of
a college career (4-5 years). The study also estimated that about 13 percent of college women had
been stalked since the beginning of the school year. For completed rapes, nearly 60 percent that
took place on campus occurred in the victim's residence, 31 percent occurred in other living quarters on campus and 10 percent occurred at a fraternity. Most of the sexually assaulted women knew the person who victimized them. For completed and attempted rapes, nearly 90 percent of the victims knew the offender, who was usually a classmate, friend, ex-boyfriend or acquaintance.

Climate for Non-Christian Religious Minorities

The First Amendment to the US Constitution requires the separation of church and state, which has been extended to public education on campuses like MU. Our public institutions of higher education must therefore be hospitable to students of all faiths and no faith. Thus, the First Amendment restricts public universities from erecting nativity scenes, crosses, menorahs and other religious symbols to the exclusion of those of other faiths. However, according to the Anti-Defamation League (2003), “campuses have become a new proving ground for the tactics of all manner of extremists, forcing some colleges and universities onto the frontline in the fight against extremism and anti-Semitism.” Among the issues addressed regarding religious diversity include (a) lack of visibility or respect for religious history, culture and/or holidays in the scheduling of campus events and exams, (b) stereotypes, (c) verbal harassment, (d) Anti-Semitic behavior among campus community members, (e) Anti-Semitic public speeches on campus, and (f) hate incidents and hate crimes. Yet, there is little data available about the climate for religious diversity on university campuses across the country.

Anti-Semitism is probably the most widely discussed issue regarding campus climate for religious diversity, yet given the events of September 11, 2001, anti-Islamic hate has become a much more focal issue on university campuses across the country. In fact, Phase I of the MU Campus Climate Study occurred within weeks after 9/11 and the findings reflected some of the increases in bias during that time. “Middle Easterners” were identified as one of the least accepted racial-ethnic groups on campus. For example, among the 3100 participants in Phase I, students, faculty and staff were more than 3 times more likely to say the would not be a friend of a person of Middle Eastern descent (n = 327; 11%) than someone who was African American (n = 84), American Indian (n = 87), Asian (n = 102), Hispanic (n = 109), or Caucasian (n = 31). Respondents were at least twice as likely to say they would not be roommates with a person of Middle Eastern descent than members of the others groups, and at least three times more likely to say they would not share an office with a Middle Easterner. Unfortunately, the classification of “Middle Easterner” could mean many different things, and could include persons of many different religious backgrounds, and the Rankin Climate Assessment for Underrepresented Groups did not request participants to identify their religious affiliation (although subsequent phases of data collection did request this information). Only 19 of the 3100 participants in Phase identified as Middle Easterners, and among those, the majority (n = 13) rated the campus climate for religious differences as accepting or very accepting, with approximately 26 percent indicating that they were uncertain (n = 3) or that the climate was not accepting (n = 2). However, 39 percent of Middle Easterners (n = 7) in Phase I indicated they had been victims of harassment on campus (compared to 19.2% of the total sample), over half of which indicated that they believed the harassment was due to their religion (n = 4).
Hate Crimes and Hate Incidents

In its 2001 Report to Congress, the U.S. Department of Education documented an increase in reported hate crimes on American campuses from a total of 1,312 in 1997 to 2,067. According to the U.S. Department of Justice (2001), a hate crime can be generally defined as a crime which in whole or part is motivated by the offender's bias toward the victim's status, and are intended to hurt and intimidate individuals because they are perceived to be different with respect to their race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender or disability. A hate incident is an action in which a person is made aware that her/his status is offensive to another, but does not rise to the level of a crime. Offenders look for the reaction of the community. If the hate attack is ignored, they might easily conclude that other members of the college community are in sympathy with their bigoted ideology, which becomes a significant indicator of campus climate.

Between 1998-2000, the MU Police Department reported that there were (a) 6 reported hate crimes, (b) 60 reported sex offenses, (c) 136 cases of reported harassment, (d) 450 reported incidents of vandalism, and (e) 123 cases of aggravated and simple assault. There are no statistics on hate incidents.

Although these statistics point to some sobering realities regarding the conditions faced by underrepresented groups on college campuses, what they do not tell us is how people from these groups are affected by these events, directly or indirectly. Our investigation provides information about the social, psychological and physical well-being associated with the perceived threats related to bias, harassment, and hate.

The MU Campus Climate Study

The MU Campus Climate Study was proposed and developed over the course of two academic years by a team of MU faculty, staff, and students associated with a variety of campus units. The project was designed to occur within five specific phases of data collection: (1) National Campus Climate Survey, (2) MU Student Services Providers Survey, (3) MU Student Services Consumers Survey, (4) MU Violence and Harassment Survey, and (5) MU Target Population Focus Groups. The aim was to reveal the perceptions of these campus constituents concerning the social climate for underrepresented groups on campus, including members of racial and ethnic minority groups, people with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people, non-Christians, non-native English speakers, and women.

- Phase 1 (National Campus Climate Survey) data collection began in October, 2001 and was completed by December 31, 2001. Faculty, staff, students and administrators submitted 3324 usable surveys. Findings from Phase I were disseminated in October 0f 2002 (about the same time data collection for Phases II – IV were being completed). Data were collected using two different surveys, the Ranking Underrepresented Groups (URG) Survey, and the Rankin Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Individuals Survey. The MU Campus Climate Research Team have presented the findings from Phase I to numerous campus administrators and other groups, including but not limited to the Chancellor Richard Wallace and the Chancellor’s Staff, Provost Brady Deaton and the Provost’s Staff, the Council of Deans, Vice Chancellor Cathy Scroggs and the Student Affairs Directors.
Among the most important findings from Phase I were the following:

a) 19.2% of the URG participants reported being the victim of harassment on campus;

b) 36.3% of the URG participants reported having witnessed harassment of other individuals on campus;

c) there were significant differences between majority and minority group members regarding perceptions of campus climate for minority group members, in which minority group members perceived the environment to be less positive than majority group members in all cases;

d) there was extensive agreement among different groups that visible racial-ethnic groups, non-native English speakers, and LGBT individuals were the least accepted groups on campus;

e) individuals who reported being the victim of, or having witnessed, harassment on campus tended to report lower levels of psychological well-being;

f) 21% of the LGBT participants indicated that they had been harassed due to their sexual orientation/gender identity;

g) derogatory remarks were the most common forms of LGBT harassment (85%), but other types of harassment included verbal threats (40%), graffiti (38%), and pressure to conceal one’s sexual orientation/gender identity (36%), and

h) participants who reported being victims of LGBT harassment had significantly higher fears for physical safety, expectations that LGBT individuals would be harassed on campus, needs to conceal one’s sexual orientation/gender identity, and negative perceptions of campus responsiveness to harassment and discrimination.

A full report of the findings from Phase I can be found in Volume 1 of the MU Campus Climate Study Report, and a summary report can be found online at http://gradschool.missouri.edu/pff/campus_climate_files/frame.htm.

- Phase II of the study targeted professionals who are non-academic student service providers on campus (e.g., Student Health, Counseling Center, Success Center, Student Life, Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.). The goal was to evaluate the accessibility, suitability, and quality of their services to students from these groups, as well as the knowledge, awareness and competencies of the service providers in each unit.

- Phase III of the study targeted students who use the various non-academic services on campus to assess their perceptions of the accessibility, suitability, and quality of services to members of underrepresented groups. Information obtained from Phases II and III is intended for use by each participating unit in gaining greater understanding of how to serve all students well.
- Phase IV of the study focused on students’ experiences of violence and harassment on campus. Data was collected from faculty, students and staff, as in Phase 1, in order to assess the prevalence and types of violence and harassment experienced by members of the MU community.

- Phase V of the study will be a qualitative analysis of 6-8 focus groups that will discuss the campus climate for underrepresented groups in more depth. The purpose of this phase is to go beyond quantifying the phenomena in question, and uncover the affect that the social climate has on different constituents within the MU community. These data will aid in the broader interpretation of the findings of the earlier phases.

This report provides the findings from Phases II – IV of the MU Campus Climate Study.
Phase II of the MU Campus Climate Study targeted professionals who are non-academic student service providers on campus (e.g., Student Health, Counseling Center, Success Center, Student Life, Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.). The goal was to evaluate the accessibility, suitability, and quality of their services to students from underrepresented groups, as well as the knowledge, awareness and competencies of the service providers in each unit.

Participants

There were a total of 99 participants in Phase II of the MU Campus Climate Study. Participants included 31 men, 68 women, and 0 transgendered individuals. There were 3 persons of African or African American ancestry, 0 Middle Easterners, 3 Asians or Asian Americans, 4 Native American Indians, 2 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 89 White/European Americans, 2 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 2 others. Of these, 5 were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 5 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 3 visual, 1 hearing, 0 learning, 0 mobility, 0 speech, 0 medical, 2 psychological and 0 other. The sample included 1 bisexual persons, 4 gay men, 86 heterosexuals, 4 lesbians, 2 people who were uncertain of their sexual orientations and 1 other. In terms of religious orientation, there were 6 agnostics, 7 atheists, 1 Buddhists, 22 Catholics or Orthodox, 32 Protestants (Christian), 0 Hindu, 1 Jewish, 0 Muslim, and 26 others.

The sample included 26 undergraduate students, 7 graduate students, 1 professional student, 31 professional staff, 29 administrative staff, 4 faculty and 18 others. There was a wide range of educational levels represented among the participants, including 0 individuals with less than a high school diploma, 5 individuals with a high school diploma (no college), 33 individuals with some college, 31 with a 4-year college degree, 20 individuals with a Master’s degree, 4 people with a professional degree (e.g., MD, JD), 3 persons with a doctorate, and 3 others.

Only 20 of the 34 student services units were represented among the participants in Phase II. The number of participants reached double digits in only 4 of the 34 campus units surveyed, and the modal number of participants per unit was 1. The participants represented the following campus units: Student Health, Ellis Library, Health Sciences Library, Law Library, Journalism Library, Engineering Library, Math Sciences Library, University Counseling Center, Career Center, the Writing Center, the Learning Center, the Women’s Center, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, the Wellness Center, the Memorial Unions, the University Bookstore, Admissions, the Cashiers Office, Residential Life, and Registration. Over 63 % of the participants came from only 4 of these units. The following services were not represented in the sample: Campus Dining Services, Tate Library, the Veterinary Medicine Library, the Academic Retention Center, the LGBT Resource Center, the MU Police Department, the Black Culture Center, Greek Life, Disability Services, the International Center, the Student Recreation Center, the Financial Aid Office, and Information Access and Technology Services. In order to increase participation (albeit unsuccessfully), we guaranteed participants anonymity and assured directors that the individual unit data for Phase II would be reported only to unit directors. Thus the data reported here is aggregate data across all student services units.
Descriptive Statistics: Participants provided ratings on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Extremely Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How well do you think your office meets the needs of the following individuals on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9600</td>
<td>1.19500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6400</td>
<td>1.38100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3900</td>
<td>1.62100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8600</td>
<td>1.67800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4400</td>
<td>1.52000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1800</td>
<td>1.52900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How knowledgeable do you feel about issues relevant to the following groups of individuals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9400</td>
<td>1.17600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0600</td>
<td>1.22700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8300</td>
<td>1.45700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.5200</td>
<td>1.54800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.2700</td>
<td>1.41300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.1800</td>
<td>1.41300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please describe below any training or education you have received that was focused on issues relevant to the above groups of individuals.

PLEASE SEE APPENDIX 1 FOR TEXT RESPONSES FOR THIS ITEM.

4. How effective do you think the above trainings were in helping you to work with the following individuals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1600</td>
<td>1.83600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1600</td>
<td>1.46200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2700</td>
<td>1.65100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.1800</td>
<td>1.91900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.5200</td>
<td>1.93700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7100</td>
<td>1.74000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Please rate your perception of how emotionally safe your office is for the following individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>0.88800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.980</td>
<td>1.23100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>1.52500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.480</td>
<td>1.52200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.640</td>
<td>1.50100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.810</td>
<td>1.36400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please rate your perception of the knowledge of the other staff (as a group) in your office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.860</td>
<td>1.11700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>1.29000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>1.52900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>1.49000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.630</td>
<td>1.48100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.010</td>
<td>1.37200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please rate the availability of appropriate resources for the concerns of the following individuals in your office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.590</td>
<td>1.54600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.270</td>
<td>1.59300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>1.71200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.710</td>
<td>1.73800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.610</td>
<td>1.75500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.910</td>
<td>1.65500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please rate the importance that your office places on the needs of the following groups of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.730</td>
<td>1.41800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.720</td>
<td>1.36300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>1.66000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.170</td>
<td>1.63500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.930</td>
<td>1.65200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.490</td>
<td>1.44200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Considering all these components please rate the overall quality of your office regarding the issues of the following individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8800</td>
<td>1.22500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4800</td>
<td>1.27000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3100</td>
<td>1.43700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9400</td>
<td>1.39000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9600</td>
<td>1.52100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2600</td>
<td>1.41600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please describe any other thoughts you may have concerning the above groups of individuals and your office.

PLEASE SEE APPENDIX 2 FOR TEXT RESPONSES FOR THIS ITEM.

The following table provides AVERAGE RATINGS for items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8325</td>
<td>0.95635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4394</td>
<td>0.98561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1689</td>
<td>1.08990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7997</td>
<td>1.21519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9211</td>
<td>1.17439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1382</td>
<td>1.11400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

These data suggest that Phase II respondents overall tended to rate the quality of the services provided by their units on average as above “adequate” and below “extremely well” with respect to the issues addressed in the survey questionnaire. Respondents rated the quality of services rendered by their units lower on average for non-native English speakers, non-Christian individuals, persons with disabilities, and LGB students. Average ratings for the “effectiveness of diversity trainings,” “staff knowledge,” and “availability of appropriate resources” tended to be lower than ratings on other items. Many participants reported that they had received no training at MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups, and many others reported training that appears to have taken place outside the context of their current employment at MU. A small but significant proportion of respondents indicated that they had received training to address the needs of underrepresented groups as part of their employment at MU. Concluding comments expressed a wide range of attitudes regarding diversity reflecting pride, investment, support, and concern as well as disdain for issues regarding the treatment of underrepresented groups among student services units on campus at MU.
APPENDIX 1

Please describe below any training or education you have received that was focused on issues relevant to the above groups of individuals.

1. I have received no training.

2. Attended public, racially and culturally diverse elementary, middle and high school in suburban Washington DC; several close friends, my high school prom date, freshman college roommate were all of another race; undergraduate coursework in language, linguistics, comparative religion, cross-cultural communication; have lived in another country for several years, worked and attended classes with people of that country; t.a. training at UW-Madison on women & homosexual issues; eventually meeting gay people from college on into my current social networks; various workshops and presentations over the years since college relating to cross-cultural communication with all groups mentioned above; currently sit on the Affirmative Action Committee at my workplace. The most valuable training was the roommate, the cross-cultural communication course (3-credit, semester-length course offered by the Linguistics Department at Georgetown) th

3. No formal training as regards any particular group, but many years of experience serving all groups mentioned in number 2 above.

4. Have taken coursework in Sociology and other social science fields that focused on majority/minority relations, women's studies, etc. Also am active in social movements for social justice that involve some of these groups/issues.

5. No formal training, but have a lot of day-to-day experience with people of many of these groups, especially non-native English speakers and ethnic/religious minorities (we have a lot of international students here). I also have had exposure to many different types of people for a long time through my many years as a college/graduate student.

6. Sexual Harassment, ADA, Interviewing and Hiring employees

7. Self-education in the LGBT community

8. U.S. Government mandated training and seminars on ethnic and religious tolerance, and also programs on tolerance of sexual orientation. This was repeated training and seminars spanning over six years with opportunities for refresher training twice a year.

9. None

10. Extensive training during graduate school and periodic additional postdoctoral training.
11. Undergraduate courses in religion and women’s studies.

12. I received no training on these issues at this institution.

13. I have been trained in the following manner:
   - 1975-1981: San Diego City Schools Emergency Schools Aid Act Student Diversity Education program.
   - 1981-1985: Non Western Studies History BA in international and domestic minority cultures.
   - 1998-2002: University of Missouri BMI diversity training initiative, Diversity Design Team, Multicultural Affairs Institute, Summer Institute for Intercultural Communications, Missouri Law Campus Mediation training, Services for Independent Living Board Training.

14. Diversity Training

15. Undergrad~ Participated in oppression reduction training and subsequently began presenting training sessions myself. Graduate~ Presented diversity training to student staff in residence halls. Also learned from student leaders through multicultural affairs internship.

16. None.

17. None

18. We do a variety of diversity trainings as staff meetings incorporated into our programming and generally teach it to all staff throughout their time working at the Center.

19. N/A

20. Safe Zone training - to act as a resource for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender students

21. Practice speaking to students of different backgrounds

22. During my time with the college of Education I have had the opportunity to learn about dealing with different disabilities in the classroom setting. I have also learned about different cultures.

23. Basic CA training...covered many areas...

25. **Safe Space (LGBT) Training** Diversity training through Res Life student staff training times

26. During training for Paraprofessional staff in Residential Life we learn how to deal that problems that could possibly arise due to someone dealing with one of these issues. We go through partial ally training we are notified if one of our residents has a physical disability and learn a bit about what to do and the other issues are just learned about through personal experience.

27. In res life we receive training on many of these issues and of diversity. However I am one that believes that I can always know more about something and there are some things that I feel I could learn more about. I feel that it is very important to make minorities feel included and sometimes fail to do that. I think our diversity training needs to be intensified to really stress this issue and brainstorm ways that we can make our communities all inclusive.

28. Discussions on all of the above during work and workshops. Also learned about different religious beliefs through personal interactions with many people and reading alot of books.

29. I have received realistic appropriate education on the situations that I would encounter in my job. We are encouraged to be open-minded. We are encouraged to send people to other resources for more information and to be a resource for our students.

30. -Student Staff Training Sessions about each of the groups mentioned above

31. **African American Politics**

32. During training we covered aspects that could affect different groups on campus. I feel that through this training and through on the job experience I have become adequately to well informed on issues facing a lot of minority groups. My mother is physically disabled so I have a large amount of first hand experience in working with disabled persons.

33. Residential Life training specifically looks at the challenges racial/ethnic disabled and LGBT individuals face on campus and tries to educate student staff members of how these individuals may be served better on campus.

34. Res Life tries very hard to make sure its staff is aware of and concerned about issues relating to racial/ethnic minorities and LGBT individuals. I feel that they want very much to foster an accepting and safe environment for all students. Student staff go through week-long training at the beginning of each semester and attend in-services during the semester. Diversity issues are often the focus of such training.

35. We have had several in-service staff meetings on the following issues: Individuals with disabilities Gay Lesbian and Bisexual orientation individuals and healthcare Individuals of foreign descent Individuals with hearing disabilities Individuals with
36. A family member is a lesbian and I have tried to learn what I can to be more understanding and strengthen our family relationships. I have always loved learning other languages and about other cultures. I am proficient in English, Spanish, and have some knowledge of American Sign Language, French and Navajo. The next ones that I hope to study are Chinese, Japanese, and German. I served a mission for my church for almost 2 years in Argentina. I learned about the frustration of not speaking the language efficiently when I first arrived to being told I spoke like a native. Since it was a religious mission, we worked with people from many religious and cultural backgrounds. It was a wonderful learning experience.

During my college education I also took several courses on working with students with disabilities. For the past 20 years I have been a member of the world's oldest women's organization.

37. Through personal experience.

38. Continuing medical education at seminars

39. Taking Geography 2 caused me to learn much more about a few of the "non Christian" religions. I have since become much more aware of the Muslim faith and many of the issues on campus following September 11th and with the current situation in the Middle East.

40. I attended ACH convention last year and attending sessions that related to above issues.

41. I have received training on diversity issues, race issues, LGBT issues and have taken classes or educated myself on women's issues and LGBT community.

42. Our staff meetings (every three weeks) are thematic-- we have focused on topics such as sensitivity to LGBT orientations, resources we offer to minorities, etc. A requirement to work here is conscientiousness and precise language is enforced in the office (though many of us use precise language out of the office too). Most of our education is informal though; we learn about non-native English speakers by working with the international language partners program. We learn about LGBT services by interacting with those who work at the LGBT Center on campus. Our main focus is women so most of our training deals with women.

43. I have attended sessions involving rape awareness, diversity issues, etc. I also teach several of these in a course. Besides specialized training, I also read on my own about these issues.

44. I've had some diversity training but not a lot.
45. American's w/ Disabilities Act Guidelines are used often. Minority information sessions attended. Meet w/ students on their housing issues.

46. I don't think it's possible for me to write down all of the training and education I have gained at the Women's Center. And there is still so much to learn. I've learned about myself more than I thought I might ever know just by being in an open, comfortable place where people are proud to be who they are. I was going to say "...where women are proud to be women." But it's much more than that. It's an open environment for everyone to be whatever they want. As little or as much of themselves as they'd like to be. There are resources all around if I ever have any questions and just the simple everyday tasks I perform further open my eyes to the world out there and what I should do to make it a better place. I'm not going to say that I would be a different person if I didn't work here, I'd still be me, I just wouldn't know as much about myself and be as proud of who I really am and as open to others. (If you were looking for specifics helping with each pr

47. I have received numerous hours of diversity training In-Services and one-on-one experience with these individuals through Residential Life.

48. In-services for our staff. I live with an individual with multiple disabilities.

49. Various training programs and presentations working with diversity issues (Project Safe/ Safe Space Programs)

50. Former Sociology major. Most experience with racial/ethnic minorities.

51. We have a diversity training seminar related to different races, religious beliefs, disabilities and sexual preferences.

52. Have attended teleconference dealing with ADA issues. Attended professional development session dealing with Race/orientation issues.

53. Have taken continuing education classes related to handling individuals w/disabilities and racial/ethnic minorities.

54. I have attended workshops at conferences, read articles, watched television shows, talked to individuals who are in these categories and to staff in offices designated as the primary contact offices for these categories of students all in an effort to expand my ability to understand and to serve them as individuals.

55. In-service presentation

56. World Religions Course (3 credit hours) 3-month diversity training program prior to crisis counseling Psychology of Exceptionality (3 credit hours) Multicultural Counseling Competencies Psychology of Women Feminist Therapy
57. In a work context none. Outside of work: Trained as a peer counselor in college in a campus ministry elder in my church.

58. several workshops on each of the groups above discussions in Masters level classes conversations with knowledgeable individuals

59. Being a trained counselor I have either taken courses or been involved in training in all areas. I have also taught classes that have used all of the above as topic areas.

60. Within the 100 hours of Career Center training for career specialists we had a 2 hour class regarding "diversity".
Please describe any other thoughts you may have concerning the above groups of individuals and your office.

1. Just yesterday a disabled student spoke very well of the MU Libraries' services and our ability to address his needs. He did have trouble with the Law Library (not part of MU Libraries) however. Our collections are not very strong in foreign-language material. We have databases specifically designed to address informational needs of women, gender minorities, students seeking information about and from countries outside of the US, students seeking information on other religions, and students seeking information on Asian and Asian-American affairs. Our regular social science and history databases address other information needs relating to these groups. Some of the other reference librarians hold intolerant private beliefs with regard to members of some of these groups but they keep these beliefs separate from their interactions with individual students.

2. I think we do a good job treating everyone respectfully and equally. Everyone who comes in is assisted to the best of our ability regardless of what they look like or how they might be different than others. We have never singled out anyone as being less important to serve than anyone else.

3. Our office is constantly striving to collect more information on all of the groups listed above and keep all of the employees in our office aware of concerns of these groups.

4. Race, religion, sexual orientation or language plays no part in our day to day activities. We have an ethnically diverse staff and are evenly split between male and female employees. Sexual harassment is not tolerated and this is stated up-front during initial interviews for all full-time and student staff. As well we do not allow any material content or language of a crude offensive or exploitative nature.

5. I find these questions almost impossible to answer. We strive to meet the informational needs of any and all. Since our materials budget is curriculum driven we have more resources in the areas that are taught on campus but we bend over backward to put people in touch with other sources of information when local materials don't meet the need.

6. Some employees don't realize or don't care that they are ethnocentric and make people uncomfortable by proselytizing their Christian beliefs at the workplace.

7. The needs of these groups is just not an issue at present. The atmosphere is pretty egalitarian and the supervisor of the office is tolerant.

8. The Women's Center is the safest environment on campus by far. I feel for any of these groups even if we haven't focused as heavily on all issues for each population. When faced with uncharted territory we would learn.

9. I've enjoyed working with many different people.
10. I believe that Residential Life is extremely liberal and open-minded when it comes to any individual. I am very proud to be a part of residential life at Mizzou and part of the reason is that we are so open and want every resident to have a wonderful experience at Mizzou. I think we work hard at making a welcoming, safe, and healthy environment for everyone.

11. Well, I was having trouble deciding from which perspective I should answer. I think I drifted some between the reslife goals and actual occurrences in my specific community I did try to stick with the goals of reslife though. It is very hard to do so because I am torn between ideal and actual. For example I don't feel the residents in my community provide a very inclusive setting for minorities. Where as the staff believes in helping include everyone. It is important to break diversity into these categories so that they all get the attention they deserve and this needs to be addressed in training as well.

12. Disabled groups could use more emphasis in my opinion.

13. Racial/ethnic minorities and LGBT individuals' concerns are addresses FAR more than non-Christian religious minorities and non-native English speakers...lack of knowledge/resources on these less-addressed issues is glaringly apparent. Women are not a minority on this campus (actually they are a majority at 52%...) and are not in my opinion treated in an unfair way. We have a strong Women's Center on campus with excellent resources.

14. We care about helping all students to be healthy so that they can be successful. We try to respect their beliefs and not judge. We have had groups come and speak to us as a clinic on their issues and concerns so that we can be even more compassionate and understanding of their needs. Currently our building is not as user-friendly to those with physical disabilities as it will be when we move to a new building this fall.

15. Our physical building is old and therefore not as accessible to individuals with physical limitations. We do have many features to accommodate but the layout is limited by the age of the building. Our new facility will be fully accessible. We make accommodations but it would be better if we were equipped so that all of the students could get all of the services without accommodation. We need to have more minority employees.

16. Our office deals with academic difficulties many of these groups may encounter. We have a Student Support Services grant that specifically addresses disadvantaged students. We don't deprive any student of our services as long as they meet the Federal guidelines for one part of our program. All of our other services are available to any who request or wish to make use of them.

17. It would be great to have additional training for all of the areas. Time away from work to provide additional training is very hard to come by.

18. This is a place that is safe and open to anyone and everyone. The one rule is no open hate. That makes it just about the safest place on campus. I gave the people with disabilities a slightly lower rating on how they would do here because I'm not sure how easy it would be for them to
move around in here. Sadly, there is nothing we can do about that; the place is too little for all of our resources.

19. We do not have anyone on staff who speaks languages other than English. We have some counter surfaces that are too high. Otherwise, I think that our office meets these needs well.

20. I don't have a frame of reference to rate how emotionally safe my office is for the individuals that you are inquiring about. We are a retail store. Our only concern is if a person (be they a woman or man, of a racial/ethnic minority, of whatever sexual orientation, or a non-native English speaker, regardless of their faith status, or be they a person of disability) is if they are a paying customer. My only real concern is the language barrier if a person is not a native speaker. We do the best that we can to properly communicate with our customers, but dealing with highly technical details to a non-native speaker has a challenge set that we do not necessarily have resources to aid us in at all times. Some people are better at understanding accents than others.

21. Advocates of “diversity” are true racists in the basic meaning of that term: they see the world through colored lenses, colored by race and gender. To the multiculturalist, race is what counts — for values, for thinking, for human identity in general. No wonder racism is increasing: colorblindness is now considered evil if not impossible. No wonder people don’t treat each other as individuals: to the multiculturalist, they aren’t. Advocates of “diversity” claim it will teach students to tolerate and celebrate their differences. But the “differences” they have in mind are racial (or gendered) differences which means we’re being urged to glorify race (or gender or disability or religion, etc.) which means we’re being asked to institutionalize separatism. “Racial identity” erects an unbridgeable gulf between people as though they were different species with nothing fundamental in common. If that were true — if “racial identi
PHASE III: 
STUDENT SERVICES CONSUMERS SURVEY

Phase III of the MU Campus Climate Study targeted students who use the various non-academic services on campus to assess their perceptions of the accessibility, suitability, and quality of services to members of underrepresented groups. Information obtained from Phases II and III is intended for use by each participating unit in gaining greater understanding of how to serve all students well. We specifically sought responses from students who used the following 34 non-academic services on campus:

- Student Health Center
- University Counseling Center
- Women's Center
- LGBT Resource Center
- International Center
- Office of Multicultural Affairs
- Career Center
- The Learning Center
- Academic Advising
- Academic Retention Services
- Disability Services
- Black Culture Center
- Wellness Resource Center
- Student Recreation Center
- Residential Life
- Greek Life
- Memorial Unions
- Information Access and Technology
- University Bookstore
- Math Sciences Library
- Ellis Library
- Law Library
- Journalism Library
- Veterinary Medicine Library
- Health Sciences Library
- Engineering Library
- Admissions
- Financial Aid
- Cashier's
- Registration
- MU Police Department
- Campus Dining Services

Instrument

A 36-item instrument was developed specifically for use in Phase III to examine student perceptions of each of the student services units on campus. Each of the six target groups (i.e., women, racial-ethnic minorities, LGBT individuals, people with disabilities, non-native English speakers, and non-Christian religious minorities) were rated on six items as follows:

1. How well do you think the [specific student service] meets the needs of the following individuals on campus?

2. How knowledgeable do you feel the staff of the [specific student service] are about issues relevant to the following groups of individuals?

3. Please rate your perception of how emotionally safe the [specific student service] is for the following individuals.

4. Please rate the availability of appropriate resources for the concerns of the following individuals in the [specific student service].
5. Please rate the importance that the [specific student service] places on the needs of the following groups of students.

6. Considering all these components please rate the overall quality of the [specific student service] regarding the issues of the following individuals.

Ratings were on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (adequate) to 7 (extremely well). Exploratory data analyses indicated that the six items for each group could be collapsed into subscale scores regarding the responsiveness of each student services unit toward each group.

**ACADEMIC ADVISING**

**Participants**

Four hundred thirty one of the 1134 participants in Phase III indicated that they had received services from Academic Advising. Three hundred twenty four of those participants provided ratings regarding Academic Advising (75%).

Participants included 89 men, 233 women, and 1 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.66, SD 3.96). Three hundred nine of these participants identified as heterosexual, 5 identified as bisexual, 5 as gay men, 1 as lesbian, and 1 as uncertain regarding sexual orientation.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 13), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 6), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 10), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 6), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 9), White/European (n = 294), and Other (n = 4). Fourteen participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 10), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 7), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 7), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 5).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 30), Atheist (n = 10), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 255), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 5), Other (n = 15).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Academic Advising to One’s Own Group (N = 324)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3561</td>
<td>1.64935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4145</td>
<td>1.50581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3576</td>
<td>1.46239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.5550</td>
<td>1.85989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8611</td>
<td>1.77928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2308</td>
<td>1.95734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (See Appendix 1)

ACADEMIC RETENTION

Participants

Twenty seven of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had received services from the Academic Retention Center. Twenty-three of those participants provided ratings regarding Academic Retention (85%).

Participants included 3 men, 20 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 31 years (M = 20.70, SD 2.65). All of these participants identified as heterosexual.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 13), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 0), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 2), White/European (n = 4), and Other (n = 2). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 0), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 0), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 2), Atheist (n = 0), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 20), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Academic Retention to One’s Own Group (N = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.4167</td>
<td>0.82496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6000</td>
<td>1.08337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>0.11785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.1667</td>
<td>1.05719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, non-Christian individuals, non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

Comments

1. The Academic Retention Services from my point of view seem to be catering only to the black community. I received a scholarship from them because I am of <deleted to maintain anonymity> descent and culture. As part of the requirements for my scholarship I am to attend meetings and interactive activities with the other people that are part of this organization. However, the majority of the other people that attend the activities are black and make me feel like an outcast. I look mostly white and have never had a problem adapting and I have never discriminated against because of the color of my skin. I do feel like I am not accepted in this organization and I believe it is because I am a minority in this group. I met all the requirements for the scholarship and they are not helping to integrate me into the college community but rather make me feel as if I do not belong.

2. Largely I think ARS is a waste of time for everyone. I think they have an inviting atmosphere for all minorities though.<br> <br> <br> <br>

ADMISSIONS

Participants

Six hundred ninety one of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had received services from the Admissions Office. Five hundred seventy of those participants provided ratings regarding the Admissions Office (83%).
Participants included 153 men, 416 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.92, SD 4.11). Five hundred thirty nine of the participants identified as heterosexual, 10 as bisexual, 8 as gay, 3 as lesbian, 2 as uncertain, and 2 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 25), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 13), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 14), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 16), Middle Eastern (n = 1), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 21), White/European (n = 509), and Other (n = 12). Twenty two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 9), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 8), Mobility (n = 5), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 10), Psychological (n = 7), and Other (n = 6).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 56), Atheist (n = 17), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 454), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 8), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 24).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Admissions to One’s Own Group (N = 570)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7730</td>
<td>1.53885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3737</td>
<td>1.22593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4611</td>
<td>1.40947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.6281</td>
<td>1.34580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.8565</td>
<td>1.90142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9848</td>
<td>1.86581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments:** (See Appendix 2)

**BLACK CULTURE CENTER**

**Participants**

Seventy five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had received services from the Black Culture Center. Fifty-three of those participants provided ratings regarding the Black Culture Center (71%).

Participants included 10 men, 43 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 35 years (M = 20.92, SD 3.28). Fifty one of these participants identified as heterosexual, 1 as bisexual, and 1 as a gay male.
Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 17), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 2), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 2), White/European (n = 30), and Other (n = 2). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 4), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 1), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 0).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 5), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 42), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 2).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Black Culture Center to One’s Own Group (N = 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.9167</td>
<td>0.97610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6202</td>
<td>1.24367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6111</td>
<td>1.49399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.4931</td>
<td>0.66026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.1667</td>
<td>1.64992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by LGB, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

**Comments**

1. **this is absolutely the best student service on campus!**

2. **This being a student center for racial minorities<comma> it doesn't seem as inviting for people of caucasian ancestry. But<comma> when at the center<comma> I've never felt discrimated against<comma> just feel like a minority<comma> kind of like<comma> why are you in here.**

3. **The BCC is a great resource for our black students. It is not however a very open atmosphere to anyone that is not apparently african american. As a white female I am there often simply because I have many friends who are black<comma> but I have many other friends that are other minorities on this campus<comma> and their needs do not seem to be addressed in any of our "minority" offices. United Ambassadors that are run**
through admissions but holds their meetings in the BCC are often referred to as a "black organization" when truly it is a "minority" organization. The perception that black equals minority on this campus needs to change to include all minorities including the homosexual/transgender population on campus.

4. I am white and have never had any problems using the computer there enough said.

**BOOKSTORE**

**Participants**

Six hundred twenty one of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Bookstore. Three hundred ninety of those participants provided ratings regarding the Bookstore (63%).

Participants included 115 men, 274 women, and 1 transgender individual ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.81, SD 4.41). Three hundred sixty eight of the participants identified as heterosexual, 7 as bisexual, 6 as gay, 1 as lesbian, 0 as uncertain, and 0 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 14), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 12), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 12), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 6), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 13), White/European (n = 348), and Other (n = 5). Seventeen participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 8), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 5), Mobility (n = 4), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 7), Psychological (n = 7), and Other (n = 6).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 34), Atheist (n = 12), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 318), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 6), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 10).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Bookstore to One’s Own Group (N = 390)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>1.53620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7135</td>
<td>1.30601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2579</td>
<td>1.56810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0115</td>
<td>1.53958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0833</td>
<td>1.97825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7255</td>
<td>1.64141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).
Participants

Two hundred thirty eight of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had received services from the Career Center. One hundred fifty nine of those participants provided ratings regarding the Career Center (67%).

Participants included 39 men, 118 women, and 1 transgender individual. One hundred forty seven participants identified as heterosexual, 4 as bisexual, 2 as gay, 2 as lesbian and 1 as uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 11), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 4), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 5), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 2), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 6), White/European (n = 134), and Other (n = 1). Five participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 4), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 3), Psychological (n = 3).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 15), Atheist (n = 6), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 120), Hindu (n = 1), Jewish (n = 2), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 10).

Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Career Center to One’s Own Group (N = 159)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4872</td>
<td>1.31315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3822</td>
<td>1.31235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>1.60078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0500</td>
<td>1.39522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4259</td>
<td>1.76995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average rating by non-native English speakers is suspect due to the small number of participants and the restricted range of responses.
Comments

1. The Career Center has some amazing resources, and unfortunately I just realized that this semester. I wish I had been more aware of the opportunities there when I needed them.

2. I think the services that the career center provides are outstanding, and in no way differ among the above groups.

3. The Career Center is there to provide resources for motivated students who are willing to work to find a career, this it does well.

4. I don't think there are many people who speak other languages who work there.

5. The staff at the career center is probably the best on campus. I have always gotten great information in deciding on a major.

CASHIER

Participants

Four hundred forty five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Cashier’s Office. Two hundred ninety of those participants provided ratings regarding the Cashier’s Office (65%).

Participants included 86 men, 202 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 21.13, SD 4.42). Two hundred seventy one of the participants identified as heterosexual, 7 as bisexual, 5 as gay, 1 as lesbian, 1 as uncertain, and 0 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 10), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 7), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 13), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 7), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 8), White/European (n = 256), and Other (n = 4). Twelve participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 8), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 3), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 8), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 3).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 28), Atheist (n = 8), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 229), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 4), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 9).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Cashier’s Office to One’s Own Group (N = 290)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2583</td>
<td>1.46793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2295</td>
<td>1.38768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2698</td>
<td>1.54602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8229</td>
<td>1.56443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.6071</td>
<td>1.45092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9091</td>
<td>2.01434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (See Appendix 4)

CAMPUS DINING SERVICES

Participants

Five hundred forty four of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from Campus Dining Services. Three hundred eighty of those participants provided ratings regarding Campus Dining Services (70%).

Participants included 108 men, 269 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.26, SD 2.98). Three hundred fifty five of the participants identified as heterosexual, 7 as bisexual, 4 as gay, 2 as lesbian, 2 as uncertain, and 0 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 16), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 11), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 11), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 7), Middle Eastern (n = 2), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 14), White/European (n = 337), and Other (n = 5). Eighteen participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 9), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 8), Psychological (n = 6), and Other (n = 5).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 34), Atheist (n = 12), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 301), Hindu (n = 3), Jewish (n = 5), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 17).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Campus Dining Services to One’s Own Group (N = 380)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3141</td>
<td>1.62161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5143</td>
<td>1.44111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1288</td>
<td>1.59819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9722</td>
<td>1.35479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8444</td>
<td>1.74854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7600</td>
<td>1.19045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (See Appendix 5)

DISABILITY SERVICES

Participants

Twenty-seven of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had received services from Disability Services. Sixteen of those participants provided ratings regarding Disability Services (59%).

Participants included 2 men, 14 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 32 years (M = 21.25, SD 3.17). All of these participants identified as heterosexual.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 0), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 1), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 0), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 2), White/European (n = 14), and Other (n = 0). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 4), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 5), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 4).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 2), Atheist (n = 0), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 14), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 0).
**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Disability Services to One’s Own Group (N = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.6667</td>
<td>0.47140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9103</td>
<td>1.16987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>1.17851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.1667</td>
<td>1.66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by non-Christian individuals, Racial-ethnic minorities, LGB, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. **Outstanding experiences with disability services. Fund them. Heavily.**

2. **Disability services is an amazing resource for individuals on campus with any type of disability.**
   
   When I came to Mizzou I wasn't aware that colleges even had resources like this. My experiences with them have been wonderful. They are a caring group of individuals who do there best to help.

**ELLIS LIBRARY**

**Participants**

Five hundred eighty two of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Ellis Library. Four hundred three of those participants provided ratings regarding the Ellis Library (69%).

Participants included 116 men, 284 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.98, SD 4.06). Three hundred seventy five of the participants identified as heterosexual, 9 as bisexual, 7 as gay men, 2 as lesbian, 2 as uncertain, and 8 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 16), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 13), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 12), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 7), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 11), White/European (n = 358), and Other (n = 5). Twenty-one participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.
Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 9), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 4), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 8), Psychological (n = 6), and Other (n = 5).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 41), Atheist (n = 12), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 312), Hindu (n = 3), Jewish (n = 3), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 20).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Ellis Library to One’s Own Group (N = 403)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9770</td>
<td>1.31043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9189</td>
<td>1.62025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2698</td>
<td>1.54602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7713</td>
<td>1.65992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9333</td>
<td>1.28428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2222</td>
<td>1.81238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments:** (See Appendix 6)

**ENGINEERING LIBRARY**

**Participants**

Sixty of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Engineering Library. Thirty-six of those participants provided ratings regarding the Engineering Library (60%).

Participants included 21 men, 15 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 19 to 27 years (M = 21.61, SD 2.30). Thirty-five of the participants identified as heterosexual, and 1 as a gay man.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 4), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 2), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 3), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 0), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 27), and Other (n = 1). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 0), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 0), and Other (n = 0).
In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 2), Atheist (n = 2), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 28), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).

Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Engineering Library to One’s Own Group (N = 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>2.12132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.620</td>
<td>1.69199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>1.51658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.851</td>
<td>1.83228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, LGB, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

Comments

1. Quiet place to study good information

2. Get over the notion that being a woman racial or ethnic minority LGBT persuasion non-native english speaking non christian or a student with a disability. It matters not and has no relevance.

FINANCIAL AID

Participants

Four hundred five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Financial Aid Office. Two hundred seventy seven of those participants provided ratings regarding the Financial Aid Office (68%).

Participants included 70 men, 205 women, and 1 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 50 years (M = 20.82, SD 3.91). Two hundred sixty of the participants identified as heterosexual, 5 as bisexual, 3 as gay, 1 as lesbian, 1 as uncertain, and 0 as other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 14), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 9), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 10), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 7), Middle Eastern (n = 1), Native American
Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 8), White/European (n = 241), and Other (n = 4). Nine participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Twenty-one participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 6), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 7), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 6), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 5).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 25), Atheist (n = 9), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 219), Hindu (n = 4), Jewish (n = 3), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 9).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Financial Aid Office to One’s Own Group (N = 277)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9770</td>
<td>1.31043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9189</td>
<td>1.62025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2698</td>
<td>1.54602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7713</td>
<td>1.65992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9333</td>
<td>1.28428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2222</td>
<td>1.81238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments:** (See Appendix 7)

**GREEK LIFE**

**Participants**

One hundred thirty of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from Greek Life. One hundred of those participants provided ratings regarding Greek Life (77%).

Participants included 24 men, 75 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 24 years (M = 19.87, SD 1.38). Ninety-four of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 as bisexual, 1 gay man, and 1 lesbian.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 0), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 1), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 1), Middle Eastern (n = 1), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 97), and Other (n = 0). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.
Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 3), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 4), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 2), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 2).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 6), Atheist (n = 3), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 86), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 2), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Greek Life to One’s Own Group (N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9583</td>
<td>1.75651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7662</td>
<td>1.77443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
<td>2.02941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>2.95898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.5417</td>
<td>1.81238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.3333</td>
<td>0.94281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by LGB individuals and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

**Comments**

1. Now that we are a dry campus and we as Greeks have upheld our end by following the rules of maintaining a dry campus Greek life has failed to provide us with transportation to our social events and has yet to provide a Greek Office area for meetings. These things are crucial for the social bills of our houses are becoming an issue particularly when much less was spent when we were a "wet" campus.

2. Greek Life needs to take action against Fraternities that have repeated counts of sexual assault and rapes filed against them. "annex" IS part of fraternity property regardless of the legalities. I know MANY women who have been assaulted and/or raped by fraternity members during or after fraternity event. The Emilie O. case got attention but I think that although legally she may not have had a case the university and Greek Life in particular should be ashamed of themselves. When I was an undergraduate here I knew of at least 15 alleged incidents at the Delt house. There were countless others by other fraternities. Most of us had to be very careful; however there has to be something more stringent that can be done to insure the girls' safety. I know that neither I nor my sorority sisters felt safe at fraternity houses all the time and often we felt unsafe at events. I'm not against frats or the Greek system -- I was part of it and I loved it but I do thi
3. Greek Life does the most amazing job ever. They work together with all the chapters and they give identity to the student numbers involved on this campus. I couldn't ask for a better experience in the world!

4. As a Greek, I feel MU is drastically trying to cut programming and activities and feel that Dry 2000 not only increased drunk driving but unfairly singles out Greek houses as the only place of alcohol use. East Campus provides the same party scene and therefore discriminates Greeks from holding social. Without Greek-lead activities such as Homecoming, what would MU be?

5. wet campus

HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY

Participants

One hundred eighty two of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Health Sciences Library. One hundred two of those participants provided ratings regarding the Health Sciences Library (56%).

Participants included 22 men, 80 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 21.95, SD 6.17). Ninety-seven of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 as a gay man and 2 lesbians.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 5), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 4), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 5), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 2), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 85), and Other (n = 2). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 3), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 3), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 2), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 2).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 10), Atheist (n = 4), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 83), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 2).
**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Health Sciences Library to One’s Own Group (N = 102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2963</td>
<td>1.46434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.0458</td>
<td>1.23617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2708</td>
<td>1.94924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8333</td>
<td>1.19523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>2.62996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9375</td>
<td>1.08356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by LGB individuals are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. very helpful

2. fine except again with teh disabled people and all the stairs and high shelves of books.

3. fine

4. Everytime I have gone to the Health Sciences Library I have a really difficult time getting help from the staff.

5. As a RN student I love the HSL its such a convienance to not have to truck across campus.

**INFORMATION ACCESS & TECHNOLOGY**

**Participants**

Three hundred sixty two of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from Information Access and Technology. Two hundred thirty seven of those participants provided ratings regarding Information Access and Technology (66%).

Participants included 74 men, 161 women, and 1 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 21.53, SD 5.16). Two hundred twenty two of the participants identified as heterosexual, 5 as bisexual, 4 as gay, 2 as lesbian, 1 as uncertain, and 0 as other.
Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 9), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 4), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 10), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 6), Middle Eastern (n = 2), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 7), White/European (n = 210), and Other (n = 3). Ten participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Sixteen participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 6), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 4), Mobility (n = 3), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 4), Psychological (n = 4), and Other (n = 2).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 24), Atheist (n = 8), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 188), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 3), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 6).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of Information Access and Technology to One’s Own Group (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.5417</td>
<td>1.99954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2598</td>
<td>1.47182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8889</td>
<td>1.41084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9785</td>
<td>1.68696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5455</td>
<td>1.42223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.7500</td>
<td>0.41786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments**

1. When they do well it affects all students equally when they have problems it affects all students equally

2. some IATS staff need diversity and sensitivity training in regards to asking questions of or explaining information to "non-techie" customers.

3. Very helpful when needed!

4. IATS is a big waste of money and resources -- it doesn't serve anyone's needs is inefficient and wasteful. The whole technology system would be better run by an outside corporation who was contracted to do the job right everytime instead of slacking off and being worthless.

5. I don't know what IATS is like for non-english speakers but I am sure it is adequate for all the other groups.
6. IATS is fine

7. They are very helpful to those of us who know nothing about computers - pretty patient too.

8. This service needs much improvement-customer service

9. they're awesome one of the best things at our school in my opinion

10. I have only been there once and that was three years ago. They were very nice walking through loading my e-mail for my computer off campus.

11. There just are not that many people who are really computer/technology savvy. I think that people who have other troubles such as language or disability must have a harder time getting the help they need.

12. Doesn't every student have to go through IAT now? I never talked to a human being in dealing with them but only followed the directions. This could possibly be frustrating to someone who did not read English or who had difficulty maneuvering a mouse/keyboard. It may also be difficult for the technologically insecure since sometimes the directions were frustrating.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

Participants

Ninety-three of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the International Center. Fifty of those participants provided ratings regarding the International Center (54%).

Participants included 9 men, 41 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 35 years (M = 21.60, SD 3.50). Forty-four of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 as bisexual, 2 as a gay man, 1 lesbian, and 1 as uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 2), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 3), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 3), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 3), Middle Eastern (n = 1), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 0), White/European (n = 39), and Other (n = 0). Six participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 0).
In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 5), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 39), Hindu (n = 1), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 3).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of International Center to One’s Own Group (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
<td>0.95743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8415</td>
<td>1.16545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8333</td>
<td>1.11555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>0.99458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8333</td>
<td>1.11555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.0278</td>
<td>0.79174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. I looked at info about Studying Abroad

2. ask an international student.<br> <br> it helped me with what i wanted to know<br> no problems.

3. Where should I start? Perhaps an increase of funding and broadening and deepening<br> training concerning INS issues for IC staff.

4. Lynn Aguado is wonderful. She has helped me find a perfect study abroad program.

**Participants**

Eighty three of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Journalism Library. Forty-nine of those participants provided ratings regarding the Journalism Library (59%).

Participants included 10 men, 38 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 50 years (M = 20.82, SD 4.47). Forty-three of the participants identified as heterosexual, 3 as bisexual, 1 as a gay man, 1 lesbian, and 1 as uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-
ethnic (n = 2), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 1), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 3), White/European (n = 46), and Other (n = 0). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 3), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 1), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 7), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 35), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 3).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Journalism Library to One’s Own Group (N = 49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
<td>1.39158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0132</td>
<td>1.29122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.2619</td>
<td>1.28329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5556</td>
<td>1.58698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>1.32497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

**Comments**

1. *The J-library is not accessible to handicapped people who cannot walk down a flight of stairs.*

2. *fine*

3. *Great library with lots of sources for the nosy and curious alike.*

4. *In a specialized setting such as this<comma> it does not seem to make any difference at all whether one belongs to any minority other than "Journalism student."*

5. *A person with a handicap cannot even get down to the lower level of the library!! That's just wrong.*
6. Very small and crowded. Would not have liked to be physically challenged there. Only used their services once.

**LAW LIBRARY**

**Participants**

Fifty-six of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Law Library. Twenty-three of those participants provided ratings regarding the Law Library (41%).

Participants included 11 men, 12 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 31 years (M = 21.30, SD 3.02). Twenty-two of the participants identified as heterosexual, and 1 as bisexual.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 0), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 2), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 1), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 20), and Other (n = 0). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 2), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 16), Hindu (n = 1), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Law Library to One’s Own Group (N = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>3.46410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5833</td>
<td>1.14261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7667</td>
<td>1.61417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8333</td>
<td>1.45297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, racial-ethnic minorities, LGB, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**
Comments

1. Its ADA policy is vague, reasonable accommodations are not made by staff. Regular hours of operation are not supported by staff with knowledge of ADA compliance. Administration does not make reasonable effort for accommodations. I had a very specific case of ADA non-compliance that was mentioned to Interim Dean and Vice-Director, who gave poor information and unreasonable effort.

2. I just use it as a quite place to study--I never use the services.

3. The staff cares and tries to do the best they can. However, the law school itself has an air that is somewhat negative towards women -- not from the library staff however. Also, most of us speak English and very little other languages. The staff tries very hard to help non native english speakers but sometimes it's just hard to tell what they are saying. Many of them do not speak very clear English. The law library does an excellent job or helping disabled people. They get specialized attention and help with the shelves. I marked 6s on that because a library by nature, with high shelves, simply isn't very accommodating to them. But the staff makes up for it.

4. Great quiet place to study. Why isn't it available to all students that pay to go here?

5. The Law Library is beautiful and the staff are very helpful, although I was not pursuing their usual requests. I found it to be the most inviting library on campus and one of the easiest to study in. There was always a good mix of people when I was there.

Participants

One hundred forty two of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Learning Center. One hundred eleven of those participants provided ratings regarding the Learning Center (78%).

Participants included 29 men, 82 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 50 years (M = 20.97, SD 4.56). One hundred seven of the participants identified as heterosexual, 1 as bisexual, 1 as gay male, 0 as lesbian, and 1 as uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 11), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 5), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 1), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 1), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 6), White/European (n = 90), and Other (n = 0). Five participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 4), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 5), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 2), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 3).
In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 9), Atheist (n = 8), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 81), Hindu (n = 1), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 9).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Learning Center to One’s Own Group (N = 111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8611</td>
<td>1.08207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7618</td>
<td>1.23496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9722</td>
<td>1.29384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.1372</td>
<td>1.04381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.6111</td>
<td>2.14950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.1667</td>
<td>0.47140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by LGB individuals are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. *The math tutoring sessions are very helpful.*

2. *The staff at the learning center is always great and helpful. Sally Foster is the lady that I have come into contact the most and she is great. She not only goes above and beyond to help students, but she gives useful information. The learning center is now in the student success center which adds to the experience.*

3. *Most sciences/mathematics seem to be more geared toward a male and/or minority crowd.*

4. *My experience with the learning center has been excellent. I don't think their or any other service at MU varies among the above ethnic/religious/sexual groups.*

5. *I have noticed the learning center to be great for all people!*

6. *The learning center does a fine job of helping all students. I have never seen anything on campus discriminate against random people and if anything teachers discriminate and it is only against Greeks because you haven't told them that's not allowed. Everything else has rules but if we're getting into minorities let's mention Greeks as well.*

7. *I would like to see more test banks for classes because they really help*
8. I don't think that the learning center is going to effect different sexes and ethnicity differently.

9. As a member of an unrepresented group--older, "non-traditional" students, my one experience with the learning center was awful. The student at the front desk, a young man, tried to make me feel as if I had no business asking about services such as work-study. It was the first time I had ever been in the center and he tried to make me feel ignorant because I did not know how everything operated there. I will go back if I find I need help with a class, but so far, that has not been necessary.

10. In your survey in general you should indicate what type of disability you are talking about. B/c do you mean people with physical disabilities (in a wheelchair) or people with mental retardation or learning disabilities. I think that the learning center for example does a good job of helping students who may have a learning disability, however I don't think it does a good of helping those who are physically challenged b/c there is no ramp for them to use to get in the learning center...

11. The Learning Center is a great place for nontraditional students. I believe your surveys should include them as well.

12. It's been so long since I went there, I really do not remember it but I do know that the place annoyed me.

**LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL & TRANSGENDER RESOURCE CENTER**

**Participants**

Sixteen of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the LGBT Resource Center. Eleven of those participants provided ratings regarding the LGBT Resource Center (69%).

Participants included 2 men, 9 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 24 years (M = 20.45, SD 1.75). Five of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 as bisexual, 1 as gay male, 3 as lesbian, and 0 as uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 0), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 0), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 0), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 0), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 0), White/European (n = 11), and Other (n = 0). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 0), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 1), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 1).
In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 4), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 5), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the LGBT Resource Center to One’s Own Group (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.2778</td>
<td>1.10972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.7037</td>
<td>0.45474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9167</td>
<td>1.42400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.4722</td>
<td>1.21297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, non-Christian individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**: <NONE>

**MATH LIBRARY**

**Participants**

Thirty-two of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Math Library. Twenty-three of those participants provided ratings regarding the Math Library (72%).

Participants included 10 men, 13 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 19 to 47 years (M = 22.74, SD 6.04). Twenty-one of the participants identified as heterosexual, 1 as bisexual, and 1 as gay male.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 0), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 0), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 21), and Other (n = 0). One participant indicated that he or she was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 0).
In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 3), Atheist (n = 0), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 17), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 2).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Math Library to One’s Own Group (N = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.5833</td>
<td>1.06066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0385</td>
<td>1.30198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.3333</td>
<td>1.15470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>1.25831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.4167</td>
<td>0.58926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, non-Christian individuals, racial ethnic minorities, LGB individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. *It's a room with books full of math!!!! It's wheel chair accessible and there is no ethnic filter at the door!!*

2. *very helpful*

3. *Again<comma> my experience with the math sciences library is limited. I've only been in the library a couple of times and therefore<comma> can not comment on their performance. However<comma> I don't think the math science library is "disability" friendly. It's been a few years since I have been in this library and from what I remember<comma> the aisles were very small.*

4. *I was in the Math Sciences library today. The only thing that may apply here is that I'm not sure if there's an elevator for persons with disabilities.*

5. *It may be hard to move around in the small library with a physical disability.*
Participants

Five hundred twenty eight of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Memorial Unions. Three hundred eighty five of those participants provided ratings regarding the Memorial Unions (73%).

Participants included 99 men, 286 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 20.93, SD 4.18). Three hundred fifty seven of the participants identified as heterosexual, 9 as bisexual, and 7 as gay male, 2 lesbians, and 2 uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 18), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 10), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 11), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 9), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 12), White/European (n = 339), and Other (n = 8). Sixteen participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 9), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 5), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 9), Psychological (n = 5), and Other (n = 6).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 35), Atheist (n = 12), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 310), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 5), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 13).

Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Memorial Unions to One’s Own Group (N = 385)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1358</td>
<td>1.14492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7008</td>
<td>1.33961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3788</td>
<td>1.44567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4214</td>
<td>1.46660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9912</td>
<td>1.12007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6905</td>
<td>1.46593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (See Appendix 13)
One hundred ninety five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the MU Police Department. One hundred seventy three of those participants provided ratings regarding the MU Police Department (89%).

Participants included 47 men, 125 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 37 years (M = 20.76, SD 2.62). One hundred fifty eight of the participants identified as heterosexual, 3 as bisexual, and 5 as gay male, 1 lesbians, 0 uncertain, and 1 other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 4), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 4), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 5), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 5), White/European (n = 157), and Other (n = 4). Six participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 5), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 0), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 4), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 18), Atheist (n = 3), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 137), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 4), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 7).

### Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the MU Police Department to One’s Own Group (N = 173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.6154</td>
<td>1.80455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1872</td>
<td>1.52732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>3.8680</td>
<td>0.90393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4190</td>
<td>1.81410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>1.01379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.9667</td>
<td>1.12670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments:** (Please see Appendix 8)
Thirty-five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Office of Multicultural Affairs. Thirty-one of those participants provided ratings regarding the Office of Multicultural Affairs (89%).

Participants included 7 men, 24 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 32 years (M = 20.58, SD 2.35). Twenty-nine of the participants identified as heterosexual, and 2 lesbians.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 11), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 3), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 6), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 4), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 2), White/European (n = 16), and Other (n = 0). Three participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 0), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 0).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 3), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 25), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 1).

### Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Office of Multicultural Affairs to One’s Own Group (N = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0417</td>
<td>2.28674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5797</td>
<td>1.53895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3.9667</td>
<td>2.14217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.8730</td>
<td>1.42901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>1.06066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6667</td>
<td>1.33333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, LGB individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**
Comments

1. Pablo is a wonderful individual who has been very helpful in so many ways!

2. They all seemed know what they were talking about and knew where to find additional information as I needed it.

3. I think there are appropriate resources on our campus and I think the center has them but I am not sure if they are being used to their fullest potential.

Participants

Seven hundred twenty seven of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Student Recreation Center. Five hundred ninety four of those participants provided ratings regarding the Student Recreation Center (82%).

Participants included 165 men, 424 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 48 years (M = 20.61, SD 3.24). Five hundred fifty nine of the participants identified as heterosexual, 8 bisexual, 11 gay men, 3 lesbians, 0 uncertain and 2 other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 23), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 21), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 14), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 13), Middle Eastern (n = 4), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 22), White/European (n = 526), and Other (n = 10). Twenty-five participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 14), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 10), Mobility (n = 2), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 9), Psychological (n = 5), and Other (n = 7).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 54), Atheist (n = 16), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 473), Hindu (n = 3), Jewish (n = 8), Muslim (n = 2), Other (n = 23).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Student Recreation Center to One’s Own Group (N = 594)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4766</td>
<td>1.56128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3328</td>
<td>1.53895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8963</td>
<td>1.41585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0795</td>
<td>1.42575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3182</td>
<td>1.81769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2681</td>
<td>1.45889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (Please see Appendix 9)

REGISTRAR’S OFFICE

Participants

Six hundred twenty three of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Registrar’s Office. Four hundred seventy of those participants provided ratings regarding the Registrar’s Office (75%).

Participants included 124 men, 144 women, and 1 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 51 years (M = 21.15, SD 4.47). Four hundred forty one of the participants identified as heterosexual, 7 bisexual, 11 gay men, 2 lesbians, 1 uncertain and 1 other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 22), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 15), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 11), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 11), Middle Eastern (n = 2), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 16), White/European (n = 410), and Other (n = 10). Twenty-two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 12), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 8), Mobility (n = 4), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 14), Psychological (n = 6), and Other (n = 7).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 40), Atheist (n = 14), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 378), Hindu (n = 3), Jewish (n = 7), Muslim (n = 2), Other (n = 17).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Registrar’s Office to One’s Own Group (N = 470)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1068</td>
<td>1.47220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4389</td>
<td>1.53895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9718</td>
<td>1.46947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9324</td>
<td>1.42901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.6217</td>
<td>1.73057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4515</td>
<td>1.62695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (Please see Appendix 10)

RESIDENTIAL LIFE

Participants

Five hundred eighteen of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from Residential Life. Four hundred seventeen of those participants provided ratings regarding the Residential Life (81%).

Participants included 94 men, 319 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 36 years (M = 20.20, SD 2.01). Three hundred ninety three of the participants identified as heterosexual, 8 bisexual, 4 gay men, 2 lesbians, 1 uncertain and 1 other.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 17), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 13), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 10), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 8), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 12), White/European (n = 370), and Other (n = 11). Sixteen participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 12), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 6), Mobility (n = 3), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 9), Psychological (n = 3), and Other (n = 7).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 35), Atheist (n = 11), Buddhist (n = 2), Christian (n = 337), Hindu (n = 1), Jewish (n = 7), Muslim (n = 1), Other (n = 17).
**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Residential Life to One’s Own Group (N = 417)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0667</td>
<td>1.64678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5703</td>
<td>1.39788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1812</td>
<td>1.65076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9324</td>
<td>1.42901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.9889</td>
<td>1.72915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.6622</td>
<td>1.18936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**Comments:** (Please see Appendix 11)

**STUDENT HEALTH CENTER**

**Participants**

Five hundred sixty seven of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Student Health Center. Four hundred forty of those participants provided ratings regarding the Student Health Center (78%).

Participants included 104 men, 332 women, and 2 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 49 years (M = 21.00, SD 3.69). Four hundred ten of the participants identified as heterosexual, 10 bisexual, 8 gay men, 3 lesbians, and 2 uncertain.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 16), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 15), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 11), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 11), Middle Eastern (n = 3), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 18), White/European (n = 390), and Other (n = 7). Twenty-five participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 11), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 11), Mobility (n = 4), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 12), Psychological (n = 5), and Other (n = 8).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 40), Atheist (n = 11), Buddhist (n = 2), Christian (n = 345), Hindu (n = 2), Jewish (n = 6), Muslim (n = 2), Other (n = 20).
Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Student Health Center to One’s Own Group (N = 440)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3371</td>
<td>1.58668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3873</td>
<td>1.39788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1800</td>
<td>1.52553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.9818</td>
<td>1.69944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4783</td>
<td>1.80719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7101</td>
<td>1.40635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

Comments: (Please see Appendix 12)

UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER

Participants

Fifty-five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the University Counseling Center. Forty-one of those participants provided ratings regarding the University Counseling Center (80%).

Participants included 5 men, 36 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 27 years (M = 21.27, SD 1.91). Thirty-seven of the participants identified as heterosexual, 1 bisexual, 1 gay male, and 2 lesbians.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 4), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 1), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 2), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 3), White/European (n = 35), and Other (n = 0). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 1), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 2), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 3), Atheist (n = 1), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 28), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 5).
**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the University Counseling Center to One’s Own Group (N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.0889</td>
<td>1.35045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5571</td>
<td>1.82795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3667</td>
<td>2.36995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.5242</td>
<td>1.93644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2500</td>
<td>2.87228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, LGB individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**

**Comments**

1. *i personally have had no quams with the counseling center at all. people over there are very helpful and friendly.*

2. *Th etherapist that i talked to was very nice<comma> but it was very impersonal<comma> and I felt invaded by the camera and voice recorder<comma> I wouldnt go back.*

3. *My first meeting with a grad student<comma> after the initial evaluation<comma> well<comma> she didn't even show up to the meeting. I gave her another chance and she yawned all the way through it. Someone needs to work on tact. I never went back - that is not worth my time. I had a much better experience with a Psychiatrist at the SHC.*

4. *This is the best service I have ever used on this campus. They kept me from transfering schools! I loved it.*

5. *The only experience I have had with the Counseling center was for Biofeedback. I am not sure why I had to take the entrance interview because I was there for pain relief not counseling. As far as counseling services go<comma> a few sessions is not enough for anybody!*

6. *The counseling center was not flexible and did not take vulnerability of women into consideration.*

7. *I do not feel the my views on the counseling center are accurate with the majority of campus. I had a serious eating disorder<comma> and went to them for help. They*
assigned a student to me that admittedly did not understand English. It was a very difficult thing to talk about especially with someone that couldn't understand me literally.

**VETERINARY MEDICINE LIBRARY**

**Participants**

Sixteen of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Veterinary Medicine Library. Fourteen of those participants provided ratings regarding the Veterinary Medicine Library (88%).

Participants included 1 man, 13 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 32 years (M = 22.00, SD 4.16). Eleven of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 bisexual, and 1 gay male.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 1), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 0), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 0), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 0), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 1), White/European (n = 12), and Other (n = 1). One participant indicated that she or he was a non-Native English speaker.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 1), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 0), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 0), and Other (n = 0).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 1), Atheist (n = 0), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 13), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 0).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Veterinary Medicine Library to One’s Own Group (N = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1970</td>
<td>1.71078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.3333</td>
<td>0.57735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by persons with disabilities, non-Christian religious minorities, racial-ethnic minorities, LGB individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**
Participants

Seventy-five of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Wellness Resource Center. Fifty-seven of those participants provided ratings regarding the Wellness Resource Center (76%).

Participants included 11 men, 46 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 27 years (M = 20.37, SD 1.99). Fifty-four of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 gay male, and 1 lesbian.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 4), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 1), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 2), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 1), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 3), White/European (n = 47), and Other (n = 2). Three participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 3), Hearing (n = 0), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 0), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 1), Psychological (n = 2), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 5), Atheist (n = 0), Buddhist (n = 0), Christian (n = 47), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 0), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 3).

Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Wellness Resource Center to One’s Own Group (N = 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.0933</td>
<td>0.57658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9783</td>
<td>1.24306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4833</td>
<td>1.82650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>5.2778</td>
<td>1.43695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by LGB individuals, and non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.**


Comments

1. *IF you're not a minority<comma> woman<comma> LGBT<comma> a religious minority<comma> disabled or a non-native english speaker<comma> you have no business in the Wellness Resource Center. It's a worthless operation that is a good way for people to make money doing nothing.*

2. *I think that not as many guys are interested in the type of things the WRC does.*

WOMEN’S CENTER

Participants

Fifty of the 1134 participants of Phase III respondents indicated that they had utilized services from the Women’s Center. Thirty-eight of those participants provided ratings regarding the Women’s Center (76%).

Participants included 3 men, 35 women, and 0 transgender individuals ranging in age between 18 to 29 years (M = 21.00, SD 2.14). Thirty of the participants identified as heterosexual, 2 bisexual, 1 gay male, and 4 lesbian.

Participants were asked to indicate their “ancestry” by checking all that applied from the following list of alternatives: African (n = 2), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 2), Bi-racial/Multi-ethnic (n = 0), Hispanic/Latino(a) (n = 1), Middle Eastern (n = 0), Native American Indian/Alaskan Native (n = 0), White/European (n = 33), and Other (n = 1). Two participants indicated that they were non-Native English speakers.

Participants indicated that they had the following types of disabilities: Visual (n = 2), Hearing (n = 1), Learning (n = 2), Mobility (n = 1), Speech (n = 0), Medical (n = 0), Psychological (n = 1), and Other (n = 1).

In terms of religious identification, participants identified themselves as belonging to the following groups: Agnostic (n = 9), Atheist (n = 2), Buddhist (n = 1), Christian (n = 22), Hindu (n = 0), Jewish (n = 1), Muslim (n = 0), Other (n = 2).

Descriptive Statistics

Ratings by Group of the Responsiveness of the Women’s Center to One’s Own Group (N = 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS W/ DISABILITIES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>1.53055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.5229</td>
<td>1.05253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2500</td>
<td>1.39171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>1.93793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.3333</td>
<td>1.08866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.8000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Anchors on the Likert rating scale included 1 (not at all), 4 (adequate), and 7 (extremely well).

**The average ratings by non-native English speakers are suspect due to the small numbers of participants and the restricted range of responses.

**Comments**

1. I think the Women's Center is such a great resource for women. I wish that more women were aware of the services that the Women's Center offers.

2. The women's center does a really good job working with what they're given<comma> fund-wise and worker-wise.

3. The Women's Center is just a place to seat and watch TV.

4. Women center staff are very friendly

**SUMMARY**

The vast majority of student service units evaluated in Phase III received average ratings from all six underrepresented group participants that were above a rating of “adequate” and below a rating of “extremely well,” with only a few exceptions. Average ratings that were below “adequate” were obtained for a small number of student service units in Phase III with respect to LGBT and/or non-Christian religious minorities. An expansive number of comments were provided by Phase III participants that reflected a wide range of attitudes reflecting pride, investment, support, and concern as well as disdain for issues regarding the treatment of underrepresented groups among student services units on campus at MU.
Appendix 1: Comments Regarding Academic Advising

1. My Academic Advisor is a horrible advisor. You make an appointment to see her and the only reason she remembers to show up is because someone in one of her classes needs to make up a lab. She also acts like it's a huge burden for you to take up her time and doesn't seem very knowledgeable about what she is talking about. The second time I made an appointment with her she didn't ever show up. I left a note and she never got back to me either. My experience thus far have all been negative. Although all of my friends rave about their advisors.

2. Advising has no correlation with your sexual orientation

3. definitely needs to be improved

4. I have had no problems with advising based on my gender. I do not see how most of these groups would need special advising. We all have to take pretty much the same general education and the same requirements for our majors. I would be surprised if an advisor told a student the wrong information because he/she was of a special group. The only group that may need special attention is the non-English speakers because there are certain instructors who if they speak really fast for example might be avoided under the advisors guidance.

5. Academic advising has been my worst experience at Mizzou. <NAME DELETED> needs to be replaced. She not only is uninformed and has given me wrong information she is also hard to find and not too friendly.

6. I think that Academic Advising varies per person and on what area they are being advised in. Academic advising often has more to do with what the student puts into it.

7. Need more emphasis on actual advising, not degree checks, approval etc. Perhaps a peer advisor as well.

8. What about straight, white males?

9. I think it is too hard to set up appts. with your advisor and once you do they don't really help that much so you walk out of there more confused that when you went in.

10. My success at MU is largely due to services received through academic advising.

11. Academic advising for me on this campus has been an absolute nightmare. My relationship with my assigned adviser consists of her showing me a course book. I have received better information from fellow students and high school teachers than I have from my adviser. The only support I find comes from the head of my department who is of course extremely busy and at times unaccessible. In my
opinion advising is the weakest point of the entire university and a majority of students also feel this way.

12. It depends on whom the academic advisor is.

13. General Honors advisors did not help me at all when I needed help when I didn't have a major yet. The new psych advisors just try to get you in and out as quickly as possible. It is many times inadequate.

14. I really don't have a huge opinion about how they are acquainted with the issues of each of these groups I believe they treat everyone equally and in a friendly yet professional manner trying to treat everyone equally.

15. <NAME> is the most amazing advisor ever. She is helpful and the first of 3 advisors I have had that was so great.

16. The only concern of the academic advising is to make sure we stay here as much as possible so the university can profit as much as possible from us.

17. Seeing that academic advising is usually first come first serve I don't see a problem with it. As for the knowledge of advisors regarding the different groups I know they probably have not touched up on their history of gay and lesbian rights movements or every civil rights case known to man they are there to help students not get a history lesson

18. they know a lot about what they advise on but don't tell us enough that i feel we should know now that i am in my third year of school. and i feel this goes for everyone not just one specific demographic group.

19. i have to go to class but I think for the most part it's great. I don't like it when graduate students are academic advisors though cause one i had once didn't seem to really know that much or care.

20. I really don't think that advising will be different for any particular class of people

21. My needs as a woman have been pretty much met but it is difficult for my advisor to understand what works for me as an older "non-traditional" student. I constantly find myself in conflicting situations and information comes too late for me to use it effectively. I often find myself in difficult situations because my advisor does not understand what it is that I need to know.

22. Advisors are not really concerned with students in general. Once again the whole customer service issue seems lost on them
23. **Academic advising has been horrible since my freshman year. That's why I don't use it now.**

24. **As a female I am not sure how everyone else is. Advising meetings are one on one and not open to everyone else.**<br>**I am sure that it is fine**

25. **The people in the education department (advisors) change so often that some of them are not very knowledgeable.**

26. **I haven't been here in so long that I'm not very sure what good my numbers will do for this place. I hardly went because I already knew my major when I came and didn't really need to go.**

27. **Every time I go to an adviser about any academic topic they either have nothing to recommend or answer questions with broad meaning statements that have nothing to do with the question you asked. Do they know anything? I go to them only with questions listed on the brochures about academic advising that they are supposed to be able to answer and they just sit there and tell you "You'll have to ask the professor," or "You'll have to ask your faculty adviser" and refer you to everyone but themselves to answer things they should know. What's the point in having them?**

28. **I find academic advising as a whole to be unhelpful and stressful. It is just another hoop that students need to jump through and very seldom does any real good for students either academically or personally.**
Appendix 2: Comments Regarding Admissions

1. I have noticed that this survey has totally ignored what it may be assuming to be the majority which is the Christian Religious Minorities. I feel that the University and Admissions do more to accommodate the Racial/Ethnic Minorities and the Lesbian Gay Bisexual & Transgender than they do the Women Non-Native English Speakers those with disabilities and Religion as a whole especially Christian who just get lumped in with protestants. 85% of college students stop going to church after college mostly because they didn't know where they could go away from home. If the University spent as much time and money on these groups (in proportion to the size of the groups) as they do the Racial/Ethnic Minorities and the Lesbian Gay Bisexual and other groups who may be more vocal then groups would be more fairly represented. It often seems that the loudest group is the group that gets the most and that is not in any way fair.

2. I have not really thought all that much about admissions or had any contact with them.

3. I was unable to answer these questions about all but the women because I have never seen how these others are treated by admissions. I think admissions tries to do thier best to accommodate for everyone on campus no matter who you are.

4. I see all sorts of people on campus from all shapes and sizes to all races and ethnicities. I think that is just great but I think the activities you provide for black students in general contribute to segregation. Wander into Eva J's or Brady Commons and you'll see what I mean. Of course this could just be the way sociology works but maybe there is something that the university is not providing that encourages segregation.

5. The Office of Admissions does an excellent job dealing with all sorts of people from all over the world.

6. This survey does not adequately reflect how I feel about admission issues. I personally feel that it shouldn't matter to admissions whether or not someone is white black male female gay heterosexual or whatever. The ONLY catagory that should warrant ANY special consideration is persons with disabilities. Frankly I don't know enough to properly evaluate MU's admissions on this issue. As far as the rest of the catagories are concerned I would like to point out that the Affirmative Action statute is intended to prohibit discrimination. Many institutions however have used this as a means to discriminate against white males. Gender race and religion should not be considerations whatsoever in the admissions of students.

7. I don't even know why this is an issue. I don't think the university practices any prejudices with regards to admission proceedures.
8. I feel that tolerance of other religions and races has overshadowed the people who are physically disabled. Our time and money and energy should be put into other things—not helping out with past wrongs, etc. We do not need affirmative action on our campus. I know that goes against everyone else in the world right now, but I feel discriminated against as a white, middle-class female.

9. When information is sent out to perspective students it would be nice to receive literature from the different clubs on campus that represent the individuals above.

10. Don't put Christmas decorations on campus! It is REALLY offensive and shows Mizzou non-Christians that MU does not respect their religious beliefs.

11. There is no reason whatsoever that this should be a question on the survey. Admissions should be based solely on standardized test scores and high school performance. Anything outside of that criteria is a sign of bias and injustice to student who cannot help the color of their skin or their place and surroundings in life. Do not penalize students for the outcry some voice calling their place in life "discriminated." They are the ones drawing attention to the situation. There is no problem.

12. I'm really tired of the whole "diversity" thing. I think it's pretty much - how about making scholarships based on NEED and/or MERIT, and NOT RACE???????? am I not "diverse" just because I'm white?!

13. I don't know if it's racially related and therefore irrelevant but I went to see the residency advisor at one a clock on a Wednesday afternoon, and she was gone for the weekend. Seems to me that is no way to run an office.

14. Too much emphasis is placed on separating people into groups...we all have the same opportunities regardless of the above criteria.

15. I guess I don't understand why these groups were singled out; there are lots of other 'groups' of people but really, we're all just people. Why not ask how did admissions treat you? Then if you think there is a trend go back to the first part of the test and find out what they are to categorize if you must.

16. I think that MU is publicly concerned with the needs of minorities and persons with disabilities, but they are more concerned with the public appearance of the school than the actual needs of its students. The students are being exploited because they come to this school to obtain a high-quality education which has not been the concern of this school for a long time.

17. I have no information concerning how admissions deals with any of these groups, since I am neither a member of said groups nor have I witnessed there interaction with any member thereof.
18. Since this is the heart of the Bible belt, of course people are going to be discriminated against. This university is mainly white, middle-class, suburbanite kids. Doesn't get any simpler than that.

19. I don't know why they include the "lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender" group admissions doesn't know your sexual orientation and they don't care. I believe that Admissions is fair to all groups of students.

20. I feel that even more scholarships should be provided to african-americans in particular. I find it interesting how much money, support, and attention black athletes get but not other blacks in the academic arena.

21. I think it is wrong if an African American can come to the University of Missouri with the same grades as me and they come for free whereas I pay full tuition. I think it is harder for someone like me who is a white male from Missouri to get accepted than it is for a women, African American, someone from another country, someone from another state, or even someone with a disability. I think there should be one admission line and you are either above it or below it and not worry about how racially diverse the school is. You are turning away some very bright individuals.

22. I have found the admissions process to be extremely fair and balanced toward all groups that apply.

23. I'm not sure about a lot of different groups but I don't think that mid-Missouri is really a good place for anybody that is of a minority background whether it be ethnic, social, sexual preference whatever. I don't think that the campus accommodates enough the needs of those students. There need to be more multicultural affairs and things like curriculum and seminars and more opportunities on learning about different people in general.

24. I used the office of admissions but I wouldn't really know how well they react to minority groups.

25. Sometimes I felt like there was reverse discrimination as if Admissions was trying so hard to accommodate the minority they forgot about the majority.

26. Admissions especially when one takes into account the current presence of Minorities at MU is not adequately concerned with the campus climate as it relates to minorities.

27. This University must get rid of any racial, ethnic, gender, disability or religious profiling or bias. It's pathetic that we're sorted and treated like numbers but if you're LGBT a minority or can claim some reason you're different you can instantly get everything done for you so you don't sue. Equality means equality.
28. I am not sure that my opinions mean anything because I am not really familiar with the "issues" these groups have. I am a woman, but I don't really see any special issues that admissions would deal with.

29. Admissions to law school does not get enough women in the class. Nationally, there is a 51/49 ration of women to men. Here, it is very close to 30/70 after the first semester ended.

30. I think admissions may be too concerned with minority groups, people are people who really cares about anything else?

31. Most of these questions go to the moral convictions of the people that the University has hired.

32. It does not matter if any of the demographic groups apply to a person, admission should not matter on any of these factors. Only consider their academic merit. Its a load of to include info on this it only makes an issue out of a subject that ought not be an issue. By leaving topics relating to these groups off admissions papers we eliminate this whole issue period.

33. It is much easier for racial and ethnic minorities to get scholarships to this school and they require less of them...how fair is that?

34. My experience with the Admission dept was fine. As I am not one of the above groups or have great contact with any one of those groups it is hard for me to tell how and what and when the Admission dept meets or whatever those people needs. I based my answers on what I have heard and since I have not really heard that the dept is faulty in some groups I would assume that they meet the needs of the above said groups.

35. I feel that most people go out of their way to help people of minority. Sometimes it takes away from the overall quality of the service to meet a few peoples needs when in reality more help is needed for the majority.

36. I don't think any of these groups are in any way what so ever at a disadvantage. There is more help for people who are a-typical on this campus than in anywhere in the world. The lengths that people go to are fantastic with respect to being completely fair. However, saying that it is still a pain to do anything on campus if don't already know how to do it and sometimes that is hard for people who feel like they could be labeled.

37. I think there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed. Why does the University diploma say "in the year of our Lord?"

38. Please stop putting labels on people. Just let people be. There are laws in place and especially on this campus everybody is so scared of
being labeled a "hater" by people with nothing better to do that they bend over backward to accommodate every type of person more than adequately.

39. Besides those with disabilities I don't know what needs these groups have that are any different than any of mine. And what constitutes an emotionally unsafe atmosphere for any of these students? Do only white American heterosexual English speaking Christian males without disabilities work in the admissions office? If so is their only job to harass students who aren't all of these or do they actually help with admissions like they are paid to do? I understand that sometimes these groups of people are faced with prejudices everyday but I do not understand how because of their differences in something as little as color or sex they by default have different needs than anyone else on this campus who may happen to be in the majority.

40. I had a hard time rating this stuff because I don't have any experience with half of the groups mentioned as I am not disabled or a minority or gay or a non-native English speaker.

41. I don't think that any of these groups have that many issues with Admissions to be this big of a part of the survey. I think Admissions does a fine job and I belong to some of these groups.

42. I think that people need to quit giving scholarships to people based on ethnicity race and sexual orientation. Personally I need some "free" scholarships so that I can stay at the University. I bust my ass all summer so that I still have to take out loans. Try starting a United White College Fund. Get rid of them all and treat students with equality like everyone so preaches they want.

43. Other than Non-English speakers I don't see that any of these groups have special needs that admissions needs to cater to.

44. Admissions being concerned with minority representation always seems to be pretty standard at schools. Also I really don't think there is a problem with women and Admissions either. As for the rest of the groups of people with such a large school there's bound to be people that fall into those categories. I don't see why sexuality should be important to Admissions though.

45. I am for diversity on campus. However I don't feel that minority groups should be given any special treatment than any other student. Admissions should be the same for all students. If a student cannot meet the standard requirements to be admitted then they shouldn't be allowed here.

46. I think that everything is fine with admissions. People whine a lot when they don't get what they want. Maybe they should just try harder.
47. I'm pretty much neutral on this topic in general. I didn't have a lot of experience with Admissions, but what experiences I did have were satisfactory.

48. I think too much emphasis is placed on pleasing everyone. That will never happen. Someone will always complain about something.

49. They should be a little less snotty when incoming freshmen call and ask questions!

50. I think that a lot of opportunities are missed by the campus as a whole because the are so targeted at a specific minority group.

51. I feel that the staff of MU do their best to accommodate EVERYONE regardless of how the above issues may affect a particular person.

52. Considering I'm not much of a minority it is hard for me to answer any subjective questions. Admissions was fine for me.

53. I don't really know anything about any of these categories because the only one I belong to is "women." I can't answer accurately for the rest.

54. None of the above criteria should be used when determining admission. It should be based solely on merit.

55. Why is women included here? I highly doubt there is any bias in gender in admissions after all we don't live in the stone age. Personally I think admissions needs to focus on all of these groups (excluding women - which is just ridiculous - you should remove women from the list here)

56. I think these questions really aren't applicable to the admissions process. My involvement with admissions has been all computerized.

57. I think that the university caters to the needs of all groups on campus and is quite accommodating. I have had nothing but good experiences.

58. The only group above that I can truly identify with is that of the women. I did not feel that I was treated any differently than any other person.

59. It's not fair that a white student can't get any scholarships because we're white ... aren't I being discriminated against because I'm white?

60. I don't fall into any of these groups so I really have no idea how they are handled. I don't think to much is made of these groups. I don't think there needs to be a special interest put into these groups because by doing that you are discriminating against white heterosexual religious males.
61. this university goes above and beyond the call of duty for all these groups. evidence of this is that no matter what the statistics are of the ratio of any one of these groups to the student population this university is one of the most diverse and diverse friendly institution.

62. The neglect of putting in "sexual orientation" in the non-discriminatin clause for MU is a gross disappointment for me. It makes me ashamed of MU.

63. I have not had a negative experience with this.

64. It is not fair that a student will not be admitted into a graduate program because of his or her sexual orientation. This is outrageous and should be changed immediately.

65. I don't really know a lot about how the admissions staff treats these individuals. I only relate to the women group and I feel that they deal with me well.

66. I don't see any efforts into making international students wanted on this campus. We pay almost tripled the price and we are mistreated by the staff. Most of the time inexperienced new comers end up making double payments and never realize until late. Health insurance for instance is a fee already included in the school bill automatically. However we all receive forms to apply to the health insurance inside our admissions package and hence receive a second bill in the mail. The student center of course has nothing to do with it...

67. I worked for the Outreach Team and still have no idea how the Admissions office or process services any of these people individually. In addition it is only fair that if you treat them specially that every applicant recieves some type of special treatment not just those with something different about them.

68. Shows no favoritism.

69. I answered these to the best of my ability but I really don't have experience with how well these groups of people are accomodated. To do so I would have to sit around admissions and I've never done that before nor do I plan to.

70. it should be encouraged public display of affection regardless of sexual orientation

71. I feel people that are not heterosexual are not appropriatley cared for by school administration

72. None of these issues were even addressed in my admission to the university.

73. I think that surveys like these might actually regress the advances that society has made regarding the equality of religious gender and sexual groups. By segregating each group like we have on test sheets and surveys we are already saying that there is a distinct difference among groups of people. I can't stand the way that forms of any sort
will often inquire my religious or racial background. The only way to make things equal is to put us all together. I see the relevance of this survey and it is important to cater to the students needs. I also believe that segregating someone on a sheet of paper does not fall too short of segregation in society as a whole.

74. i think admissions does a fine job. this is a university after all so of course this is a school with some of the most diverse groups of people. that is why i have rated them pretty high. now if we were talking about a community college or a smaller 4-year college like columbia college they probably would noe get as high of a score because they are not used to it every day like the people here at MU.

75. it is difficult for me to speak for another person's experience with admissions.

76. I really don't fully know the complete roll of Admissions other than accepting applications.

77. If I'm outside most of these minority groups am I really qualified to rate Admissions based on the unspecified concerns of said groups?

78. I don't remember how I was treated by admissions. I'm a senior; that was 4 years ago; and I didn't quiz them about their views on minorities!

79. In the future why don't you put all categories down and not just minorities. I think that many of these groups are over compensated for.

80. When I was admitted to this school I was never made aware of the Woman's Center. I was also never informed of the disability center or given help regarding my learning disability.

81. It's upsetting to me that you don't care about the quality of admissions for white males who are christian and not disabled.

82. I am a white male at the university am disturbed by the number of black organizations and even women organizations. The Business school has a number of black organizations and I feel that if someone wanted to start a White Accounting Club the University would be strongly against it.

83. I'm not as concerned with the groups of " races " as I am with the fact that being a transfer student and a white young female I have encountered more rude staff at this school than certainly any other that I have been at. They are impersonal and act like every question you ask is dumb. For instance just because I go here doesn't mean I know where one fourth of the buildings are or that I needed to fill out a particular form to do something. Maybe they should consider that.
84. After doing clerical work in admissions for a semester I can say that the staff of the admissions department are all very informed, helpful individuals. I emphasize the International Admissions staff under great pressure and large work loads they are still gracious and understanding to all international students at Mizzou.

85. I don't feel knowledgeable to answer any of these questions. I don't know how they deal with these certain groups. Maybe the questions should be aimed at particular groups concerning their views individually. If responses from one particular group seem to be the same, you will have your answer on how they are really treated. As a white, non-disabled, heterosexual, English and Spanish speaking woman believing that some things cannot be explained yet it might not be god, I think that Admissions was fine. No complaints and really not that big of a deal.

86. Well, this is kinda off the subject but why doesn't MU have a white or German cultural center?

87. I am disappointed that you do not have a category for older, non-traditional students. That is in my estimation the most under-represented group on campus.

88. Admissions is a large staff of individuals. It is impossible to identify each person on that side of the university. Usually the first person you will come in contact with in Admissions is actually a student. I feel that Admissions does what it can regarding various groups on campus. The individual representatives strive to ensure that they are meeting the needs of all students and often go out of the way to participate in events hosted by the various student groups on campus. The advising side actually has very little contact with the students and most don't really like meeting with the students. They are very caught up in the "power" of their positions and often don't think of the customer service they should be providing. Their jobs are there because of the students but that often is forgotten in all departments on this campus.

89. It seems that the more rare yet high profile a group is the better attention it will recieve. This is due to the fear of legal repurcussions that could occur if a group feels it is treated unfairly. I feel that not much attention is paid to the special needs of women but I also feel that special attention is not due to us. We should not be treated any differently everyone should be on an even plain.

90. I'm not entirely sure what you mean by admissions. I have never felt uncomfortable or unwelcomed at admissions but I really cannot say how much they take into account who I am. Personally I feel that when I'm in admissions I am just another faceless student to be moved through the system.

91. I really don't think that this is an issue. First of all it is not on the admissions letter if you are or are not gay so that has nothing to do with admissions.
Secondly, there are so many "politically correct" standards out there for quotas to admit people already so why try to create more? I am a girl. I hope I was not admitted just because I was a girl and I had to meet the quota for guy/girl ratio. I hope that I didn't pay for private school so that I could work hard to be in the top 10% of my class to come to MIZZOU and get in just because I am a girl. Do you get that? Do all you stupid PC people get that? We are people admit us based on grades not special treatment for women, ethnic groups, homosexuals, or anyone else...admit us because we are people and deserve to be here.

92. Persons with disabilities, racial/ethnic minorities, and women are given more attention than others for legal and constitutional reasons. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, & transgender are given moderate attention for the same reason but slightly less because of cultural taboos. Non-native English speakers and Non-Christian Religious minorities are given little or no attention because legally and constitutionally Admissions does not have to care.

93. I am not really sure on how non-Christian religious minorities and persons with disabilities are affected because I haven't personally been exposed to or known anyone exposed to those services.

94. I believe that the admissions department works hard to understand the needs of the different groups. However, I think there are certain events Admissions holds that cater to some of the above groups more than others. There are resources that Admissions has on the various groups but it may be a question of how much interaction Admission has with each of these groups. And if they are doing things right it may not be noticeable that they have an issue with the any groups because their prejudices shouldn't exist or be seen. I think overall Admissions does a great job of reaching all potential students but tries a little harder with some groups than others.

95. I do not feel admissions treats any of the groups listed above differently.

96. WASPs are students too. Our needs should be acknowledged in some way as well.

97. I really am only involved with admissions when I must get a specific document. From what little I have seen it appears that no group is really given extra precedence over another.

98. While I may not fall into any of the above categories directly I do have several friends that fit into all these categories. I feel that since I have heard little discouraging news from my friends and acquaintances about the admissions office I feel there is probably very little that falls to a critical level. then again if the individuals were overwhelmingly impressed with the abilities of the admin. dept. I'm sure I would have
heard this too. Personally however, it is hard for me to very judgemental about these issues since they never really affected me directly.

99. There are so many different departments that deal with all these issues that I have never had a major problem with feeling like an ethnic group or a minority was discriminated against.

100. It goes without saying that all these people should be treated equally by the employees involved with admissions, but as I have no personal experience with these categories, I cannot give accurate information on how admissions has treated them.

101. The staff is not concerned with any students or even other MU staff outside their department. They are generally unhelpful and seem unhappy with their jobs. They are not concerned about any discomfort or disabilities that anyone who uses their services may have.

102. Admissions does not do a good job with the majority of these groups. Women, I believe, are treated fairly while racial minorities and really any other minority group are not treated as fairly. Being a member of a racial minority, I know I have experienced this discrimination.

103. I think a non-discrimination policy including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals helps to promote safety and security among that part of the population on the campus.
Appendix 3: Comments Regarding the Bookstore

1. It is a typical bookstore, overpriced books, overpriced clothes, overpriced music and movies. What more could you ask for?

2. should open at 7:30. <br> bloodsuckers.

3. Everyone at the bookstore is equally rude to everyone.

4. too expensive. don't take advantage of us!

5. Prices are extremely inflated, so I have found.

6. i am concerned because the MU bookstore sells things that are made in sweatshops. i don't want to be associated with slave labor, etc. also they rip you off when you buy/sell back your books. also the old bookstore was better because they had pepsi products and cigarettes.

7. I think they discriminate against students in general. Don't we know we can't afford $30 for a t-shirt?

8. One problem I see with the bookstore is its cramped isles. A person in a wheelchair or even just crutches, etc. would have a difficult time moving around in there. Also Lots of things are placed high out of reach.

9. I think they let them loiter in the walkways too much. Take a seat everyone!

10. The bookstore is overpriced and it never has small enough sizes for women.

11. It appears to be fine.

12. The Bookstore is great - they always have out books celebrating all people.

13. Again I don't see how asking about the bookstore towards issues is incredibly relevant trying to rate these things. The bookstore has a variety of information and items for everyone.

14. They serve their expensive purpose, but I understand that texts have valuable knowledge that is worth a lot of money.

15. Shows no favoritism.

16. Why are the books so expensive? Why we were are required to by so many of them since they are usually underused? Why can't we use the library as a resource for class books? Why can't the the bookstore be less about making money for the university?
17. Don't have any concerns

18. very nice place

19. they are a big help and they have basically everything anyone could need. the only qualm i have is the price of the books. i don't know why they feel the need to make THAT much money off of us. if they are going to charge us so much more than what it costs them why don't they at least put that money towards something good? i know the bookstore workers don't make that good of money so where the hell does it all go? and they are kind to everyone and treat everyone the same so they are good in that aspect.

20. everything’s great with them exept they always run out of small sizes in clothes and don't seem to reorder them!

21. I love our bookstore they are so helpful there even when its incrediblly busy.

22. Overall the experiecne has been fairly good except that recommended books often have to be ordered it can be expensive and computer software can take all semester or more to get in.

23. I think the bookstore lacks on the subject of science. I would like to see more books concerning physics and medicine.

24. Not enough women's apparel; females shop there the most and are apt to buy more clothing. More definitely needs to be offered

25. Again. older "non-traditional" students are pretty much invisible and there are more than you'd think out there.

26. The bookstore meets the needs of the above individuals when it sells books. Since only half of the products sold by the bookstore are books and the other half commercialized goods (cards clothes candy makeup) the bookstore is only fulfilling half of the needs of the students on campus. If you lived on campus did not have a car and for some reason could not use the Columbia transit system you would be hard pressed to find the items you needed such as hair products.

27. The prices are rediculous! I CANNOT STAND having to shop in there. This applies to ALL groups.

28. The bookstore does not care. They are in it for the money.

29. Although the man in charge of textbooks is sometimes rude and will not take other conditions into consideration. For example if a student were to change classes on the
day after the bookstore quits refunds at the start of the semester, he will not take them back. Sometimes there should be exceptions.

30. The aisles are so very narrow, I'm amazed when a wheelchair can go through there. It's often hard to navigate through the main part of the store and then the textbook part is just plain confusing.

31. They may not have people there that can understand people that don't speak English. Handicapped people may have problems.

32. There are lots of materials on anything there. The staff is friendly.

33. The older white lady at the front is nice. She wears glasses and is a warm person. Great idea!

34. The narrow walkways might be difficult for the wheelchair bound and there seems to be only English-speaking employees so it might be difficult for a non-English speaker to get the help they need. The store is also very crowded which might make it more difficult to meet certain patrons' needs. Overall though, there has been great improvement in this area since I was an undergrad too.
Appendix 4: Comments Regarding Cashier’s Office

1. I have only dealt with the Cashier's on a personal basis. I don't know how the other groups are handled.

2. I usually get quick service at the cashiers office.

3. That bill is so confusing I honor Cashiers for being so patient with everybody.

4. The Cashier's is the most equal place on campus. They don't care what color you are where you came from what you do with your friends who you date who or what you worship or whether you have a disability -- they only care about your money and only know you as a number. Maybe they're the model you all should follow.

5. I really don't have major experience with the cashiers. I just checked that box because I recieve a paycheck through the UMC.

6. It's fine

7. I have never been to the cashier's office without having a problem caused by an MU employee.

8. They need to be open later

9. The Cashier's office like a lot of other offices present in this study should not and do not need to worry about the needs for these groups. Their function is to assure that these students are paying their university bills not to help these students with any problems they may have due to their status.

10. Shows no favoritism

11. Cashier is about taking our money that's all.

12. Seven up again "Your skin color is different than mine your american money is no good here" Its all green to the university

13. As an older "non-traditional" student I'd say the cashiers do okay except when they mistake me for the mother of a student.

14. They are equally rude to all students

15. I don't think that the cashier's should show special preference to any minority or special group.
16. I use this place mostly to pay bills and turn in special forms. It doesn't really seem like a place that is going to pay much attention to special needs.

17. If they have a check for then they will give it to you plain and simple.

18. money will see no ethnicity

19. They steal money from minorities, women, gays, non-english speakers, non-christians and people with disabilities. You know that white male christians are good people too and maybe you should inculde them in your survey sometime.

20. The desks in the Cashier's office are too high for someone that may be in a wheelchair. however there may be a place for disabled individuals that I'm not aware of.

21. They do not keep convenient hours for those who have to work during the day or who have to drive to get to classes. I don't think this is a climate concern but more a neglect of those students that attend classes at night.
Appendix 5: Comments Regarding Campus Dining Services

1. food is food

2. more vegan options. learn how to cook kuggle if you're going to try.

3. Campus Dining Services doesn't provide choices good for people looking for a healthy alternative to the high fat foods served in the cafeteria! The salad is often wrinkled, the salad dressing is mislabeled and the veggie burgers are cooked in the same grease as the hamburgers.

4. Healthier foods should be provided and meals should not be so heavy in carbohydrates. Frequently the main meal is served with sides that are the same color which is not appealing and is usually an indicator of too much of one thing (ie. carbohydrates). Furthermore the staff at many of the Dining locations tend to be extremely rude particularly those of various races to white students (most commonly aimed toward white males however I have noticed similar problems with females as well).

5. look food providers are food providers. if i was a vegan non-christian with disabilities i might want different types of food. i dont expect food providers to be knowledgeable about me my religion disabilities sex etc. that is not their job or business frankly.

6. While I'm not sure how CDS would deal with issues concerning such groups as LGBT and the religious minorities since it is just a place to eat after all I am happy to know that there is a vast diversity of employees from the minority groups working for CDS. I am an employee myself and could name at least one person who fits these categories who works at CDS. Because of this awareness I think CDS serves everybody's needs equally.

7. THE FOOD AT DOBBS SUCKS IT IS INHUMAN THE WAY THE POOR FRESHMEN ARE FORCED TO EAT DOBBS CRAP!!!

8. CDS does an amazing job of catering to everyone's needs especially those with disabilities.

9. Many Christian Holidays are celebrated but not many of other religions. I don't mind but I can see how someone of another religion might.

10. I think enough idiots work the dining halls already. try keeping food there all the time...not in regulated times. Not everyone gets hungry all at once. Maybe our country is fat because the only thing that is ever open is the grill.

11. Many of the women that use campus dining services (mainly the dining halls) are involved with sororities as well and at times do not use all of the meals that pay for. The lowest
meal plan you can get is 7 a week but if women can eat other places as well I think that they should be allowed to have a lesser meal plan if they feel it is necessary such as 3 or 4.

12. The food on campus is absolutely terrible.

13. Some Kosher meals would be appreciated by Jewish Students.

14. We are humans; we eat. The only concern that I can see would be if it is wheelchair accessible.

15. Campus Dining services do not have a preference to the issues. Many of them have special days where they honor other cultures they really are not prevalent in trying to be outstanding in being part of the issues concerned with these groups of people.

16. The space in Eva J's is too small for most mobile people to be able to move around during the lunch hours. It seems almost impossible that a person in a wheelchair could easily maneuver around in there.

17. Campus Dining Services does a great job meeting the needs of persons with disabilities and racial/ethnic minorities. I have noticed their exceptional effort in these categories.

18. Dobbs is terrible-- I don't mean to sound rash but I lost a good 15 lbs when I came to college b/c there was no substance to any of the food rarely any fruit etc. something needs to be done to aid the quality of the food.

19. Great selection of food and there are no problems with it.

20. It has been four years since I have used the Campus Dining Services and I know they have made many changes in it over that time so once again I do not feel like I know enough information to answer these questions.

21. A great selection

22. The counters are too high for some people with disabilities. the temperatures behind those counters are near unbearable. It's hard to hear what people are saying to order let alone understand someone who does not speak English well. But the largest is problem is the lack of variety!!! Fresher vegetables as well as more vegetarian dishes. More foods that are appropriate for other religious groups that do not eat certain products. Fix some of this and perhaps the food will be better too.

23. They have more food than you can shake a stick at. Anyone could find something they like.

24. Salad bars are too tall for people with disabilities (Wheelchairs)!
25. The whole thing is still voluntarily segregated without a whole lot of integration of races, although it has improved slightly.
Appendix 6: Comments Regarding Ellis Library

1. I think Ellis library does a great job, regardless of a patron's race, gender, sexuality or disability.

2. A facility housing a wealth of knowledge is extremely underutilized especially with the quick availability of information on the Internet.

3. Wish research librarians were there longer.

4. Maybe harder for handicapped people to get around.

5. Ellis library is extremely hard to get around in. This is bad for people with learning disabilities who can be confused by the strange directions and floor levels. It is also bad for wheelchair bound or others with physical disabilities.

6. I don't really see how the library could be discriminatory. Maybe the staff could use some education on these special needs. Also, disabled persons may have difficulty moving around the library and acquiring books etc.

7. Ellis need a renovation and a better system of reshelving books.

8. It's usually too warm in there. Hard on people with MS and others who may be heat sensitive.

9. Ellis is very well balanced for all of these categories.

10. I do not feel The Ellis Library meets the needs of anyone. I do not care for it at all.

11. Ellis Library is a great resource for information. It is very well organized and a pleasurable place to be.

12. It's an amazing library with everything we could ever want or need.

13. On number 5 I put a "4" for women because everyone knows how dangerous it can be to be up in the stacks by yourself - especially being a woman. I don't expect them to put guards in every room or anything but it does bother me a little that I have to find someone to go with me - especially at night if I need to go upstairs in the library. The staff is very knowledgeable though and always willing to help I'm sure.

14. Everyone can study or read or research here without a problem.

15. Sometimes the staff need to be a little more considerate cause they talk loud sometimes when helping people.
16. General complaint. It sometimes can be years before interlibrary loan articles are received especially those in a foreign language. I am NOT kidding about the years either. I am talking about one real situation while working on my thesis and several months for others for articles in Spanish not other languages that may be harder to access.

17. The only problem that I have with Ellis Library is that the workers are rude.

18. No acknowledgement of older "non-traditional" students the most under-represented group on campus.

19. How do persons with disabilities get to the smaller non-elevator accessible wings of Ellis?

20. Handicapped people may have a problem getting books.

21. Ellis can be intimidating for students who do not have library training. I can see where it would be both frustrating and emotionally risky. However they have a great collection on a variety of topics including those that would be of interest to the above groups.

22. Although students in wheel chairs may not be able to navigate through all of the stacks and make it through the narrow corridors I assume that staff on hand would be more than willing to "be the legs" for wheelchair-bound students unable to enter these areas.
Appendix 7: Comments Regarding Financial Aid

1. I got scholarships. Because I earned them through hard work. Not through whining about the unfairness of life

2. Besides in admissions, i think that all the places that i have filled out this survey for should and are on a non-discriminatory basis. Everyone can use the Rec Center and feel emotionally safe. If you don't, then it's not the rec center fault, it's the persons

3. I believe many of the resources on campus may be difficult to use if I was not a native speaker and/or did not know a lot of english

4. Financial Aid is very biased against anyone who isn't a racial or ethnic minority. Racial Minority groups receive a significant unjust advantage.

5. Financial Aid office is not a welcoming looking on. It is closed off to students leaving only a front desk access. Students may not feel comfortable inquiring info from the student sitting up front. Perhaps a more let's sit down and plan your financial future of college atmosphere. This is a great place to give out more info about the university since most new students will have to visit financial aid first. or know about this office and how to get in contact with it before registering etc.

6. I feel as if there are not really very many opportunities for financial aid for members of white middle class

7. I think they help everyone except me.

8. They screw out-of-staters!

9. What a strange and unavailable group of people on the other side of that half round desk.

10. I think financial aid is given way too quickly to those who simply fill the minority requirement. I think aid should be given based on need and performance. It is a known fact that a student is a lot more likely to receive help if they are black or another minority.

11. especially with tuition hikes this is very important to students

12. I feel that too much emphasis for scholarships is placed on minorities. Just because I am a white american doesn't mean that I am not a minority in some other way. Being from an small public school, being the only person here from my highschool. I don't feel there is enough emphasis put on need for scholarships. Just because the FAFSA says my family is financially secure to pay for my school doesn't mean they are. Two public school teachers can hardly afford to send their children to Mizzou.
13. I think that it is <expletive deleted> that people have a better shot at getting financial aid because of their race. <expletive deleted> that. I am a white anglo saxon and I leave that <expletive deleted> blank because I am afraid that it will hurt me. I do not come from a lot of money. Those lists on financial aid packets should be <expletive deleted> outlawed

14. i know the university policy on diversity but I find that as a mostly white male that it is much harder for me to get financial aid. In fact I think the poor white male is probably the most underrepresented demographic on campus.

15. I think there should be more financial aid geared toward women and people with learning disabilities.

16. I could get no useful information about what is available to me as an older"non-traditional" student except "fill out a FAFSA."

17. I don't see how the University is decreasing the minority scholarships but are remodeling the rec center.

18. Financial Aid may be the most helpful group on campus. I saw them helping all different groups of people and all seemed to receive the same level of service. Again I wouldn't know what it was like for others but I was impressed.
Appendix 8: Comments Regarding MUPD

1. Police are supposed to be unbiased, fair, and just. I have the utmost faith in them and so should you.

2. The MU Police Department is a vital aspect of this campus. These officers give as much as possible to the students of this campus while some of them are even students themselves. Problems that arise as far as the usefulness of the police department are not to be found within the operation of the department itself but in the relationship that the students have with the department. Students are not aware of the myriad of uses this department has. Furthermore, students are unaware of the full capabilities of this department because they see them as simply an annoyance. Once the students give the department the proper respect and trust that it deserves the utilization of the MUPD can be optimized.

3. Overall I had good experiences with MUPD. However, I have heard some cases from friends where their needs were not met. (For example a harrasing phone call that was made to one friend to her dorm phone.)

4. Women and the Police Dept - They provide many resources and they are great at exploring options as far as persecution is concerned. However, I do not feel that they make a victim feel as empowered as they can. I know it is not their duty to make a decision for a victim but maybe a little persuasion. I mean a rape victim may look to the police for what they should do and although the police may explore their options they may want to know that they have more support behind them (from the police for example) if they chose to pursue prosecution for such an emotionally draining experience.

5. One night during the first semester I heard a girl scream outside in the parking lot of my hall and you could tell it wasn't a playing around scream. I called the MUPD and an officer came and drove around the parking lot and left. He didn't even bother to get out of his patrol car. That was very disconcerting.

6. I've always had great experiences with MUPD.

7. Why are these people entitled to more protection or special programs? If they're militant angry or try to force others to do things shouldn't they be subject to the same laws as everyone else?

8. There needs to be more communication between the University and MUPD. My female roommate and I had a situation where we were being harassed and threatened by two other female students. MUPD was concerned with our safety while Residential Life concentrated on not getting sued by the offending parties.

9. In my dealings with the MU Police Department I believe that the officers I came into interaction with are prejudiced against men. Note: everyone I dealt with were women.
10. I am a woman and had to deal with MUPD on two occasions last year that were very frightening. I lived alone on campus and was receiving obscene phone calls late at night. Each time the initial visit out to investigate was fine but there was really nothing done after that. If there was nothing that could be done that is fine. I just wish I had been told that. I was told that it was being taken care of and then ended up just getting the run-around because no one was actually doing anything about it but I kept expecting some kind of phone call or response to have closure to a very frightening experience. Unfortunately that never came and the issue was just kind of dropped. I was very disappointed with the MUPD from this situation.

11. I only called MUPD once. I'd locked my keys in my car. They weren't able to get them out for me but they did seem nice about the whole thing and they advised me to call AAA who were able to get the keys out. So I had only this one experience but it was satisfactory all around.

12. They do care about women because one night when a woman was chased through Peace Park they were very concerned about not only her welfare but the welfare of the other females in the park that night.

13. I feel that the MU Police Dept. does their best to deal with these issues. Ultimately if a student affected by one of the above issues has a problem with the MU Police dept. then it is mostly likely an individual acting on his/her own rather than being a good representative of the departments attitude as a whole.

14. I am guessing on most of the things - I am really not sure. I just know that as a female they were very helpful to me. My second year here I was being harrassed by a guy who lived on my residence hall floor and the officers I dealt with were great. They helped me feel safe. Honestly I felt kind of dumb going in to talk to them about it but they put me at ease immediately letting me know that it wasn't right and that they took it very seriously. I had been to everyone in Residential Life about it and they all passed the buck to someone else. When I talked to the MUPD they got results immediately. I am extremely greatful for their help! I think it is very important because like I said most people just blew me off when in actuality it was an extremely dangerous situation not to mention very negative living environment for me.

15. need to be out on street at night

16. One question I don't understand is the one regarding the resources for concern. If someone is concerned with getting assaulted or raped or murdered I do not think there needs to be a separate resource for each group of people. No one wants any of that to happen to them- I don't care if they are white blue religious or have three genders. The police department is there to serve and to protect. And they do a good job.
17. Being a female college student, I was once stranded in the pouring rain with two other girls in a deserted parking lot. We saw a police officer and asked if we could get a ride and he said no. (I completely understand why police officers cannot give rides to people) However, he just drove off and did not offer to follow us back to the dorms. I felt scared after that moment and have been dissatisfied with the MU police department since.

18. They do a good job.

19. I'm not really sure how the MU police respond or take care for any other group except women because I haven't had that much experience with them. I just put on this survey a rough estimate of what I thought.

20. I don't know personally how many resources the MU police have for the various groups so my rating was just based on opinion and no fact.

21. Women's safety after dark

22. If you're trying to find out if I think MU PD is racist or discriminating, the answer is no, not to my knowledge.

23. I think if these people go to the police for help, they should get it. Until help is needed and help is denied, there is no problem that the University can fix. If problems exist for any of these groups, it is up to them to speak out.

24. I really don't know enough about the MU PD to form a strong opinion either way. The one time I needed their help, they were helpful.

25. I am fairly neutral on this issue with the MU PD. I don't really see them around too much, but there are times when they patrol more than normal.

26. I think the police department here at the University of Missouri have a bad name for themselves. They abuse their privileges to have everyone forced to interact with them. These prejudice, closed-minded, attention-seeking individuals end up causing more harm for the human race than good. I do agree that the police do protect and most cops are good people, but without diversity, nothing works well. It's easy to accept someone who is like yourself and has common interest. What happens when the person isn't skinny like you or the person is another race or gender than you? Everyone, no matter how much power man gives you on earth, should learn to accept differences and still be productive positive citizens. Until this occurs, the University Police Department will have a bad name.
Appendix 9: Comments Regarding the Student Recreation Center

1. Wow, I wasn't aware the being a Non-Christian at the gym had any big impact. I'm a non-christian but I couldn't care less about the knowledge the employees have or the emotional environment. I don't go there to bitch about my life I go to work out. Of course I'm white so I don't face the obvious religious discrimination that a Muslim might face.

2. The Recreation Center is for exercising and health why do they have to address minority issues? Just use the facilities and quit complaining all the time.

3. I think the rec center does provide services for most aforementioned groups relatively well. But I don't think its their place to accomodate for people with different lifestyle preferences. Hence the word preference. The preferences are up to students themselves while all other examined variables cannot be changed at all. If the rec center did start changing things because of certain lifestyle preferences I would be disappointed that my money is being used to support something I do not. Don't do it.

4. I really feel the staff at the Rec center does a good job accomodating everyone to the best of their abilities. I see a lot of different people up there (and I am up there a lot). I think that despite everyone's differences no one is hindered by any problems which these differences might bring up. Everyone is able to focus on the reason they are there whether to get in shape or just have a good time.

5. The student rec center is a place to work out that's it.

6. I don't see how issue dealing with the above groups of individuals has anything to do with the Student Recreation Center. Also the rec center is there for everyone use.

7. If we start having leagues for Gays Lesbians Bisexuals and Transgeders and/or Non religious minorities there is no way that this campus can call itself non biased or equal.

8. In my observations these groups of people along with everybody else get treated very well and the same.

9. As far as I can tell there isn't really a correlation between any of these groups and their resources in the rec center except those persons with disabilities. I never see anyone of this category in the rec center; therefore I assume there is no way for them to operate any of the equipment offered. However any experience I have in the Rec center has afforded the opinion that this is the one place on campus where ethnicity etc. are not an issue. People go to work out and that's what they do.
10. My thoughts of the SRC have nothing to do with one demographic or another. For example, the ventilation is terrible and there's no pool. And the parking situation is horrible especially at night for off-campus students.

11. I don't think there should be any special considerations for any group except for persons with disabilities at the rec center. This whole politically correctness idea has gotten way out of hand.

12. I don't think the Student Recreation Center should concern itself much with identifying the specific needs of these specific groups except perhaps Women and non-native English speakers. By not making the effort to separate the other groups segregation should not occur. I don't see why there should be special concerns for these groups.

13. I would not only like to see more equipment but more disabled students taking advantage of the facility. Maybe there could be some promotion to encourage the Rec center for people of ALL physical conditions.

14. There should be more equipment typically used by women. Most females wanting to stay in shape do not prefer to lift large amounts of weight rather elliptical running machines tread-mills bicycles and stair climbers are preferred.

15. There is many times lack of available work out equipment. There is many times not a court for volleyball next to all of the basketball.

16. I dont understand what your sex or race or religion has to do with excersicing. maybe people with disabilities have some limitations at the centre but other than that i dont know what a non-native lesbian wants in a rec center so i have no idea if her needs are met.

17. One of the reasons I rated their relationship with women so low was because I would like to use the rec center but because of how I dress for religious reasons I am often made to feel uncomfortable there. I am fairly sure that this is not a problem of the staff but more so one of the student body.

18. Its hard for them to meet students' needs when they aren't equipped with the resources to do so.

19. There should be more women around the weight room to explain how to use equipment. Men are a little intimidating especially the one's with all the big nasty buldging veins in their disproportioned muscles.

20. The Rec Center is a place for Greeks and "pretty people" and not for those of us who aren't perfect or already fit. It's disgusting but not because anyone at the Rec Center makes it that way.
21. THE REC CENTER DOES NOT HAVE A VARIETY OF MACHINES FOR WOMEN. THEY HAVE 75% FREE WEIGHTS AND NOT ALL PEOPLE ARE ABLE OR COMFORTABLE ENOUGH TO USE THEM.

22. I have always had positive experiences at the rec center. The staff is really helpful and friendly.

23. The student rec center can be a little intimidating for the larger women on campus especially with all the half-naked sorority girls walking around.

24. the rec center is fine for most everyone regardless of race sexual preference or religion. there is really no way to discriminate or be unfair about that at the rec center! to my knowledge there is little or no access or benefits there to persons with disabilities though. this is not a good thing at least i dont feel that it is. however i am not informed about it really.

25. i dont see how what these groups have to do with the inadequately equiped rec-center

26. Again why do these students exercise differently than anyone else? The rec center is doing what it is supposed to do: provide a place for students to exercise.

27. get a seperate weight room for women!

28. The student rec center just needs to be improved anyways. It has nothing to do with the minorities except for maybe persons with disabilities.

29. I am actually unfamiliar with any Disability things the Rec Center offers or if it even does.

30. I have no idea how any of these things relate to the Rec Center. I am a woman and am pleased with the facilities. I don't have any disabilities or know anyone with disabilities down here so I can't say that I have any knowledge on how the Rec accomodates those who do. I don't see how race sex or religion plays a part in Rec Center facilities unless some would like things organized to their affiliations.

31. There are a lot of stairs that you need to climb to get to many places in the rec center. I am not aware of any handicapped accessible elevators or such in the rec center but I could be mistaken.

32. There should be separate workout areas for both men and women because it is too crowded with men right now.

33. I've only used the Rec Center once and it was too crowded. Now I work at Gold's Gym and get a free membership. I don't understand why there would be different accomodations for different people. We're all humans and we all use the same equipment to work out.
34. I think that the student recreation center is a great place to work out and have fun with nice people working there. However, I am there quite often and I never see any people with physical disabilities working out playing basketball etc. This is a concern to me because I believe that everyone should feel welcome there.

35. I didn't see any elevators in the rec center so I am a little concerned about how disabled people will get through the rec center.

36. I work out every day. The Rec center is highly unsatisfactory for me and most of the women I know. There are too few cardiovascular machines for us to efficiently work out (yet three fourths of the weight room is taken up by weight-lifting machines—a primarily male activity).

37. Again the rec center is awesom!! No complaints!

38. Needs air conditioning

39. women are treated very fairly with equal opportunities. they have 2 locker rooms and equal use of equipment

40. As a woman I have had a great experience with this but I do not think it meets the needs of all types of people.

41. Anyone who has been to the Student Recreation Center knows that the workers do not discriminate against minorities and how would they even know if lesbian gay bisexual or transgender people were there to discriminate against.

42. the student rec center really doesn't need to know anything about the above people other than disabled. do you really think that the sexual orientation or religion has anything to do with working out?

43. Worked for the Student recreation center went through their training programs question many of the supervisors sincerity and purpose.

44. NONE of these issues except maybe people with disabilities should have any special treatment at the Rec center. It is ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS to treat people that are of different race religion or that CHOOSE to like their own sex more than the opposite sex differently in a workout environment.

45. to crowded
46. Once again, I have never studied the Rec. Center and noticed how well each of these groups is accommodated. I only fit into the 'women' category so I don't know how knowledgeable I am with the other areas.

47. More of those groups in the staff team

48. Are human beings also and have biases just like a majority of people.

49. I would like more trial weeks (free) for aerobics classes

50. Air conditioning!!

51. I don't think any of these categories besides women and persons with abilities has any relevance in the rec center issues. It’s where people work out. Obviously men and women use different equipment and exercise programs and people with disabilities have different needs, but what difference does your ethnicity, sexual preference or religion make. COME ON!! You can still work out or play basketball or whatever, right?

52. I believe that they need a rec center for women because it is intimidating to be there and compete with the men.

53. I think the machines in the rec center weight room are totally geared for men and the rec center has overlooked some needs of its women. At my YMCA at home there are three machines for abs and two others that work on inner and outer thighs. At the rec there is only one strictly ab machine which is very often taken and one butt machine both machines that females value more than males. Also, if you don't like running on the indoor track in the winter there are never enough tread mills which also seems to be a machine that more women use than men. But there doesn't seem to be any lack of upper body machines and weights. And also for some women's intramural sports the director of the rec center doesn't really care if we have other teams to play or not cause I know for soccer one year in the open league all of the teams didn't show up. We should have the opportunity to play guys teams if there aren't enough women or else someone should make sure the girls come to the games. Don't

54. I work at the rec center and we do not place any emphasis on any of the groups rather we have a holistic approach to treat everyone the same.

55. I think the Rec center could have more classes for women. Like a women only yoga class or something like that.

56. Sorry for not filling a lot of this out. I don't think that different ethnicity or sexual preferences are going to really affect how someone feels working out. It's a place to go and work out and relieve stress. The only reason I ranked adequate for women is
because most women enjoy the classes and cardio equipment and most of the time these areas are overcrowded.

57. Again, how can I appropriately answer these questions when I can't really know how the SRC meets the needs of all these groups when I'm only in one of them?? The only real experience with any other group that I know of is that the rec center does supply wheelchairs for w/c basketball.

58. I feel the rec center is a great place to work out, however, I feel that it will be so much better after the expansion project is finished. There needs to be a closer place to park without being penalized by MUPD. Furthermore, the staff is knowledgable of most basic knowledge however I get so much more information and I don't feel as if I'm bothering anyone at my gym downtown if I have a question. At the rec center sometimes it seems as if most workers could care less if they where there or not, but hey I can completely identify to the students working there.

59. Think about it...Disabled person's don't have special equiptment and non-Native English speakers don't have signs in their native lounge. Other than those issues, there is no problem. Everyone can use the machines and no one, no matter what they might tell you, has special needs based on their religious beliefs or who they want to have sex with.

60. The need of a woman, one word, TAMPPONS. There are no tampon machines in the rec center. It needs to be bigger too, b/c there's always a crowd.

61. This will change soon enough and I know that men also feel this way, but the rec center caters only to those who wish to play basketball. 14 basketball courts and 4 stair steppers seems a little askew especially when there are 24,000 students on campus and many more of them would rather use cardiovascular equipment and/or weights than engage in basketball.

62. I don't think that I can accurately rate most of the categories in which you talk about, because I only fit in one. I don't see how some of the categories pertain to the student rec center. Everybody, no matter what category they fit in to, have equal access to the rec center. The only people who are less likely to benefit from the rec center are those with physical disabilities.

63. Whenever I have been to the rec-center I have never seen or heard of any act that might be considered unfair or impartial to any particular race, creed, sex, lifestyle, or nationality. I think the rec-center staff does a good job of maintaining the facility and the thought of unfair treatment to certain people is ridiculous.

64. The free weight area in the Weight Roon is strongly dominated by males. I don't know is this would be true if seperate Weight Rooms were available.
65. I think that everyone who uses the rec center has the same concerns regardless of age, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

66. People without these disabilities or inclinations have never looked for reasons to approve or disapprove of the staff set-up or environment of the rec center.

67. Don't know enough about the REC center on these issues to have a strong opinion either way. I have not had any problems there.

68. It is a place to work out nothing more. I don't see how any of these groups with the exception of handicap access would have a problem there. Everybody has the same access to the weights or exercise regardless of creed, gender or sexuality.

69. The Student rec center does not seem to be one on one contact. It does not look wheelchair friendly and I have never seen people with disabilities there.

70. The Student Rec Center is one of the most racially profiling places I've ever experienced at MU. Not to make race an issue but it is more important a difference issue. If you don't have a diverse staff you don't know a lot about diversity and you are never forced to learn. The rec center needs competition from other gyms such as Wilson's and Gold's Gym so that if a student isn't happy with the services at the rec center they can take their money somewhere else. Why would you force students to pay for a service they never use? That is violating our rights as students. The rec has no profounding factor on one's education. One Columbia Police Officer told me that he sees more racial profiling at the rec center than he witnesses at the CPD. That's sad! One caucasian female who works at the rec center told myself and others that it is an unwritten rule to "watch out for people sneaking in because they go play basketball." 75% of African-Americans play basketball. That's

71. The SRC has offered all the sports except soccer there is a field outside the recreation center but there is no goals to play soccer. For non native english speakers soccer is the most important sport that we like to watch and play. But as u know without goals in the soccer field we can not play soccer (immagin playing basketball with out baskets). I went to the manager of the rec center and I asked him to put the goals in the field but there was no response. I went to the international center to tell the manager of the rec center that there is a big portion of people play soccer and they want the goals back... but still nothing happened. I hope the words I wrote it not a waisting of time and I hope they make a change for soccer fans (english and non english speakers).

72. Nice variety of programs to accommodate everyone

73. I'm not sure how prepared the student rec center is prepared for individuals who are disabled. I never see a disable person in the gym working out so I
wonder if the staff at the gym is capable of assisting someone with disabilities.  

Also, I do not remember seeing any signs that read both English or Spanish/French. Maybe that's not necessary for a predominantly english-speaking campus.
Appendix 10: Comments Regarding Registration

1. I think they are doing a fine job for the most part. More consideration should be shown for students with disabilities that cannot write or something like that. If you make it easier to navigate your website...I am saying blindingly easy then all of these ratings would improve.

2. Registration is for all students. How can you be biased when you type numbers on a screen?

3. I would say that registration is one of the least pleasant least courteous and least helpful departments at the entire university. Besides being generally unhelpful the can be quite rude especially to new students.

4. I don't understand why these groups need special attention from Registration except perhaps non-native English speakers.

5. I feel that registration truly neglects minorities. I feel that they think of us as only a quota that needs to be fulfilled.

6. I believe Registration does a great job. The only complaint I would make is about helping students find other classes etc. when what they want and need is full. I am sure students are sick of taking classes they do not need or like but they have to fill the full time requirement. It would also be nice to see more faculty in Reg. for more one on one attention.

7. Registration is where everyone's a number and everyone gets mistreated. I don't think they discriminate they hate everyone.

8. I don't know how there could be any biases in registration.

9. I think registration on campus is very well organized an it works great for everyone.

10. Maybe there is a way to register in other languages but I am not aware of it. All of the course descriptions and course manuals are in English. However I speak English and I have never really looked into other languages.

11. There should be a category for non-traditional students those that are older than what is normally the age of college students or those that have families already. The University should also address their needs because they are very different from any of the other groups.

12. Registration isn't based on any of those. They have nothing to do with it.

13. Registration seems to be overall a well working place for everyone.
14. I wish there would be more of one class offered because by the time I register, most classes are full.

15. Allowing disabled students priority early registration is very accommodating to persons who need to arrange their schedule around an illness or disability.

16. I don't understand why registering would be any different for any different person.

17. I do not feel that registration has any additional stress on any certain group of people.

18. As a woman I have had a positive experience with this.

19. Do to the fact that I am not involved with many of the above categories, guessing will not at all help. I do know however that the early registration for students with disabilities has helped a great deal. The fact that athletes get to do early registration means that people with real needs should get to do it as well, not out of convenience but to help someone who is already at a disadvantage.

20. Possibly make it easier accessible to register

21. As a native English speaker, I have no idea what sorts of resources Registration offers for students who might still be struggling with English as a second language. If there are specific resources, I would be interested in knowing about them so that I could recommend them to other students who might be interested.

22. I have never experienced any kind of discrimination with the registration office. I am interpreting the kinds of questions that you are asking in this survey to mean that there are people in these groups that interpret some kind of discrimination. Is it possible that they're being a bit too paranoid?

23. I really would think that most groups would be treated the same, but it also depends on the individual that you are dealing with. Registration is the worst experience I ever had at MU. They send you everywhere and then you end up right where you started. Maybe it's a huge lack of organization when it comes to registration. Maybe it's the lack of unity of MU and the specialization and ignorance of everything else outside of that knowledge. It's been four years since I've been through it, but it sucked.

24. Again, as an older student, I found my needs fairly well served by registration. There is a tendency to be over-solicitous as if one's ability to understand is somehow diminished by age.

25. I don't see registration as actually having much contact with the individual students. In all the years that I have been here, I have had to actually go through registration one time and it took maybe three minutes. It is all done by phone or computer.
26. It seems as if there is no exposure to the groups listed above at MU. Unless you are a racial minority, woman, non-native English speaker, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, etc then you don't come in contact with these groups. We meet in small groups when activities are organized but attendance from students outside of these groups is very low. So although we are on campus, we aren't really accepted just tolerated as long as we're not in the way or too visible.

27. The only people I have come into contact with in registration are nice old women. To think that registration has anything to do with race, religion, or all the others described above is almost crazy.

28. Working in an Administrative Position, I fail to see how any persons are treated differently than any others irregardless of any of the above groups of individuals.

29. I actually tend to register online. The only time I have been to a registration site or the office is when I needed help registering or I needed a piece of paper that said I was indeed a registered student here at Mizzou.

30. Registration is the worst, least understanding, least caring department I've run across on campus and has been so the numerous times I have needed their services over the last several years. They go out of their way to give students and parents of students misinformation and to verbally and emotionally harass them. It seems to be getting better since certain staff members have been moved or released but supervisors just don't seem to care if you were yelled at or harassed by the people in that office.

31. Registration at Mizzou has come a long way since I was an undergrad. The ability to register in a variety of different ways makes it easier to complete the process in the most suitable way for each person. This should provide almost complete emotional security since you can do it without talking to anyone except an advisor.

32. all the ways of registering for classes are great and very helpful.
Appendix 11: Comments Regarding Residential Life

1. Being agnostic, I can tell you I felt very uncomfortable with how some of the Christian groups would hold devotions in our lounge area on Sundays. I lived on the Honors Learning Community in Gillett. And people from Christian groups would come around and try to talk to people living on the floor. I felt that there wasn't a lot of respect for people who were not Christian and did not want to be bothered with having religion shoved at them. I didn't always feel very safe living in the dorms and being a woman. I knew someone who was raped and I heard of incidents of sexual harassment. It made me nervous.

2. I did not have a good experience with Residential Life. I don't know how the other groups are handled.

3. I know a person who used the online registration form to ensure he had a room. However, the form did not work and consequently he is without a rooming assignment for the upcoming semester. This was in no way his fault and was an error on the part of Res Life. Despite his objections, Res Life will still not give him a room.

4. LGBT issues aren't a priority at all for anyone on campus, other than those that work at the center or are actually LGBT community members themselves. I wish that would change.

5. I have been a part of the choice community during my time in the dorms. This was the only way that I found out about the Women's Center and the wellness resource center. I have not enjoyed any kind of privacy and I feel quite awkward during most of the day. I do not think the matching system as far as roommates go is adequate. I also do not feel that the price I pay for this room is justified. I will not be staying on-campus next year and I will not be recommending the res. halls to any of my friends. I did like the PA's and CA's. They are very important to my ability to survive this environment.

6. no issues here but that may be my biased viewpoint. I have not heard of or evidenced any problems though.

7. My experiences with residential life encouraged diversity.

8. Res Life tries to please too many of the campus minorities -- we have to put up with bulletin boards about how terrible white people are, about how men are pigs and disgusting and terrible and how they put down women, always have and always will. I have to walk past bulletin boards that proclaim Gay Pride and don't respect my religious beliefs, and Atheists and other religions deface all the Christian posters but get angry when people deface theirs. They claim intolerance but they are the most intolerant.
9. Residential life makes every effort to make sure that every student living on campus is satisfied with the services provided.

10. I think the res life people do a great job.

11. Residential Life is extremely open and active about minority groups.

12. Lots of Christian activities, meetings, etc. when I lived in the dorms. Had a religious P.A. and she tried to goad me into going to 'The Rock' or whatever that church is on campus. Was a hostile situation.

Also, there are sex-segregated bathrooms in the dorms - this is bad for women and transgendered people. Rapes happen every year in the dorms and they are only mildly addressed.

13. They just live here; it isn't an issue. I think residential life needs to learn how to be more effective and open before they try to answer these questions.

14. Residential life should be much nicer than what it is for such a big university.

15. I was in an all women's dorm which supplied a lot of knowledge on women's issues, but I don't know much about all the other groups.

16. I was harassed my second year here on my Res Hall floor. I talked to my CA who told me to talk to my RHC. She said there was nothing that could be done about it, which was COMPLETELY untrue. She said that I just had to try to ignore it. My Dad called Frankie Minor about the situation and Frankie wouldn't take his call until my dad threatened to have a lawyer contact him about it. That is when Minor talked to my dad - not before the threat of legal action. I went to MUPD who immediately informed me that I was told things that were untrue - that things could be done about it. The first day I went to the police about it, the guy was kicked off of the floor. But until Res Life was made to do something by the police they had no interest in helping me. As a female, I felt very unsafe on my floor. It is unacceptable to me that Res Life didn't care at all about the problem until they were made to care by the police and possible litigation. And had anyone looked into it when

17. I think Residential Life could be more well rounded.

18. Residential Life did nothing really to help the cost of living for a single African American mother.

19. This is all the same. People should NOT receive special treatment based on a lifestyle choice or a difference in ethnic background. The only problem with res life is they are NOT accommodating to people with terrible living situations. I wanted to move out of the hall and into a Greek House because on my floor I was "the Greek Girl" and they tried to prevent it. Fortunately my parents valued my happiness and desire to stay at school more than your expensive fine.
20. I had a lesbian roommate and Res. Life didn't respond to the situation particularly well. Isn't there a separate community for students of different sexual orientation? That's where this girl should have been because she didn't know how to live with a heterosexual roommate<comma> so she ended up moving in with another lesbian at semester. The situation wasn't dealt with efficiently. And as for the other groups I'm not sure. This survey isn't very accurate unless the person participating is a member of these groups.

21. My Freshman year a woman was raped by a stranger in her dorm room. This means that whatever is necessary to make residential life here tolerable is not being done.

22. Everyone has has their needs met

23. I wish the CA's would try to get a little more involved in the individuals on their floors instead of always making bulletin boards and going to meetings about stuff. My CA even told me she thought she spent too much time talking about stuff in meetings instead of doing the actual things. I don't think any CA i've had in the past 2 years has really gotten to know me. Maybe just even on the first week of school the CA's should just go around and talk to every one of their residents. It seems like the people that get the CA positions are way to busy to really have time for any issues or needs of people on the floor.

24. I think women should be better protected and made to feel more safe in their residence halls.

25. Frankly<comma> I believe this survey is biased and out of line. The fact that you put as a category "Non-Christian Religious Minorities" dismays me. I live in a dorm<comma> and I can attest to the fact that Christianity is a minority just as much as atheism<comma> Buddhism<comma> etc. are. In fact<comma> I know more atheists than Christians in my dorm out of about 100 people that I know. I really feel you are biased against white<comma> male<comma> Christians<comma> because from your survey<comma> you apparently don't care about them. I knew this campus was liberal<comma> but this is ridiculous.

26. Residential life actually uses these differences to bring people together and learn from one another. I had a great experience living in the dorm and meeting people that fit into each group listed (although people are not always open with their sexuality...for example... <offensive comment deleted>).

27. I feel that res life may be one of the most diverse departments on campus. They are as well as or more well versed on the needs of students with disabilities than even disability services. I think that res life strives to help its students<comma> but no matter the amount of screen there will always be conflict between individual groups in the res hall. I worked and lived in the res halls for 3 years and heard and saw many of the concerns for the groups above played out. The largest issue however is the lesbian<comma> gay<comma> bisexual & transgender group. This is mostly because
college is the time that most students fitting into these categories will realize or admit this side of themselves. Not enough is said about this.

28. i feel that in it's commendable effort to be understanding and accepting of LGBT students res life goes too far to be balanced. it seems like that particular student group is accorded a disproportionate amount of time and energy in programs bulletin boards etc. while other groups who are equally deserving such as non-native English speakers or women are slighted. in the four years that i lived in MU res halls i met very few people who were openly or privately antagonistic or disrespectful of homosexual students. i saw far more venom directed toward people of religious faith than any other group.

29. Having worked for res life I think that the department has adequate resources and understands the needs. However carrying this out depends on the people living in the halls.

30. I am assuming you mean the leadership and administration not the actual life inside dorms (meaning the residents themselves) which is far too often not as hospitable to these groups.

31. When I lived in the dorms my room was broken into twice and I was sexually harassed in my bed. When I complained I was told that I was an adult and should confront my attackers at least twice in person before they would step in. I applied to move out of the dorms my first semester Freshman year do to this incident. MU has a policy that no freshman can live off campus unless they are 21. Instead of enforcing that policy or attempting to address my problem Residential Life just let me out without asking any questions. While it was good for me that I got out I find it disturbing that they didn't care one way or the other whether anybody obeys policy.

32. I think Residential Life is the most awful aspect of MU. The school I just transferred from has a wonderful residential life program. The quality of their programs RA's/PA's/CA's Dining Hall Facilities residence halls and other things are far superior to MU's. MU's residential facilities are awful. I have never lived or been in a worse environment. The people at the Residential Life office are also not very helpful. It takes a lot of time to get a straight answer from a worker.

33. All of the FIGS and learning communities really shrink the size of this big campus experience. They make living at Mizzou the BEST
Appendix 12: Comments Regarding Student Health

1. It is a student health center, not a hospital. You get what you pay for.

2. The only of the above categories I fit into is that I am a woman which is why I rated the health center as adequate in the rest. I have heard several times that a woman has come in because something is wrong and the health center not only repeatedly questions if she is pregnant but often demands a test be done. If a woman is not sexually active I think she'd know she wasn't pregnant. I don't believe the rumors that the health center will tell you in all situations that you're either pregnant depressed or have mono are unfounded. They had to have started somewhere.

3. I don't see how issue dealing with the above groups of individuals has anything to do with the Student Health Center. Also the health center is there for everyone's use i think its discriminatory of you to not include men on this questionnaire. I also feel that this survey perpetuates feeling of discrimination between the people of this university and is not accomplishing any kind of goal. Further more i feel this survey is adding to the discrimination of these people by singling them out and asking people to act or do things differently around them.

4. It's been a while I don't really remember

5. I have little personal experience about how the Student Health Center treats these groups but I saw nothing that indicated it would be less than extremely well.

6. THE SHC is just plain bad-- I ended up going to a private doctor in town.

7. they do a good job but aspirin water and rest are not always the cure for everything. listen to your patients!

8. i dont go to the student health center for the fear that i will probably be more sick when i leave. also insurance for students totally SUCKS. it sucks for everyone. the lines and the less than quality service at the HS hurt everyone too.

9. They don't call it the Student Death Center for nothing. It's just a bad deal all around as far as health care goes but at least they don't discriminate they can't help it if they don't have the resources to get doctors that actually know what they're doing.

10. More information about how some medical information and treatments might affect members of different cultures.

11. Importance does not necessarily imply quality
12. I am personally able to diagnose my self at the student health center. I go in and tell my symptoms and say what antibiotic works for me and i get it. Also there is a particular person on the Student Health Center Staff that has caused myself terrible grief. Her name is <name deleted>. She has snooped into my personal medical records and used her influence to lie to others about my sexual history. I am too uncomfortable to go to the Health Center for fear she may tell my business.

13. Again I don't think that any one is being biased at the Health center. They're there to help; they don't care who they help.

14. The health center on campus is worthless. I have been misdiagnosed twice. Why have a health center if you have below average staff? I would either take it away or completely revamp it.

15. I would rather have a rapid circus monkey perform brain surgery on me than use the Student Health Center again. They should either close or hire real doctors.

16. I think that the Health Center needs to be held to higher standards. As a woman I don't feel comfortable going there for "womanly" needs or problems. I think that they are just trying to get people in and out and aren't focusing on the person as much as they could. For instance my brother was diagnosed with Mono at the student health center but actually had a very serious bacterial infection.

17. The people at the student health center have no idea what they are talking about most of the time

18. Everyone that works there is knowledgeable and supportive and helpful. They are great. The building is very hard to get to the parking stinks and getting about in a wheelchair is really difficult.

19. Again since I only fit into the woman category I don't know how they meet needs of other groups.

20. The student health center is good in general categories such as these but it lacks when it comes to helping everyone with short term illnesses such as the flu because you must have symptoms for almost 2 weeks i believe.

21. Dayna Glanz is awesome! She is great with patients - she explained a lot of stuff to me with my Well Woman Exam and actually would follow up with me. But the advisor for SHAPE (I think that is through student health) is unfriendly - Terry something I think.

22. The student health center could improve on a variety of staff members.

23. The details about helth insurance should be better explained before a person comes to the USA. One should know that dental and other specific kinds of doctors are not
covered. I've seen many individuals in pain and without money be surprised that their insurance isn't going to help them.

24. I feel that the Health Center is far too small for the number of students enrolled at MU.

25. There is no difference in people unless you treat them with special privileges. That is why they throw such a fit about getting different treatment and quite frankly, some of those things are by choice and their choices should not be rewarded.

26. I've used the Student Health Center and it was adequate for my needs.

27. To be honest the Student Health Center scares me; they have misdiagnosed me on a couple of things and I feel they do not take the time to understand my disease before they prescribe medication to me. I have always felt they didn’t really listen to me when I would tell them about how I wasn't feeling well. I refuse to use this service for anything that may be important at all because I do not trust them.

28. Let us go were we think it meets our needs instead of been forced to use this inadequate facility.

29. I would like to see cheaper prescriptions available.

30. Again, we are dealing with human beings here not populations. If someone is sick, the health center won't yell at someone for being protestant or baptist or gay or black. They will do what they do for everybody: "Take two advils and drink some powerade".

31. Every time I've been there they've been really busy and the people at the desk don't seem very personable or sympathetic to the students. I've heard many bad stories about it too.

32. Any time that anyone I know has gone to the student health center they need poweraid or get a "cold kit." I went there last year with what my doctor in St. Louis referred to as a "textbook case of mono" and somehow they thought I was pregnant even after I swore I had not touched a boy in at least 4 months and was on birth control. They insisted I have bloodwork done and couldn't pick up the mono... c'mon now.

33. I've heard a variety of stories of that the staff of the student health center have sometimes misdiagnosed patients frequently. So I'm not to optimistic about the health services they give but it seems they give everyone the same opportunity provided of course they've paid their student fees.

34. I have been really happy as a woman to have the health center. I go there for my yearly checkups and for any problems and it's free of charge (well technically not but when I go there I do not have to pay). It is stressful the first time going and the health center made it alot easier. I know many girls that use the Health center for this reason.
35. The people are very helpful...especially dr.s and nurses. The clerical individuals (including check-in and check-out people) are not very friendly or sympathetic.

36. I can only speak for myself here as far as how the health center treats individuals - across the board horrible. I've even heard complaints from other students than myself. I have gone there a few times and been grossly misdiagnosed more than once. Consequently I had to have a minor surgical procedure done. (I know for a fact I am not the only one that has been through this) The doctor I go to currently stated that SHC had notified me 3x about a positive diagnosis concerning my current treatment by mail. I can assure you I recieved nothing of the sort. Furthermore I've been told I was pregnant when I wasn't and it seems their cure for everything is to rehydrate I understand its an important concept but its not going to help certain situations. There have been two occasions when I was told to return by an admitting staff for followups they even gave me an appointment card with a specific date when I returned on that date I was told there was

37. The Student Health Center lacks a sense of security and comfort for women who are seeking medical attention for certain conditions such as the "morning after" pill or other medical attentions applying to women.

38. How would you like to have to take a urine test even if there is NO REAL REASON necessary. The fact that it is free does not matter if the University fee is going for something that is NOT Necessary.

39. I've had one contact with Student Health and have had no reason to return to the center. Again I can't really comment on their performance.

40. The health center can only do so much for students with disabilities just like they can only do so much for anyone with any very serious medical problem.

41. They are professionals in the health professions.

42. In general I don't trust the Student Health Center because I know people who have been mis-diagnosed. The low scores don't really have anything to do with the minority groups as much as they do with the Health Center in general

43. I hate the health center. They misdiagnosed me and I had mono and ended up in the ER sick for weeks. I think it is a waste of money.

44. I hate the student health center it is a terrible operation. you should not be allowed to get a prescription w/o seeing a doctor first time birth control users should not be allowed to get birth control w/o talking to a dr
45. The student health center treats all people equally crappy, therefore it doesn't matter how they treat individual groups.

46. I have not used the student health center often. It was always too busy and crowded along with a lack of parking. Maybe instead of building another rec center we should concentrate on expanding the student health center and giving it a better parking lot.

47. The times I have used the Health Center, I have experienced inadequate care. I felt my problems were out of range for the staff.

48. I frankly do not like the SHC or Student Death as several of my acquaintances tend to call it. I often feel like the doctor's and nurses are looking down their noses at me and half the time I know that they just don't know how to handle people. I don't appreciate the attitudes of the people who work there (all except for a very few of the workers whom I have semi-befriended). I really think that most of the people in the SHC wish they were not stuck in it and that leads to them not being helpful at all to the people who need them. I try to avoid the place as much as possible.

49. Don't know much about anything else except the women category. I have found Stu Health to be very good in helping women.

50. I don't think there are many brochures in another language - i could be wrong never seen it thought

51. The staff at the Health Center are vey nice but they're presumptious when making diagonosis about women's health. For example, many times nurses assume that a women may be pregnant or have an STD when she's having problems with her genitalia (even though the patient may state that she hasn't had intercourse). I think their assumptions are influenced by the stereotype that college women may engage in casual sex. It seems that a thorough checks are needed and more referrals if they are unsure of some cases. Also, I don't think there has ever been a week or month dedicated to minority health where information is given about certain illnesses and diseases that target, for example, African Americans.

52. The gynecological department is excellent and all the staff are open to listening to individual concerns no matter what the problem.

53. The staff and services have always been very helpful. Although the move of the pharmacy did not bother me, the previous location was more convenient.
Appendix 13: Comments Regarding Memorial Unions

1. Great facilities for events, great food services. High quality facility. The purpose of the memorial unions is to serve in the memory of past students and faculty, not worry about pleasing all the wishes of minority groups.

2. Jews are not happy about the anti-Semitic display currently up in the union.

3. All I do in Memorial Union is study, I never talk to anyone at the front desk if that's what you're getting at.

4. Memorial Union is too loud especially when fairs are conducted. Since this environment is used as a mass study area, these fairs should be quarantined to the rooms with doors that may shut.

5. Poor access for handicapped in some places. Just a note... I don't expect memorial union to meet my concerns. And most of my concerns about religion, sex, etc. have nothing to do with memorial union as far as I can tell.

6. I have never encountered any problem or trouble at the Memeorial Union in regards to any group.

7. Provides programming for all ages, races, and gender.

8. The Unions are more than welcoming for campus organizations, especially minorities, LGBT militants, anti-Christian organizations, etc. The Unions aren't responsible for different races studying separately -- the people themselves are. That's pathetic.

9. Memorial union features a lot of special events for minority groups and I think they therefore excellently meet the needs of most of the above groups. I am not aware of any special LGBT of disability events held at Mem Union but I'm sure no one would stop these groups from having a function there.

10. Very conducive to studying. It is always clean and a great place to go to meet friends or just eat lunch.

11. I don't feel that Memorial Union is concerned about people as a group like this survey implies.

12. The back ramp is too wide; bring the handrails in.

13. My only compliant with the services that memorial union provides is that the food is overpriced and the selection is a bit poor. No discrimination here.
14. Memorial Union is a very comfortable place where I feel at home. I enjoy studying there and eating lunch there. It is the best place on campus to study with a group.

15. Memorial does a fine job with everything.

16. I am in Memorial Unions right now. I am surrounding by people of different backgrounds, religions and sexual orientations. Myself included, we all seem happier than pigs in shit working on school projects.

17. I do not think that ethnicities are effected at Memorial unions.

18. For the most part Memorial Unions meets the needs of students. However, with all the construction it can be hard to get to where you want to go at times.

19. No complaints here but no kudos either. Older "non-traditional" students are pretty much unacknowledged everywhere.

20. Don't have any strong opinions but I have had good experiences with Memorial Union.

21. This is just a place to study. It has nothing to do what gender, creed, or sexuality you are. Anyone can study there.
PHASE IV:
SEXUAL HARASSMENT, HATE CRIMES
AND HATE INCIDENTS

Phase IV of the MU Campus Climate Study focused on students’ experiences of violence and harassment on campus. Data was collected from faculty, students and staff in order to assess the prevalence and types of violence and harassment experienced by members of the MU community.

Participants

There were a total of 1356 participants in Phase IV of the MU Campus Climate Study. Participants included 465 men, 887 women, and 4 transgendered individuals. There were 39 persons of African or African American ancestry, 9 Middle Easterners, 46 Asians or Asian Americans, 55 Native American Indians, 25 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 1214 White/European Americans, 23 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 27 others. Of these, 69 were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 119 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 34 visual, 11 hearing, 18 learning, 16 mobility, 1 speech, 16 medical, 14 psychological and 20 other. The sample included 34 bisexual persons, 18 gay men, 1252 heterosexuals, 17 lesbians, 10 people who were uncertain of their sexual orientations and 1 other. In terms of religious orientation, there were 132 agnostics, 60 atheists, 17 Buddhists, 325 Catholics or Orthodox, 560 Protestants (Christian), 9 Hindu, 22 Jewish, 3 Muslim, and 97 others. The sample included 569 undergraduate students, 186 graduate students, 23 professional students, 247 professional staff, 211 administrative staff, 19 faculty administrators, 148 faculty and 42 others. There was a wide range of educational levels represented among the participants, including 9 individuals with less than a high school diploma, 64 individuals with a high school diploma (no college), 622 individuals with some college, 301 with a 4-year college degree, 182 individuals with a Master’s degree, 25 people with a professional degree (e.g., MD, JD), 118 persons with a doctorate, and 31 others.

Sources of Victimization

- There were 224 participants (16.5%) who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU.
- There were 33 participants (2.4%) who reported being victims of hate crimes on campus.
- There were 95 participants (7.0%) who reported witnessing hate crimes on campus.
- There were 142 participants (10.5%) who reported being victims of hate incidents.
- There were 340 participants (25.1%) who reported witnessing hate incidents on campus.
**Multiple Victimization**

We evaluated the extent to which participants reported being victimized by two or more of these events (i.e., sexual harassment, hate crimes, hate incidents). We found that 6 participants (0.4%) reported being victimized by all three (sexual harassment, hate incident, and hate crime), 5 participants (0.4%) reported being victimized by both sexual harassment and hate crimes (but not hate incidents), 12 participants (0.8%) reported being victimized by hate crimes and hate incidents (but not sexual harassment), and 39 participants (2.9%) reported being victimized by sexual harassment and hate incidents (but not hate crimes).

In order to further clarify this finding, we tabulated the types of sexual harassment, hate crimes and hate incidents reported by individuals in the multiple victimization groups. As seen in Table 1, the demographics of the six participants who reported all three types of victimization were mostly students, women, of White/European American ancestry, heterosexual, and equally divided among Christians and religious minorities. None were non-native English speakers. Four of these participants reported membership in more than one underrepresented group. There was logical congruence for all of these participants between their demographic characteristics and the reported types of sexual harassment, hate crimes and hate incidents. Table 2 provides the data for respondents who indicated they had been victimized by sexual harassment and hate crimes. All five of these participants were heterosexual women. Four were students and one was a faculty member. Four were White/European American and one was a person of color. One person had a disability and two were members of religious minority groups. The types of hate crimes reported were mostly gender based, but two of these participants indicated that the crimes were race-ethnicity based. Our analyses of the multiple victimization data should help to moderate concerns about the potential for malicious participants who attempted to artificially inflate percentages of victimization because (a) there were relatively few cases involving multiple victimization, and (b) those cases that contained reports of multiple victimization contained data that was logically consistent with such reports.
Table 1: Reported multiple victimizations from sexual harassment, hate crimes and hate incidents (n = 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics and Types of Sexual Harassment, Hate Crimes and Hate Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Participant A</th>
<th>Participant B</th>
<th>Participant C</th>
<th>Participant D</th>
<th>Participant E</th>
<th>Participant F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious minority</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for sexual favors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual speech/jokes</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/intimidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Hate Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Hate Incidents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Reported multiple victimizations from sexual harassment and hate crimes (n = 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics and Types of Sexual Harassment, Hate Crimes and Hate Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Participant A</th>
<th>Participant B</th>
<th>Participant C</th>
<th>Participant D</th>
<th>Participant E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious minority</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted contact</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for sexual favors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual speech/jokes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/intimidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Hate Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experiences of Sexual Harassment

Participants

Of the 224 participants who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU, there were 29 men, 194 women and 1 transgendered individual. There were 8 persons of African or African American ancestry, 2 Middle Easterners, 7 Asians or Asian Americans, 13 Native American Indians, 4 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 199 White/European Americans, 3 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 10 others. Of these, 9 were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 32 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 8 visual, 4 hearing, 5 learning, 4 mobility, 0 speech, 6 medical, 6 psychological and 4 other. The sample included 6 bisexual persons, 3 gay men, 199 heterosexuals, 10 lesbians, 3 people who were uncertain of their sexual orientations and 0 others. In terms of religious orientation, there were 21 agnostics, 10 atheists, 5 Buddhists, 45 Catholics or Orthodox, 107 Protestants (Christian), 1 Hindu, 4 Jewish, 0 Muslim, and 27 others.

The sample included 73 undergraduate students, 27 graduate students, 3 professional students, 56 professional staff, 49 administrative staff, 0 faculty administrators, 27 faculty and 8 others. There was a wide range of educational levels represented among the participants, including 3 individuals with less than a high school diploma, 10 individuals with a high school diploma (no college), 84 individuals with some college, 64 with a 4-year college degree, 30 individuals with a Master’s degree, 2 people with a professional degree (e.g., MD, JD), 24 persons with a doctorate, and 7 others.

Characteristics of Sexual Harassment

The forms and frequencies of sexual harassment were reported by Phase IV participants were as follows:

Unwanted contacts were reported by 97 participants to have occurred between 1 (n = 16) to 10 times (n = 1).

Requests for sexual favors in exchange for grades/job/promotion were reported by 8 participants to have occurred between 1 (n = 4) to 3 times (n=1).

Uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes were reported by 134 participants to have occurred between 1 (n = 9) to 20 times (n = 1).

Threats/intimidation were reported by 34 participants to have occurred between 1 (n = 7) to 4 times (n = 1).

Other forms were reported by 53 participants between 1 (n = 6) to 12 times (n = 1).

Participants indicated that the sexual harassment took place on campus (n = 149), off campus (n = 24) and both on and off campus (n = 51).
Participants reported that the sexual harassment was **committed by** the following types of individuals.

- Work Supervisor (n = 41)
- Academic Advisor (n = 4)
- Faculty/TA (n = 60)
- Peer (n = 80)
- Co-worker (n = 63)
- Classmate (n = 34)
- Staff Person (n = 30)
- Other (n = 24)

Participants indicated that they **discussed** the harassment with the following types of individuals.

- Nobody (n = 54)
- Residential Life Staff (n = 5)
- MU Police (n = 7)
- Columbia Police (n = 7)
- Faculty/TA (n = 24)
- Academic Advisor (n = 3)
- Counselor (n = 15)
- Family (n = 59)
- Friends (n = 124)
- Significant Other (n = 71)
- Religious/Spiritual Advisor (n = 6)
- Other (n = 47)

“**If you reported this/these incident(s), was there an official report filed?**”

- Yes (n = 14)
- No (n = 90)
- Unsure (n = 14)
- No response (n = 106)

Forty-one participants rated the effectiveness of the responses they received from any university official with whom they had discussed the sexual harassment from “not at all effective” (1) to “very effective” (7). The mean rating for the sample on this item was 2.85 (SD = 2.34), indicating that the majority of respondents did not perceive the responses received by university officials to be effective.

**Relationship of Harassment to Psychological Well-Being**

We were interested in the relationship between experiences of sexual harassment and psychological well-being. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with victimization by harassment (yes or no) as the grouping variable and three dependent measures of psychological
well-being, including depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety, and self-esteem. The findings indicated that experiences of sexual harassment at MU were associated with higher rates of depressive symptoms and greater fears for personal safety. No differences were found between groups on self-esteem.

Hate Crimes Victimization

Participants

Of the 33 participants who reported being victimized by hate crimes at MU, there were 16 men, 17 women and 0 transgendered individuals. There were 2 persons of African or African American ancestry, 0 Middle Easterners, 4 Asians or Asian Americans, 2 Native American Indians, 0 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 25 White/European Americans, 1 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 1 other. Of these, 1 person was a non-native English speaker. There were a total of 4 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 0 visual, 2 hearing, 1 learning, 1 mobility, 0 speech, 0 medical, 0 psychological and 1 other. The sample included 3 bisexual persons, 2 gay men, 26 heterosexuals, 1 lesbian, and 0 others. In terms of religious orientation, there were 6 agnostics, 3 atheists, 1 Buddhist, 8 Catholics or Orthodox, 12 Protestants (Christian), 2 Hindu, 0 Jewish, 0 Muslim, and 1 other.

The sample included 13 undergraduate students, 5 graduate students, 1 professional student, 5 professional staff, 6 administrative staff, 0 faculty administrators, 5 faculty and 0 others.

Characteristics of Hate Crimes

The 33 participants who reported victimization by a hate crime indicated that the crimes were based on their:

- Gender (n = 8)
- Sexual Orientation (n = 5)
- Race/Ethnicity (n = 9)
- Religion (n = 5)
- Non-native English (n = 0)
- Disability (n = 0)
- Other (n = 5)

Respondents indicated that hates crimes occurred in the following manner:

- Threatening or Harassing Emails (n = 4)
- Threatening or Harassing Phone Calls (n = 5)
- Assault with Intention to Harm (n = 4)
- Threat of Violence (n = 7)
- Physical Attack (n = 3)
- Assault with a Weapon (n = 2)
- Rape or Other Sexual Assault (n = 2)
• Attempted Murder (n = 0)
• Robbery/Theft (n = 2)
• Vandalism (n = 5)
• Other (n = 15)

Participants indicated that they **discussed** the hate crimes with the following types of individuals.

• Nobody (n = 6)
• Residential Life Staff (n = 3)
• MU Police (n = 4)
• Columbia Police (n = 4)
• Faculty/TA (n = 3)
• Academic Advisor (n = 2)
• Counselor (n = 3)
• Family (n = 9)
• Friends (n = 16)
• Significant Other (n = 10)
• Religious/Spiritual Advisor (n = 3)
• Other (n = 3)

“If you reported this/these hate crime(s), was there an **official report** filed?”

• Yes (n = 2)
• No (n = 15)
• Unsure (n = 1)
• No response (n = 15)

Thirteen participants rated the effectiveness of the responses they received from any university official with whom they had discussed the hate crime from “not at all effective” (1) to “very effective” (7). The mean rating for the subsample on this item was 2.08 (SD = 1.32), indicating that the majority of these respondents did not perceive the responses they received from university officials to be effective.

**Relationship of Hate Crime Victimization to Psychological Well-Being**

We were interested in the relationship between hate crime victimization and psychological well-being. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with hate crime victimization (yes or no) as the grouping variable and three dependent measures of psychological well-being, including depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety, and self-esteem. The findings indicated that **hate crime victimization was associated with greater fears for personal safety**. No differences were found between groups on depressive symptoms or self-esteem.
Hate Incident Victimization

Participants

Of the 142 participants who reported being victimized by a hate incident at MU, there were 52 men, 88 women and 2 transgendered individuals. There were 13 persons of African or African American ancestry, 2 Middle Easterners, 12 Asians or Asian Americans, 8 Native American Indians, 7 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 98 White/European Americans, 3 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 7 other. Of these, 13 persons were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 19 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 3 visual, 0 hearing, 5 learning, 4 mobility, 0 speech, 4 medical, 3 psychological and 4 other. The sample included 10 bisexual persons, 10 gay men, 107 heterosexuals, 7 lesbians, and 4 uncertain. In terms of religious orientation, there were 22 agnostics, 6 atheists, 5 Buddhists, 22 Catholics or Orthodox, 59 Protestants (Christian), 3 Hindu, 4 Jewish, 1 Muslim, and 15 other.

The sample included 56 undergraduate students, 25 graduate students, 3 professional students, 35 professional staff, 17 administrative staff, 0 faculty administrators, 15 faculty and 7 others.

Characteristics of Hate Incidents

The 142 participants who reported victimization by hate incidents indicated that the incidents were based on their:

- Gender (n = 42)
- Sexual Orientation (n = 37)
- Race/Ethnicity (n = 57)
- Religion (n = 52)
- Non-native English (n = 9)
- Disability (n = 5)
- Other (n = 10)

Respondents indicated that hates incidents occurred in the following manner:

- Offensive remarks or jokes (n = 122)
- Offensive gestures (n = 43)
- Public displays of objects, signs, or symbols (n = 51)
- Public speeches (n = 40)
- Offensive editorials (n = 49)
- Offensive cartoons (n = 43)
- Offensive news stories (n = 28)
- Offensive graffiti (n = 29)
- Offensive pamphlets (n = 30)
- Exclusion from activities, organizations or services (n = 35)
- Other (n = 15)
Participants indicated that they discussed the hate incidents with the following types of individuals:

- Nobody (n = 26)
- Residential Life Staff (n = 9)
- MU Police (n = 3)
- Columbia Police (n = 1)
- Faculty/TA (n = 21)
- Academic Advisor (n = 6)
- Counselor (n = 4)
- Family (n = 63)
- Friends (n = 97)
- Significant Other (n = 55)
- Religious/Spiritual Advisor (n = 17)
- Other (n = 12)

“If you reported this/these hate incident(s), was there an official report filed?”

- Yes (n = 2)
- No (n = 72)
- Unsure (n = 7)
- No response (n = 61)

Eighteen participants rated the effectiveness of the responses they received from any university official with whom they had discussed the hate incident from “not at all effective” (1) to “very effective” (7). The mean rating for the subsample on this item was 2.06 (SD = 1.63), indicating that the majority of these respondents did not perceive the responses they received from university officials to be effective.

**Relationship of Hate Incident Victimization to Psychological Well-Being**

We were interested in the relationship between hate incident victimization and psychological well-being. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with hate incident victimization (yes or no) as the grouping variable and three dependent measures of psychological well-being, including depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety, and self-esteem. The findings indicated that hate incident victimization was associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms. No differences were found between groups on fears for personal safety or self-esteem.

**Witnessing Hate Crimes**

**Participants**

Of the 95 participants who reported witnessing hate crimes at MU, there were 40 men, 55 women and 0 transgendered individuals. There were 6 persons of African or African American ancestry, 3 Middle Easterners, 5 Asians or Asian Americans, 8 Native American Indians, 2
Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 80 White/European Americans, 3 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 4 other. Of these, 6 person was a non-native English speaker. There were a total of 18 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 7 visual, 1 hearing, 5 learning, 2 mobility, 0 speech, 1 medical, 0 psychological and 5 other. The sample included 4 bisexual persons, 3 gay men, 80 heterosexuals, 5 lesbians, and 2 uncertain. In terms of religious orientation, there were 13 agnostics, 4 atheists, 0 Buddhists, 25 Catholics or Orthodox, 42 Protestants (Christian), 2 Hindu, 0 Jewish, 0 Muslim, and 5 other.

The sample included 41 undergraduate students, 13 graduate students, 1 professional students, 22 professional staff, 14 administrative staff, 0 faculty administrators, 10 faculty and 2 others.

**Characteristics of Hate Crimes**

The 95 participants who reported witnessing hate crimes indicated that the crimes were based on:

- Gender (n = 24)
- Sexual Orientation (n = 44)
- Race/Ethnicity (n = 60)
- Religion (n = 26)
- Non-native English (n = 11)
- Disability (n = 6)
- Other (n = 5)

Respondents indicated that hate crimes occurred in the following manner:

- Threatening or Harassing Emails (n = 11)
- Threatening or Harassing Phone Calls (n = 30)
- Assault with Intention to Harm (n = 19)
- Threat of Violence (n = 22)
- Physical Attack (n = 18)
- Assault with a Weapon (n = 3)
- Rape or Other Sexual Assault (n = 2)
- Attempted Murder (n = 0)
- Robbery/Theft (n = 1)
- Vandalism (n = 26)
- Other (n = 15)

**Relationship of Witnessing Hate Crimes to Psychological Well-Being**

We were interested in the relationship between witnessing hate crimes and psychological well-being. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with witnessing hate crimes (yes or no) as the grouping variable and three dependent measures of psychological well-being, including depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety, and self-esteem. No differences were found between groups on depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety or self-esteem.
Witnessing Hate Incidents

Participants

Of the 340 participants who reported witnessing hate incidents at MU, there were 127 men, 211 women and 2 transgendered individuals. There were 16 persons of African or African American ancestry, 3 Middle Easterners, 14 Asians or Asian Americans, 14 Native American Indians, 13 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 291 White/European Americans, 7 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 8 other. Of these, 19 persons were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 43 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 13 visual, 2 hearing, 10 learning, 5 mobility, 6 medical, 4 psychological and 9 other. The sample included 16 bisexual persons, 11 gay men, 292 heterosexuals, 8 lesbians, and 6 uncertain. In terms of religious orientation, there were 46 agnostics, 20 atheists, 8 Buddhists, 70 Catholics or Orthodox, 147 Protestants (Christian), 3 Hindu, 4 Jewish, 1 Muslim, and 32 other.

The sample included 146 undergraduate students, 56 graduate students, 6 professional students, 68 professional staff, 35 administrative staff, 3 faculty administrators, 42 faculty and 12 others.

Characteristics of Hate Incidents

The 340 participants who reported witnessing hate incidents indicated that the hate incidents occurred in the following manner:

- Offensive remarks or jokes (n = 305)
- Offensive gestures (n = 160)
- Public displays of objects, signs, or symbols (n = 116)
- Public speeches (n = 88)
- Offensive editorials (n = 91)
- Offensive cartoons (n = 109)
- Offensive news stories (n = 67)
- Offensive graffiti (n = 93)
- Offensive pamphlets (n = 54)
- Exclusion from activities, organizations or services (n = 78)
- Other (n = 13)

Relationship of Witnessing Hate Incidents to Psychological Well-Being

We were interested in the relationship between witnessing hate incidents and psychological well-being. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with witnessing hate incidents (yes or no) as the grouping variable and three dependent measures of psychological well-being, including depressive symptoms, fears for personal safety, and self-esteem. Findings indicated that participants who reported witnessing hate incidents also reported higher levels of depressive symptoms and greater fears for personal safety. No differences were found between groups on self-esteem.
SUMMARY

There were 224 Phase IV participants (16.5%) who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU. Sexual harassment reported in Phase IV was primarily reported by women (n = 194) of European American descent (n = 199) and heterosexual orientation (n = 199). The primary forms of sexual harassment reported in Phase IV were “unwanted contacts” (n = 97) and “uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes” (n = 134). Sexual harassment reported in Phase IV was committed most often by work supervisors (n = 41), faculty/TAs (n = 60), peers (n = 80), and coworkers (n = 63). Participants in Phase IV reported that they most often discussed the harassment with nobody (n = 54), family (n = 59), friends (n = 124), and significant others (71). The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding sexual harassment did not perceive them to be effective. Experiences of sexual harassment were associated with higher rates of depressive symptoms and fears for personal safety.

There were 33 Phase IV participants (2.4%) who reported being victims of hate crimes on campus at MU. Hate crimes reported in Phase IV were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 8), race/ethnicity (n = 9), sexual orientation (n = 5), religion (n = 5) and other (n = 5). The types of hate crimes reported by Phase IV participants included threats of violence (n = 7), threatening or harassing phone calls (n = 5), vandalism (n = 5), and other (n = 15). Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate crimes with nobody (n = 6), family (n = 9), friends (n = 16), and significant others (n = 10). The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate crime victimization did not perceive them to be effective. Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms.

There were 142 Phase IV participants (10.5%) who reported being victims of hate incidents on campus at MU. Hate incidents reported in Phase IV were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 42), race/ethnicity (n = 57), sexual orientation (n = 37), religion (n = 52) and other (n = 10). The types of hate incidents reported by Phase IV participants included offensive jokes or remarks (n = 122), offensive editorials, cartoons or news stories (n = 120), and public displays of objects, signs or symbols (n = 51). Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate incidents with nobody (n = 26), faculty/TA (n = 21), family (n = 63), friends (n = 97), and significant others (n = 55). The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate incident victimization did not perceive them to be effective. Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms.

There were 95 Phase IV participants (7.0%) who reported witnessing hate crimes and 340 Phase IV participants (25.1%) who reported witnessing hate incidents on campus at MU.
APPENDIX A
SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY

“Please describe how this/these incident(s) affected your daily life at MU.”

1. It has made me very uncomfortable.

2. I avoided contact with him as much as possible.

3. I don't think this event drastically changed my way of life- rather it taught me to be more aware of the people around me.

4. I have never really been sexually harrassed but I don't think that it could be a problem especially at local bars. I have seen it.

5. They didn't affect me much. I learned to ignore them.

6. Not much...I ignored them...

7. It didn't. It made me feel uncomfortable around the person but I chose not to be in the presence of the perpetrator.

8. Experienced some discomfort and embarrassment initially but no long-term effects.

9. It made me more aware that I need to make sure that I am not alone with certain people.

10. They really didn't have a scarring psychological effect on my daily life. I'm grown quite accustomed to the whistling touching hollering and staring. I just ignore it because I realize that there is no possible way to reprimand that.

11. Not too bad made it uncomfortable.

12. It didn't. I told him I didn't appreciate it and he stopped.

13. It didn't really affect me too much. It hurt me think if I'm giving a wrong impression to people.

14. Unwanted contact has become a norm on some levels--its just something you blow off nowadays.

15. I made sure to avoid that person and have limited contact.

16. I was offended but talked with that person about it and it was resolved.
17. I take most of these incident(s) as part and parcel of the insular mindset of some of the MU population. Some times I engage in dialogue with the "witless" individual and other times I just ignore the comments.

18. It didn't really affect me too much with I being male and the other person being female. I was uncomfortable at the time and I did avoid one on one interaction with this person until they quit and moved on to another position elsewhere.

19. I put my foot down and told the offender that such behavior was inappropriate and if it continued I would take legal action. The behavior stopped.

20. The contact was a hug & kiss on the cheek from a tenured faculty (male) to a tenure track (female). It was unwanted but happened before I could stop it. It didn't affect my daily life at MU. I set boundaries with the person and it didn't happen again.

21. Not at all other than their occurrence is annoying and forever alters your opinion of some people.

22. Being a woman this is just part of our current social structure. I don't like it and I call people out on it when I am offended or I believe they are overgeneralizing.

23. Made me not want to go to work

24. First I'd like to say that the harassment I experience if it is indeed harassment started when an individual e-mailed me over a period of time about romantic feelings. It did not entail physical contact or any threat of it. At first

25. I ignored them.

26. The person is being brought before the student conduct committee. The incident was distracting.

27. They make me realize that MU is still governed by a "boys will be boys" mentality and reinforced my sence that confronting this behavior will only bring problems on me rather than consequences to the perpetrators. Much worse was the sit

28. They have sometimes put me in uncomfortable situations (i.e. I have to be very stern and sometimes rude when confronting that particular person) which is out of my natural character but necessary for me to get my point across to them that they need to back off.

29. really didn't bother me too much. Some days it would make me a little uncomfortable but most days it was just humorous.

30. I did not talk to the person in a one on one setting. I did not know how I could prove this.
31. It caused me to eventually move from the position I worked in to another one

32. it wasn't really that bad, not as bad as touching or stalking me. it made me feel uncomfortable, but i kept making it clear that i didn't appreciate it and they eventually stopped. it didn't really affect my daily life; i didn't stop going to class or anything.

33. I have always found working in a male dominated career very challenging. I have had to smile and "be one of the guys" on more than one occasion while co-workers and supervisors giggled, sneered, and poked and joked around with each other. It has caused me to lose respect for those co-workers and supervisors. It is very hard to feel comfortable once one becomes aware of the fact that your male colleagues are only thinking of your breasts and your <expletive>.

34. I tried to avoid him at all cost.

35. I didn't take the situation very seriously, but I did mention it to a coworker because she would have to walk the same hallway and perhaps come in contact with this person. I wanted her to be aware. Word spread and before I knew it, I was writing down the incident for the head of my department.

36. I have had to develop and cringe-and-bear-it attitude. It is highly unlikely that the situation will change.

37. It made me uncomfortable. I did not want to be alone with the individual but I knew if I didn't reject them overtly I would easily get access to the department chair and get anything I needed for my office and the folks I worked with. It was constantly like walking a tight rope trying to balance what I was comfortable with in regard to the contact but also wanting the extra attention and "perks" for my area.

38. Made me paranoid of seeing the person again. My work suffered. I had a harder time sleeping at night because I was extremely angry.

39. frightening

40. Just made me feel uncomfortable with appearance; tried to say away from said person.

41. Obviously it made me feel powerless, useless, intimidated, and very cynical about supposedly "intelligent" people. Fear comes to mind as well because I never knew what was going to happen to me when I came to work. Can I tell you too that once a man entered my office on his way to my boss's office and he had a gun because my boss was having an affair with one of the secretaries. There was no comfort in knowing that I wasn't the only one singled out for the physical stuff.
42. I did not like having one-on-one meetings with this person because every time I did, I could see their eyes travel from direct eye contact with me to my chest back to my eyes. This person did not try to hide evidence from a previous office relationship. This person left town and called me on the telephone to retrieve something from their top desk drawer. I noticed a dirty picture cutout from a magazine rubber-banded to a handful of letters when I was rummaging through the desk drawers to look for something. After discovering this information in the desk drawer, I always felt very uncomfortable going in to the office. I never told the person I discovered this information in their desk drawer for fear of retribution.

43. Sexual jokes rarely offend me personally, but I can tell when they make others uncomfortable. In the law school, however, there are many males who make "jokes" about how they are superior in some way to women. At the law school level,

44. I made sure I was never alone with the person and told him in no uncertain terms that I would report him if he didn't stop. He did.

45. This series of incidents involved another worker who would repeatedly visit my desk, bringing unrequested "gifts" (chocolates, various items) and talking to me in what I perceived as a suggestive vein, often bringing up sexual subjects perhaps intending to engage me in conversation on those subjects. I shared an office with several men all of whom quickly realized what was going on. The visits were uncomfortable while they happened, and then after my office-mates often made me feel inadequate because I was not able to make him go away without being outright rude, something I always hesitated to do. This was a stressful situation for everyone involved. I believe myself and my office-mates.

46. I made a critical mistake assuming more educated individuals would somehow be less prone to sexual misconduct and innuendo. I was clearly wrong. I have witnessed many comments, jokes and even sponsored programs that are very inappropriate.

47. I felt uncomfortable at the time but soon forgot about it. I expressed my feelings that I was not comfortable with the situation just in case my body language may have been misleading in any way.

48. It made it harder to concentrate on lecture when I felt like I was being watched.

49. It annoys me and makes me feel like I have to work twice as hard at my job to get taken seriously at all. Sometimes some staff/fac members don't want to listen to me because they assume that a woman can't be in a position of responsibility in a job that is typically held by a man. It just makes me feel like I can't get my job done when some people don't want to take you seriously.
50. Made it difficult to concentrate on work even dreaded to be in the same workspace. Made me feel unaccepted as a coworker embarrased me offended my religious beliefs and felt unrespected as a worker.

51. For the most part I think the touching/hugging/sexual jokes were done pretty innocently and those doing/saying things did not mean to intimidate or "harrass." It did not last long enough for me to "make a scene" and it was not repeated on a frequent basis.

52. It made me uncomfortable to be with this person in the same room even more so if there were no other employees around.

53. They didn't; but I would say that I'm tired of the men my age who are obsessed with pornography and they then begin to treat the women around them as sexual objects.

54. Usually just offensive. There were some guys that I wasn't comfortable to be around but they were easily avoidable. Most of the time if you ignore them they stop. And I believe that most of the time it's not supposed to be harrassment; just guys kidding around. Sometimes things that they would say i'm okay with my close friends; the fact that I didn't know them that well is what made it offensive. Plus none of the incidents became worse over time.

55. Didn't really affect my daily life. I dislike these particular people and will not work with them again. I made it clear during the interaction that I did not appreciate sexually explicit language and jokes.

56. Not really at all. It was uncomfortable when it happened but it didn't make me feel bad about myself or humiliated in any way. People talk all the time and that's probably all it was.

57. It was my geograhy professor. He told me how he enjoyed receiving oral sex. I dropped the class.

58. Not a lot just slightly uncomfortable and did not know how to react

59. While these incidents don't affect my daily life they do make me question how seriously the college considers sexual harassment. I have not complained about these incidents but some occurred in front of the Dean.

60. My job wasn't affected but I have made efforts to avoid certain people and situations where I might meet them.

61. Just having to avoid certain people and having to change routes taken to class or screening phone calls.
62. I don't wanna say that these incidents affected me in any way too big, but one in particular did. I was meeting with my TA for one of my classes in his office and he was making some masturbation jokes. It made me feel totally uncomfortable when this happened. I don't even know if anything happened so I didn't make any sort of report or anything, but I don't go and speak with him any more in his office alone.

63. It has made me fearful of being alone with fraternity boys while they are drinking. I trust them less.

64. not much

65. I was annoyed, if anything.

66. they didn't effect me at all honestly

67. Gave me interesting stories to tell. Honestly I was not affected by this in a negative way; it was never intimidating or harmful to my psyche. It really didn't bother me or hurt me in any way at all.

68. My life on campus was not changed to any significant degree; my life at home was affected in that I had to screen calls and keep the blinds down.

69. I pretty much eat lunch by myself now. I try to avoid walking past men where 3 or more are gathered if possible.

70. I have felt belittled professionally and sexualized because of my gender. I am concerned about discussing this because these are my colleagues.

71. Disappointment in the University as having such a condition

72. I feel nervous walking around male students because I feel that the MU campus is sort of like a "meat market" where girls can show off what they have or don't have and men are the judges.

73. The incident in which a TA made inappropriate comments did not affect me very much because he said them to the whole class not just me. When he talked like that it was uncomfortable for all the women there. The incident in which several men in a car yelled to me while walking down the street made me afraid to walk alone on campus for awhile but because it never happened again I became comfortable again the next semester.

74. I ignored it and assimilated it into my daily life. I didn't let it affect me.

75. It was okay behavior in supervisors eyes. I just had to tell him straight how it was going to be. I just got used to it. So I dealt with it the best way I could.
76. I'm leary of giving my number out or talking to individuals that I don't know well. It was a minor disturbance which only occurred for a few days.

77. not really much

78. I've learned to deal with it. I just ignore it no matter how much I don't like it. It is worst when walking by the new business school with the construction workers. I have never seen them at work...it seems as if all their breaks occur at the same time as class breaks...conincidence?? I see them sitting and watching every single female that walks by. It makes going to certain classes (in that general direction) very uncomfortable.

79. It was just really weird. I had to have other people around whenever I would go over to my some of my friend's rooms. Just so he was not there. It kind of scared me.

80. Worried that he has issues that will affect clients that he serves in mental health

81. it just made me uncomfortable and upset for awhile

82. Didn't bother me too much considering that I knew previous to the event that this person is unstable mentally and I don't quite think she understood why it was offensive.

83. They are merely an aggravation. Actually the greatest aggravation comes from a double standard. It ranges from comments to jokes to greeting cards and bumper stickers. Male bashing is acceptable and even encouraged where similar statements about women result in outrage. I actually wouldn't care if what was good for one was good for the other. I have a sense of humor. It is the inequality that has led to the ongoing aggravation. Under those circumstances it is offensive.

84. I didn't really look at it as affecting my life at MU more of a thing associated with a certain age group that would be present anywhere.

85. Did not affect my life at MU because I wasn't going to MU at the time but the individual was.

86. None...I just went about my business

87. This incident has affected me greatly. I will never set foot outside of my dormitory without mace or some form of defense to ensure that if I was ever verbally assaulted like that again I would be able to take action. The guy with his head out of the window repeatedly asked me for a ride then proceeded to ask me if I liked sex then proceeded with even more disturbing/obscene 'cat calls'. This has affected me because now I feel vulnerable and am afraid of being attacked.
88. Not really at all.

89. I didn't want to be in class, I received lower scores on speeches and unable to concentrate on task of learning.

90. makes you feel nervous and uncomfortable

91. did not want to be around that person and at times did not want to come to work.

92. It makes me uncomfortable and feel like I am not respected.

93. They definitely made me more self-conscious and think twice about the type of clothing I was wearing to perhaps initiate such remarks.

94. I put no to question # 2. But I have worked in an office before where I felt that some of the language/behavior of some of my co-workers was inappropriate for the work environment.

95. made it difficult to work in the same area and continue to try to avoid this person--really didn't enjoy coming to work

96. I felt angry with the situation primarily because I know too well what often happens at the University when an administrator or faculty member is accused of sexual harassment -- a little slap on the hand. However, the victim is often treated with skepticism and is branded a squealer. Though I did not report the incidences that happened to me, I did assist another young lady who was harassed by the same person in pressing a sexual harassment grievance. This institution is a prime example of the "good-ole-boy" syndrome where it comes to faculty and administrators. Male domination is alive and well at the University of Missouri.

97. I was shamed, nervous and upset about these incidents, not knowing how to get them to stop. I was also angry when behaviors got in the way of me doing my job.

98. I was uncomfortable at times and others I just shrugged it off as a joke!

99. I feel that ANY talk of sex in the workplace is inappropriate. Unfortunately stating this opinion in a response brands you as an outsider and a non-team player.

100. These incidents lead to a request for a transfer to another department.

101. I threatened to tell his supervisor and call his wife to inform them that he was coming on to me. It startled him enough to leave me alone from that point to which he harassed someone else in the office.
I was withdrawn for fear of attracting more unwanted uncomfortable sexually comments.

Not very much. At first I just went along with the jokes until they became very sexually explicit. Then I asked the person not to tell them to me anymore. The sexual suggestions made me uncomfortable but I did not take them seriously.

It was annoying but had not affect on my work.

It made it harder to concentrate and perform well in the environment that this person was in. There was a constant state of dread about having to deal with that person and how my response would affect my grade.

The incident of unwanted contact occurred with my night shift supervisor over 20 years ago. At the time I felt I had no recourse beyond making it clear to him that I wanted it to stop. It made it hard to come to work each night knowing that he would be sullen and I couldn't do anything to suit him. We were a pretty small group so I also was afraid that some night I'd be alone with him which thankfully never happened.

It made the classroom a very uncomfortable place to be. I had NO motivation to complete my design work or participate for the fear of some comment. Even after going to the Dean of the school about the TA NOTHING was done to him for his behavior. I did horribly in the class and I feel that he took out his aggression against me after learning that I made a complaint about his behavior. Of course I could have requested a review of my grades but how could I when I spent the semester hating the class. I just wanted to get it over with and get on to the next semester.

I wasn't the only female in the class who had to endure this. Many of us were intimidated by him.

When I first came for several years I was very unhappy in my department depressed at times. I was one of two women in my department with many senior men who had traditional marriages. For example I did not wear a wedding ring and this was a source of questioning. Remarks were made just about every day about my clothing. Yet expectations for achievement were very high higher than the men had ever faced in their careers. I saw a counselor for intensive periods of time three times.

Our copier is located in a very small crowded room. Every time I would go to the copier this person would essentially corner me and invade my personal space talk in a manner that was unwelcome and touch inappropriately. I would try to be very quiet when going to use the copier to avoid the unwanted attention or would only use the copier when I knew this person was not around. This made me nervous and uncomfortable.
110. Affected my health, my mental status - fearful of retaliation if reported belief that if the incidents were reported nothing would be done from MU administration to protect me. Fear of losing job and associated benefits (health insurance, retirement, etc.). Hated to go to work, fear of even saying anything to supervisor.

111. I felt at the mercy of frat boys, honestly. They pretty much had open access to women in sororities it seemed and many times I felt physically unsafe and verbally threatened when in a fraternity house for whatever reason. I felt that MU was a tremendously sexist environment.

112. The incidents have not adversely affected my daily life at MU.

113. My daily life has not been affected. The only change is how I deal with the person.

114. This was many years ago. The faculty member was from China and his family was stuck there. He would give me gifts (trinkets). He didn't give others gifts. Continually invited me out to lunch I would refuse. If we were out on a office luncheon he would offer to pay for my lunch and not others. He always wanted me to come to his house. I refused nicely. Even my co-workers noticed and would prevent him from being alone with me. Things did finely escalate and I got upset. He did finally leave me alone. I also left shortly after this because of a better job offer.

115. I transferred out of the position I was in to my current position.

116. I quit my job within the month.

117. I have often cried upon pulling into my parking garage. I dread coming to work. I dread meeting certain faculty in the hallway. My supervisor refuses to deal with the situation other than to tell me that it's my fault. Personnel refuses to do anything either. I hide in my office and try to stay away from them. When they enter my office I get nauseous. I feel jittery. I hate it. I feel helpless and hopeless. But I need this job.

118. caused anger and resentment

119. It has dramatically affected my daily life at work and at home. I do not wish to describe it.

120. They don't really affect me much. I just try to avoid the person.

121. It made me feel uncomfortable...knowing that I had to work with this person on a daily basis. It made me lose respect for him.
The unwanted and suggestive contacts by a co-worker made me very uncomfortable in that person's presence. I was also angry because there seemed to be little intervention from management after the situation was reported. I was a relatively new employee at the time and had to decide how to pursue the problem. I very clearly told the co-worker at least twice that he should address me only by my given name without the "endearing" terms and that his interest in me was not welcomed.

It has made me uncomfortable in certain situations. It has made it difficult to progress in certain jobs. I have changed jobs because of it. I have been assertive towards the individuals in making my opinion known even if I felt it may cost me my job.

It put me in a couple of awkward situations that I had to navigate professionally.

It was very uncomfortable having a client coming in telling me he knew where I lived and how nice my Christmas tree was. He would often come into the clinic after hours to talk to me so I would have to lock all the doors and close the blinds so he would not know I was in the office. There was one time that this individual was even in the parking garage lurking around my car. My husband and I were both bothered by this individual. He even wanted me to read letters that he was writing to his ex-girlfriend from over a year which I told him I could not do.

I have seen undercurrents of prejudice based on sex. This is not particular to MU. As long as no flagrant violations occur decision makers are free to use their discretion to silently and subtly implement their preferences in hiring and promoting.

Sometimes these comments hurt my feelings other times I'm able to shrug them off. I know the person who makes these comments doesn't intend to make me feel uncomfortable it's just their way of teasing.

I didn't report them because I did not think of them as being serious offenses. The guy would just catch me on a bad day when I wasn't in the mood to talk and he would start talking about his sex life and my sex life. It annoyed me more than anything--I was not offended.

It was very uncomfortable coming to work. And the supervisors did nothing. Made it seem like it was no big deal. That was one of the determining factors of finding another position at MU.

They didn't affect me after I called to each person's attention what the problem was and that I did not expect them to do it again.

Fortunately it's not particularly upsetting. I just understand that because I am female my boss will exclude me ALL THE TIME. I only get called in to meetings if they are prescheduled "all staff" meetings or if they deal specifically with my programs. All meetings where my boss is seeking the advice and
input of his staff, I am not included. It is annoying and angering but not emotionally scarring.

132. These incidents have affected my daily life because the inappropriate comments are made by someone in a higher position and make me and others around me feel very uncomfortable.

133. It affected my marriage, my family, my self esteem, my job, my outlook on life.

134. I dreaded coming to work and felt sick at the thought of being around these people all day. One was my administrative supervisor. He seemed bitter toward women and made comments that they had no place in the business world and that women belong in the bedroom or kitchen. In addition to him, I had a co-worker from another department who was stalking me both around the work area and admitted to driving past my home. I was afraid to undress or change clothes in my own home for fear he was peeking in my windows (ever with window coverings). The co-worker also left a sexual letter on the windshield of my vehicle.

135. It makes my job more difficult working with this person as she constantly makes inappropriate remarks in the office about our clothing and other sexual issues.

136. I have come to recognize certain people's biases based on sex, gender, sexual orientation. I avoid these people when possible and feel that their biases have caused them to portray me and other women in a negative way to superiors. I communicate very clearly with these people and document as many things as I can in writing. I try to protect myself.

137. An unwanted distraction from the work I needed to be doing.

138. I would not say that they impact my day-to-day activities rather that they impact my perceptions of those individuals.

139. I am use to it. I just let it go and told them that they are really rude people.

140. At the time I worked at the AP Green Building. Black male was in womens restroom and went into the middle stall had pants down at ankle watched as women went into adjoining stall with a mirror. I was the person who noticed the mirror and called the Ellis Security. It made me very aware of who is around me and took a self defense class. Police were there right away and the person was caught.

141. It made all of the women in class uncomfortable with the Professor and it made the men feel the need to protect the women.
142. Not much affect; the unwanted contact was very brief. When jokes make me uncomfortable I just leave.

143. I dreaded coming to work; and especially dreaded when he'd call me into his office; press against me; etc. He kept telling me he loved me which made me VERY uncomfortable since he was married and I was engaged. He would get drunk and cal

144. It only caused me to feel uncomfortable around the person that made the contact.

145. Luckily I come from a very supportive department and the perpetrator was a temporary guest. The harassment was a one time event. I felt humiliated; lonely; and filthy after the encounter. After discussing the incident with my peers; I felt supported and ok; but slightly embarrassed.

146. It is very uncomfortable; it's hard to go to class and work and see these people again; especially since I don't know how to approach them.

147. It is hell in here.

148. I hated coming to work. I hated being anywhere near this person. I was always unhappy; and I was extremely stressed. I sought counseling over the incidents.

149. I took a different position within the same unit.

150. There was no profound or lasting impact on my university-related activities because of the behaviors referred to above.

151. They made me a uncomfortable. I avoided the person for a while and decided to report him if it continued; fortunately; he stopped.

152. Little impact. Told the instructor I was uncomfortable and the behavior was not repeated. Did not appear to impact my grade.

153. I was less comfortable in my work space; and wary of opening e-mails from the co-worker.

154. Made me uncomfortable interacting with this person.

155. I do not relax with this person in any way. I watch myself closely with this person.

156. I continue to do my job to the best of my abilities. I try to distance myself from the offenders as much as possible.
I was forced out of a well-paying position in my area of study and for financial reasons accepted a position in another department of the same college (CAFNR) at a 20% pay cut. In addition, some of the same faculty members who forced me out continue to be openly hostile. I consulted with a lawyer who informed me that I had an extremely good case (with ample documentation as I kept a running log) but told me that the psychological cost of such a law suit was high and the financial compensation might not be worth it. I am trained in an agricultural science that does not employ people locally outside the University. Finally, I would have to admit that I have a fairly cynical attitude toward these official policies since I continue to see both covert and overt gender discrimination in CAFNR.

This happened years ago when I was a student at MU. I rebuffed the advance and as far as I know my grade was not affected. My daily life at MU was not affected. The faculty member involved was well known for this sort of thing so I never really had any respect for him as a person to begin with and I was not exactly caught off guard by the proposition. It was not threatening so much as irritating.

It made me nervous. Multiple times female students would flirt and get way to close to me when they wanted to discuss their grades. (A couple of times it seemed like they were brushing their breasts against me intentionally.) Once I even gave the student an undeserved grade change because I just wanted her to go away. I was afraid that someone in my department would see her being so overfriendly and think that I was encouraging the behavior.

I shrugged them off. He honestly thinks he's being funny. He is the dictionary definition of ignorant or unknowing that his behavior causes others to be uncomfortable.

I hated going to the class (math 10) that this person was in (not that I didn't already dread math anyway) and I avoided that floor of my dorm where the other one lived and the lounge if he was in it.

On mizzou campus itself i feel much safer than off campus walking around at night.

This was quite a few years ago and luckily it was at the end of a semester so it had little effect on my learning environment.

Mainly to heightened my awareness of such possibilities and be more cautious of individuals.

I was very bothered by them and told the person to remove the website or I would turn him in and he removed it. I did not report him.

Conversation made me feel as if I should vacate the area I was in which would interrupt my work. I was uncomfortable with topics discussed.
Shocked, disgusted, disturbed. Tried to shrug it off or tried to find other reasons for it.

Made walking into any space occupied by this person uncomfortable. I often changed direction when I saw the person coming.

Makes me uncomfortable for the rest of the day

It has not affected my daily life except that I avoid this person as much as possible. I did let them know that it was inappropriate and if it happened again he would be reported.

I am more cautious around people. I tend to not trust people as much or get close to people who I think are my friends.

I have had several incidents of supervisors raising their voices at me. One time my supervisor pounded his fist on the desk while speaking to me. I've felt that my job was at jeopardy at times. My unique situation is that I have to oversee on a managerial level the work being done by people that are my supervisor. Complicated situation.

I have been accused of 'threatening' behavior regarding a member of the opposite sex. This was unofficial but it placed me under a microscope and the individual has gone out of her way to be rude and unprofessional.

I dread having to go in the same area as he was and I couldn't avoid doing that.

I simply told the person that I did not appreciate his humor and he could keep it to himself. He was bordering on sexual harassment and I would file a complaint if it was done again. He NEVER offended me again.

I no longer will contact this person. He has created a hostile work environment in which many of the women will not contact him for his help or will only do so when it is unavoidable. This makes our work time more difficult since we have no support in this area and it makes me uncomfortable in his presence.

Not really

Some of the fraternity guys yell sexual jokes at women when they are walking past their houses. I feel extremely uncomfortable walking past any fraternity house so I will cross the street or take different routes to class to avoid confrontation.

n/a
180. The person creeps me out, I shudder to think about it, I get nervous if I see or come into contact with him.

181. After contacting HR and sitting down with the faculty member to explain that the action was unwelcomed and inappropriate, there was no other affect. Our working relationship was not hindered. The person apologized and no other problems ever occurred.

182. I do not think it really affects my daily life because it is so common to hear comments and jokes about women, especially from college age men.

183. Demeaning. At the time, however, the practice was generally accepted.

184. I stopped attending the class and received the first "C" of my undergraduate career.

185. Makes me scared to walk on or even come on campus at night.

186. Didn't really affect me except that I am apprehensive about seeing the perpetrator on or off campus.

187. Not at all really, I just avoid the other student now.

188. Not applicable.

189. They made me mad at the time, but I got over it and shortly forgot about it.

190. The first incident occurred in a class 4 years ago. A male student jokingly propositioned me offering sexual favors in lieu of taking an exam. The second incident occurred this semester in a class discussion and a male student said a sexually explicit "joke" that made me and I suspect other women in the room uncomfortable.

191. Years ago when I was still new to the college, a Professor in my department told me a very sexually explicit joke. Normally, I wouldn't have been offended; however, at the time I didn't know this guy... and he didn't know me. I thought it was inappropriate for him to share this joke with someone he didn't know. Personally, I don't discuss sensitive issues with people unless I know them well enough on a personal level to know whether or not they'd be offended by the issue and/or material discussed. At the time, I didn't say anything to him about being offended, but I did mention to the office gals that I thought his behavior inappropriate. I wasn't overly distressed by the incident, but I can see how someone else might have been quite upset by it.
it makes me angry that this is basically considered acceptable and if nothing else has made me more aware of underlying misogynistic beliefs of the general american culture. i feel as if i'm being made to look at myself as something less.

It bothers me because it takes away from concentration on school teaching the class

Most of the incidents occurred while I was a student working on a degree here. It was awful because I felt powerless to stop what was happening. I found myself avoiding certain faculty members and I was afraid I was going to be penalized because I wouldn't go along with their sexual jokes and inuendos.

Had a strong dislike of the person.

Very little. It just made for an uncomfortable working situation. The perpetrator is no longer with the University.

The sexual jokes, innuendos, speech occur frequently and are primarily annoying. There was one faculty member who has since retired however that I felt very uncomfortable around because of comments he would make and his body language. I avoid being alone with him or even walking by him. There have been two incidents of someone sending me inappropriate gifts - one was a staff person and one was a student of mine. The student also wrote me letters that contained information that indicated he had been following me. Both incidents frightened me a great deal.

Please note that I don't believe any of these incidents rise to the level of sexual harassment that is actionable under the law.

I feel that often I can't even leave my home without being talked to disrespectfully. my friend and I left the other evening to eat we were wearing our pajamas keep in mind and we were hollered at by boys in cars 3 times. We were referred to as "slut," "whore" and "bitch." We were wearing our pajamas and still were treated like objects. I feel very uncomfortable about walking at night and I wish that harassment was a little less prevalent around campus.

They have made me fine on my daily life. I know that this happens and I am fine with that. I guess for the most part it has only educated me more.

It just annoyed me that no one reprimanded these boys

The incident didn't affect my daily life at MU. The perpetrator was a student.
It just makes it hard to challenge students to treat each other differently and to respect each other when faculty and staff even fall into the stereotypes.

It made me mad.

Not much....but I'd love to see some of the fratunities be disbanded because their behavior in uncalled for.

I dismissed much of what I was told as immature male ego. As the only married female in the office, I experienced less harrassment than my female co-workers. At first when the administrator was new, people laughed along at his jokes.

I tried to avoid being alone with him as much as possible

It didn't other than I wondered if someone else would take more offense than I did and if my co-worker should be warned by myself about the possiblity for misinterpretation of his hugging behavior.

You just learn that whatever you are doing when there is a nasty or unpleasant task to be performed you are going to be expected to do it because women won't lower themselves to that level.

To see nasty graffiti remarks about gays is a form of harassment I think. It's just that the perpetrator is anonymous. So when I see stuff like this on the bathroom walls or the library study desks or when I'm walking across campus and hear a student say casually to their buddy "you are *such* a faggot!" - I feel marginalized. But what can you do? I mean you just go on and live your life.

I generally ignore it. I am more careful about being alone with others.

made it a nightmare I almost dropped from school

I didn't particularly like being at work.

it was scary not knowing what to expect on a day to day basis. sometimes i was treated like a human and sometimes not with no warning. i'm a pretty friendly touchy person it takes a lot to make me uncomfortable but i was uncomfortable.

It didn't affect my daily life at MU.

The incidents of unwanted contact and what I call "stalking behavior" had little effect in the long term. I was able to threaten the perpetrator with "telling the administrative office" and the incidents stopped. Over all during and shortly after the incidents I felt somewhat "soiled" or "violated." My personal space
had been compromised. The incidents of uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes was usually
in the context of overhearing a joke aimed at demeaning the gay/lesbian population. On a
couple of occasions I actually asserted myself and told the perpetrator that their
sense of humor was grossly inappropriate. On other occasions I just felt disenfranchised.

217. It made the classroom uncomfortable and kept me from being able to learn

218. Scared to be alone at work to leave work alone or be cornered at work by them.

219. Makes the workplace an uncomfortable place.

220. I don't think it was intentional so I blew it off.

221. I was very unhappy in my profession even though I was working hard at my job. Eventually changed departments fields and position from the one where harassment was occurring. Am very happy with my present situation.

222. I hate going to class

223. It was frightening and made me think more carefully before putting myself in a situation like that. I am more likely to have a friend usu. male accompany me if I feel uncomfortable.

224. I pretty much forgot about it.

225. It makes you not speak your mind about anything. You tend to stay by yourself. Almost like letting people have their way with you.

226. I simply thought these were crude ignorant individuals with few-to-no redeeming qualities as human beings.

227. I avoid the person now at every opportunity. I did not report it to anyone due to the fact that I had just started working here and was unsure of management. If it happened again I would report it to whomever necessary to get rid of this person.

228. This incident has not really affected me at all.

229. It was a subtle suggestion in which I indicated that was wrong. It did not affect my daily life at MU.

230. I interact with this person as little as possible and he is my supervisor. I have become subdued around him.
231. Made me very angry and uncomfortable. I have changed some of my research goals at MU based on the actions of this person because I do not want to work for or with this person.

232. I am not called by name - nor are any of the women in the law school. This male individual calls us all 'baby cakes' - 'sugar' - 'hot stuff'. Its more annoying than anything and unprofessional behavior for someone in law school.

233. It made me feel uncomfortable.

234. made going to class uncomfortable. in the other situation, it made me avoid those persons.

235. It hasn't affected me in any way. I just brushed it off.

236. not at all. I can't believe that sexual graffiti is even included. it is (usually) not directed at any specific individual. sexist jokes and cartoons are everywhere as well. while there are indeed instances in which these may be maliciously directed at an individual, it is not typical. i do not really feel that i have been a victim of sexual harassment but i responded positively because these are included in the above 'definition' of sexual harassment. to me, these are more matters of political correctness than anything else. sexual jokes and graffiti usually reflect nothing more than bad taste and i feel that when considered as sexual harassment, these only detract from problems that are truly important.

237. It made me uncomfortable around others.

238. My daily life was not affected in general. I felt very uncomfortable being around this person but fortunately I didn't see him frequently.

239. The leering was other students when I was a student and the unwanted touching incident made me uncomfortable in my workplace.

240. Made me feel slightly uncomfortable in the work environment.

241. Not much. I let it slide even though it makes me feel uncomfortable when it happens.

242. I became aware of how I dressed around one person. I became aware of my positioning when asking questions or showing a report and eyes tended to be down the shirt rather than on the work.

243. Sometimes they make me uncomfortable but I have gotten used to it so now i normally just ignore it.
244. I was personally insulted and felt that I would not academically be taken seriously or respected working under that advisor. I have since left that department and advisor for a better atmosphere.

245. Innuendo creates uncertainty and doubt and a natural avoidance of such situations.

246. Both times I was walking on campus and a driver passing by shouted or whistled. It didn't bother me that much, but if fits in with your description of harrassment.

247. Minor irritation and time expenditure.

248. Makes me feel intimidated and less effective.

249. Loss of respect of individual. Avoiding individual when ever possible.

250. I was working in a classroom where a course was taking place. The professor made a very rude sexual comment that shocked me and by the look on the face of the only other girl in the classroom I believe she was stunned as well. This incident did not affect my daily life other than the fact that I lost a lot of respect for the professor and stated in no uncertain terms that I did not want him on my committee.

251. Just caused unnecessary stress

252. Made me uncomfortable; didn't know who to react. Was surprised by the comment made. Knew of others who experienced this and other forms of sexual harassment from the same individual.

253. This isn't sexual harrassment but I didn't know what other catagory to put it in. Some guys thought it would be funny to give me and some friends a gallon of urine orange juice and other stuff. They told us it was orange juice. they were our "good guy friends" but we haven't spoken to them since. It made us really mad that those guys would do that to us.

254. I was stressed out due to the worry about what my boyfriend would think and trying to decide how to handle people who sexually harrass others.
APPENDIX B
SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY

“Please describe the response from any university official with whom you discussed this/these incident(s).”

1. N/A-DID NOT REPORT<comma> REALLY NOT THAT SERIOUS.

2. They were shocked<comma> but no action was taken.

3. I talked to my CA and I talked to a counselor<comma> and a professor because I was taking a test on rape that day. I reported it to the MU police because it occured in a fraternity<comma> and they filed a report. I was happy with the treatment I received.

4. n/a

5. Understanding.

6. University officials repeatedly assured me that they would handle this serial offender. When nothing appeared to come of this "investigation" even after legal counsel got involved<comma> I received the very clear message that they would divulge no info on the disposition of their investigation. The serial perpetrator is still a dept. chairman.

7. I described the incidents to my manager and I explained that the harasser didn't know that he was being offensive to me and once I told him that it was a problem<comma> the harassment stopped. I didn't want any further action taken unless the harassment continued. My manager had a meeting the same week and covered MU's non-harassment policy. Accentuating the relevant points.

8. My supervisor said she would take care of it. After a long while<comma> the men stopped bothering me; but I also made a point not to be anywhere they might be.

9. Simply discussed the activity as ongoing

10. Supervisor<comma> I worked in a shop that was 95% men<comma> what did I expect.

11. N/A

12. Faculty and staff generally agree that male bashing<br> <br> is accepted.

13. I did not discuss with any University official.

14. The Dean of the Dept. asked the instructor if my aligations were true; he said no; she said<comma> it didn't happen. After the dean of the Dept. was unwilling to make a real effort to determine if what I said was true<comma> I decided there was no way to fight it; just live with it.
15. the problems stopped.

16. result of discussion was that we as women just didn't understand the person

17. I have never discussed it with anyone.

18. N/A

19. Human resources talked to me and made me realize I should have spoken up sooner. The director of my department also talked to me about standing up for my rights of not letting the person keep making sexual remarks if it made me uncomfortable. I have also had an incident where someone has ejaculated on my office chair. This was reported to the police but nothing conclusive was ever found out about who did it. Our office doors are now locked every night.

20. Dr. Edward Keiser

21. Of course the Dean acted concerned but not once did they ask me to come back and sign any form or letter. They went to the TA told him what and who the accusations came from. Of course the next time I had to see him in class he pulled me out into the hallway and proceeded to yell at me for several minutes. I feel the University let me down. I thought maybe there might be an inquiry but I received nothing but a good embarrassing butt chewing.


23. My supervisor indicated the problem was with me because I couldn't handle the faculty better. I was verbally reprimanded for having gone home one afternoon after an encounter. Personnel indicated we should "suck it up."

24. vet school faculty were not supportive (with some admirable exceptions) in the '70's; this situation has changed (improved)drastically

25. I hesitate to discuss the response.

26. Thanks for the information

27. I reported the incident of unwanted/suggestive contacts with my manager and with the department director. Instead of dealing with the co-worker causing the problem the director asked me to decide what action should be taken. I was never informed if any action was taken by my manager. However on one occasion my manager was present when the co-worker was using suggestive terminology towards me. My manager then privately asked me if the situation was still a problem.
28. MUPD wanted me to charge a student that threatened me and I chose not to. They were very professional and understanding of my situation and they were concerned for my well-being.

29. The Director said that he would talk to the client if I was unable to get him to stop.

30. I did not/have not "reported" it as it's not a provable charge. I just know of some cases where it's coincidental that the "favored" candidate gets the increases in salary or promotion in title. Many female managers I have seen would have been Directors and Chairs if they were males in charge of their areas.

31. Basically the response was...well he is a foreign doctor and that is how they act in their country. He means nothing by it. Just don't say anything else to anyone. But finally after it happening to more and more people - they finally let him go. But it took way too long and I don't think anything would have ever been said to him if it wouldn't have happened so many times. He was a faculty member in the Ophthalmology department.

32. I talked to the police and was told I had to talk to the Chair of the department. "You have to go through proper channels." Then from my chair "You are just a woman are you sure this happened?" "I will handle it" and nothing was done for three weeks. I then said unless it was taken care of in a week I would go back to the police.

33. The supervisor of the co-worker was shocked and spoke with the individual. Told him to stay away from my office.

34. Discussed with Supervisor who claimed that she would speak to this person as she had numerous times.

35. Security was there right away. Police were present within 10 minutes. Charges were filed and all is well.

36. He is tenured and cannot be fired.

37. I was told that the best thing to do would be start looking for another job. Recently I was told that there probably won't be funding for my position possibly as soon as in a few days.

38. The case was reported to my boss. He reported it to HR. They investigated and gave the person a warning to stop and to stay away from me. The day after given his warning he proceeded to trap me in a room and threaten me. He also continued to make lewd jokes. I reported this to my boss and to HR. He was fired.

39. Discussed it with the perpetrator only and he ceased the action.
40. No response at all but I was notified that my position was being closed out seven months later.

41. Took my statement on the incident.

42. I have support from other faculty to whom I discussed this situation. Never had any form of an apology for inappropriate behavior. No way of knowing it won't happen again.

43. My supervisor simply said that I had no power to defend myself against these accusations. Since I am a male I have 'no rights'.

44. This person is abusive to my female supervisor as well. Upper administration doesn't think this is a problem. Indeed the concern is that we need this person and cannot risk losing him although most of the women feel that he should be replaced if he cannot act decently with his co-workers. I informed my supervisor that the next time (the 3rd time) this behavior occurs I was filing an official grievance.

45. n/a

46. The chairman of the department said I should be happy I could possibly get a free blouse out of the deal. My supervisor however was enraged and spoke to the chairman about it who again didn't care.

47. Personnel in Human Resources took notes confirmed that my planned actions were the proper way of handling the situation and later contacted me to make sure everything was resolved and needed no further action. It was handled in discreet manner. I had desire to bring any charges against the faculty member. I just wanted to insure that the situation did not happen again. No other faculty members including the chair were ever made aware of the situation.

48. Support.

49. Not applicable

50. I have only discussed this issue with faculty that have initiated the conversation and were very understanding.

51. I didn't personally report it but the other faculty in the department knew what was going on.

52. I have discussed both instances of the inappropriate gifts and the possible stalking with my dean. He handled both appropriately and professionally.
53. The residential staff was helpful in connecting me to the police. The police (campus)
helped in making me feel safe. However, they could do nothing to him until they found that he had had a warrant for his arrest.

54. The female staff did not believe that the human resource person was very sympathetic.
The complaints were made against a vice chancellor for student affairs at the time. I believe there was concern about publicity...plus the Chancellor liked this man and backed off from taking swift and severe action. As a result, the chancellor and the vice chancellor both lost their jobs.

55. For some offensive bathroom graffiti, I called the MU facilities department and someone came by later that day to paint over it (or wipe it off).

56. One of my supervisors laughed.

57. They were quite concerned, but never really did anything about it. Mostly they told me to try to avoid this person, which I was doing anyway.

58. In the case of the unwanted touching, my supervisor was very supportive. I made the final decision to try to solve the problem informally and was glad it worked. Had the problem not been solved informally, my supervisor was willing to support my efforts to solve the problem via official channels and was up front in saying so.

59. My supervisor lied to saying it would be dealt with apparently that meant they had listened to me and would do nothing further. When I followed up on it, I was told something had been done when I showed this was wrong. They did what I and my lawyer had originally requested. Later without telling me they contacted the harasser and changed things back to the way it was before.

60. The counselor I talked to at the staff counseling center seemed sympathetic but had not suggestion for me but to change jobs. The counselor seemed very "pro MU" and strongly suggested that I not seek legal action and implied that my case would be trivial.

61. Don't rock the boat. You may lose your job.

62. Several months later it was brought up with my supervisor only because she asked if I would share my office with this man and I refused. I told her why. She said if it happens again to let her know. She did not ask any details of the incident.

63. Discussed it with fellow faculty and they just rolled their eyes and nodded in agreement that they knew exactly what I was talking about and their body language indicated their disgust, but no formal action or complaint was filed.

64. The officials seemed very concerned and ensured that certain measures would be taken to deal with the incident. However, the young man was my neighbor...
in the residence hall and was simply moved to an adjacent and connecting residence hall which didn't seem very effective in my eyes.

65. He said this incident bordered on sexual harrassment. He sent out a department wide e-mail reiterating the school's code and told me if anything like that ever happened again to immediately inform him of such incidents.

66. Did not report.

67. Because it was not the first problem with the professor it was requested that I state the incident on record. Everyone I dealt with was very pleasant.

68. Being aware of a number of other staff members who experienced sexual harassment from the same individual I felt that it is very difficult for staff to "rock the boat" and file complaints against a faculty person. Staff are fearful of coming out on the short end of the stick when they try to take action against a faculty member.
“If you did not report this please describe your reason(s).”

1. Because I just figured that he was kidding around and I didn't see any reason to get him in trouble for it. He does it to everyone else too so I figured it was nothing different.

2. I didn't feel the need.

3. I would not report the incident if it happened again...I would deal with it on my own...or have my significant other do so.

4. I feel that the behavior is generally accepted and is best handled if ignored.

5. Fear that I would have a stressful situation on my hand.

6. I didn't report any incidents because I felt they were too trivial to report. Plus I wouldn't even be able to identify or recognize the ones that did it. It seemed like a waste of time. I thought that it wouldn't solve anything. Plus where I'm from the police don't really care about these issues anyway. They'll just say "okay we'll take care of it" and the next day it's all the same. It's just unnecessary stress added to my life to take such minute things to the police.

7. no violation of a law

8. It was not a big deal and I easily handled it on my own.

9. I think that it is no big deal because most of the time it's just my friends but other than that I didn't want anyone to get in trouble.

10. there's no reason to cause a conflict when no harm was done

11. I talked it over with the person and that was effective to get them to stop.

12. Female harassment of a male employee is not generally an discussed based on the power necessary to harass someone. Traditionally men have been in more positions of power over women and all of the cases and most of the examples of sexual harassment represent this one-sided perspective males harassing females. To be honest I would have been a little embarrassed reporting the incident. It seems to be a cultural double standard that I have internalized despite my sociological background.

13. I dealt with the situation. The behavior stopped.
14. I felt that it was nobody's business.

15. I found it to be a mild form of boundary crossing and he stopped his behavior after it was discussed.

16. I have developed effective ways of discouraging such behavior--some direct, some indirect. My responses stopped the behaviors so further action wasn't necessary.

17. I have dealt with these situations directly as they are most often perpetrated by people who are uninformed about sexual harassment. After such a discussion harassment has ceased to be a problem with that particular person. Also the harassment I have received has been quite slight given the entire range of possibilities. I would report harassment that continues despite discussions with the individual or that was more serious in nature.

18. I felt that I could take care of the problem by direct action with the person.

19. even though I wish situations like that would never occur I was not harmed physically or mentally. The overall effect is a short-lived disturbance and sense of discomfort. I didn't feel like it was worth reporting especially because I didn't know the names of those boys.

20. wasn't serious enough (didn't bother me enough) to say something

21. Did not know how this could be proven. Their word against mine.

22. I decided it wasn't worth the hassle and changed jobs...besides it was back in the 70's and it just wasn't talked about then.

23. i didn't think that it was a big enough deal to report. so i didn't.

24. To whom would I report this? The boss that was giggling with the boys? This was before the Univ became concerned about sexual harassment so there really was no where for me to go.

25. I thought it would stop on it's own and he is no where around anymore.

26. I can ill afford to risk my job.

27. Fear of retaliation or at the very least loss of access and special consideration. Also embarrassment.

28. I felt it was adiquatly taken care of by my religious leaders.

29. wouldn't of mattered didn't know who the person was and never will.
30. Young: did not feel it was that important; just the way that person was (he did it to lots of women) so tried to pay him no mind.

31. At the time there was no one to report anything to. In any case I know how the University works and it seems more important to "keep it out of the news" than it is to actually help someone. Has anyone ever actually been fired for doing this? I remember a few decades back when the VC for Student Services was accused of this he was "demoted" to a faculty position in Educational Counseling & Psychology. (Gasp in disbelief if you like but it's true.)

32. I did not want to cause any undue attention to myself or my family.

33. Only evidence in this case is my testimony. It's my word against his we have all classes together as we are in the same first year of law school section. Also although it's unfortunate it is true that when something of that nature is alleged many think it is because the female is unhappy that the "relationship" ended. It would just complicate life too much to call attention to it. I'd rather keep my friends and just avoid him. It is easier and more prudent for me to get on with my life than it is to take any action -- Especially since I don't believe this particular person is a threat to other women.

34. I was able to handle it on my own.

35. This was not something that I was sure qualified as harrassment and I didn't feel comfortable as the rare woman in a workplace full of men saying anything. This was in many ways a pride issue and also an unsureness on my part about just how rude I should have to be myself before I brought in others to help. Eventually a co-worker reported these incidents to my supervisor who spoke with the man involved but I didn't report anything nor did I officially know anything about his reprimand.

36. How do you tell a senior official their behavior is inappropriate when you sit at an entry-level position? What do you say when a person's reputation is parially reknown for his bawdy yet offensive humor? For many of us it is a calculated risk to report such behavior which could come at a great professional cost and cause significant social ramifications.

37. I didn't think it could be verified.

38. nobody would care

39. It's not worth the hassle and of course the problems complaining will create in the day to day atmosphere.
40. I discussed it with my immediate supervisor who said it was considered a work place atmosphere so I felt I was being asked to tolerate it. I also felt that if I complained after that I would lose my job.

41. I told him directly if he didn't stop I would see to it that our director would make sure he did. After that he pretty much avoided me. He later transferred out of the department. To my knowledge he is still employed by the University but I am unaware of any further incidents.

42. The incidents occurred off campus with students and did not require University intervention.

43. As said before I think most of the time they're just being dumb guys and it didn't get to the point where I felt I was being damaged emotionally/psychologically/esteem-wise. On the whole it's more of a nuisance and I wish they'd grow up.

44. I know that these types of situations are generally not taken seriously by bureaucrats in administration... regardless of the institution. I was a grad student and they were long-time staff people (men). I had to work with these individuals if I wanted a job I had no choice and so dealt with it as best I could on my own rather than create a big issue and lose the job. Sad but true. They're probably just as inappropriate and crude today but at least I don't have to deal with them anymore.

45. It wasn't necessary but I couldn't get the "no" to unclick on question 8.

46. I did not know who to go to.

47. It wasn't a big deal and it eventually stopped and it didn't disrupt my life and didn't make me doubt myself.

1) not sure who to report to 2) since everyone knows about it and has never done anything about it why should they now?

48. It would be difficult to prove the actions took place and the incidents were very minor.

49. Did not feel it was important enough to report and did not want the person to bother me more. I knew that if I did it how I was handeling it things would cool down after a while. If they didn't i would have definately taken other actions.

50. Well I wasn't sure if what happened would be classified as harassment so I didnt want to get my ta in trouble if there was nothing there. I didnt want to go through the whole semester and have it be weird in class too.

51. It wasn't really grounds too since nothing really happened in the long run since I pushed him against the wall and ran out.
52. our near campus neighborhood has a lot of creeps in it, we just ignore them

53. I didn't think it was necessary.

54. wasn't important enough

55. Didn't bother me, and I don't think this person has done it to anyone else. It would also be incredibly embarrassing to admit to anyone that I was uncomfortable in a situation and was going to start whining about it. I can and will get over this on my own.

56. Initially, I was hesitant because I did not think it was severe enough to report, but I became uncomfortable enough that I had made the decision to report it to the police and told that person that I was going to. He never called again so I decided not to pursue it.

57. Want to keep my job without hassle and will move on in a short period of time

58. It wasn't anything that made me feel threatened. I think a lot of the problem is attitude towards women and members of the LGBT group. I think educating people about issues facing these groups helps dispel stereotypes and reduces occurrences of harassment. If the harassment were physical or threatening, I would have reported it.

59. Someone else in my class talked to the TA about his behavior and he stopped, so I didn't need to do anything. I didn't report the men in the car because I didn't know if they were MU people and I didn't find it necessary.

60. I at the time did not think anything would or could be done in response.

61. It went no further than my supervisor. I was made to feel nothing would be done so why should I cause problems or make them problem worse.

62. I felt like I handled the situation in an effective manner and the person stopped harassing me so I saw no need to report it.

63. It was considered sexual harassment but what isn't. It wasn't offensive to me, we're all college students right. I know what is crossing the line and would take the proper repercussions if needed. It wasn't though.

64. I have never reported anything because it is simply something I have become used to...they're doing work for the university and the impression I have been given is that the university really wouldn't take much action to stop the behavior.

65. I was off during the summer when it really got bad. During school he would email me or instant message me. It didn't get bad till later.
i didn't want to bother with it

I didn't think it was necessary. It was noticed by a student supervisor and taken care of. It never happened again.

I think Americans have become childish and self centered with their demands to be singled out for protections and favors. Those who scream for tolerance are usually those who are the least tolerant. I think that studies such as this and the resultant policies only encourage people to wear their feelings on their sleeves and look for opportunities to become offended. I don't believe I have a right to not be offended. I know that no such right exists. It is completely impractical and impossible. I am more irritated by the demand for adherence to often juvenile attitudes and beliefs and I choose to deal with these situations as an adult rather than as a child.

I figured I would be overreacting and that it's a pretty normal thing.

I decided to go to the Columbia Police.

It wasn't worth my time. They have an opinion. I just happen to disagree.

I didn't know who to talk to and since I did not know who the people were so therefore myself or the law could not take any action about it.

I didn't think it was a big deal because she was my friend and she was drunk. She wouldn't have done it soberly.

I did not go higher up because of the deans negative responses to me knowing no one would want to see if this instructor was really discriminating against straight men.

not to extreme just guys trying to get attention

Didn't seem like something anyone would care about

I didn't think it was serious enough. I didn't feel threatened just annoyed and grossed out to put it roughly.

this happened approx 12 years ago--the climate on campus was very different then than what it is now particularly for me--I transferred to another postition and was very selective of where I went and did my research on the personnel in the area--I am also a bit older now than I was

The climate of the University being the way it is I did not want to jeopardize my employment at the University or my chances of moving up.
80. I was afraid I wouldn't be supported and would eventually lose my job under other guises.

81. I did not take it seriously and did not feel that I was in any harm from the person doing it.

82. As stated above, it would brand me a non-team player.

83. no confidence in self.

84. He left me alone after I basically 'called his bluff' and threatened to involve his wife.

85. It was before there was a sexual harassment policy and I was young and dumb.

86. The problem of the sexual jokes was solved by the supervisor's insight to ask me if the jokes bothered me. I told him the more explicit ones were out of line so he told the person to stop telling them. I actually didn't directly report the sexual advances until that supervisor was laid off. I mentioned to my supervisor that I was glad he was gone because he kept coming into my office and making suggestive comments. I usually just laughed them off or made a little joke to defuse the situation. I was worried that if I caused any problems with this particular supervisor he was in a position to hinder my work on a daily basis. My supervisor felt he should report that person's conduct in case he was considered for future University job possibilities.

87. It wasn't affecting my work and wasn't worth the effort.

88. Again, this was over 20 years ago. If there was policy against such behavior at that time I wasn't aware of it. I had encountered similar incidents in previous jobs and it just seemed like something I would have to deal with wherever I went.

89. Nothing seemed to "add up" to harassment. It was just a daily barrage from very ignorant older people. Other people seemed to think it was just their way their eccentricity joking etc. I was encouraged to just laugh it off. Looking back several years of my life were spent in this atmosphere and yet I could not pin down what it was until more women entered the department and the atmosphere changed. We were able to turn it around. I still hear insensitive things from one of the old timers but we have a support group now to satirize it behind his back.

90. After discussing this with my significant other and with co-workers I decided that I would avoid speaking to or looking at this person avoid this person and see if this person would be intelligent enough to understand their approach was unwanted. This approach did work well with the exception of a few awkward times. This person was eventually asked to resign and did.

91. Did not report because believed MU would do nothing about it - the harasser was "a good ole boy" within the MU system.
92. There seems to be no course of action for students who are sexually harassed by students.

93. Because I felt the leering was too small a matter to involve Campus Police.

94. I do not believe that it was necessary.

95. I thought I may have been making too much of this. One of my friends noticed the behavior too and thought it was odd. I actually felt relieved that someone else confirmed my suspensions. She helped me out. One day I got upset because he wanted to go out for lunch and wasn't taking a polite no thank you for an answer. I guess he heard me talking to my friend and backed off.

96. I was certainly in an awkward position as filing a formal complaint against a female co-worker is a bit odd.

97. Didn't want to make a fuss - I felt it better to just remove myself from the situation.

98. I don't feel the need to - it's pretty harmless. I don't see the person that often anymore.

99. I did not see that reporting it would help. I discussed it with the person responsible and tried to move on. Of the people I have known who have reported such the rank of the offender was more important than the incident.

100. I did not feel that this person was a great threat but just a bother.

101. I didn't read ahead. Please see response to question 10. It's just a fact of bureaucracy that decision makers at each level have a given amount of freedom.

102. These aren't really sexual harassment comments just comments I feel are inappropriate in a supervisor/employee relationship. Perhaps they wouldn't be inappropriate in a purely friendly relationship.

103. See above.

104. I did not tell my husband because he would have "killed" him. I didn't want my husband getting into any trouble because of that ass.

105. I took care of it myself. I thought it was an educational opportunity. I have had to talk with people who report to me about their actions and I have had to define sexual harassment. Many have been surprised that it is the perception of the person being harassed that determines harassment because most of them said "I was only joking" or "I didn't mean anything bad when I touched her" and such comments.
It's not really reportable and not overly upsetting. There is nothing blatant going on.

Did not want to go to my supervisor for fear of being fired. I also did not want to go to my supervisor because some of the sexual comments were made to me about my supervisor (from another female) and it would be embarrassing having to explain the situation to him. I also don't think my supervisor would do anything about it.

After discussing the incident with my boss I felt that the situation was under control. My Boss has talked with the co-workers and felt it had been effective.

I did not report the Department Chair because he was a tenured full professor and I don't feel anything would have been done. He had emotionally abused me many times in the past and when I reported or asked what could be done I was told there was nothing I could do he had the right to say what he wanted.

The director of my program probably would not care or do anything about it.

I felt without Supervisor's support that I would be labeled the trouble maker.

I was untenured at the time these events occurred. In the case of one faculty member he was a full professor in my department and I felt that my career advancement would be affected if I reported it. A second faculty member also made unwanted advances. By that time I was tenured and he was not. I felt that he would leave me alone as I left campus for a while on a research development leave.

Nothing was done that I considered at a level that I thought required action.

Why should I? This type of thing happens everyday. I did not feel that it was needed. I deal rude and narrow minded people everyday.

It doesn't bother me that much

Not serious enough.

I did not feel it was significant enough to report.

It was a one time event from a person the University had no or little control over. They could not take official action against this individual because he was not an employee. I doubt they would have taken unofficial action against this man because of his potential as a monetary donor to the university.

I didn't think the University could do anything about it or even if they would care. I have a friend who was physically assaulted (punched in the face) in a fraternity house and we called MU police and he told her he
wasn't going to do anything about it because they were just a bunch of drunk college kids. The MU police is not very helpful in Greektown and they should be.

120. fear of retaliation, potential threat to my reputation, especially as a business owner in town, poor health, knowing that the director was giving more credence to his stories, potential loss of health benefits, and the fact that I am on probation and the director is not a reasonable person.

121. This was nearly 25 years ago and I considered the trade offs of confronting the individual and the system to working around the individual. I chose to work around the individual.

122. I felt that I was able to deal with the matter effectively myself.

123. actions stopped anyway.

124. one time occurrence

125. It seemed like a fairly minor incident and I was not aware of my options at that time.

126. Seemed pretty minor and the perpetrator was not employed in my workplace for very long.

127. I felt it was minor and that I would not have to report it at all as long as it does not happen again.

128. People feel comfortable saying ANYthing to an overweight person like me. In addition, overweight people tend to not get a responses from officials. Or at least that's my perspective.

129. In real life propositions are made. As long as rebuffing the proposition does not have any adverse consequences, the unwanted attention does not persist, it is not worth getting upset about in my opinion. (in my case the implied threat--to lower my grade if I declined along with an offer to raise it if I accepted--was not carried out).

130. I know that the idea of a man being harassed by female students would not be taken seriously.

131. He was not being intentionally mean or rude. He was trying to be funny. He does not think.

132. Didn't ever think about it. Most undergraduates (especially freshman and sophomores) don't realize that they can or are too immature to think through
the reasons not to so that they can find the reasons to do it. If I had been a few years older I would have reported it. I don't let anything like that happen to me now but of course hindsight is 20/20. Also I just don't think I wanted to deal with the increased attention it would have brought to the situation.

133. I don't feel that anything would be done as the identity of the individual was unknown to me and they are usually just passer by incidents.

134. Like I said it was several years ago and I didn't feel there was a need.

135. I have not reported all incidents. Sometimes I did not feel threatened. It would be my word against theirs. Sometimes I did not know the individual and they left the scene soon after the incident. I did not want to get a foreign student in trouble.

136. I never saw the website again and was satisfied that it was removed. If it would have reappeared I would have taken it further. His person knew I meant it.

137. I felt nothing would come from reporting it. Ignoring the situation or laughing seemed to defuse conversation.

138. I did not think they were serious enough and also I did not see what can be done.

139. My coworker talked to me about the employee and told me that the person didn't mean anything by it and that once I got to know the person I would understand that he didn't mean his actions to be offensive. I gave the employee the benefit of the doubt and the actions stopped within a couple of weeks.

140. Didn't feel it was a big enough deal to report it was just a few sexual comments.

141. I immediatly gave the person a warning and it has never happened again.

142. I did not think it was a big deal. The person is my friend and I didn't want to cause problems.

143. I did not wish to create a worse situation than already existed.

144. I didn't really think there was anything to be done about it and I felt that if I said anything about it would look like I was trying to cause trouble.

145. I felt I was able to control the situation myself.

146. When my supervisor discussed this with her supervisor the attitude was that his behavior was not a problem.
147. Did not feel situation warranted it
148. It will make the problem worse.
149. n/a
150. I suppose I am used to it. I do not feel threatened by the comments so I do not feel the need to report them to anyone or get someone in trouble.
151. I assumed I would be discredited or not believed.
152. Fear
153. i didn't want to draw more attention to it
154. I didn't feel it was necessary the incident wasn't that serious.
155. Not applicable
156. It did not seem that serious to me. Just because somebody makes sexual references to me doesn't mean I have to bring charges against them or anything like that. It wasn't serious enough to me.
157. These were isolated incidents so I didn't think they were worth following up on with university staff. However if they occurred frequently by the same person I might have been inclined to bring this to the attention of staff.
158. While I think the professor used poor disgression in choosing to tell a sexual joke to a stranger in the workplace I didn't really consider it sexual harassment. He wasn't in a position to use the behavior to adversely affect my job or position. He wasn't my supervisor or anywhere in my "chain of command" (so to speak). I am not easily offended anyway I just know that his behavior was not appropriate and I think he's lucky I didn't take serious offense.
159. nothing would get done anyway i would feel like i was whining.
160. I did not report the rape because I was really drunk and I don't really remember what happened. Just that he had sex with me against my consent when i was passed out.
161. i don't know where to report them
162. I was afraid of retaliation.
163. Some people are insensitive jerks. You learn to deal with it.
I felt no danger to my person. I was not serious enough to warrant action. I never confronted the perpetrator directly, so it was my own responsibility at that point.

I did not report the behavior of the older faculty member for a couple of reasons. First, I was not tenured at the time and he was a senior faculty member. I was worried about possible repercussions. Second, I figured he was retiring soon and so it was just a temporary situation. Finally, while I found his comments offensive and his presence made me uncomfortable, I also believed him to be relatively harmless and he was fairly easy to avoid. I had also been told that his behavior had been reported by others in the past and he had been talked to but it didn't do any good. I think many had an attitude of tolerating him because he just didn't know any better.

I did not want to talk about it and I was embarrassed and I felt as if it was my fault.

Not a big deal to me but to others it might be

It took place off campus and it was a student.

Not significant enough to report. More just uncomfortable than anything.

The student was under my supervision. He received one and only one warning. He had to make a formal apology to all students who were affected by his language. He stopped the behavior. He was reprimanded by myself and supervising faculty.

no one really give a damn

not that serious-never escalated

I was not sufficiently offended or bothered by this coworker's behavior to report it.

Because it wouldn't make any difference.

1. I think that a mature woman should be capable to handle these kind of things by herself without involving officials.

2. I was told that MU officials always defend the interests of the professor.

3. Did not want publicity.

It's a tough thing to deal with when all of your peers are male.

I didn't feel that it was a major issue.
I wanted to see if I could take care of the problem myself first. I figured that the perpetrator was just uneducated about personal space, sexual harassment and similar issues and might benefit more from a personal rebuke rather than an administrative one. I honestly think that she thought that just because I'm a gay male that I wouldn't take offense if she touched me inappropriately.

I did not think the department would be very responsive and I did not want to face any retaliation.

Felt that nothing would be done.

Didn't seem like a big deal.

Advice of counselor at employee assistance and legal counsel.

Wasn't worth the effort.

I didn't think the situation severe enough to bother any university official. I gathered myself as lucky and having learned my lesson.

It wasn't anything serious and it didn't really bother me.

I work in a male-dominated area and it wouldn't have been considered serious by those in charge.

Several years ago I was severely sexually harassed and the man was fired; however, the company rehired him in a different area. I was promised that would not happen. There was evidence and he even confessed but yet he was rehired. I have a very hard time trusting management personnel due to this.

I gave the faculty a harsh stare after he made the comments about women. He then stated that he guess he should not have said something like that. We resolved the problem ourselves.

I felt my response stopped the actions.

I wasn't sure if it was appropriate to complain about "just like a woman, bitching all the time" comments. Seemed petty to me but it definitely has affected my attitude and performance at work.

I would have placed myself and my job in jeopardy.

Most would consider "unwanted hugging" a minor offense.

This is not something that would probably be looked at by the administration as undesirable behavior. In fact, most of the female faculty would
respond "you have to pick your battles" and this would not be one of them to pick. But - I simply started calling him hot stuff etc back and its seems to be working

193. I didn't feel that it was needed.

194. I felt it was not necessary because it had no negative impact on my life.

195. not important.

196. i didn't think they could do anything about it.

197. I spoke directly to the person and they modified their behavior. It is no longer a problem.

198. There were the most minor forms of sexual harrassment and the touching may have been accidental.

199. The actions were irritating but I did not feel threatened.

200. Doesn't really matter its not like they are doing anything THAT bad.

201. I did not feel it was serious enough to put her in a situation that may end in termination.

202. would cause too much trouble

   a) it did not bother me enough to report it b) it was drivers passing by how could I identify them? I don't remember car types or license plate #s

203. I dealt with the incident myself by communicating with the person about how I felt about it. Problem solved.

204. Fear of losing job.

205. Needed the income.

206. I did report it to my superior but I did not ask for anything to be done. I felt I would handle it directly myself with an appropriate response if it happened again.

207. We didn't think it would be taken seriously.

208. It did not happen on campus and I am unsure if he was a Mizzou student although he claimed to be a grad student.
APPENDIX D
HATE CRIME SURVEY

“Please describe how this/these hate crime(s) has affected your daily life at MU.”

1. They were rare and didn't affect me much.

2. I am for more carefull about who I associate with. I segregate myself from the minority group that harrassed me.

3. I have not allowed it to get to me. I am the better person.

4. backrupcy loss of contact with my school

5. Made me nervous roaming freely on streets.

6. STUPIDITY OF OTHERS DOES NOT AFFECT MY LIFE. I HOLD MY HEAD HIGH

7. Institutional imposition of additional legal hurdles and requirements with corresponding expenses in order to try and mimic benefits enjoyed automatically by my straight coworkers.

8. Often I will not let anyone know that I am in a fraternity and will not wear my letters in class.

9. made me feel angry for a few days and wish that i had chosen another university to attend

10. I got over it. The class ended

11. Makes me nervous and I hate passing a group of young white men.

12. Lower gpa will never take classes from the communications dept. - when I had intended to minor there

13. it has made me somewhat paranoid and has definitely colored how I react to other MU students particularly white straight-appearing males. I often fear for my safety.

14. Not Applicable. Although I did receive numerous sexual harassment phone calls which resulted in a change of address. Fear. Frightened.

15. I do not allow them to govern my life

16. Created a tremendous amount of stress and anxiety in whether or not I would be able to continue to have a job in order to support my family.
17. I realized how "un-educated" some of our students can be.

18. little effect.

19. Note: this happened nearly 30 years ago when I was an MU student. It actually happened off-campus (though it started at edge of campus). The University police were involved so I am including it here. I was very agitated when people approached me unexpectedly from behind for a very long time. I became more untrusting of men though I eventually married a great one. I have always been thankful I was not killed--I think that helped me put the rape in perspective. I have been more watchful of my surroundings ever since--and that is a good thing. I don't believe it has really had any adverse effects on my life for many years now and (except for being very careful to avoid risky situations) I don't believe it affects my daily life at MU now. I do have concerns for my students' safety since I know only too well what kinds of things can happen to them.

20. Makes me and my family scared to venture out in the evenings or nights even for a casual walk. People say this is the USA but white people have no clue what it is like to be a racial minority in this country. It is awful. There is a lot of ignorance, apathy, insensitivity and craving for power/control in this culture. It is shocking. It has shown me how self-centered people here really are -- and also how incapable they are of adopting someone else's perspective. There needs to be a positive cultural revolution in this country.


22. It has made me reluctant to interact with my professional peers as they condemn what they do not perceive as valuable in the context of their established value set. It is frustrating to work in an environment that claims to promote/celebrate diversity while on a non-official level it vehemently attacks any activity it perceives as not falling in line with their established worldview.

23. It pisses me off that MU lets any religion hand out fliers and speak in the circle. Mostly Christian religions will tell you that you are going to hell if you don't take their flier or attend their church. I'm Cherokee and I'm not going to take any of their fliers or their talk of going to hell so if they yell at me I'm going to yell right back.

24. Male faculty especially likes to intimidate women. I tend to be nervous when doing my job because they will try to get you fired if you make them angry.

25. it made it difficult to focus or care about anything that used to be important to me. it almost killed me.

26. It causes concern and alarm and is in general an unsafe and unhealthy work environment.
27. it just upsets me that people are so cruel

28. When the U S was in Irac, two Irac students were in the same hallway I was working in and one of them spit on me and kept walking.

29. It made me very cautious at each corner. Also, HATE crimes require a great deal of courage or stupidity. I believe that it is the overall acceptance of differences at ole MU that need to be questioned.
APPENDIX E
HATE CRIME SURVEY

Please describe the response from any university official with whom you discussed this/these hate crime(s).

1. Again, they were shocked. It took place following the Sept. 11th attack so everyone was still in shock from that.

2. They allowed me to drop one of my classes even though it was past the drop date.

3. They would say they would meet with my lawyer and not meet with him.

4. SYMPATHETIC, BUT NOTHING CAN BE DONE.

5. Powerlessness to effect change at best, deferral to "federal law" as an excuse at worse.


7. I have never talked about it to anyone.

8. I was told that the person who had done this had been with the University for many years and that it was just the way she was. That she had too many "higher up friends" on campus to really do anything about her and that hopefully she would retire soon.

9. Seemed to think it absurd that a minority attack on a caucasian is a hate crime. Although a caucasian attack on a minority would certainly be considered a hate crime.

10. I escaped and was able to get to a house to phone police. Response from University and Columbia police was rapid. I will always be greatful to the late Sgt. Mick Deaver, who handled the case with great diligence and sensitivity and who was very reas.

11. When I called the police officer, she asked me if my family spoke English and if we were US citizens. I knew right away that these were illegal questions by some hill-billy gal. However, I was appalled that an officer of the law would be so insensitive to these issues. Nothing came of my report -- not even a visit or a follow up call or a patrol car. I won't call them again unless my house burns down or I am shot by the nazis and kkk in this country. Sucks.

12. Supportive.

13. They were nice to me, but we couldn't prove anything so it seemed hopeless.
14. Supervisor - "it is the nature of the job". Never any attempt to explain things to the general public or in the newspapers to clear our name. We are somehow "expected" to take the abuse and harassment without any response or emotion.
APPENDIX F
HATE CRIME SURVEY

“If you did not report this incident please describe your reason(s).”

1. I wasn't sure who to speak to.

2. You think Holsoff or Bond give a shit?

3. They'd probably laugh and think I should have tougher skin.

4. they stopped and i wasn't sure anything could be done

5. because it was just some jackass giving me trouble for being catholic while all of the stuff in the news is happening. also<comma> the guy is a creditless drug addict

6. I could not remember what any of them looked like and just wanted to forget about it.

7. I don't know. Perhaps it was that I felt humiliated and angry. My initial reaction involved violent thoughtsand I think that hoping to forget about it would just make it pass. But it certainly left an impression. Maybe it was because I figured that tghis kind of interaction was inevitable.

8. lack of confidence in self. my own fault.

9. It was not reported because no one believes hate crimes exist against white people and are often ignored. If a white person does complain<comma> you are perceived as a bad person and a racist. This is reinforced by this survey. It only lists minority complaints and does not address EVERYONE.

10. Because of the above reason stated....

11. didn't report. What good would it do? The Grievance procedure starts with your supervisor. The supervisor in MOST cases is the CAUSE of the problem.

12. There is no good reason for not reporting something like this!


14. There is no desire to enforce the same codes of behavior across all political lines. Probing questions regarding this incident were met with ridicule and condemnation<comma> so I did not bother to take the issue further.

15. No one gives a damn....if you are not in the majority in religion you are just overlooked

16. Noone cares<comma> my boss is a man and has no respect for women either.
17. <br> <br> Because I was told to ignore it. And the public does not care what I have to go through to do my job, it is generally felt that Police Officers are fair game for harassment and assault; they can not respond to media "half truths" by telling the truth. We have to sit with our teeth clenched shut and wait for our day in court to get the truth out there after my name is drug through the mud. There is not a follow up story at the end that explains that the original one sided media story was not the whole story.

18. There was not enough evidence to file a report.

19. I could not point out he students and I didn't know where they went. They walked away very fast.

20. It happened too fast to get the license plate number. Also I was younger and not nearly as persistant as I am now.
APPENDIX G
HATE CRIME SURVEY

“Please describe how witnessing this hate crime has affected your daily life at MU.”

1. I just think it's ignorant, and don't fall into it.

2. These affected me more than anything I've ever experienced.

3. Just makes me reluctant to expand my friend base to other groups of people.

4. I only heard of it. But the thought of Homphobia on this campus made me realize how closed minded many people still are. And how sad and upset that makes me feel.

5. I hate people speaking in one way and doing another way. Like Americans, they often say they are not racial discrimination. In fact, they are.

6. Made me more aware of my personal sexual orientation and ethnicity, but did not affect my daily life much except expanded sympathy for those that must deal with adversity.

7. It is disturbing to know that hate crimes are taking place in Columbia.

8. OPENED MY EYES TO SUCH A "LIBERAL" CAMPUS.

9. This has made me aware to not make myself a target by being too noticable.

10. Always on the look out for threatening situations.

11. Well I found that at MU it seem ok for African Americans to pick on white males. A white male sat down with us at the brady food court and some of the others ran him off with threats and pushing. They told him that little white %ucks were not welcomed.

12. Often I will not let anyone know that I am in a fraternity and will not wear my letters in class.

13. angering

14. Since seeing this incident when I was a child, I am more considerate of other people's feelings.

15. My friend told me about some boys in a car who tried to run her off the road while she was riding her bike home from work. They yelled "dike!" and she actually fell off her bike into a ditch. This incident made me become more careful and paranoid about walking and/or jogging around the campus and town.
16. It makes me fearful of what I say, not just at MU but in Columbia in general. It makes me worry about some of my friends.

17. I don't like seeing it, especially since my only observation has been vandalism. That seems like such a cowardly way to confront people who are different from yourself (not that I think anyone should take more serious steps!). It just shows insensitivity, immaturity, and ignorance on the part of the one doing the vandalism.

18. I did not witness this at MU, so it does not affect my life at MU.

19. It made me pray for both parties involved because I felt sorry for the people who felt like they had to be mean and for the people taking the verbal harassment.

20. It didn't happen on campus, but I have a strong dislike for people that participate in hate crimes. They are silly and unnecessary. No one should be judged by another in that way.

21. I hear about it so much happening else where. It did not affect my daily life, but if it was a personal friend it may have.

22. It has just made me more aware of my surroundings and what is occurring on campus.

23. Unfortunately, being a white male, witnessing incidences that might be construed as hate crimes does not phase me that much. I am neither racist nor sexist. I saddens me to see these events but I realize that others are not raised in open environments. I blame the people that commit the hate crimes but I also blame the environment.

24. I was shocked and it opened my eyes to others' perspectives.

25. It has soured my opinion of the Greek system.

26. It has just made me aware of the intolerance of some people.

27. Did not occur at MU.

28. It has made me less trusting.

29. not at all.

30. It didn't change me that much because it is clear that there is a significant proportion of the population here that is racist, sexist, homophobic, etc (prejudiced). You can see it everyday in the way people act and in what they say.
31. We live in the South and that means there is a great deal of intolerance and ignorance here. I try and work to neutralize this.

32. I think that people are so intolerable of anything that is out of their norm. I don't feel safe to offer my opinion about anything for fear of someone not agreeing and taking physical action.

33. It made me think that there are some major assholes out there. There was a man in speakers circle arguing with a Muslim student and telling her that she was going to hell because of her beliefs.

34. It hasn't really affected my daily life. It just made me very upset that people are so ignorant.

35. It made me disappointed and ashamed to be apart of a student body that cannot/will not respect each others' differences. It also creates for a very tense learning environment.

36. It makes me shy from association with those types of people sometimes to the point where I don't like to go out to certain clubs because of the types of people that go there.

37. Made me realize that not everyone may be accepting of me and other groups.

38. just more aware

39. It makes you think a little bit more

40. It hasn't. I have been brought up to respect people even if I don't agree with their beliefs sexual orientation or religion. We are human beings and deserve each other's respect.

41. Makes me more aware of what I think and how I behave. Makes me more outspoken that such things should not be tolerated. I tend to try to gain knowledge of others believes and views. I think that ignorance about people beliefs and backgrounds is a big contributor to fear.

42. It makes me sad that some of my co-workers can be so narrow-minded. I am not that affected by their actions but I do not get very involved with these co-workers on a personal basis. As a result I am perceived as rather aloof.

43. It makes me believe that hate crimes against non-minority's are ignored and swept under the rug.

44. It makes me stay aware of my surroundings

45. Again I felt MU was an intolerant environment.
46. I have worked with the LGBT Resource Center to affect change in the entire residence hall. I am very aware of my surroundings as a result of this incident.

47. It was two black men threatening a white man with violence simply because he was white. The incident caused me to be more careful about walking alone at night on campus.

48. Very stressful. Created a major distrust among colleagues. Was not conducive to a warm work-together for the good of the organization atmosphere.

49. It didn't I just take these things as a fact of others lives

50. I don't let it interfere.

51. Made me very angry and I went out of my way to tell the person/persons who were effect by the hate and verbal hate that not all persons feel that way and I don't feel that way. (It was during the 9/11 tragedy)

52. I don't let people get to know me any more so that the things I have witnessed will not happen to me.

53. little effect

54. depressing

55. It made me question the safety of my friends on campus and has made me more suspicious of people in general.

56. It hasn't affected my daily life but it made me very upset at the time.

57. It makes me more aware of my surroundings and limits my ability to trust others sometimes.

58. I just observed it.

59. It pissed me off that someone could be so mean

60. It did nothing to change my perception of the campus if people wish to act like children there is not much that can be done. Such passive-aggressive homosexual bashing is not acceptable but there is little that can be done by an outsider to the situation.

61. It made me even more determined to be aware of the varied attitudes and behaviors of the people I see around my department and work with. If you are perceptive you can get a basic understanding of who the bigots homophobes
misogynists and racists are in your daily life. Several times I've found myself letting someone know that "Hey as a feminist - that offends me"... or even "Do you realize I'm a lesbian?" just to let them know that seemingly random remarks are harmful and someone in their professional circle is listening who is offended by certain behaviors and expressed attitudes. A lot of people back down and shut up when they realize I'm not afraid to stand up look 'em in the eye and say "Hey that stupid comment you just made applies to me dummy"

62. Makes me vigilant.

63. I saw this hate crime at my friend's apartment and it really scared me b/c I didn't think that happened as often at MU.

64. Made more aware of problems in current society.

65. It didn't

66. On a car someone wrote "stupid niggers" that was parked outside a residence hall.

67. I was scared because it happened at a party. The people were drunk so i shrugged it off and it affected me only a little.

68. has not

69. not much

70. It makes me mad.

71. it hasn't

72. It made me realize that there are a lot more closed-minded people in the University that I thought. It made me less naive.

73. I do not judge people by their looks but by their actions. People dress and look differently by choice but you can't make assumptions that an individual is racist or judgemental. Being unique is what makes everyone individual. I try not to view one person according to their race. I view everyone as equal and as a friend unless they give reason otherwise like making unnecessary verbal comments or gestures.

74. I have come to actually expect people to hate me because of the color of my skin almost. This not only comes from MU but from society in general.

75. It made me realize that discrimination is still a major problem.

76. Made me think about how ignorant people in this world can be.
77. This fight did not happen at MU. It happened a long time ago. It was between 2 different people who couldn't understand the language of the other.

78. I wouldn't say that it has affected my daily life, but it does make me angry that some people are not accepted into certain groups or positions based on the color of their skin or their racial background.

79. I am concerned for my friends that are homosexual—I do not feel that they are safe on campus if their sexual orientation is known.

80. While I was not an eyewitness, the student told me she was scared to prosecute because the boy was rich but that she told University officials what had happened and because of it the school expunged her 0.0 GPA for that semester. She did not seek outside counseling and eventually left MU.
APPENDIX H
HATE INCIDENT SURVEY

“Please describe how this/these hate incident(s) has affected your daily life at MU.”

1. I know that it's only a small minority of people who feel this way towards women so it doesn't tend to bother me.

2. It made me decide not to be open about my sexuality because I figured it would cause too many problems and possibly harassment. It also made me think about how often people offend others and never even realize it.

3. They didn't.

4. It made me rethink whether this was the right university for me and made me more aware of my race on this campus.

5. I have to deal with the fact that I'm black every single day unlike white people. Sometimes I get angry sometimes I think it's funny. Sometimes I just let it go sometimes I have to vent. I remember during a intramural basketball game at the Student Rec Center our team was all African American and the other team was white. The scorekeeper was white and he did everything in his power to make sure the white team won. He stopped the clock for their free throws but he wouldn't stop the clock for ours. Sometimes he wouldn't add the points when we scored and once he even added the points we scored to the other side. It was very frustrating having someone supposed to be neutral working against us. But we ended up winning anyway. Still the bad thing about was the scorekeeper got away with it. Last I checked cheating was an offense.

6. I am intimidated by some of the African American males on this campus b/c of this incident.

7. it's the same everywhere

8. It makes being around the particular person a bit uncomfortable but I just avoid topics that would set him off and it seems to work well enough.

9. The incident occurred at the Student Health Center. It was a remark made by a nurse there. I was going to be treated and noticing I was Asian the first statement she made was "Do you speak English well?" This offended me greatly because of the sheer ignorance with which the statement was made. These incidents do not occur often but it shocked me that someone who encounters so many students per day could be so stupid.

10. People are going to dislike others differences. There is no way around that. Even if one racial group was the only one left they would find silly ways to discriminate
against each other. Your empowerment comes from understanding what makes you strong.

11. I am more cautious when I approach a group of Anglo students and I am cautious when discussing "sensitive" topics in class.

12. Didn't affect me at all. Never lost sleep over it and never will.

13. It was uttered by a person of great power in my workplace in front of my coworkers and so I have felt uncomfortable in my workplace.

14. I was excluded from academic life.

15. These incidents do not normally affect my daily life at MU.

16. They haven't affected me at all but it is disturbing to realize how close minded some of the people at MU are when it comes to government and policy.

17. My race has become a salient factor during my time at Mizzou. Casual remarks are made and my racial membership has been publicly ridiculed. It has made me conscious of my racialized existence and affected my behavior.

18. This happened when I was a graduate student many years ago. The jokes were made by my advisor and supervisor. Because of their behaviors I limited the amount of communication I had with him.

19. Just makes me afraid to be myself but I don't think everybody needs to know I'm a lesbian.

20. It made me realize that some people were to be avoided. I was the target of gossip where this individual claimed that my husband beat me because men of our ethnicity were violent (even though I have never been beaten or even threatened) and claimed other horrible things about me. She also said many things that were untrue concerning me as she perceived my 'race' and 'religion'.

21. As with the sexual harassment...I have learned to cringe-and-bear-it.

22. I will often not let anyone know that I am in a fraternity and will not wear fraternity letters on campus.

23. The incidents made me feel conspicuous that I needed to blend better to avoid these people/sentiments. They both occurred during a summer when I took courses at MU before I was staff so they didn't have a great effect on my daily life at MU--I was only on campus a few hours 3 times a week and I knew I'd soon be gone.
24. I'm more cautious around that individual.

25. I was offended and upset that someone could have such a narrow mind.

26. Unfair work distribution in amount and type of work assigned. Did not have the boss's "ear" concerning work issues. Double standard of work expectations. Double standard of job evaluation. Made to feel that my abilities were less valuable and less acceptable than a man's. Daily put down comments or jokes etc.

27. Generally these are the types of things that I either read in the Maneater or see written on the wall of the bathroom.

28. They made me aware of prejudices against Catholics. Those opposed to Catholicism became more vocal with the recent scandals involving Catholic priests.

29. I prayed for these people.

30. It lowered my self-esteem and made me afraid to walk on campus in the evenings

31. Very suspicious of management intentions and true goals. Watch what is done/said very closely around certain female peers.

32. It doesn't at all. It has nothing to do with MU; it's just the way our culture is working right now.

33. It simply irritates me. I am a christian and it seems as if many people think that it's okay to bash christianity or mock it simply because it is the predominant religion in the area. I would never disrespect the Muslim religion or the Jewish religion but if I or anyone else for that matter were to make rude generalizations or to mock the their followers it would definitely been considered bigoted and hateful(as it should). However I hear a lot of people mock christianity what I believe in right in front of me and it actually is offensive.

34. I was disappointed for several days and sometimes lost my focus on my job.

35. Being a proponent of free speech I laugh most instances like these off as enlightened individuals who hold nothing sacred. Unfortunately most of these instances are probably misconstrued as hate incidents. They did not affect my daily life at MU.

36. I have a very strong social support network so these incidents concern me and I remain alert to them I am not directly affected by them.
37. It made me very aware that I at any time could be discriminated against. This is a fact of life for me being an African-American woman in America. I went on with my daily life normally but I was extremely disturbed by the incident being a freshman away from home for the first time.

38. It doesn't affect me at all because I knew that MU has a known reputation of being a racist campus before I came here and the worst part about this campus is that for the amount of money we pay to go here some of the professors (Caucasian) are racist too...but I will remain here and I know where I stand on this campus and I won't allow anyone to make me believe any different.

39. It doesn't really affect my daily life. It's been that way for as long as I can remember

40. I am more careful of what I say to people and I am more aware of what and who is around me.

41. I feel insecure in expressing ideas or values for fear of being harassed for them.

42. I can point out daily incidents where my membership as a female who is an ally to the LGBT community is not welcomed.

43. It destroyed my confidence and hurt my feeling.

44. It didn't I just went on

45. They did not affect me at all because I am bigger than that

46. They made me question how I might be affected by such behavior and made me strive to keep an even more open mind and heart.

47. The LGBT some religious organizations have NOW and other various organizations have poor opinions of Catholics.

48. I wanted to slap the young men that hung the flag.

49. I don't trust people

50. I felt like I was not a member of the MU community.

51. Made me annoyed of immature people with immature notions about immature topics of discussion. I think children should be better educated on religious matters. No dogma. Just education. That little campus crusader really annoys me with his pompous immature mimicked notions of what/who god is.

52. It doesn't bother me too much. I don't take a lot of things personally
53. I try not to think about it but if I am upset enough I will write a letter to the organization.

54. All this mostly occurred off campus. I kind of felt more safer on campus.

55. These incidents have truly opened my eyes as to how callous and cruel some people can be. I grew up in an environment where race wasn't that big of an issue but after these incidents I scrutinize people more often and I'm less trusting of others.

56. It makes me wary of who I trust.

57. For the most part I realize that there are certain small minded people that are simply not going to change their mind - I try not to let incidences like these change my attitudes or affect my daily life but that can be a challenge. I've heard students and even teachers that have made insensitive remarks and it does make me feel uncomfortable. For the most part I learn to deal with it.

58. They create an uncomfortable environment not conducive to learning and generally give me the impression that I am neither welcome nor altogether safe at MU.

59. It happens to everyone. People need to quit excluding and blaming others. I live with it and try not to do the same to others who are different from me.

60. This happened to me on this campus in 1970. It was an anti-Vietnam war protest staged over by the Memorial Union by MU students and other non-MU student groups. I found the demonstration to be very offensive and from that point forward stayed away from ANY gatherings or protests. I took this behavior very personally and never forgot the incidents. Consequently I seldom join in any gatherings that involve highly controversial discussions.

61. I started doubting myself. I became very conscience of every interaction with minorities. As I deal with a very large diverse population of the university including faculty and staff I started scrutinizing my every action. I have always believe rules and procedures must apply to all without regard to gender and ethnic background. I started treating minorities preferentially but that is wrong. I also felt that since the faculty member was gay/black my supervisor was backing him because of his minority status and because he was a faculty member to be protected.

62. It depends on the source. I've become increasingly confident in speaking out when people tell offensive jokes or make remarks or gestures. If something in print offends me I will usually write a letter to the editor. Public displays of object signs & symbols is much harder to address. If someone wears a symbol that's offensive or displays it in his or her work area I'm a lot less comfortable addressing that so I tend to avoid the person altogether.

63. I do not let them rule my day.
64. MU sucks. I just realized it while I was filling out this survey.

65. resentment and anger

66. I'm used to jokes by now. Not much affect at all.

67. It has not affected my daily life.

68. I changed jobs because of this.

69. Created a very negative impression of the department director and other staff involved.

70. I work in an office with people who are very loud about their religious beliefs. These people/particular person have contributed to making working here very difficult. On a regular basis I hear them describe how people who are different from them (i.e., non-Baptists, vegetarians, gays/lesbians) are wrong and in trouble with "God." There have been many days when I have found it difficult to stay at work the entire day after listening to some diatribe against gay people. It is one of the most intolerant places I have ever worked. My bosses are great but they do not do anything about this situation. I am using these people as motivation to go back to school!

71. Other than not receiving a raise for four years, it created a lot of stress and tension at work and at home.

72. I got irritated and angry. I broke off ties with several people because of various incidents. I left the program I was involved in (for many reasons, including the nasty atmosphere.)

73. I have become more cautious and try to make sure that I document things more thoroughly and act professionally (if not try to imitate male behavior which has resulted in being aware of the double standard of male equals assertive female equals bitch). I honestly dislike working here and feel often as if I could cry or even just explode at any moment.

74. I get mad and try to educate people that this kind of incident really hurts and it's wrong.

75. I was annoyed by assumptions about my beliefs and at times wary of how I was responded to.

76. It made me feel very sad that people could be so mean.

77. made me aware of being "other" not fully included in campus community

78. I dropped out of everything. I come and do my work, stay to myself, and leave as soon as I can.
79. It certainly made that class very uncomfortable. This person was a member of a minority group and had a chip on his shoulder about people who were white. Every comment he made in class (and they were all made at the top of his voice) was about how terrible white people were and how their experiences weren't valid because they had no minority point of view.

80. I realized "how un-educated" some of the students can be.

81. Although this person is not my boss I have to share space and I have felt uncomfortable when he makes jokes about different ethnic groups, people from other states and jokes related to alcohol and mental illness. Overall he is just very insensitive to the employees.

82. I feel continuously targeted and attacked as a middle class white male.

83. The e-mails and face-to-face conversations threatened continued employment and I lost my job. (See above under sexual harassment because the incidents were linked.)

84. It makes teaching certain groups of students challenging.

85. I know I cannot depend on certain people to include me in activities. I have to find out through third parties and show up.

86. It's just a part of life. One that makes me angry (as a woman) that there exists advertising on campus (ads in the Maneater etc.) that objectifies women. Also even though your survey doesn't consider being Christian a min

87. I have witnessed people that have been discriminated because of their race and/or language barrier.

88. The girls in the dorm next to mine made a lot of offensive comments about me being white and hanging out with african-american males that lived in my dorm. I became wary of them in the lounge dining hall etc. it made my attitude toward them worsen but for the most part i just tried to ignore their "white girl" remarks.

89. It really didn't change anything. I have seen the same behavior in Highschool.

90. I shrug it off.

91. Be more careful and try to hide the accent.

92. It has made me cautious in my work with others.
93. Makes me more aware of my surroundings and less trust worthy of others.

94. It made me become even less involved in the daily life at MU. I became even more self-conscious and introverted because of these incidents.

95. A member of our staff used to call me Pedro. This was derisory and unwelcome.

96. It effects me every day because the person(s) making the comments are still here; plus these types of comments are made all the time by others in many parts of society.

97. It irritates me to hear people of various standings including professors make comments regarding religion especially as if there aren't any people left that ARE very into their religions.

98. It makes me cautious and more aggressive about my beliefs on equality.

99. For example it is unpleasant to have people yelling stuff out of car window at me either because I'm a woman or because I'm a lesbian. I've experienced both. It makes me feel unsafe and more cautious and vigilant. In fact all of the things I've experienced have made me feel unsafe.

100. I know that I am in a minority; that's not a problem. The "hate incidents" serve as a reminder that not everyone is aware that religious minorities exist that not everyone is Christian--and that we don't believe we're damned to hell because of it!

101. I just ignore them for the most part it is not my problem.

102. None of the hate incidents I have experienced at MU rise beyond the level that I would expect to find in the community at large. In fact I think MU is freer of such incidents than the community at large. They haven't much affected my MU experience.

103. It just bothers me that almost anyone can go into speakers circle and hand out fliers condemning others peoples thoughts and actions....it is just not right

104. no substantive impact

105. This can be pervasive among some groups. But fortunately the groups of people I associate with are tolerant people. But nevertheless graffiti nasty jokes vulgar gestures are all there. As students mature

106. made me fill miserable
107. When I see hate graffiti (which is almost daily) I get angry. I wonder why I should feel threatened in the place in which I work. I also wonder why it takes so much time to get it removed.

108. It causes concern and alarm and is in general an unsafe and unhealthy work environment

109. a feeling of alienation

110. made me feel uncomfortable around certain people

111. makes me feel not wanted here at Mizzou

112. Minimal impact. I continue to practice my religion and try to treat everyone with dignity and respect.

113. They don't terribly affect me. I take the opportunity to dispel whatever preconceptions people have about me.

114. They have not affected life at MU. I tend to ignore these sorts of incidents.

115. it made me realize in an institute of higher learning there are a vat array of morons

116. I completely shut down and do not involve myself in much of the MU professional or social activities.

117. generally created a climate of distrust and varying degrees of anger.

118. I hesitate to say that this is a "HATE" incident but in the fact that there was explicit insensitivity and intolerance to the beliefs of others I feel this was a genuinely hostile environment in which to place employees. I found the environm

119. I feel much more comfortable with those who look like me.

120. I don't let such things as people's attitude toward my faith affect my daily life. People are entitled to their opinions and I am entitled to evaluate such opinions and get on with my life.

121. I had to move out of my dorm room during my Freshman year for a month.

122. It showed me that there are some very racial insensitive people here on Campus way more than I had thought on a Campus that prides itself as being Diverse.
123. I felt happy that someone actually thought I was indeed a "Jesus Freak" though I got upset at the "Fuck You". It wasn't that bad. I did not report it and I accidentally marked question number 7.

124. For the most part I didn't really feel affected by these incidents until recently when I was in a situation that could affect my grade and that to me was really disturbing.

125. Did not.

126. Racism and other forms of hateful expression are an unfortunate part of life. Blatant hate incidents that I have experienced at MU are few. The atmosphere however is charged with animosity.

127. Frustrated me because I did not know how to respond without sounding defensive (the person would have said it was just a joke).

128. I have been made to feel inadequate and incompetent.
APPENDIX I
HATE INCIDENT SURVEY

Please describe the response from any university official with whom you discussed this/these hate incident(s).

1. They just say they will deal with it in the future

2. The supervisor talked with the employees and students.

3. My hall coordinator was very helpful.

4. In this particular case, back in those years, the right to demonstrate was fully supported by the University and police providing it was peaceful. What I experienced was the verbal barbs thrown at me by jerks who didn't understand or care what the Vietnam War was all about. They only went with the flow. Under that context I don't believe the University had any recourse and I've never held it against them.

5. I have not had to discuss any such incidents with my manager recently. I feel confident that with my current manager, I could have an open discussion and appropriate action would be taken. But about 15 years ago, a male coworker who was very hateful towards women lost his temper and physically threatened a woman. His supervisor and mine were both out of the building at the time. When they returned and several of us described what happened, they decided the woman who was threatened should take a couple of weeks off to let things calm down. The man was allowed to stay on the job. I don't think the incident was ever reported at a higher level.

6. I discussed the incident with my manager and with other managers in the department. There was no action taken. I felt that the problem was that I had to be more tolerant of the ignorance of others.

7. There was no response. Basically, I need to deal with it.

8. Denial that the situation existed; he (new supervisor) is male and is one of the people who has made certain gender-biased comments as well as comments that people without children should be the people working the extra (unpaid) hours. He said so laughing although it wasn't funny and I said so! Another coworker who constantly makes sure we know he has "higher up's" ear (which is hard to know for sure - he has communication with that person has made offensive comments towards people with disabilities. When I need to provide services in my job for people with disabilities, I have had to do extra work, research, and calling of HR to make sure appropriate accommodations are made.

9. Showed understanding, did nothing, based on my verbal report, even I have written proof.
10. Everyone just sort of accepts his jokes since he is a Director. I don't think that anyone feels empowered to talk to him about this.

11. It was suggested that I should leave if I was "unhappy." When I did not quit, my work evaluation was falsified with the knowledge of the Unit leader (I refused to sign it) my work was plagiarized and the harassment increased in intensity. My associate in the same program (also a woman) suffered through the same treatment and also lost her job. We were both told by our immediate supervisor that he was "surprised that we stood it as long as we did" when he terminated us. We were also advised by numerous faculty members aware of the harassment that we would never get another job with the University if we complained even if our grievances were completely legitimate.

12. again i only discussed in class where the conversation was against this type of discrimination.

13. My supervisor at work promised to reprimand hospital co-workers for making offensive statements about gays and lesbians. In class I have discussed hate incidents on campus in an academic way and my professors have responded in academic ways.

14. The offensive remarks towards a non-native speaker or towards an atheist were perceived as acceptable and normal. Like: "we can't do anything about them" "you ARE a foreigner" "we live in a very conservative state were atheist ARE considered immoral"

15. Understanding but no action... problem seems much to pervasive to address directly.

16. There was no response really. My res. life hall advisor person put together some paperwork and due to the whole situation the person the incident was with (my roommate) was moved to another room at the end of the semester.

17. They are disbelieving and chose to ignore my comments.
APPENDIX J
HATE INCIDENT SURVEY

“If you did not report this incident please describe your reason(s).”

1. It didn't seem that important. You can't control people's opinions.
2. Didn't feel that it was worth the effort.
3. They weren't an issue.
4. Fear of having a stressful situation.
5. Honestly, I knew they wouldn't care. If the scorekeeper was going to get in trouble he would've got in trouble during the game. But no one said a word except us. But no one wanted to hear us. It is irresponsible and unjust behavior like that that makes me feel that white people can literally get away with murder on this campus. I know it's just an intramural game but cheating is a strong offense and anyone who does should be penalized no matter what color their skin is.
6. It was only two males so I figured that I probably wasn't the only girl they had made comments to and how would I be able to report two random guys that may or may not be in the same place by the time I had reported it.
7. nothing illegal
8. He has a right to express his views and have his biases just like I have a right to disagree. Plus he doesn't think he's being close-minded or bigoted because he's a "Liberal" and a scientist--and they are always unprejudice aren't they?
9. It was a small incident and has not occurred again. I didn't feel it was worth reporting.
10. I TA. The incidents in question have been students who either knowingly or unknowingly have criticized my religious beliefs. I do not discuss my beliefs with students. However because of how I dress some of them can figure out what I am. Because of the classes I teach my religion and some of the beliefs have come up. Students have felt free to call them "stupid" etc. Why don't I report it? Well one I since I am the one in charge of the class it would appear rather whinny. Two it would then open me up to accusations of pushing my religion down other's throats even though I never bring up the subject in classes. Three I want to still be seen as a person and not that (fill in name of religion) TA.
11. The major incident involved the MU police intimidating a group of African-American male undergraduate students. Who polices the police?
12. It didn't bother to the point where I needed to involve the authorities. If there were serious threats made, then I would have told the police.

13. Fear of retaliation


15. There is no need. People can hate me for any reason they want. That is their right not to like me. The idea of a "hate incident" seems silly to me; "hate crimes" deserve attention...not something petty like snide remarks.

16. WHY WASTE THE TIME. NEVER TAKEN SERIOUSLY. CAMPUS POLICE BELIEVE IT IS A WASTE OF TIME

17. didn't feel like it

18. I did not know really what to do with this. When I found out some of the things that were being said, I tried to correct her, but she told people I was in denial. I eventually just tried to avoid her. I just didn't want to make waves.

19. I cannot afford to lose my job.

20. This university doesn't look kindly on fraternities or sororities. Often it does not allow our organizations the same privileges as other student groups - including funding, access to student databases, etc.

21. I didn't feel this was significant enough to report. It was something I was used to at the time.

22. It was a comment I overheard someone make. The individual who made it was not aware of my religious affiliation.

23. It was someone who I called a friend before, and who my friends were friends with. I thought it wasn't necessary, but I let him know how much it upset me.

24. I didn't feel that it was necessary.

25. It wasn't needed.

26. I was not aware of any policy of hate incident and though noone would understand or care.

27. Department was involved, re-org was occurring and was worried about my job. Other smaller issues regarding reverse discrimination against
males would be seen as weak and non-important vs. protecting possible female infringements.

28. Because it is way too pervasive to report every little thing that occurs and I don't really let them get to me.

29. I don't think that with my particular issue the people that offended me even realized that what they were doing was wrong. Therefore I stand up for myself when I can but there is no need in this circumstance to get anyone in trouble.

30. These types of incidents are pervasive. I feel like a little baby crying over spilled milk when I think about reporting such incidents. Comments about gays are made over the radio on television in the newspaper in textbooks and on posters. If I complained about every hate incident MU Police would have to create a special division to handle the case load.

31. I did not report the incident because it was on a weekend and on ninth street. There were very derogatory remarks yelled and screamed at myself and my friends walking back to the dorms. The guys were white and in a car and sped off. We did not even think about reporting the incident because we were in shock.

32. It doesn't really matter because most people are ignorant and I just move on. If I lived day by day worrying about what non-minorites think of me being here it would be a total waste of time.

33. Free Speech

34. They are frequent occurrences that result from misunderstanding I believe more often than outright hatred.

35. I was not aware there was a hate incident policy

36. First because of the language barrier I think I cannot win the argue with a native speaker. Second the hate came from a person who represented the government who is kind of in charge of my life here.

37. it wasn't a big deal just ignorant people making jokes

38. did not fell like it

39. The actions were too nonchalant might be too difficult to prove.

40. Freedom of speech and it doesn't really bother me to much

41. Others had already reported it.
42. I am not a wuss. It is just the burden of being a white American male

43. I was unaware of what to do when the incident occurred so I made no effort to report it.

44. I figure he will eventually see he is not making the world a better place by trying to CONVINCE people of things but see that it is better to openly discuss things with reason and without bias. Yes I know good luck with that. I must sound like more of an idealist than the CampusCrusader! There all doomed to die at their own hands. Filthy filthy humans. Nothing can help them.

45. It wasn't worth my time

46. You can report such things?

47. I did not believe anything would be done to help the situation.

48. I did not know to actually report offensive comments jokes flags etc.

49. People were already protesting and it wasn't being taken seriously.

50. Didn't feel it was necessary

51. Again I just felt that this was SOP in missouri and that it was something that i would just have to put up with.

52. it happens every day to everyone from every walk of life. get over it.

53. As I stated in #9 above it would have been futile and wouldn't have resulted in anything substantial. I can say that it gave me a better perspective on life and our human rights in this country. I stayed away from Providence Rd and Broadway on Wednesdays following the September 11 because I don't agree with Mark Haim and those folk's views on Afganistan. Like I said I stay away.

54. If your supevisor won't back you then my position at the university was at risk.

55. Because I'm a white male I would and have been ignored with my complaints.

56. I did not report the incident described above to a higher level because I believed that our supervisors should have done that. Today I would not hesitate to do that myself. In general as long as I do not feel threatened (or notice that anyone else feels threatened) I will first attempt to address the offender directly so that hopefully we will be able to improve our working relationship.

57. There doesn't seem to be much administrative or authoritative support.
58. Seemed silly and petty.

59. I did not report it because I did not have anything to back it up with.

60. The person was a supervisor and is perceived to be an ethnic minority.

61. I probably thought it wasn't my place to report an incident involving other people and no violence actually took place.

62. What could would it do to report it? The grievance procedure is set up in such a way that the supervisor is the first person to contact. The supervisor is generally always the problem in the first place.

63. Felt there was nothing I could do about it anyways. I wasn't physically threatened so I didn't think I had a case.

64. I know this is not a good way to think but I did not report the incidents because I know that reporting it will not change the way some people think and I know that nothing would ever happen.

65. General day-to-day comments and attitudes (how does one document attitudes?) are not things that can be documented easily. I am trying to keep records though.

66. It was reported by others who were offended by the act.

67. The incidents were in most regards unwitting and I saw little reason to pursue the issues.

68. remarks not significant enough to report -- no crime took place and remarks did not come from MU employee.

69. It's futile.

70. Nothing will be done about it since he has all of the power and makes it known that he has the power.

71. I am convince I will be seen as over-reacting if not ludicrous.

72. I choose my battles. This lack of sharing of information is an annoyance but there are bigger professional issues we are going to have to deal with here soon. It's not worth fighting over.

73. As I said above there is no recourse for low-grade hate against Christianity except the love of Christians toward others.
74. I informed my CA and she spoke to their CA about it and to them. As long as she knew about it and they knew she knew, I wasn't going to do anything else about it.

75. I am not going to waste my time on people like that.

76. It has to be extremely serious and affect once work and life significantly in order for me to report it.

77. Don't think it's necessary.

78. Felt like nothing would be done if the incident was reported.

79. I did not report it because I was embarrassed and felt that there was nobody at the law school administration with whom I felt comfortable enough to talk to about it.

80. I didn't want to become a target of others' comments or be accused of any additional untrue activities (see section on harassment).

81. What are they going to do? If there truly is a separation of church & state are they going to do away with all displays of xmas? If so then I'm the bad guy. And everyone here knows I don't celebrate xmas but I don't care if they do--why should I get hassled EVERY year?

82. Not that big of a deal. I stay strong in my beliefs and know that it doesn't matter what other people think of me.

83. I didn't see the point. I didn't think any University official would care or that they would see it as something out of their control and thus out of their jurisdiction.

84. I don't know that these "incidents" are against any policies and they are certainly not criminal--for example some people believe that Jews "killed" Jesus while others believe that Jews drink the blood of innocent children during Passover seders and therefore we are repugnant to them. Those folks are free to believe what they will no matter how ill-informed or prejudiced they might be.

85. Once again no one really cares if a church group or fraternity bothers you.....they put a lot of money into the univeristy through their programs so they are overlooked.

86. Although the jokes about Christians and Republicans from our faculty and even one dean in my school are extremely offensive and show a surprising intolerance and I do worry about impact on students I was too busy to worry about in proportion to the any potential harm caused to others. (And no harm to myself.) I have
also resolved to speak up if these occur in future and point out the apparent intolerance inherent in these offensive remarkis.

87. I don't think most people know that they could "report" a hate incident. I think most people unfortunately just put up with it. Sad but true.

88. I've almost become jaded... As if I expect this kind of crap from society on a daily basis.

89. Pointless. Again the police are expected to take crap off of people. I have learned to laugh at it now most of the time.

90. These instances are related to the backlash after 9-11 and hopefully are just an extreme situation. However ignorance about the outside world and other cultures and the reliance on violence to solve problems is so pervasive in official US policy that I do not consider this a problem MU alone can solve.

91. did not feel it was valid enough

92. There are too many to count and there is no way chance of getting anything done about it until peoples attitudes change

93. If someone hates me it's their problem not mine. I will recompense their behavior with love.

94. People make remarks regarding gays and lesbians without realizing they are talking to one. To report the incident would elevate it to a higher level than I feel it needs to be. If it bothers me enough I will tell the person I find it offensive. I am not concerned if any action I would take (directly with the individual(s) or via reporting) would reveal my sexual orientation.

95. Why should I? If by the time the people making these offensive remarks and gestures are in a college environment it is very doubtful their behavior will ever change nor will they ever want to learn anything beyond what is already programmed into their minds. The world is full of idiots and assholes and the only thing to do is learn yourself how best to deal with them.

96. It happens all the time and it is very difficult to prove.

97. well this section is about incidents which do not rise to the level of a crime which should be reported. generally speaking one can either ignore these incidents or point out their inappropriateness to the offender. i've done both.

98. I'm not sure that this was a "reportable incident..." Also I would have feared for the way I was perceived in that office.
99. It didn't seem worth reporting. If I did the only thing that I would get is a "Why this usually doesn't happen here." It does.

100. It's not that big of a deal. It's almost a compliment to a Christian to be called a Jesus Freak.

101. Thought it was an isolated incident.

102. Don't think that it would do a bit of good.

103. Felt uncomfortable reporting so as not to rock the boat but still feel "violated".
APPENDIX K
HATE INCIDENT SURVEY

“Describe how this/these hate incident(s) affected your daily life at MU.”

1. It didn't really affect my life very much. It is upsetting to know that some people still have prejudices, but I try to avoid such people.

2. I was simply shocked that the people performing this hate incident could be that immature.

3. My boyfriend took the sign down and made a point of letting everyone know that's wrong. It hasn't really changed me because I always knew certain people committed hate incidents but I still do not discriminate against any one.

4. It didn't really. It might bug me that people can be so hurtful towards each other, but I get over it.

5. They really don't affect my daily life. I see them and think it's sad that people do this to each other, but it doesn't necessarily involve me.

6. They haven't

7. It has made me more open to other ways of life and aware of what it would be like to have to defend yourself all the time. I don't feel threatened, but I get angry when one of my friends is badgered for being who he is.

8. It made me mad because they were voicing and trying to push their views on others when people like me were not and were subjected to listen to them.

9. I again just feel like it's overly negative and there's no need for it.

10. They made me feel bad but didn't affect me much.

11. It made me uncomfortable that people are so judgmental and do not respect others

12. Witnessing and hearing of my fellow minority students being ostracized, insulted, discriminated against and offended made me question why I even came here. It's really vexing to know that while I am here trying to be the best I can be that there are people who don't want me to be the best. There are people here who want to drag me down and see me fail. Just like with the incident at the game it's obvious that people here don't want to see us succeed. The only positive side about it is that it draws me closer to my people and makes me stronger.
13. It didn't really affect me other than I felt bad for the person but the person told the instigator off so she held her own.

14. It made me realize that some people are not as nice as they portray themselves to be.

15. They didn't really affect me because the occurred in passing. However I know to ignore the ignorant.

16. it's the same everywhere

17. It hurt me to see those people act in that way towards others. However it has not affected my everyday life here at MU.

18. It just makes me think of how hateful people can be.

19. made me angry


21. It upset me but it did not really effect me like it did others.

22. As a member of a "ethnic minority" I understand that my contributions to daily life at MU is viewed through various socio-economic and cultural lens. I interact in the majority culture world as necessary but I am not part of it.

23. No effect at all.

24. Didn't really affect my daily life

25. Do not...Did not occur on campus

26. Regarding areas near campus-I am also referring to the public display of hate towards Muslims and Arab Americans following 9/11 especially the harrassment that owners of Osama's coffee shop suffered.

27. They are upsetting in any community but especially in an academic one. Other than that there has been no direct effect on my daily life except that occasionally circumstance have been such that a response from me seemed useful in the situation.

28. It doesn't seem to be any worse here than other universities I've attended/visited.

29. Made me realize how obnoxious and hateful some students at MU could be (toward Asians) especially drunken young fraternity men.
30. It hasn't

31. this stuff happens everywhere

32. The incidents did not affect my daily life at MU much at all other than the disgust I felt after witnessing them.

33. Made me more sympathetic for those who dealt with it b/c of ethnicity but did not affect my views of those who were faced with incidents b/c of sexual orientation.

34. they had a chilling effect on participation in academic programs by African-American students. There was a significant erosion of trust between African-American students and other students and faculty.

35. I found the incident upsetting and wanted to distance myself from the individuals who made the offensive remarks.

36. It made me think about how society singles out individuals that it perceives as weak. How remarks even seemingly joking remarks can damage a person's self esteem and self worth.

37. Not at all.

38. Didn't

39. It is very unpleasant but doesn't really affect my daily life

40. As a gay man it certainly makes me think twice about how open I can be and what activities I can participate in and remain secure (personally and professionally).

41. It has not affected the day to day activities of my life. However it has made me a more aware friend and employee.

42. Same as always just put up with it.

43. Made me sad. We were handing out flyers for a christian meeting and my fellow peers would not hand them out to white males. (I did) one even took back a flyer that i had given to a white male.

44. I will often not let anyone know that I am in a fraternity and will not wear fraternity letters on campus.

45. I found that these incidents reminded me of the lack of acceptance that exists and they jarred me to work more to promote understanding and acceptance.
46. angering

47. The only affect it had on my daily life at MU is that I feel embarrassment for this American person who committed this hate incident and I am embarrassed that foreign people witnessed this.

48. I am personally offended by any show of hate. I find it especially offensive when it on the basis of something out of the other person's control such as their race. I don't want a person of a minority race to think that I am prejudiced against them just because some foolish people of my race participate in hate incidents.

49. Made me uncomfortable.

50. It just makes me not want to be here as I often feel that I have a minority view point. It also saddens me that so many people involved in education can have these totally ignorant views of other people and the world in general.

51. I did not feel secure in that working environment. I am glad I don't work for that individual any longer. I often spoke up and was made to feel like a 2nd class citizen for countering the status quo. And Man Eater is too sexually implicit and devalues women and sex by portraying them in a crude and base manner on a regular basis.

52. While I'm all for free speech and I'm not that big a fan of political correctness gone over-board, I think that we could all stand to be a little more sensitive of those around us. Perhaps not easy given the variety of ages, ethnicities, etc. on a large university campus.

53. I pretty much ignored it. I guess because it wasn't directed at me. However if I was on the receiving end I would have been quite hurt.

54. Again it didn't happen at MU but it makes me more aware of the stigmas that surround us.

55. I was filled with disgust and wanted to do say something to those who perpetrated the hate incident. Unfortunately I did not.

56. They didn't.

57. Disgust and anger. I speak out more for minority groups especially Asians trying to get people to understand what it's like from another country. I know a lot of Asians and have been in close contact with them for two years and people really don't understand what it's like for them. You hear about Black equality but not other minority groups. They get ignored.
58. Didn't affect my daily life but I found it very disgusting and was sad that such ignorant people could be a part of the university community.

59. I prayed for these people.

60. I unfortunately believe these activities are commonplace and that I am rather unaffected by them in my daily life.

61. greater awareness

62. They did not affect my life since it was not directed towards me<br><br><br>

63. It disgusted me and made me think about why people do what they do.

64. They've had very little effect on my daily life.

65. The incident made me reflect on my own behavior and question myself if I had ever inadvertently done the same thing. I was able to answer no fortunately but it really heightened my sense of awareness.

66. I am aware of it but I don't know how much I can actually do about it. I try to refrain from that type of activity and people associated with that activity.

67. Developed almost a hate for management learning to deal with it to keep level of income. I've been singled out as a trouble person for my views and passed over on several opportunities.

68. My life has not been affected but I look for it more often where I have seen it before.

69. Being a proponent of free speech I laugh most instances like these off as enlightened individuals who hold nothing sacred. Unfortunately most of these instances are probably misconstrued as hate incidents. They did not affect my daily life at MU.

70. Made me more vigilant in protecting my friends and family from such abuse.

71. It makes me wonder just how accepting this campus is toward ethnic diversity.

72. It isn't fair but it is how some people think. I don't know if there is a way to change it. Tolerance of everyone can be spread through each person's daily actions.

73. It's disappointing that people here are still sometimes as cruel and immature as a lot of high schoolers— it made me more aware of what certain people who even just seem homosexual can go through in the dorms for the amusement of others.
74. Well they happened between some people that I know and not towards someone to there face so it hasn't affected me too much.

75. do not affect my daily life but affect my friends

76. same feelings....Everyday we hear that MU's trying to make change there's no doubt that MU is different than 10 yrs ago but the people here really haven't changed much if so Why is there a minority version of every organization on this campus? Why aren't we allowed to participate in non-minority organization if we choose instead of those for minorities? I have heard cases where people knew they had the potential( very active on campus good grades) yet they were still turned away. I had a friend who was falsely accused of plagiarism just because her paper sounded to good to be true and she actually took time out to work so hard on the paper....so no I think MU hasn't changed much and still needs improvements

77. I was embarrassed to by going to the same school with the people making thoses remarks.

78. they dont effect me

79. Again...poor opinion of Greek system.

80. Well currently on some days informal speeches are given which make muslims feel unwelcome at Speaker's circle offensive graffitti towards all groups..including dorm living residents are found in all campus bathrooms except for the main floor memorial union south bathroom outside jesse wrench audotorium...and greek fraternities and sororities CONSISTENTLY every year exclude members who are not like them in appearence class background or racial group from their organization and activities. They make the campus very unfriendly very unwelcoming and lead me to be inclined to NEVER give any donations in the future as an alumnus.

81. It hasn't.

82. I think those responsible are a part of an infectious social and cultural disease. It ticked me off.

83. Not greatly.

84. It made me more aware of all around me.

85. At certain times there are speakers at various locations on campus who are speaking out. Some of this material is offensive to me especially the religious speakers. I don't like having to walk past these people in order to get to class.
86. It upset me because it upset my friend so much. It made me a bit more aware of some of the things people say and perhaps their intentions behind them.

87. I think that it is sad. Even if people hold bigoted and ignorant ideas I don't understand why they feel that need to share them or force them on others.

88. did not occur at MU

89. They made me disappointed in my fellow students and made me wish that there was something I could do to change the offender's behavior.

90. I experienced some other students displaying and discussing pornographic materials and telling sexist jokes. I feel like it degrades the status of women at Mizzou and makes it seem like Mizzou is full of a bunch of rude boorish good old boys.

91. It made me angry that people would behave like that--it seemed very immature. I expected the level of thinking at a university to be much higher and the ignorance of people who commit hate crimes/incidents surprise me.

92. it makes me upset when i see the lack of tolerance and acceptance here at MU. We take pride in our accomplishments but often fail to recognize the negative climate towards certain groups here on campus.

93. It is the same as hate crimes. They are a way of life in mid-Missouri.

94. It makes the campus seem less hospitable. although the incident was not directed towards me it saddens me deeply to see the way others are treated and the apparent lack of recourse these individuals have.

95. Not very much since I am not directly affected I try not to think about it too much.

96. Sometimes I feel i am nothing here.

97. It makes me feel like people can't be who they are or who they want to be because someone somewhere will take offence and revenge.

98. They made me lose a lot of respect for the people who made the comments.

99. Doesn't

100. it didn't

101. Not very much once again. Once you lower yourself down to their level you are no good as them
102. Made me strive to be more tolerant.

103. Like always when I see this kind of behavior, it causes me to doubt mankind. It just disappoints me greatly.

104. Only one of the incidents occurred since I joined the faculty here and it was unrelated to the University. I found each of the incidents very distasteful. It left me in a ethical dilemma wondering how I should react—whether to condemn the jokes, gestures, and speech; walk out; or what.

105. I'm not sure they really bothered me. Hate incident is fairly strong if not unfair language. The people that do the 'hate incident' are usually ignorant but it's their freedom.

106. Did not effect me but made me realize the views of the people/department that made those comments.

107. I was nervous that this would blow up to a big public incident. It did catch the media's attention.

108. I don't trust or respect the people who made the remarks.

109. It created a debate in one of my classes. Other than that it didn't affect me. It made me more aware.

110. not much

111. I feel sympathy for the victims and a connection that has lead to friendships.

112. They didn't really. Some people are just small-minded fucks.

113. Same as my remark about hate crimes.

114. They haven't affected me personally although they do bother me.

115. They didn't really affect my life.

116. I take it and walk on. I know my place in life and it doesn't include those who make remarks or hateful actions.

117. Life is too short to be so pity.

118. Not very much.

119. These incidents just show me that even students that are as educated as to attend a university are still quite ignorant. It upsets me.
they made me feel uncomfortable and angry at the people who were untolerant of others.

they didn't

The offensive phrases didn't bother me because of their commonplace status in today's popular music but I saw a Confederate flag hanging in a window in campus and this made me feel uncomfortable.

The hate incidents did not have a direct effect on me personally. I have only witnessed these accounts. It is sad that this is still going on in today's society.

It didn't affect me personally other than causing sympathy for the victims.

not at all

As I said before I try not to let them affect my daily life but it is hard to constantly brush off the remarks and messages. Has somewhat affected my comfort level.

I just felt bad for the person experiencing it but I didn't have any long lasting repercussions or anything.

The residence halls are a challenging place for our minority students on a regular basis--this incident simply reminded me that this was true and how much work we have yet to do as a community.

It didn't. To be honest some minority groups behave in such a way that they ask for it. Not that it is right to do but sequestering oneself does put that person(s) in a position to be jeered or poked fun at.

Do not affect me greatly just think they are a shame and very ridiculous

It made me aware that there were people directly around me everyday that were open with their hate. I didn't take it personally however and I forgave the person that felt this way because I couldn't do anything about it. If it happened to me personally I probably would have taken action.

My friends and I are used to the unfair treatment so we just deal with it. we don't complain. we don't protest. we just try not to do the same to others.

I am disappointed in the individual who makes those comments. I respect them a lot less.
134. not a whole lot

135. This was an anti-gay issue and very isolated. It didn't affect my life at MU at all.

136. I dreaded coming to work each day because it occurred on a daily basis.

137. Occurred many years ago - no current impact.

138. Just helps me to be more tolerable.

139. didn't

140. Looking at a little graffiti or a few signs don't have a lot of effect on my life. If I lived in a place where there was a lot of this garbage around, I would probably move. One of the reasons I live in Columbia is that it is a relatively good place to live.

141. It saddened me and agrieved me that people are so mean. I was spent mental time consumed with it rather than mental time working.

142. Didn't really affect my daily life, but made me angry that people can be so rude, also sad for the victims.

143. Same as my response above. Except that this person's supervisor would not act either.

144. I didn't feel comfortable and I felt embarrassed for the person receiving them.

145. I did not actually witness it but a student told me about it. He was attending a class at night (not on our campus at a satellite site where classes are offered) and a security guard was very aggressive about asking him why he was in the building. Another incident involved a colleague also an ethnic minority who was threatened by a staff member and treated differently. While both of these were dealt with, it is deeply disappointing to me that these things continue today. I think that all staff need some kind of training. In addition, I have been very offended by Maneater cartoons and columns dealing with ethnicity, race and gender. I know there is first amendment freedom but those things should continue to be challenged by the rest of the community.

146. I think that these incidents are few and are isolated. They raise my awareness of how strongly people feel about certain issues but do not cause me to react nor do they effect my daily life at MU.

147. Makes working environment uncomfortable when any of these incidents occur - don't know how to respond to person/people committing offense.
I do not let them affect me daily.

I can't describe any more. I'm getting depressed thinking about it.

It didn't. I ignored the behavior and it stopped.

They didn't affect me directly but I did feel sorry for the groups the behavior was directed toward.

Although they don't effect me directly, these incidents really impact the way I see America. It makes me sad to live in a place where people are still judged by external factors that for one, they cannot control, and two are not reliable indicators of who the person really is on the inside. I just wish America wasn't such a fast-paced arrogant society. Maybe we could all learn to take time to get to know people before judging them and not take so much pride in our country that we can't appreciate others' cultures.

The same faculty members described above are also blatantly racist and ethnocentric. They have made comments to students in the classroom. Students report to me but do not carry the point any further because of fear of retribution - grades, recommendations, TA assignments etc.

I object strongly to your table in item 12 above. To say that something offensive is a 'hate incident' is political correctness run amok. It's even worse than political correctness - it's an attack against my right to speak my mind without fearing an official backlash. I'm not referring to thoughts/opinions I'd personally like to speak/air because I don't harbor any ill will against any group of people but I mind greatly 'politically correct' THUGS attempting to limit my right to do so.

has not affected it

They haven't greatly affected my daily life at MU other than to create a feeling of sadness that people can treat each other with so little respect.

This is a daily occurrence in the residence halls. I have never worked in such a sexist environment as MU. Daily I hear and correct students saying "that's so gay" or "so retarded". It makes me realize that I am an educator but some days it really tears me down.

Very stressful and tense. Was not conducive to a warm let's get it done attitude to accomplish anything for the organization. Created lots of back stabbing and back biting.

It made me feel like I was working with a bunch of UNprofessionals.
160. This is a community of learning. All voices should be freely heard. Incidences like these silence people.

161. They sadden me. They make it more difficult for me to make this campus a welcoming and supportive learning environment for everyone.

162. It has not.

163. I have gone out of my way to help a person in need when I can.

164. They didn't.

165. The incidences make me wonder why everyone isn't included in protection from hate incidents. I wondered about the students on campus¿ wondered if anyone who had been a victim of a hate incident¿ if they would hold against me or anyone of the same ethnic background as the person causing the offense. Did I do enough to help the person out¿ afterward? Should I step in and help out?

166. I feel that MU often is not as enlightened as it would claim to be and people often are ignorant or careless about these things. I really wonder if there is a better place and am seeking it!

167. It impacts my perceptions of those individuals. As a staff member¿ there are expectations that I confront such behavior and address the situation with all those impacted.

168. I hated it¿ and went out of my way to help those who were effected.

169. It has not really affected MY daily life - however I am more aware of my surroundings and offer assistance to our students for their protection.

170. Such incidents make be feel uncomfortable and in some cases angry. Some incidents have led me to discuss these issues in class.

171. I do not worry about hate everyday¿ but some people do.

172. They don't. People have always been like this; people will always be like this. You can try to punish them¿ but it doesn't change how they think. Time will mellow them out or kill them. Meanwhile¿ I'll let them have their free speech and opinions--even if they are wrong--because that's what America is about. It is not about being Politically Correct ALL the time. Therefore¿ I don't let these incidents bother me¿ and if I do¿ I hash it out with friends who help me keep a good perspective.

173. The remarks did not affect my daily life at MU.
174. again -- made me feel "other" because of non-Christian, non-European ancestry

175. I feel very protective of my friends and students who are members of a minority group. I find myself talking to a number of students who need to discuss an incident that was hateful.

176. Well it really didn't affect my daily life at MU, I witnessed the event elsewhere.

177. It made me lose faith in the University; this is supposed to be a place for higher learning; I thought people were supposed to educated, not ignorant.

178. I am careful with whom I associate on campus and off. I am usually covert about my visits with others whom I know are or can be easily hated.

179. Did not occur at MU. Made me sensitive as to how others feelings can be hurt.

180. It didn't; I agree with them!

181. The incident occurred off-campus and had no impact on my university-related activities.

182. These incidents have not influenced my life; only made me aware that other people are affected by that, especially after 9/11.

183. It made the workplace uncomfortable. I was conflicted about what to do to stop the incidents. I was worried about my own minority group status being revealed. I found a new job and the person who had been the target of the hate incidents also quit. The environment at my new job is much more open and respectful and I am not afraid to reveal my religious affiliation.

184. Even on university campus, hate incidents can occur. I became more cautious and protective when dealing with others.

185. It just made me think about how I hadn't really seen that kind of graffiti before at MU. I wouldn't say it affected my daily life, but I do consider it a tragedy that there are still people with prejudices against others even on a college campus.

186. I try to avoid this person and I do not talk to him that much. I feel uncomfortable when I am in the office and he is in the lobby. I will just stay in my office sometimes and shut the door so I don't have to listen to him.

187. I was frustrated by the level of ignorance and intolerance--and concerned for my friends and co-workers.
didn't

Not much. The speaker wasn't taken seriously by those he insulted.

As I was not the target, it affected me less so than the victims. However, I was sympathetic to the victims and embarrassed that this could occur on our campus. It strengthened my resolve to not only support victims but to try to diminish or eradicate these types of incidents.

I simply ignored the individual who made the suggestion that a gay applicant for a position in our Department not be given the position because he was gay. The person making this suggestion was an adjunct faculty member not directly employed by MU and not directly involved in the interview or hiring process.

not at all

Low morale, low level of commitment. I now consider my job "just a paycheck" whereas I used to enjoy a sense of satisfaction and even a feeling of contribution to the public good.

I felt really sorry for the person that it happened to and vowed never to leave someone out of an activity that they want to be a part of.

The group being made fun of was a gay/lesbian group. The fraternity guys were laughing at them and making fun of them. I knew this would happen. It was no surprise. It didn't really affect me.

These type of incidents are disturbing but happen throughout the country (and the world). It doesn't affect me specifically in my work at MU.

It reminded me there are some very small people out there.

It made me sad but the response of others encouraged me. Yesterday in Speakers Circle a street preacher was talking with some students. A girl walked by and yelled that he was crazy. A student who was debating with the preacher (and didn't appear to share the preacher's faith) turned to her and told her they were simply having a discussion. That response -- coming from someone who didn't share the preacher's beliefs -- quieted her.

it just creates a general disgust for the world!

It just made me sad and upset...sometimes angry. I get more upset about other people being targeted than I do myself because I don't think it's ever been as serious towards me as it is towards non-heterosexuals, non-Christians or
minorities. It made me open my eyes that racism, bigotry, and antisemitism are a reality on campus.

201. They have been rare occurrences in my personal experience here. When they took the form of spoken remarks directed to me (jokes) or shouted at members of a particular group (gays, blacks) they either angered or discouraged me depending on the circumstances and the persons involved. On some occasions I have rebuked another for such comments; on others I have avoided a person's company because he insisted on making such comments.

202. Made me aware that there are many intolerant people attending mu

203. Not at all.

204. as before; it just makes me think back to highschool

205. It had not affected my daily life.

206. These offenses were against other people I am acquainted with. It did not affect me directly.

207. I have not been affected by the incidents.

208. I am momentarily disturbed.

209. I am always saddened, angered, and disturbed by willful acts of hate towards others. They also serve to reinforce for me that people need to be encountered as individuals to be truly known for who they are.

210. not much

211. I am careful not to put myself in a situation where I might be the victim.

212. Made me aware of the work that still has to be done on this campus to change most individual attitudes.

213. They made me become more introverted and more careful.

214. Not to a large extent. It certainly doesn't make me feel any safer.

215. upsetting

216. Just part of life here.

217. Again it pissed me off
They didn't.

I know that if they're doing it to that person, they'll do it to me.

I feel angry about it.

I don't affect my daily life - I just happened to see it happen.

made me feel embarrassed by my white peers.

I'm not sure if the type of incident I'm thinking of applies here. I have had the experience of listening to other people making disparaging (and highly negative) remarks about my ethnic/religious background in my presence but I don't believe these people.

it makes me angry and always on the watch for some ignorant fool to hurt someone else's feelings.

I was particularly affected when Fred Phelps came spreading his ugliness and also by the defacing of the bulletin board outside of the LGBT Resource Center during a football weekend. Both things made me feel sick and frightened for myself and others.

Again, they make me aware that some folks are jerks.

Inspires me to work at improving my own sensitivity to these issues.

They did not affect me at MU.

I would not say that it affected my daily life. The affect that it did have on me was to look down upon some of the faculty that MU hires.

It makes me really frustrated to see these things going on here. I would hope that when people come to college they would be willing to encounter new things but it just doesn't happen like that. I try to confront people about the things they say but for the most part it does no good.

It didn't

Not at all

I thought it was horrible but it did not affect my daily life.

It makes me appalled at the ignorance of people on this campus. I feel that I need to do or say what I can to stop people from hurting others out of their own ignorance.
They affected me here no different than the would affect me anywhere else. In general, it is kind of sad.

In this particular case "hate incident" is a somewhat harsh label for it. A friend made an inappropriate joke in the presence of a person belonging to the targeted minority group and felt really bad about it when he realized what he'd just done.

No direct affect on me. Being an openminded person I felt empathy for the person toward whom the remarks were addressed. Seeing the hurt of the individual involved I have become more aware of my comments and actions and try to avoid expressing my opinions in any manner that would hurt another's feelings.

No substantive influence

I am aware that a great deal of education needs to be done on very basic issues of respect for people who are gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender, who are Muslim or who are a racial minority. Also, the awareness of sexism needs to be increased.

Just go on with my life. Perhaps I should have gotten more involved in G/L/B organizations but I don't want that to become the center of my life either. GLB organizations can raise awareness but until the university establishes policies and makes them really clear....

They do not.

well, what can you do...

For the most part, the incidents had little affect except to make me uncomfortable.

it just made me sad. I hate losing hope for humanity.

It pisses me off! It just reaffirms that you can take the white sheet off the hater but you can't take the white sheet out of the hater.

They are very unpleasant and I don't consider myself part of the norm (though most would think I was to look at me). I am inclined to think of people I don't know as hostile to my perspectives unless I discover otherwise (though I try not minimize this as much as I can). I refrain from presenting my views in most cases unless I know those present.

Same as before. Wish they wouldn't happen and would hope our students and staff could be more mature and a better type of person but have come to expect the ignorance and attitude.
By being witness to various hate incidents during my time as an undergraduate student, it made me much more aware of how much hate there still is in this world. It really makes me sick to my stomach to think of how many close minded people are still out there. Because I have been fortunate enough to not be the direct victim of a hate incident, I find it important to try and stop occurrences in the future. The hate incidents caused me to be much more proactive in my daily life to try and educate others who might have been or one day be the perpetrators of such incidents.

It made me very uncomfortable. I didn't know how to relate to my friends who were experiencing it because they were racially different from me.

Not at all.

Excluded

made me more aware of choosing the people I choose to associate with.

It bothered me a little and I tried to avoid the people who took part in the hate incidents.

The person who made the remark was the victim's supervisor and I felt upset that this was tolerated by the supervisor's supervisor when it was brought to his attention.

I attempt to correct such situations by reporting them to the proper personnel or removing the inappropriate materials.

They don't affect what I do. I just feel like this kind of thing should be a thing of the past; that we should ALL be more enlightened that this.

I'm a WASP, so it really doesn't affect me on a daily basis. It does, though, REALLY suck that it exists and is prevalent enough so that I can see it. It makes me like MU less.

They're, unfortunately, part of the culture of a state that is still displaying "old South" attitudes in the 21st century.

Seeing someone tease or make fun of another person because of their color or ethnicity has made me a little bit less trusting of the motivations and kind-heartedness of others around me.

I figure that some people have some growing up and learning yet to do if they find this sort of thing amusing or satisfying. I'm not part of the "college culture" - just come and do my job and don't really interact with the students as a whole, so this is not a big concern to me or something I encounter often.
261. I am daily distressed by people's hatred of one another. If I can be a peacemaker, I will do so.

262. The really didn't affect my daily life at MU. People have to learn to take things with a grain of salt and not get so worked up about everything.

263. Again - they haven't, I ignore them.

264. It made me think sometimes freedom of speech is not the best thing in the constitution.

265. None of these incidents happened at MU, but witnessing them has made me more sensitive to discriminatory behaviors and attitudes.

266. Brought to my attention that people talk about stupid things. If you're too sensitive, you'll take everything offensively. People need to lighten up and not consider differences as a negative thing.

267. They made me feel uncomfortable and brought disrespect to the University community.

268. It did not really affect me personally because it did not happen to me or a member of my minority group. However, it did make me think about how bad I would feel if it had been me in that person's shoes.

269. I find that hate incidents are only committed by ignorant, intolerant people. I don't surround myself by such people, so therefore it does not greatly affect my life at Mizzou.

270. A friend's picture of her family, including her lesbian partner and children, was defaced in her office by an anonymous jerk. My life was affected as above with the creation of a sense of a general climate of distrust and anger.

271. The incidents remind me that these problems still exist and need to be addressed. I am aware that what may seem fairly petty on an everyday level adds up and is only an indication of a much more serious problem below the surface. While I have not become active with anti-discrimination activities on campus, my work addresses equity and I work in my community and personal life in Columbia for equity/diversity issues.

272. It seems that there is a lack of understanding or awareness about sexuality at MU - and in general that is just sad - one would assume that people who have begun college would be a little more aware and a lot less ignorant.

273. The incident made me more conscious of other's feelings and more aware of offensive jokes than I have been in the past. Now, I feel offended when I hear such things and do not want to be associated with the people who say them.
274. They don't affect me personally but I don't agree with how people treat each other sometimes.

275. It showed me that people are still ignorant regardless of if they have a degree or not.

276. There are speakers at speakers circle that are offensive in their closed mindedness and their judgement of others. I think that it is wrong and hate should not be allowed to voice itself there.

277. made me feel a very uncomfortable

278. It doesn't affect my life on campus but in general I let people know if they have said something that is unnecessary and even if it doesn't offend me if they could refrain from repeating rude comments.

279. saddens me

280. I have come to accept it.

281. In a such a diverse community as MU there are a lot of people with differing opinions and many of the are more than willing to share them. In as much as I believe in free speech I have to accept the fact that people have a Constitutional protected privilege to make fools of themselves.

282. there is always underlying tension. Racial groups tend to stay mainly exclusive and there is not much interaction. I don't expect people to line up to shake hands and become friends either though. It does not effect my daily life at MU in any major way.

283. Made me question the leadership at the Maneater.

284. It makes me feel there are bigots and racists on campus who hate people who are not like them.

285. Please see the previous section. The incident didn't happen here at MU.

286. I don't like how a person can dislike someone based on their racial background and then dislike everyone that shares that same background.

287. It had no effect on my daily life.

288. They influence my daily interactions with students given that I feel the need to support students who have been victims of hate incidents.

289. It didn't affect it happened at the gym during a basketball game.
290. I have not seen any hate incidents at the University only outside. I think MU employees take this very seriously and would do something to correct any wrong inflicted.

291. There is no daily affect but I do not believe that MU is as enlightened a community as I first believed when I moved here. I think there is as much prejudice and hatred on our campus as in the "uneducated" areas surrounding Columbia.

292. Many of the extremely right-winged speakers that lurk around Speaker's Circle and distribute hate filled pamphlets have often caused me to take other routes to class.

293. It made me upset because these incidents upset others that I am close to.

294. I was embarrassed for my department.

295. Usually pretty optimistic and upbeat but have a sense of the reality of life.

296. I feel that politics rules an reigns here and to hell with Truth and a good persons reputation. Whatever is expedient for the University System will over-ride justice every time. I used to be proud to work at the University now I feel that it is simply a powerful force in a small town this is where the jobs are but watch your back. The powers that be are in no way objective or concerned with getting to the truth if it is financially convenient to have you gone and the issue is politically volatile you are history.

297. I think that people are sometimes curl and stupid but they do not directly affect my activities.

298. I have not felt comfortable with the person making the offensive remark or joke.