

12-2017

Campus Climate, Peer Dispositions, and the Inclusion of LGBTQ and Transgender Students at a Jesuit University

Cassie L. Barnhardt

University of Iowa, cassie-barnhardt@uiowa.edu

Jodi Linley

University of Iowa, jodi-linley@uiowa.edu

Amanda L. Mollet

University of Iowa, amanda-mollett@uiowa.edu

Carson W. Phillips

University of Michigan, carsonp@umich.edu

Ryan L. Young

University of Iowa, ryan-l-young@uiowa.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>

Recommended Citation

Barnhardt, Cassie L.; Linley, Jodi; Mollet, Amanda L.; Phillips, Carson W.; and Young, Ryan L. (2017) "Campus Climate, Peer Dispositions, and the Inclusion of LGBTQ and Transgender Students at a Jesuit University," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 6 : No. 2 , Article 19.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol6/iss2/19>

This Scholarship is brought to you for free and open access by ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact epublications@regis.edu.

Campus Climate, Peer Dispositions, and the Inclusion of LGBQ and Transgender Students at a Jesuit University

Cassie L. Barnhardt

Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of Iowa
cassie-barnhardt@uiowa.edu

Jodi L. Linley

Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of Iowa
jodi-linley@uiowa.edu

Amanda L. Mollet

Doctoral Candidate, Educational Policy and Leadership Studies, University of Iowa
amanda-mollett@uiowa.edu

Carson W. Phillips

Research Area Specialist, Office of Budget and Planning, University of Michigan
carsonp@umich.edu

Ryan L. Young

Doctoral Candidate, Educational Policy and Leadership Studies, University of Iowa
ryan-l-young@uiowa.edu

Abstract

Using a campus climate framework, this study identifies students who hold positive dispositions towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer (LGBQ) and transgender students at a Jesuit university. Findings reveal that just more than one-quarter of students hold positive dispositions toward LGBQ and transgender students and desire that the campus work towards being more inclusive towards this group. Our binomial logistic regression of 602 student responses demonstrated that women are more inclined to hold positive dispositions. Similarly, students who agree that non-Catholics should be supported by their campus are also inclined to hold positive dispositions toward LGBQ and transgender students. Further, we observed positive effects when students attended multicultural events and completed diversity courses.

Students who experience supportive collegiate environments, where their identities are affirmed, possess a greater sense of belonging in the campus community and a greater likelihood of persistence.¹ Contemporary research has shown that college students whose sexual identities are minoritized, meaning they are rendered “lower status, visibility, and power,” face unwelcoming campus climates across institutional types and contexts.² Specifically, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer collegians report experiencing more discrimination on campus than their heterosexual peers.³ For LGBQ and transgender students at religiously affiliated institutions, perceptions of campus climate are especially complicated and concerning. The past three decades have seen a

small number of studies about LGBQ students at religiously affiliated institutions. Studies suggest that campus climates range from isolating to oppressive and homophobic to psychologically damaging at Catholic, Jesuit, and Christian institutions.⁴ By and large, the studies of LGBQ students at faith-based institutions are outdated, and some religious organizations have moved beyond pathological notions regarding non-heterosexuality to greater openness and acceptance of one’s LGBQ sexual orientation. Indeed, Pope Francis voiced that the *Catechism* dictates LGBQ people must not be discriminated against, and their social integration is ideal.⁵ With the changing context of faith, might LGBQ and transgender students at religiously affiliated

institutions today experience a campus climate distinct from the generation of LGBQ and transgender collegians who preceded them?

To consider the climate for LGBQ and transgender students, our analysis aims to understand the phenomenon of positive dispositions towards LGBQ and transgender students in the context of a religious educational setting. This analytical ambition emerged as a matter of both professional practice and scholarly interest. In 2014, the campus diversity office of a Jesuit university approached us to conduct a comprehensive climate survey with an interest in gauging the quality of the climate for LGBQ and transgender community members. The campus's motivation was born from its efforts to increase inclusion of its LGBQ and transgender students, evidenced largely by the 2010 creation of an office for LGBQ and transgender student services whose mission focuses on "equity, visibility, and inclusion of [lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender] students."⁶ The Campus Diversity Office (the entity that initiated the study) was operating from the perspective that relative inclusion is mediated by more than organizational structures; inclusion is also a cultural phenomenon created by the tendencies, behaviors, and attitudes within students' peer environments.⁷ As such, we determined that to understand the climate for inclusion of LGBQ and transgender students, and to assist the diversity office in facilitating inclusive change on campus, we needed to understand the nature of students' dispositions towards LGBQ and transgender students on campus.

The timing and appropriateness for examining dispositions regarding LGBQ students in the context of Catholic education is optimal for reasons beyond its utility to the campus in this study. Pope Francis began his papacy in 2013. Despite the maintenance of Catholic doctrinal commitments disapproving of LGBQ sexuality, Pope Francis has taken an outwardly more inclusive stance towards LGBQ individuals.⁸ The American LGBQ magazine *The Advocate* even identified Pope Francis as its person-of-the-year in 2013, arguing that the symbolism of his overt statements on withholding judgment and making room for LGBQ people in the Church have been profound in shifting popular sentiments within the Catholic community.⁹ Alongside Pope Francis'

public discourse, the Jesuit and Ignatian educational values provide a broader organizational backdrop; Jesuit campuses serve nearly a quarter of a million students.¹⁰ Distinctively, the Jesuit tradition is prefaced in social justice ideals and frames its education as providing "students with the opportunity to become thoughtful, competent and compassionate men and women for others, with a commitment to the greater good and a passion for justice."¹¹ Jesuit education, when realized, compels students to seek equality and dignity and to reform society and any unjust structures they encounter.¹² This study focuses on identifying students who hold dispositions favorable to improving the campus for LGBQ and transgender students.

The university we studied is not altogether novel; its desire to be inclusive of LGBQ and transgender students positions it alongside a host of other Catholic colleges that are investing in and providing resources to support LGBQ and transgender students and hoping to ultimately facilitate greater inclusion.¹³ Such organizational aspirations for inclusion are not unique to Catholic or Jesuit education. The professional and ethical obligations among all campus educators to support student success (especially for minoritized students) compel a renewed emphasis on understanding how peer environments contribute to the campus being inclusive of its LGBQ and transgender students. Here, we offer a model for understanding college students' LGBQ and transgender dispositions through the lens of campus climate, so that campuses might be better equipped to create an affirming community for students with minoritized gender and sexual identities.

Literature

Before we review the relevant literature, it is important to note that we consistently use the acronym LGBQ across all studies even though this does not fully represent the expression of all sexual and gender identities. Of particular note, some studies include findings relevant to transgender identities, which are not directly represented in our acronym. We specify this in order to convey that identity is quite differentiated, including distinctions between gender and sexual identity, and the literature

included below contributes additional nuance beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, knowing that within-group variation exists, there is the potential for students with minoritized sexual or gender identities to have common experiences with perceiving a sense of exclusion in the campus climate, although the magnitude or intensity of such experiences are likely to be unique based upon which identities students possess.¹⁴

Campus Climate and Sexual Identity

The quality of the campus climate contributes to LGBQ student success.¹⁵ Research demonstrates that LGBQ students experience the campus more negatively than their heterosexual peers.¹⁶ A negative climate comprised of heterosexism and anti-gay attitudes contributes to LGBQ students experiencing academic and interpersonal distress as well as a greater likelihood of departure from college.¹⁷ Conversely, when LGBQ students hold positive perceptions of their campus climate, these impressions function as a buffer against potential negative outcomes.¹⁸

Improving the campus climate for LGBQ and transgender students is a foundational antecedent to assuring their overall success in college. Identifying students who hold dispositions favorable to extending greater campus support for LGBQ and transgender students is one step towards building an inclusive and positive campus climate for LGBQ students.¹⁹ Woodford et al. examined the relationship between students' demographic characteristics and the likelihood of students to support increased civil rights for LGBQ people.²⁰ Among the characteristics, the students' frequency of attending religious services had the largest effect size. Further, in comparison to secular peers, affiliation with certain religious traditions (e.g. Roman Catholic, Protestant, Christian, Muslim) was a significant negative predictor for LGBQ and transgender peer support.²¹ Alternatively, women consistently have increased inclination to hold more positive dispositions (e.g., willingness to socialize/work with LGBQ and transgender people, supportive of same-sex marriages, supportive of same rights for LGBQ and transgender people, avoid using "that's so gay" language) towards LGBQ and transgender individuals.²² Fingerhut identified the

expanding number of campuses with Gay Straight Alliances in which LGBQ and heterosexual students join together to improve the campus climate for LGBQ students.²³

Support for LGBQ and transgender students varies by institution. The presence of campus LGBQ and transgender centers positively contributes to campus climate.²⁴ Fine identified that institutional surroundings (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) did not significantly predict the likelihood for a campus to have an LGBQ and transgender center.²⁵ However, other studies demonstrate that campuses produce microclimates where students associate tangible spaces on campus with a particular measure of inclusion/exclusion towards their LGBQ and transgender students.²⁶ Vacarro argues that the sociospatial microclimates associated with residence halls, dining halls, LGBQ and transgender centers, classes, or academic departments (and so on) signal the importance of understanding how peers' positive dispositions towards LGBQ and transgender can emerge, and can vary widely within the campus environment.²⁷ Moreover, people and spaces of affirmation are crucial for assuring equal access to inclusive education for LGBQ and transgender students.

LGBQ Dispositions and Ally Development

Educational researchers, administrators, and practitioners work to identify ways to improve the climate and success for LGBQ and transgender students. Fostering and supporting LGBQ and transgender potential allies is one approach that campuses pursue. The growth of formal ally programs has proliferated campuses with Safe Zone programs being the most frequent ally development programs.²⁸ The presence of LGBQ and transgender Safe Zone programs can improve campus climate and increase the visibility and quantity of peer allies.²⁹ Studies examining the influence of completing courses (i.e. cultural diversity in education course, psychology course with an emphasis of LGBQ identity) found increases in self-reported allyship.³⁰ Despite the visibility of ally training programs, not all programs have the same curriculum, goals, or outcomes. Woodford et al. identified some of the purposes of these programs, which include reducing harassment and discrimination,

increasing visibility of LGBQ and transgender support, and creating awareness by educating students.³¹ Across this body of literature, little attention has been allotted to identifying which students hold favorable dispositions as potential allies, or those who would like to see the campus better serve its LGBQ and transgender students? While definitionally allies are “members of dominant social groups (e.g., men, Whites, heterosexuals) who are working to end the system of oppression that gives them greater privilege and power based on their social-group membership,” for our study, we are not examining allies *per se*.³² Rather, we are working to identify students who hold dispositions favorable to the cause of the campus acting more supportive towards LGBQ and transgender individuals. Such individuals may also hold strong potential for becoming vocal and engaged allies on campus.

Some research has explored antecedents to heterosexual college students’ ally dispositions or behaviors. Broido explored three likely predictors for potential allies including “increased information on social justice issues, engagement in meaning-making processes, and self-confidence.”³³ Her study also noted that engaging in dialogue with students who had different perspectives was likely important to the potential for allyship. Generally, Fingerhut observed acting as an LGBQ and transgender ally is correlated with one’s level of education, as well as being a heterosexual women with greater educational attainment.³⁴ Reason and Broido more specifically outlined several common ally behaviors among college students to include: engaging in dialogue about difference with others with a dominant identity, critically identifying inequities, developing skills to educate others with dominant identities about inequities, advocacy around diverse curriculum, and providing support for LGBQ and transgender students.³⁵

While scholarship has directed attention to ally dispositions, few studies have examined dispositions towards LGBQ and transgender students in the context of religion. Munin and Speight are among the notable exceptions; using a sample that included mostly Catholic respondents (although it also had individuals from other faith traditions such as Protestant and Jewish) they observed that faith was a source of consternation

for students who identified as heterosexual allies of LGBQ individuals.³⁶ On the one hand students’ faith motivated them to support their LGBQ and transgender peers. However, in working to understand the oppression that their LGBQ and transgender peers experienced, they came to view their faith as one source of the oppression. Students discovered that their faith, at times, contradicted its ideals of justice, love, and acceptance that first motivated their interest in extending support to LGBQ and transgender peers.³⁷ Because faith-based institutions, and specifically Jesuit institutions, encourage students to use their faith as a guide for action, one’s faith can contribute to one’s understanding social inclusion. Further, with respect to realizing inclusion for LGBQ and transgender students on campuses, faith takes on additional importance because of its accompanying moral positions on sexual orientation and gender, therefore creating a need to understand how faith intersects with other personal characteristics in formulating one’s disposition towards LGBQ and transgender inclusion.

Methods

Conceptual Framework

Our study uses the Multicultural Organization Development [MCO] framework as a conceptual lens for identifying the characteristics, behaviors, perceptions, and organizational contexts that mediate the extent to which individuals hold inclusive attitudes towards community members that hold marginalized or oppressed identities.³⁸ The MCO is a campus climate framework consisting of four dimensions: the *compositional* dimension (the relative representation of diverse individuals), the *historical* legacy of inclusion or exclusion, the *psychological* impressions (affective responses that individuals in the community routinely experience), and the prevailing *behavioral* experiences that dominate the ways community members interact across difference.³⁹ The *structural* dimension was later elaborated to note the importance of campus policies and institutionalized practices in mediating the relative inclusion or exclusion minoritized students experience on campus.⁴⁰ To date, this framework is typically applied towards understanding the dynamics associated with the

racial climate on campus, and to facilitate organizational planning to improve the relative in/exclusion a campus community exudes.⁴¹ MCOB acknowledges that climate is a function of how individuals experience, engage in, and perceive their organizational experiences, while simultaneously noting that the organization tacitly and overtly contributes to the quality of the climate through its norms, values, practices, and policies.⁴² The synergy of individual and organizational dynamics makes the MCOB framework constructive for pinpointing opportunities for community member and organizational development, transformation, and change.

In this study, we use the MCOB framework to assess factors that contribute to students' relative dispositions regarding the campus extending support to LGBQ and transgender individuals/peers. The MCOB framework places a priority on understanding the role of organizational contexts alongside students' personal characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors. In campus climate research, organizationally-derived meaning systems (such as the organization's religious commitments, or the ways organizational leaders communicate) are understood as exerting differential influences upon organizational community members; this process is characterized as the relative strength that a particular campus climate has over individual behavior.⁴³ Moreover, our study captures the features of MCOB to identify students who hold positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions.⁴⁴

Data and Instrument

The university from which our sample is drawn is located in one of the most demographically diverse metropolitan areas of the United States. In addition to the university's present interest in understanding the relative inclusion for LGBQ and transgender students, this focus is an extension of a decade-long pursuit to engage in planning and restructuring campus services and programs to meet the evolving needs of a demographically shifting community of students and employees. A major initiative of the campus's diversity office is to pursue periodic assessment and evaluation of the campus climate; it is from

the undergraduate portion of these processes in which we obtained our data.

The survey instrument was developed in cooperation with the campus diversity officer, the student affairs leadership team, a student focus group, the campus LGBQ and transgender network (a working group of campus educators), and our research team. Administrators placed a high priority on co-constructing the instrument with the researchers, such that the product reflected both the attributes of the local campus culture and the multiple dimensions of campus climate embedded in MCOB.⁴⁵ In total, the survey consisted of 65 attitudinal/perceptual and behavioral items, and 6 open-ended items. Closed-ended survey items were measured on Likert-type scales. Response options included: "strongly disagree" (1), "disagree" (2), "agree" (3), "strongly agree" (4). (There was an option to respond with "No basis for judgment," but it was almost never utilized.) Other items asked respondents to rate the frequency with the choices of: "never" (0); "once or twice" (1); "a few times" (2); and "many times" (3). Respondents were also prompted to report on a battery of personal background and demographic questions. While a pilot test did not explicitly occur with the student version of the survey instrument, many survey items were refined and revised based on the administration of (and subsequent analysis of) two largely parsimonious and parallel survey instruments that were administered to faculty and staff in the months preceding the administration of the student survey.

In the fall of 2014, all undergraduate students were invited to participate in the online survey. We used Dillman's Total Design Method to guide the survey distribution process; this included contacting students up to three times within a four-week period to solicit their participation.⁴⁶ Students that completed the survey were entered into a raffle to win prizes valued at around \$100. Overall, the survey yielded a response rate of 23%, totaling 897 students. Specifically there were 634 responses for our outcome of interest. Using bivariate techniques, we compared these 634 cases to the respondent group according to one's race, sexual orientation, sex, and religious faith tradition to look for dissimilarities. Specifically, relative to the campus population demographics, the

respondent group and our sample had an overrepresentation of women (73.8%, versus 26.2% males). To adjust for this response bias, we generated a probability weight to ensure that the

sample reflected the distribution of men and women in the campus population (60% females, 40% males). The descriptive statistics for the analytical sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variables included in ordered logistic regression disaggregated by response choice

Descriptives	Status Quo (N=423)		LGBT positive disposition (N=179)		Overall (N=602)	
		SD		SD		SD
<i>Dependent Variable</i>						
This community provides support to the unique challenges that come along with being a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender student.	3.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.28	0.45
<i>Demographic and Personal Characteristics</i>						
Heterosexual [^]	96.0%	0.20	85.0%***	0.36	93.0%	0.26
Catholic [^]	41.0%	0.49	39.0%	0.50	40.0%	0.49
Female [^]	58.0%	0.50	68.0%*	0.47	60.0%	0.49
White [^]	48.0%	0.50	37.0%*	0.48	45.0%	0.50
Class Year	2.47	1.13	2.73*	1.10	2.54	1.13
<i>Campus Environmental Characteristics</i>						
Importance of religious mission and value in selecting this campus (four item factor) [~]	0.02	1.00	-0.08	0.98	0.00	1.00
This community provides support to the unique challenges that come along with being a non-Catholic student.	3.31	0.40	3.39***	0.59	3.20	0.48
Specific school/college	5.38	2.91	5.88	2.86	5.52	2.90
Completed diversity requirement [^]	0.45	0.50	0.5	0.50	1.47	0.50
Frequency of attending multicultural events and activities on campus	1.80	0.68	2.00***	0.72	1.86	0.70
Perception of percentage of students who share my race	44.4%	25.73	39.9%	26.61	43.1%	26.04
Perception of percentage of faculty who share my race	40.6%	28.07	37.1%	28.96	39.6%	28.35
This campus's senior leaders communicate the reasons and philosophies behind important decisions.	3.11	0.82	2.83***	0.86	3.03	0.84
I feel free to publicly express my positions and views on campus (in-class, in my non-class activities)	3.19	0.70	3.13	0.73	3.18	0.71
<i>Interaction Effects</i>						
Female Diversity Course Interaction	0.23	0.42	0.22	0.42	0.23	0.42

Notes: Significance tests were performed using t-tests and Crosstabs with X², depending on whether variable was measured continuously or categorically, respectively.

[^]Denotes dummy coded variable. [~]Denotes standardized measure. Statistics are based on weighted data.

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Variables

Our outcome variable consisted of students' responses to the survey item: "Rate the extent to which the campus community provides support to the unique challenges that come with belonging to one of the following groups," and a series of groups were identified, one of which included "Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender students." Response options included the following: "The campus should not support this group, it is unnecessary" (1.52% responded), "The campus should provide less support to this group than it does currently" (3.51% responded), both of which we characterized as *antagonistic* dispositions towards LGBQ and transgender community members (N=32). The other two survey response options for this item included: "The campus' current level of support is adequate" (67.7% responded), which we characterized as a *status quo* disposition (N=423), and "The campus should provide greater support to this group than it currently does" (27.9% responded) we labeled as reflecting a positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions (N=179).

Following an initial multinomial logistic regression analysis, a likelihood ratio test concluded that the two antagonistic response options ("The campus should not support this group, it is unnecessary" and "The campus should provide less support to this group than it does currently") were to be statistically indistinguishable and were subsequently collapsed into one category. Together, these two categories accounted for 32 cases. A subsequent ANOVA analysis including Tukey post-hoc tests indicated that on many demographic characteristics (sexuality, gender and race), these 32 cases were statistically different from the other two outcome variable response groups (see Appendix).⁴⁷ Given the small number of cases and unrepresentativeness of this group, we chose to focus only on respondents in the status quo and LGBQ and transgender positive disposition categories: "The campus's current level of support is adequate" and "The campus should provide greater support to this group than it currently does." Moreover, our empirical analysis was also supported in our conceptual objective to focus on understanding factors that contribute to college students holding positive LGBQ and

transgender dispositions distinctive from those who hold views that affirm the status quo.

Our control variables consisted of five personal characteristics. These demographic variables (and the corresponding coding applied to them) reflected a balance between the typical variables utilized in the college effects literature and the specific personal characteristics that the campus felt were important to examine relative in/exclusion in its particular climate.⁴⁸ Resultantly, we included dummies for respondents' sexual orientation (1=straight/heterosexual, 0=bisexual, gay/lesbian, prefer not to state, or other), Catholic affiliation (1=Catholic, 0=non-Catholic), sex (1=female, 0=male) race (1=white, 0=non-white), and one's class year (first-year (1) to senior (4)). The decision to code race/ethnicity as a white/non-white dichotomy reflects both empirical, conceptual, and local concerns with regards to these data. While this campus is a majority minority campus, white remains the largest single racial group on campus, with the second largest group being a wide variety of multiracial/multiethnic combinations. Empirically therefore, both the number of cases in each group and the number of variables in the model overall greatly limits the power of the analysis. This is magnified by the fact that in models (not shown) that do include either single racial test groups (e.g. Latinx vs. non-Latinx) or every racial group included, no model was significant after adding campus environmental variables. Finally, the decision to conceptualize race on this campus reflects a climate where non-white students are still very much minoritized compared to their white peers. Importantly, this was not a decision to attempt to collapse the experiences specific to any group on campus, our analysis could not relate such distinctions regardless. With respect to sexual orientation we contrasted students who identified as heterosexual (93% of respondents) compared to students who indicated any other sexual orientation or preferred not to state their sexual orientation. Overall, this group consisted of 43 students including: bisexual (3% of total respondents), gay/lesbian (2% of total respondents), prefer not to state (2% of total respondents), or other (1% of total respondents).

The second block of independent variables included a factor that measured how much the

religious mission and tradition of the university factored into one's choice to attend this university (four-item factor, see Table 2). The factor was evaluated using exploratory and confirmatory analysis using principal component varimax rotation, resulting in a single factor with an eigenvalue of 2.55, and a reliability of $\alpha=.812$. We standardized the four variables and multiplied each by its corresponding factor weight. The religious selection factor variable was then

produced by calculating the mean of the four products. Next, we standardized the factor variable. As somewhat of a counterpoint, but attentive to the role of religion on campus, we included a measure where students rated the extent to which the campus supports the unique challenges of being a non-Catholic student ($\mu=3.2$, Table 1), or an out-group member in the context of a Jesuit, Catholic university.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Factor Loading Values for Importance of Religion in University Selection Decision Factor

	Mean	SD	Factor Loading
This campus's mission resonates with my personal and academic values.	3.27	0.66	0.86
I have become more devoted to this campus's religious teachings since attending.	2.50	0.96	0.84
Prior to attending, I was committed to this campus's religious teachings.	2.03	0.92	0.80
I selected this institution because of the religious affiliation and mission.	2.37	0.97	0.70

Eigenvalue: 2.51; N=602; $\alpha=0.806$

The next three items were structural/behavioral climate variables including: a categorical variable denoting which school/college a student was enrolled in (there were 5 schools/colleges on-campus and all students have an academic home of this type), whether a student had fulfilled the diversity course requirement in the general undergraduate education curriculum (1=yes, 0=no), and how often a student attended multicultural events (1=never, 2=occasionally, 3=frequently). Following these variables, we included a series of perceptual variables consistent with the racial climate for consistency with MCOB as a framework. Two items had students estimate the percentage of students and the percentage of faculty that share the same race/ethnicity as the respondent (0-100). This item was included as a complementary measure to routine compositional diversity measures used in campus climate studies (e.g. controlling for one's race/ethnicity, or the representativeness of racial/ethnic groups). The percentage measured respondents' perceptions of their campus racial/ethnic climate; a measure that is foundational to any application of a MCOB framework where organizational members' perceptions of a critical mass of racially similar individuals contributes to their views about the

need for inclusive change.⁴⁹ Other perceptual variables focused on psychological impressions of the organization including a variable indicating the extent to which respondents agreed that campus senior leaders communicate the reasons behind important decisions and a variable denoting how free one feels to publically express their views on-campus. We conceptualized these items as holding a relationship to students' LGBQ and transgender dispositions because community members' perceptions of organizational decisions, and their perceptions about having freedom to speak out, frames organizational members' views about the necessity of organizational inclusion and change.⁵⁰ As we progressed through our multivariate modeling we also chose to include test an array of interaction terms; only the cross-product of one's sex with their response to taking the diversity course is reported (because of its significance). Descriptive statistics were generated using cross tabulations with chi-square tests and t-tests. These are reported in Table 1.

Analysis

We generated a series of three blocked binomial logistic regression models to calculate parameter estimates. Each model was evaluated by comparing the goodness-of-fit statistics as they

were entered sequentially. Our full model of LGBQ and transgender dispositions is represented as:

$$\ln[P/(1-P)] = \alpha + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + \epsilon$$

In this equation, \ln is the natural log, and P represents the probability of a student holding positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions compared to the probability of holding status quo attitudes. X_1 is the set of personal characteristics; X_2 are the campus experiences and perceptions one has, and X_3 is the interaction term. The error is logistically distributed. The model fit statistics we utilized included the likelihood ratio tests, pseudo R^2 , and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) to determine which model better fit the observed data.⁵¹ When comparing the models we considered the findings of the likelihood ratio tests, the BIC difference, and the Wald X^2 .

Limitations

Notably, the campus from which we draw our sample may be unique. Specifically, its deliberate efforts to advance inclusion for LGBQ and transgender people may be novel relative to similar religiously affiliated campuses. Similarly, with 45% white students, it is among the most racially/ethnic diverse student samples used to evaluate positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions or to apply an MCOF framework. As such, the findings from this study should be interpreted with some caution for the effects observed may be positively skewed. Even so, it is possible that the relative climate for inclusion may not be so different, for the state in which the campus is located is not exceptional; on average, the percentage of Catholics in the state indicating that “homosexuality should be accepted” is just three percentage points above the average for U.S. states.⁵² Furthermore, while structural changes have advanced social and civil rights for LGBQ and transgender people in U.S. society (as evidenced in state-level marriage equality statutes and the 2015 Supreme Court affirming the constitutionality and legality of same-sex marriage), the relative experience of being included cannot be dictated through policy. Notably, national trend data indicates that feelings of acceptance are experienced differentially as a function of one’s particular sexual orientation and gender identity which has produced a de facto

hierarchy of inclusion under the generalized umbrella of greater civil rights for the LGBQ and transgender community.⁵³ Moreover, our analysis is only able to assess students’ attitudes towards LGBQ and transgender people as a generalized category, rather than individual distinct groups who experience exclusion and/or oppression in nuanced and discrete ways as a function of their particular identity. This study is limited by the fact that it cannot sort out differential attitudes towards the within-group characteristics of the LGBQ and transgender community writ large. It would be timely and appropriate to explore future analyses that can dissect these differences.

Results

Our models are presented in Table 3 and are explained in terms of odds ratios. Our models present the odds of holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition compared to the odds of holding a disposition that affirms the status quo. A significant odds ratio of 1 is associated with a positive increase in odds, whereas a value less than 1 indicates a decline in the odds. Each of our three models were significant, with the full model (Model 3) generating a log likelihood of -304.67, which was significant at the $p \leq .001$ level, and had a BIC of 711.74, and a pseudo R^2 of 0.14. The goodness-of-fit statistics suggest that each of the models improved as the log likelihoods got progressively closer towards zero, signifying that Model 3 fit the observed data best. The differences in the BICs of Model 2 to Model 1 (7.26) demonstrated that the inclusion of campus characteristics alongside individual characteristics offered a superior fit, evidenced by the Wald X^2 test significance at the $p \leq .001$ level.

With respect to students’ background characteristics, one’s sexual orientation was associated with one’s disposition towards LGBQ and transgender students. We observed that identifying as heterosexual is associated with decreasing the odds of holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition (OR=0.28, $p \leq .001$, Model 3). Aside from sexual orientation, being female and progressing through college (one’s class year) increased the odds of holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition in all three models. In Model 2, the odds of a female holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition

increased 1.73 times ($p \leq .001$) compared to these odds for men. Being white reduced the odds of

holding a positive LGBQ and transgender in Model 1; in Models 2 and 3 this evaporated.⁵⁴

Table 3. Odds ratio of demographic, campus environmental, and interaction effects on LGBT positive disposition

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	OR (SE)	OR (SE)	OR (SE)
Constant	0.78 (0.41)	0.01*** (1.15)	0.00*** (1.23)
<i>Demographic and Personal Characteristics</i>			
Heterosexual	0.22*** (0.33)	0.28*** (0.36)	0.28*** (0.36)
Catholic	0.94 (0.2)	1.14 (0.23)	1.06 (0.24)
Female	1.57* (0.2)	1.73* (0.22)	3.43*** (0.34)
White	0.64* (0.2)	0.74 (0.31)	0.66 (0.32)
Class Year	1.27** (0.09)	1.29** (0.09)	1.30** (0.09)
<i>Campus Environmental Characteristics</i>			
Importance of religious mission and value in selecting this campus (four item factor)		0.98 (0.11)	0.98 (0.12)
This community provides support to the unique challenges that come along with being a non-Catholic student.		3.11*** (0.22)	3.01*** (0.22)
Specific school/college		1.03 (0.03)	1.02 (0.04)
Completed diversity requirement		0.98 (0.21)	1.49 (0.26)
Frequency of attending multicultural events and activities on campus		1.40* (0.15)	1.38* (0.15)
Perception of percentage of students who share my race		0.99 (0.01)	1.00 (0.01)
Perception of percentage of faculty who share my race		1.01 (0.01)	1.00 (0.01)
This campus's senior leaders communicate the reasons and philosophies behind important decisions.		0.68*** (0.13)	0.67** (0.13)
I feel free to publicly express my positions and views on campus (in-class, in my non-class activities)		1.10 (0.15)	1.09 (0.16)
<i>Interaction Effects</i>			
Female Diversity Course Interaction			3.37** (0.44)
Model Fit Statistics			
N	602	602	602
Log Likelihood	-333.72	-308.55	-304.67
Pseudo R2	0.05	0.13	0.14
LR	38.52	88.86	96.63
LR(df)	5	14	15
Prob>X ²	0.000	0.000	0.000
BIC	705.84	713.11	711.74
Model Comparison Statistics			
<i>Comparison Between Models</i>		2 v. 1	3 v. 2
BIC difference		7.26	-1.37
Wald X ²		26.3	76.96
Wald X ² (df)		0.000	0.000
Likelihood Ratio		-50.34	-7.77
LR(df)		9	1
Prob>LR		0.000	0.005

Note: *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$; Weighted N:602

Relative to the influence of the organizational contexts of the university we observed three significant effects. When students reported the campus as supporting non-Catholic identifying students, these affirming views were associated with an increase in the odds of a student holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition (OR=3.01, $p \leq .001$, Model 3). Also, the extent to which students strongly agreed that the campus's senior leaders communicated the reasons and philosophies behind important decisions, was associated with a reduction in the odds (OR=0.67, $p \leq .01$, Model 3) that a student would hold a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition rather than a status quo disposition. Behaviorally, we found that when students attended multicultural events on campus with greater frequency, such action was associated with an increase in their odds (OR=1.38, $p \leq .05$, Model 3) of holding a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition. In Model 3, we found an interaction effect where women who had taken a diversity course had far greater odds (OR=3.37, $p \leq .01$) of holding positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions.

Discussion and Implications

Prior analyses have worked to identify individual-level predictors of LGBQ and transgender allyship among college students by considering the extent to which students support affirming public policies for LGBQ and transgender people. Here, our study is unique in that it speaks to (1) the tangible prevalence of students with positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions within a religiously affiliated campus community, and (2) the dispositions of students who view their campus specifically as being in need of extending greater support to LGBQ and transgender students.⁵⁵ Just less than 28% of students held positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions, conversely about 5% of students held antagonistic LGBQ and transgender dispositions, and the remaining two-thirds of students held status quo dispositions by virtue of their feelings that the campus's current level of support was suitable. Objective measures regarding prevalence of dispositions is important for studying the campus climate for inclusion, and for the application of a MCOB framework. Documenting these dispositions reflects how students feel about LGBQ- and transgender-oriented organizational

change on their campus specifically, rather than documenting sentiments about inclusion towards LGBQ and transgender people in broader society. Prior work has tended to use one's sentiments about public policies related to LGBQ and transgender rights as a proxy for ally sentiments among college students.⁵⁶ In this study, we see a modest share of students seeking progressive organizational change, a small fraction desiring regressive organizational change, and the vast majority holding rather inert positions about how the community supports its LGBQ and transgender members. For campus educators and student affairs practitioners seeking to use MCOB these foundational metrics are useful in making sense of the objective climate, upon which it can then be reevaluated at a later date.⁵⁷ Further, it must be noted, the campus in the study sought to improve the climate for LGBQ and transgender individuals, independent of how the LGBQ and transgender climate compared to that of its peer universities.

Beyond prevalence, our findings further provide a window into the context and role of LGBQ and transgender dispositions at a religious educational setting, and specifically in the organizational context of Jesuit education. Previous studies have used one's religious affiliation as a proxy for gauging the influence of religion on one's attitudes. Here we bundle one's affiliation with the extent to which one reports being influenced by the campus's religious mission and values, and one's perceptions of the university as needing to support those who fall outside of the campus' religious tradition (non-Catholics). These additional measures allowed us to observe shades of nuance in the data, leading to our finding that one's religious affiliation had no significant effect on students' LGBQ and transgender dispositions. Instead, students' concerns for their non-Catholic peers were positively related to also holding positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions. This finding is compatible with Munin and Speight's qualitative work, which observed college students tending to assume LGBQ and transgender allied views when they were simultaneously motivated by their social justice religious ideals and viewed the church as acting in repressive ways towards women and individuals.⁵⁸ These authors further found that allyship was fostered when students

demonstrated the ability to take on the perspectives of out-group members. Our study appears to support Munin and Speights' qualitative findings as evidenced by our observation of a positive quantitative relationship between one's concern for non-Catholics and the odds of one assuming a positive LGBQ and transgender disposition.

Our findings, coupled with the aforementioned prior scholarship, cumulate to beg for future research regarding the manner in which empathy for out-group members relates to LGBQ and transgender dispositions in college student populations. Generally, holding positive regard for out-group individuals is captured in some of the emerging research on measuring allophobia (a term understood as the inverse of negative views expressed in racism, sexism, homophobia thus denoting positive perceptions of outgroup identity groups).⁵⁹ Positive regard for others is also compatible with the well-established line of inquiry by social psychologists denoting the role of empathy in reducing bias.⁶⁰ Moreover, the acknowledgement of differences and empathy seem to be critical cognitive and affective dimensions that prime college students for positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions.

Our findings revealed that women were likely to possess positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions. We assert that this finding, like the non-Catholic finding, should be interpreted as reflective of the role empathy has in promoting such dispositions. When scholars observed the same gendered result in the same direction, they have made similar attributions that women are especially empathetic toward their LGBQ and transgender peers.⁶¹ Therefore, we assert our finding conveys a general effect of gender. That is, our finding might best be explained by the broader societal context in which women experience discrimination, rather than the unique context of the campus from which our data were drawn. The consistency across studies using an array of sample populations, alludes to the context that women in the U.S. exist within patriarchal hegemony and are subject to systemic sexism (e.g. labor, healthcare discrimination, etc.). Women in our study may be empathetic to the experiences of LGBQ and transgender students in the same hegemonic environment that privileges cisgender

heterosexual masculinity.⁶² Even so, we do recognize that in the context of the Catholic Church, the hegemonic patriarchy is institutionalized in its structures, so it is also possible that this organizational context may be the phenomenon in which the women in our study are responding. Future qualitative work may better unbundle these potentialities.

With the inclusion of interaction terms, we found a relationship between the campus context and one's gender; women who took a diversity course were more inclined to hold positive LGBT dispositions. At this campus, diversity course enrollment is a distinctive MCOB behavioral strategy that the campus has created for its students in order to advance larger educational aims. Over the last several years, the campus has not only adopted enrollment in a diversity course as a graduation requirement, but it has been expanding the range of course options that can fulfill the requirement. By including a diversity course in its requirements, the campus has been explicit about its intention to reflect the body of research denoting that diversity courses foster students' sense of empathy and social justice and moral discernment.⁶³ Here, for this particular Jesuit campus, a diversity course intersects with one's gender such that women have far greater odds of holding positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions compared to their male counterparts who were exposed to the same curricular experience.

Finally, our findings revealed that there is a positive relationship between students holding positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions and the frequency in which one attends multicultural events on campus; that is, more frequent attendance advances positive LGBQ and transgender dispositions. Multicultural student services support staff might find these results especially validating. Programming focused on inclusion have a clear role in contributing to the community's understanding of diverse groups.⁶⁴ Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller remind educators however, that multicultural programming cannot be the domain of student affairs or multicultural staff exclusively if the campus desires any social inclusion gain from it.⁶⁵ Rather it must be an effort put forth by the entire campus.⁶⁶ The campus in this study worked extensively to infuse

multicultural programming across all domains of the university over the past decade such that it serves students in and out of the classroom so that it touches them as students, leaders, community servants, and in their religious/spiritual life. Programs within the university have even earned national awards for their abilities to infuse multiculturalism into their programming. Moreover, our findings reflect that the multicultural programming appears to assist with

the university's goals for diversity and inclusion by virtue of being positively associated with fostering positive LGBTQ and transgender dispositions among students who participate with greater frequency. Diversity-oriented educational programming, a long discussed strategy articulated under MCOE, appears to be contributing to the espoused goals of cultivating greater inclusion for minoritized identity groups—here LGBTQ and transgender students.⁶⁷

Notes

¹ Jeni Hart and Jennifer Fellabaum, "Analyzing Campus Climate Studies: Seeking to Define and Understand," *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1, no. 4 (2008); Bernice R. Sandler and Roberta M. Hall, "The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students" (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1986); Terrell L. Strayhorn, "Measuring Race and Gender Differences in Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Campus Climate and Intentions to Leave College: An Analysis in Black and White," *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 50, no. 2 (2013).

² Dafina-Lazarus Stewart, Kristen A. Renn, and G. Blue Brazelton, *Gender and Sexual Diversity in U.S. Higher Education: Contexts and Opportunities for LGBTQ College Students*, New Directions for Student Services, 152 (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2015).

³ Susan R. Rankin et al., "State of Higher Education for Lesbian Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People: 2010 National College Climate Survey" (Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride, 2010); Michael R. Woodford et al., "Discrimination and Mental Health among Sexual Minority College Students: The Type and Form of Discrimination Does Matter," *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Mental Health* 18, no. 2 (2014).

⁴ Regarding Catholic colleges see: Patrick G. Love, "Contradiction and Paradox: Attempting to Change the Culture of Sexual Orientation at a Small Catholic College," *Review of Higher Education* 20, no. 4 (1997); "Cultural Barriers Facing Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Students at a Catholic College," *Journal of Higher Education* 69, no. 3 (1998); Robbee Wedow et al., "I'm Gay and I'm Catholic": Negotiating Two Complex Identities at a Catholic University," *Sociology of Religion* 78, no. 3 (2017). For Jesuit colleges see: Bryce E. Hughes, "Who Am I to Judge?: How a Jesuit University Addresses LGBT Issues on Campus" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2015). For Christian colleges see: Joshua R. Wolff and Heather L. Himes, "Purposeful Exclusion of Sexual Minority Youth in Christian Higher Education: The Implications of Discrimination," *Christian Higher Education* 9, no. 5 (2010).

⁵ Elise Harris, "What Does Pope Francis's 'Apology' to Gays Really Mean?," *Crux: Taking the Catholic Pulse*, July 1, 2016, <https://cruxnow.com/analysis/2016/07/01/pope-franciss-apology-gays-really-mean/>; Vatican, "Apostolic Journey to

Rio De Janeiro on the Occasion of the XXVIII World Youth Day: Press Conference of Pope Francis During the Return Flight," (July 28, 2013), https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/july/documents/papa-francesco_20130728_gmg-conferenza-stampa.html

⁶ The study site used the acronym "LGBT" to refer to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. Some related literature focuses exclusively on sexual orientation and does not include gender. These studies use "LGB" or "LGBQ" acronyms. For consistency in our prose, we use "LGBQ" exclusively; although "LGBTQ" represents both sexual and gender identities, all of our references did not include transgender participants. We believe adding a "T" within this study could enhance conflation between gender and sexual orientation; as such we exclude the T from the acronym. In lieu of adding "T" within spaces when referring to scholarship that is exclusive to sexuality, and LGBTQ to convey that we are referring to individuals with minoritized sexual and gender identities generally.

⁷ Alexander W. Astin, *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1993); Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini, *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2005).

⁸ Lucas Grindley, "The Advocate's Person of the Year: Pope Francis," *The Advocate*, December 16, 2013, <http://www.advocate.com/year-review/2013/12/16/advocates-person-year-pope-francis>

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, "U.S. Jesuit Higher Education," <http://www.ajcunet.edu/history/>.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Pedro Arrupe, "Men for Others: Education for Social Justice and Social Action Today," <http://onlineministries.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html>; Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA), "Go Forth and Teach: The Characteristics of Jesuit Education," in *Foundations*, ed. Carl E. Meirose, S.J. (Washington, DC: JSEA), 1994.

¹³ Michael O'Loughlin, "Being Gay at a Catholic University," *Religion & Politics*, June 18, 2013,

<http://religionandpolitics.org/2013/06/18/being-gay-at-a-catholic-university/>; Kyle Spencer, "A Rainbow over Catholic Colleges," *The New York Times*, August 4, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/04/education/edlife/how-georgetown-became-a-gay-friendly-campus.html?smid=pl-share&r=0>

¹⁴ The study site uses the acronym "LGBT" to refer to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. In our prose we are careful to use "LGBQ" when referring to scholarship that is exclusive to sexuality, and we add the term transgender specifically to note a specific reference to gender identity.

¹⁵ Genny Beemyn and Sue R. Rankin, "Introduction to the Special Issue on "LGBTQ Campus Experiences," *Journal of Homosexuality* 58, no. 9 (2011); Susan R. Rankin, "Campus Climates for Sexual Minorities," in *New Directions for Student Services – Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Research, Policy, and Personal (No. 111)*, ed. R. L. Sanlo (San Francisco, CA: Wiley Jossey-Bass, 2005); Rankin et al., "State of Higher Education."

¹⁶ Jason C. Garvey and Susan R. Rankin, "Making the Grade? Classroom Climate for LGBTQ Students across Gender Conformity," *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 52, no. 2 (2015); Susan D. Longerbeam et al., "Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual College Student Experiences: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of College Student Development* 48, no. 2 (2007); Rankin et al., "State of Higher Education."; Kristen A. Renn, "LGBT and Queer Research in Higher Education: State and Status of the Field," *Educational Researcher* 3, no. 2 (2010).

¹⁷ Rankin et al., "State of Higher Education"; Peter Silverschanz et al., "Slurs, Snubs, and Queer Jokes: Incidence and Impact of Heterosexist Harassment in Academia," *Sex Roles* 58, no. 3-4 (2008); Michael R. Woodford, Alex Kulick, and Brittanie Atteberry, "Protective Factors, Campus Climate, and Health Outcomes among Sexual Minority College Students," *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 8, no. 2 (2015).

¹⁸ Rankin et al., "State of Higher Education."

¹⁹ Michael R. Woodford et al., "Endorsement for Civil Rights for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People among Heterosexual College Students: Informing Socially Just Policy Advocacy," *Journal of Community Practice* 21, no. 3 (2013); Meredith G. F. Worthen, "College Student Experiences with an LGBTQ Ally Training Program: A Mixed Methods Study at a University in the Southern United States," *Journal of LGBT Youth* 8 (2011).

²⁰ Woodford et al., "Endorsement for Civil Rights."

²¹ Ibid.

²² Eric G. Lambert et al., "College Students' Views on Gay and Lesbian Issues," *Journal of Homosexuality* 50, no. 4 (2006); Michael R. Woodford et al., "Predictors of Heterosexual College Students' Attitudes toward LGBT People," *Journal of LGBT Youth* 9, no. 4 (2012).

²³ Adam W. Fingerhut, "Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance with the LGBT Community?," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 41, no. 9 (2011).

²⁴ Melinda D. Kane, "Finding 'Safe' Campuses: Predicting the Presence of LGBT Student Groups at North Carolina Colleges and Universities," *Journal of Homosexuality* 60, no. 6 (2013).

²⁵ Leigh E. Fine, "The Context of Creating Space: Assessing the Likelihood of College LGBT Center Presence," *Journal of College Student Development* 53, no. 2 (2012).

²⁶ Annemarie Vacarro, "Campus Microclimates for LGBT Faculty, Staff, and Students: An Exploration of the Intersections of Social Identity and Campus Roles," *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 49, no. 4 (2012).

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Michael R. Woodford et al., "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Ally Training Programs on Campus: Current Variations and Future Directions," *Journal of College Student Development* 55, no. 3 (2014); Safe Zone Project (<http://thesafezoneproject.com/>) is a training program that prepares individuals in an organization to create LGBQ-inclusive environments, and to identify themselves as being open to talking and extending support to LGBQ individuals in the organization.

²⁹ Nancy J. Evans, "The Impact of an LGBT Safe Zone Project on Campus Climate," *Journal of College Student Development* 43, no. 4 (2002).

³⁰ Steven Z. Athanases and Timothy G. Larrabee, "Toward a Consistent Stance in Teaching for Equity: Learning to Advocate for Lesbian- and Gay-Identified Youth," *Teaching and Teacher Education* 19, no. 2 (2003); Amy D. Waterman et al., "From Curiosity to Care: Heterosexual Student Interest in Sexual Diversity Courses," *Teaching of Psychology* 28, no. 1 (2001); Woodford et al., "Predictors of Heterosexual College Students' Attitudes toward LGBT People."

³¹ Woodford et al., "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Ally Training Programs."

³² Ellen M. Broido, "The Development of Social Justice Allies During College: A Phenomenological Investigation," *Journal of College Student Development* 41, no. 1 (2000).

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Fingerhut, "Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance with the LGBT Community?"

³⁵ Robert D. Reason and Ellen M. Broido, "Issues and Strategies for Social Justice Allies (and the Student Affairs Professionals Who Hope to Encourage Them)," in *New Directions for Student Services* 110, (2005).

³⁶ Art Munin and Suzette L. Speight, "Factors Influencing the Ally Development of College Students," *Equity and Excellence in Education* 43, no. 2 (2010).

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Sylvia Hurtado et al., “A Model for Diverse Learning Environments: The Scholarship on Creating and Assessing Conditions for Student Success,” in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, ed. J. C. Smart and M. B. Paulsen (New York: Springer, 2012); Sylvia Hurtado et al., “Enacting Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity through Educational Policy and Practice,” *The Review of Higher Education* 21, no. 3 (1998).

³⁹ Sylvia Hurtado et al., “Enacting Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity.”

⁴⁰ Jeffrey F. Milem, Mitchell J. Chang, and Anthony L. Antonio, *Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2005).

⁴¹ Damon A. Williams, *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education* (Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2013).

⁴² Cassie L. Barnhardt et al., “University Leaders’ Public Advocacy: An Educational Asset in Creating Inclusive Climates,” *Teachers College Record* 120, no. 9 (2018, In Press).

⁴³ Ibid.; Marvin W. Peterson and Melinda Spencer, “Understanding Academic Culture and Climate,” in *Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures*, ed. W. G. Tierney, New Directions for Institutional Research (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1990).

⁴⁴ Hurtado et al., “Enacting Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity”; Milem et al., “Making Diversity Work on Campus.”

⁴⁵ William H. Bergquist, *The Four Cultures of the Academy* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 1992).

⁴⁶ Don A. Dillman, *Mail and Internet Surveys, the Tailored Design Method* (New York: Wiley, 2000).

⁴⁷ As evident in Table 3, the group of antagonist students were demographically mostly male (69%), all were heterosexual, and a majority were white (61%). Those who responded with antagonistic perspectives expressed significantly lower levels of agreements that the campus provides support to non-Catholic students, and that they felt free to express their positions and views on campus.

⁴⁸ Pascarella and Terenzini, *How College Affects Students*, 2.

⁴⁹ Rachele L. Pope, Amy L. Reynolds, and John A. Mueller, *Creating Multicultural Change on Campus* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2014).

⁵⁰ Sefa Hayibor, “Is Fair Treatment Enough? Augmenting the Fairness-Based Perspective on Stakeholder Behavior,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 140, no. 1 (2017).

⁵¹ James S. Long, “Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables,” *Advanced Quantitative Techniques in the Social Sciences Series 7*, (1997).

⁵² Pew Research Center, “Religious Landscape Study,” *Pew Research Center’s Religion & Public Life Project* (blog), May 11 2015, <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>.

⁵³ Pew Research Center, “A Survey of LGBT Americans: Chapter 2: Social Acceptance,” *Pew Research Center’s Social & Demographic Trends Project* (blog), June 13, 2013, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/chapter-2-social-acceptance/>.

⁵⁴ We also generated models (not reported, but available upon request) to test to see if there were observable differences when we recoded the faith variable to test for differences between being Catholic, non-Catholic (spiritually identified), and non-Catholic (atheist or agnostic). The two non-Catholic groupings evidenced no empirical differences; therefore we utilized a binary Catholic v. non-Catholic (all) in the final modeling presented.

⁵⁵ Eric Swank, Michael R. Woodford, and Colin Lim, “Antecedents of Pro-LGBT Advocacy among Sexual Minority and Heterosexual College Students,” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 10, no. 4 (2013).

⁵⁶ Woodford et al., “Endorsement for Civil Rights.”

⁵⁷ Peterson and Spencer, “Understanding Academic Culture and Climate.”

⁵⁸ Munin and Speight, “Factors Influencing the Ally Development of College Students.”

⁵⁹ Todd L. Pittinsky, Seth A. Rosenthal, and Matthew R. Montoya, “Measuring Positive Attitudes Towards Outgroups: Development and Validation of the Allophilia Scale,” in *Moving Beyond Prejudice Reduction: Pathways to Positive Intergroup Relations*, ed. Linda R. Troop and Robyn K. Mallett (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2011); Todd L. Pittinsky and Stefanie Simon, “Intergroup Leadership,” *The Leadership Quarterly* 18, no. 6 (2007).

⁶⁰ For examples see: C. Daniel Batson et al., “Empathy, Attitudes, and Action: Can Feeling for a Member of a Stigmatized Group Motivate One to Help the Group,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28 (2002); John F. Dovidio et al., “Perspective and Prejudice: Antecedents and Mediating Mechanisms,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30 (2004); Krystina A. Finlay and Walter G. Stephan, “Improving Intergroup Relations: The Effects of Empathy on Racial Attitudes,” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30, (2000).

⁶¹ Lambert et al., “College Students’ Views on Gay and Lesbian Issues”; Munin and Speight, “Factors Influencing the Ally Development of College Students”; Woodford et al., “Predictors of Heterosexual College Students’ Attitudes toward LGBT People.”

⁶² Lisa LaMar and Mary Kite, “Sex Differences in Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians: A Multidimensional Perspective,” *Journal of Sex Research* 35, no. 2 (1998).

⁶³ Regarding students’ empathy and social justice tendencies see Nicholas A. Bowman, “Dissonance and Resolution: The Non-Linear Effects of Diversity Courses on Well-Being and

Orientations toward Diversity,” *Review of Higher Education* 33, (2010); Nicholas A. Bowman, “Promoting Participation in a Diverse Democracy: A Meta-Analysis of College Diversity Experiences and Civic Engagement,” *Review of Educational Research* 81, no. 1 (2011); Mitchell J. Chang, “The Impact of an Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement on Students’ Racial Views and Attitudes,” *Journal of General Education* 51, no. 1 (2002); Patricia Gurin et al., “Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes,” *Harvard Educational Review* 72, no. 3 (2002); Thomas F. Nelson Laird, “College Students’ Experiences with Diversity and Their Effect on Academic Self-Confidence, Social Agency, and Disposition toward Critical Thinking,” *Research in Higher Education* 46, no. 4 (2005); Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Mark E. Engberg, and Sylvia Hurtado, “Modeling Accentuation Effects: Enrolling in a Diversity Course and the Importance of Social Action Engagement,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 76, no. 4 (2005). Regarding students’ moral discernment see Sylvia Hurtado,

Matthew J. Mayhew, and Mark E. Engberg, “Diversity in the Classroom and Students’ Moral Reasoning,” in *Annual Meeting of the Association of Study of Higher Education*, Portland, OR, 2003; Eugene T. Parker III et al., “The Impact of Diversity Courses on College Students’ Moral Development,” *Journal of College Student Development* 57, no. 4 (2016).

⁶⁴ Bettina C. Shuford, “History and Evolution of Multicultural Student Affairs,” in *ACPA Publication : Multicultural Student Services on Campus : Building Bridges, Re-Visioning Community*, ed. Dafina-Lazarus Stewart (Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011).

⁶⁵ Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller, *Creating Multicultural Change on Campus*.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Milem et al., “Making Diversity Work on Campus.”

Appendix
Descriptive statistics of students not included in logistic regression.

	Deliberately Antagonistic (N=32)	SD
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		
This community provides support to the unique challenges that come along with being a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender student.	1.65	0.48
<i>Demographic and Personal Characteristics</i>		
Heterosexual	100%***	0
Catholic	43.0%	0.5
Female	31.0%***	0.47
White	61.0%*	0.49
Class Year	2.73	1.12
<i>Campus Environmental Characteristics</i>		
Importance of religious mission and value in selecting this campus (four item factor)		
This community provides support to the unique challenges that come along with being a non-Catholic student.	2.43***	0.87
Specific school/college	4.84	2.75
Completed diversity requirement	1.27*	0.45
Frequency of attending multicultural events and activities on campus	1.67	0.69
Perception of percentage of students who share my race	47.07%	25.68
Perception of percentage of faculty who share my race	39.60%	23.94
This campus's senior leaders communicate the reasons and philosophies behind important decisions.	2.86	0.87
I feel free to publicly express my positions and views on campus (in-class, in my non-class activities)	2.69***	0.87
<i>Interaction Effects</i>		
Female Diversity Course Interaction	0.49	0.51

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$