

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR GAY, LESBIAN,
BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER PERSONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE
FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION AT TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY**

A Dissertation

by

KERRY WAYNE NOACK

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR GAY, LESBIAN,
BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER PERSONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE
FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION AT TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY**

A Dissertation

by

KERRY WAYNE NOACK

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

D. Stanley Carpenter
(Chair of Committee)

Kelli Peck-Parrott
(Member)

Lisa O'Dell
(Member)

Ben D. Welch
(Member)

Jim Scheurich
(Head of Department)

August 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of the Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender
Persons as Perceived by the Faculty, Staff and Administration at
Texas A&M University. (August 2004)

Kerry Wayne Noack,

B.G.S., West Texas State University;

M.A., West Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. D. Stanley Carpenter

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the current campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration at the institution. Specifically, the study looked at differences in perceptions and behaviors based on university position, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, age, and interaction with members of the sexual orientation minority.

The population for the survey consisted of 5,863 individuals at Texas A&M University, including 513 administrators, 1,992 faculty members, and 3,358 professional staff members. Based on the work of Krejcie and Morgan, a random sample of each of the three employment categories was taken, which resulted in a sample of 1,020 individuals.

The survey instrument used was the *Assessment of Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups*, developed by Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D. A selected group of

questions from the survey were analyzed in order to conduct this research. The usable response rate was 47.9%.

Overall, the data supported the finding that the University does not provide a campus environment that is welcoming to all members of the community, especially those individuals who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Several statistically significant differences were found to exist among the positions of the participants, as well as race/ethnicity, age, gender and sexual identity.

The research also confirmed that an individual's attitudes and behaviors toward gay men, lesbians, bisexual men and women or transgender persons were influenced in a positive manner in relation to the frequency of contact that the person had previously had with members of this population. When compared to the norms established by a similar study across the United States, Texas A&M University was found to have a more negative campus climate.

Implications for practice suggest ways in which the university can work toward improving the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender students. Among the suggestions are the development of new policies that create a more supportive environment and new programs to serve the needs of the sexual orientation minority and to educate the campus community. Suggestions for future research are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation is the result of the assistance of many special people. For their part in making the completion of this work possible, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to the following people:

To my chair, Stan Carpenter, and the members of my committee, Lisa O'Dell, Kelli Peck-Parrot and Ben Welch. Thank you for your encouragement, support, patience and suggestions.

To my neighbor, Dr. Ranjita Misra for her assistance and advice with the statistical evaluation.

To my colleagues at Measurement and Research Services for their support through the dissertation process.

To Tissa Salter for her advisement and suggestions on the formatting and editing of the dissertation. Your input has been influential in the “finishing” of this dissertation.

To the many friends and family members who have supported me throughout this endeavor, with a special thanks extended to those who helped with the “stuffing parties.” The encouragement from all of you throughout this process has been instrumental in its completion.

To my parents, Leon and Junett Noack, who have always encouraged me to reach for my dreams and to pursue my educational and professional goals. Thank you for your love and support throughout the doctoral program.

Finally, to my College Station core. A sincere thank you goes out to Dr. Eric Wilson for not giving up on me and for being the thorn in my side, and to Dr. Mary Sherwood, Marti Marberry, Ron George and Tracey Forman, who played the part of “formatting queen.” The unending love and support from each of you, and your willingness to stand by me and believe in me, has been more powerful than you will ever know.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	5
Operational Definitions	6
Significance of the Study	7
Organization of the Dissertation	8
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
Introduction	9
Campus Climate in Higher Education.....	12
Role of Higher Education.....	17
Current Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Students	20
Historical Perspective at Texas A&M University.....	23
Role of Faculty, Professional Staff, and Administration	29
Impact of Demographic Variables	32
Gender	32
Race.....	35
Age and Education	38
Personal Interaction and Exposure.....	41
University Position.....	43
Summary	44

CHAPTER	Page
III	METHODOLOGY46
	Population.....47
	Survey Instrument51
	Data Collection.....55
	Data Analysis62
	Research Questions63
	Research Question One63
	Research Question Two63
	Research Question Three64
	Research Question Four64
IV	RESULTS.....65
	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....65
	Research Question One72
	Research Question Two79
	Position.....103
	Age108
	Ethnicity117
	Gender125
	Sexual Identity.....128
	Research Question Three130
	Research Question Four139
	Summary of the Findings147
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS154
	Summary154
	Purpose of the Study154
	Summary of the Methodology.....155
	Conclusions155
	Discussion157
	Recommendations160
	Implications for Practice160
	Directions for Further Research165
	REFERENCES167

	Page
APPENDIX A	180
APPENDIX B	190
APPENDIX C	191
APPENDIX D	192
VITA	194

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
3.1	Summary of Subgroup Sample Sizes51
3.2	Summary of Postcard Return Rates58
3.3	Summary of Postcard and Survey Response Rates59
3.4	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Subgroup.....60
3.5	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Gender.....61
3.6	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Ethnicity61
4.1	Demographic Characteristics of the Administrators, Faculty, and Staff.....67
4.2	Demographic Characteristics of the Administrators68
4.3	Demographic Characteristics of the Faculty70
4.4	Demographic Characteristics of the Staff71
4.5	Means and Standard Deviations of Student Remarks by Underrepresented Group73
4.6	Means and Standard Deviations of Staff Remarks by Underrepresented Group74
4.7	Means and Standard Deviations of Faculty Remarks by Underrepresented Group75
4.8	Means and Standard Deviations of Teaching Assistant Remarks by Underrepresented Group76
4.9	Means and Standard Deviations of Administrator Remarks by Underrepresented Group76
4.10	Means and Standard Deviations of the University's Ability to Address Issues Regarding Underrepresented Groups77
4.11	Means and Standard Deviations of Overall Campus Climate of Underrepresented Groups.....78

TABLE	Page
4.12 Means and Standard Deviations of the University's Campus Climate in General by Attitudes	79
4.13 Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Students	81
4.14 Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Staff	83
4.15 Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Faculty	85
4.16 Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Teaching Assistants	86
4.17 Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Administrators	88
4.18 University Addresses Issues Related to Sexual Orientation	90
4.19 Disapproval of Homosexual Display of Public Affection	92
4.20 Campus Climate	94
4.21 Campus Acceptance of Gay Men	96
4.22 Campus Acceptance of Lesbians	98
4.23 Campus Acceptance of Bisexual Men or Women	100
4.24 Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons	102
4.25 Differences Among Position For Specific Survey Questions	105
4.26 Mean Differences in Frequent Staff Remarks by Position	106
4.27 Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Bisexuals by Position	107
4.28 Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public Homosexual Affection by Position	107
4.29 Differences Among Age For Specific Survey Questions	111
4.30 Mean Differences in Frequent Student Remarks by Age	111

TABLE	Page
4.31 Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Gay Men by Age	112
4.32 Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons by Age	113
4.33 Mean Differences in Rating of Campus Climate (Non-homophobic/Homophobic) by Age	114
4.34 Mean Differences in University Addressing Sexual Orientation by Age	115
4.35 Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public Homosexual Affection by Age	116
4.36 Differences Among Ethnicity For Specific Survey Questions.....	121
4.37 Mean Differences in Frequent Student Remarks by Ethnicity.....	121
4.38 Mean Differences in Frequent Staff Remarks by Ethnicity	122
4.39 Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons by Ethnicity	123
4.40 Mean Differences in Rating of Campus Climate (Non-homophobic/Homophobic) by Ethnicity	125
4.41 Differences Among Gender For Specific Survey Questions	127
4.42 Differences Among Sexual Identity For Specific Survey Questions	129
4.43 Differences Among Frequency of Contact With GLBT Persons.....	131
4.44 Mean Differences in Friend of Lesbian or Bisexual Woman for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	133
4.45 Mean Differences in Friend of Gay or Bisexual Man for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	134
4.46 Mean Differences in Friend of Transgender Man or Woman for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	134
4.47 Mean Differences of Sharing an Office with Gay or Bisexual Man for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	135

TABLE	Page
4.48 Mean Differences of Sharing an Office with Lesbian or Bisexual Woman for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	136
4.49 Mean Differences in Challenging Sexual Orientation Comments by Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	137
4.50 Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public Homosexual Affection by Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	138
4.51 Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons by Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons	139
4.52 College/University Thoroughly Addresses Campus Issues	141
4.53 University Addresses Issues Regarding Heterosexism and Sexual Orientation by Sexual Identity	142
4.54 University Addresses Issues Regarding Race or Racism by Race/Ethnicity	143
4.55 University Addresses Issues Regarding Sexism or Gender by Gender.....	144
4.56 Perceptions of Campus Climate by Sexual Identity	145
4.57 Perceptions of Campus Climate by Race/Ethnicity	146
4.58 Perceptions of Campus Climate by Gender	147

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

As colleges and universities march into the twenty-first century, these institutions of higher education will find themselves grappling with escalating diversity issues and their interactions within the campus climate. The meaning of diversity has changed; it has progressed from a concept of simply recruiting underrepresented populations, to having campus populations more closely mirror the demographics of society; further, some institutions have embraced the concept “of creating a shared community that maintains the integrity of difference” (Hirano-Nakanishi, 1994 p. 64). No longer is the focus on just increasing the numbers of African American students, now the aim is attracting and retaining underrepresented groups.

Texas A&M University is attempting to address the same issues like other colleges and universities (Texas A&M University, 1999). *Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence* (Texas A&M University, 1999) was published as the culmination of months of study and preparation in order to achieve the goal, as set forth in October, 1997, by then President Ray Bowen, that Texas A&M University would become one of the ten best public universities in the nation by the year 2020. The Vision outlined twelve imperatives that would be instrumental in the institution’s success of reaching this goal and one of the imperatives focused specifically on diversity issues within the academic community at Texas A&M University. The mission implies that diversity

The style and format of this dissertation follows that of the *NASPA Journal*.

“goes beyond race and ethnicity to all manner of thought and action” (p. 43), and goes so far as establishing the following goal: “reduce to zero the number of students, faculty, or staff who leave because of a perception of a less-than- welcoming environment” (p. 43). The current president of Texas A&M University, Dr. Robert Gates, further emphasized this goal of inclusivity when he listed diversity as one of his three key initiatives during an address to the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2002 (Texas A&M University, Office of University Relations, 2002). After considerable input and rhetorical debate, the university has written a mission statement underscoring its commitment to diversity; following is an excerpt from the official university statement found on the University’s webpage:

A commitment to diversity means a commitment to the inclusion, welcome, and support of individuals from all groups, encompassing the various characteristics of persons in our community. Among these characteristics are race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, and disability. (Texas A&M University, 2001)

Yet, in *The Best 345 Colleges* (Franek, 2002) a Texas A&M University student is quoted as saying “The one flaw I can point out about A&M is that people of minorities whether a religious minority, a racial minority, or a minority based on sexual orientation are not necessarily encouraged to come here by what they see. . . Honestly, we are a school of white, heterosexual, Christian students” (p. 505). Thus, Texas A&M was still perceived as having a culture and climate that was not free of discrimination and was less than welcoming.

According to Rankin (1998), institutions of higher education should be places free of discrimination that provide opportunities for all students. Rankin added that colleges and universities must provide a nurturing environment if they are to fulfill its mission of creating knowledge. A key to creating a comfortable and diverse campus environment is for the institution to assess the campus climate (Hurtado, Carter & Kardia, 1998a; Malaney, Williams, & Geller, 1997). Studying the climate is important because it provides a means of associating the attitudes of its members towards particular behaviors (Waldo, 1998). Additionally, Waldo suggested that studying the organizational climate would also aid in better understanding the organizational culture, as climate is a measurable function of culture. The importance of culture lies in the fact that all institutions have an organizational culture that either enhances or deters the process of diversification (Darder, 1994). Darder added that all institutions are “grounded on a set of values and beliefs” (p. 26). Historically, Texas A&M has focused largely on the diversity issues of race and ethnicity in relation to creating a more welcoming environment and more positive campus climate, while not focusing on other populations (Hurtado et al., 1998b; Troy & Green, 2001a, 2001b).

However, according to a 1990 survey conducted by *USA Today* and *People for the American Way*, Sherrill and Hardesty (1994) reported the individuals who endure the largest number of acts of intolerance on college campuses, who report such incidents, are members of the sexual orientation minority. Additionally, Levine and Cureton (1998) reported that gays and women were the victims of “the most vicious graffiti and name calling” (p. 77). In 1997, there were some 1,102 hate crimes related to sexual orientation

reported, but the research showed this number was low because anti-gay crimes on college campuses were grossly unreported (D'Augelli, 1989b; Herek, 2000b; Rankin, 1998). Over the last several years, Texas A&M University has struggled to define ways to best address the sexual orientation minority when it comes to student rules and other University policies (Yeager, 1999). The influence the public at large has on college and university policy decisions is an oft-cited reason for the laissez-faire approach on some campuses (Malaney et al., 1997). By succumbing to outside pressures however and neglecting this consortium when discussing diversity, the University not only negatively impacts the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender person, but the entire campus community (Lucozzi, 1998; Troy & Green, 2001a, 2001b; Waldo, 1998). According to Tierney (1992), "a diverse community does not merely tolerate difference; it honors it, while encouraging dialogue and cooperation" (p. 43).

Statement of the Problem

If the mission of higher education is the advancement of knowledge, then, in a nurturing and welcoming environment, the leadership of colleges and universities must continue to strive for a state of inclusive diversity that fosters a positive campus climate free of outside pressures for all, including the sexual orientation minority. Research shows the college years to be pivotal for the homosexual, because the gay identity development process often occurs at this time (Levine & Evans, 1991). The importance of the college years is further emphasized when considering Cass' (1984) six-stage model of Sexual Identity Formation. Additionally, there is an increasing number of individuals who are acknowledging their sexuality at a younger age, thereby increasing

the number of students who have already accepted their identity before entering college (Lucozzi, 1998). However, there is also another population enrolling simultaneously who have been conditioned to have negative attitudes towards the sexual minority population due to the perceptions of society at large (Malaney et al., 1997). Therefore, providing an atmosphere where heterosexuals and members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population can have mutually positive attitudes towards one another will be an asset fostering today's students to become the leaders of tomorrow (Bowne & Bourgeois, 2001). Three groups playing an instrumental role in this challenge are faculty, staff, and administrators (Renn, 2000; Somers et al., 1998). Yet, few colleges and universities have actually taken the steps to conduct a campus climate study in order to fully assess the environment for this minority group (Malaney et al., 1997), and when research has been conducted in the past, it has largely focused on the perceptions of the students (Watkins, 1998).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the current campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration at the institution.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration?

2. Do perceptions towards and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as education/age, ethnicity, and gender?
3. What is the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administrators towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons?
4. How does the current campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compare to the norms established by a recent national study?

Operational Definitions

Diversity: A commitment to establishing a safe and nurturing inclusive community that values and celebrates the human characteristics making each individual unique and different, inclusive of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation and socioeconomic background.

Campus Climate: The resulting behaviors and attitudes of a community's formal and informal environment; a function of culture and based on the member's values and beliefs.

Sexual Orientation Minority: Members of the community at-large who have identified themselves as being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender relative to enduring emotional, romantic, sexual or affectional attraction to another person.

Significance of the Study

As most educators know, the college years represent a period of self-identity development for many college students, including those members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Hogan & Rentz, 1996; Levine & Evans, 1991). Considering the charge of institutions of higher education to create knowledge (Rankin, 1998), and to prepare students to live and function in a diverse society (Lucozzi, 1998), it is important that the campus environment be one that fosters positive attitudes among all students, regardless of sexual identity (Bowne & Bourgeois, 2001). As members of the campus community, the faculty, staff, and administration play a significant role in the development of the campus climate and subsequently the self-identity of students through decisions relative to the classroom, various interactions, comments and campus policies (Renn, 2000; Malaney et al., 1997). According to Edgert (1994), these decisions are largely based on the perceptions of the individuals.

The intent of this study is to help define the current campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration at Texas A&M University. The data and conclusions will provide information that can be used to gauge progress toward attaining the institutional goal of lowering to zero the number of individuals who would leave the university because they feel unwelcome. Additionally, the data and conclusions will provide institutional leaders information on which to base policy making decisions that can affect the campus climate.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I has provided an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the guiding research questions, definitions of terms, and the significance of the study. A review of the relevant literature is covered in Chapter II. Chapter III describes the research methodology and includes a description of the population, survey instrument, and data collection procedures. Chapter IV documents the results of the data analysis. Lastly, Chapter V summarizes the findings and conclusions, and outlines recommendations for practice and directions for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Throughout the 1990s, college campuses have continued to evolve into communities with increasingly diverse student populations, which has led to an increasing amount of tension and number of conflicts on campus (Hurtado et al., 1998a; Levine & Cureton, 1998). This issue has been further complicated because the meaning of diversity has changed. In recent years, diversity has progressed from a concept of simply bringing underrepresented populations to campus, to having campus populations mirror the populations in society, to a point at some institutions “of creating a shared community that maintains the integrity of difference” (Hirano-Nakanishi, 1994, p. 64). No longer is the focus on simply increasing the numbers of African American students, but increasing the campus representation of all underrepresented groups and providing an environment where each group can function (Hirano-Nakanishi, 1994). D. G. Smith (1997a) related that today, campus diversity issues are more and more directly related to the larger societal issues. The evolution of campus diversity has also created a paradigm shift in the basic concept of equality, which has historically focused on numbers. According to Darder (1994), equality has become “an institution’s ability to embrace a culturally democratic view of life that not only supports participation by all constituents, but also provides avenues for different cultural voices to be heard and integrated within the changing culture and history of the institution” (p. 21).

Texas A&M University, an original land-grant institution, is not unlike the other institutions throughout the country responding to issues related to diversity. In recent years, students of minority populations who have chosen to study at the university have experienced various acts of bigotry or intolerance. These acts have not only targeted members of the more traditionally recognized minority populations of Hispanics, African-Americans, and females, but have also involved members of the international and sexual orientation minority. For example, in 1998, Dan Campbell, a captain of the Texas A&M football team stated that he was proud to attend a school where “women like men, and men like women” while speaking at Aggie Bonfire, where several thousand people had gathered, and many others were watching as it was broadcast on regional television and via a live internet feed (Texas A&M University, ALLIES). Another incident occurred as recently as October 2003, when a student organization on campus drove around campus with signs on the sides of their trucks that stated “Texas A&M, where guys like girls and girls like guys,” and “Satan is a flamer” (Szuminski, 2003). At that time, In striving to balance the needs of the various minority groups with those of both the external and internal university campus, Texas A&M University has responded.

In 1997, then university president, Dr. Ray Bowen, announced the Vision 2020 project. The project was to gather information and culminate in a report that would provide the necessary guidelines to propel the university to the stature of being considered one of the top ten institutions in the United States by the year 2020. The report, *Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence* (Texas A&M University, 1999),

defined twelve imperatives that would be essential if the university's ultimate goal as set forth by President Bowen was to be met. The sixth imperative: "Diversify and Globalize the A&M Community," focused on the topic of diversity within the Texas A&M University community. In establishing the parameters for this imperative, the report explains "the ability to survive, much less succeed, is increasingly linked to the development of a more pluralistic, diverse, and globally aware populace. It is essential that the faculty, students, and larger campus community embrace this more cosmopolitan environment" (p. 43).

One of the three precepts listed in the report in response to this imperative focused on diversity. The report defined the University's vision of diversity as one that "goes beyond race and ethnicity to all manner of thought and action" (Texas A&M University, 1999, p. 43). It continued, "an educated person must appreciate and interact with people of all backgrounds and engage ideas that challenge his or her views" (p. 43). In response to the precept to lead in diversity, the report established a series of goals. One of the goals clearly responded to the changing environment of colleges and universities resulting from the increasingly diverse student population. The second goal was to "create an environment that respects and nurtures all members of the student, faculty, and staff community. Reduce to zero the number of students, faculty, or staff who leave because of a perception of a less-than-welcoming environment" (p. 43).

The university's commitment to diversity was further reinforced in an address to the Faculty Senate by the newly appointed university president, Dr. Robert Gates in the fall of 2002 (Texas A&M University, Office of University Relations, 2002). During the

address, he listed diversity and globalization of the university community as one of the three initiatives of *Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence* (Texas A&M University, 1999) that he planned to focus on during his administration. In support of this initiative, President Gates recently appointed the first Vice President and Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Diversity at the University (Smith, 2003). According to the University's website, the University defined its commitment to diversity as "a commitment to the inclusion, welcome, and support of individuals from all groups, encompassing the various characteristics of persons in our community. Among these characteristics are race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, and disability" (Texas A&M, 2001).

If Texas A&M is to work towards the goal of creating a more welcoming campus that promotes and respects all members of the community, the institution must gain a better understanding of the current campus environment for all minority groups, including the sexual orientation minority. This is especially true considering the increasing numbers of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students who are entering college (Lucozzi, 1998), coupled with the number of students entering college who are predisposed to having negative attitudes towards this population (Malaney et al., 1997). The first step in the process is to have a good understanding of what campus climate is.

Campus Climate in Higher Education

Campus climate has become the center of attention for improving the campus environment due to its focus on "the formal and informal environment—both

institutionally and community-based—in which individuals learn, teach, work and live in a post-secondary setting” (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1992, p. 2). D. Smith (1997b) added that climate is the means in which an institution “communicates to students that they belong, that they fit, that this is their place, and this place for learning is indeed a place for learning—not a place for harassment, not a place for anti-Semitism or homophobia, not a place for incivility of any kind” (p. 44). This emphasis upon campus civility was recently addressed at Texas A&M University when President Dr. Robert Gates made a statement to the University community regarding recent actions on campus, stating that the university campus is a place where, at the very least, civility should exist (R. M. Gates, personal communication, November 26, 2003).

The campus climate has been identified as a mechanism in the change process because it is associated with the attitudes of the organization’s members toward various dimensions of the organization, such as particular behaviors, participant views, and malleable character, and it is a measurable function (Peterson & Spencer, 1990; Waldo, 1998). Additionally, Peterson and Spencer added that not only can campus climate be identified and studied, but it could be changed. According to Tierney (1990), the purpose of studying campus climate is to see how it affects the decision-making processes and goals of the organization. D. G. Smith (1997a) stated that studying campus climate goes beyond studying groups of students and their specific needs “to include studying institutional characteristics that affect the psychosocial environment and therefore may influence all students’ experiences, levels of involvement, and academic achievement” (p. 10).

Studying the campus climate within institutions of higher education is also critical because all institutions are grounded on a set of values and beliefs, which either enhances or deters the process of cultural diversification (Darder, 1994; Malaney et al., 1997; Peterson & Spencer, 1990). In some cases, it is the very essence of the institution's drive to maintain the current organizational dynamic of power that leads it to stifle cultural democracy (Darder, 1994). Tierney (1988) concluded that institutions can be influenced by "strong forces that emanate from within" (p. 3). Darder addressed another issue regarding the importance of assessing the campus climate by stating that what institutions do not act on oftentimes affects their constituents' lives as much as what they do act on. Thus, a better understanding of the campus climate will provide an improved understanding of the organizational identity, by providing a mechanism for attracting new members, and by demonstrating how the organization is different and unique (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

In the pursuit of creating a more comfortable, diverse learning environment, institutions are conducting assessments of the campus climate in order to gain a better understanding of the environment (Hurtado et al., 1998a). In a review of the research related to campus climate assessment, Peterson and Spencer (1990) discussed the three types of climate previously identified by Peterson in 1988. The objective climate focused on the behavioral or formal activity that could be directly observed, while the perceived climate consisted of images of how the organization actually functioned and should function. The third type, psychological climate, served as the motivational

dimension of how participants felt about their organization or work linked to the individual.

While issues surrounding racial, sex, religious, and ethnic minorities have been at the forefront when it comes to discussions relating to higher education and diversity, one minority group that has been gaining an increasingly large amount of attention across the country is that of sexual orientation (O'Mara, 1997). This is partly due to more institutions including "cultural diversity" as a part of their mission statements, as well as the increased attention on issues relating to the sexual orientation minority across mainstream America (Bennett, 2000; Herek, 2000a; Kim et al., 1998, O'Mara, 1997).

From a historical perspective, the discussion regarding this issue has evolved considerably. In the initial years of discussing homosexuality, the focus was on issues relating to the fact that it was considered to be a mental disorder and that members of the sexual orientation minority were considered to be child molesters and predators. However, in the last ten years, the focus has changed to evolve more around the civil rights for this population (Bennett, 2000; Herek, 2002). For example, there has been an increasing amount of discussion, legislation, and court rulings pertaining to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons. From gays in the military, to the legalization of civil unions and debate about same-sex marriage in several states and other countries, to a recent Supreme Court ruling that struck down a law that prohibited same-sex sodomy, to whether or not homosexuality is genetic, issues related to sexual orientation are no longer kept hidden in the closet and out of the public eye (Grossman, 2003; Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994; Torres-Reyna, 2002; Tygart, 2002; Watkins, 1998).

This interest is not to say that the sexual orientation minority is becoming more accepted in society. For example, there is a movement at both state and national levels to ensure that same-sex marriage does not become legal or recognized and there is continued debate within numerous religious organizations regarding the acceptance of the sexual orientation minority (Grossman, 2003; *Homosexuality debate strains ABC*, 1994). Another example can be found in the state of Iowa, where, within the last ten years, a bill prohibiting the use of state funds to support homosexuality, such as teaching a course at a public institute passed the House of Representatives, but did not pass the Senate (Snyder, 1995). Parallel with what is going on within the government and religious organizations, it can be assumed that colleges and universities across the country have experienced the same negative attitudes towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population that is prevalent in society in general (Nelson & Krieger, 1997).

Even though issues surrounding the sexual orientation minority are not new, gay and lesbian rights are a point of contention on many campuses (Levine & Cureton, 1998). Today, there is an increasing number of individuals entering college who are ready to explore their sexual orientation or who have already acknowledged their sexuality not only to themselves, but to their friends, families, and communities (D'Augelli, 1989a; Lucozzi, 1998). However, there is also a population coming to the university that has been conditioned by their cultural background to have negative attitudes toward and a fear of the sexual orientation minority (Malaney et al., 1997). This issue is further compounded when taking into consideration that many students are

making the decision about the college or university that they plan to attend based on the stage of the coming out process that they are currently in (Lopez and Chism, 1993). This is further emphasized by Lucozzi (1998), who summarizes the college search process by stating that for many members of this population, “finding a gay-friendly college environment could represent a student’s first opportunity to experience an accepting and supportive community” (p. 49).

The research supports the contention that not only are negative attitudes towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons held, but actions are frequently taken against these individuals. Studies have indicated that these students are often subjected to antigay attacks, negative comments, physical violence, and verbal harassment (Schellenberg, Hirt, & Sears, 1999; Simoni, 1996). Additionally, Levine and Cureton (1998) reported that gays are among those individuals on college campuses most likely to receive the brunt of the “most vicious graffiti and name calling” (p. 77). In 1990, Tierney summarized several campus studies by stating “beliefs that gays are sick and unnatural and deserve to be punished are examples of bigoted attitudes that are widely held—and acted out” (p. 44).

Role of Higher Education

Creating a welcoming and nurturing environment for all students within the setting of colleges and universities is critical due to the role that the campus climate at institutions of higher education plays in the educational process. This is further enhanced when one considers the role the educational process plays in the decisions, education, and life-experiences of college students (Edgert, 1994; Lottes & Kuriloff,

1994). This is partially because college provides an opportunity for students to interact with diverse groups that will challenge their preconceived ideas and views (Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994). In discussing the impact of college on students, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) concluded “discernible consistencies in the evidence indicating not only that those who attend college change their attitudinal positions in a number of different areas but that they do so as a result of attending a college or university, and not simply in response to normal, maturational impulses or to historical, social or political trends” (p. 325). Thus, one can see the potential impact on students that can result by including and addressing gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues within the college experience.

According to Schellenberg, Hirt, and Sears (1999), higher education tends to change individual’s attitudes toward homosexuals. In their study of college students at an East coast university, Lottes and Kuriloff (1994) found a 25.0% increase in the acceptance of homosexuals among students from their freshman to senior year. Additionally, education has been found to have one of the most consistent correlations regarding heterosexist attitudes (Simoni, 1996).

Despite the correlation between education and heterosexist attitudes, and that there is an ever-increasing visible presence of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender students on university campuses, the topic of sexual orientation is oftentimes considered taboo (Hurtado, Carter, & Kardia, 1998). In fact, in most college courses, gay, lesbian, and bisexual “issues are ignored, demeaned, or glossed over” (Renn, 2000, p. 134), which can impede the learning process for students. And, on campuses where courses

dealing with gay students and gay studies are in the curriculum, these courses are coming under increased scrutiny from legislators and the general public alike because they do not want tax dollars used to support these endeavors (Charlton, 2003; Snyder, 1995). The scrutiny may also come from the students on campus, who, in the words of Rhoads (1995) may perceive the faculty member as “indoctrinating students to be gay” (p. 60). Additionally, as conveyed by Rhoads, teaching students about gay issues can also cause retribution towards the faculty member because he or she may be assumed to be a member of this group, which may affect current or future employment. Simoni (1996) added that if a campus is dominated by heterosexist attitudes, all students are harmed because the real world is not represented. The impact on heterosexuals is notable because they do not benefit from functioning in a diverse community. Cress and Sax (1998) add that campuses devoid of diversity will create learning environments lacking in the fundamental facets of educational development and life preparation. Thus, they conclude that there is a need to include gay, lesbian, and bisexual students in campus programs. Nelson and Krieger (1997) further this argument by stating college “should foster personal growth and development and allow students to explore their potential” (p. 79).

The benefits of encouraging and fostering dialogues and interactions among students are numerous, and include critical thinking skills, analytical and problem-solving skills, and civic-mindedness (Astin, 1993). Tierney (1992) added that “we learn about difference by existing in communities of difference” (p. 46). Additionally, Lottes and Kuriloff (1994) suggested that society at large may benefit from the increased

tolerance among students in regard to tolerance of homosexuality when the potential of the students to rise to positions of power is considered. Tierney (1992) best summarized the overall situation when he quoted a study from the University of Oregon. He stated that “the university environment is neither consistently safe for, nor tolerant of, nor academically inclusive of lesbians, gay men, or bisexuals” (p. 43).

Current Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Students

Over the last two decades, the number of studies dealing with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues relative to college students has increased exponentially (Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; D’Augelli, 1989a; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Kim et al., 1998; Nelson & Krieger, 1997). The increase in studies has partially been a result of the increased attention that this population has received, oftentimes due to the horrific incidents that this group has encountered, such as the death of Matthew Shepard, a 21 year old gay college student in Wyoming who was brutally murdered in 1998 (CNN, 1998). It is also in response to the growing number of studies that have documented the violence and victimization towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons (Berrill, 1992; D’Augelli, 1989a; Bochenek & Brown, 2001; Rhoads, 1995), as well as the negative effect on these individuals resulting from their exposure to violence and harassment on campus (D’Augelli & Rose, 1990; Myers, 1993). Additionally, there is an increased concern regarding this population due to the evidence that supports the population’s classification of being at a higher risk for attempted suicide (McFarland, 1998; Paul et al., 2002).

Some studies have suggested that the sexual orientation minority has been subjected to various forms of harassment, including antigay attacks, negative comments, physical violence and verbal harassment (Schellenberg et al., 1999; Simoni, 1996). According to Cage (1993), enduring verbal and physical harassment is considered a way of life for many gay students. In fact, in their study of anti-gay violence and victimization in 1988 which documented the occurrences of threats, vandalism, harassment, and assaults towards the gay/lesbian population, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force found that 19.0% of the 7,248 reported incidents of violence occurred on college and university campuses. The critical impact of this antigay mentality is further compounded when one considers that it is during the college years that many of these students go through the sexual identity process (Cass, 1984; Levine & Evans, 1991). To provide a better understanding of the campus climate, the research presents two types of studies, those studies utilizing identified gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals and those utilizing the entire campus community or self-identified heterosexuals.

The initial wave of antigay studies and surveys were conducted between 1985 and 1989 by Yale University, Rutgers University, The Pennsylvania State University, University of Massachusetts at Amherst and University of Illinois, and focused on gay and lesbian students as the survey population. The results of these surveys suggested that between 45 and 76 percent of gay and lesbian students reported being verbally harassed or threatened. These numbers create a greater sense of concern when one factors in the fact that it has been reported that as many as 90 percent of those

individuals who completed surveys stated that they had been harassed, but never reported it (Rankin, 1998). Additionally, in his study of gay and lesbian students, D'Augelli (1989b) reported that almost all incidents of harassment went unreported due to concerns about additional harassment.

While these types of institutional surveys based on the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population continued throughout the 1990s, Rankin (2003b) conducted a national campus climate assessment that included fourteen colleges and universities throughout the country. Subjects completing the survey included undergraduate and graduate students, staff, faculty, and administrators. According to the results, 28 percent of all respondents reported being harassed in the last year, while some 51 percent agreed that they concealed their sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation. As an individual group, the undergraduates reported the largest amount of harassment, with 36 percent.

In more recent years, the institutional campus climate studies have increased in popularity (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Johnson, Brems, & Alford-Keating, 2000; Kim et al., 1998; Waldo, 1998). Unlike the other type of antigay studies and surveys, in most instances these studies addressed attitudes of the entire student community or those labeling themselves as heterosexual. Instead of reporting incidents of harassment or violence, the majority of these studies focused on attitudes toward the sexual orientation minority. Homophobic attitudes were usually identified and compared within institutions according to gender, race, religiosity, and age or year of study. While the research reflected a significant number of studies addressing homophobia among college

students, the numbers of studies focusing on faculty, staff, and administration have been noticeably fewer (Hogan & Rentz, 1996; Watkins, 1998).

Historical Perspective at Texas A&M University

When it comes to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues, Texas A&M University has a history dating back to as early as 1952. It was in that year, that the university launched an investigation into rumors regarding homosexual conduct on campus, which resulted in the suspension of seven students. In response to the investigation, then President M. T. Harrington stated, "We have conducted a thorough investigation of rumors of homosexuality on this campus and seven students who admitted having been involved have been suspended" (*Suspend Aggies: Admit practice of perversion*, 1952, p. 1). Twenty years would pass before the presence of gay students on campus would have an everlasting impact on the university that would not be stymied by the university administration.

In 1976, a group of students who had formed Gay Student Services applied for official recognition as a service-related organization (Gay Student Services, 1978). After months of discussion, the group received a letter denying their application. The letter from Dr. John Koldus, Vice-President of Student Affairs, asserted that the group could not be recognized because homosexual conduct was illegal in Texas, and because student organizations should not be involved in educational matters, as they are the responsibility of faculty and staff. Additionally, he wrote that the organization was not "consistent with the philosophy and goals that have been developed for the creation and existence of Texas A&M University" (*Gay Student Services v. Texas A&M University*,

1980, p. 2). Communications regarding the application also included a memo from then President Jack Williams, stating the University would not recognize the group “until and unless we are ordered by higher authority to do so” (p. 3). The denial of their recognition as a student organization led the group to file a lawsuit against the University requesting full recognition as an organization in 1977 (D. Martin, personal communication, March 25, 2001).

Following several delays, the suit was finally heard before Judge Ross Sterling in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. Judge Sterling ruled in favor of the university, stating that the university did not have to recognize the group because it was a social group, similar to a fraternity or sorority, which are not recognized by the university. During subsequent appeals, the University argued that the application was denied because of the “fraternal” nature of the group and the increased health risks associated with homosexuality. However, the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit ruled in 1984 that the University was in violation of the student’s first amendment rights by denying their right to form Gay Student Services (*Gay Student Services v. Texas A&M University*, 1984). The University later filed an appeal before the Supreme Court in 1984, with lawyers paid for by private funds, as the state was no longer representing the University. However, the case came to an end when the Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal, allowing the Fifth Circuit’s ruling against the University to stand (D. Martin, personal communication, March 25, 2001; *Texas A&M University v. Gay_Student Services*, 1985).

In the years since the legal action and subsequent official recognition of the student group, Texas A&M has experienced various levels and periods of debate and discussion regarding issues related to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population. Like the original case in 1976, many of the issues revolve around recognition of, service to, and level of support to this population.

Recognizing sexual orientation as a protected group has been the center of several discussions in the last ten years. In 1989, then President William Mobley appointed a special commission on diversity at the institution. One result of the special commission's work was a new "University Statement on Harassment and Discrimination" which was accepted by the President in May, 1990. The new statement said,

Faculty, staff and students should be aware that discrimination and harassment based on the age, ethnic background, family status, gender, handicap, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status of individuals or any other subgroup stereotyping or grouping within the University community is unacceptable. (Texas A&M University, 1990, p. 2)

However, the new statement caused a great deal of turmoil and debate on campus, which resulted in a petition drive by several faculty members (Moewe, 1991). One of the letters included a memo for individuals to sign that expressed their discontent with the new statement of harassment and discrimination. The letter was written by three members of the faculty, and suggested that the university was carrying out a moral travesty "against the sons and daughters of Texas, at the taxpayer's expense" and placed

homosexuality in the same context as that of pedophilia and bestiality (L. M. Smith, S. W. McDaniel, & S. F. Crouse, personal communication, January 16, 1991). Following several months of discussion, the University President decided to make changes to the statement of harassment and discrimination by removing the various groups mentioned in the initial statement. The new statement read: “Faculty, staff and students should be aware that any form of harassment and any form of illegal discrimination against any individual is inconsistent with the values and ideals of the University community” (Texas A&M University, 1991, p. 3). Additionally, President Mobley removed sexual orientation as a protected group among university students that had been a part of the Students’ Rights Article II section of the university rules and regulations since 1989 (Ackerman, 1991), replacing it with the more generic wording regarding “illegal discrimination” mentioned in the statement of harassment and discrimination (Texas A&M University, 1991).

Several years later, in 1999, an amendment to include sexual orientation in the Students’ Rights Article II section of the University’s Student Rules was proposed and approved by the Student Senate, Graduate Student Council and Faculty Senate. However, Dr. Ray Bowen, President of the University at the time, rejected the amendment which, once again, left this group of students feeling unwelcome (Yeager, 1999). Today, after a change in 2000, Article II states:

Each student shall have the right to participate in all areas and activities of the university, free from any form of discrimination, including harassment, on the basis of race, color, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, disability, age, sexual

orientation, or veteran status in accordance with applicable federal and state laws. (Texas A&M University, 2003a)

Shortly after being named President in 2002, Dr. Robert Gates publicly declared his commitment to diversity. In an address to the Faculty Senate, he stated:

A commitment to diversity means a commitment to the inclusion, welcome, and support of individuals from all groups, encompassing the various characteristics of persons in our community. Among these characteristics are race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, and disability. (Texas A&M University, Office of University Relations, 2002)

More recently, the Faculty Advisory Council of the College of Education and Human Development proposed a statement of tolerance for adoption by the department that contained language that celebrated and promoted the lifestyles of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community. However, like the statement developed and proposed in 1990 for the University, the statement resulted in an uprising from some faculty members in the college. The more outspoken opponents to the new statement wrote letters citing religious, legal, and health reasons for not supporting the statement. Interestingly, at least one of the writers of the most recent letters was also involved in the letters written in 1989. Additionally, like the letter written in 1990, the authors refer to pedophilia in the context of discussing sexual orientation, as well as argue the fact that homosexuality (at the time) was illegal in Texas, and that homosexuality is an unhealthy lifestyle (D. S. Carpenter, personal communication, February 4, 2003). Thus, despite

increasing discussion and awareness of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population over the last ten years, there are still members of the faculty and administration who view them as a constituency that simply should not be recognized.

Beyond recognition as a group that should not be discriminated against, over the years, the University has attempted some types of programming for the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population. While it is not a department devoted solely to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons, the Gender Issues Education Services office of the Department of Student Life has assisted in the coordination of some campus-wide programs, including Coming Out and Gay Awareness Weeks and the Guess Who's Gay panel (Texas A&M University, Gender Issues Education Services, n.d.). Additionally, the office sponsored a survey completed by students regarding gender issues on campus that consisted of some questions dealing with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population (Texas A&M University, 2000). Despite the programs listed above, the University has not taken full advantage of all its opportunities to be inclusive of the sexual orientation minority.

One example of this lack of inclusion can be found in the *Perspectives on the Climate for Diversity: Findings and Suggested Recommendations for the Texas A&M University Campus Community* (Hurtado et al., 1998). This University commissioned study directed by a research team from the University of Michigan had as its central focus race and ethnicity. While the survey instrument consisted of a few questions regarding sexual orientation, there were no findings reported in the executive summary relating to sexual orientation. The executive summary primarily focused on issues

regarding race and ethnicity. Additionally, in the last few years, the Human Resources Department at the University has sponsored the TAMU Faculty and Staff Work Life Studies. Among many other questions, these two studies ask questions about discrimination based on race and color, but do not include sexual orientation (Troy & Green, 2001a, 2001b).

Therefore, despite some positive steps toward creating a more welcoming campus environment for the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population, it does not appear that the environment overall is less oppressive. According to one student, quoted in *The Best 345 Colleges* (Franek, 2002), “the one flaw I can point out about A&M is that people of minorities whether a religious minority, a racial minority, or a minority based on sexual orientation are not necessarily encouraged to come here by what they see. . . . Honestly, we are a school of white, heterosexual, Christian students” (p. 505). In 1999, Michael Schaub, a graduating senior assessed the situation in the following manner, “In four years at Texas A&M, I have never felt welcome...Gay students entering this university are left with an unmistakable impression: They’re not wanted here” (Schaub, 1999, p. 1). Additionally, over the last several years, Texas A&M has been ranked by Princeton Review among the top-10 of the least gay-friendly campuses in the United States (Yeager, 1999; Franek, 2002).

Role of Faculty, Professional Staff, and Administration

Providing an educational atmosphere where heterosexuals and members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population can have mutually positive attitudes toward one another is nothing short of an asset that will assist today’s students in

becoming the leaders of tomorrow (Bowne & Bourgeois, 2001; Hogan & Rentz, 1996). According to the research, the faculty, professional staff and administration are three groups on campus that can have an impact on creating a mutually inclusive environment for heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, and transgender persons (Renn, 2000; Somers et al., 1998). Cress and Sax (1998) added that when it comes to assessing the campus climate, the faculty and staff can be considered the weather radar.

According to Renn (2000), the faculty can play an instrumental role in the positive self-identity development of college students through the classroom. They can promote a positive welcoming environment within the classroom, support student research in the field of sexual orientation, and discuss topics of sexual orientation in the classroom when appropriate. Additionally, D'Augelli (1992) and Tierney (1992) stated that students' attitudes can be affected significantly when a class deals with sexual orientation through the curriculum or special projects. Renn (2000) added that the professoriate has the opportunity, through the classroom, to assist students "by helping them unlearn incorrect assumptions and prejudices about various sexual orientations" (p. 133). Additionally, Lopez and Chism (1993) reflected that the students in their study strongly believed that professors had a responsibility to provide environments that were respectful and nurturing. However, it is far more likely that the faculty will have a negative impact on student development and create an unwelcoming and less than hospitable environment for gay and lesbian persons (Malaney et al., 1997).

Faculty can create a negative environment for students in any number of ways, among them being negative comments, discriminatory practices and homophobic actions

(Renn, 2000). Malaney et al. (1997) pointed out that some faculty members even go as far as espousing their negative opinions towards gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons in the classroom. In addition to the aforementioned direct actions by the faculty, a faculty member may facilitate harassment indirectly. For example, when a member of the faculty takes a passive stance in response to a negative comment or action by another person in the classroom, the professor is indirectly creating a negative environment by allowing such conduct within the classroom setting to occur (Lopez & Chism, 1993; Renn, 2000).

Though it would be expected that the classroom environment would be free of harassment and intimidation, campus climate studies have shown that this is not true for the gay, lesbian, and bisexual student population (Renn, 2000). A UCLA study, summarized by Tierney (1992), suggested the impact on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students by stating how this group of students is “significantly more likely than their heterosexual counterparts to have experienced problems associated with harassment, discrimination, and loneliness” (p. 43).

As Nelson and Krieger (1997) so pointedly explain, “as college student personnel, be it faculty, administration, or resident assistants, we have an ethical responsibility to search for this ideal environment” (p. 79) that is free of sexual orientation minority discrimination.

Impact of Demographic Variables

Gender

Numerous studies have documented the attitudinal differences of the sexes towards the sexual orientation minority (Herek & Capitanio, 1999; Kite & Whitley, Jr., 1998; Simoni, 1996; Smith & Gordon, 1998). The various cited works have incorporated several types of attitude measurements, including the *Attitudes Toward Lesbian and Gay Men* scale designed by Herek, the *Situational Attitude Survey* by Sedlacek and Brooks (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997), Bem's Sex Role Inventory, and the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals by Hudson and Ricketts (Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000). Additionally, other researchers have taken aspects of the previously mentioned instruments and designed their own survey for use with their specific population (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Rankin, 1994; Rankin, 2003b). In reviewing the literature regarding gender differences, there tend to be two different genres of study. One line of the research looks at gender attitudes toward the homosexual population as a collective group, while other research looks at attitudes among individuals toward gay men and lesbians as separate groups (D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Simoni, 1996). There have been very few studies that involved faculty, staff and administration (Hogan & Rentz, 1992), the overwhelming majority have used students as the respondent group, while some have used the general population.

While there have been some mixed findings in the research with undergraduate and graduate students, overall, the literature shows that women tend to be less homophobic than men (D'Augelli, 1989a; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997). In a study of

181 students, Simoni (1996) concluded that male students had more negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian students than females did. This was further supported by LaMar and Kite (1998), who surveyed 270 students at Ball State University and found that women were more tolerant than men toward homosexual persons. Johnson et al. (1997) also reported findings revealing the conclusion that women are less homophobic than men. While Cotton-Huston and Waite's (2000) research did not support this conclusion of gender bias, they explained their findings to be limited as a result of participant self-selection. However, in a meta-analysis investigating differences in gender attitudes towards the homosexual population, Oliver and Hyde (1993, 1995) concluded there was no significant difference.

Another factor that has been discussed in the literature was the differences in attitudes of men and women towards lesbian and gay men as separate groups. In a study of 1,300 United States households, Herek and Capitanio (1999) found that men tended to have more favorable attitudes towards lesbians than they did towards gay men. Data from a national survey conducted in 1999 that was subsequently analyzed for the purposes of better understanding gender gaps in attitudes also concluded that men were far more negative toward gay men than they were toward lesbians. This negativity was demonstrated in attitudes regarding relationships, adoption, mental illness of gay men, and the idea that they are child molesters (Herek, 2002).

Engstrom and Sedlacek's (1997) study of 550 residence hall students also supported the finding that stronger homophobic feelings were exhibited towards gay men than toward lesbians among both men and women. In her research of heterosexist

attitudes among students attending four schools in the Los Angeles area, Simoni (1996) concluded that male students had more negative attitudes towards gay men. Nelson and Krieger (1997) also found that men's attitudes toward the homosexual population were significantly more negative than those of women. In general, the literature shows that men have greater negative attitudes toward gay men than they do toward lesbians, while women have more similar attitudes towards lesbians and gay men (D'Augelli, 1989a; Herek, 2000a; Herek, 2000b; Herek, 2002; LaMar & Kite, 1998).

The attitudes of men and women towards the sexual orientation minority are also reflected in their beliefs and actions (Haddock & Zanna, 1998). D'Augelli and Rose (1990) reported that men make more derogatory remarks towards gays and lesbians than women do. Johnson et al. (1997) stated that not only are men less willing to grant human rights to gays, but they also have a lower level of belief in the concept that homosexuality has a genetic basis. LaMar and Kite (1998) reported that men had a stronger "belief that homosexuality is immoral and violates society's norms" (p. 191), and that women were more supportive of rights for the homosexual population.

In a study of voter attitudes and behaviors in regards to homosexuality, Strand (1998) found that there was a correlation between gay-related voting and sex of the voter. In a review of the data collected from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the Higher Education Research Institute of the University of California at Los Angeles, Cress and Sax (1998) found that men were less likely to support gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues. Herek (2002) further emphasized this in stating that women tend to be more favorable towards and supportive of gay rights. In

fact, they reported that over 45 percent of the male respondents believed that homosexuality should be outlawed, while only 24 percent of the women believed this. This factor was further emphasized by Cotton-Huston and Waite (2000), who found in their review of the literature that at most colleges and universities, men were more responsible for acts of violence towards the sexual orientation minority than women. Summarily, it was concluded from the literature that attitudes and behaviors towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population could be linked to gender differences.

Race

Another demographic variable that has been identified and researched as a correlate of heterosexist attitudes has been racial or ethnic group. Unlike gender bias, bias towards homosexuals by members of ethnic minority groups has not been significantly documented in the literature, and where it has been documented, it has produced conflicting results. Some studies have identified some ethnic minority groups as having more negative attitudes toward the sexual orientation minority, while others have not (Alcalay et al., 1990; Kim et al., 1998; Waldo, 1998). When considering race as a correlate for negativity towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population, the research has relied on the same types of attitudinal measurements as that of gender bias (Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997). However, a flaw that has been identified in the research is the fact that it is oftentimes based on the analysis of a single item. This flaw may be a contributing factor to the differences in findings (Simoni, 1996). Additionally, Simoni stated that another problem associated with documenting differences between minority groups was that in some of the research,

the sample sizes of the minority groups were too small to produce significant results. Like the research regarding gender bias, the primary population has been college and university students.

One of the few studies that specifically investigated students' attitudes towards the homosexual population based on ethnic background was conducted at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1998. With a sample size of 397 students, only 55.5% were Caucasian, while the rest classified themselves as Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, Filipino Americans, Native Hawaiians, mixed-ethnicity or other. Based on their research, Kim et al. (1998) concluded that Caucasians had more accepting views than did the Japanese, Filipino, and Chinese people.

Waldo (1998) found somewhat differing views between undergraduate and graduate students in his study at a large research institute in the Midwest. Based on responses from 1,927 students, Waldo found that white/European American undergraduate students viewed the campus as being less negative towards the sexual orientation minority than did the students of color. Additionally, he found that students of color tended to be more supportive of events and policies, and more willing to have personal contact with members of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population. However, with the graduate students, Waldo found that they were less willing to have personal contact with or be supportive of policies related to this student group.

A study based on a telephone survey of the adult population in California examining ethnic differences presented another insight to the role of race. In their study, Alcalay et al. (1990), found that there was no significant difference in attitudes toward

the homosexual population between Hispanics and whites or blacks. Hispanics were found to be no more homophobic than others, and just as supportive of civil rights for the homosexual population.

Mixed results were also found in a study based on data collected from the General Social Survey over a period of time. The study focused on comparing attitudes toward homosexuality between Hispanics, blacks, and non-Hispanic whites, and considered the morality of homosexuality as well as the civil rights of the sexual orientation minority. Through their analysis, Bonilla and Porter (1990) concluded that while the Hispanic group was more tolerant than the blacks, their attitudes based on the morality issue did not differ from the non-Hispanic whites. However, in regards to the civil rights of this population they were far less tolerant than the other two groups. Interestingly, the study found that blacks had more negativity than the other two groups on the issue of morality, but they had the highest level of approval in regards to the civil rights issue. Ernst et al. (1991) also confirmed in their study that the black community held the most negative attitudes toward the gay population.

Summarily, the research regarding the effect of race and ethnicity on attitudes toward sexual orientation has been limited and with mixed results. While some studies have found that non-white minority groups hold more negative views toward this population than the Caucasian population, other studies have not supported this same conclusion.

Age and Education

A review of the literature has also resulted in the identification of two more demographic variables that are oftentimes considered by researchers when defining the climate as it relates to homophobia. The two factors, age and education, can stand as independent variables, but are considered to be synonymous for the purposes here due to the underlying assumption that with an increase in education, there will be an increase in age (Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994; Simoni, 1996; Waldo, 1998). One caveat regarding age, is that age and education work in conjunction, except where the individual may be older than 60. Research showed these individuals may be more negative towards homosexuality because of the social environment regarding the sexual orientation minority in which they grew up (Strand, 1998). Works by individuals such as Bobo and Licari (1989) and McClosky and Brill (1983) provide insight as to why these demographic variables may play a role in the attitudes of individual. They state that education encourages openness and acceptance of ideas such as freedom of expression and a right to privacy. Like the research dealing with race and ethnicity based bias, the research focusing on age and education is also limited. There have been some studies that have specifically addressed the interaction of age and education with heterosexual attitudes, while other studies in the research have been based on the analysis of these two demographic variables as they are found in the various attitudinal measurements used in assessing attitudes towards the sexual orientation minority.

In their study at a large, private, eastern university, Lottes and Kuriloff (1994) found a significant change in the acceptance of homosexuality between the freshman and

senior years among students attending the university. In 1987, Lottes and Kuriloff surveyed the first-year freshman and asked, among other things, how they felt about the following statements, “I can accept and approve of homosexual relationships for males” and “I can accept and approve of homosexual relationships for females” (p. 41). As freshman, 55.0% of the male and 44.0% of the female students disagreed or strongly disagreed with the first statement, while 47.0% of the males and 48.0% of the females felt the same way about the second statement. However, by their senior year, the percentages had decreased to 39.0% of the males and 23.0% of the females for the first statement, and 27.0% of the males and 26.0% of the females on the second statement. Thus, there was about a 25.0% increase in the acceptance of homosexuality between the freshman and senior years.

In a study conducted at two different institutions, one being a Carnegie Research University-I and the other a Carnegie Baccalaureate College-II, in the Northeast, Malaney et al. (1997) considered the differences between freshman and seniors as one of the factors in their analysis of the campus climate at the research institution. Their research further supported the impact of education on attitudes as they found that seniors had a more favorable attitude towards gays, lesbians and bisexuals than did the freshman. Simoni (1996) also found similar results based on her research with college students at the bachelors, master's, and doctorate levels. In analyzing the demographics of education and age, she found that the younger and less educated students were more negative than the older and more educated students. The study at the University of Hawaii at Manoa of freshman through graduate level students also found an increased

acceptance of homosexuality among students as they became more educated (Kim et al., 1998).

Another, though somewhat different, view on the issue of education and time is demonstrated through Waldo's (1998) study of more than 1,900 heterosexual, gay, lesbian, or bisexual undergraduate and graduate students. In his analysis of demographic correlations, he found that among heterosexual students, the number of semesters correlated to an increasingly negative view of the academic environment for the gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. Thus, it showed that as the students became more educated, they became more aware of the negative environment in which the sexual orientation minority is subjected to. This same study also concluded that with more semesters at the university came an increasing openness to being in contact with gay, lesbian, or bisexual people.

In studying the behaviors of individuals, Strand (1998) used the data from several national surveys to draw his conclusions. He specifically looked at state initiatives concerning gays in Oregon and Colorado in 1992 and Oregon and Idaho in 1994. These initiatives were all similar in that each one would have repealed any civil rights protections for members of the sexual orientation minority that already existed, in addition to prohibiting the states from enacting any protections for this group in the future. Both the Oregon measures and the Idaho measure failed to pass. In studying the data collected during exit poll interviews at these sites, Strand found that individuals with more education were in greater opposition to the initiatives, which were anti-gay in nature, than those individuals with only a high school diploma.

Summarily, the research supports the conclusion that as individuals become more educated, they tend to become more liberal in their views and are more accepting of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population. Additionally, the older and more educated individuals tend to have a better understanding and recognition of the negativity experienced by this population.

Personal Interaction and Exposure

A fourth demographic area that has been identified in the research as being relevant in better understanding the campus climate as it defines heterosexist attitudes is the impact of personal interaction with or exposure to a member or members of the sexual orientation minority (Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Nelson & Krieger, 1997; Waldo, 1998). The research findings in this area are limited and are partly based on data collected in association with the various attitudinal measurements used in assessing attitudes towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population. However, there have been a few studies conducted that primarily look at attitudinal changes resulting from interactions with members of this group (Nelson & Krieger, 1997).

In attempting to understand how homophobic attitudes may be affected as a result of exposure to the gay and lesbian population through the use of a peer panel consisting of members of this group, Nelson and Krieger (1997) studied a group of 190 college students over a period of three semesters. The study involved the use of a pre- and post-test in conjunction with the intervention of the peer panel. Their findings suggested that participants exhibited more tolerant views towards homosexuals

following the intervention of the panel than they did prior to their exposure to the peer panel.

Similar to the concept of using a peer panel to investigate the impact of exposure to the sexual orientation minority on one's heterosexist attitudes, Waldo and Kemp (1997) conducted a study centering on an openly gay professor. Using one course taught by a gay professor and three taught by heterosexual faculty members, the researchers compared students' scores on the *Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men* scale. The results of the study indicated that the students in the class with the gay faculty member exhibited improved attitudes towards the gay, lesbian and bisexual population when compared to the students in the classes without the gay professor.

Other studies have also concluded that homophobia oftentimes decreases among heterosexuals once they have had first-hand experience with a member of the sexual orientation minority who is a family member, friend, or colleague (Tierney, 1992). For example, in their study of 173 business and psychology undergraduate students, Cotton-Huston and Waite (2000) found that students who had had a personal acquaintance with a gay person expressed fewer negative attitudes when compared to those students who had not.

The impact of having a friend or family member who is a member of the sexual orientation minority is further supported through a study involving some 435 students at Carnegie Research I University located in the Northeast. Malaney et al. (1997) found that students who had a gay, lesbian or bisexual acquaintance were more likely to be in favor of gay, lesbian, and bisexual rights and were more likely to intervene if they

witnessed an act of harassment. Those individuals who did not report having an acquaintance were less likely to express an interest in learning more about the sexual orientation minority and were less likely to notice harassment.

In summary, the research supports the correlation that personal relationships with or exposure to members of the sexual orientation minority, whether it be classified as close or simply casual contact, tend to decrease the homophobic attitudes of heterosexuals (D'Augelli, 1989a; Simoni, 1996). O'Mara's (1997) research involving interviews with twenty-five members of a gay student group emphasized this point as a similar thread appeared in many of the interviews focusing on the reactions of individuals when they discovered someone was gay or lesbian. These findings give further support for Herek's (1986) suggestion that disclosure of sexual orientation is one of the best ways to reduce homophobia. In essence, the research indicates that people's attitudes are improved when they know someone that is gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.

University Position

An additional demographic variable that has had very limited discussion in the literature is the role of one's position at the university in relation to attitudes and behaviors towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population. A review of the research has resulted in the identification of one article that deals with this variable in this specific way (Hogan & Rentz, 1996).

In a study at two state-assisted Midwestern universities, Hogan and Rentz (1996) used the *Index of Attitudes Towards Homosexuals* as a means of measuring homophobia

among the faculty and student affairs professionals. Based on the data gathered from the 310 participants, Hogan and Rentz found a significant difference in the homophobia scores between the groups, concluding that the faculty had higher levels of homophobia than the student affairs professionals did.

Another study related to this subject area was conducted at the University of Maine at Farmington. However, instead of comparing the positions at the University, the study analyzed and compared attitudes of educators, including faculty, clerical staff and professionals, to the attitudes of students. Geller (1990) concluded that the educators were more comfortable with the sexual minority population than the students. Due to the limited research in this area, drawing a conclusion regarding the impact of one's university position on attitudes and behaviors toward the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population proved difficult.

Summary

A review of the literature has provided a foundation for better understanding campus climate and the interaction between the sexual orientation minority and campus climate. Additionally, it discussed what role institutions of higher learning play in creating environments that are free from discrimination and negativity and foster welcoming and nurturing environments for all individuals. The literature review has also identified the current climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender students on college and university campuses, and demonstrated the part that the faculty, professional staff, and administration play in creating a positive campus environment. However, the

literature has provided very little discussion of faculty, professional staff, and administrator attitudes and behaviors toward the sexual orientation minority.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this research project was based on the survey method, primarily utilizing a questionnaire. According to Gall, Borg, and Gall (2002), the purpose of the survey method is to gather data from the participants in the study in order to gain an insight to their “characteristics, experiences, and opinions” (p. 289) that can be used to make generalizations about the population that is represented by the sample group. By utilizing the questionnaire method, each participant is given the opportunity to answer the same questions as the other participants, but they have the flexibility to answer the questions in any order and in their own time frame (Gall et al., 2002).

Therefore, the design of this study was developed in a way to achieve the goal of gaining a better understanding and perspective of the attitudes and behaviors of the faculty, professional staff, and administration towards the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population at Texas A&M University. More specifically, the purposes of this study were:

1. To identify the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration.
2. To determine if perceptions towards and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as education/age, ethnicity, and gender.

3. To identify the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administration towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons.
4. To determine how the campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compares to the norms established by a recent national study.

This chapter will focus on the population of the study, the survey instrument, the data collection, and the analysis of the data.

Population

The population for this study included the faculty, professional staff, and administration at Texas A&M University, located in College Station, Texas. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies the university as a Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges considers it to be one of the original land-grant institutions. Additionally, the University has been designated as a sea grant and space grant, making it one of the few institutions with all three designations, and was granted admission to the prestigious Association of American Universities in 2001.

Texas A&M University is a part of The Texas A&M University System, which consists of nine institutions and seven agencies. One of the five largest public universities in the United States, based on 2003 data, the University had a total student population of 45,000, consisting of 36,300 undergraduates and 8,700 graduate and

professional students. The University is made up of ten colleges and schools, including the Dwight Look College of Engineering, George Bush School of Government and Public Service, Mays Business School, and the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Architecture, Education and Human Development, Geosciences, Liberal Arts, Science, and Veterinary Medicine.

The University opened its doors as the first public institution in Texas in 1876, with a focus on agriculture, mechanical, and military education. During its first eighty-five to ninety years of existence, the institution basically remained unchanged as an all male institution with mandatory membership in the Corps of Cadets. However, with the admission of women in 1963 and the end of mandatory membership in the Corps of Cadets in 1965, the University began to grow and develop into the institution that it is today.

Through its statement of commitment to diversity, the University has asserted that it considers sexual orientation as one of the characteristics of a person that should be recognized. However, according to the mission statement of the institution, the focus on creating and serving a diverse population is reflected through racial, ethnic, and geographic groups. The University's statement on harassment and discrimination does not list specific groups, but states:

The University also strives to protect the rights and privileges and to enhance the self-esteem of all its members. Faculty, staff and students should be aware that any form of harassment and any form of illegal discrimination against any

individual is inconsistent with the values and ideals of the University community.

(Texas A&M University, 2003b, p. 10)

The original population for the survey consisted of 5,863 individuals at Texas A&M University, including 513 administrators, 1,992 faculty members, and 3,358 professional staff members, and was based on the employee's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Job Category. The names of the members of the target population were provided by the Department of Human Resources at Texas A&M University. The three job classifications used to develop the three subgroups were executive/administrator/management, faculty, and professional. All members of the administration, faculty, and professional staff, whether they were full-time or part-time, or tenured or untenured, were included in the population.

Based on the size of the population, it was determined that a random sample of the total population would be appropriate. To achieve a representative sample of faculty, professional staff, administration and minorities, a two-phase process was conducted in order to identify the sample size. Initially, the population was divided into three groups, defined as faculty, professional staff, and administration. Based on the work of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), who developed the *Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population* based on a formula published by the National Education Association for determining sample size, representative sample sizes for each group were determined. Using the formula provided in Krejcie and Morgan, the three initial sample subgroup sizes were 220 administrators, 322 faculty, and 325 professional staff members. These

individuals were randomly chosen from the population with the use of a computer program, and the results were entered into a Microsoft Access database.

According to Longmore, Dunn, and Jarboe (1996), it is not uncommon to establish a sample that will contribute to reaching the goals of the research project. Therefore, it was determined that over-sampling the minority population in each of the three subgroups was an important step. In addition to achieving a representative subgroup of minorities in each category in the sample size, the over sampling of the minority population was important in this study for two other reasons. One reason was the small number of minority members on campus. The other reason was the fact that it has been projected by the Texas State Demographer that the non-Caucasian population in the state of Texas is expected to exceed the Caucasian population by 2010 (Texas State Data Center, 2001).

In order to achieve the desired representation, the next step involved a form of stratified sampling (Gall et al., 2002). The process included calculating the overall percentage of minorities in each population group, and then using that percentage as a base point in determining the additional number of minorities that should be randomly chosen from the original population minus those individuals that had already been chosen. For example, of the original population of 513 administrators, 13.6% were considered to be minority, which included American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Hawaiian Native; African American or Black; Asian or Pacific Islander; Middle Eastern; and Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic. Based on this percentage, it was then determined that in addition to the 220 administrators already chosen for the subgroup, an additional 30

minority faculty members had to be chosen, thus creating a final administrator subgroup sample size of 250. By utilizing the process above, subgroup sample sizes for all three subgroups were determined. Table 3.1 summarizes the subgroup sample sizes for all three groups.

Table 3.1
Summary of Subgroup Sample Sizes

Subgroup	Size	Minority %	Subgroup Sample Size	Additional Minority	Total
Administrator	513	13.6	220	30	250
Faculty Professional	1992	19.0	322	61	383
Staff	2090	19.0	325	62	387

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) to be used in this study is the *Assessment of Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups*, developed by Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D., Senior Diversity Planning Analyst at The Pennsylvania State University. During the initial stages of the review of the literature for this study, it was discovered that Dr. Rankin had embarked on a national study of the campus climate for underrepresented groups, as well as a national study on the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender individuals in 2000 (Rankin, 2003b). Following additional research, it was discovered that Texas A&M University was one of the thirty institutions across America that had initially been invited to participate in the study. Further review revealed that the Office of Gender Issues Education Services in the

Department of Student Life had begun the process of gaining approval to participate; however, unresolved issues kept the department from gaining the final approval needed for the University to participate in the study (S. Alderete, personal communications, January 30, 2003) Though the survey itself went beyond the scope of the current study, it was determined that the instrument would provide the information necessary to answer the research questions. In addition to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons, the survey asked questions about eight other groups, including, but not limited to racial and ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and individuals of particular religious backgrounds. After contacting Dr. Rankin and receiving the approval from her to use the instrument and conduct the study at Texas A&M, IRB approval was sought and received in Spring 2003.

The survey instrument consisted of eight pages with five sections, and included both closed form and open form questions. Part One focused on the participants' campus experiences with diversity. There were twelve questions in this section; however, several questions had secondary questions depending on the participant's answer to the initial question. Including the secondary questions, there could have been as many as twenty questions to answer. There were two types of questions in this section. The first five questions were similar to Likert scale type questions, where participants were asked to respond on a five-point scale where 1 represented "never" and 5 represented a choice of "10 or more times." These questions dealt specifically with the individual's personal experiences of hearing others on campus make negative comments about underrepresented groups. The rest of the questions in this section were of the

response choice variety, where respondents chose between “yes or no,” or chose among a variety of possible answers and “mark all that apply.” The final questions dealt with the participant’s personal experience with or observation of misconduct or harassment on campus.

Part Two of the questionnaire assessed the attitudes and actions of the participants relative to diversity issues and included closed form questions. The questions in this section were also of the Likert scale model and the response choice model of “yes or no.” On each of the scale model questions, the participants were to answer on a five-point scale. Depending on the question, the Likert scale was that of “None” (1) to “Very Frequent” (5), “Strongly Agree” (1) to “Strongly Disagree” (5), “Very Accepting” (1) to “Not at all Accepting” (5), or “Very Unlikely” (1) to “Very Likely” (5). The fifteen questions in this section focused on the participant’s personal interactions with members of the underrepresented groups, their perspective on how the campus responded to various acts of harassment, and their beliefs and actions in response to specific acts by members of the underrepresented groups, such as their disapproval of public affection involving a homosexual couple.

Collecting demographic information was the focus of Part Three of the survey instrument. This section consisted of eleven choice response questions about the individual completing the survey instrument. Question topics included gender, sexual identity, age, racial/ethnic group, and university position. Several of these questions specifically dealt with information relative only if the respondent was a student. Thus, only nine of the eleven questions were critical to the purpose of this study.

The fourth section of the survey instrument asked closed form questions about the participant's views on how to improve the climate on campus for underrepresented groups. This section of the questionnaire included eight statements. The first seven statements requested the participant to respond on a five-point scale, from "Worsen Considerably" (1) to "Improve Considerably" (5). Each of the statements presented an idea or concept that could be used to improve the campus climate, such as providing sensitivity workshops and programs, or requiring students to take classes focusing on different groups. The last question asked the respondents to rate the campus climate on a five-point scale for eleven different issues. For example, the issues/scales included items such as "Respectful" (1) to "Disrespectful" (5), and "Non-homophobic" (1) to "Homophobic" (5).

Part Five, the last section of the survey was reserved for comments. This section requested the survey participants to record any additional suggestions that they may have to reach the goal of improving the climate of the campus.

Reliability and validity information was provided by Rankin and Associates (2002). The survey instrument was based on the works of Hurtado (1999), Gross and Aurand (1999), Rankin (1994), and a meta-analysis of climate studies for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons (Rankin, 1998). The instrument was reviewed by numerous individuals with experience in diversity issues and research methodology, in addition to members of some of the constituent groups that were focused on within the study. The author of the survey conducted a pilot study at her home institution, The Pennsylvania State University. In examining the internal consistency of responses for

reliability, the researcher found correlation coefficients between $r = .45$ and $r = .60$. These correlations were based on responses to the rating of the campus climate and likelihood of harassment. Rankin and Associates also explained how stability of the instrument, content validity, and construct validity were all achieved through the development of the questionnaire. Though this information was limited, it was the only information provided by the author of the instrument.

Data Collection

The study was conducted from May through July 2003. The survey packets were mailed to the randomly selected faculty, professional staff, and administration. The survey packet (Appendix A) included a participant information sheet, eight-page survey instrument, a stamped and self-addressed envelope for return of the paper survey to Dr. Susan Rankin at Rankin & Associates in Howard, Pennsylvania, and a stamped and self-addressed post card for return to the principal investigator in College Station, Texas. The participant information sheet included information on the purpose of the study, a brief description of the survey instrument, a suggested deadline for returning the survey, a description on how confidentiality of the participants would be assured, and information about Texas A&M University's Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects in Research.

Due to the high sensitivity and personal nature of some of the survey questions, respondent confidentiality was assured through a multi-stage process. The process involved randomly assigning a computer-generated number to each participant. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the participant was requested to mail the survey to Dr.

Rankin, and then mail the postcard, which had the randomly assigned number on it, to the researcher. This allowed the researcher to communicate with the non-respondents during the follow-up process. All 1,020 survey packets were mailed on Monday, May 5, 2003.

The return date for the survey and postcard was May 19, 2003. By the end of the first week, May 12, 2003, 144 postcards had been received, while fifteen survey packets had been returned to the researcher because the individuals were no longer employed at Texas A&M University, or they refused to participate in the survey. At the end of the second week, an additional 55 postcards and seven survey packets were returned. The final count of returned postcards as of May 30, 2003, which allowed for any postcards mailed by the deadline to be included was 232. The total number of survey packets returned was thirty-two. At that time, there was no way of determining how many useable surveys there were because all surveys went to Dr. Rankin in Pennsylvania and were not to be opened until the time of processing in late July 2003. Additionally, the researcher assumed that the respondent returned the postcard as well as the survey and that Rankin & Associates in Howard, Pennsylvania, received the survey.

Approximately two weeks after the deadline for return of the surveys and postcards, a reminder postcard (Appendix B) was mailed to all potential participants that had neither returned their postcard, nor had their survey packet returned. The follow-up postcard reminded the randomly selected faculty, professional staff, or administrator that a survey packet had been mailed to them previously, and it requested that they please

complete the survey and return it and the postcard by June 19, 2003. Additionally, the postcard gave a phone number and email address for use in requesting an additional packet if the first packet was never received or misplaced. Individuals requesting an additional survey packet were sent one. This follow-up postcard yielded an additional 32 returned postcards stating that the survey had been mailed. During this time, the researcher received seven phone calls or emails from individuals who said they did not want to participate in the study.

Approximately one week after the deadline for return of the survey and postcard, on June 27, 2003, a second survey packet was mailed to all of the remaining participants. The remaining participants were those individuals that had not returned the postcard stating that the survey had been sent, or had not had their name removed from the list due to a returned survey packet. Consequently, 717 survey packets were mailed out. Each survey packet included a participant information sheet (Appendix C), the eight-page survey instrument, a stamped and self-addressed envelope for return of the paper survey to Dr. Susan Rankin in Howard, Pennsylvania, and a stamped and self-addressed post card for return to the principal investigator. The researcher requested that all surveys and postcards be returned by July 18, 2003.

The second survey packet mail out resulted in an additional 40 postcards to be returned to the researcher by the end of the first week. At the end of the second week, July 11, 2003, the researcher received 25 more postcards. Once the deadline of July 18 had been reached, the number of returned postcards totaled 87. An additional thirty-one survey packets were returned to the researcher because the recipient was no longer at the

institution or he/she refused to participate. Prior to requesting that the surveys be scanned in August, fourteen more postcards were received, bringing the grand total of postcards received during the second survey packet mailing to 101. Ample time between the final deadline and the request for the surveys to be opened and processed was allowed so the surveys would have time to be returned to Dr. Rankin.

The overall response rate of the postcards was 364 out of the original 1,020, or 35.7%. However, a total of seventy survey packets were returned, which allowed an adjustment to the total sample to be made, resulting in a new sample size of 950. Table 3.2 provides a summary of the rates of return of the postcards to College Station, Texas, for the three mail outs that were conducted from May through July 2003. Thus, accounting for this decline, a return rate of 364 surveys out of 950, or 38.3% was expected. At this time, the breakdown between the three subgroups could not be established because the returned postcards did not identify the respondents as members of the faculty, professional staff, or administration.

Table 3.2

Summary of Postcard Return Rates

Subgroup	5-May Mailing	3-Jun Sample Size	27-Jun Sample Size	Total
Returned Postcards	232	32	101	364
Returned Surveys/Denials*	32	7	31	70
Total	264	39	132	434

*Returned because potential respondent is no longer at the institution or he/she declined to participate.

The researcher sent an email to Dr. Sue Rankin on August 1, 2003, requesting that the surveys received in her office be opened and processed. On August 12, the researcher received an email containing the data that was gathered from the processed surveys, as well as a MS Word document containing the comments made in Part Five of the questionnaire. The Word document contained comments made by 131 respondents. Upon review of the data, it was noted that 460 surveys were actually returned to Dr. Rankin, however, only 451 of those were usable and processed. Thus, instead of the return rate of 364 that was expected by the researcher, the number of usable surveys was 451. Due to the difference in the numbered of returned postcards and the number of surveys, it was determined that either the postcard was lost in the mail, or the respondent never actually mailed the postcard. Therefore, with the adjustment made for the number of surveys returned unusable, shown in Table 3.3, the useable response rate for the study was 451 of 941 or 47.9%.

Table 3.3

Summary of Postcard and Survey Response Rates

	n
Returned Postcards	
May 5 Mailing	232
June 1 Follow-up	32
June 27 Mailing	101
Total	364
Additional Surveys Returned	96
Unusable Surveys Returned	9
Total Surveys Returned and Processed	451

After the data from the 451 surveys was received, it was examined to determine whether the responding sample was similar to the population. The first comparison was the representation of each subgroup among the respondents and the actual population. Table 3.4 summarizes this data. According to the original population database, several members of the faculty, professional staff, and administration were also students at the university. For unknown reasons, twenty-four individuals marked their student position at the university instead of their professional position. In addition, nine respondents omitted this question. These thirty-three responses were excluded from the comparison in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Subgroup

Type	Respondents		Population	
	n	%	n	%
Faculty	125	27.7	383	37.5
Professional Staff	212	47.0	387	38.0
Administrator	81	18.0	250	24.5
Unexpected	24	5.3		
Missing	9	2.0		
Total	451	100.0	1020	100.0

Table 3.5 compares the gender and position of survey respondents to the survey population. The Table shows the comparisons based on disaggregated as well as aggregated data. Those 24 individuals who provided an unexpected response to the question on university position and the nine who did not answer the university position question were excluded from the analysis. Four respondents skipped the question on

gender; therefore, their responses were not used for this analysis. Consequently, the responses from 414 individuals are used in this comparison.

Table 3.5

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Gender

Type	Respondents				Population			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%
Faculty	73	58.4	52	41.6	1244	62.4	748	37.6
Professional Staff	91	43.5	118	56.5	1723	51.3	1635	48.7
Administrator	43	53.8	37	46.2	321	62.6	192	37.4
Faculty, Staff, and Administrator	207	50.0	207	50.0	3288	56.1	2575	43.9

Table 3.6 below shows the comparison of the respondents to the population based on ethnicity. For the purposes of this analysis, all minority groups were collapsed into one category, entitled minority. This group consisted of all respondents who answered to a specific minority group, or considered themselves to be multi-racial. The analysis did not include the 24 individuals who gave an unexpected response to the

Table 3.6

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Ethnicity

Type	Respondents						Population			
	Caucasian		Minority		Missing		Caucasian		Minority	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Faculty	91	74.6	31	25.4			1614	81.0	378	19.0
Professional Staff	143	69.5	63	30.6			2379	70.8	979	29.2
Administrator	64	79.0	17	21.0			443	86.4	70	13.6
Faculty, Staff, and Administrator	298	71.3	111	26.6	9	2.2	2575	75.7	1427	24.3

question regarding university position, as well as the nine who did not answer the question regarding position. As is noted below, there were eight individuals that did not respond to this question. The number of respondents used for this comparison was 418.

The comparisons of respondents to the population based on university position, gender, and ethnicity reflected some variances. The largest variance was noted between the positions of the respondents and the population. There was a larger response rate from the professional staff than from the faculty and administrators, which resulted in a disproportionate response rate among all respondents. A larger percentage of women among all positions responded to the survey than was represented in the population. There was not a large difference between the groups based on ethnicity. The variances that were present in the respondent group did not appear to be large enough to bias the study.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the surveys were analyzed using the SPSS Statistical Analysis package, Version 11.5. The surveys were capable of being scanned. The scanned data were placed into a SPSS database for the purposes of analysis. Each of the questions and possible answers were coded as separate variables as necessary. This was critical when a question stated, “mark all that apply,” thus having multiple answers. Because the questionnaire contained more information than necessary for the purposes of this study, the original database was altered and all unnecessary items were deleted. A list of the survey items used in the data analysis for this study can be found in Appendix D.

Due to the nature of this study, the use of descriptive statistical analyses techniques and inferential statistics was required. Thus, the analysis included the use of frequency tables, cross tabulations, mean and standard deviations. The inferential statistics included Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Independent Samples t-test. The analysis and interpretation of the data followed the guidelines outlined in *Educational Research: An Introduction* by Gall et al. (2002).

Research Questions

Research Question One

What is the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration?

This question was addressed using descriptive statistics. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each subgroup for eight of the survey questions that were identified as being relative in describing the current campus climate for the population. The issues presented dealt with the number of insensitive or disparaging remarks made about various groups by members of the campus community, and the perspective of respondents on how the university addresses various campus issues. Additionally, the level of acceptance of various groups is considered, as well as the overall campus climate in regards to homophobia, sexism, and racism.

Research Question Two

Do perceptions towards and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and

administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as education/age, ethnicity, and gender?

This question was addressed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, mean, and standard deviation. Additionally, inferential statistics such as Independent Samples t-Test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with corresponding post-hoc tests were conducted to determine differences between demographic variables.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administrators towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons?

This question was addressed using inferential statistics such as the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine if attitudes and actions of individuals was related to the frequency of contact that they had had with the defined population.

Research Question Four

How does the current campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compare to the norms established by a recent national study?

This question was addressed using descriptive statistics, such as mean and cross-tabulations that were used to compare data from this survey to data from a national study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the current campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration at the institution. More specifically, this study was to provide an overview of the current climate at the University, determine how selected demographic variables interact with the participants' perceptions and experiences, determine the impact of contact with members of the sexual orientation minority on heterosexuals' attitudes and actions, and to compare the University's climate to norms established by a recent national study.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Basic demographic information was collected on each survey participant. While the target population of the survey was faculty, staff, and administrators, the survey provided additional choices of undergraduate, professional, and graduate student as position options. Of all the survey respondents, 47.0% selected staff as their position. The second largest group was the faculty (27.7%), followed by administrators at 18.0%. A small percentage (5.3%) responded to one of the three student positions. Nine individuals did not respond to this question. The participants who did not respond to the question and those who responded as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student were not included in the data analysis. The mode of the age range was the 43-52 year old age group. Four individuals did not respond to this question. Men made up the largest percentage of all the respondents, representing 50.3% of the sample. The

percentage of females was 47.9%, with one individual, representing 0.2%, selecting transgender as their gender. Seven respondents did not answer this question. In regard to the sexual identity of all the respondents, the majority of the respondents (90.0%) selected heterosexual. The other participants responded in the following manner: 2.9% bisexual, 1.3% gay, 1.1% lesbian, and 1.1% uncertain. Some sixteen individuals, representing 3.5% of the responding group did not answer the question. The majority, representing 93.6% of all respondents were full-time employees of the university, while 5.5% were part-time. Four survey participants did not respond to this question. In terms of the racial/ethnic group to which respondents identify, the largest group identified themselves as White/Caucasian (75.6%). Asian/Pacific Islander was the next largest group, with 9.3%, followed by Chicano/Latino/Hispanic (8.9%), African American/Black (7.1%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (2.2%), and Middle Eastern (1.1%). When each percentage is added together, the total exceeds 100.0% because an individual of a multi-racial/multi-ethnic background could choose more than one group. Of all the respondents, 26.6% identified as a non-White/Caucasian, and 70.7% identified as White/Caucasian. Twelve individuals did not respond to this question. Table 4.1 summarizes the demographic variables for the administrators, faculty, and staff as a group, adjusted for missing responses.

Table 4.1
Demographic Characteristics of the
Administrators, Faculty, and Staff

Characteristic	Total Sample	
	n	%
Position:		
Administrator	81	19.4
Faculty	125	29.9
Staff	212	50.7
Age:		
23-32	61	14.6
33-42	109	26.1
43-52	127	30.5
53 and over	120	28.8
Gender:		
Male	207	50.0
Female	207	50.0
Race/Ethnicity:		
African American/Black	25	6.1
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	0.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	34	8.3
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	25	6.1
Middle Eastern	1	0.2
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	25	6.1
White/Caucasian	298	71.3
Sexual Identity:		
Bisexual	11	2.9
Gay	6	1.5
Heterosexual	300	90.9
Lesbian	5	1.2
Uncertain	4	1.0
Status:		
Full-time	399	95.5
Part-time	19	4.5

Table 4.2 displays the demographic characteristics of those individuals who chose administrator as their position at the university. The age category selected most

Table 4.2

Demographic Characteristics of the Administrators

Characteristic	Total Sample	
	n	%
Age:		
23-32	2	2.5
33-42	19	23.5
43-52	27	33.3
53 and over	33	40.7
Gender:		
Female	37	46.3
Male	43	53.8
Race/Ethnicity:		
African American/Black	6	7.4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	3.7
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	4	4.9
Middle Eastern	0	0.0
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	4	4.9
White/Caucasian	64	79.0
Sexual Identity:		
Bisexual	0	0.0
Gay	3	3.8
Heterosexual	75	93.8
Lesbian	0	0.0
Uncertain	2	2.5
Status:		
Full-time	79	95.5
Part-time	2	2.5

often was that of 53 and over (40.7%), followed by the 43-52 age group at 33.3%. There were more males (53.8%) than females (46.3%) responding, and the majority worked on campus full-time. The majority of the respondents were White/Caucasian (79.0%), with the second largest ethnic group being African American/Black (7.4%). There were no American Indian/Alaskan Native or Middle Eastern respondents among this group. Heterosexuals represented 93.8% of the administrators responding, and the remaining responders were either gay (3.8%) or uncertain (2.5%). There were no lesbians or bisexuals self-identified among the administrators.

The demographic information regarding those participants who identified themselves as faculty is presented in Table 4.3. The 43-52 year old age group (37.6%) was selected most often, followed by the 53+ category at 29.6%. There was a larger percentage of males among the faculty, with 58.4% identifying as male. Among the faculty, 74.6% of the respondents identified themselves as White/Caucasian. Of those considered to be non-white, the largest group was the Asian/Pacific Islander group, which comprised 13.1% of the total population. There were no individuals who responded as American Indian/Alaskan Native or Middle Eastern. The percentage of individuals who responded as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or uncertain was 8.3%, with bisexual being the largest group and the other three being equal. Slightly more than 7.0% of the faculty said they worked only part-time on campus.

Table 4.3

Demographic Characteristics of the Faculty

Characteristic	Total Sample	
	n	%
Age:		
23-32	14	11.2
33-42	27	21.6
43-52	47	37.6
53 and over	37	29.6
Gender:		
Female	52	41.6
Male	73	58.4
Race/Ethnicity:		
African American/Black	4	3.3
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	16	13.1
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	4	3.3
Middle Eastern	0	0.0
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	7	5.7
White/Caucasian	91	74.6
Sexual Identity:		
Bisexual	4	3.3
Gay	2	1.7
Heterosexual	111	91.7
Lesbian	2	1.7
Uncertain	2	1.7
Status:		
Full-time	116	92.8
Part-time	9	7.2

Table 4.4 shows the demographic data for those respondents who identified themselves as professional staff. The majority of the respondents were within the age group of 33-42 (29.9%), followed closely by the 43-52 age group (25.1%). 33-42 year olds comprised the mean age range. More female staff members (56.5%) responded than did males (43.5%). Among the staff, only 69.1% responded as White/Caucasian. Six other race/ethnic groups were represented among the staff, including two American Indian/Alaskan Natives and one Middle Eastern. The other four groups were relatively the same in size, ranging from 6.8% to 8.2% in size. The respondents who identified themselves as gay, bisexual, or lesbian represented 5.3% of the staff respondents. No one self-identified as uncertain. 96.0% chose full-time as their employment status.

Table 4.4
Demographic Characteristics of the Staff

Characteristic	Total Sample	
	n	%
Age:		
23-32	45	21.3
33-42	63	29.9
43-52	53	25.1
53 and over	50	23.6
Gender:		
Female	118	56.5
Male	91	43.5
Race/Ethnicity:		
African American/Black	15	7.2
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	0.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	7.2
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	17	8.2
Middle Eastern	1	0.5
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	14	6.8
White/Caucasian	143	69.1

Table 4.4 continued
Demographic Characteristics of the Staff

Characteristic	Total Sample	
	n	%
Sexual Identity:		
Bisexual	7	3.4
Gay	1	0.5
Heterosexual	194	94.6
Lesbian	3	1.4
Uncertain	0	0.0
Status:		
Full-time	204	96.2
Part-time	8	3.8

Research Question One

What is the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration?

Table 4.5 illustrates the means and standard deviations of the number of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by students in the last year about the underrepresented groups. The calculations are representative of a five-point scale: 1=Never, 2=one to two times, 3=three to five times, 4=six to nine times and 5=twenty or more times, and are based on the responses of all the administrators, faculty, and professional staff collapsed into a single group. Overall, more remarks were made about the sexual orientation minority than any other group. The mean for this group was above 2.00, whereas, the mean of all other groups was below 2.00. The fewest remarks were made about persons with disabilities, while non-native English speakers had the second highest mean.

Table 4.5
Means and Standard Deviations of
Student Remarks by Underrepresented Group

Group	n	M	SD
Women	399	1.84	1.194
Men	396	1.60	.961
Racial minorities	395	1.84	1.134
Ethnic minorities	393	1.84	1.149
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	397	2.03	1.291
Persons with disabilities	393	1.20	.495
Non-native English Speakers	397	1.95	1.208
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	395	1.76	1.167
Older or younger persons	393	1.45	.891

The faculty, professional staff, and administrators also provided information on the number of insensitive remarks they had heard in the last year made by staff members on campus. Overall, the number of remarks made by staff appears to be less than that of the students. While gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons continue to rank at the top with 1.67, the same number of comments was reported about women as well. Non-native English speakers followed closely behind at 1.67. However, based on the standard deviation, it can be determined that the dispersion of scores for the sexual orientation minority was broader than that of women. The staff were least likely to make comments about persons with disabilities. Table 4.6 presents the information for the number of staff remarks made about each group.

Table 4.6

Means and Standard Deviations of Staff Remarks by Underrepresented Group

Group	n	M	SD
Women	400	1.67	.994
Men	400	1.51	.855
Racial minorities	403	1.61	.943
Ethnic minorities	399	1.64	1.002
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	399	1.67	1.065
Persons with disabilities	398	1.15	.453
Non-native English Speakers	401	1.66	1.033
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	400	1.60	1.062
Older or younger persons	399	1.37	.831

Table 4.7 presents the information for the remarks made about groups on campus by the university's faculty. According to the results, members of the faculty tended to make more disparaging or insensitive comments about women than any other group, with a mean of 1.56. The group with the second highest score was the sexual orientation minority (1.48). Non-native English speakers and persons with differing religious backgrounds were close behind at 1.43. Individuals with disabilities continued to have the fewest negative comments made about them.

Table 4.7
Means and Standard Deviations of
Faculty Remarks by Underrepresented Group

Group	n	M	SD
Women	389	1.56	.947
Men	386	1.30	.720
Racial minorities	383	1.37	.785
Ethnic minorities	383	1.35	.767
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	385	1.48	.938
Persons with disabilities	381	1.12	.421
Non-native English Speakers	387	1.43	.850
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	386	1.43	.898
Older or younger persons	383	1.27	.744

The number of remarks made by teaching assistants, reported by the faculty, staff, and administrators, is the lowest among the students, staff, faculty, teaching assistants and administrators. Table 4.8 illustrates the data for the teaching assistants. The mean for all nine groups ranges between 1.05 and 1.21. Overall, the target of disparaging remarks by teaching assistants is non-native English speakers, followed by women. Comments about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons ranked as third highest. The fewest number of remarks were reportedly about individuals with disabilities.

Table 4.8
Means and Standard Deviations of
Teaching Assistant Remarks by Underrepresented Group

Group	n	M	SD
Women	339	1.17	.593
Men	335	1.13	.504
Racial minorities	333	1.14	.488
Ethnic minorities	333	1.13	.477
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	332	1.16	.630
Persons with disabilities	332	1.05	.247
Non-native English Speakers	332	1.21	.664
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	332	1.13	.510
Older or younger persons	331	1.13	.491

Women were the focus of more disparaging and insensitive remarks reportedly made by campus administrators. The mean for women was 1.37. Those individuals considered as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender had the second highest mean at 1.31.

Table 4.9
Means and Standard Deviations of Administrator Remarks by
Underrepresented Group

Group	n	M	SD
Women	380	1.37	.776
Men	381	1.19	.586
Racial minorities	376	1.22	.575
Ethnic minorities	376	1.24	.625
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	377	1.31	.748
Persons with disabilities	376	1.04	.209
Non-native English Speakers	377	1.25	.742
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	375	1.27	.745
Older or younger persons	373	1.16	.567

The fewest remarks were made about persons with disabilities. Table 4.9 illustrates the means and standard deviations for the number of remarks made by administrators.

The campus climate can further be described by looking at the manner in which the faculty, staff, and administrators agree or disagree on whether or not the University thoroughly addresses campus issues related to several demographic groups on campus. Table 4.10 illustrates this information by presenting the means and standard deviations for six specific groups. The scores presented are based on a five-point scale: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Uncertain, 4=Disagree and 5=Strongly Disagree. Overall, the respondents believed that the University did the least effective job at addressing issues regarding sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia on campus. At 3.03, this was the only group that had a mean above 3.00. The second highest concern was that of age or ageism. The faculty, staff, and administrators believed that the University did the best job at addressing issues related to disabilities.

Table 4.10

Means and Standard Deviations of the University's Ability to Address Issues Regarding Underrepresented Groups

Group	n	M	SD
Race or racism	408	2.65	1.161
Gender or sexism	405	2.74	1.190
Sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia	402	3.03	1.194
Age or ageism	403	2.76	.977
Disabilities	405	2.27	.887
Religious beliefs or religious harassment	406	2.77	1.123

In Table 4.11, means and standard deviations are presented based on the attitudes of the survey participants toward the overall campus climate for several groups. The respondents were able to rate the climate on a five-point scale including very accepting (1), accepting (2), uncertain (3), not accepting (4), and not at all accepting (5). Four of the fifteen groups listed had means above 3.00. All four groups dealt with campus acceptance of members of the sexual orientation minority, including gay men, lesbians, bisexual men or women, and transgender persons. According to the respondents, the campus is least accepting of transgender persons (3.44), followed by gay men (3.25), bisexuals (3.24) and lesbians (3.19). Of those groups not dealing with sexual orientation, the group most likely not to be accepted on campus was African

Table 4.11

Means and Standard Deviations of Overall Campus Climate of Underrepresented Groups

Group	n	M	SD
Men	404	1.25	.569
Women	403	1.86	.825
African Americans/Blacks	399	2.51	1.046
American Indian	399	2.36	.821
Asian/Pacific Islander	398	2.19	.748
Chicanos/Latinos/Hispanics	398	2.09	.899
Whites/Caucasians	399	1.21	.541
Gay men	401	3.25	1.065
Lesbians	399	3.19	1.037
Bisexual men or women	398	3.24	1.017
Transgender persons	398	3.44	1.055
Persons with disabilities	402	1.95	.727
Persons with different religious backgrounds	400	2.42	1.119
Persons of different age	400	1.99	.833
Non-native English speakers	403	2.48	.975

Americans/Blacks (2.51), which was .68 less than the lowest mean of the four groups specifically linked to sexual orientation. The campus was found to be most accepting of Whites/Caucasians (1.21) and men (1.25).

The campus climate in general was also rated on a scale of one to five for three attitudes that have ranges that can be assumed to be either negative or positive. The scale ranged from one for the more positive attitude, such as non-homophobic, to five for the negative attitude (homophobic, for example). The three attitudes dealt with race, sex, and homophobia. Of the surveys used, overall, the University was considered to be more homophobic than racist or sexist. The mean for homophobia was 3.03. The other two scores were 2.74 on sex and 2.65 on race. Table 4.12 presents the data.

Table 4.12

Means and Standard Deviations of the University's Campus Climate in General by Attitudes

Attitude	n	M	SD
Non-racist/racist	408	2.65	1.161
Non-sexist/sexist	405	2.74	1.190
Non-homophobic/homophobic	402	3.03	1.194

Research Question Two

Do perceptions toward and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as age, ethnicity, gender and sexual identity?

The descriptive statistics for the demographic variables for each of the survey questions targeted in this section are presented next. The first five tables provide information about the reported number of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by students, staff, faculty, teaching assistants or administrators on campus in the last year. The scale for the questions was Never (1), 1-2 times (2), 3-5 times (3), 6-9 times (4), and 10 or more times (5).

Table 4.13 illustrates the information for the number of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by students in the last year. Overall, the administrators ($m=2.24$) reporting hearing more remarks made by students than the faculty ($m=1.92$) or staff ($m=2.00$). 17.1% of the administrators reported hearing more than six remarks made by students in the last year. The youngest age group ($m=2.44$) reported hearing more remarks than the oldest group ($m=1.68$) did, which heard the fewest number of remarks.

Table 4.13

Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Students

	n	never (1) freq. (%)	1-2 times (2) freq. (%)	3-5 times (3) freq. (%)	6-9 times (4) freq. (%)	10 or more times (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	76	33 (43.4)	15 (19.7)	15 (19.7)	3 (3.9)	10 (13.2)	2.24	1.39
Faculty	119	64 (53.8)	25 (21.0)	12 (10.1)	11 (9.2)	7 (5.9)	1.92	1.24
Staff	202	99 (49.0)	50 (24.8)	23 (11.4)	13 (6.4)	17 (8.4)	2.00	1.28
Age								
23-32	61	24 (39.3)	13 (21.3)	6 (9.8)	9 (14.8)	9 (14.8)	2.44	1.50
33-42	105	43 (41.0)	25 (23.8)	19 (18.1)	8 (7.6)	10 (9.5)	2.21	1.31
43-52	120	60 (50.0)	29 (24.2)	14 (11.7)	8 (6.7)	9 (7.5)	1.98	1.25
53 and over	110	68 (61.8)	23 (20.9)	11 (10.0)	2 (1.8)	6 (5.5)	1.68	1.09
Gender								
Female	195	89 (45.6)	46 (23.6)	28 (14.4)	15 (7.7)	17 (8.7)	2.10	1.30
Male	198	104 (52.5)	43 (21.7)	22 (11.1)	12 (6.1)	17 (8.6)	1.96	1.29
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	35	14 (40.0)	7 (20.0)	7 (20.0)	3 (8.6)	4 (11.4)	2.31	1.39
Heterosexual	362	182 (50.3)	83 (22.9)	43 (11.9)	24 (6.6)	30 (8.3)	2.00	1.28
Ethnicity								
African American	23	7 (30.4)	9 (39.1)	2 (8.7)	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	2.39	1.44
Asian	30	23 (76.7)	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.37	0.72
Hispanic	23	9 (39.1)	5 (21.7)	4 (17.4)	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	2.39	1.50
Multi-Racial	24	12 (50.0)	6 (25.0)	3 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	3 (12.5)	2.00	1.35
White/Caucasian	287	138 (48.1)	66 (23.0)	36 (12.5)	24 (8.4)	23 (8.0)	2.05	1.29

While only 7.3% of the 53 and over age group reported hearing six or more remarks, almost 30.0% of the 23-32 age group heard at least six remarks. The females ($m=2.10$) and those individuals that identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or uncertain ($m=2.31$) heard more remarks than their counterparts, males ($m=1.96$) and heterosexuals ($m=2.00$). While the number of females and males reporting more than six remarks was similar at 16.4% and 14.7% respectively, the difference between the other two groups was more substantial at 20.0% for the sexual orientation minority and 14.9% for heterosexuals. Both the Hispanics and African Americans reported hearing more remarks than any other ethnic group with a reported mean of 2.39. Each of these groups also had 21.7% of the respondents reporting six or more remarks. The Asian group had the lowest mean at 1.37 and had no one reporting more than six remarks.

The reported number of remarks made by staff was different than that of remarks by students. The frequency, mean and standard deviation for each demographic variable and the number of remarks made by staff are presented in Table 4.14. Though 8.8% of the staff reported hearing at least six remarks, on average, the administrators ($m=1.78$) reported hearing more remarks. However, the staff ($m=1.76$) were quite similar. Among the different age groups, the 23-32 group had the highest reported mean (1.84) and the largest percentage reporting over six remarks (11.5%). The second highest was 43-52 ($m=1.80$, 10.7%), while the lowest was 53 and over. Only 4.5% of those 53 and over reported hearing staff make at least six remarks. Like the previous question, the females reported a higher frequency of remarks than the males. However, for staff remarks, heterosexuals reported higher numbers of remarks. 8.5% of heterosexuals

Table 4.14

Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Staff

	n	never (1) freq. (%)	1-2 times (2) freq. (%)	3-5 times (3) freq. (%)	6-9 times (4) freq. (%)	10 or more times (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	79	43 (54.4)	19 (24.1)	11 (13.9)	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)	1.78	1.07
Faculty	115	88 (76.5)	14 (12.2)	5 (4.3)	4 (3.5)	4 (3.5)	1.45	0.98
Staff	205	117 (57.1)	48 (23.4)	22 (10.7)	9 (4.4)	9 (4.4)	1.76	1.09
Age								
23-32	61	33 (54.1)	16 (26.2)	5 (8.2)	3 (4.9)	4 (6.6)	1.84	1.19
33-42	103	68 (66.0)	19 (18.4)	9 (8.7)	3 (2.9)	4 (3.9)	1.60	1.03
43-52	122	70 (57.4)	24 (19.7)	15 (12.3)	9 (7.4)	4 (3.3)	1.80	1.12
53 and over	112	76 (67.9)	22 (19.6)	9 (8.0)	1 (0.9)	4 (3.6)	1.53	0.95
Gender								
Female	195	113 (57.9)	45 (23.1)	20 (10.3)	8 (4.1)	9 (4.6)	1.74	1.10
Male	200	132 (66.0)	35 (17.5)	18 (9.0)	8 (4.0)	7 (3.5)	1.62	1.04
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	34	19 (55.9)	12 (35.3)	2 (5.9)	1 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	1.56	0.75
Heterosexual	365	229 (62.7)	69 (18.9)	36 (9.9)	15 (4.1)	16 (4.4)	1.68	1.09
Ethnicity								
African American	25	13 (52.0)	9 (36.0)	2 (8.0)	1 (4.0)	0 (0.0)	1.64	0.81
Asian	28	25 (89.3)	3 (10.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.11	0.32
Hispanic	23	12 (52.2)	5 (21.7)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	2 (8.7)	1.96	1.30
Multi-Racial	23	16 (69.6)	3 (13.0)	2 (8.7)	1 (4.3)	1 (4.3)	1.61	1.12
White/Caucasian	290	175 (60.3)	59 (20.3)	31 (10.7)	12 (4.1)	13 (4.5)	1.72	1.10

reported hearing at least six remarks, while 2.9% of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and uncertain respondents heard at least six remarks. The Hispanic group had the highest reported mean (1.96), with 12.7% reporting six or more remarks. The Asian group reported hearing the fewest remarks again ($m=1.11$, 0.0%).

Table 4.15 presents the data for each demographic variable based on reporting the number of remarks made by faculty about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons. On average, the administrators reported hearing the largest number of remarks (1.57) compared to the faculty (1.54) and staff (1.41). 8.1% of the administrators reported hearing six or more remarks. Among the different age groups, the 43-52 group had the highest reported mean (1.55) and highest frequency of remarks (7.6%), and the youngest group had the lowest mean (1.38) and frequency of remarks (5.1%). Unlike the two previous questions, the males ($m=1.51$, 7.7%) reported higher numbers of remarks than the females ($m=1.46$, 4.9%). More than twice the number of gay, lesbian, bisexual and uncertain respondents (12.1%) reported six or more remarks compared to the heterosexuals (5.7%). The mean for the non-heterosexual group was 1.70, while the mean for the heterosexuals was 1.46. As they did for the first two questions, the Hispanics continue to have the highest reported mean (1.68) and largest percentage reporting six or more remarks (9.1%). Likewise, the Asian group continued to have the lowest reports ($m=1.17$, 0.0%).

Overall, the number of remarks made by teaching assistants was the lowest among the five groups. Administrators ($m=1.21$, 3.2%) reported hearing more remarks than the other two positions. Those respondents reporting to be 23-32 (4.2%) had the

Table 4.15

Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Faculty

	n	never (1) freq. (%)	1-2 times (2) freq. (%)	3-5 times (3) freq. (%)	6-9 times (4) freq. (%)	10 or more times (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	74	51 (68.9)	12 (16.2)	5 (6.8)	4 (5.4)	2 (2.7)	1.57	1.02
Faculty	117	82 (70.1)	20 (17.1)	6 (5.1)	5 (4.3)	4 (3.4)	1.54	1.01
Staff	194	148 (76.3)	23 (11.9)	14 (7.2)	7 (3.6)	2 (1.0)	1.41	0.86
Age								
23-32	58	45 (77.6)	8 (13.8)	2 (3.4)	2 (3.4)	1 (1.7)	1.38	0.86
33-42	100	73 (73.0)	15 (15.0)	6 (6.0)	3 (3.0)	3 (3.0)	1.48	0.96
43-52	119	82 (68.9)	20 (16.8)	8 (6.7)	7 (5.9)	2 (1.7)	1.55	0.97
53 and over	107	80 (74.8)	12 (11.2)	9 (8.4)	4 (3.7)	2 (1.9)	1.47	0.94
Gender								
Female	186	138 (74.2)	24 (12.9)	15 (8.1)	5 (2.7)	4 (2.2)	1.46	0.91
Male	195	139 (71.3)	31 (15.9)	10 (5.1)	11 (5.6)	4 (2.1)	1.51	0.97
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	33	20 (60.6)	8 (24.2)	1 (3.0)	3 (9.1)	1 (3.0)	1.70	1.10
Heterosexual	352	261 (74.1)	47 (13.4)	24 (6.8)	13 (3.7)	7 (2.0)	1.46	0.92
Ethnicity								
African American	23	20 (87.0)	2 (8.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	1.22	0.67
Asian	29	24 (82.8)	5 (17.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.17	0.38
Hispanic	22	16 (72.7)	1 (4.5)	3 (13.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.1)	1.68	1.29
Multi-Racial	24	20 (83.3)	1 (4.2)	2 (8.3)	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	1.33	0.82
White/Caucasian	279	195 (69.9)	45 (16.1)	20 (7.2)	13 (4.7)	6 (2.2)	1.53	0.97

Table 4.16

Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Teaching Assistants

	n	never (1) freq. (%)	1-2 times (2) freq. (%)	3-5 times (3) freq. (%)	6-9 times (4) freq. (%)	10 or more times (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	63	58 (92.1)	1 (1.6)	2 (3.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.2)	1.21	0.79
Faculty	102	94 (92.2)	4 (3.9)	1 (1.0)	3 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	1.15	0.57
Staff	167	153 (91.6)	7 (4.2)	4 (2.4)	1 (0.6)	2 (1.2)	1.16	0.60
Age								
23-32	48	44 (91.7)	2 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	1.17	0.63
33-42	88	82 (93.2)	3 (3.4)	2 (2.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1.13	0.54
43-52	105	96 (91.4)	3 (2.9)	3 (2.9)	1 (1.0)	2 (1.9)	1.19	0.71
53 and over	90	82 (91.1)	4 (4.4)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	1.17	0.62
Gender								
Female	155	140 (90.3)	5 (3.2)	6 (3.9)	2 (1.3)	2 (1.3)	1.20	0.69
Male	174	162 (93.1)	7 (4.0)	1 (0.6)	2 (1.1)	2 (1.1)	1.13	0.58
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	29	25 (86.2)	2 (6.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.4)	1 (3.4)	1.31	0.93
Heterosexual	303	280 (92.4)	10 (3.3)	7 (2.3)	3 (1.0)	3 (1.0)	1.15	0.59
Ethnicity								
African American	20	19 (95.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.10	0.45
Asian	25	25 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.00	0.00
Hispanic	21	18 (85.7)	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)	0 (0.0)	1.29	0.78
Multi-Racial	24	21 (87.5)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	1.25	0.74
White/Caucasian	234	216 (92.3)	9 (3.8)	3 (1.3)	2 (0.9)	4 (1.7)	1.16	0.65

largest percentage of people hearing more than six remarks, however, the highest mean (1.19) was attributed to those in the 43-52 age group. 2.6% of the females heard more than six remarks, while 2.2% of the males heard more than six remarks. Females (1.20) also had the largest mean. Members of the sexual orientation minority (6.8%) reported hearing more than six remarks by teaching assistants three times as often as the heterosexuals (2.0%). The mean for heterosexuals was 1.15, while the non-heterosexuals was 1.30. Among the ethnic groups, Hispanics ($m=1.29$, 4.8%) continued to report more frequent remarks than all the other groups. Neither the Asian nor African American groups reported hearing more than six remarks during the last year. Their reported means were 1.00 and 1.10 respectively. Table 4.16 demonstrates the number of disparaging remarks made by teaching assistants.

Table 4.17 illustrates the number of remarks that were heard being made by campus administrators. On average, the administrators (1.39) reported hearing more remarks than the faculty (1.32) or staff (1.27). However, the faculty (5.4%) had the largest percentage of individuals reportedly hearing six or more remarks. The four age groups had relatively small differences, with means ranging from 1.24 to 1.35, and percentage of respondents hearing more than six remarks ranging from 2.8% to 3.8%. The 23-32 age group had the largest percentage reporting more than six remarks, while the 33-42 and 43-52 age groups had the largest means. Females ($m=1.37$, 3.8%) continued to have higher scores than the males ($m=1.25$, 2.7%) in both areas. The gay, lesbian, bisexual, uncertain group was almost identical to the heterosexuals. The groups

Table 4.17

Remarks About Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons by Administrators

	n	never (1) freq. (%)	1-2 times (2) freq. (%)	3-5 times (3) freq. (%)	6-9 times (4) freq. (%)	10 or more times (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	74	53 (71.6)	14 (18.9)	6 (8.1)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1.39	0.70
Faculty	110	91 (82.7)	12 (10.9)	1 (0.9)	3 (2.7)	3 (2.7)	1.32	0.86
Staff	193	160 (82.9)	21 (10.9)	7 (3.6)	3 (1.6)	2 (1.0)	1.27	0.70
Age								
23-32	52	44 (84.6)	5 (9.6)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.9)	1.27	0.77
33-42	100	77 (77.0)	16 (16.0)	4 (4.0)	1 (1.0)	2 (2.0)	1.35	0.78
43-52	117	92 (78.6)	13 (11.1)	8 (6.8)	4 (3.4)	0 (0.0)	1.35	0.76
53 and over	107	90 (84.1)	13 (12.1)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	2 (1.9)	1.24	0.70
Gender								
Female	184	140 (76.1)	30 (16.3)	7 (3.8)	4 (2.2)	3 (1.6)	1.37	0.80
Male	190	161 (84.7)	17 (8.9)	7 (3.7)	3 (1.6)	2 (1.1)	1.25	0.70
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	31	23 (74.2)	7 (22.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.2)	0 (0.0)	1.32	0.65
Heterosexual	346	281 (81.2)	40 (11.6)	14 (4.0)	6 (1.7)	5 (1.4)	1.31	0.76
Ethnicity								
African American	25	19 (76.0)	4 (16.0)	2 (8.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.32	0.63
Asian	24	23 (95.8)	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.04	0.20
Hispanic	25	17 (81.0)	2 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.5)	1.48	1.21
Multi-Racial	24	20 (83.3)	2 (8.3)	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)	1.33	0.92
White/Caucasian	274	218 (79.6)	37 (13.5)	11 (4.0)	6 (2.2)	2 (0.7)	1.31	0.72

had means of 1.32 and 1.31 respectively. The Hispanic group continued to have the highest mean (1.48) and percentage (9.5%) of individuals reporting more than six remarks. Both the Asian and African American groups had no individuals reporting six or more remarks, and the Asian group had the lowest mean (1.04) on the scale of 1 to 5.

Table 4.18, reports the findings on the respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that the university addresses issues regarding sexual orientation on campus. The administrators (41.0%) were the most likely to disagree or strongly disagree compared to the faculty (39.8%) and the staff (31.1%). However, on average, the faculty had the largest mean (3.24), while the staff had the lowest at 2.91. 49.6% of the 33-42 age did not believe that the university addresses issues regarding sexual orientation on campus. Whereas, 52.5% of those 53 and over believed the university did address issues regarding sexual orientation. Overall, the 33-42 age group (3.40) had the highest mean, while the oldest group (2.60) had the lowest mean. Females were more likely to disagree with the statement than males. 42.5% of the females at least disagreed with the statement, and only 28.9% of the males disagreed with the statement. On average, non-heterosexuals had a mean of 3.31 and heterosexuals had a mean of 3.00. Those that disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement represented 51.4% of the sexual orientation minority, whereas, 34.0% of the heterosexuals disagreed or strongly disagreed. African Americans (50.0%) were more likely to at least disagree with how the university addresses sexual orientation issues, and Asians (16.6%) were least likely to at least disagree. In fact, 46.7% of Asians believed that the university addresses the issues regarding sexual orientation. Overall,

Table 4.18

University Addresses Issues Related to Sexual Orientation

	n	Strongly Agree (1) freq. (%)	Agree (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Disagree (4) freq. (%)	Strongly Disagree (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	78	9 (11.5)	24 (30.8)	13 (16.7)	20 (25.6)	12 (15.4)	3.03	1.29
Faculty	118	8 (6.8)	23 (19.5)	40 (33.9)	27 (22.9)	20 (16.9)	3.24	1.15
Staff	206	28 (13.6)	46 (22.3)	68 (33.0)	44 (21.4)	20 (9.7)	2.91	1.17
Age								
23-32	59	2 (3.4)	12 (20.3)	25 (42.4)	11 (18.6)	9 (15.3)	3.22	1.05
33-42	107	7 (6.5)	15 (14.0)	32 (29.9)	34 (31.8)	19 (17.8)	3.40	1.13
43-52	122	17 (13.9)	25 (20.5)	34 (27.9)	30 (24.6)	16 (13.1)	3.02	1.24
53 and over	113	18 (15.9)	41 (36.3)	30 (26.5)	16 (14.2)	8 (7.1)	2.60	1.13
Gender								
Female	198	22 (11.1)	34 (17.2)	58 (29.3)	52 (26.3)	32 (16.2)	3.19	1.22
Male	201	22 (10.9)	58 (28.9)	63 (31.3)	38 (18.9)	20 (10.0)	2.88	1.14
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	35	5 (14.3)	6 (17.1)	6 (17.1)	9 (25.7)	9 (25.7)	3.31	1.41
Heterosexual	367	40 (10.9)	87 (23.7)	115 (31.3)	82 (22.3)	43 (11.7)	3.00	1.17
Ethnicity								
African American	24	2 (8.3)	2 (8.3)	8 (33.3)	8 (33.3)	4 (16.7)	3.42	1.14
Asian	30	5 (16.7)	9 (30.0)	11 (36.7)	4 (13.3)	1 (3.3)	2.57	1.04
Hispanic	24	0 (0.0)	4 (16.7)	11 (45.8)	5 (20.8)	4 (16.7)	3.38	0.97
Multi-Racial	25	5 (20.0)	6 (24.0)	8 (32.0)	4 (16.0)	2 (8.0)	2.68	1.22
White/Caucasian	289	30 (10.4)	71 (24.6)	78 (27.0)	70 (24.2)	40 (13.8)	3.07	1.21

African Americans had the largest mean at 3.42, compared to a low of 2.57 among Asians.

The next table, Table 4.19, reflects the likelihood of an individual's level of disapproval of public display of affection by a gay or lesbian couple. Of the three respondent positions, the administrators were more likely to disapprove of display of affection in public by a homosexual couple. Some 56.2% of the administrators were likely to disapprove of the event, while 51.4% of the staff, and 41.2% of the faculty were likely to disapprove. Administrators also had the highest overall mean of the three groups with a mean of 3.33. Among the age groups, those individuals between the ages of 43 and 52 were most likely to disapprove of public affection by a same-sex couple. This group was followed closely by the 23-32 group (53.4%) and 53 and over (52.7%). However, among the youngest group, 23-32, only 33.9% said they were likely to disapprove. Males (49.5%) and females (49.2%) responded similarly, with a difference of only 0.3%. On average, males (3.18) had a higher mean than females (3.11). A difference existed between the two sexual identity groups. 51.1% of heterosexuals said they were likely to disapprove of homosexual public affection, whereas, only 28.2% of the other group said they were likely to disapprove. While the African American (66.7%) group had a large number of individuals believing they would disapprove, a larger percentage of the Multi-racial group (70.8%) said they would disapprove. Once again, the Asian group was least likely to disapprove, however, at 33.4%, over a third of them were still likely to disapprove.

Table 4.19

Disapproval of Homosexual Display of Public Affection

	n	Very Unlikely (1) freq. (%)	Unlikely (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Likely (4) freq. (%)	Very Likely (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	73	7 (9.6)	20 (27.4)	5 (6.8)	24 (32.9)	17 (23.3)	3.33	1.36
Faculty	119	22 (18.5)	35 (29.4)	13 (10.9)	35 (29.4)	14 (11.8)	2.87	1.34
Staff	204	23 (11.3)	48 (23.5)	28 (13.7)	67 (32.8)	38 (18.6)	3.24	1.31
Age								
23-32	58	4 (6.9)	18 (31.0)	5 (8.6)	18 (31.0)	13 (22.4)	3.31	1.31
33-42	106	20 (18.9)	32 (30.2)	18 (17.0)	24 (22.6)	12 (11.3)	2.77	1.30
43-52	119	17 (14.3)	22 (18.5)	11 (9.2)	44 (37.0)	25 (21.0)	3.32	1.37
53 and over	112	10 (8.9)	31 (27.7)	12 (10.7)	40 (35.7)	19 (17.0)	3.24	1.28
Gender								
Female	195	27 (13.8)	53 (27.2)	19 (9.7)	63 (32.3)	33 (16.9)	3.11	1.35
Male	198	24 (12.1)	50 (25.3)	26 (13.1)	63 (31.8)	35 (17.7)	3.18	1.32
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	32	7 (21.9)	10 (31.3)	6 (18.8)	7 (21.9)	2 (6.3)	2.59	1.24
Heterosexual	364	45 (12.4)	93 (25.5)	40 (11.0)	119 (32.7)	67 (18.4)	3.19	1.34
Ethnicity								
African American	21	2 (9.5)	3 (14.3)	2 (9.5)	9 (42.9)	5 (23.8)	3.57	1.29
Asian	33	4 (12.1)	7 (21.2)	11 (33.3)	9 (27.3)	2 (6.1)	2.94	1.12
Hispanic	24	4 (16.7)	5 (20.8)	6 (25.0)	6 (25.0)	3 (12.5)	2.96	1.30
Multi-Racial	24	3 (12.5)	2 (8.3)	2 (8.3)	8 (33.3)	9 (37.5)	3.75	1.39
White/Caucasian	286	37 (12.9)	83 (29.0)	25 (8.7)	92 (32.2)	49 (17.1)	3.12	1.35

Table 4.20 illustrates the demographic variables regarding how each respondent rated the campus climate on a scale of non-homophobic (1) to homophobic (5). A rating above three is considered to be more homophobic than non-homophobic. The faculty considered the campus to be most homophobic with a mean score of 3.64, compared to administrators (3.51) and staff (3.30). However, a larger percentage of the administrators (57.3%) considered the campus to be more homophobic. The youngest age group, 23-32, had the highest mean rating (3.75) and the largest percent rating the campus as homophobic (62.5%). The 33-42 age group (3.63, 60.4%) was close to that of the youngest group. The oldest group, those 53 and over, considered the campus least homophobic with only 37.8% considering the campus climate as being homophobic. The mean was slightly above the neutral rating at 3.14. Females (3.64, 56.2%) considered the campus climate to be more homophobic than the males (3.25, 42.2%). While both sexual identity groups rated the campus climate as being homophobic, non-heterosexuals rated the climate at 3.88 versus the heterosexuals at 3.40. Some 63.7% of non-heterosexuals rated the climate as being homophobic. African Americans perceived the campus climate as being the most homophobic, with 66.7% rating it homophobic and a mean of 4.00. More members of the Asian (37.5%) group considered the campus to be non-homophobic than any other group. The mean score for the Asian group was 2.83.

Table 4.20

Campus Climate

	n	Non-Homophobic				Homophobic		M	SD
		(1) freq. (%)	(2) freq. (%)	(3) freq. (%)	(4) freq. (%)	(5) freq. (%)			
Position									
Administrator	75	6 (8.0)	11 (14.7)	15 (20.0)	25 (33.3)	18 (24.0)	3.51	1.23	
Faculty	113	6 (5.3)	15 (13.3)	30 (26.5)	25 (22.1)	37 (32.7)	3.64	1.22	
Staff	201	15 (7.5)	36 (17.9)	64 (31.8)	45 (22.4)	41 (20.4)	3.30	1.20	
Age									
23-32	56	3 (5.4)	5 (8.9)	13 (23.2)	17 (30.4)	18 (32.1)	3.75	1.16	
33-42	101	6 (5.9)	15 (14.9)	19 (18.8)	31 (30.7)	30 (29.7)	3.63	1.22	
43-52	120	5 (4.2)	20 (16.7)	42 (35.0)	24 (20.0)	29 (24.2)	3.43	1.15	
53 and over	111	12 (10.8)	22 (19.8)	35 (31.5)	23 (20.7)	19 (17.1)	3.14	1.23	
Gender									
Female	194	10 (5.2)	19 (9.8)	56 (28.9)	54 (27.8)	55 (28.4)	3.64	1.14	
Male	192	16 (8.3)	42 (21.9)	53 (27.6)	40 (20.8)	41 (21.4)	3.25	1.25	
Sexual Identity									
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	33	1 (3.0)	5 (15.2)	6 (18.2)	6 (18.2)	15 (45.5)	3.88	1.24	
Heterosexual	356	26 (7.3)	57 (16.0)	103 (28.9)	89 (25.0)	81 (22.8)	3.40	1.21	
Ethnicity									
African American	24	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	7 (29.2)	6 (25.0)	10 (41.7)	4.00	1.06	
Asian	24	3 (12.5)	6 (25.0)	10 (41.7)	2 (8.3)	3 (12.5)	2.83	1.17	
Hispanic	25	2 (8.0)	3 (12.0)	8 (32.0)	6 (24.0)	6 (24.0)	3.44	1.23	
Multi-Racial	23	2 (8.7)	8 (34.8)	5 (21.7)	5 (21.7)	3 (13.0)	2.96	1.22	
White/Caucasian	284	17 (6.0)	42 (14.8)	78 (27.5)	76 (26.8)	71 (25.0)	3.50	1.19	

The next four tables illustrate the level of acceptance on campus for gay men, lesbians, bisexual men or women, and transgender persons. Respondents were asked to rate how they perceive the overall campus climate to be for each of the sexual minority groups on a scale of very accepting (1), accepting (2), uncertain (3), not accepting (4), and not at all accepting (5). Table 4.21 provides the assessment of the campus climate for gay men. Among the three positions, the administrators (58.3%) were more likely to rate the campus more not accepting than the faculty (45.8%) or staff (38.7%). The means for the three positions were 3.41, 3.39, and 3.12 respectively. At least 50.0% of the 23-32 (55.0%) and 33-42 (50.0%) year olds rated the campus as not accepting of gay men. All four groups had means above the mid-point of uncertain, though the 53 and over group had the lowest mean at 3.01. The highest average of 3.53 was posted by the 23-32 age group. 50.7% of the females considered the campus not accepting, whereas, only 39.1% of the males rated it the same way. The largest percentage of the males (35.1%) was uncertain about the climate for gay men. Overall, the sexual minority rated the climate for gay men at 3.39, compared to 3.24 by heterosexuals. While the number of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and uncertain (47.2%) and heterosexuals (44.4%) was similar, almost 50.0% more heterosexuals considered the campus to be accepting of gay men. The range of ratings for the five ethnic groups was broad, with a low of 17.2% of the Asians and a high of 54.1% of the African Americans rating the climate as not accepting.

Table 4.21

Campus Acceptance of Gay Men

	n	Very Accepting (1) freq. (%)	Accepting (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Not Accepting (4) freq. (%)	Not at all Accepting (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	79	7 (8.9)	10 (12.7)	16 (20.3)	36 (45.6)	10 (12.7)	3.41	1.14
Faculty	118	4 (3.4)	15 (12.7)	45 (38.1)	39 (33.1)	15 (12.7)	3.39	0.98
Staff	204	15 (7.4)	43 (21.1)	67 (32.8)	61 (29.9)	18 (8.8)	3.12	1.07
Age								
23-32	60	2 (3.3)	6 (10.0)	19 (31.7)	24 (40.0)	9 (15.0)	3.53	0.98
33-42	102	6 (5.9)	10 (9.8)	35 (34.3)	37 (36.3)	14 (13.7)	3.42	1.04
43-52	121	7 (5.8)	25 (20.7)	36 (29.8)	39 (32.2)	14 (11.6)	3.23	1.09
53 and over	117	10 (8.5)	27 (23.1)	38 (32.5)	36 (30.8)	6 (5.1)	3.01	1.05
Gender								
Female	193	10 (5.2)	30 (15.5)	55 (28.5)	74 (38.3)	24 (12.4)	3.37	1.05
Male	205	15 (7.3)	38 (18.5)	72 (35.1)	61 (29.8)	19 (9.3)	3.15	1.06
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	36	2 (5.6)	4 (11.1)	13 (36.1)	12 (33.3)	5 (13.9)	3.39	1.05
Heterosexual	365	24 (6.6)	64 (17.5)	115 (31.5)	124 (34.0)	38 (10.4)	3.24	1.07
Ethnicity								
African American	24	1 (4.2)	3 (12.5)	7 (29.2)	11 (45.8)	2 (8.3)	3.42	0.97
Asian	29	3 (10.3)	2 (6.9)	19 (65.5)	5 (17.2)	0 (0.0)	2.90	0.82
Hispanic	24	2 (8.3)	4 (16.7)	9 (37.5)	6 (25.0)	3 (12.5)	3.17	1.13
Multi-Racial	25	2 (8.0)	4 (16.0)	12 (48.0)	6 (24.0)	1 (4.0)	3.00	0.96
White/Caucasian	288	16 (5.6)	51 (17.7)	78 (27.1)	108 (37.5)	35 (12.2)	3.33	1.08

Table 4.22 illustrates the perception of the campus climate in regard to its acceptance of lesbians according to the demographic variables. On average, the administrators (3.32) were more likely to see the campus as not accepting of lesbians than the faculty (3.31) or staff (3.06). Though the means are somewhat similar, the breakdown illustrates this point further as 53.8% of the administrators considered the campus non-accepting versus 43.2% for faculty and 35.9% for staff. The 23-32 age group viewed the campus as more negative for lesbians than the other three age groups. The oldest group, 53 and over, were the most likely to view the campus as being accepting of lesbians. Whereas 47.6% of the female respondents considered the campus not accepting of lesbians, only 36.0% of the males viewed the campus climate in the same way. Females (3.32) also posted the highest mean of the two gender groups. Over 40.0% of both sexual identity groups considered the campus to be non-accepting, but the gay, lesbian, bisexual and uncertain group (44.4%) had the largest percentage and highest mean. A larger difference was found when considering how accepting the campus was. In this case, 25.6% of the heterosexuals considered the campus accepting, whereas, only 17.7% of the non-heterosexuals found this to be true. African Americans (3.42, 54.1%) continued to post the highest mean and percentages of non-acceptance among the ethnic groups. The group to view the campus as the most accepting of lesbians was the Asian group (2.90, 17.2%).

Table 4.22

Campus Acceptance of Lesbians

	n	Very Accepting (1) freq. (%)	Accepting (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Not Accepting (4) freq. (%)	Not at all Accepting (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	78	8 (10.3)	11 (14.1)	17 (21.8)	32 (41.0)	10 (12.8)	3.32	1.18
Faculty	118	4 (3.4)	17 (14.4)	46 (39.0)	40 (33.9)	11 (9.3)	3.31	0.95
Staff	203	14 (6.9)	45 (22.2)	71 (35.0)	61 (30.0)	12 (5.9)	3.06	1.02
Age								
23-32	60	2 (3.3)	6 (10.0)	21 (35.0)	27 (45.0)	4 (6.7)	3.42	0.89
33-42	101	6 (5.9)	11 (10.9)	37 (36.6)	37 (36.6)	10 (9.9)	3.34	1.00
43-52	120	7 (5.8)	29 (24.2)	36 (30.0)	36 (30.0)	12 (10.0)	3.14	1.08
53 and over	117	10 (8.5)	27 (23.1)	40 (34.2)	33 (28.2)	7 (6.0)	3.00	1.05
Gender								
Female	193	9 (4.7)	31 (16.1)	61 (31.6)	74 (38.3)	18 (9.3)	3.32	1.00
Male	203	16 (7.9)	42 (20.7)	72 (35.5)	58 (28.6)	15 (7.4)	3.07	1.05
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	36	2 (5.6)	4 (11.1)	14 (38.9)	13 (36.1)	3 (8.3)	3.31	0.98
Heterosexual	363	24 (6.6)	69 (19.0)	120 (33.1)	120 (33.1)	30 (8.3)	3.17	1.04
Ethnicity								
African American	24	1 (4.2)	3 (12.5)	7 (29.2)	11 (45.8)	2 (8.3)	3.42	0.97
Asian	29	3 (10.3)	2 (6.9)	19 (65.5)	5 (17.2)	0 (0.0)	2.90	0.82
Hispanic	24	2 (8.3)	4 (16.7)	10 (41.7)	6 (25.0)	2 (8.3)	3.08	1.06
Multi-Racial	25	2 (8.0)	4 (16.0)	12 (48.0)	6 (24.0)	1 (4.0)	3.00	0.96
White/Caucasian	286	16 (5.6)	56 (19.6)	83 (29.0)	104 (36.4)	27 (9.4)	3.24	1.05

The result of the demographic variable analysis of the respondents' interpretation of the campus climate for bisexual men or women was similar to the view of the climate for gay men or lesbians. Even though both the administrators and faculty members viewed the climate the same overall and more negatively than the staff, a larger percentage of the administrators (52.5%) considered the campus non-accepting compared to the faculty (44.4). Overall, the youngest group (3.45) viewed the campus as more not accepting than did the 33-42 (3.38), 43-52 (3.23), and the 53 and over (3.04) age groups. In addition, 53.3% of the 23-32 age group considered the campus as not accepting compared to 32.5% of the oldest group. Females (3.39, 47.7%) viewed the campus as being less accepting of bisexuals than the males (3.10, 34.6%). Those individuals that identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual or uncertain (3.31) considered the campus environment to be less accepting of bisexuals than the heterosexuals (3.23). However, for both groups, more than 40.0% considered the campus to be not accepting for bisexuals. The African American group (3.38) considered the campus to be least accepting of bisexuals, followed by White/Caucasian (3.31), Multi-racial (3.16), Hispanic (3.04), and Asian (2.83). 50.0% of the African Americans viewed the campus as not being accepting of bisexuals, which was considerably higher than the percentage of Asians at 13.3%. Table 4.23 presents this data.

Table 4.23

Campus Acceptance of Bisexual Men or Women

	n	Very Accepting (1) freq. (%)	Accepting (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Not Accepting (4) freq. (%)	Not at all Accepting (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	78	6 (7.7)	6 (7.7)	25 (32.1)	32 (41.0)	9 (11.5)	3.41	1.05
Faculty	117	5 (4.3)	9 (7.7)	51 (43.6)	37 (31.6)	15 (12.8)	3.41	0.96
Staff	203	14 (6.9)	41 (20.2)	78 (38.4)	56 (27.6)	14 (6.9)	3.07	1.01
Age								
23-32	60	2 (3.3)	7 (11.7)	19 (31.7)	26 (43.3)	6 (10.0)	3.45	0.95
33-42	101	7 (6.9)	10 (9.9)	37 (36.6)	32 (31.7)	15 (14.9)	3.38	1.08
43-52	119	5 (4.2)	20 (16.8)	48 (40.3)	35 (29.4)	11 (9.2)	3.23	0.98
53 and over	117	10 (8.5)	19 (16.2)	50 (42.7)	32 (27.4)	6 (5.1)	3.04	1.00
Gender								
Female	193	8 (4.1)	24 (12.4)	69 (35.8)	69 (35.8)	23 (11.9)	3.39	0.99
Male	202	16 (7.9)	32 (15.8)	84 (41.6)	55 (27.2)	15 (7.4)	3.10	1.02
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	36	2 (5.6)	4 (11.1)	14 (38.9)	13 (36.1)	3 (8.3)	3.31	0.98
Heterosexual	362	23 (6.4)	52 (14.4)	140 (38.7)	112 (30.9)	35 (9.7)	3.23	1.02
Ethnicity								
African American	24	1 (4.2)	3 (12.5)	8 (33.3)	10 (41.7)	2 (8.3)	3.38	0.97
Asian	30	4 (13.3)	2 (6.7)	20 (66.7)	3 (10.0)	1 (3.3)	2.83	0.91
Hispanic	24	3 (12.5)	4 (16.7)	8 (33.3)	7 (29.2)	2 (8.3)	3.04	1.16
Multi-Racial	25	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	12 (48.0)	8 (32.0)	1 (4.0)	3.16	0.94
White/Caucasian	284	13 (4.6)	42 (14.8)	102 (35.9)	97 (34.2)	30 (10.6)	3.31	1.00

The data for campus acceptance of transgender persons by demographic variable is presented in Table 4.24. Identical to the attitudes toward gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals, the administrators were more likely to consider the campus as not accepting of transgender persons. Where only 39.4% of staff and 47.1% of faculty viewed the campus as not accepting, 59.0% of the administrators held this viewpoint. Overall, the 33-42 age group believed the campus was not accepting of transgender persons, posting a mean of 3.64. The 53 and over group viewed the campus as most accepting, posting a mean of 3.22. However, 56.7% of the 23-32 age group identified the campus as not accepting, while 53.5% of the 33-42 age group did. Compared to males, females were more likely to see the campus as a negative experience for transgender persons. 49.2% of the females considered the campus not accepting compared to 42.0% of the males. The overall mean for the females was also higher. Even though they differed by only 0.8%, heterosexuals (44.8%) viewed the campus as non-accepting at a higher rate than non-heterosexuals (45.6%). However, on average, non-heterosexuals had a higher mean. Among the five ethnic groups, African Americans (54.1%) were the most likely to believe the campus was not an accepting environment for transgender persons. African Americans also posted the highest mean of 3.63. Asians were the least likely to see the campus environment as a negative place for transgender persons. Only 17.8% of the Asians viewed the campus as not-accepting, and the mean at 2.90 for this group was actually less than the uncertain point of 3.00.

Table 4.24

Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons

	n	Very Accepting (1) freq. (%)	Accepting (2) freq. (%)	Uncertain (3) freq. (%)	Not Accepting (4) freq. (%)	Not at all Accepting (5) freq. (%)	M	SD
Position								
Administrator	78	6 (7.7)	2 (2.6)	24 (30.8)	29 (37.2)	17 (21.8)	3.63	1.09
Faculty	117	2 (1.7)	7 (6.0)	53 (45.3)	32 (27.4)	23 (19.7)	3.57	0.93
Staff	203	12 (5.9)	29 (14.3)	82 (40.4)	46 (22.7)	34 (16.7)	3.30	1.09
Age								
23-32	60	3 (5.0)	5 (8.3)	18 (30.0)	22 (36.7)	12 (20.0)	3.58	1.06
33-42	101	6 (5.9)	7 (6.9)	34 (33.7)	24 (23.8)	30 (29.7)	3.64	1.15
43-52	119	4 (3.4)	11 (9.2)	54 (45.4)	28 (23.5)	22 (18.5)	3.45	1.01
53 and over	117	6 (5.1)	15 (12.8)	53 (45.3)	33 (28.2)	10 (8.5)	3.22	0.96
Gender								
Female	193	7 (3.6)	15 (7.8)	76 (39.4)	54 (28.0)	41 (21.2)	3.55	1.03
Male	202	12 (5.9)	23 (11.4)	82 (40.6)	52 (25.7)	33 (16.3)	3.35	1.07
Sexual Identity								
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Uncertain	36	2 (5.6)	2 (5.6)	16 (44.4)	5 (13.9)	11 (30.6)	3.58	1.16
Heterosexual	362	18 (5.0)	36 (9.9)	143 (39.5)	102 (28.2)	63 (17.4)	3.43	1.05
Ethnicity								
African American	24	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	9 (37.5)	8 (33.3)	5 (20.8)	3.63	1.01
Asian	28	3 (10.7)	3 (10.7)	17 (60.7)	3 (10.7)	2 (7.1)	2.93	0.98
Hispanic	24	2 (8.3)	4 (16.7)	9 (37.5)	4 (16.7)	5 (20.8)	3.25	1.23
Multi-Racial	25	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	13 (52.0)	5 (20.0)	3 (12.0)	3.20	1.04
White/Caucasian	286	10 (3.5)	25 (8.7)	107 (37.4)	87 (30.4)	57 (19.9)	3.55	1.02

In order to determine significant differences among and between demographic variables, several inferential statistics were performed on each of the targeted questions. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used when there were more than two groups within a demographic variable, such as administrator, faculty and staff for position. Levene's test for equality of variances was used to determine homogeneous variance. Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) and Tamhane's post-hoc analysis was used as a follow up analysis when the ANOVA yielded statistically significant values. Independent samples t-Test was used when only two groups existed within demographic variable, such as male and female for the gender variable. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was considered statistically significant for all of the statistical procedures.

Position

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine to what extent differences existed between the three positions for each of the survey topics. The three position categories were administrator, faculty and staff. The number of respondents for each position and question differ because all respondents did not answer every question. Table 4.25 illustrates the mean and standard deviations of each question by position, as well as the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for each of the questions.

The administrators reported hearing more remarks made on campus about the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population than any other group. Additionally, of the three positions, they considered the campus community to be the least accepting of members of this minority group. Administrators were also more likely to disapprove of

a public display of affection by a homosexual couple. Meanwhile, the faculty believed the campus was more homophobic than the administrators and staff, in addition to being the least likely to agree that the university addresses campus issues related to sexual orientation.

Administrators were more similar in their scores to faculty on six of the twelve topics. They were more similar to the faculty on all the questions dealing with the perceived campus acceptance of members of the sexual orientation minority. They were also more similar to faculty in the assessment of the campus climate as being homophobic or non-homophobic. The staff was more similar to the faculty on three of the five questions dealing with the number of negative remarks heard on campus about the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population. The staff and administrators were more similar in their belief in how the university addresses issues dealing with sexual orientation and the level of disapproval of public affection by a homosexual couple. For all questions except for the number of remarks by administrators and staff, the administrators had the greatest standard deviation.

Six of the twelve questions yielded a statistically significant difference in the scores between the three positions. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicated that eleven of the twelve questions had homogenous variance, and one did not have homogeneous variance. Thus, where variance was found to be equal, the researcher used Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) post-hoc test to further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means. Tamhane's T2 post-hoc test was used to

Table 4.25

Differences Among Position For Specific Survey Questions

Survey Question	Administrator (n=80) M(SD)	Faculty (n=125) M(SD)	Staff (n=209) M(SD)	n	df	F	p	Eta2
Student Remarks	2.24 (1.39)	1.92 (1.24)	2.00 (1.28)	397	2,394	1.41	N.S.	.007
Staff Remarks	1.78 (1.07)	1.45 (.98)	1.76 (1.09)	399	2,396	3.58*	.029	.018
Faculty Remarks	1.57 (1.02)	1.54 (1.01)	1.41 (.86)	385	2,382	1.05	N.S.	.005
Teaching Assistant Remarks	1.21 (.79)	1.15 (.57)	1.16 (.60)	332	2,329	.19	N.S.	.001
Administrator Remarks	1.39 (.70)	1.32 (.86)	1.27 (.70)	377	2,374	.73	N.S.	.004
Gay Men Acceptance	3.41 (1.14)	3.39 (.98)	3.12 (1.07)	401	2,398	3.47*	.032	.017
Lesbian Acceptance	3.32 (1.18)	3.31 (.95)	3.06 (1.02)	399	2,396	3.10*	.046	.015
Bisexual Acceptance	3.41 (1.05)	3.41 (.96)	3.07 (1.01)	398	2,395	5.57**	.004	.027
Transgender Acceptance	3.63 (1.09)	3.57 (.93)	3.30 (1.09)	398	2,395	3.99*	.019	.020
Campus Climate	3.51 (1.23)	3.64 (1.22)	3.30 (1.20)	389	2,386	2.89	N.S.	.015
Addresses Sexual Orientation Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	3.03 (1.29)	3.24 (1.15)	2.91 (1.17)	402	2,399	2.80	N.S.	.014
	3.33 (1.36)	2.87 (1.34)	3.24 (1.31)	396	2,393	3.87*	.022	.019

*p<.05

**p<.01

further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means on the question where homogeneous variance did not exist.

The staff and administrators reported hearing disparaging and insensitive remarks made by staff members at about the same rate, as their mean differences were only .03, which was not statistically significant. However, the difference between the staff and faculty was .30 ($p < .05$). Table 4.26 demonstrates the relationships.

Table 4.26

Mean Differences in Frequent Staff Remarks by Position

	Position	Mean Difference	p
Staff	Administrator	-.03	N.S.
	Faculty	.30*	.038
Administrator	Staff	.03	N.S.
	Faculty	.33	N.S.
Faculty	Staff	-.30*	.034
	Administrator	-.33	N.S.

* $p < .05$

Table 4.27 shows the mean differences by position for campus acceptance of bisexual men or women. The differences between the staff and administrators and the staff and faculty were equal, at .34 ($p < .05$). There was no difference between the administrators and faculty.

Table 4.27**Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Bisexuals by Position**

	Position	Mean Difference	p
Staff	Administrator	-.34*	.033
	Faculty	-.34*	.012
Administrator	Staff	.34*	.033
	Faculty	.00	N.S.
Faculty	Staff	.34*	.012
	Administrator	.00	N.S.

*p<.05

Table 4.28 demonstrates the mean differences by position for the participants' level of disapproval of homosexual public affection. The largest difference between the means, .46, was found to exist between the administrators and faculty. However, this value was not found to be statistically significant. The next largest difference of .37

Table 4.28**Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public Homosexual Affection by Position**

	Position	Difference	p
Staff	Administrator	-.09	N.S.
	Faculty	.37*	.039
Administrator	Staff	.09	N.S.
	Faculty	.46	N.S.
Faculty	Staff	.37*	.039
	Administrator	-.46	N.S.

*p<.05

existed between the staff and faculty and was found to be significant ($p < .05$). The difference between the staff and administrators was only .09 and was not significant.

Even though the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) found differences between positions to be significant in three other questions, campus acceptance of gay men, campus acceptance of lesbians, and campus acceptance of transgender persons, the post-hoc tests did not reveal any statistically significant differences between any two positions.

Age

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed to determine the extent of the differences between the various age groups and each targeted question. Five age groups were identified in the survey: 22 or under, 23-32, 33-42, 43-52 and 53 and over. There were no respondents in the youngest category, so this group was removed from all data analyses. The number of respondents differed for each question because not all respondents answered each question. Table 4.29 illustrates the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the means and standard deviations for the twelve questions.

The 23-32 age group had the highest mean on six of the twelve questions, whereas the 43-52 age groups had the highest mean on four and the 33-42 age group had the highest mean on three (the last two groups had the same mean on one question). The 23-32 age group reported hearing more negative remarks made by students and staff, were more likely to believe the campus was less accepting of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals, and considered the campus climate to be more homophobic than the other groups. The greatest number of negative remarks made by faculty, and teaching

assistants was reported by the 43-52 age group. This group was also the most likely to disapprove of public affection by a homosexual couple. The 33-42 and 43-52 age groups had the same mean for the reported number of negative remarks made by administrators. Additionally, the 33-42 age group considered the campus to be least accepting of transgender persons and were least likely to believe the university addressed issues dealing with sexual orientation. The greatest standard deviation for each question was spread among the four groups, with 23-32 having two, 33-42 having three, 43-52 having six, and the 53 and over having one.

Similarities among the four groups also differed. The two younger groups, 23-32 and 33-42, were more similar on six of the twelve questions. They were similar in the number of remarks made by students, level of acceptance of gay men, bisexuals, and transgender persons, assessment of the campus climate as being homophobic, and believing the university addresses sexual orientation issues. The 23-32 and 43-52 age groups were more similar in the reported number of negative remarks made by staff and level of disapproval of homosexual public affection. The youngest and oldest groups were more similar in the reported number of remarks heard from faculty and teaching assistants. The 33-42 and 43-52 age groups were similar in student and administrator remarks, and the 43-52 and 53 and over groups were more similar in acceptance of lesbians.

Eight of the twelve questions yielded a statistically significant difference in the scores among the four age groups. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicated that ten of the twelve questions had homogenous variance, and two did not have

Table 4.29

Differences Among Age For Specific Survey Questions

Survey Question	23-32 (n=61) M(SD)	33-42 (n=109) M(SD)	43-52 (n=127) M(SD)	53 or over (n=120) M(SD)	n	df	F	p	Eta2
Student Remarks	2.44 (1.50)	2.21 (1.31)	1.98 (1.25)	1.68 (1.09)	396	3,392	5.69**	.001	.042
Staff Remarks	1.84 (1.19)	1.60 (1.03)	1.80 (1.12)	1.53 (.95)	398	3,394	1.88	N.S.	.014
Faculty Remarks	1.38 (.86)	1.48 (.96)	1.55 (.97)	1.47 (.94)	384	3,380	.42	N.S.	.003
Teaching Assistant Remarks	1.17 (.63)	1.12 (.54)	1.19 (.71)	1.17 (.62)	331	3,327	.17	N.S.	.002
Administrator Remarks	1.27 (.77)	1.35 (.78)	1.35 (.76)	1.24 (.70)	376	3,372	.54	N.S.	.004
Gay Men Acceptance	3.53 (.98)	3.42 (1.04)	3.23 (1.09)	3.01 (1.05)	400	3,396	4.45**	.004	.033
Lesbian Acceptance	3.42 (.89)	3.34 (1.00)	3.14 (1.08)	3.00 (1.05)	398	3,394	3.10*	.027	.023
Bisexual Acceptance	3.45 (.95)	3.38 (1.08)	3.23 (.98)	3.04 (1.00)	397	3,393	3.00*	.030	.022
Transgender Acceptance	3.58 (1.06)	3.64 (1.15)	3.45 (1.01)	3.22 (.96)	397	3,393	3.36*	.019	.025
Campus Climate	3.75 (1.16)	3.63 (1.22)	3.43 (1.15)	3.14 (1.23)	388	3,384	4.55**	.004	.034
Addresses Sexual Orientation Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	3.22 (1.05)	3.40 (1.13)	3.02 (1.24)	2.60 (1.13)	401	3,397	9.40**	.001	.066
	3.31 (1.31)	2.77 (1.30)	3.32 (1.37)	3.24 (1.28)	395	3,391	4.00**	.008	.030

*p<.05

**p<.01

homogeneous variance. Where variance was found to be equal, the researcher used Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) post-hoc test to further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means. Tamhane's T2 post-hoc test was used to further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means on the questions with unequal variance.

Table 4.30 illustrates the differences found between the age groups and the number of disparaging or insensitive remarks made by students. The greatest significant difference (.76) was found between those individuals between 23 and 32 years of age and those 53 and over. Another statistically significant difference (.53) was found between the 33-42 age group and those 53 and over. Though the difference between the

Table 4.30

Mean Differences in Frequent Student Remarks by Age

Age	Mean Difference	p
23-32		
33-42	.23	N.S.
43-52	.47	N.S.
53 and over	.76*	.004
33-42		
23-32	-.23	N.S.
43-52	.23	N.S.
53 and over	.53*	.010
43-52		
23-32	-.47	N.S.
33-42	-.23	N.S.
53 and over	.29	N.S.
53 and over		
23-32	-.76*	.004
33-42	-.53*	.010
43-52	-.29	N.S.

*p<.05

23-32 group and 43-52 group was .47, and the 23-32 group and 33-42 group was .23, neither of those groups was found to be statistically significant.

The two largest differences between age groups and their level of acceptance of gay men was found between the 53 and over group and both the 23-32 and the 33-42 year old age groups. The relationship between the oldest and youngest group produced a mean difference of .52 and .41 between the other two groups. Both of these differences were statistically significant. While the difference between the 23-32 and 43-52 groups was .30, it was not statistically significant. The differences between the other groups, 23-32 and 33-42, and 33-42 and 43-52, were not statistically significant either. Table 4.31 illustrates this information.

Table 4.31

Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Gay Men by Age

Age	Mean Difference	p
23-32		
33-42	.11	N.S.
43-52	.30	N.S.
53 and over	.52*	.009
33-42		
23-32	-.11	N.S.
43-52	.19	N.S.
53 and over	.41*	.020
43-52		
23-32	-.30	N.S.
33-42	-.19	N.S.
53 and over	.22	N.S.
53 and over		
23-32	-.52*	.009
33-42	-.41*	.020
43-52	-.22	N.S.

*p<.05

The greatest difference (.42) between the perceived levels of acceptance of transgender persons on campus existed between the 33-42 age group and the 53 and over group. The second largest difference, .36, existed between the 23-32 and 53 and over age groups. However, this difference, as well as other differences of .15 and .06 was not statistically significant. The two youngest age groups were most closely alike at only .06. This information is shown in Table 4.32.

Table 4.32

Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons by Age

	Age	Mean Difference	p
23-32	33-42	-.06	N.S.
	43-52	.15	N.S.
	53 and over	.36	N.S.
33-42	23-32	.06	N.S.
	43-52	.20	N.S.
	53 and over	.42*	.024
43-52	23-32	-.14	N.S.
	33-42	-.20	N.S.
	53 and over	.22	N.S.
53 and over	23-32	-.36	N.S.
	33-42	-.42*	.024
	43-52	-.22	N.S.

*p<.05

Table 4.33 illustrates the differences between the four age groups and how they rate the campus climate on a scale from non-homophobic to homophobic. A higher score reflects a more homophobic view of the campus climate. The two highest mean

differences were found between the 53 and over group and the 23-32 and the 33-42 groups. The difference for the first group was .61, while the difference for the second group was .50. Both differences were statistically significant. No other groups were found to be statistically significant, and the two most similar groups at differences of .12 and .20 were the 33-42 group and the 23-32 and 43-52 groups.

Table 4.33

Mean Differences in Rating of Campus Climate (Non-homophobic/Homophobic) by Age

	Age	Difference	p
23-32	33-42	.12	N.S.
	43-52	.32	N.S.
	53 and over	.61*	.010
33-42	23-32	-.12	N.S.
	43-52	.20	N.S.
	53 and over	.50*	.014
43-52	23-32	-.32	N.S.
	33-42	-.20	N.S.
	53 and over	.30	N.S.
53 and over	23-32	-.61*	.010
	33-42	-.50*	.014
	43-52	-.30	N.S.

*p<.05

Statistically significant differences were also found between the age groups and their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that the university addresses issues relating to sexual orientation. The most significant difference of .80 was found to exist between the 53 and over group and the 33-42 group. Two other statistically

significant differences were present and both involved the 53 and over group. The two most similar groups were the 23-32 age group coupled with the 33-42 and 43-52 age groups. Table 4.34 presents the data for this analysis.

Table 4.34

**Mean Differences in University Addressing
Sexual Orientation by Age**

	Age	Difference	p
23-32	33-42	-.18	N.S.
	43-52	.20	N.S.
	53 and over	.62*	.005
33-42	23-32	.18	N.S.
	43-52	.38	N.S.
	53 and over	.80*	.001
43-52	23-32	-.20	N.S.
	33-42	-.38	N.S.
	53 and over	.42*	.027
53 and over	23-32	-.62*	.005
	33-42	-.80*	.000
	43-52	-.42*	.027

*p<.05

Table 4.35 presents the differences found between the four age groups and the likelihood of feeling disapproval of public affection by a homosexual couple. The largest difference, .55, existed between the 33-42 and 43-52 age groups, and was found to be statistically significant. The next largest difference was found to be .54, and existed between the 23-42 and 33-42 age groups; however, it was not statistically significant. The other large difference (.47) existed between the oldest group and the 33-

42 age group and was statistically significant. The other three pairings were quite similar at differences of only .01, .07, and .08.

Table 4.35

**Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public
Homosexual Affection by Age**

	Age	Difference	p
23-32	33-42	.54	N.S.
	43-52	-.01	N.S.
	53 and over	.07	N.S.
33-42	23-32	-.54	N.S.
	43-52	-.55*	.011
	53 and over	-.47*	.045
43-52	23-32	.01	N.S.
	33-42	.55*	.011
	53 and over	.08	N.S.
53 and over	23-32	-.07	N.S.
	33-42	.47*	.045
	43-52	-.08	N.S.

*p<.05

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) also identified significance between the age groups in two other questions. The two questions were level of acceptance of lesbians and level of acceptance of bisexuals. However, like the demographic variable of position, the post-hoc tests did not reveal any significant differences between specific age groups.

Ethnicity

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed to determine the extent of the differences between the different ethnic groups and each evaluated question. The survey consisted of six ethnic groups, African American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Chicano/Latino/Hispanic, and White/Caucasian. Due to the small number of Middle Eastern and American Indian/Alaskan Native respondents, these two groups were eliminated. Additionally, since some respondents chose more than one ethnic category, those respondents' choices were recoded and a new group, Multi-racial, was added to identify all individuals who chose more than one ethnic group. The number of respondents for each question differed because every respondent did not answer all the questions on the instrument. Table 4.36 illustrates the means, standard deviations and results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the twelve questions.

The ethnic groups reporting the highest means were primarily divided into two groups. Those identifying as Hispanic posted the highest means for all categories dealing with the number of negative remarks heard on campus, while those identifying as African American/Black were mostly likely to consider less accepting of all four sexual orientation groups, perceived the campus as being more homophobic, and believed the university did not address issues relating to sexual orientation. Both of these groups reported the same mean for number of student remarks. The multi-racial group posted the highest mean for disapproval of public homosexual affection. The greatest differences in standard deviation were found to exist between the Asian and

Hispanic groups. This was true on nine of the twelve questions. The other three questions involved African American/Black and Hispanic groups, Hispanic and multi-racial groups, and the Asian and African American/Black and multi-racial groups.

When considering similarities, there was no interaction between groups that dominated the interactions. All five groups were represented in at least one of the twelve questions. However, African American/Blacks represented one of the two similar groups in nine survey questions, while Hispanics were represented in four groups, including the three that excluded the African American/Black group.

Five of the twelve questions yielded a statistically significant difference in the scores between the five ethnic groups. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicated that four of the twelve questions had homogenous variance, and eight did not have homogeneous variance. Where variance was found to be equal, the researcher used Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) post-hoc test to further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means. Tamhane's T2 post-hoc test was used to further analyze the difference between the subgroups' means on the questions where variances were unequal.

Table 4.36

Differences Among Ethnicity For Specific Survey Questions

Survey Question	Asian (n=34) M(SD)	African American (n=25) M(SD)	Hispanic (n=25) M(SD)	Multi- Racial (n=25) M(SD)	White/ Caucasian (n=298) M(SD)	n	df	F	p	Eta2
Student Remarks	1.37 (.72)	2.39 (1.44)	2.39 (1.50)	2.00 (1.35)	2.05 (1.29)	387	4,382	2.94*	.020	.030
Staff Remarks	1.11 (.32)	1.64 (.81)	1.96 (1.30)	1.61 (1.12)	1.72 (1.10)	389	4,384	2.58*	.037	.026
Faculty Remarks	1.17 (.38)	1.22 (.67)	1.68 (1.29)	1.33 (.82)	1.53 (.97)	377	4,372	7.85	N.S.	.020
Teaching Assistant Remarks	1.00 (.00)	1.10 (.45)	1.29 (.78)	1.25 (.74)	1.16 (.65)	324	4,319	.79	N.S.	.010
Administrator Remarks	1.04 (.20)	1.32 (.63)	1.48 (1.21)	1.33 (.92)	1.31 (.72)	368	4,363	1.05	N.S.	.011
Gay Men Acceptance	2.90 (.82)	3.42 (.97)	3.17 (1.13)	3.00 (.96)	3.33 (1.08)	390	4,385	1.74	N.S.	.018
Lesbian Acceptance	2.90 (.82)	3.42 (.97)	3.08 (1.06)	3.00 (.96)	3.24 (1.05)	388	4,383	1.35	N.S.	.014
Bisexual Acceptance	2.83 (.92)	3.38 (.97)	3.04 (1.16)	3.16 (.94)	3.31 (1.00)	387	4,382	2.00	N.S.	.020
Transgender Acceptance	2.93 (.98)	3.63 (1.01)	3.25 (1.23)	3.20 (1.04)	3.55 (1.02)	387	4,382	3.19*	.014	.032
Campus Climate	2.83 (1.17)	4.00 (1.06)	3.44 (1.23)	2.96 (1.22)	3.50 (1.19)	380	4,375	4.05**	.003	.041
Addresses Sexual Orientation Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	2.57 (1.04)	3.42 (1.14)	3.38 (.97)	2.68 (1.22)	3.07 (1.21)	392	4,387	2.92*	.021	.029
	2.94 (1.12)	3.57 (1.39)	3.12 (1.35)	3.75 (1.39)	3.12 (1.35)	388	4,383	2.15	N.S.	.022

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 4.37 illustrates the mean differences among the ethnic groups and the number of disparaging and insensitive remarks heard by students on campus in the last year. The two largest differences were between the Asian and African American and Hispanic groups. Even though both of these groups differed by 1.02, the only relationship found to be statistically significant was the one between the Asian and African American respondents. In addition to being significantly different from the African American individuals, the Asian group was also statistically significant from the White/Caucasian category. They had the third largest difference at .69. None of the other groups had statistically significant differences. The two most similar groups were the African American and Hispanic (.00) and Multi-racial and White/Caucasian groups (.05).

Significant statistical differences were also found to exist between the ethnic groups regarding the number of remarks that heard made by the staff on campus. The largest difference between any two groups was between the Asian and Hispanic group, however, it was not statistically significant at a p-value of .051. The next two largest differences between groups, at .61 and .53 existed between the Asian group and the African American and White/Caucasian groups, respectively. Both of these relationships were found to be statistically significant. No other groups were found to

Table 4.37

Mean Differences in Frequent Student Remarks by Ethnicity

Ethnicity		Mean Difference	p
Asian			
	African American	-1.02*	.038
	Hispanic	-1.02	N.S.
	Multi-racial	-.63	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.69*	.001
African American			
	Asian	1.02*	.038
	Hispanic	.00	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.39	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	.34	N.S.
Hispanic			
	Asian	.34	N.S.
	African American	1.02	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.00	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	.39	N.S.
Multi-racial			
	Asian	.63	N.S.
	African American	-.39	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.39	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.05	N.S.
White/Caucasian			
	Asian	.69*	.000
	African American	-.34	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.34	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.05	N.S.

*p<.05

have significant differences. The two groups most similar to each other were African American and White/Caucasian (.08) and African American and Multi-racial (.03).

Table 4.38 illustrates this information.

Table 4.38
Mean Differences in Frequent Staff Remarks by Ethnicity

Ethnicity		Mean Difference	p
Asian	African American	-.53*	.042
	Hispanic	-.85	N.S.
	Multi-racial	-.50	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.61*	.001
African American	Asian	.53*	.042
	Hispanic	-.32	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.03	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.08	N.S.
Hispanic	Asian	.85	N.S.
	African American	.32	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.35	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	.24	N.S.
Multi-racial	Asian	.50	N.S.
	African American	-.03	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.35	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.11	N.S.
White/Caucasian	Asian	.61*	.001
	African American	.08	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.24	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.11	N.S.

*p<.05

When considering ethnicity and acceptance of transgender persons, the largest mean difference between any two ethnic groups exists between the Asian and Black groups (.70). However, this difference was not found to be statistically significant. The second largest difference was between the Asian and White groups (.62), and it was computed to be statistically significant. The two most similar groups based on mean difference were the Black and White groups (.08) and the Hispanic and Multi-racial

groups (.05). The only statistically significant relationship to be found was the one between the Asian and White groups. Table 4.39 illustrates this information.

Table 4.39
Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons
by Ethnicity

Ethnicity		Mean Difference	p
Asian	African American	-.70	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.32	N.S.
	Multi-racial	-.27	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.62*	.022
African American	Asian	.70	N.S.
	Hispanic	.38	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.42	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	.08	N.S.
Hispanic	Asian	.32	N.S.
	African American	-.38	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.05	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.30	N.S.
Multi-racial	Asian	.27	N.S.
	African American	-.42	N.S.
	Hispanic	-.05	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.35	N.S.
White/Caucasian	Asian	.62*	.022
	African American	-.08	N.S.
	Hispanic	.30	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.35	N.S.

*p<.05

Table 4.40 illustrates the mean differences for each ethnic group relationship based on their rating of the overall campus climate on a scale of non-homophobic to homophobic. The Multi-racial group considered the campus to be the most homophobic, while the group rating the climate least homophobic were those identifying as Asian. The two largest differences existed between the Black and the Asian (1.17) and the Black and Multi-racial (1.04) groups. Each of these was found to be statistically significant. The two groups with most similar means were Hispanic and White (.06) and Asian and Multi-racial (.12). Neither the means of these two groups nor any other groups were found to be statistically significant.

Based on the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for each question, factored by ethnicity, five questions were found to yield significant results. Upon further review of the post-hoc tests for each question, the question regarding the university addressing sexual orientation was not found to have any significant relationships between any two ethnic groups.

Table 4.40
Mean Differences in Rating of Campus Climate (Non-homophobic/Homophobic) by Ethnicity

	Ethnicity	Difference	p
Asian	African American	-1.17*	.006
	Hispanic	-.61	N.S.
	Multi-racial	-.12	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.67	N.S.
African American	Asian	1.17*	.006
	Hispanic	.56	N.S.
	Multi-racial	1.04*	.022
	White/Caucasian	.50	N.S.
Hispanic	Asian	.61	N.S.
	African American	-.56	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.48	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.06	N.S.
Multi-racial	Asian	.12	N.S.
	African American	-1.04*	.022
	Hispanic	-.48	N.S.
	White/Caucasian	-.54	N.S.
White/Caucasian	Asian	.67	N.S.
	African American	-.50	N.S.
	Hispanic	.06	N.S.
	Multi-racial	.54	N.S.

*p<.05

Gender

Independent samples t-tests were performed on each of the twelve survey questions to determine any significant differences for each of the remaining demographic variables. The variables included gender and sexual identity. Table 4.41 presents the means, standard deviations and t-test for each of the twelve survey questions

based on the gender of the participant. Though transgender was an option on the survey, none of the respondents used in the data analysis chose this as an option.

With exception of the number of insensitive remarks reportedly made by faculty members, and attitudes regarding approval of homosexual public display of affection, females had the largest mean when compared to males. However, both females and males had the highest standard deviation on five of the questions, while posting the same standard deviation on two of the questions.

The independent samples t-tests for each question by gender identified four statistically significant results ($p < .05$). Levene's test for equality of variances indicated that ten of the twelve questions had assumed equal variances, while two did not have assumed equal variances. The results reported for each survey question were based on whether or not the variances were assumed equal. On the campus climate scale of non-homophobic to homophobic, the females considered the campus to be more homophobic with a mean of 3.64, compared to that of the males at 3.25. This was the greatest difference between the two groups at .39. The other three significant values were found to exist on the level of campus acceptance perceived for gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. The largest difference was on acceptance of bisexuals (.29), which was followed by acceptance of lesbians (.25), and then gay men (.22).

Table 4.41

Differences Among Gender For Specific Survey Questions

Survey Question	Female (n=207) M(SD)	Male (n=207) M(SD)	n	df	t	p	Eta2
Student Remarks	2.10 (1.30)	1.96 (1.29)	393	391	1.06	N.S.	.003
Staff Remarks	1.74 (1.10)	1.62 (1.04)	395	393	1.20	N.S.	.004
Faculty Remarks	1.46 (.91)	1.51 (.97)	381	379	-0.58	N.S.	.001
Teaching Assistant Remarks	1.20 (.69)	1.13 (.58)	329	327	0.97	N.S.	.003
Administrator Remarks	1.37 (.80)	1.25 (.70)	374	372	1.51	N.S.	.006
Gay Men Acceptance	3.37 (1.05)	3.15 (1.06)	398	396	2.09	.037*	.011
Lesbian Acceptance	3.37 (1.05)	3.07 (1.05)	396	394	2.39	.017*	.014
Bisexual Acceptance	3.32 (1.00)	3.10 (1.02)	395	393	2.82	.005**	.020
Transgender Acceptance	3.39 (.99)	3.35 (1.07)	395	393	1.92	N.S.	.009
Campus Climate	3.55 (1.03)	3.25 (1.25)	386	384	-2.18	.030*	.027
Addresses Sexual Orientation Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	3.64 (1.14) 3.11 (1.35)	2.88 (1.14) 3.18 (1.32)	399 393	397 391	-1.27 -0.48	N.S. N.S.	.017 .001

*p<.05

**p<.01

Sexual Identity

Sexual identity was collapsed into two categories. The first category consisted of all respondents that identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or uncertain. The second category included all heterosexuals. Table 4.42 provides the means, standard deviations and t-test for each of the twelve target questions.

The non-heterosexual group consistently had the highest mean on all questions except for the number of remarks reportedly said by staff members and the level of disapproval of public homosexual affection. Each group posted the highest standard deviation on six of the twelve questions.

The independent samples t-tests for each question by gender identified only two statistically significant results ($p < .05$). Levene's test for equality of variances indicated that nine of the twelve questions had assumed equal variances, while three did not have assumed equal variances. The results reported for each survey question were based on whether or not the variances were assumed equal. The most significant relationship found was based on how the two groups felt about a public display of homosexual affection. The mean difference for this question was .40, while the significance was .015. The other statistically significant result existed between the two groups and how they rated the campus climate on a scale of non-homophobic to homophobic.

Table 4.42

Differences Among Sexual Identity For Specific Survey Questions

Survey Question	GLBU (n=38) M(SD)	Heterosexuals (n=380) M(SD)	n	df	t	p	Eta2
Student Remarks	2.31 (1.39)	2.00 (1.28)	397	395	-1.39	N.S.	.005
Staff Remarks	1.56 (.75)	1.68 (1.09)	399	47.260	0.90	N.S.	.001
Faculty Remarks	1.70 (1.10)	1.46 (.92)	385	383	-1.39	N.S.	.005
Teaching Assistant Remarks	1.31 (.93)	1.15 (.59)	332	30.220	-0.92	N.S.	.005
Administrator Remarks	1.32 (.65)	1.31 (.76)	377	375	-0.12	N.S.	.000
Gay Men Acceptance	3.39 (1.05)	3.24 (1.07)	401	399	-0.79	N.S.	.002
Lesbian Acceptance	3.31 (.98)	3.17 (1.04)	399	397	-0.73	N.S.	.001
Bisexual Acceptance	3.31 (.98)	3.23 (1.02)	398	396	-0.41	N.S.	.000
Transgender Acceptance	3.58 (1.16)	3.43 (1.05)	398	396	-0.83	N.S.	.002
Campus Climate	3.88 (1.24)	3.40 (1.21)	389	387	-2.18	.030*	.012
Addresses Sexual Orientation Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	3.31 (1.41) 2.59 (1.24)	3.00 (1.17) 3.19 (1.34)	402 396	38.60 394	-1.27 2.45	N.S. .015*	.005 .015

*p<.05

**p<.01

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administrators towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons?

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine to what extent differences existed between the three levels of interaction between survey participants and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons on the targeted questions. The levels are a result of collapsing the original five levels into three levels: none, slight/some, and frequent/very frequent. The number of respondents for each position and question differ because all respondents did not answer every question. Table 4.43 illustrates the means, standard deviations and results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the twelve questions analyzed.

Those individuals reporting to have had no contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population had the highest means on seven of the twelve survey questions. They had the highest mean, and were thus less likely to be friends with or share an office space with a member of the sexual orientation minority. They also posted the highest mean for likelihood of disapproval of public affection among homosexual couples. Those individuals who had frequent/very frequent interaction with the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population posted the highest means on willingness to challenge someone who made derogatory comments about sexual orientation, and assessment of the campus climate as being accepting of all four sexual orientation groups. They believed it to be less accepting than those who had no contact

Table 4.43

Differences Among Frequency of Contact With GLBT Persons

Survey Question	None (n=75) M(SD)	Slight/Some (n=220) M(SD)	Frequent/ Very Frequent (n=108) M(SD)	n	df	F	p	Eta2
Friend of lesbian or bisexual woman	1.38 (.49)	1.18 (.69)	1.06 (.23)	397	2,382	15.15**	.001	.073
Friend of gay or bisexual man	1.39 (.49)	1.20 (.40)	1.10 (.30)	399	2,381	11.98**	.001	.059
Friend of transgender man or woman	1.48 (.50)	1.34 (.48)	1.24 (.43)	385	2,375	5.36**	.005	.028
Share office with lesbian or bisexual woman	1.21 (.41)	1.07 (.26)	1.03 (.17)	332	2,373	8.85**	.001	.045
Share office with gay or bisexual man	1.22 (.42)	1.10 (.30)	1.07 (.26)	377	2,372	5.22**	.006	.027
Share office with transgender man or woman	1.30 (.46)	1.22 (.41)	1.18 (.38)	401	2,368	1.77	N.S.	.010
Challenge sexual orientation comments	3.39 (1.32)	3.70 (.97)	4.18 (.96)	399	2,380	12.91**	.001	.064
Disapprove of Public Homosexual Affection	3.41 (1.25)	3.23 (1.26)	2.76 (1.48)	398	2,379	6.07**	.003	.031
Campus acceptance of gay men	3.20 (.86)	3.18 (1.07)	3.42 (1.17)	398	2,386	1.87	N.S.	.010
Campus acceptance of lesbians	3.19 (.84)	3.09 (1.04)	3.33 (1.15)	389	2,383	1.87	N.S.	.010
Campus acceptance of bisexuals	3.20 (.80)	3.14 (1.03)	3.45 (1.09)	402	2,382	3.17*	.040	.016
Campus acceptance of transgender persons	3.26 (.86)	3.39 (1.06)	3.67 (1.14)	396	2,382	3.69*	.030	.019

*p<.05

**p<.01

or only slight/some contact. The individuals reporting no contact had the highest standard deviation on six of the questions, while those reporting frequent/very frequent contact had the highest standard deviation on five of the questions. Those participants reporting slight/some contact had the highest standard deviation on one question.

As might be expected, the individuals who reported at least slight contact with members of the sexual orientation minority were most similar on the issues related to willingness to be friends or share an office space with members of the sexual orientation minority. Whereas, those having no contact or only slight/some contact were most similar on the other six issues that dealt with campus acceptance, disapproval of public homosexual affection, and willingness to challenge others who make derogatory comments about sexual orientation.

Nine of the twelve questions yielded a statistically significant difference in the means between the three levels. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicated that none of the questions had homogeneous variance. Thus, Tamhane's T2 post-hoc test was used to further analyze the difference between the subgroup's means.

The means of the variables for frequency of contact and being the friend of a lesbian or bisexual woman were statistically significant from one another. The greatest difference (.32) existed between those individuals who had had no contact with members of the sexual orientation minority and those who had had frequent contact. The second largest difference (.19) was between those who had no contact and those that reported having slight or some contact. The difference (.13) between those individuals who had

slight or some contact and frequent or very frequent contact was also statistically significant. Table 4.44 presents these data.

Table 4.44
Mean Differences in Friend of Lesbian or Bisexual Woman for
Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.19*
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.32*
Slight/Some	None	-.19*
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.13*
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.32*
	Slight/Some	-.13*

*p<.05

Table 4.45 illustrates the data for the differences between the means associated with each frequency of contact group and whether or not the individual would be the friend of a gay or bisexual man. All three relationships were statistically significant. The largest difference (.30) was between those that had no contact and frequent/very frequent contact. A difference of .20 existed between those that had no contact and slight/some contact. The two groups with the most similar means with a difference of .10 were slight/some and frequent/very frequent.

A statistically significant difference was also found to exist between the frequency of contact and participants' decision to be friends with a transgender person. The greatest difference (.24) was between those reporting to have had no contact and

those reporting to have had frequent/very frequent contact. This was the only statistically significant value. Table 4.46 discusses this data.

Table 4.45

**Mean Differences in Friend of Gay or Bisexual Man for
Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons**

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.20*	.010
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.30*	.001
Slight/Some	None	-.20*	.010
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.10*	.037
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.30*	.001
	Slight/Some	-.10*	.037

*p<.05

Table 4.46

**Mean Differences in Friend of Transgender Man or Woman for
Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons**

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.14	.143
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.24*	.005
Slight/Some	None	-.14	.143
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.10	.171
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.24*	.005
	Slight/Some	-.10	.171

*p<.05

Table 4.47 presents the data for the mean differences associated with frequency of contact and the individual's willingness to share an office with a gay or bisexual man. Those respondents reporting to have no contact with gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender persons, and those having had frequent/very frequent contact had the greatest differences in means. This difference (.15) was also the only statistically significant relationship identified. The two groups having had some contact, slight/some and frequent/very frequent, were almost identical, having mean differences of only .02.

Statistically significant relationships were also found to exist among the levels of contact and the respondents' agreement to share an office with a lesbian or bisexual

Table 4.47

Mean Differences of Sharing an Office with Gay or Bisexual Man for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.12	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.15*	.030
Slight/Some	None	-.12	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.02	N.S.
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.15*	.030
	Slight/Some	-.02	N.S.

*p<.05

woman. Table 4.48 illustrates these calculations. The largest difference (.18) was calculated to exist between those people who had no prior contact with a person of this group and those who had the greatest amount of contact. This difference was found to

be statistically significant, as was the difference between those reporting no contact and those reporting slight/some contact. The difference between these two groups was .13. The difference between the two groups that had prior contact were not significant.

Table 4.48

Mean Differences of Sharing an Office with Lesbian or Bisexual Woman for Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.13*	.037
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.18*	.004
Slight/Some	None	-.13*	.037
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.04	N.S.
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.18*	.004
	Slight/Some	-.04	N.S.

*p<.05

Survey participants were also asked to respond to their willingness to challenge others on derogatory comments regarding sexual orientation or gender identity. Participants were able to answer on a five-point scale: Very Unlikely (1), Somewhat Unlikely (2), Uncertain (3), Somewhat Likely (4), and Very Likely (5). Table 4.49 illustrates the data for the question based on the level of contact participants had previously had with gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender persons. The largest difference of .79 existed between those with no contact and those with the most frequent contact. This difference was found to be statistically significant. The second highest difference (.48) was between the two groups reporting having had previous contact. The

difference between those with some contact and those with frequent contact was statistically significant. No other groups were found to be statistically significant.

Table 4.49
Mean Differences in Challenging Sexual Orientation Comments by
Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	-.31	.217
	Frequent/Very Frequent	-.79*	.001
Slight/Some	None	.31	.217
	Frequent/Very Frequent	-.48*	.001
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	.79*	.001
	Slight/Some	.48*	.001

*p<.05

Table 4.50 presents the data associated with the level of contact with the sexual orientation minority and the respondents' feelings of disapproval for a display of public affection by a gay or lesbian couple. Survey participants responded to their level of disapproval on a five-point scale: Very Unlikely (1), Somewhat Unlikely (2), Uncertain (3), Somewhat Likely (4), and Very Likely (5). Two of the relationships were found to be statistically significant. The difference of .65 between those with no prior contact and those with the most frequent contact was the largest. The other significant difference (.47) was between the groups reporting slight/some prior contact and those with frequent/very frequent contact.

A statistically significant difference between means also existed between frequency of contact and an individual's belief that the campus was accepting of transgender persons. Table 4.51 illustrates this information. The two groups with the largest difference were the group that had no contact and the group with frequent/very frequent contact. The difference of .41 found to exist between these two groups was

Table 4.50

Mean Differences in Disapproval of Public Homosexual Affection by Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	.18	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.65*	.007
Slight/Some	None	-.18	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	.47*	.021
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	-.65*	.007
	Slight/Some	-.47*	.021

*p<.05

statistically significant. The smallest difference, which was not significant, was between those with no contact those individuals with slight/some contact.

Based on the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for each question, nine items were identified as yielding significant results. Upon further review of the post-hoc tests for each question, the item regarding acceptance of bisexuals was not found to have any significant relationships.

Table 4.51
Mean Differences in Campus Acceptance of Transgender Persons by
Frequency of Contact with GLBT Persons

	Position	Mean Difference	p
None	Slight/Some	-.13	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	-.41*	.024
Slight/Some	None	.13	N.S.
	Frequent/Very Frequent	-.28	N.S.
Frequent/Very Frequent	None	.41*	.024
	Slight/Some	.28	N.S.

*p<.05

Research Question Four

How does the current campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compare to the norms established by a recent national study?

The comparison data used in this analysis was based on the unpublished campus climate assessment findings of a national study conducted by Dr. Susan R. Rankin (2003a). The national study was conducted during 2000 at seventeen colleges and universities located in ten U.S. states. No determination of statistical significance in any comparisons could be established because no data from the national study was provided to the researcher conducting this project. Therefore, all analyses were limited to the findings presented in the draft copy provided by Rankin (2003a).

According to the national study, 25.0% of the survey respondents reported they had been harassed on their home campuses, and 42.0% of the respondents had observed

conduct on their campus that they felt created an offensive, hostile, intimidating working or learning environment. However, of the survey participants at Texas A&M University, 20.9% reported having been harassed, and almost fifty percent (48.6%) had observed others being harassed.

The faculty, staff and administrators at Texas A&M believed that office personnel on campus were less accepting of persons of a different sexual orientation compared to the national study. Locally, 22.0% of the respondents thought people in offices were not accepting of the sexual orientation minority, whereas, the national percentage was lower at only 13.6%.

One of the questions in the survey comparing differences between the two groups dealt with the degree to which respondents believed their campuses addressed issues regarding specific issues on campus. Individuals had five choices: strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree. For the purposes of this analysis, the two levels of agreement and disagreement were collapsed into two choices of agree and disagree. Therefore, the three levels used were agree, uncertain, and disagree. Table 4.52 presents the data for this comparison. When compared to the national study, the faculty, staff and administration at Texas A&M University had higher levels of disagreement on four of the six issues surveyed. Comparatively, the Texas A&M study revealed that those at the University were less likely to believe that the university effectively dealt with issues regarding race or racism, gender or sexism, sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia, and religious beliefs or religious harassment. The greatest difference involved sexual orientation. 35.6% of the respondents believed

Texas A&M did not deal with this issued compared to 23.3% of the respondents in the national study. However, the study illustrated the perception that Texas A&M did a better job at dealing with campus issues related to disabilities and age or ageism.

Table 4.52
College/University Thoroughly Addresses Campus Issues

Issues	National Study						Texas A&M Study					
	Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree	
	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
race or racism	55.5	8307	23.5	3524	20.9	3143	51.7	211	19.6	80	28.7	117
gender or sexism	53.7	8023	23.8	3557	22.5	3363	48.4	196	23.2	94	28.4	115
sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia	49.5	7376	27.2	4059	23.3	3483	34.3	138	30.1	121	35.6	143
age or agism	26.0	3872	44.1	6589	29.9	4465	39.2	158	42.2	170	18.6	75
disabilities	49.6	7394	28.5	4250	22.1	3290	64.7	262	26.2	106	9.1	37
religious beliefs or religious harassment	44.1	6590	34.2	5114	21.6	3231	44.3	180	28.8	117	26.8	109

Further analysis of the question related to what level the university addresses campus issues was conducted by analyzing specific issues in relation to relative demographic variables. Table 4.53 presents the data for analysis of how the university addresses sexual orientation as perceived by the sexual identity of the respondents. While 14.7% more of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and uncertain population at Texas A&M believed the University did not address issues regarding sexual orientation, the difference in the number of heterosexuals believing the same was 57.1%.

Overall, a larger percentage of individuals at Texas A&M University (28.8%) believed the University did not thoroughly address issues related to race or racism on campus compared to the national study (21.0%). The difference was not only reflected

Table 4.53

University Addresses Issues Regarding Heterosexism and Sexual Orientation by Sexual Identity

Perceptions		National Study Sexual Identity			Texas A&M Study Sexual Identity		
		GLBU	Heterosexual	Total	GLBU	Heterosexual	Total
agree	n	318	6025	6343	11	127	138
	% within sexual identity	34.8%	50.5%	49.4%	31.4%	34.6%	34.3%
uncertain	n	187	3314	3501	6	115	121
	% within sexual identity	20.4%	27.8%	27.3%	17.1%	31.3%	30.1%
disagree	n	410	2591	3001	18	125	143
	% within sexual identity	44.8%	21.7%	23.4%	51.4%	34.1%	35.6%

among minorities at the institution, but it was also true of Caucasians. Among people of color, the difference was 7.0%, while there was an even larger difference of 9.5% among Caucasians. Fewer people at the University were uncertain about this issue as well.

Table 4.54 provides the information for the data discussed.

Table 4.54**University Addresses Issues Regarding Race or Racism by Race/Ethnicity**

Perceptions		National Study Race/Ethnicity			Texas A&M Study Race/Ethnicity		
		Minorities	Caucasian	Total	Minorities	Caucasian	Total
agree	n	2693	5614	8307	48	158	206
	% within race/ethnicity	49.4%	58.9%	55.5%	44.0%	54.3%	51.5%
uncertain	n	1236	2288	3524	23	56	79
	% within race/ethnicity	22.7%	24.0%	23.5%	21.1%	19.2%	19.8%
disagree	n	1521	1622	3143	38	77	115
	% within race/ethnicity	27.9%	17.0%	21.0%	34.9%	26.5%	28.8%

Similar to the national study, female respondents at Texas A&M were more likely to believe that the University did not address issues related to sexism or gender than males. Additionally, a larger percentage of both females and males at Texas A&M disagreed with the statement that the university addresses issues related to sexism when compared to the data from the national study. While both gender groups in this study were less likely to believe this issue was effectively addressed, the difference between the two male groups was smaller than the difference between the two female groups. Table 4.55 illustrates the information. Since no transgender persons responded in the Texas A&M study, the transgender participants in the national study were dropped in order to make comparisons between females and males only.

Table 4.55

University Addresses Issues Regarding Sexism or Gender by Gender

Perceptions		National Study			Texas A&M Study		
		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
agree	n	2340	1175	3515	76	118	194
	% within gender	49.9%	61.0%	24.8%	38.0%	58.4%	48.3%
uncertain	n	2481	852	3333	54	39	93
	% within gender	24.3%	22.6%	23.5%	27.0%	19.3%	23.1%
disagree	n	4564	2758	7322	70	45	115
	% within gender	25.8%	16.4%	51.7%	35.0%	22.3%	28.6%

Survey participants were also asked to rate the campus climate in general on a scale for several attitudes, including heterosexism, racism and sexism. The following tables provide comparison data for each of these attitudes based on the associated demographic variable. Table 4.56 illustrates the data for the campus climate based on a scale of non-homophobic to homophobic. The scale of one to five was collapsed into three categories, where a one or two was defined as non-homophobic, three was neutral, and four or five was homophobic. Overall, 35.9% of the respondents in the national study considered their campuses to homophobic. However, the percentage of participants rating the climate as homophobic at Texas A&M (49.1%) was considerably higher than the national average. Those individuals identifying as gay, lesbian, bisexual or uncertain were more likely to consider the campus as homophobic for both of the surveys.

Table 4.56**Perceptions of Campus Climate by Sexual Identity**

Perceptions		National Study Sexual Identity			Texas A&M Study Sexual Identity		
		GLBU	Heterosexual	Total	GLBU	Heterosexual	Total
non-homophobic	n	175	3584	3759	6	83	89
	% within sexual identity	19.3%	30.5%	29.7%	18.2%	23.3%	22.9%
neutral	n	235	4114	4349	6	103	109
	% within sexual identity	25.9%	35.0%	34.4%	18.2%	28.9%	28.0%
homophobic	n	497	4048	4545	21	170	191
	% within sexual identity	54.8%	34.5%	35.9%	63.6%	47.8%	49.1%

Table 4.57 presents the data for respondents' perceptions of their campuses as being racist or non-racist. Overall, the percentage of participants at Texas A&M that rated the campus climate as racist was 62.0% higher than the percentage of national respondents. While 3.7% more of the minorities at Texas A&M considered the institution to be racist compared to the national study, the percentage of Caucasian participants at Texas A&M who rated the campus as racist was almost twice that of the national study. 17.3% of the Caucasians in the national study rated their campuses as racist compared to 34.0% of the Caucasians at Texas A&M. At Texas A&M, 34.5% of the respondents considered the campus to be racist.

The final comparison was based on rating the campus climate on a scale of non-sexist to sexist. The responses were analyzed based upon the gender of the participants. Since no transgender persons responded at Texas A&M, the transgender participants in

the national study were dropped in order to make comparisons between females and males only. Table 4.58 illustrates the data that is associated with this comparison.

Table 4.57

Perceptions of Campus Climate by Race/Ethnicity

Perceptions		National Study			Texas A&M Study		
		Race/Ethnicity			Race/Ethnicity		
		Minorities	Caucasian	Total	Minorities	Caucasian	Total
non-racist	n	1222	4629	5851	34	100	134
	% within Race/Ethnicity	35.2%	49.3%	45.5%	33.0%	35.5%	34.8%
neutral	n	1132	3140	4272	32	86	118
	% within Race/Ethnicity	32.6%	33.4%	33.2%	31.1%	30.5%	30.6%
racist	n	1118	1623	2741	37	96	133
	% within Race/Ethnicity	32.2%	17.3%	21.3%	35.9%	34.0%	34.5%

Overall, the campus climate at Texas A&M was perceived to be much more sexist in comparison to the national study. At Texas A&M, 35.5% of the respondents rated the climate as sexist compared to only 21.3% of those in the national study. While there was a difference between both surveys in both female and male respondents, the difference in the percentage of females considering the campus as sexist was much greater—a difference of 18.8% compared to 7.4%.

Table 4.58

Perceptions of Campus Climate by Gender

Perceptions		National Study			Texas A&M Study		
		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
non-sexist	n	3174	2456	5851	54	87	141
	% within gender	39.6%	51.9%	45.5%	27.4%	44.6%	36.0%
neutral	n	2766	1386	4272	55	57	112
	% within gender	34.5%	29.3%	33.2%	27.9%	29.2%	28.6%
sexist	n	2076	892	2741	88	51	139
	% within gender	25.9%	18.8%	21.3%	44.7%	26.2%	35.5%

Summary of the Findings

1. What is the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration?

The analysis for this question was based upon eight questions identified in the questionnaire. Overall, the university employees rated the campus climate as being more homophobic than either sexist or racist. In terms of campus climate for diversity in regards to various groups, the top four groups that were regarded as being least accepted on campus were gay men, lesbians, bisexual men or women, and transgender persons. The three most accepted groups were Whites/Caucasians, males, and females.

Another issue that was considered as a way to define the current climate was to look at the beliefs of the participants in relation to their level agreement as to how the

thoroughly the university addresses campus issues related to several demographic groups. Again, the issue identified as being the least likely to be addressed by the university was sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia. The two subsequent issues were age or ageism and religious beliefs.

Five questions were similar in nature because they focused on the number of insensitive or disparaging remarks made by various members of the university community in the previous year about various underrepresented groups. Based on the average of all five means, more comments were made about gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons than any other group. Women were a very close second, while non-native English speakers followed. However, women had the highest mean on two questions, and tied with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons for the highest mean on a third question.

Therefore, in relation to other groups on campus, the study results demonstrate that gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender persons were more likely to be the victims of derogatory or insensitive comments. Additionally, respondents judged the campus environment to be least friendly to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons.

2. Do perceptions towards and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as education/age, ethnicity, and gender?

To gain a broad perspective of how the survey respondents differed from one another based on their positions and at the university and other demographic variables,

the researcher examined the frequencies, means and standard deviations for each of the variables and subgroups on relevant survey questions. The initial findings are based on descriptive, and not inferential statistics. However, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), post-hoc tests, and independent samples t-Test were utilized to determine statistical significance between variables.

Of the three positions, the administrators were found to be the group that most often heard the largest number of remarks made by various campus groups. Additionally, they were the group that was most likely to disapprove of homosexual public affection and believe the campus was accepting of the four sexual orientation groups. The university faculty considered the campus to be more homophobic than the other two groups and was most likely to believe that the university did not address campus issues related to sexual orientation.

Individuals who were between the ages of 23-32 and 43-52 were most likely to report hearing more remarks than the other two age groups. The youngest group, 23-32, was most likely to view the campus as not being accepting of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. The 33-42 age group considered the campus to be the most homophobic of all the age groups, most likely to believe the university did not address issues about sexual orientation, and believed the campus was not accepting of transgender persons. Those respondents that were 43-52 were most likely to disapprove of homosexual public affection.

Males reported hearing more insensitive and disparaging remarks made by faculty about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons than the females did.

Females reported hearing more of these remarks by the other four groups on campus, including students, staff, administrators and teaching assistants. Women also rated the campus climate as more unaccepting of members of the sexual orientation minority than did men. Females tended to disapprove of public affection by a homosexual couple, rate the climate as more homophobic, and were more likely to believe the university did not handle issues about sexual orientation thoroughly.

Respondents who identified as heterosexual were more likely than gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or uncertain respondents to disapprove of homosexual public affection. Heterosexuals also reported hearing more insensitive remarks made by administrators, while non-heterosexuals reported hearing more remarks by students, staff, faculty and teaching assistants. Not surprisingly, non-heterosexuals considered the campus to be more homophobic and were more likely to believe the university did not address campus issues related to sexual orientation.

Of the seven racial/ethnic groups, Hispanics reported hearing more insensitive remarks made about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons. However, African Americans considered the campus to be least accepting for all four sexual orientation groups, as well as viewing the campus as being more homophobic. African Americans were also the most likely to disagree with the view that the university thoroughly addresses campus issues regarding sexual orientation. The multi-race group was most likely to disapprove of homosexual public affection.

The analysis of variance and subsequent post-hoc tests revealed numerous statistically significant findings. Significant findings were identified among the position

groups for reported staff remarks, level of acceptance of bisexuals, and disapproval of public affection by a homosexual couple. Several significant findings were reported for the four age groups. These included reported student remarks, acceptance of gay men and transgender persons, disapproval of homosexual public affection, rating of the campus climate, and agreement or disagreement about whether the university addressed sexual orientation issues on campus. The racial/ethnic groups differed significantly for student and staff remarks reported, acceptance of transgender persons, and rating of the campus climate.

The independent samples t-tests also revealed several statistically significant findings for gender and sexual identity. Males and females differed significantly regarding acceptance of gay men, lesbians, and bisexual men or women. Statistical significance was also identified for rating of the campus climate and whether the university addresses issues about sexual orientation on campus. Non-heterosexuals and heterosexuals significantly differed on their rating of the campus climate and disapproval of homosexual public affection.

3. What is the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administrators towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons?

To determine if the amount of contact with gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender persons had any statistically significant relationship with individuals' beliefs and attitudes, analysis of variance and subsequent post-hoc tests were utilized. The data

revealed several significant relationships, including the more contact a person had, the more likely they were to be friends with a lesbian or bisexual woman, a gay or bisexual man, and a transgender person. Additionally, more contact led to increased likelihood in willingness to share an office with a lesbian or bisexual woman or a gay or bisexual man. Those who had more contact were also more likely to challenge others on derogatory comments regarding sexual identity/gender identity, and were less likely to feel disapproval for homosexual public affection. A significant difference was also found to exist in the attitude toward campus acceptance of transgender persons. In all cases, the significant differences were found to exist between those that had had no contact and those that had frequent/very frequent contact. In a few cases, differences were found between individuals reporting slight/some contact and those reporting frequent/very frequent contact.

4. How does the current campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compare to the norms established by a recent national study?

This question was analyzed by using cross-tabulations of Texas A&M survey data and comparing it to the data from the national study that were discussed in the unpublished findings by Rankin (2003a). Overall, when compared to the national data, the administrators, faculty and professional staff at Texas A&M University believed that the climate was worse at Texas A&M. They were more likely to believe that the university did not thoroughly address issues regarding race or racism, sexism or gender, and sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia. Additionally, those respondents at

Texas A&M believed their home campus to be more sexist, racist, and homophobic compared to national levels.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The previous chapters presented an introduction to the study, the literature review, the methodology and procedures used in the study, and a presentation of the data in reference to the answer to each research question. This chapter will provide a brief summary of the purpose, procedures and major findings, and a summary of the results. Additionally, conclusions are drawn and recommendations for further study are presented.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the current campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration at the institution.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the current campus climate at Texas A&M University for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration?
2. Do perceptions towards and experiences with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons differ between and among the faculty, professional staff, and administration and/or based upon demographic variables such as education/age, ethnicity, and gender?

3. What is the relationship between the frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and the attitudes and actions of faculty, professional staff, and administrators towards gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons?
4. How does the current campus climate at Texas A&M University, as perceived by the faculty, professional staff, and administration, compare to the norms established by a recent national study?

Summary of the Methodology

The study was conducted during May through August of 2003. The population selected for this study was the faculty, administrators, and professional staff at Texas A&M University. Random sampling was used to identify survey participants for each of the three groups. Over sampling was done for the minority population. The selection process yielded a sample size of 1,020 individuals. Through returned mail, participant denials, and surveys deemed unusable, the final sample size was reduced to 941 participants. Based on this final sample size, there was a 47.9% response rate.

The response rate may have been affected by the length of the survey. The survey instrument used in the study was the *Assessment of Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups*, developed by Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D.

Conclusions

From this study, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. More insensitive and disparaging remarks are perceived to be made about gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons than any other underrepresented groups at Texas A&M University.
2. The overall campus climate at Texas A&M University is considered to be the least accepting of gay men, lesbians, bisexual men or women, and transgender persons compared to other groups on campus.
3. Texas A&M University is thought to be more homophobic than sexist or racist.
4. Males are less likely than females to acknowledge the campus community as an unfriendly environment toward the sexual orientation minority.
5. Asians reported hearing fewer remarks and were most likely to view the university as an accepting community for the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population than any other racial/ethnic group.
6. African Americans were more likely than Caucasians to view the campus environment as negative toward the sexual orientation minority, but they were also more likely to disapprove of homosexual actions.
7. Older individuals considered the campus environment to be more accepting of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons and less homophobic.
8. Administrators heard more insensitive or disparaging remarks about the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population and considered the campus to be least accepting of this group.

9. Previous interaction with gay men, lesbians, bisexual men or women, or transgender persons decreased heterosexist attitudes among the administrators, faculty, and professional staff.

10. Texas A&M University has a more negative campus environment on issues regarding homophobia, racism, and sexism compared to other institutions in the United States.

11. The Vision 2020 goal of creating a nurturing and respectful academic climate where all individuals of differing backgrounds feel welcome has not been met.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that the campus climate at Texas A&M University is unwelcoming for members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender population. Among underrepresented groups on campus, including racial and ethnic minorities, non-native English speakers, or persons with disabilities, on average, the faculty, staff and administrators at the university reported hearing more negative remarks about the sexual orientation minority than any other group in the past year. Additionally, the campus climate for these four groups individually ranked as the top four among all the groups when it came to their level of acceptance on campus.

This study also suggests that the university needs to make improved and committed efforts to focusing on and addressing campus issues regarding sexual orientation. While the university has made visible efforts to address issues regarding racism and sexism--and this study shows that many of the respondents believe that--the same cannot be seen for issues about sexual orientation or heterosexism/homophobia.

As the literature shows, universities must take the initiative to address these issues both inside and outside the classroom.

The research shows that females tend to have less negative attitudes toward the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender population and have a better understanding of the campus climate for this group. This study showed that females considered the campus to be more homophobic than males and that they also reportedly heard more remarks made on campus than males. Additionally, males had a higher level of disapproval of homosexual public affection than females.

This study also indicated that race played a role in attitudes toward the sexual orientation minority. In dealing with levels of acceptance on campus for the four groups, African Americans consistently considered the campus to be least accepting for these groups among all the ethnic groups. Additionally, they considered the campus to be more homophobic than the other groups, and were more likely to believe the university did not address issues regarding sexual orientation. However, they also posted the second highest score for level of disapproval of homosexual public affection. Thus, they not only acknowledged the overall campus attitudes, but they were individuals who held negative beliefs. Interestingly, the racial/ethnic group that consistently ranked issues regarding this population lower than any other group was the Asian population.

The research supports the concept that as individuals become older, they tend to have a better understanding and recognition of the negativity faced by gay men, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender persons. However, this study suggests that the older

population had a view of the campus that was not as negative towards this minority group compared to other groups. The oldest individuals rated the campus most accepting of all groups, in addition to considering it the least homophobic, and rating it in the most positive light respective to believing the university addresses sexual orientation issues on campus.

This study also portrays the role of position as a factor in understanding the climate. On several issues, faculty and staff differed significantly. The limited research suggested that staff may be less homophobic than faculty. However, on the issue of public homosexual affection, staff had a higher level of disapproval than faculty. Additionally, staff interpreted the campus climate as more accepting than faculty or administrators. Thus, these findings reinforce the idea that increased education tends to reflect more openness towards this minority population because faculty and administrators may have more education than the campus staff due to the nature of their positions.

This study reinforces the review of the literature's findings that increased interaction with gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender people will lead to more positive attitudes and behaviors towards them. It also shows that willingness to share an office space or be friends with a person of a differing sexual orientation increased commensurate with the level of interaction. Additionally, individuals who had previous interaction with the members of the sexual orientation minority were less likely to express disapproval of public homosexual affection and were more likely to challenge others who made derogatory comments about this group.

In relation to other college and university campuses across the United States, Texas A&M University has much room for improvement. Individuals at Texas A&M were much more likely to believe that the university did not address issues regarding not only homophobia/heterosexism, but also race or racism, gender or sexism and age or ageism among others. Additionally, Texas A&M was considered more homophobic, sexist, and racist compared to other institutions. Clearly, Texas A&M University is not an inclusive environment for minority groups, especially gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgender persons.

Summarily, the results of this study suggest that Texas A&M University has not created an environment that is welcoming to members of the campus community who are gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. Additionally, the study suggest that the campus community as a whole recognizes the problems facing the university in regard to this subject. While confronting issues regarding sexual orientation may be politically explosive in the current political climate, the literature suggests that there are significant advantages to all persons when these issues are addressed. Members of the sexual orientation minority will feel safer and will be able to focus more of their energy on their academic work, while heterosexuals will have the opportunity to learn about differences in others and how to interact with people who are different from themselves.

Recommendations

Implications for Practice

Based on this research, the climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University has been defined in a manner that requires action in

order to improve the climate. As a recent article in *Texas Monthly* (Burka, 2004) describes a perception of the overall situation at the university, Texas A&M University is facing a point in its history characterized by a need for change. And, in this case, change is playing a significant role in a push/pull that pits a clinging to long-standing university traditions against institutional desire for prominence and prestige. While the article treads lightly in the area of sexual orientation, this is an issue that cannot be left unnoticed, but demands attention. As the *Texas Monthly* article summarizes by quoting a letter to the student newspaper, the *Battalion*, “Can a homosexual not stand as the Twelfth Man” (Higgins, 2003, as cited in Burka, 2004, p. 206)?

One way the university can work to create a more positive campus climate is by taking a firm stand in recognizing members of the sexual orientation minority as an underrepresented group through policy decisions. While the university does include sexual orientation in some university policies, there are still situations where sexual orientation is not included. For example, sexual orientation is listed as a protected group in the statement on harassment and discrimination in the University’s student rules; however, it is not listed as a part of the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) statement that largely applies to faculty, staff, and administrators. While this is a system-wide policy, Texas A&M could take a leading role in changing the policy or in institutionalizing their own statement.

Another example can be found in the recent case in the College of Education, when they attempted to include language that would “celebrate and promote” diversity, including sexual orientation, in a new statement of tolerance. After much dissent was

heard among the faculty, the statement was rewritten and used “value and respect” in place of “celebrate and promote”. While this situation was creating an atmosphere of great debate among members of the campus community, had the College maintained its original position, it would have been seen as a positive step forward for the sexual orientation minority community.

Another way the university can improve the recognition of individuals with same-sex partners is by expanding benefits offered to heterosexual couples to homosexual couples. For example, benefits for homosexual couples at the university are basically limited to receiving a spousal membership at the Texas A&M University Recreation Center. However, the university could pursue other avenues, such as extending health insurance benefits to same-sex partners, or including the death of a partner’s immediate family member as a reason for taking emergency leave from work, as it does for heterosexual couples. While this prospect is often undermined by the contention that it is against State of Texas policies, a public institution in Texas has yet to step forward in an attempt to challenge the legality of it. Yet, when it comes to issues regarding other underrepresented groups, many universities will step forward and challenge both written and unwritten policies, even when state policies do not address the issue.

A third area in which the university could step forward is through programming. While the university does have an office, Gender Issues Education Services, which works with limited programming for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students, the university does not currently have a specific office dedicated to programming for this

underrepresented group as it does for other groups. Racial/ethnic minority groups are supported by programming efforts in the Department of Multicultural Services, while students with disabilities have an office, Services for Students with Disabilities, dedicated to them. In addition, there is Adult Student Services and the Women's Center that focus on specific campus groups.

Additionally, Gender Issues Education Services and the Division of Student Affairs have been very cautious in actually sponsoring any type of educational programming on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues due to concerns about spending university funds on programming for this group. This has largely been in response to criticism from individuals about using university funds to discuss or mention sexual orientation. Thus, increased programming, such as workshops, mini-conferences, or educational weeks that are sponsored by the university or departments within the university would be a way to emphasize the importance of members of the sexual orientation minority.

The classroom setting is another area that can be used by the university to address the campus environment for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons. While academic freedom is in place to protect faculty members, the question still exists for those individuals who are evaluated and given promotions and tenure by people who have taken strong viewpoints toward sexual orientation in a negative manner. It is uncertain whether a faculty member who is gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender, or that includes sexual orientation issues in their class discussions will be treated in a fair manner. Exposure to sexual orientation issues are shown to be a way of improving

attitudes and behaviors toward this group, and the classroom is a way that this can be accomplished.

Human Resources at Texas A&M University could also play a role in improving the campus climate. For example, the next time they conduct the TAMU Faculty and Staff Work Life Studies, they could include issues relating to sexual orientation. In addition, they could prominently provide and encourage partner placement on campus for homosexual couples.

Historically, Texas A&M University has been an institution that has been far from welcoming to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender population. From the point at which the University was forced to recognize a student group composed of gay, lesbian and bisexual students to the present time, the sexual orientation minority is an underrepresented group that continues to need recognition and support by the campus community, flowing from the top of the organizational chart to the bottom.

Tradition is deep at Texas A&M University, and as President Robert Gates points out, the University has been built on issues tied to religion and moral values (Burka, 2004). Yet, for those who fight against recognition of the sexual orientation minority, it is couched upon these two issues they most often build their defenses. Thus, in order to make significant progress toward creating a welcoming environment for all faculty, staff, administrators and students, the University will need to take a new position in addressing issues pertaining to sexual orientation, starting with the basic building blocks on which decisions at Texas A&M University are made.

Directions for Further Research

This study was intended to provide initial research into the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty, professional staff and administrators. Several directions for further research are suggested.

First, this study should be replicated with the student body at Texas A&M University in order to gain their perspective. With this data, and the data provided by the student population, a broader perspective and insight of the entire campus community can be gained.

Secondly, additional analysis with the current data should be conducted to determine if the relationships found to exist between frequency of contact with the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender population and individual's attitudes and actions toward this population differ based on demographic variables, such as race/ethnicity, age, campus position.

Though this specific study focused on the underrepresented group of the sexual orientation minority, additional analysis could also look at other survey questions to determine what type of relationships exist relative to other populations surveys, such as race/ethnic groups, people of other religions, or non-English speaking students.

Further research could focus on the comments made by research participants in section five of the survey. This could provide some additional insight into some of the other diversity issues that are of concern to those individuals who completed the study.

If the survey were to be revised, additional survey questions that would provide insight into individual's attitudes and behaviors toward diverse groups are education level/attainment and socio-economic status or level of income.

This survey was conducted from the end of the spring term through the second summer term. This is a time period in which members of the academic community may not be working due to the nature of their contracts. Thus, conducting this survey during a long-semester, such as the spring or fall, may contribute to differing results.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, T. (1991, April 8). A&M faculty join to protect anti-bias rule. *Houston Chronicle*.
- Alcalay, R., Sniderman, P. M., Mitchell, J., & Griffin, R. (1990). Ethnic differences in knowledge of AIDS transmission and attitudes towards gays and people with AIDS. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*, 10 (3), 213-222.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bennett, L. (2000). Fifty years of prejudice in the media. *Gay & Lesbian Review*, 7 (2), 30-34.
- Berrill, K. T. (1992). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men* (pp. 19-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bobo, L., & Licari, F. C. (1989). Education and political tolerance: Testing the effects of cognitive sophistication and target group affect. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53, 285-308.
- Bochenek, M., & Brown, A. W. (2001). *Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students in U. S. schools*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Bonilla, L. & Porter, J. (1990). A comparison of latino, blacks, and non-hispanic white attitudes toward homosexuality. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 12 (4), 437-452.

Bowne, A. M., & Bourgeois, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: The contribution of pluralistic ignorance, dynamic social impact, and contact theories. *Journal of American College Health, 50* (2), 91-96.

Burka, P. (2004, May). Corps values. *Texas Monthly, 32* (5), 122-127, 201-206.

Cage, M. C. (1993). Openly gay students face harassment and physical assaults on some campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 39* (27), A22-A24.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (1992). *Assessing campus climate: Feasibility of developing an educational equity assessment system*. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model. *Journal of Sex Research, 20*, 143-167.

Charlton, B. (2003, August 26). *Representative works to restrict sexuality curriculum at Michigan State University*. The State News. [Online]. Available: <http://www.statenews.com>

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

CNN. (1998, October 12). *Gay Wyoming student dies from beating*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.cnn.com/US/9810/12/wyoming.attack.01/index.html>.

Cotton-Huston, A. L., & Waite, B. M. (2000). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions. *Journal of Homosexuality, 38* (3), 117-133.

Cress, C. M. & Sax, L. J. (1998). Campus climate issues to consider for the next decade. In K. Bauer (Ed.), *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities* (pp. 65-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Darder, A. (1994). Institutional research as a tool for cultural democracy. In D. G. Smith, L. E. Wolf, & T. Levitan (Eds.), *Studying diversity in higher education* (pp. 21-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989a). Homophobia in a university community: Views of prospective resident assistants. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 546-552.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989b). Lesbians' and gay men's experiences of discrimination and harassment in a university community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17 (3), 317-321.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1992). Teaching lesbian/gay development: From oppression to exceptionality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 22, 213-227.

D'Augelli, A. R., & Rose, M. L. (1990). Homophobia in a university community: Attitudes and experiences of heterosexual freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 484-491.

Edgert, P. (1994). Assessing campus climate: Implications for diversity. In D. G. Smith, L. E. Wolf, & T. Levitan (Eds.), *Studying diversity in higher education* (pp. 51-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. (1997). Attitudes of heterosexual students toward their gay male and lesbian peers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38 (6), 565-576.

Ernst, F. A., Francis, M. D., Nevles, H., & Lemeh, C. A. (1991). Condemnation of homosexuality in the black community: A gender-specific phenomenon? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20 (6), 579-585.

Franek, R. (2002). *The best 345 colleges, 2003 edition*. New York: Random House.

Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (2002). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). New York: Longman.

Gay Student Services. (1978). *Gay student services* [Brochure]. College Station, TX: Author.

Gay Student Services v. Texas A&M University, 612 F.2d 160 (1980).

Gay Student Services v. Texas A&M University, 737 F.2d 1317 (1984).

Geller, W. W. (1990). *Students and educators: Attitudes on gay and lesbian matters*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 914)

Grossman, J. (2003, November 20). Two states offer different legal paths on same-sex marriage. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/11/20/fl.grossman.samesex/index.html>.

Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. (1998). Authoritarianism values, and the favorability and structure of antigay attitudes. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation* (pp. 82-107). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (1986). The social psychology of homophobia: Toward a practical theory. *Review of Law and Social Change*, 14 (4), 923-934.

Herek, G. M. (2000a). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues*, 56 (2), 251-266.

Herek, G. M. (2000b). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9 (1), 19-22.

Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 40-66.

Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1999). Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about lesbians and gay men: Evidence from survey context effects. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 36 (4), 348-360.

Hirano-Nakanishi, M. J. (1994). Methodological issues in the study of diversity in higher education. In D. Smith, L. Wolf, & T. Levitan (Eds.), *Studying diversity in higher education* (pp. 63-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hogan, T. L., & Rentz, A. L. (1996). Homophobia in the academy. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37 (3), 309-314.

Homosexuality debate strains ABC (1994). *Christian Century*, 111 (22), 714.

Hurtado, S., Carter, D. F., & Kardias, D., (1998a). The climate for diversity: Key issues for institutional self-study. In K. Bauer (Ed.), *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities* (pp. 53-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hurtado, S., Maestas, R., Hill, L., Inkelas, K. K., Wathington, H., & Meador, E. W. (1998b). *Perspectives on the climate for diversity: Findings and suggested*

recommendations for the Texas A&M University campus community. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education.

Johnson, M. E., Brems, C., & Alford-Keating, P. (1997). Personality correlates of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 34 (1), 57-69.

Kim, B. S., D'Andrea, M. J., Sahu, P. K., & Gaughen K. J. (1998). A multicultural study of university students' knowledge of and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, & Development*, 36 (3), 171-182.

Kite, M. E. & Whitley, Jr., B. E. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual methodological analysis. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation : Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men and bisexuals* (pp. 39-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607 - 610.

LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35 (2), 189-196.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Levine, H. & Evans, N. J. (1991). The development of gay, lesbian, and bisexual identities. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 1-24). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Longmore, M. A., Dunn, D., & Jarboe, G. R. (1996). *The survey research project manual*. New York: West Publishing Company.

Lopez, G. & Chism, N. (1993). Classroom concerns of gay and lesbian students. *College Teaching*, 41 (3), 97-103.

Lottes, I. L., & Kuriloff, P. J. (1994). The impact of college experience on political and social attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 31 (1/2), 31-54.

Lucozzi, E. A. (1998). A far better place: Institutions as allies. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators* (pp. 47-52). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Malaney, G. D., Williams, E. A., & Geller, W. W. (1997). Assessing campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at two institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38 (4), 365-375.

McClosky, H., & Brill, A. (1983). *Dimensions of tolerance: What Americans believe about civil liberties*. New York: Russell Sage.

McFarland, W. P. (1998). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual student suicide. *Professional School Counseling*, 1 (3), 26-29.

Moewe, M. C. (1991, May 13). Gays, guidelines and A&M. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*.

Myers, P. (1993). Lesbian studies and multicultural teaching: A challenge in diversity. In D. Schoem, L. Frankel, X. Zuniga, & E. Lewis (Eds.), *Multicultural teaching in the university*. (pp. 133-146). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (1988). *Anti-gay violence, victimization and defamation in 1988*. Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Nelson, E. S., & Krieger, S. L. (1997). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuality in college students: Implementation of a gay men and lesbian peer panel. *Journal of Homosexuality, 33* (2), 63-81.

Oliver, M. B., Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114* (1), 29-51.

Oliver, M. B., Hyde, J. S. (1995). Gender differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: A reply to Whitley and Kite. *Psychological Bulletin, 117* (1), 155-158.

O'Mara, K. (1997). Historicising outsiders on campus: The re/production of lesbian and gay insiders. *Journal of Gender Studies, 6* (1), 17-31.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from 20 years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Paul, J. P., Catania, J., Pollack, L., Moskowitz, J., Canchola, J. Mills, T., Binson, D., & Stall, R. (2002). Suicide attempts among gay and bisexual men: Lifetime prevalence and antecedents. *American Journal of Public Health, 92* (8), 1338-1345.

Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures: New directions for institutional research #68*. (pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rankin, S. (1994). *The perceptions of heterosexual faculty and administrators toward gay men and lesbians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Rankin, S. R. (1998). The campus climate report: Assessment and intervention strategies. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators* (pp. 277-284). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Rankin, S. R. (2003a). [Campus climate assessment findings]. Unpublished raw data. University Park, PA: Rankin & Associates.

Rankin, S. R. (2003b). *Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people: A national perspective*. New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Rankin & Associates (2002). [Campus climate for diversity: a national assessment. Reliability/validity information]. Unpublished raw data. University Park, PA.

Renn, K. A. (2000). Including all voices in the classroom: Teaching lesbian, gay, and bisexual students. *College Teaching*, 48 (4), 129-135.

Rhoads, R. A. (1995). The college campus climate for gay students. *Education Digest*, 61 (1), 57-60.

Schaub, M. (1999). A farewell to Aggieland. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.rtis.com/reg/bcs/pol/touchstone/april99/farewell.html>.

Schellenberg, E. G., Hirt, J., & Sears, A. (1999). Attitudes toward homosexuals among students at a Canadian university. *Sex Roles, 40* (1/2), 139-152.

Sherrill, J., & Hardesty, C. A. (1994). *The gay, lesbian, and bisexual students' guide to colleges, universities, and graduate schools*. New York: New York University Press.

Simoni, J. M. (1996). Pathways to prejudice: Predicting students' heterosexist attitudes with demographics, self-esteem, and contact with lesbians and gay men. *Journal of College Student Development, 37* (1), 68-78.

Smith, D. (1997a). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Smith, D. (1997b). How diversity influences learning. *Liberal Education, 93* (2), 42-47.

Smith, L. (2003, November 19). First VP of diversity takes office. *The Battalion*, (Texas A&M University, College Station) p. 1.

Smith, M. R., & Gordon, R. A. (1998). Personal need for structure and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Social Psychology, 138* (1), 83-87.

Snyder, J. (1995). Gays too welcome on Iowa campuses, lawmakers charge. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 41* (36), A32.

Somers, P., Cofer, J., Austin, J. L., Inman, D., Martin, T., Rook, S., Stokes, T., & Wilkinson, L. (1998). Faculty and staff: The weather radar of campus climate. In K. Bauer (Ed.), *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities* (pp. 35-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Strand, D. A. (1998). Civil liberties, civil rights, and stigma: Voter attitudes and behavior in politics of homosexuality. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men and bisexuals* (pp. 108-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Suspend Aggies; Admit practice of perversion. (1952, May 12). *Bryan Daily Eagle*, (Bryan-College Station, TX) p.1.

Szuminski, S. (2003, October 9). Young conservatives protest coming out week. *The Battalion*.

Texas A&M University. (1990). *Final report and recommendations of the committee for a discrimination-free campus*. College Station, TX: Author.

Texas A&M University. (1991). *Rules and regulations revisions 1991-92*. College Station, TX: Author.

Texas A&M University. (1999). *Vision 2020: Creating a culture of excellence*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.tamu.edu/vision2020/culture/>.

Texas A&M University. (2000). *Gender issues campus climate assessment report and recommendations: Texas A&M University-2000*. College Station, TX: Author.

Texas A&M University. (2001). *Diversity*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.tamu.edu/00/start/divr.html>.

Texas A&M University. (2003a). *Texas A&M University student rules 2003-2004*. [On-line]. Available: <http://student-rules.tamu.edu/>.

Texas A&M University. (2003b). *Texas A&M University undergraduate catalog 2003-2004*. College Station, TX: Author.

Texas A&M University, ALLIES. (n.d.) *Bonfire '98 controversy*. [On-line]. Available: <http://allies.tamu.edu/bonfire/bonfire98.htm>.

Texas A&M University, Gender Issues Education Services. (n.d.). *Programs*. [On-line]. Available: <http://studentlife.tamu.edu/gies/programs/>.

Texas A&M University, Office of University Relations. (2002). *President Robert Gates addresses faculty senate*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.tamu.edu/univrel/aggiedaily/news/stories/02/091002-4.html>.

Texas A&M University v. Gay Student Services, 471 U.S. 112 (1985).

Texas State Data Center (TSDC). (2001). *2001 population projections - State of Texas* [On-line]. Available: http://txsdc.tamu.edu/tpepp/2001_txpopprj_txtotnum.php.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59 (1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). (1990). (Editor's Notes). *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tierney, W. G. (1992). Building academic communities of difference: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus. *Change*, 24 (2), 40-46.

Torres-Reyna, O. & Shapiro, R. Y. (2002). The polls-trends: Women and sexual orientation in the military. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 618-632.

Troy, M., & Green, B. (2001a). *Work life satisfaction survey for administrative, professional and support staff* (Research Rep. No. 117). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University, Measurement and Research Services.

Troy, M. & Green, B. (2001b). *Work life satisfaction survey of faculty* (Research Rep. No. 118). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University, Measurement and Research Services.

Tygart, C. E. (2002). Legal rights to homosexuals into the areas of domestic partnerships and marriages: Public support and genetic causation attribution. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25 (3), 20-28.

Waldo, C. R. (1998). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26 (5), 745-774.

Waldo, C. R., & Kemp, J. L. (1997). Should I come out to my students? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 34 (2), 79-94.

Watkins, B. L. (1998). Bending toward justice: Examining and dismantling heterosexism on college and university campuses. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators* (pp. 267-276). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Yeager, D. (1999). *Gay & lesbian life at Texas A&M: An interview of Shaun Travers*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.rtis.com/reg/bcs/pol/touchstone/september99/gaylife.html>.

APPENDIX A

Assessment of Climate for Underrepresented Groups

Doctoral Researcher: Kerry Noack

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

May 5, 2003

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am a doctoral student conducting a research study on the campus climate at Texas A&M University. I am requesting your cooperation as a voluntary participant in this study, which will provide the University with a more in-depth understanding of the campus climate as it pursues the goals set forth in Vision 2020 and continues to work on improving the environment for working and learning at the University.

This study is about your campus experiences with diversity, your attitudes and actions relative to diversity issues, your background information, and your thoughts on the campus climate. You are being asked to voluntarily participate in this study because you are a member of the faculty, professional staff, or administration at Texas A&M University. You are one of a limited, random sample.

Please complete the *Assessment of Climate for Underrepresented Groups* and mail it in the postage paid envelope. It will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete the survey. Please return the survey by May 19.

Obviously, you do not have to complete any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. Additionally, since this survey was used in a nation-wide benchmark study, there may be questions that will not pertain to you.

The study will be conducted in a manner that will ensure complete confidentiality. The surveys will not be coded or marked in any manner that would lead to any opportunity to identify you. All completed paper surveys will be mailed to a researcher at The Pennsylvania State University. The data from all completed surveys will be processed by the researcher at The Pennsylvania State University and submitted to me in aggregate form. In order to track the number of respondents and to conduct appropriate follow-ups if needed, participants are requested to mail the enclosed, randomly numbered postcard to a separate address. Hence, all I will know is that you have mailed the postcard indicating that you have completed the survey. There will be no possibility of connecting your responses to you.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

Please take a few minutes to complete and return the survey. Your participation is crucial to the success of the project.

Thanks,

Kerry W. Noack
Doctoral Researcher
(979) 845-0532
k-noack@tamu.edu

Stan Carpenter, Ph.D.
Chair, Advisory Committee
(979) 845-2706
stanc@tamu.edu

Assessment of Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups

CAMPUS
CODE #

1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Rationale: You have been selected to participate in a survey of students, faculty, and staff regarding the climate on your campus for underrepresented groups. This survey is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential. Individuals will not be identified, and only group data will be reported.

Directions: Please read and answer each question carefully. For each answer, darken the appropriate oval completely. If you want to change an answer, erase your first answer completely and darken the oval of your new answer. You may decline to answer specific questions. **Your answers will be scored by machine, so please use a NUMBER 2 PENCIL.**

Questions concerning this project should be directed to:

Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D.
Senior Diversity Planning Analyst
313 Grange Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-8415
srx2@psu.edu

© Copyright 2000, Rankin

Part 1. Campus experiences with diversity

Within the past year, have you....

1-1 Heard a student make insensitive or disparaging remarks about ...

	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10 or more times
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

1-3 Heard a faculty member make insensitive or disparaging remarks about ...

	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10 or more times
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

1-2 Heard a staff member make insensitive or disparaging remarks about ...

	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10 or more times
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

1-4 Heard a teaching assistant make insensitive or disparaging remarks about ...

	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10 or more times
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

1-5 Heard an administrator make insensitive or disparaging remarks about ...

	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10 or more times
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

1-6 Have you personally experienced harassment (any conduct that has interfered unreasonably with your ability to work or learn) on this campus?

- Yes
- No (if no, skip to question 1-7)

1-6a Do you feel that this conduct was due to ... (Mark all that apply)

- your race
- your gender
- your sexual orientation
- your age
- your disability
- your religious beliefs
- your ethnicity
- other

1-6b In what form was this conduct? (Mark all that apply)

- derogatory remarks
- written comments
- anonymous phone calls
- unsolicited e-mails
- graffiti
- threats of physical violence
- actual physical assault or injury
- other

1-6c Where did this conduct occur? (Mark all that apply)

- in a class
- in a residence hall
- in a campus office
- in a public space on campus (e.g. student union)
- while working at a College/University job
- while walking on campus
- campus event

1-6d Who was the source of this conduct? (Mark all that apply)

- student
- faculty
- teaching assistant
- resident assistant
- administrator
- staff member
- campus police
- don't know

PAGE 2

1-7 Have you observed any conduct on this campus that you feel has created an offensive, hostile, intimidating working or learning environment?

- Yes
- No (if no, skip to question 1-8)

1-7a Do you feel that this conduct created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment for persons of different ... (Mark all that apply)

- races
- genders
- sexual orientations
- ages
- abilities
- religious beliefs
- ethnicities
- other

1-7b In what form was this conduct? (Mark all that apply)

- derogatory remarks
- written comments
- publications on campus
- unsolicited e-mails
- graffiti
- threats of physical violence
- actual physical assault or injury
- other

1-7c Where did this conduct occur?

- in a classroom
- in a residence hall
- in a public space on campus (e.g. student union)
- in a campus office
- campus event

1-7d Who was the source of this conduct? (Mark all that apply)

- student/student group
- faculty member
- teaching assistant
- resident assistant
- administrator
- staff member
- campus police
- don't know

1-8 Are you employed by the College/University?

- Yes
- No (if no, skip to Part 2)

While employed, did you encounter any of the following? (Mark one for each line)

1-9 I experienced discriminatory hiring based on ... Note: Discriminatory refers to a prejudicial bias

	Yes	No		Yes	No
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Religious background	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Non-English speaking status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Age differences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1-10 I experienced discriminatory firing based on ...

	Yes	No		Yes	No
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Religious background	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Non-English speaking status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Age differences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1-11 I experienced discriminatory promotion based on...

	Yes	No		Yes	No
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Religious background	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Non-English speaking status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Age differences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1-12 The people in the offices I frequent are accepting of persons of different...

	Yes	No		Yes	No
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Religious background	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Non-English speaking status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Age differences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Part 2. Attitudes and actions relative to diversity issues

2-1 Generally speaking, how much contact would you say you have with persons of the following backgrounds?

	None	Slight	Some	Freq.	Very Freq.
African Americans/Blacks	1	2	3	4	5
American Indians/Alaskan Natives	1	2	3	4	5
Asians/Pacific Islanders	1	2	3	4	5
Chicanos/Latinos/Hispanics	1	2	3	4	5
Middle Eastern	1	2	3	4	5
Whites/Caucasians	1	2	3	4	5
Openly gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with religious backgrounds other than your own	1	2	3	4	5

2-2 Would you be comfortable being close friends, roommates, or office partners with a person who is ... (please mark one response for each category)

	Close Friend		Roommate		Share Office	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
African American/Black	<input type="radio"/>					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	<input type="radio"/>					
Asian/Pacific Islander	<input type="radio"/>					
Chicano/Latino/Hispanic	<input type="radio"/>					
Middle Eastern	<input type="radio"/>					
White/Caucasian	<input type="radio"/>					
Non-native English speaking	<input type="radio"/>					
heterosexual woman	<input type="radio"/>					
heterosexual man	<input type="radio"/>					
openly lesbian or bisexual woman	<input type="radio"/>					
openly gay or bisexual man	<input type="radio"/>					
transgender man or woman	<input type="radio"/>					
person with disability	<input type="radio"/>					
person with religious beliefs different than your own	<input type="radio"/>					
person with HIV or AIDS	<input type="radio"/>					

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

2-3 The College/University thoroughly addresses campus issues related to ...

	Strongly Agree		Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	
	1	2		3	4
race or racism	1	2	3	4	5
gender or sexism	1	2	3	4	5
sexual orientation or heterosexism/ homophobia	1	2	3	4	5
age or ageism	1	2	3	4	5
disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
religious beliefs or religious harassment	1	2	3	4	5

2-4 The College/University has visible leadership from the administration who foster diversity on campus.

Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) Uncertain (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

2-5 The curriculum adequately represents the contributions of people from underrepresented groups.

Note: Underrepresented groups refer to women, people of color, people with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender people, non-Christian people, non-native English speaking people.

Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) Uncertain (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

2-6 The classroom climate is welcoming for students from underrepresented groups.

Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) Uncertain (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

2-7 The workplace climate is welcoming for employees from underrepresented groups.

Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) Uncertain (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5)

How likely are you, as an individual, to...

2-8 Challenge others on racially derogatory comments.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-9 Challenge others on ethnically derogatory comments.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-10 Challenge others on derogatory comments regarding sexual orientation/gender identity.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-11 Feel disapproval for a display of public affection (e.g. kiss) by a heterosexual couple.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-12 Feel disapproval for a display of public affection (e.g. kiss) by a gay or lesbian couple.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-13 Refuse to participate in comments or jokes that are derogatory toward persons in underrepresented groups.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-14 Voice disapproval at offensive graffiti directed at persons from underrepresented groups.

Very Unlikely (1) Somewhat Unlikely (2) Uncertain (3) Somewhat Likely (4) Very Likely (5)

2-15 How would you rate the overall campus climate for diversity in regards to the following groups:

	Very Accepting (1)	Accepting (2)	Uncertain (3)	Not Accepting (4)	Not at all Accepting (5)
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Women	1	2	3	4	5
African Americans/Blacks	1	2	3	4	5
American Indians/Alaskan Natives	1	2	3	4	5
Asians/Pacific Islanders	1	2	3	4	5
Chicanos/Latinos/Hispanics	1	2	3	4	5
Whites/Caucasians	1	2	3	4	5
Gay Men	1	2	3	4	5
Lesbians	1	2	3	4	5
Bisexual Men or Women	1	2	3	4	5
Transgender Persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with religious backgrounds different from your own	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of ages different than your own	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5

Part 3. Background information**3-1 What is your gender?**

- female
- male
- transgender

3-2 What is your sexual identity?

- bisexual
- gay
- lesbian
- heterosexual
- uncertain

3-3 What is your age?

- 22 or under
- 23-32
- 33-42
- 43-52
- 53 and over

3-4 What is your position?

- undergraduate student
- professional student (e.g. law, medicine)
- graduate student
- staff
- administrator
- faculty

3-5 Are you full-time or part-time?

- full-time
- part-time

3-6 Do you have a disability that substantially limits a major life activity (such as seeing, hearing, learning, walking)?

- Yes
- No

3-7 With what racial/ethnic group do you identify? (If you are of a multi-racial/multi-ethnic background, mark all that apply.)

- African American/Black
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Chicano/Latino/Hispanic
- White/Caucasian

3-8 What is your citizenship status?

- US citizen - born in the United States
- US citizen - naturalized
- permanent resident (immigrant)
- international (F-1 or J-1 visa)

3-9 To whom are you most attracted?

- women
- men
- both men and women

3-10 If you are a student, where do you live?

- residence hall
- other campus housing (e.g. co-op)
- off campus
- family student housing
- fraternity or sorority house

3-11 If you are a student, are you a member of a Greek letter organization?

- Yes
- No

Part 4. How to improve the campus climate

In your opinion, how would each of the following affect the climate for underrepresented groups on your campus?

Note: Climate refers to the current perceptions and attitudes of faculty, staff and students.

4-1 Provide more awareness/sensitivity workshops/programs to help members of the campus community become more aware of the concerns of ...

	Worsen Considerably	Worsen Slightly	No Change	Improve Slightly	Improve Considerably
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

4-2 Require all students to take at least one class that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives on ...

	Worsen Considerably	Worsen Slightly	No Change	Improve Slightly	Improve Considerably
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

4-3 Require all staff to take at least one class that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives on ...

	Worsen Considerably	Worsen Slightly	No Change	Improve Slightly	Improve Considerably
Women	1	2	3	4	5
Men	1	2	3	4	5
Racial minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnic minorities	1	2	3	4	5
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered persons	1	2	3	4	5
Persons with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
Non-native English speakers	1	2	3	4	5
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Older or younger persons	1	2	3	4	5

4-4 Provide more art, music, and cultural events that recognize distinctive cultures.

Worsen	Worsen	No	Improve	Improve
Considerably	Slightly	Change	Slightly	Considerably
①	②	③	④	⑤

4-5 Provide more art, music and cultural events that recognize lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender persons.

Worsen	Worsen	No	Improve	Improve
Considerably	Slightly	Change	Slightly	Considerably
①	②	③	④	⑤

4-6 Provide more art, music and cultural events that recognize persons with disabilities.

Worsen	Worsen	No	Improve	Improve
Considerably	Slightly	Change	Slightly	Considerably
①	②	③	④	⑤

4-7 Include services that enhance the campus climate for diversity as one of the criteria for faculty/staff evaluation.

Worsen	Worsen	No	Improve	Improve
Considerably	Slightly	Change	Slightly	Considerably
①	②	③	④	⑤

4-8 Please rate the campus climate in general using the following scale:

Friendly	①	②	③	④	⑤	Hostile
Communicative	①	②	③	④	⑤	Reserved
Concerned	①	②	③	④	⑤	Indifferent
Respectful	①	②	③	④	⑤	Disrespectful
Cooperative	①	②	③	④	⑤	Uncooperative
Competitive	①	②	③	④	⑤	Noncompetitive
Improving	①	②	③	④	⑤	Worsening
Accessible to Persons with Disabilities	①	②	③	④	⑤	Inaccessible to Persons with Disabilities
Non-racist	①	②	③	④	⑤	Racist
Non-sexist	①	②	③	④	⑤	Sexist
Non-homophobic	①	②	③	④	⑤	Homophobic

Return Postcard

Please mail this postcard when you
mail the survey.

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX B

Follow-up Postcard

Dear Respondent--

As a member of the faculty, professional staff, or administration at Texas A&M, you were recently selected to participate in an assessment of the current campus climate at TAMU. You should have received a packet of information that included the *Assessment of Climate for Underrepresented Groups* survey and a postcard acknowledging your participation. **If you have not already done so, please complete and mail the survey at your earliest convenience.** Since you are part of a limited, random sample, your participation is crucial to the success of this project. The due date for the survey is June 19.

If you have any questions, or would like to request a new survey packet, please contact me at 845-0532 or k-noack@tamu.edu.

Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thanks!

APPENDIX C

Assessment of Climate for Underrepresented Groups Doctoral Researcher: Kerry Noack

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

June 27, 2003

Dear TAMU Employee,

On May 5, a survey assessing the campus climate at Texas A&M University among the faculty, professional staff, and administration was mailed to you. If you recently returned the survey instrument, please accept sincere thanks for your cooperation and time.

If you have not yet returned the survey, I would greatly appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the survey and return it by **July 18**. Your participation is vital to the success of this study as you are one of a limited, random sample.

Your voluntary participation in this study will provide the University with a more in-depth understanding of the campus climate as it pursues the goals set forth in Vision 2020 and continues to work on improving the environment for working and learning at the University.

This study is about your campus experiences with diversity, your attitudes and actions relative to diversity issues, your background information, and your thoughts on the campus climate.

Obviously, you do not have to complete any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. Additionally, since this survey was used in a nation-wide benchmark study, there may be questions that will not pertain to you.

The study will be conducted in a manner that will ensure complete confidentiality. The surveys will not be coded or marked in any manner that would lead to any opportunity to identify you. All completed paper surveys will be mailed to a researcher at The Pennsylvania State University. The data from all completed surveys will be processed by the researcher at The Pennsylvania State University and submitted to me in aggregate form. In order to track the number of respondents and to conduct appropriate follow-ups if needed, participants are requested to mail the enclosed, randomly numbered postcard to a separate address. Hence, all I will know is that you have mailed the postcard indicating that you have completed the survey. There will be no possibility of connecting your responses to you.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

Please take a few minutes to complete and return the survey by **July 18**. *Your participation is crucial to the success of the project.* THANK YOU!

Sincerely,

Kerry W. Noack
Doctoral Researcher
(979) 845-0532
k-noack@tamu.edu

Stan Carpenter, Ph.D.
Chair, Advisory Committee
(979) 845-2706
stanc@tamu.edu

APPENDIX D

Questions Used In Data Analysis

- 1-1 Heard a student make insensitive or disparaging remarks about. . .
- 1-2 Heard a staff member make insensitive or disparaging remarks about. . .
- 1-3 Heard a faculty member make insensitive or disparaging remarks about. . .
- 1-4 Heard a teaching assistant make insensitive or disparaging remarks about. . .
- 1-5 Heard an administrator make insensitive or disparaging remarks about. . .
- 2-1 Generally speaking, how much contact would you say you have with persons of the following backgrounds?
- 2-2 Would you be comfortable being close friends, roommates, or office partners with a person who is . . .
- 2-10 Challenge others on derogatory comments regarding sexual orientation/gender identity.
- 2-11 Feel disapproval for a display of public affection (e.g. kiss) by a heterosexual couple.
- 2-12 Feel disapproval for a display of public affection (e.g. kiss) by a gay or lesbian couple.
- 3-1 What is your gender?
- 3-2 What is sexual identity?
- 3-3 What is your age?
- 3-4 What is your position?

- 3-5 Are you full-time or part-time?
- 3-6 With what racial/ethnic group do you identify? (If you are of a multi-racial/multi-ethnic background, mark all that apply.)
- 4-8 Please rate the campus climate in general using the following scale:

VITA

KERRY WAYNE NOACK
408 Onyx Drive
College Station, TX 77845

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

- 2004 Doctor of Philosophy
 Educational Administration
 Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
- 1990 Master of Arts
 Communications
 West Texas A&M University, Canyon, TX
- 1986 Bachelor of General Studies
 West Texas State University, Canyon, TX

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

- 8/00-Present Testing Services Administrator
 Measurement and Research Services
 Texas A&M University
 College Station, TX
- 1/96-08/00 Academic Advisor
 Office of Professional School Advising
 Texas A&M University
 College Station, TX
- 02/93-1/96 Senior Director for Educational Services
 Department of Student Services
 West Texas A&M University
 Canyon, TX
- 01/91-02/93 Director of Student Activities Council and Testing
 Student Services
 West Texas State University
 Canyon, TX