

# **Let's do diversity**

Appendix Chapter 1:  
Diversity and social equality at the  
University of Amsterdam in numbers

Report of the  
University of Amsterdam  
Diversity Commission

# Table of Contents

- §1. Methodology: the survey..... 3
  - Using a survey while doing justice to diversity and inclusion..... 5
  - Response and non-response ..... 6
- §2. Selection of the statements ..... 8
  - Theme 1. The experience and observation of inclusion and exclusion at the UvA ..... 8
  - Theme 2. Attitudes towards diversity and inclusion at the UvA ..... 10
  - Theme 3. Attitudes towards UvA responsibility regarding diversity and inclusion. 12
- §3. Details of the presented data..... 14
  - Overview of all answers ..... 14
  - Zooming in on discrimination ..... 16
  - Figures behind the main chapter ..... 16
- Bibliography ..... 21
- Endnotes..... 21

# Appendix Chapter 1:

## Diversity and social equality at the University of Amsterdam in numbers

This Appendix provides additional information about the methodological approach and the data as discussed in chapter 1 ‘Diversity and Social equality at the University of Amsterdam in numbers’. We zoom in on the conducted survey and successively present

- the methodology (§1),
- the analysis behind the selection of statements for the report (§2),
- details of the figures presented in the report (§3).

### **§1. Methodology: the survey**

The aim of this sub-study was twofold. First, we wanted to explore the composition of the UvA community, of all UvA students and all UvA employees, or staff, with regard to various characteristics that are seen as dimensions of ‘diversity’ (gender, age, sexual orientation, (dis-)ability, class, ethnicity/race, immigrant generation, religion). Furthermore, we wanted to explore whether experiences of exclusion – which are painfully illustrated by the in-depth stories in the other, qualitative sub-studies – were broadly shared, and how broadly people at UvA appreciate diversity and diversity policy. We also wondered if these experiences and attitudes were spread equally over the UvA community, or that having certain characteristics makes one more or less exposed to experiencing discrimination, and/or appreciating diversity. Therefore, and because the registered data only contained details about gender (for staff and students) and ethnic background (only for students), our study also contained a quantitative survey.

The survey questions were developed with input from various people, including the entire Diversity Commission and the Contact Group, which whom we discussed the themes and personal background characteristics to include, as well as the specific phrasings of the questions. We also used other surveys as sources of inspiration (such as those of ASVA (2016) and Coenders (2016) and of various American and English universities).<sup>1</sup> We made two different versions for staff and for students, in Dutch and English. Part of the questions were translated by a professional translator, the rest was translated by ourselves. The version for staff and students primarily differed in the questions in relation to the respondent’s position at UvA (job position versus study-phase); in relation to phrasings about the respondent’s environment (work-environment versus study-environment); and in Dutch the versions differ in how the respondents are addressed: with the formal ‘u’ or the informal ‘jij’. Before conducting the final version of the survey, the survey was piloted: seven students and eleven employees inside (and one person

outside) UvA filled out the test-survey; most – but not all – were members of the contact group.

We used the websoftware Qualtrics to conduct the surveys. Weblinks to the survey were distributed via an email sent by the Communications Bureau (from the sending account ‘Committees UvA’) to all staff and students in two separate emails (except for the faculties of AMC and ACTA, where the link to the survey was included in regular newsletters). Respondents were prevented from taking the survey twice, through Qualtrics placing a cookie on their browser that did not permit them to take the survey more than once. However, in theory, respondents could have filled out the survey twice by using a different computer or a different browser, or by clearing their browser cookies. We could not entirely prevent this. To further discourage people from taking the survey twice, and to prevent people from outside UvA to participate in the survey, the survey link was not placed on public websites, or any website at all. In theory, the survey could have been filled out by people outside UvA, when they would have been forwarded the email with the link. We are unaware to what extent these double or external responses occurred, but as the survey had more the character of an opinion poll than a very consequential, binding vote, we do not expect this to have happened often.

### *Confidentiality*

We were extremely concerned about confidentiality, as we asked questions that to many felt very personal, and we also asked questions that enabled people to express attitudes that are critical to the status quo at UvA. If not treated utterly confidentially, this could make people very vulnerable. We took various measures to ensure utmost confidentiality. We used an external survey program (Qualtrics), and we did not connect the email-addresses with the survey response, and we guaranteed the respondents that the data were *not* going to be shared with other parties. Furthermore, we only present data at aggregate levels, in which groups as reported are large enough to prevent individual respondents to be identified. The analyses were exclusively performed by people from this sub-team of the Commission Diversity (using SPSS), and only this sub-team had access to the data.

The data we gathered with this survey are very rich. As time was very limited in the current study, we analyzed only part of the data. Hopefully, in the near future we will have the opportunity to perform additional analyses on the data.

### *Time path*

In the first research phase, starting at April 15<sup>th</sup>, the sub-team identified, got permission to use, and analyzed the registered data. We then concluded that it was desirable to have additional data, so we decided on conducting a survey. This survey had to be conducted before the summer break. We managed to distribute the survey on June 6<sup>th</sup>; this timing was far from ideal, as in this last month of the academic year staff and students are incredibly busy. In the second half of June, we placed reminders on the announcement

monitors in various buildings, and on June 27<sup>th</sup> (the first Monday after the closing of second semester), a reminder email was sent to all staff and all students. In the morning of July 4<sup>th</sup>, we closed the survey.

### **Using a survey while doing justice to diversity and inclusion**

This survey presented us with a challenge that relates to the nature of quantitative, or 'structured', methodological approaches. Contrary to open, qualitative approaches (which are suitable to explore phenomena in-depth and to get to know the definitions, labels and interpretations as used by the people themselves) structured approaches (which are very suitable to study large numbers of people, as the structured nature of the data enables immediate comparison between people) work with questions and response categories that are formulated by the researcher. In the design of the survey, we tried to avoid that people who diverged from the majority and/or from a certain implicit norm felt marginalized while filling out the survey questions. We paid extra attention to the definition of questions and response categories, the range of response categories, and the order of the response categories.

Many of the decisions involved a trade-off between the practical and methodological advantages on the one hand (the more structured the responses, the easier the analysis and less interpretational work is needed from the researcher in processing them), and the need to do justice to people's self-definitions on the other hand. Another trade-off is the balance between offering convenience for the majority of the respondents (by placing the response category that is most often selected first), and avoiding the suggestion by placing this category first, that this category also is the *norm*.

For example, to avoid imposing a binary idea of gender – forcing people to choose between the two standard options 'man' and 'woman' – we considered adding the response category 'other'. However, using the response categories 'man', 'woman' and 'other' still seems to reflect that the researchers regard 'man' and 'woman' as the norm, and every other gender-identity as a deviation from the norm. In other words, it suggests that those with other gender-identifications are 'less-than-normal'. As, particularly for a Commission researching 'diversity and inclusion', we found this undesirable, we choose to make gender an open question, where we asked people to write down their sex/gender. For reasons of practicality and comparison, most questions of course contained pre-defined response categories, although many questions did include the response category 'other', with the possibility to specify this answer in an open text field. This way, respondents were not forced to select answers that they did not completely agree with (which was not the case anyway, as respondents were allowed to skip questions), and this enabled us to detect responses that we overlooked in the formulation of the response categories.

Another example is that, when asking about the country of birth of the respondents and their parents, we considered placing the response category 'Netherlands' first. This would

facilitate the answering for the great majority of respondents who then would not have to scroll down a list of countries and continents to find their answer. However, we wanted to avoid the impression that coming from the 'Netherlands' is the norm and that having roots from elsewhere is 'less-than-normal'. Hence we placed the countries and continents in alphabetical order. The same we did for the list of disabilities, medical conditions, and illnesses to avoid making some sort of hierarchy; except that here, for the clarity of the response, we started the list with "No, I do not have a disability, medical condition or illness."

For every theme (in-and exclusion, attitudes toward diversity, UvA's role, and also about the Commission itself), we included open questions to give respondents ample opportunity to voice their concerns in their own terms, and to collect all information that people wanted to share.

We not only tried to avoid marginalizing people who deviate from the majority and/or a certain norm, we also tried to avoid the marginalization of people who are critical or even averse to the theme of 'diversity'. We tried to avoid the impression that only people who appreciate diversity were welcome to fill out the survey, or that some opinions are 'better' than others. First, we used the neutral announcement that the survey was about 'belonging' (thuisvoelen) at UvA. Second, we explicitly addressed those who might feel less invited to react to a request of the Commission Diversity by including an explicit invitation in the email.<sup>2</sup> Finally, we included a wide range of stances in the statements, including stances that are more hesitant or more critical towards how the theme of diversity is generally presented; such as "It is better not to pay particular attention to specific groups, as this jeopardizes the quality of research and education," and "It is better not to pay particular attention to specific groups, as it entrenches their position as 'different'," and "I feel uneasy whenever the topic of diversity and exclusion is discussed."

### **Response and non-response**

Of the staff, 2,815 respondents filled out the survey. In relation to the 8,998 people registered as UvA personnel,<sup>3</sup> this is a response rate of 31%. 3,841 students filled out the survey, which is approximately 10% of the total students registered (36,649).<sup>4</sup>

As explained in chapter 1, we are hesitant to generalize the findings to the entire UvA population. Like any survey, particularly those that are distributed through emails, this survey is unlikely to be fully representative of the entire university. It is likely that people with a strong affiliation with the theme of diversity and inclusion are overrepresented, which makes it likely that people with minority backgrounds are overrepresented. Nevertheless, as the numbers are large, particularly among the staff, the survey presents the situation and opinions of a substantial share of the university population. Furthermore, these large numbers enable us to discover trends: to explore whether certain experiences and opinions are more present among some groups of respondents than others.

As also described in chapter 1, women were slightly overrepresented in the survey. 61% of the student respondents is female, versus 56% of the student body.<sup>5</sup> 53% of all staff respondents is female, versus 48% of the UvA employees.<sup>6</sup> We have furthermore shown that the ethnic composition of the student respondents was very similar to the ethnic composition of the student body (comparison was on the level of the three main categories ethnic Dutch, ‘non-Western’, and ‘Western’), which suggests that the bias regarding minorities being overrepresented is not very large – or even absent. Mirroring the population, the largest numbers of respondents are from the faculties Behavioral and Social Sciences (FMG), Science (FNWI) and Humanities (FGw) (see Table 1.1). FMG, FNWI and the Humanities also have the highest response rates. Of the larger faculties displayed in the table below, Law (FdR) and Economics and Business (FEB) have substantially lower response rates. (Because about 30% of the respondents did not select a faculty, these response rates do not add up to the total response rate.)

**Table 1.1 Responserate of the largest faculties, and central services**

	Staff			Students		
	Survey	Popul.	Rate	Survey	Popul.	Rate
Beh. & Social Sciences (FMG)	502	1902	26%	787	8615	9%
Science (FNWI)	492	2002	25%	555	7497	7%
Humanities (FGw)	354	1526	23%	683	6897	10%
Economics & Business (FEB)	117	738	16%	297	6052	5%
Law (FdR)	97	634	15%	181	3867	5%
Medical (AMC)	<30	n.a.	n.a.	191	3084	6%
Central management/services	331	1723	19%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

*Source: Survey Diversity Commission, UvAData 2015/16 (student population), and UvAData UvAData 2016, PID and PNID included (staff population)*

*Note: the responserates per faculty are lower than the total response rate, because many respondents did not select a faculty: 31% of the staff respondents and 27% of the student respondents. Furthermore, respondents who are affiliated with more than one faculty/service are only registered once.*

### *Non-response question*

To check for a bias based on an affiliation with diversity, we asked people who did not want to fill out a survey to answer a single ‘non-response question’. This was the question “How do you view the current attention for ‘diversity and inclusion’ at UvA?” which was also included in the survey. We hoped to be able to compare the non-response group with the respondents, regarding their attitude toward diversity at the UvA. However, this question was only filled out by a relatively small part of the non-response group (611 employees and 1179 students). Hence this non-response question cannot be regarded as representative for the non-response group.

These respondents however confirm the idea that people who are more appreciative of diversity are more likely to fill out the survey. The respondents who answered only the non-response question less often appreciate attention paid to the theme ‘diversity and

inclusion': 38% indicated that they were satisfied with the current attention or that they wanted more attention paid to the theme of diversity, against 61% of the staff respondents who filled out the survey. Among the students this was 48% against 68%. In addition, the critical share is larger, at least for the staff; of those who answered the non-response question 12% indicated that UvA should not pay attention to the theme of diversity and inclusion, against 7% of the regular respondents. Among the students this is 19% against 11%.

## §2. Selection of the statements

We developed statements around three themes, which were presented in three consecutive parts of the survey:

- Theme 1: The experience and observation of inclusion and exclusion at the UvA;
- Theme 2: Attitudes toward diversity and inclusion at the UvA;
- Theme 3: Attitudes toward responsibility of the UvA in matters of diversity and inclusion.

Answering options were '(almost) never', 'sometimes', 'frequently', '(almost) always', 'no answer', or 'strongly disagree', 'disagree', 'neither disagree nor agree', 'agree', 'strongly agree', 'no answer'.<sup>7</sup>

Based on the survey data we could analyze to what extent these sets of statements coherently reflect underlying concepts. For each of the three dimensions we used factor analysis to explore to what extent these statements are indicative of an underlying concept, such as 'experiences of exclusion'. As in the end we decided not to use the created factors, we used these analyses to select statements that are central to the measured concepts. For staff and students we carried our separate factor analyses. As the resulting factors turned out to be very similar, and as we only use the factors to select meaningful statements and do not use them in our analysis, we only present the factor analyses for the employee respondents here.

### **Theme 1. The experience and observation of inclusion and exclusion at the UvA**

Exploratory factor analysis showed that nearly all of the statements reflect a broader, underlying concept, which we labeled '*presence of exclusion*' (or simply 'exclusion').<sup>8</sup> We used all but three of the twenty statements to create one single factor, which we call 'presence of exclusion', onto which all twenty statements load quite strongly.<sup>9</sup> Three components were excluded because they loaded less strongly on the factor and reduced the explained variance. Furthermore, content-wise they somewhat diverted from the rest. Apparently being insecure about your skills as an employee, and participation in events and meetings is not entirely the same as experiencing in- or exclusion. Table 2.1 shows the statements and the factor loadings for the employee respondents for this theme.



To facilitate the understanding of presented figures, and because the N for the factor is relatively low (1012), for our analyses we do not use the factor but two of the statements. We choose two statements that load highly on the factor (which means they strongly reflect the concept of 'exclusion'), have a high N, and have complementary meanings (about own encounters, and about broader observations).

- I observe practices that I find discriminatory or exclusionary towards myself or others (N=2212; factor loading .747),
- I am discriminated against (N=2233; factor loading .616).

The statements that we selected for the student respondents indicative of 'presence of exclusion' resonate with those selected for the staff analyses:

- I observe practices that I find discriminatory or exclusionary towards myself or others (N=3114; factor loading .666),
- I am discriminated against by teachers (N=3153; factor loading .621).

**Table 2.1 Statements and factor loadings 'Presence of exclusion' (staff)**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Loading</b>
I experience or observe discrimination: At the level of the department <i>Ik ondervind of observeer discriminatie: Op afdelingsniveau</i>	.808
I experience or observe discrimination: At the level of the faculty <i>Ik ondervind of observeer discriminatie: Op facultair niveau</i>	.751
I observe practices that I find discriminatory or exclusionary towards myself or others <i>Ik zie praktijken die ik uitsluitend of discriminerend vind voor mijzelf of voor anderen</i>	.747
I experience or observe discrimination: In my direct working environment <i>Ik ondervind of observeer discriminatie: In mijn meest directe werkomgeving</i>	.726
I experience or observe discrimination: In other situations <i>Ik ondervind of observeer discriminatie: Door anderen/in andere situaties</i>	.707
I experience or observe discrimination: In teaching situations <i>Ik ondervind of observeer discriminatie: In onderwijssituaties</i>	.647
In decision-making processes, divergent opinions are taken seriously <i>Afwijkende meningen binnen besluitvormingsprocessen worden serieus genomen</i>	-.628
I am discriminated against <i>Ik word gediscrimineerd</i>	.616
I feel that 'divergent' culture-related norms and values - such as wearing a headscarf - are disapproved of <i>Ik ervaar dat 'afwijkende' cultuurgebonden normen en waarden worden veroordeeld, bijvoorbeeld het dragen van een hoofddoek</i>	.614
I feel uncomfortable with the dominant behavioural norms <i>Ik voel mij ongemakkelijk onder de heersende gedragsnormen</i>	.593
Expressing any criticism I may have of how things are done at UvA, will disadvantage me at work <i>Ik denk dat het nadelige effecten voor mij persoonlijk heeft als ik kritiek uit op de gang van zaken aan de UvA</i>	.576

I feel that I belong <i>Ik heb het gevoel dat ik erbij hoor</i>	-.571
I feel that it is safe for me to point out problems to my superiors <i>Ik voel me veilig om problemen aan te kaarten bij mijn leidinggevende(n)</i>	-.563
My contributions at meetings are taken seriously <i>Mijn bijdragen tijdens vergaderingen worden serieus genomen</i>	-.503
I can be myself without negative consequences <i>Ik kan mijzelf zijn zonder dat dit negatieve consequenties heeft</i>	-.500
<i>I enjoy going to work</i> Ik ga met plezier naar mijn werk	-.477
It is useless to express any criticism I may have of how things are done at UvA, as nothing will change <i>Ik denk dat het zinloos is als ik kritiek uit op de gang van zaken aan de UvA, omdat er niets zal veranderen</i>	.442

<b>Excluded from the factor</b>	
I feel insecure about my qualities as an employee <i>Ik voel me onzeker over mijn kwaliteiten als medewerker</i>	
I attend the drinks receptions and other social activities that are organized <i>Als er een borrel of andere sociale activiteit is, neem ik hieraan deel</i>	
I attend the meetings that are organized <i>Als er een vergadering is, neem ik hieraan deel</i>	

## Theme 2. Attitudes towards diversity and inclusion at the UvA

Exploratory factor analysis showed that about half of the statements that express attitudes towards ‘diversity’, appear to measure a common, underlying concept, which we call ‘**appreciation of diversity**’. We used eight of the fourteen statements to create one factor, onto which they all load quite strongly. Apparently, ‘comfort with diversity’ and ‘own effort/responsibility’ do not entirely reflect appreciation of diversity. They loaded less strongly on the same factor and reduced the total explained variance. See the statements and the factor loadings for the employee respondents for this theme in Table 2.2.<sup>10</sup>

Although the N for this factor (1758) is not very low, for reasons of accessibility, for our analyses we choose two statements. Again we chose two statements that strongly load onto the factor, have high N and have complementary meanings (about the value of diversity for the academic environment in general, and the appreciation of one’s own work environment becoming more diverse):

- Diversity in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and school of thought enriches the academic environment (N=2150; factor loading .741),
- I would welcome it if my direct work environment became more diverse in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and schools of thought (N=2091; factor loading .776).

For the students we selected the statements that are (nearly) the same:

- Diversity in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and school of thought enriches the academic environment (N=3006; factor loading .744),
- I would welcome it if my direct study environment became more diverse in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and schools of thought (N=2968; factor loading .778)

Furthermore, we analyze the answers to the question, asked to students and staff in the same way:

- How do you view the current attention for 'diversity and inclusion' at UvA?<sup>11</sup>

Finally, the following statement is interesting to include in the analyses, as it reflects the discourse that science is objective (and hence independent from the context):

- The content of education and research is independent from the degree of diversity among staff and students.

**Table 2.2 Statements and factor loadings 'Appreciation of diversity' (staff)**

Statement	Loading
It is better not to pay particular attention to specific groups, as this jeopardizes the quality of research and education <i>Aandacht voor specifieke groepen is onwenselijk, want dit doet afbreuk aan de kwaliteit van onderzoek en onderwijs</i>	-.808
I would welcome it if my direct work environment became more diverse in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and schools of thought <i>Ik zou het toejuichen als mijn directe werkomgeving aan de UvA meer divers wordt qua achtergronden, culturen en levensstijlen</i>	.776
The serious inclusion of non-western perspectives in educational curricula enhances the learning environment <i>Het serieus behandelen van niet-westerse perspectieven in onderwijs-curricula draagt positief bij aan de academische vorming</i>	.754
Diversity in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and school of thought enriches the academic environment <i>Diversiteit in achtergronden, culturen, levensstijlen en denkscholen verrijkt de academische omgeving</i>	.741
It is better not to pay particular attention to specific groups, as it entrenches their position as 'different' <i>Aandacht voor specifieke groepen is onwenselijk, want dit versterkt hun positie als 'anders'</i>	-.719
It is unnecessary to target specific groups, as everyone is equal <i>Aandacht voor specifieke groepen is onnodig, want iedereen is gelijk</i>	-.705
It is important that everyone is aware that the differences between people add value <i>Het is belangrijk dat iedereen zich bewust is van de meerwaarde van verschillen tussen mensen</i>	.677
The content of education and research is independent from the degree of diversity among staff and students	-.587

<i>De inhoud van onderzoek of onderwijs staat los van de mate van diversiteit onder medewerkers en studenten</i>
--

<b>Excluded from the factor analysis</b>
I feel safer in a work environment made up of people who are similar to me in terms of background, culture and lifestyle <i>Ik voel me veiliger in een werkomgeving met mensen die zo zijn als ik qua achtergronden, culturen en levensstijlen</i>
I feel uneasy whenever the topic of diversity and exclusion is discussed <i>Ik voel me ongemakkelijk wanneer het thema diversiteit en achterstelling besproken wordt</i>
It is unnecessary to target specific groups, as everyone is equal <i>Aandacht voor specifieke groepen is onnodig, want iedereen is gelijk</i>
Attention must be paid to the majority, as problems with 'diversity' lie with the majority, not with minorities <i>Aandacht voor de meerderheid is nodig; problemen omtrent 'diversiteit' liggen bij de meerderheid en niet bij de minderheden</i>
When someone makes discriminatory remarks, I say something about it <i>Als iemand discriminerende opmerkingen maakt, zeg ik er iets van</i>
If I were asked as a member of a committee researching diversity and discrimination at my department, I would participate <i>Als ik gevraagd zou worden voor een commissie die diversiteit en discriminatie gaat onderzoeken binnen mijn afdeling, zou ik hieraan deelnemen</i>
If a masterclass was offered about dealing with diversity as a professional, I would participate <i>Als er een masterclass zou worden aangeboden over het omgaan met diversiteit als professional, zou ik hieraan deelnemen</i>

### **Theme 3. Attitudes towards UvA responsibility regarding diversity and inclusion**

Exploratory factor analysis showed that two of the statements of this part of the survey related to this theme, those about the general social responsibility of the UvA, do not reflect the same constructs as the others. These were excluded. The other statements regarding this theme appear to represent two broader underlying attitudes, which we labeled: '**action is needed to enhance diversity**' (Component 1) and '**action is needed to better deal with exclusion**' (Component 2). See the statements and the factor loadings of the pattern matrix in Table 2.3.<sup>12</sup>

Again, the N for the two factors is very low (1100), and we decide to use other variables instead for our analyses. We choose two statements that with regard to their meaning (and factor loading) is central to the ideas 'action is needed to enhance diversity' and 'action is needed to better deal with exclusion':

- UvA must do more to increase diversity among its staff, (N=1989; factor loading .915)<sup>13</sup>,

- If I would report exclusion and/or discrimination, I would *not* be taken seriously (here we took the reverse of the statement '... I would be taken seriously'; N=1757; factor loading -.802).

The students were asked the same questions:

- UvA must do more to increase diversity among its staff, (N=2772; factor loading .924),
- If I would report exclusion and/or discrimination, I would *not* be taken seriously (here we took the reverse of the statement '... I would be taken seriously'; N=2344; factor loading -.809).

**Table 2.3 Statements and factor loadings 'Action is needed...' (staff)**

Statement	Loading Comp 1.	Loading Comp 2.
UvA must do more to increase diversity among its staff <i>De UvA moet meer doen om de diversiteit onder medewerkers te vergroten</i>	.915	-.106
UvA must do more to increase diversity among its students <i>De UvA moet meer doen om de diversiteit onder studenten te vergroten</i>	.912	-.141
UvA should do more to make the university more inclusive and to combat exclusion <i>De UvA moet meer doen om de universiteit inclusiever te maken en uitsluiting tegen te gaan</i>	.831	-.001
I am satisfied with how UvA deals with the topic of diversity and discrimination <i>Ik ben tevreden over hoe de UvA omgaat met het thema diversiteit en discriminatie</i>	-.601	-.280
UvA is already doing enough to increase the presence of divergent schools of thought in education <i>De UvA doet voldoende om de aanwezigheid van afwijkende denkscholen te vergroten in het onderwijs</i>	-.590	-.097
UvA is already doing enough to increase the presence of divergent schools of thought in research <i>De UvA doet voldoende om de aanwezigheid van afwijkende denkscholen te vergroten in het onderzoek</i>	-.585	-.191
If I would report exclusion and/or discrimination, I would be taken seriously <i>Wanneer ik melding zou maken van uitsluiting en/of discriminatie, zou ik serieus genomen worden</i>	-.128	-.802
If I would report exclusion and/or discrimination, something would be done about it <i>Wanneer ik voorvallen van uitsluiting en/of discriminatie zou aankaarten, zou er iets aan gedaan worden</i>	-.152	-.751
If I would ask for support because of my disability, I would be taken seriously <i>Wanneer ik ondersteuning zou vragen aangaande een functiebeperking, zou ik serieus genomen worden</i>	-.055	-.748
If I were to experience discrimination, I would go to a confidential adviser (vertrouwenspersoon) <i>Wanneer ik discriminatie zou meemaken, zou ik me wenden tot een vertrouwenspersoon</i>	.215	-.708

I know who to approach at UvA if I need to discuss instances of discrimination <i>Ik weet waar ik in de UvA moet zijn als ik ervaringen van discriminatie zou willen bespreken</i>	-.158	-.520
---	-------	-------

<b>Excluded from the factor analysis</b>		
As a university, UvA has a social responsibility to reduce the inequalities in society <i>Als universiteit heeft de UvA een maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid de ongelijkheid in de samenleving te verkleinen</i>		
As a university, UvA plays an important role in shaping responsible citizens <i>Als universiteit speelt de UvA een belangrijke rol bij het vormen van verantwoordelijke burgers</i>		

*Note: Component loadings are reversed (negative) to create variables in the direction of 'action needed'.*

*Note: Component loadings under .300 are in gray.*

### §3. Details of the presented data

#### Overview of all answers

The variables that we selected for the analyses, based on the factor analyses, are displayed in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Variables staff [text that is specific for students between square brackets]**

Label	Question (English)	Question (Dutch)
1. Observe exclusion	I observe practices that I find discriminatory or exclusionary towards myself or others	Ik zie praktijken die ik uitsluitend of discriminerend vind voor mijzelf of voor anderen
2. Experience discrimination	I am discriminated against [by teachers]	Ik word gediscrimineerd [door docenten]
3. Diversity is enriching	Diversity in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and school of thought enriches the academic environment	Diversiteit in achtergronden, culturen, levensstijlen en denkscholen verrijkt de academische omgeving
4. More diversity is welcome	I would welcome it if my direct work [study] environment became more diverse in terms of background, culture, lifestyle and schools of thought	Ik zou het toejuichen als mijn directe werk-[studie-] omgeving aan de UvA meer divers wordt qua achtergronden, culturen en levensstijlen
5. Diversity needs more attention	How do you view the current attention for 'diversity and inclusion' at UvA?	Wat vindt u [vind je] van de aandacht voor het thema 'diversiteit en inclusie' op de UvA?
6. Science is independent	The content of education and research is independent from the degree of diversity among staff and students	De inhoud van onderzoek of onderwijs staat los van de mate van diversiteit onder medewerkers en studenten
7. UvA must do more to enhance diversity	UvA must do more to increase diversity among its staff	De UvA moet meer doen om de diversiteit onder medewerkers [/docenten] te vergroten
8. Will not be taken seriously	If I would report exclusion and/or discrimination, I would not be taken seriously	Wanneer ik melding zou maken van uitsluiting en/of discriminatie, zou ik niet serieus genomen worden

The answers of the respondents (those who answered the selected questions) are discussed in chapter 1, based on the dichotomized answers ('yes/no'). Tables 3.2 and 3.3 present the answers in more detail for the staff and student respondents, and clarify how the answers were recoded into the dichotomized answers.

**Table 3.2 Answers to various statements (staff) (%)**

	N	(almost) never	some- times	fre- quently	(almost) always		Total	no (a)	yes (bcd)	
Observe exclusion	2212	59	30	9	2		100	59	41	
Experience discrimination	2233	85	11	3	1		100	85	15	
		strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	Total	not agree (abc)	agree (de)	
Diversity is enriching	2150	1	1	8	39	51	100	10	90	
More diversity is welcome	2091	1	6	31	36	26	100	38	62	
Science is independent	2053	11	29	24	25	11	100	64	36	
UvA must do more to enhance diversity	1989	3	11	32	32	22	100	46	54	
Will not be taken seriously	1757	9	50	30	8	3	100	89	11	
		a	b	c	d	e	f	Total	not agree (abcde)	agree (f)
Diversity needs more attention <sup>1)</sup>	2206	3	3	2	31	25	36	100	64	36

<sup>1)</sup> Answers to the question 'How do you view the current attention for 'diversity and inclusion' at UvA?' are: (a) UvA should not pay attention to this, as no such problems exist at UvA; (b) UvA should not pay attention to this, as this is not a topic that should occupy UvA; (c) UvA should not pay attention to this, as this will not solve such problems at UvA; (d) I have a neutral stance towards this topic; (e) The current attention for this topic is good; (f) More attention should be paid to this topic

**Table 3.3 Answers to various statements (students) (%)**

	N	(almost) never	some- times	fre- quently	(almost) always		Total	no (a)	yes (bcd)	
Observe exclusion	3114	67	24	7	2		100	67	33	
Experience discrimination	3153	92	6	1	1		100	92	8	
		strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	Total	not agree (abc)	agree (de)	
Diversity is enriching	3006	2	2	8	34	54	100	12	88	
More diversity is welcome	2968	2	5	26	35	32	100	33	67	
Science is independent	2870	9	28	23	25	15	100	60	40	
UvA must do more to enhance diversity	2772	8	14	32	28	18	100	54	46	
Will not be taken seriously	2344	10	45	34	8	3	100	89	11	
		a	b	c	d	e	f	Total	not agree (abcde)	agree (f)
Diversity needs more attention <sup>1)</sup>	3051	6	3	2	21	45	23	100	77	23

<sup>1)</sup> Answers this question are the same as in the staff survey.

## Zooming in on discrimination

Fortunately, of all respondents who experience discrimination, the majority experiences discrimination not more frequently than ‘sometimes’. However, when we for example look at these figures per ethnic group, we see that still 5% of the respondents with ‘non-Western’ backgrounds – among staff as well as students – experience discrimination frequently or even (almost) always (see Table 3.4).

**Table 3.4 Experiences of discrimination in relation to ethnic background**

	Staff					Students				
	(almost) never	some-times	fre-quently	(almost) always	Total	(almost) never	some-times	fre-quently	(almost) always	Total
Ethn Dutch	90%	8%	2%	0%	99%	95%	4%	1%	0%	100%
Non-W	69%	26%	3%	2%	99%	80%	15%	4%	1%	100%
Western	81%	15%	3%	1%	101%	89%	9%	2%	0%	100%

In a separate question we asked “If you personally experience discrimination/exclusion, on what grounds does this mainly happen?” Here, roughly a quarter of the respondents selected a ground for discrimination. Of the total respondents roughly a quarter (28% of all employee respondents and 25% of all student respondents) selected one or more grounds for discrimination. That this share is much higher than the share that answered affirmatively to the statement “I am discriminated against” could indicate that many people do not label all forms of exclusion as ‘discrimination’. Another reason for the difference could be that some respondents only acknowledge certain experiences as occurrences of exclusion/discrimination when these experiences are explicitly listed as possible grounds for discrimination, such as for example exclusion based on age, hierarchical position and class background. *It seems that in order to do justice to the varied experiences of belonging, exclusion and discrimination of people, a broad understanding of discrimination is needed.*

## Figures behind the main chapter

### *A gendered effect of age (staff)*

In chapter 1 we described that a gendered effect of age exists among the respondents: older respondents slightly more often experience exclusion than younger respondents, but this only applies to female respondents. (see Table 3.5) This analysis is only performed on the staff respondents.

**Table 3.5 Share of respondents who have experienced discrimination (staff) (per gender per age group)<sup>1)</sup>**

	Male		Female	
	% Yes	N (total)	% Yes	N (total)
30 or younger	9%	225	10%	325
31-40	14%	235	17%	357
41-50	16%	217	18%	241
51-60	11%	222	18%	150
older than 60	8%	135	27%	75

<sup>1)</sup> Gender category ‘Other’ is not included because of small numbers



### *Hinder of disabilities, medical conditions and illnesses*

In the survey we asked respondents to indicate if they have disabilities, medical conditions and illnesses. 69% of the staff respondents who gave a valid answer selected the answer “I do not have disability, medical condition or illness.” The other 31% (717 respondents) were asked to what extent they feel hindered by their condition. Of those with a condition:

- 30% are hardly/not hindered
- 24% are slightly hindered > labeled ‘hindered’
- 30% are hindered > labeled ‘hindered’
- 13% are strongly hindered > labeled ‘hindered’ & ‘strongly hindered’
- 3% are very strongly hindered. > labeled ‘hindered’ & ‘strongly hindered’

Those with a condition that belong to the last four categories are labeled ‘hindered’; they comprise 17% of the total staff respondents. 4% of the staff respondents experience (very) strong hindrance. The rest of the respondents (83%; those who did not indicate they have a condition, or who are not hindered by it) are labeled ‘not-hindered’. Of the student respondents, 25% is affected by a condition, 11% even (very) strongly.

In chapter 1, we described that hindrance is not equally spread over all categories of respondents, and that female respondents are much more frequently affected by a condition than male respondents, which is the case for nearly all ethnic groups. The figures are presented in Table 3.6 (hindrance) and Table 3.7 (strong hindrance).

**Table 3.6 Respondents that experience *hindrance* per subcategory<sup>1)</sup>**

	Staff				Students			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)
Ethnic Dutch	15%	769	24%	851	22%	898	31%	1404
N-W (2nd gen)	18%	38	26%	57	28%	117	35%	261
N-W (1st gen)	7%	54	20%	49	12%	43	22%	69
W (2nd gen)	27%	82	27%	100	21%	138	32%	209
W (1st gen)	12%	84	21%	117	21%	72	26%	175

<sup>1)</sup> Gender category ‘Other’ is not included because of small numbers

**Table 3.7 Respondents that experience *strong hindrance* per subcategory<sup>1)</sup>**

	Staff				Students			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)	% Hinder	N (total)
Ethnic Dutch	3%	769	6%	851	9%	898	13%	1404
N-W (2nd gen)	3%	38	2%	57	9%	117	20%	261
N-W (1st gen)	2%	54	8%	49	5%	43	7%	69
W (2nd gen)	5%	82	7%	100	8%	138	17%	209
W (1st gen)	0%	84	5%	117	3%	72	5%	175

<sup>1)</sup> Gender category ‘Other’ is not included because of small numbers

### Class

In chapter 1 we referred to differences in parental education level between respondents with different ethnic backgrounds. The details are presented in Table 3.8, which show that respondents with second-generation ‘non-Western’ backgrounds less often have highly educated parents than the other groups. International students relatively often have university-educated parents.

**Table 3.8 Parental education of the respondents (share per subcategory)**

	Staff				Students			
	Without higher education degree <sup>1)</sup>		Without university degree		Without higher education degree <sup>1)</sup>		Without university degree	
	%	N (total)	%	N (total)	%	N (total)	%	N (total)
Ethnic Dutch	43%	1637	66%	1637	26%	2327	57%	2327
N-W (2nd gen) <sup>2)</sup>	56%	97	71%	97	36%	392	60%	392
N-W (1st gen)	39%	104	44%	104	26%	115	34%	115
W (2nd gen)	35%	190	52%	190	21%	350	43%	350
W (1st gen)	29%	206	35%	206	26%	252	29%	252

<sup>1)</sup> HBO (higher vocational education) and/or university

<sup>2)</sup> Due to rounding differences, in chapter 1 the 55.67% and 36.45% have been noted as 55% and 37%.

### Ethnicity, gender & discrimination

In chapter 1 we referred to the ‘non-Western’ internationals, of whom a staggering 42% experiences discrimination at least sometimes (see Table 3.9). Also among students the group of international students from ‘non-Western’ countries experiences discrimination most often (27%). 11% of them even experiences discrimination frequently or often.

**Table 3.9 Experiences of discrimination per ethnic groups (share per subcategory)**

	Staff						Students					
	(Almost) never	Some-times	Fre-quently	(Almost) always	Total	Total (N)	(Almost) never	Some-times	Fre-quently	(Almost) always	Total	Total (N)
Ethnic Dutch	90%	8%	2%	0%	100%	1488	95%	4%	1%	0%	100%	2148
N-W(2nd gen)	81%	16%	2%	1%	100%	83	81%	15%	3%	1%	100%	351
N-W(1st gen)	58%	38%	3%	1%	100%	91	73%	16%	9%	2%	100%	97
W(2nd gen)	83%	12%	3%	2%	100%	174	93%	7%	0%	0%	100%	317
W(1st gen)	81%	14%	4%	1%	100%	178	83%	13%	4%	0%	100%	227

Among ethnic Dutch, female respondents experience more discrimination than male respondents, nearly twice as many female respondents as male respondents experience discrimination (see Table 3.10). Among the other ethnic groups (where also considerable shares of men experience discrimination), the gap between the genders is much smaller or even absent.

**Table 3.10 Respondents that experience discrimination (at least sometimes) per subcategory<sup>1)</sup>**

	Staff				Students			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	% Discr	N (total)	% Discr	N (total)	% Discr	N (total)	% Discr	N (total)
Ethn Dutch	7%	710	13%	757	3%	817	6%	1300
Non-West.	32%	107	29%	124	18%	141	22%	295
West.	15%	199	21%	254	11%	190	11%	346

<sup>1)</sup> Gender category 'Other' is not included because of small numbers

### *Discrimination based on skin color & religion*

In the main chapter, we described various results regarding specific grounds for discrimination. In the following tables we present the underlying details. Table 3.11 presents the shares of respondents with various roots that experience discrimination based on skin color/race (the birth country of the mother was taken as a proxy of these roots). Table 3.12 shows figures of religion-based discrimination, for respondents who feel affiliated with various religions.

**Table 3.11 Respondents that experience discrimination based on skin color/race per subcategory<sup>1)</sup>**

<b>Birth country mother</b>	Staff	Students
	% Discr	% Discr
Aruba, Curaçao, Dutch Antilles	22%	29%
China	15%	19%
Germany	1%	5%
Indonesia	5%	17%
Morocco	17%	20%
Netherlands	1%	4%
Surinam	32%	29%
Turkey	20%	10%
Elsewhere in Africa <sup>2)</sup>	16%	34%
Elsewhere in Asia	24%	21%
Elsewhere in Europe	1%	3%
Elsewhere in North-America/Oceania	5%	4%
Elsewhere in Middle/South America	19%	11%

<sup>1)</sup> Values for N are not included because some are small.

The smallest value for N (of one of the subcategories) is 9.

<sup>2)</sup> In Ch1, the student share is erroneously noted as 35% (not 34%).

**Table 3.12 Respondents who experience discrimination based on religion per subcategory<sup>1)</sup>**

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Staff</b>		<b>Students</b>	
	<b>% Discr</b>	<b>N (total)</b>	<b>% Discr</b>	<b>N (total)</b>
No religion	0%	1,421	2%	2,180
Catholicism	2%	240	5%	244
Protestantism	8%	173	13%	203
Islam	29%	42	45%	92
Judaism	4%	<30	44%	<30
Hinduism	7%	<30	6%	<30
Buddhism	0%	<30	0%	<30
Other	2%	99	7%	156

<sup>1)</sup> To give an indication of the presence of the various religions among the respondents, values for N are indicated. Values smaller than 30 are not specified.

**Table 3.13 Religious affiliation per ethnic group**

	<b>None</b>	<b>Cath.</b>	<b>Prot.</b>	<b>Islam</b>	<b>Jud.</b>	<b>Hind.</b>	<b>Budd.</b>	<b>Other.</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Staff</b>									
Ethn Dutch	76%	10%	9%	0%	1%	0%	0%	4%	100%
Non-West.	45%	11%	10%	16%	3%	6%	1%	7%	100%
West.	63%	18%	9%	1%	2%	0%	1%	7%	100%
<b>Students</b>									
Ethn Dutch	81%	7%	7%	0%	1%	0%	0%	4%	100%
Non-West.	51%	10%	4%	19%	2%	3%	1%	9%	100%
West.	70%	11%	7%	2%	1%	0%	1%	8%	100%

#### *Experiencing discrimination & opinions*

As mentioned in chapter 1, people who experience discrimination more often are appreciative of 'diversity' and are more often in favor of action being taken. They less often have the opinion that research and education is independent of the diversity among staff and students. The details are displayed in Table 3.14.

**Table 3.14 Attitudes of respondents who have not/have experienced discrimination.**

**Respondents that answered 'yes/agree' (% per subgroup)**

	Staff		Students	
	Not discr % Yes/ agree	Discr % Yes/ agree	Not discr % Yes/ agree	Discr % Yes/ agree
N (total) <sup>1)</sup>	1910	323	2894	259
Diversity is enriching	89%	90%	88%	89%
More diversity is welcome	59%	79%	65%	80%
Diversity needs more attention	32%	64%	20%	47%
Science is independent	37%	28%	41%	35%
UvA must do more to enhance diversity	50%	74%	44%	68%
Will not be taken seriously	6%	39%	8%	39%

1) 'N (total)' refers to the number of respondents who have not/have experienced discrimination. The amount of respondents for every statement is slightly lower, as not all respondents answered all questions.

## Bibliography

- ASVA. (2016). Diversiteitsbeleid: een overbodig kwaad of een noodzakelijke stap vooruit? Een onderzoek naar diversiteit binnen de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Amsterdam: ASVA Onderzoeksbureau. Retrieved from <https://www.asva.nl/sites/default/files/pages/2016/ASVA%20onderzoek%20diversiteitsbeleid%20overbodig%20kwaad%20of%20noodzakelijke%20stap.pdf>
- Coenders, Y. (2016). Social inclusion of students in the College of Social Sciences of the UvA. Unpublished paper.
- Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage.
- Pallant, J. (2005). SPSS survival manual: A step guide to data analysis using SPSS. Allen&Unwin.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Such as the AICUPC Campus Diversity Survey of Marywood University ([www.marywood.edu/instresearch/documents/AICUPCamDiv.pdf](http://www.marywood.edu/instresearch/documents/AICUPCamDiv.pdf))
- <sup>2</sup> We used the text: 'Request to all. As it is important that we obtain a broad impression, we also ask colleagues who feel only weakly affiliated with this theme to participate in this survey'.
- <sup>3</sup> Source: UvAData, headcount 2016, including PID and PNID (people with and without UvA-contracts). This excludes the medical faculty AMC. [Dienstverband: (PID; PNID) UvA/VU: (UvA) Organisatorische eenheid: (FMG; UvA)].
- <sup>4</sup> Source: UvAData [Geaccrediteerd: (Ja) Programmatype: (Diplomaprogramma; Schakelprogramma; Bijvakprogramma) Opleiding: (UvA)]
- <sup>5</sup> Source: 1cHO Data (Selection: all students registered in 2015/2016 with all secondary education levels)
- <sup>6</sup> Source: UvAData year 2016; headcount PID and PNID.

---

<sup>7</sup> '(bijna) nooit', 'soms', 'regelmatig', '(bijna) altijd', 'geen antwoord' of 'zeer oneens', 'oneens', 'niet eens, niet oneens', 'eens', 'zeer eens', 'geen antwoord',

<sup>8</sup> We followed the approach described by Pallant (2005, Chapter 15) and Field (2013, Chapter 17).

<sup>9</sup> Principal Component Analysis; 39% of the total variance is explained. The sample size is over 1000, which according to Field (p.684 e.v.) and Pallant is excellent. More important, the factor loadings are high enough. While four or more loadings over 0.6 makes a factor reliable, in this factor 9 items load over .600, another 6 over .500, and the other two .442 and higher. The KMO value is sufficiently high (.924), Barlett's test is significant ( $p < .0005$ ), and the inter-item correlation coefficients are all below .800.

<sup>10</sup> Principal Component Analysis; 52% of the total variance is explained. Again, the overall sample size is excellent, factor loadings are high enough (7 items load over .600, one is only slightly lower .587). The KMO value, with .882 is above .600; above .800 is 'meritorious'), Barlett's test is significant (it is:  $p < .0005$ ), and the inter-item correlation coefficients are all below .800.

<sup>11</sup> For the analysis in which we compare groups, we have recoded the original categories (a) UvA should not pay attention to this, as no such problems exist at UvA; (b) UvA should not pay attention to this, as this is not a topic that should occupy UvA; (c) UvA should not pay attention to this, as this will not solve such problems at UvA; (d) I have a neutral stance towards this topic; (e) The current attention for this topic is good; (f) More attention should be paid to this topic into 1. No need for attention (a, b, c); 2. Neutral stance (d); 3. Current attention is good (e); 4. More attention should be paid (f).

<sup>12</sup> Principal Component Analysis; 59% of the total variance is explained (43% and 16%). Oblimin rotation is used as the two factors are correlated ( $r = .369$ ). Also here, the overall sample size is excellent, there are enough factor loadings over .600. The KMO value, with .840 is above .600; above .800 is 'meritorious'), Barlett's test is significant (it is:  $p < .0005$ ), and – except for one – all inter-item correlation coefficients are below .800.

<sup>13</sup> Another option would have been to take the statement 'UvA must do more to increase diversity among its students', however the staff question loads slightly higher on the factor. In addition, the composition of employees is (even) more directly influenced by the institution than that of students.