



AFP-OSU Workplace Climate Survey Preliminary Report 2

Prepared by:
Megan LePere-Schloop, PhD
Erynn Beaton, PhD

John Glenn College of Public Affairs, The Ohio State University

May 4, 2021

Overview of Fundraising Workplace Climate Survey

This survey was conducted online by researchers from The Ohio State University in partnership with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) between July 30 and August 30, 2020. The survey was sent to 17,041 AFP members aged 18+ working in the U.S. or Canada. A total of 1,783 (n=1,598 U.S., n=184 Canadian) respondents completed the survey for a response rate of 10.46%.

The survey sample frame was selected among those who are members of the Association of Fundraising Professionals that have agreed to participate in online surveys. People who identify as male responded at a lower rate to the 2018 Harris Survey of AFP members, and were therefore over-sampled for this survey. Weights were then calculated to adjust for the over-sampling of males and non-response bias across males and females working in the U.S. and Canada.

The survey instrument was modeled after a workplace climate survey developed and implemented by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) of the U.S. Federal Government. Measures used in the MSPB survey are well-validated and reliable. After adapting the MSPB survey to the research objectives, OSU researchers conducted five cognitive interviews with fundraisers. Based on feedback from the cognitive interviews, the survey was adjusted to help ensure comprehension of the questions by respondents.

Comparison to 2018 Survey: The OSU researchers consider the present survey results to be more accurate than the results of the 2018 survey for several reasons. First, the 2018 survey was sent to all 25,000+ AFP members and yielded 1,040 (n=934 U.S., n=106 Canadian) responses. Therefore, the present survey returned a better response rate, decreasing the likelihood of response bias, and a larger overall sample, which increases the validity of the results. Second, the 2018 survey utilized several self-report and time-unbound measures of sexual harassment. The present survey adheres to standards for reliable research; for example, by asking respondents about experiences with specific behaviors rather than eliciting subjective assessments of experience with sexual harassment.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment and Intersectional Social Identities

As a follow-up to our first preliminary report on the results of the Fundraising Workplace Climate Survey, this report focuses on experiences of sexual harassment across various intersectional social identities. These preliminary descriptive results are important because research suggests that people may have different experiences of sexual harassment based not simply on single dimensions of social identity (e.g. their gender *or* race/ethnicity) but the intersection of multiple social identities (e.g. their gender *and* race/ethnicity).

To be transparent, we provide the exact wording of the questions we used to group respondents by intersectional social identities below.

GENDER: How do you describe your gender identity?

- Woman or Female or Feminine (grouped as “Female” in this report)
- Man or Male or Masculine (grouped as “Male” in this report)
- Prefer to self-describe: _____ (grouped as “Self-Desc” in this report)

TRANSGENDER: Do you consider yourself to be transgender?

- Yes (grouped as “Trans” in this report)
- No (grouped as “Cisgender” in this report)

SEXUALITY: Of the following, which do you consider yourself to be?

- Heterosexual or Straight (grouped as “Hetero” in this report)
- Lesbian or Gay (grouped as “LGB+” in this report)
- Bisexual (grouped as “LGB+” in this report)
- Prefer to self-describe: _____ (grouped as “LGB+” in this report)

RACE/ETHNICITY: Of the following, which do you consider yourself to be? (Please mark ALL that apply).

- American Indian or Alaska Native (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- Asian (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- Black or African American (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- Latinx (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- Middle Eastern or North African (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)
- White or Caucasian (grouped as “Caucasian” in this report)
- Prefer to self-describe: _____ (grouped as “BIPOC” in this report)

(continued on next page)

Intersectional Social Identities of Survey Respondents

The following table presents a break down of survey respondents by various intersectional social identities. We find that the survey respondents represent diverse intersectional social identity groups. We also find that the number of respondents identifying with a number of social identities is very small, which can lead to problems when survey results need to be weighted to account for over-sampling and non-response. We therefore do not include intersectional social identity groups with fewer than 30 respondents in later tables of survey results.

Survey Respondents by Intersectional Identity

Group	Count	Percent
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	1270	71.23
Female & BIPOC*	165	9.25
Female & Caucasian	1105	61.97
Female & Hetero	1171	65.68
Female & LGB+	99	5.55
Female & Trans	2	0.11
Female & Cisgender	1267	71.06
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	504	28.27
Male & BIPOC	60	3.37
Male & Caucasian	444	24.90
Male & Hetero	379	21.26
Male & LGB+	125	7.01
Male & Trans	1	0.06
Male & Cisgender	503	28.21
<i>GENDER: Self-Desc</i>	8	0.45
Self-Desc & BIPOC	5	0.28
Self-Desc & Caucasian	3	0.17
Self-Desc & Hetero	0	0.00
Self-Desc & LGB+	8	0.45
Self-Desc & Trans	5	0.28
Self-Desc & Cisgender	3	0.17
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	231	12.96
BIPOC & Hetero	193	10.82
BIPOC & LGB+	38	2.13
BIPOC & Trans	3	0.17
BIPOC & Cisgender	227	12.73
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	1552	87.04
Caucasian & Hetero	1357	76.11
Caucasian & LGB+	195	10.94
Caucasian & Trans	5	0.28
Caucasian & Cisgender	1546	86.71
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	1550	86.93
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	233	13.07
<i>TRANS: Yes</i>	8	0.45
<i>TRANS: No</i>	1773	99.44

*Interpretation Example: 165 individuals or 9.25% of the survey's respondents identified as female & BIPOC.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment

To follow up on the 2018 Harris survey, we consider experiences of AFP members with sexual harassment.

AFP member experiences of sexual harassment behaviors over the course of their fundraising career

Research suggests that people have different understandings of what behavior constitutes sexual harassment. Asking survey respondents if they have experienced specific behaviors as opposed to simply asking, “Have you experienced sexual harassment?” therefore often provides clearer insight into people’s experiences. To better understand the experiences of AFP members with sexual harassment over their fundraising career, we asked:

Over the course of your entire career working in the fundraising profession, have you ever experienced the following behaviors? (Check all that apply)

- Unwelcome communications (e.g., emails, phone calls, notes, text messages, social media contacts) of a sexual nature
- Unwelcome invasion of personal space (e.g., touching, crowding, leaning over)
- Unwelcome sexually suggestive looks or gestures
- Pressure for sexual favors
- Pressure for dates
- Unwelcome sexual teasing, jokes, comments or questions
- The presence of sexually oriented material in any format (e.g., photos, videos)
- People having sexually oriented conversations in front of others
- Someone offering preferential treatment in the workplace in exchange for sexual favors
- Different treatment based on sex/gender (e.g., quality or nature of assignments)
- Use of derogatory or unprofessional terms related to a person’s sex/gender
- Stalking (e.g., unwanted intrusion (physically or electronically) into your personal life)
- Rape or sexual assault or attempted rape or sexual assault

(continued on next page)

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced any of the above sexual harassment behaviors during their fundraising career on at least one occasion by intersectional identity of the respondent and aggressor role (coworker, stakeholder or both). Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response. A review of the table below suggests high levels of fundraiser experience with sexual harassment behaviors across the board.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment over Career by Respondent Intersectional Identity & Aggressor Role

Group	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either*	Never
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	64.25	60.60	78.13	21.87
Female & BIPOC*	60.11	58.08	73.73	26.27
Female & Caucasian	64.85	60.96	78.77	21.23
Female & Hetero	62.93	59.90	77.24	22.76
Female & LGB+	79.47	68.66	88.34	11.66
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	56.13	39.45	63.90	36.10
Male & BIPOC	53.14	41.40	59.38	40.62
Male & Caucasian	56.54	39.17	64.53	35.47
Male & Hetero	52.40	35.97	60.12	39.88
Male & LGB+	67.47	50.05	75.41	24.59
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	59.61	55.62	71.83	28.17
BIPOC & Hetero	57.93	54.85	71.47	28.53
BIPOC & LGB+	70.57	60.67	74.16	25.84
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	63.38	57.37	76.35	23.65
Caucasian & Hetero	62.01	56.92	75.42	24.58
Caucasian & LGB+	74.67	61.15	84.09	15.91
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	61.50	56.66	74.93	25.07
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	74.04	61.08	82.57	17.43
<i>All</i>	62.90	57.15	75.78	24.22

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 73.73% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by either a coworker or external stakeholder ever in their career.

AFP member experiences with sexual harassment behaviors over the past two years

To better understand the more recent experiences of AFP members, we asked:

In the past two years while working as a fundraiser or fundraising consultant, did you experience any of the following behaviors?

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced any of the above sexual harassment behaviors during the past two years by intersectional identity of the respondent and aggressor role (coworker, stakeholder or both). Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment over Past 2 Years by Respondent Intersectional Identity & Aggressor Role

Group	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either*	Not in 2 Yrs
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	33.06	25.59	44.37	55.63
Female & BIPOC*	32.67	24.53	43.05	56.95
Female & Caucasian	33.12	25.74	44.56	55.44
Female & Hetero	31.15	24.35	42.93	57.07
Female & LGB+	54.61	39.59	60.58	39.42
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	24.70	14.54	30.32	69.68
Male & BIPOC	26.20	14.91	28.22	71.78
Male & Caucasian	24.49	14.49	30.61	69.39
Male & Hetero	22.20	13.24	28.29	71.71
Male & LGB+	32.27	18.49	36.47	63.53
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	32.35	23.90	41.24	58.76
BIPOC & Hetero	31.85	24.13	41.73	58.27
BIPOC & LGB+	35.66	22.39	38.00	62.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	31.68	23.91	42.26	57.74
Caucasian & Hetero	29.69	22.69	40.88	59.12
Caucasian & LGB+	47.95	33.85	53.54	46.46
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	29.96	22.87	40.98	59.02
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	46.12	32.14	51.23	48.77
<i>All</i>	31.77	23.91	42.13	57.87

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 43.05% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by either a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

Categories of sexual harassment behaviors

Research describes several different categories of sexual harassment behavior: gender hostility, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. In this section, we define each category, list the associated behaviors from the survey, and describe its incidence among AFP members during the past two years. Overall, initial analysis of survey data suggests that fundraisers may experience different categories and levels of sexual harassment behavior depending on their intersectional identities and the role of the aggressor. This phenomenon should be examined more closely in future research.

AFP members experiences with Gender Hostility over the past two years

Gender Hostility - Unwelcome behaviors that disparage or objectify others based on their sex or gender.

- Unwelcome sexual teasing, jokes, comments or questions
- The presence of sexually oriented material in any format (e.g., photos, videos)
- People having sexually oriented conversations in front of others
- Different treatment based on sex/gender (e.g., quality or nature of assignments)
- Use of derogatory or unprofessional terms related to a person's sex/gender

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Gender Hostility behaviors over the past two years by intersectional identity of the respondent and aggressor role (coworker, stakeholder or both). Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Experiences of Gender Hostility over Past 2 Years by Respondent Intersectional Identity & Aggressor Role

Group	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either*	Not in 2 Yrs
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	30.05	18.25	37.76	62.24
Female & BIPOC*	29.46	17.66	37.58	62.42
Female & Caucasian	30.14	18.34	37.79	62.21
Female & Hetero	28.04	16.88	36.10	63.90
Female & LGB+	52.85	33.77	56.58	43.42
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	22.81	12.04	27.26	72.74
Male & BIPOC	24.58	10.29	26.61	73.39
Male & Caucasian	22.56	12.28	27.35	72.65
Male & Hetero	20.73	10.69	25.53	74.47
Male & LGB+	29.08	16.09	32.48	67.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	29.46	17.52	36.46	63.54
BIPOC & Hetero	29.11	16.77	36.83	63.17
BIPOC & LGB+	31.70	22.39	34.04	65.96
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	28.87	17.34	36.05	63.95
Caucasian & Hetero	26.78	15.96	34.39	65.61
Caucasian & LGB+	46.02	28.66	49.68	50.32
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	27.06	16.06	34.69	65.31
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	43.88	27.72	47.34	52.66
<i>All</i>	28.95	17.36	36.10	63.90

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 37.58% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC have experienced Gender Hostility by either a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

AFP members experiences with Unwanted Sexual Attention over the past two years

Unwanted Sexual Attention - Unwelcome behaviors of a sexual nature that are directed toward a person.

- Unwelcome communications (e.g., emails, phone calls, notes, text messages, social media contacts) of a sexual nature
- Unwelcome invasion of personal space (e.g., touching, crowding, leaning over)
- Unwelcome sexually suggestive looks or gestures

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Unwanted Sexual Attention over the past two years by intersectional identity of the respondent and aggressor role (coworker, stakeholder or both). Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Attention over Past 2 Years by Respondent Intersectional Identity & Aggressor Role

Group	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either*	Not in 2 Yrs
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	12.63	17.62	26.59	73.41
Female & BIPOC*	16.29	19.95	29.88	70.12
Female & Caucasian	12.11	17.28	26.13	73.87
Female & Hetero	12.08	16.36	25.10	74.90
Female & LGB+	18.79	31.79	43.33	56.67
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	7.88	6.53	13.19	86.81
Male & BIPOC	13.31	6.34	18.01	81.99
Male & Caucasian	7.11	6.56	12.51	87.49
Male & Hetero	6.68	6.47	12.34	87.66
Male & LGB+	11.49	6.72	15.76	84.24
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	16.34	17.43	28.27	71.73
BIPOC & Hetero	14.81	19.48	28.56	71.44
BIPOC & LGB+	26.36	4.03	26.36	73.64
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	11.29	15.55	23.92	76.08
Caucasian & Hetero	10.87	14.41	22.68	77.32
Caucasian & LGB+	14.68	24.82	34.01	65.99
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	11.36	15.04	23.41	76.59
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	16.42	21.72	32.87	67.13
<i>All</i>	11.93	15.79	24.47	75.53

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 29.88% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC have experienced Unwanted Sexual Attention by either a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

AFP members experiences with Sexual Coercion over the past two years

Sexual Coercion - Pressure or force to engage in sexual behavior.

- Pressure for sexual favors
- Pressure for dates
- Someone offering preferential treatment in the workplace in exchange for sexual favors
- Stalking (e.g., unwanted intrusion (physically or electronically) into your personal life)
- Rape or sexual assault or attempted rape or sexual assault

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Sexual Coercion over the past two years by intersectional identity of the respondent and aggressor role (coworker, stakeholder or both). Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Experiences of Sexual Coercion over Past 2 Years by Respondent Intersectional Identity & Aggressor Role

Group	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either*	Not in 2 Yrs
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	3.95	3.97	7.33	92.67
Female & BIPOC*	5.36	6.70	10.06	89.94
Female & Caucasian	3.75	3.58	6.95	93.05
Female & Hetero	3.41	3.68	6.55	93.45
Female & LGB+	10.07	7.26	16.29	83.71
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	1.97	1.87	3.63	96.37
Male & BIPOC	5.12	0.00	5.12	94.88
Male & Caucasian	1.52	2.13	3.42	96.58
Male & Hetero	1.50	1.94	3.44	96.56
Male & LGB+	3.38	1.64	4.20	95.80
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	5.22	6.07	9.64	90.36
BIPOC & Hetero	4.45	6.36	8.91	91.09
BIPOC & LGB+	10.21	4.13	14.35	85.65
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	3.38	3.34	6.37	93.63
Caucasian & Hetero	2.97	3.04	5.74	94.26
Caucasian & LGB+	6.74	5.84	11.50	88.50
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	3.16	3.45	6.13	93.87
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	7.27	5.58	11.93	88.07
<i>All</i>	3.61	3.68	6.78	93.22

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 10.06% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC have experienced Sexual Coercion by either a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

AFP members perceptions of organizational equity and inclusion

We next consider the perceptions of AFP members with various intersectional social identities on organizational equity and inclusion over the past two years. To find out how respondents perceive the organization where they worked for most of the last two years, we asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with a series of five statements.

The first statement read:

In the organization where I worked for most of the past two years, minorities and non-minorities are respected equally.

The following table presents the estimated percentage of AFP members who agree/disagree that in the organization where they spent most of the past two years working ‘minorities and non-minorities are respected equally.’ Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Agreement that ‘minorities and non-minorities are respected equally’ by Respondent Intersectional Identity

Group	Agree*	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know	No Minorities
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	72.40	7.09	12.52	2.38	5.61
Female & BIPOC*	58.95	11.41	24.71	2.46	2.46
Female & Caucasian	74.33	6.47	10.77	2.36	6.06
Female & Hetero	73.43	6.78	11.87	2.50	5.42
Female & LGB+	60.53	10.69	20.02	0.97	7.79
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	81.67	6.17	6.44	1.63	4.09
Male & BIPOC	70.89	10.94	14.65	1.96	1.56
Male & Caucasian	83.18	5.51	5.29	1.58	4.44
Male & Hetero	83.76	5.15	5.22	1.27	4.60
Male & LGB+	75.32	9.29	10.16	2.72	2.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	61.11	11.10	23.17	2.34	2.28
BIPOC & Hetero	61.25	11.98	21.80	2.35	2.63
BIPOC & LGB+	60.23	5.39	32.12	2.26	0.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	75.73	6.30	9.87	2.23	5.86
Caucasian & Hetero	76.75	5.79	9.44	2.33	5.69
Caucasian & LGB+	67.30	10.55	13.43	1.42	7.30
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	74.82	6.56	10.97	2.33	5.31
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	66.22	9.76	16.29	1.55	6.18
<i>All</i>	73.87	6.91	11.56	2.25	5.41

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 58.95% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC agree that in their organization ‘minorities and non-minorities are respected equally.’

The second statement read:

In the organization where I worked for most of the past two years, the opinions and insights of minority employees were often ignored or devalued.

The following table presents the estimated percentage of AFP members who agree/disagree that in the organization where they spent most of the past two years working ‘the opinions and insights of minority employees were often ignored or devalued.’ Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Agreement that ‘the opinions and insights of minority employees were often ignored or devalued’ by Respondent Intersectional Identity

Group	Agree*	Neither	Disagree	Don’t Know	No Minorities
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	14.74	10.88	64.69	3.88	5.81
Female & BIPOC*	27.90	15.18	50.76	3.70	2.46
Female & Caucasian	12.85	10.26	66.69	3.90	6.30
Female & Hetero	13.92	10.47	65.81	4.04	5.76
Female & LGB+	24.23	15.53	51.82	1.93	6.48
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	14.20	8.39	70.77	2.35	4.29
Male & BIPOC	17.78	14.06	64.64	1.96	1.56
Male & Caucasian	13.70	7.60	71.63	2.40	4.67
Male & Hetero	11.57	8.86	71.89	2.80	4.87
Male & LGB+	22.16	6.97	67.38	0.97	2.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	25.78	15.51	53.08	3.35	2.28
BIPOC & Hetero	24.80	16.13	52.92	3.52	2.63
BIPOC & LGB+	32.12	11.47	54.16	2.26	0.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	12.96	9.81	67.48	3.65	6.10
Caucasian & Hetero	12.02	9.43	68.57	3.93	6.06
Caucasian & LGB+	20.78	13.02	58.45	1.38	6.37
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	13.60	10.26	66.62	3.88	5.64
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	22.51	12.78	57.79	1.51	5.39
<i>All</i>	14.59	10.54	65.65	3.62	5.61

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 27.90% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC agree that in their organization ‘the opinions and insights of minority employees were often ignored or devalued.’

The third statement read:

In the organization where I worked for most of the past two years, standards were higher for minorities than non-minorities.

The following table presents the estimated percentage of AFP members who agree/disagree that in the organization where they spent most of the past two years working ‘standards were higher for minorities than non-minorities.’ Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Agreement that ‘standards were higher for minorities than non-minorities’ by Respondent Intersectional Identity

Group	Agree*	Neither	Disagree	Don’t Know	No Minorities
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	8.34	16.38	63.46	6.01	5.82
Female & BIPOC*	22.90	23.08	46.02	4.93	3.08
Female & Caucasian	6.24	15.41	65.97	6.16	6.21
Female & Hetero	7.63	16.57	63.77	6.28	5.76
Female & LGB+	16.49	14.22	59.90	2.90	6.48
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	7.08	15.05	70.62	2.97	4.28
Male & BIPOC	19.15	22.46	54.87	1.96	1.56
Male & Caucasian	5.40	14.02	72.81	3.11	4.66
Male & Hetero	4.45	15.07	72.57	3.05	4.86
Male & LGB+	15.10	15.00	64.66	2.72	2.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	22.36	22.51	47.97	4.37	2.78
BIPOC & Hetero	21.80	24.25	46.04	4.70	3.21
BIPOC & LGB+	26.06	11.23	60.45	2.26	0.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	6.20	15.16	66.97	5.66	6.02
Caucasian & Hetero	5.13	15.25	67.64	6.00	5.98
Caucasian & LGB+	15.01	14.41	61.41	2.80	6.37
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	7.20	16.36	64.96	5.84	5.64
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	16.70	13.92	61.26	2.72	5.39
<i>All</i>	8.25	16.09	64.55	5.49	5.61

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 22.90% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC agree that in their organization ‘standards were higher for minorities than non-minorities.’

The fourth statement read:

The organization where I worked for most of the past two years was reluctant to promote minorities to supervisory or managerial positions.

The following table presents the estimated percentage of AFP members who agree/disagree that the organization where they spent most of the past two years working ‘was reluctant to promote minorities to supervisory or managerial positions.’ Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Agreement that organization ‘was reluctant to promote minorities to supervisory or managerial positions’ by Respondent Intersectional Identity

Group	Agree*	Neither	Disagree	Don’t Know	No Minorities
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	8.64	12.41	67.60	5.30	6.05
Female & BIPOC*	20.87	14.64	56.49	5.54	2.46
Female & Caucasian	6.89	12.09	69.20	5.27	6.56
Female & Hetero	8.01	11.60	68.93	5.45	6.01
Female & LGB+	15.87	21.67	52.40	3.58	6.48
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	7.37	9.67	76.72	2.15	4.09
Male & BIPOC	16.02	12.50	67.96	1.96	1.56
Male & Caucasian	6.16	9.27	77.94	2.18	4.44
Male & Hetero	6.10	8.65	78.87	1.78	4.60
Male & LGB+	11.23	12.78	70.17	3.29	2.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	19.70	14.01	58.32	5.69	2.28
BIPOC & Hetero	20.17	14.47	57.45	5.28	2.63
BIPOC & LGB+	16.63	11.01	64.03	8.33	0.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	6.75	11.61	70.59	4.76	6.28
Caucasian & Hetero	6.00	10.74	72.08	4.91	6.27
Caucasian & LGB+	13.02	18.83	58.25	3.53	6.37
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	7.76	11.20	70.27	4.95	5.82
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	13.58	17.63	59.14	4.26	5.39
<i>All</i>	8.40	11.92	69.03	4.88	5.77

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 20.87% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC agree that their organization ‘was reluctant to promote minorities to supervisory or managerial positions.’

The fifth and final statement read:

The organization where I worked for most of the past two years was successful in recruiting a diverse workforce.

The following table presents the estimated percentage of AFP members who agree/disagree that the organization where they spent most of the past two years working ‘was successful in recruiting a diverse workforce.’ Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

Agreement that organization ‘was successful in recruiting a diverse workforce’ by Respondent Intersectional Identity

Group	Agree*	Neither	Disagree	Don’t Know	No Minorities
<i>GENDER: Female</i>	41.65	18.29	32.90	1.91	5.25
Female & BIPOC*	49.74	15.36	30.58	1.85	2.46
Female & Caucasian	40.48	18.71	33.24	1.92	5.65
Female & Hetero	42.68	18.68	31.40	1.99	5.25
Female & LGB+	29.81	13.88	50.16	0.97	5.18
<i>GENDER: Male</i>	46.87	20.05	28.32	1.05	3.71
Male & BIPOC	45.70	19.34	31.44	1.96	1.56
Male & Caucasian	47.03	20.15	27.89	0.93	4.01
Male & Hetero	49.47	19.10	26.25	1.08	4.10
Male & LGB+	38.92	22.94	34.65	0.97	2.52
<i>RACE: BIPOC</i>	49.34	16.17	30.39	1.83	2.28
BIPOC & Hetero	51.71	14.06	29.84	1.76	2.63
BIPOC & LGB+	33.93	29.88	33.93	2.26	0.00
<i>RACE: Caucasian</i>	41.59	18.90	32.31	1.76	5.44
Caucasian & Hetero	42.45	19.39	30.83	1.89	5.45
Caucasian & LGB+	34.47	14.82	44.59	0.69	5.44
<i>SEXUALITY: Hetero</i>	43.59	18.73	30.71	1.87	5.10
<i>SEXUALITY: LGB+</i>	34.38	17.12	42.96	0.93	4.61
<i>All</i>	42.57	18.55	32.06	1.77	5.04

*Interpretation Example: We estimate 49.74% of AFP members who identify as female & BIPOC agree that their organization ‘was successful in recruiting a diverse workforce.’