Title

"Who am I to Judge?": How a Jesuit University Addresses LGBT Issues on Campus

Permalink

Author

Hughes, Bryce Edward

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

"Who am I to Judge?":

How a Jesuit University Addresses LGBT Issues on Campus

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Education

by

Bryce Edward Hughes

2015

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

"Who am I to Judge?":

How a Jesuit University Addresses LGBT Issues on Campus

by

Bryce Edward Hughes

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2015

Professor Sylvia Hurtado, Chair

Although higher education has become more welcoming and inclusive of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) faculty, staff, and students, many religiously affiliated colleges and universities face challenges to create an LGBT-affirming environment due to religious beliefs regarding homosexuality. Jesuit universities, grounded in their commitment to holistic education and social justice, offer different models of practice in engaging the tension between religious proscriptions against homosexuality and providing support for the campus LGBT community. The purpose of this study then was to explore how members of a Jesuit, Catholic university addresses LGBT issues and organizational change.

The conceptual framework guiding this study brings together a model for understanding grassroots leadership in higher education with the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) to examine the everyday, sometimes invisible tactics and strategies employed by faculty, staff, and students at a Jesuit university to improve the climate for the

campus LGBT community. This case study triangulates interviews with 43 grassroots leaders and 9 administrators, document review, and participant-observations. Embedded cross-case analyses were employed to highlight differences by constituent group (faculty, staff, students, and administrators), sexual orientation (sexual minority or heterosexual), and religious affiliation (Catholic or other affiliation).

Findings documented the conditions facing grassroots leaders at the institution as well as the tactics and strategies employed by grassroots leaders, their motivation for engaging in LGBT work, and sources of resilience. The campus climate was found to be generally positive, but participants pointed to areas where oppression persisted and continual education was needed. Participants also navigated a set of power dynamics, which were shaped by the university's Catholic identity, but they encountered these dynamics less frequently than in earlier socio-historical eras on campus. Participants demonstrated a strong commitment to the university's Jesuit mission, and for many, their involvement in LGBT issues was motivated by their religious beliefs. Tactics employed ranged from storytelling and allyship to more organized tactics like partnering with influential allies such as Jesuit priests. Finally, participants identified intrinsic and extrinsic sources of resilience. This study contributes to research on organizational change, campus climate, and shatters myths regarding LGBT members at religiously-affiliated institutions.

The dissertation of Bryce Edward Hughes is approved.

Robert A. Rhoads

Patricia M. McDonough

Adrianna J. Kezar

Sylvia Hurtado, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2015

Dedication

To Wade

For all your sacrifices and support – I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although I like to consider myself a hard-working, driven person, as a wise HEOC mentor of mine many times reminded me, scholarship is a team sport. There are countless individuals who have entered my life and offered their support and wisdom that have shaped my journey to this PhD. This list of acknowledgements is just the tip of the iceberg of support that has helped propel me forward to reach this goal.

First and foremost, I could never thank my family enough for their love and support over the years. Wade, I don't think I have ever taken enough time to express how much it meant to me to have you by my side when I decided to begin this PhD, even uprooting you from one of your favorite cities on this earth to live for four years in one of your least. You were with me when I completed my master's degree, and I can't wait to share many more milestones to come. You also are one of the most selfless people I know, and I hope I can only provide you a fraction of the support you've provided me as you pursue your writing goals as well. And, of course, I am so glad you brought Peter and Piper into my life because sometimes when I'm feeling overwhelmed with my work, it's nice to have these two cats to spend time with. Even their sleeping helps calm the environment while I work.

I also of course owe a great debt to my parents and my sister for shaping me into the person I am and encouraging me to seek ever greater challenges as life has progressed. To my parents, you not only provided the love and support I needed to thrive, but you were also willing to provide the "tough love" I needed at times to stay focused on achieving what I wanted in life. You both are also incredibly inspiring as first-generation college students who worked very hard to be able to provide the opportunities both Elyse and I have had the privilege to take advantage of. Please rest assured that the reason Elyse and I ventured as far from home as we have as adults

was because of the solid foundation you provided as well as the safe shelter to return to from time to time. And Elyse, my partner in crime, even though you have yet to make it to one of my college graduations, I still feel your support from afar. I promise I will return to visit you in New York, especially since I will no longer benefit from your surprise visits to Los Angeles!

This study, and my degree, could never have been possible without the incredible support network I have enjoyed in the HEOC program at UCLA. Much of that is due from learning from the best. Sylvia, it has been a privilege to learn not only from one of the foremost experts in the field, but from one of the most caring, generous, and supportive scholars I have ever known. Your warmth and wisdom were well-spent, and you have set an incredible example for me as I commence my own academic career. I am also incredibly grateful for the gifts each of my committee members have provided me throughout this dissertation process. Rob, I am consistently impressed by your patient and meticulous approach to teaching and mentoring future scholars; your insights continually challenge me to think more deeply about my work and the new directions I will take it in the future. Pat, from meeting with you about my first 250A three-page paper through my year as a HEOC rep to my dissertation, your mentorship, guidance, and realistic perspective have helped me remain grounded and focused on the end goal. Finally, Adrianna, I am grateful for your conceptualization of grassroots leadership in helping me put words around some of my own past experiences; thank you for being willing to venture out to Westwood to offer your experience and expertise to make this dissertation as rich and meaningful as it has been.

In addition to my official committee, two other scholars at UCLA have played an important role in helping shape me into the scholar I am now, though they have not been directly involved in the conceptualization and development of my dissertation study, but they. Kevin

Eagan, both as our NIH postdoc and now our co-PI, from that first paper we presented at AIR in New Orleans through our current project for the National Academy of Engineering, you exemplify what it means to be a productive scholar who always leaves his door open to answer the most inane of questions graduate students (I) may have. Mitch Chang, you provided much-needed mentorship early in my program, but more importantly, cemented for me that the significance of educational research lies in how it addresses important problems and informs practice.

Beyond faculty, some of the most important lessons I have learned in the HEOC program were from my peers in the program. Tanya Figueroa, you were my HEOC boo. From the year we wrote too many papers, to progressing through our dissertations together, you have been a consistent source of life and laughter throughout my time in the program. I appreciated all the times you offered to read through my work for me, and thank you for showing me around Puerto Rico! Gina Garcia, although we only worked on one paper together, your mentorship helped me decipher the hidden curriculum of the HEOC program, and you always were (and still are) willing to offer a critical eye to many of my papers and proposals. Juan Garibay, it was an honor to learn from you as one of my 299 TA's as well as beside you co-authoring several papers on the NIH project. Adriana Ruiz Alvarado, I appreciate being able to work with you on papers beyond the NIH project, although I'm especially grateful for all the work you do in STEM education (wink, wink). Marcia Fuentes, thank you as my HEOC mentor who helped me learn the ropes and introduce me to life as a PhD student in the program.

Because my advisor attracts some of the most talented scholars to the HEOC program, I have also benefited from the network of support that our small community of scholars has built over the years. I'm appreciative for the wisdom Marcela Cuellar and Lucy Arellano left with me

as they departed HEOC just as I was getting started, and I am also thankful for Sylvia's advisees who will remain in the program after I graduate—Abbie Bates, Joe Ramirez, Theresa Stewart, and Ashlee Wilkins—for providing me the opportunity to demonstrate that I actually had learned a thing or two over the years. In addition, although we have drifted in many directions since we first entered the program, the sense of community fostered by my cohort of Brit Toven-Lindsey, Adrian Huerta, George Ingersoll, Sayil Camacho, Laura Paulson, Amber Hroch, Antoní Trochez, and Michael Soh helped me feel welcome when I first started; you were some of my first friends in Los Angeles. I am also grateful to Carrie Miller for all the times we've served as each other's sounding boards over the years in addition to the time we spent together as HEOC reps.

In addition to my peers, HERI has provided me a challenging, dynamic work environment in addition to affording me the much-needed funding to enable my enrollment in the HEOC program. To my fellow CIRP GSRs who I have worked with over the years—Jen Berdan Lozano, Lesley McBain, Laura Bernhard, and Hannah Whang—your companionship and humor has helped keep the work environment warm and make me feel at home. Silvio Vallejos, Maria Suchard, Erik Butcher, and Carmen Chiuco, you are what keeps HERI functioning smoothly, and I thank you for even the small ways you make it that much easier for me to fulfill my responsibilities as a GSR. Ellen Stolzenberg, thank you for what you do for HERI, but even more so, thank you for pitching in and making one of the most unnerving times of my PhD program—the parking garage flood—so much more bearable through helping me get to and from campus. Dominique Harrison, we started together and we've grown and developed with HERI together. I can't tell you how much I've enjoyed getting to know you, and how much I appreciate all your hard work supporting our NIH team. Venus Ocampo, I miss your cut-to-the-chase attitude around the office, and I thank you for making it that much easier for me to get in touch

with my advisor and keep me moving forward in my program. And Alex Gomez, I miss you too, but I'm glad you are still on campus so I can see you from time to time. I am so grateful for the friendship we formed, and I will miss you when I move on from UCLA.

Beyond UCLA, I have cultivated a strong and growing professional network who have contributed in many ways to my own development as a scholar. Dian Squire, I am grateful for your willingness to review my work, and I am glad we have stayed in touch throughout this experience. I look forward to seeing where our professional relationship progresses next. Kris Renn, you have been an incredible mentor for me outside of UCLA in helping me conceptualize new directions to take my LGBT work and to challenge me to maintain a high level of rigor in all that I do. I appreciate all you've provided me and others in the field in establishing a solid body of literature around queer issues in higher education. And Kim Griffin, it may have seemed like a small, obvious piece of advice at the time, but I would not be where I am now were it not for the perspective you offered me as I was making my decision about which program to enroll in for my doctorate. I have been in a similar position now several times with prospective students considering multiple offers, and I will assure you I have been passing down your wisdom along to these new generations of scholars.

I also would not be at this point were it not for my colleagues and friends in the student affairs field. I am especially grateful to my former colleagues at Green River Community College who gave me my first professional opportunity following my master's program, especially Jhon Valencia who I hold dear in my heart, and to my mentors from Seattle University who taught me much about the field of higher education and student affairs. Erin Swezey and Jeremy Stringer, thank you for all your mentorship and guidance, and Bridget Turner Kelly, thank you for being such a role model in my life who inspired me to choose the path that I have

taken. Erica Yamamura, thank you for being a bridge between Seattle U and UCLA—I would not be where I am were it not for your assistance while I was in the throes of doctoral program applications. However, I also owe much to my mentors at Gonzaga who took a chance on me when I was a college senior and put forth our proposal to establish the LGBT Center at the university. Raymond Reyes and Sima Thorpe, without that opportunity I likely would not have remained in higher education and thus been on a completely different journey at this point in my life, one that may not have been as rich and meaningful as this journey has been.

To everyone from my study site, Chardin University, who participated in this study, although I cannot name you by name, my earning this degree is a direct result of your willingness to help me out. I am in deep gratitude to each and every one of you for taking the time to share your incredibly personal and moving stories with me. You each share in this accomplishment.

Finally, I would like to thank the ACPA Foundation, the NASPA Foundation's Channing Briggs Small Research Grant program, and the National Association for Campus Activities for the research grants you provided for this study. This dissertation would not have been nearly as feasible to complete were it not for your partnership in this work. I look forward to sharing the findings with each professional community in the coming year.

VITA

2000	Billings Central Catholic High School Billings, MT
2004	B.S., General Engineering Gonzaga University Spokane, WA
2004-2006	Special Project Coordinator LGBT Resource Center Gonzaga University Spokane, WA
2006-2008	Research Analyst Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Seattle University Seattle, WA
2008	Teaching Assistant SDAD 578 Seattle University Seattle, WA
2008	M.A., Student Development Administration Seattle University Seattle, WA
2008-2011	Commencement Achievement Program Support Supervisor Diversity and Multicultural Affairs Green River Community College Auburn, WA
2011-2015	Research Analyst Higher Education Research Institute University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA
2011-2014	Hobson Award Fellowship Graduate School of Education and Information Studies University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA

2012, 2013	Graduate Summer Research Mentorship Fellowship
	Graduate Division
	University of California, Los Angeles
	Los Angeles, CA
2013	Teaching Assistant
	CHS 160
	University of California, Los Angeles
	Los Angeles, CA
2014	Faculty Award
	Higher Education and Organizational Change
	University of California, Los Angeles
	Los Angeles, CA

PUBLICATIONS AND SELECT PRESENTATIONS

Eagan, K., Hurtado, S., Figueroa, T. & Hughes, B. (2014). *Examining STEM pathways among students who begin college at four-year institutions* [Commissioned paper]. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences. Available at www.nationalacademies.org

Hughes, B. (2014). Book review: *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: Grassroots leadership in higher education* by Adrianna J. Kezar and Jaime Lester. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 10*(1).

_____. & Hurtado, S. (2013). College experiences that contribute to students' thinking about their sexual orientation identity. In National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), *Bold Without Boundaries: The Annual Knowledge Community Conference Publication* [White paper] (pp. 28-30). Washington, DC: NASPA. Available at www.naspa.org

_____., Huston, T., & Stein, J. (2011). Using case studies to help faculty navigate difficult classroom moments. *College Teaching, 59*(1), 7-12.

_____. (2008). LGBT legal issues in Jesuit higher education. *Magis: A Student Development Journal, 2*, 15-22.

Hurtado S., Hughes, B.E., Figueroa, T., Eagan, M.K., & Wilkins, A. (2015, April). *Replenishing STEM pipelines: Factors that contribute to undecided students' completion of STEM bachelor's degrees*. Poster presented the American Educational Research Association annual conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Hughes, B.E., Renn, K.A., Abes, E.S., Jourian, T.J., Means, D.R., Denton, J.M., & Robinson, C.S. (2014, November). *Queering the academy: Queer theory as a theoretical foundation*

in higher education research. Symposium presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual conference, Washington, DC.

_____., Hurtado, S., & Eagan, M.K. (2014, November). *Driving up or dialing down competition in introductory STEM courses: Individual and classroom level factors.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual conference, Washington, DC.

_____. (2014, April). *"Managing by not managing": How engineering students manage sexual orientation*. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association annual conference, Indianapolis, IN.

_____., Ruiz Alvarado, A., & Hurtado, S. (2014, March). *Making privilege visible: Practices that increase salience of dominant identities*. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association annual conference, Indianapolis, IN.

_____. & Hurtado, S. (2013, November). *Investing in the future: Testing the efficacy of socialization within undergraduate engineering degree programs*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, St Louis, MO.

Garibay, J., Hughes, B., Eagan, K., & Hurtado, S. (May 2013). *Beyond the bachelor's: What influences STEM post-baccalaureate pathways*. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum, Long Beach, CA.

Hughes, B., Garibay, J., Hurtado, S., & Eagan, K. (2013, April). *Examining the tracks that cause derailment: Institutional contexts and engineering degree attainments*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual conference, San Francisco, CA.

Figueroa, T., Hughes, B., & Hurtado, S. (2013, April). *Supporting future scientists: Predicting minority student participation in the STEM opportunity structure in higher education*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Rio Grande, PR.

Hughes, B.E., & Hurtado, S. (2012, November). *College experiences that contribute to students' thinking about their sexual orientation identity*. Paper presented at the annual Association for the Study of Higher Education conference, Las Vegas, NV.

Hurtado, S., Eagan, M.K., & Hughes, B. (2012, June). *Priming the pump or the sieve: Institutional contexts and underrepresented minority STEM degree attainment*. Paper presented at Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum, New Orleans, LA.

Endersby, L., & Hughes, B. (2012, March). *From mentor to navigator: The changing tides of mentorship*. Presentation at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators annual conference, Phoenix, AZ.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Who am I to judge?" replied Pope Francis, less than five months into his tenure as head of the Roman Catholic Church, on a flight back to Rome from Brazil in response to a question from reporter about his thoughts on gay priests (Donadio, 2013). The impromptu remark surprised the media, and much of the world in turn, given the difference in the tone of his response compared to what may have been expected of his predecessors, Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI. In her article in *The New York Times*, Rachel Donadio pointed specifically to Francis's use of the colloquial Italian word for "gay," rather than the more formal, clinical term "homosexual," as a major indication of this shift in position. In addition to this remark, the Pope provided an exclusive interview to *America* magazine, published by the Society of Jesus (the Jesuit order) in the United States, where Francis made a statement that the Church ought to soften its emphasis on preaching about controversial moral concerns, like abortion or same-sex marriage, in order to become more compassionate in its work (Spadaro, S.J., 2013). Together, these statements signaled a change in tone as to how the Catholic Church might address LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) ministry and outreach moving forward. As the Pope himself is a Jesuit, much has been speculated as to what this shift may mean for the various works of the Society of Jesus, most especially the 28 colleges and universities run by the Jesuits in the United States.

Problem Statement

Considering the context of American higher education broadly, the climate for LGBT students, faculty, and staff has improved dramatically in recent years. Reflecting back on research conducted by d'Augelli (1989), Rhoads (1994), and Dilley (2002) on the experiences of

lesbian and gay students in higher education and work by Tierney (1992), Taylor and Raeburn (1995), and Martin (1996) on the experiences of lesbian and gay faculty, one can see that much has changed over the past three decades to make higher education more welcoming for and inclusive of LGBT students and faculty. For instance, where LGBT students once resorted to filing lawsuits against colleges and universities to fight for their First Amendment right to assemble (Dilley, 2002; Kaplin & Lee, 1997; Lacey, 1986), today LGBT student organizations are nearly ubiquitous across American higher education with larger institutions often hosting more than one, and LGBT campus resource centers are becoming a common fixture at many colleges and universities across the nation (Marine, 2011). Although much of this reflects the increased acceptance of LGBT people across the nation in general (Drake, 2013), colleges and universities have often preceded society in terms of LGBT activism and the adoption of policies to foster LGBT inclusion and participation (Dilley, 2002; Lacey, 1986; Renn, 2010; Rhoads, 1994).

Despite these advances, providing a welcoming and inclusive climate for LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education remains an issue with which college and university administrators continue to grapple. Homophobia and heterosexism continue to pervade the societal culture within which colleges and universities operate (Blumenfeld, 2000), and thus these oppressive forces influence the climate and culture within individual institutions (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010; Renn, 2010). For instance, Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, and Frazer (2010) found in their national study of the climate in higher education for LGBT people that LGBT respondents experienced significantly more harassment, have significantly more negative impressions of campus climate, and were resultantly more likely to consider leaving their institutions than heterosexuals. This struggle to provide a welcoming and inclusive

climate for LGBT people is especially evident at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities (Love, 1997, 1998; Wolff & Himes, 2010).

Many Christian colleges and universities require endorsement of institutional statements of faith from their faculty and staff and include adherence to religious moral principles as part of their codes of conduct for students (Eckholm, 2011; Wolff & Himes, 2010). Citing opposition from their religious denominations to LGBT rights and concerns, these statements of faith and codes of conduct include proscriptions against same-sex sexual activity, but are often interpreted to preclude the provision of support resources provided on other college campuses, such as LGBT student clubs or resource offices. Christian colleges and universities use these statements of faith as a method for transmission of organizational mission and values, and thus are seen as essential to building community on campus, yet they simultaneously have an alienating effect on LGBT members of the campus community, especially those still struggling internally with their individual sexual orientation identities (Eckholm, 2011; Wolff & Himes, 2010). In one recent example, a student at a small Bible college was expelled for her relationship with another woman and was required to repay $6000 in scholarships and financial aid before the school would release her transcripts for transfer (Grasgreen, 2013).

American Catholic Higher Education

American Catholic colleges and universities, as a subset of religiously affiliated institutions, have been dealing with these issues over the past several decades as well (Lacey, 1986; Love, 1998; Maher, 2003). While Catholic institutions typically do not require students and staff to endorse statements of faith, their missions and codes of conduct are guided by the Roman Catholic Church, which has spoken emphatically on the morality of homosexual behavior (Maher, 2003). Catholic colleges and universities also highly value their identity as

3

Catholic, and as such, they strive to portray faithfulness to the Roman Catholic Church (Maher, 2003).

However, Catholic teachings on the matter of homosexuality and gender identity have not been especially instructive in terms of how Catholic colleges and universities ought to support their LGBT communities. Catholic Church teaching refers to homosexuality as "intrinsically disordered" (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, 1975, pt. 8), but that lesbian and gay people should not be subject to unjust discrimination (Catholic Church, 1994, para. 2358). Commonly, this position has been interpreted to mean that while lesbian and gay (and bisexual) people should not be unfairly excluded from society or societal institutions, sexual acts between persons of the same sex are verboten (Maher, 2003). In addition, in 1986, then head of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI) issued a letter instructing Bishops on the matter of pastoral care of lesbian, gay, and bisexual Catholics. This letter specifically addressed the actions of Catholic organizations like Dignity, an organization which aims to support LGBT Catholics, ordering dioceses to disaffiliate from groups that work with LGBT Catholics but do not also assert the Church's teachings on sexual morality. In spite of this mandate, this document also emphasized the Church's stance against unjust discrimination toward LGBT people (Maher, 2003; Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, 1986). Similarly, while the Catholic Church has not conveyed any official teachings on being transgender, sex reassignment surgery (SRS) has been denounced by many Catholic theologians as well as Pope Benedict XVI (Israely, 2008). Therefore, specific behaviors associated with LGBT people have been condemned by the Catholic Church, but these behaviors are typically not among the issues Catholic colleges and universities most commonly confront.

This is not to say that the Catholic Church has not spoken on the matter of the responsibility of Catholic colleges and universities to promulgate the Church's teachings and traditions. In 1990, Pope John Paul II issued an Apostolic Constitution on the matter entitled *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* which outlined the essential aspects of the Catholic mission and identity of Catholic higher education (Pope John Paul II, 1990). Among these was fidelity to the Church's doctrines and teachings, primarily focused on the work of theologians in the employ of Catholic-affiliated postsecondary institutions (Currie, S.J., 2011). Currie further points out that even though there was great fear among academics that the implementation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* would require unambiguous and public assent to teachings with which they might disagree, theologians and Bishops typically take up this matter of fidelity to Church teaching privately. Additionally, the document itself stresses the importance of academic freedom and a Catholic university's responsibility to address contemporary social concerns (Pope John Paul II, 1990). In addition, Maher (2003) highlighted statements in documents from the Vatican and the American Bishops on the responsibility of Catholic elementary and secondary education to educate Catholic youth about sexuality, including addressing homosexuality in a compassionate, understanding manner. While these statements compel Catholic institutions to convey Catholic teachings on homosexuality accurately, they also emphasize the delicate nature of these issues and the importance of addressing them in a faith-centered and educational setting.

As a result, responses to the presence of LGBT individuals on Catholic campuses have been varied (Getz & Kirkley, 2006; Hatmaker, 2013; Love, 1997). Because of the Catholic Church's visible stance on certain LGBT rights issues, most notably same-sex couples' civil right to marry, administrators are often concerned that providing formal support for the LGBT community on campus may be perceived by external constituents as antithetical to the

institution's affiliation with the Catholic Church (Love, 1998). A very recent visible example is that of the University of Notre Dame; after denying multiple requests from students to officially recognize an LGBT student organization, in 2012 the university conceded and approved such an organization as part of a larger plan to improve services for LGBT students ("Notre Dame announces plans for LGBT student organization after extensive push," 2012). Yet the university was still quick to point out that the organization is considered "temporary" and part of a larger pastoral plan, tying it to the school's Catholic mission.

Jesuit Higher Education

Although many Catholic institutions remain opposed to providing formal recognition and support for the LGBT community on campus (O'Loughlin, 2013), Jesuit colleges and universities like Georgetown University have become widely recognized for their efforts to provide services and support for LGBT students, faculty, and staff (Spencer, 2013). In fact, all of the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States have some form of an LGBT student organization (see Appendix A). Several have established formal, institutionally-funded, staffed offices dedicated to providing resources on LGBT issues and support for the LGBT community. This is not to say the process has been easy for these institutions, nor that the campus climate is free of homophobia or heterosexism. These universities have simply decided to address the tensions posed by being affiliated with the Catholic Church and fulfilling their responsibilities to their campus LGBT communities in a different manner than many of their peer Catholic colleges and universities.

Many of the reasons Jesuit colleges and universities may address these tensions in a different manner than their peer Catholic institutions can be located in the Jesuit tradition and mission of these institutions. The first Jesuit colleges in Europe were established by the order's

founder, St. Ignatius of Loyola, in response to requests from civil authorities to organize formal

schools rather than rely on itinerant teachers who were not consistently available to meet

people's educational needs (Ganss, 1991). Ignatius and his first companions who helped him

establish the Jesuit order had met at the University of Paris and were well-trained academically

(Idígoras, 1994), so Ignatius saw the benefit to both the Society of Jesus and to society as a

whole for the Jesuits to establish and administer schools. His vision for education identified the

humanities, such as philosophy and logic, as an important educational foundation to prepare

students both for ministry and other professions, like law or government (Ganss, 1991). Finally,

he explicitly intended courses at Jesuit-operated colleges to be open to the public as part of their

service to society at large (St. Ignatius of Loyola, 1540/1991). The needs of the Church and the

needs of society are frequently in conflict with each other, however, and so these institutions

often found themselves engaging this tension as a way to meet these simultaneous missions—

providing instruction to members of the Society of Jesus and those not entering a life of ministry.

This tension was carried with the Jesuits as they came to the United States to establish

Jesuit missions and schools as well: "…how to retain their distinctive Catholic identity while at

the same time serving the needs of the culture for which they exist" (McKevitt, S.J., 1991, p.

210). Although the first Jesuit university in the United States, Georgetown University, came to

be affiliated with the Society of Jesus when the Society assumed leadership of the existing

institution shortly after its founding, many of the Jesuit colleges and universities currently

operating in the United States were established as missions throughout the nascent and rapidly

expanding country (McKevitt, S.J., 1991). Different institutions thus adapted their pedagogical

approach to meet the unique educational needs of their student bodies. For instance, when Santa

Clara College (now University) had been founded, not long after the Mexican-American war, the

College printed its annual bulletin in English and Spanish and offered bilingual instruction as one-quarter of its student body spoke primarily (or solely) Spanish (McKevitt, S.J., 1991). Jesuit institutions were further called to maintain this cultural responsiveness when the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus in 1972 reasserted that the order's commitment to the Catholic faith requires the Society to work for social justice in accordance with Ignatius's initial vision for the order (Currie, S.J., 2011). In turn, Jesuit colleges and universities have typically included "social justice" as one of their core institutional values.

Bringing together Jesuit institutions' commitment to justice and responsiveness to culture with the Catholic Church's exhortation against unjust discrimination toward LGBT people, it comes as no surprise that Jesuit colleges and universities approach issues that affect the LGBT communities on their campuses in a different manner than other Catholic and religiously-affiliated institutions (Spencer, 2013). Yet little empirical evidence has been collected to understand how Jesuit universities strive to provide a more welcoming and inclusive campus environment for LGBT students, faculty, and staff.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study is to explore how students, faculty, and staff at a Jesuit, Catholic university address the need for organizational change toward creating a welcoming, inclusive environment for LGBT individuals, as well as the tactics and strategies they engage to enact this change. As Jesuit colleges and universities typically feature a well-defined and ubiquitous mission, I am especially interested in uncovering the ways people who are committed to that mission strive to address the critical issue of improving the campus climate for the campus LGBT community and create organizational change that is often perceived as in conflict with the doctrine that inspires and guides institution's Jesuit, Catholic mission, revealing the

complex tensions and dynamics these organizational members encounter as they set about working to achieve change within the organization. I am also concerned with how participants assess both the effectiveness of their work and the organization's commitment to the success of their efforts, and how their roles, identities, and perspectives may be shaped by their positionality within the organization. The research questions guiding this study are:

1. How do students, faculty, and staff determine the need for organizational change in terms of creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for LGBT individuals at a Jesuit, Catholic university?

2. What are the strategies and tactics employed by these campus constituents to precipitate organizational change?

3. How do their multiple social identities, like sexual orientation or Catholic affiliation, influence their perceptions of the need for change as well as the institution's role in addressing these issues?

4. What power dynamics affect the efficacy of strategies and/or tactics to improve campus responsiveness to LGBT issues?

Scope of the Study

As I am interested in studying a contemporary phenomenon within its real-world context, this study employs a case study approach to respond to my research questions (Yin, 2014). More specifically, I developed a case study of a single university in order to analyze perceptions and strategies in creating organizational change across the institution as a whole as well as at group and individual levels within the institution. My primary source of data were in-depth, semi-structured interviews with students, staff, faculty, and administrators at the university in order to understand the phenomenon through their experiences and perceptions, but I also collected

documents and performed participant-observations at the site in order to more fully develop the case and triangulate the data.

As I am interested in understanding leadership and organizational change through the multiple perspectives of organizational members, my study is paradigmatically both constructivist and transformative in nature. Constructivist research is founded on the premise that all knowledge about reality is socially constructed but that these constructions are contextualized within individuals' distinct worldviews (Patton, 2002). Incorporating a transformative perspective then augments my constructivist lens by acknowledging that knowledge construction takes place within the context of power and oppression (Mertens, 2009). Research conducted within the transformative paradigm is concerned with issues of social justice and implications for action to create social change. Finally, my positionality as openly gay, Roman Catholic, and a graduate of two Catholic universities means that I approach this study as an informed outsider in relation to the community I am studying, which contributes to the transformative design of this study as well.

The primary conceptual framework guiding this study is Kezar and Lester's (2011) framework for understanding grassroots leadership in higher education. This framework provides a "bottom-up" perspective on how organizational change happens within an institution of higher education. Kezar and Lester outline the characteristics of grassroots leaders, the types of strategies and tactics they employ to create change, and a taxonomy of the power dynamics grassroots leaders encounter in colleges and universities, among other aspects of grassroots leadership. Their framework assumes that grassroots leadership tends to remain less visible because these individuals push for change on issues that may be at odds with the organization's

mission but do not want to jeopardize their position within the organization due to their own individual commitment to the organization's overall purpose.

Coupled with this framework is the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012). This model is used to conceptualize the campus environment in which grassroots leadership occurs. The MMDLE begins with the assumption that identity is central to the learning process, accounts for the ecological structure of the institution and its environment, and emphasizes the pervasiveness of the campus climate for diversity. The model is especially useful as it points to the curricular and co-curricular spheres of interaction where grassroots leadership takes place, and accounts for the institution's sociohistorical context and external commitments—in the particular case of this study, the study site's commitments to the Society of Jesus and the Roman Catholic Church.

The site for this study, referred to by the pseudonym Chardin University, is a private, Jesuit, Catholic, master's comprehensive university—one of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. Undergraduate enrollment totals less than 5000, of which women comprise more than half and students of color comprise slightly less than one-quarter. The campus is primarily residential as undergraduates are required to live on campus in their first two years. The average age of an undergraduate is around 20 years old, and slightly more than half identify as Roman Catholic.

Contribution of the Study

Few studies have examined how LGBT issues are addressed within Catholic education in general (Kirkley & Getz, 2007; McEntarfer, 2011; Perlis & Shapiro, 2001), let alone Jesuit colleges and universities specifically (Maher, Sever, & Pichler, 2008). Much of this existing

work focuses on evaluating particular strategies, like establishing a student LGBT organization or developing an LGBT educational program (Getz & Kirkley, 2006; Love, 1998; McEntarfer, 2011), and is typically geared toward better understanding the culture of Catholic higher education as it pertains to LGBT issues (Love, 1997; Maher, 2003; Maher & Sever, 2007). Other work has focused on student attitudes at Catholic universities toward LGBT people (Callegher, 2010; Maher, 2004; Maher et al., 2008). This study then builds on this literature in several ways; namely, none of this work has looked across multiple campus roles to understand the experiences of students, faculty, and staff comprehensively, none has focused on uncovering power dynamics affecting LGBT work, and none have employed an embedded cross-case analysis approach to point to the ways differences in perspective may be shaped by social identities.

This study extends Kezar and Lester's (2011) research by applying their framework to a type of campus unlike those examined within their study. Even though they did not find major differences between different types of institutions in terms of the strategies grassroots leaders employed to create change, none of the six institutions in Kezar and Lester's study were religiously affiliated. This limitation of their findings is important given their application of Meyerson's (2003, 2008) "tempered radicals" framework to their understanding of grassroots leaders. One important aspect to Meyerson's definition of a "tempered radical" is the person's commitment to the organization's mission. This study extends Kezar and Lester's (2011) work in important ways as Jesuit and other religiously affiliated colleges and universities are organizations with very powerful, well-defined missions that drive much of their activities.

Additionally, this study also extends the MMDLE by applying it to LGBT issues and to a religiously-affiliated university setting. Even though the MMDLE is a relatively new model, and is thus relatively untested in terms of its applicability to a variety of institutional settings, the

MMDLE is an extension of a well-established model for the campus climate for diversity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998). Although the 1998 campus climate model has also been applied to understand campus climate concerns related to sexual orientation and gender identity (Hurtado, Maestas, et al., 1998), the model's applicability to LGBT issues and religiously affiliated settings remains to be empirically tested. The MMDLE's conceptualization of the multi-contextual nature of the campus environment will be useful in capturing the sociohistorical context in which Jesuit higher education is situated, especially under Pope Francis who is still relatively new, and the model's intersectional focus will help identify new contextual considerations specific to different social identities, such as sexual orientation or religious affiliation.(2011)

Finally, this study also promotes the use of case study methods to produce rich, contextual data on an issue of critical importance to the field of higher education. Case study methods are beneficial for advancing organizational analysis of colleges and universities as they help capture the complexity and multi-faceted nature of these institutions. Additionally, case study methods are useful for understanding contemporary problems as the detailed nature of data collection and analysis leads to an understanding of the issue situated and contextualized within its real-world setting (Yin, 2014). Case study methods thus produce research that is useful to both scholars of and practitioners within higher education.

Significance of the Study

LGBT students, faculty and staff continue to experience discrimination, bias, bullying and harassment in higher education (Rankin et al., 2010; Renn, 2010; Woodford, Howell, Silverschanz, & Yu, 2012). They tend to feel silenced, more isolated, and less welcome at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities (Wolff & Himes, 2010), including Jesuit

13

universities, even though Jesuit universities have made greater strides than other religious colleges in terms of providing LGBT support and services (Maher et al., 2008; Spencer, 2013). Also, due to concern over the appearance of lacking fidelity to Catholic Church teachings on the matter, the work that is happening at these colleges and universities is often not as visible as many of the other activities these universities engage in, including some of their other social justice activities. The tenure of a new Pope who happens to be a Jesuit also provides a new window of opportunity for institutions to make strides in creating changes that support and include LGBT members of their community. One major contribution this study makes is demonstrating that people who are working to improve the campus climate at Jesuit universities for the LGBT community are simultaneously committed to these institutions' unique missions through applying a framework that acknowledges the commitment of organizational members to their organization's mission. Finally, given recent comments by Pope Francis that demonstrate the Church's need to better include marginalized people like LGBT Catholics (Spadaro, S.J., 2013), Jesuit universities will likely want to augment their existing support and services in the coming years.

This study's findings may help practitioners at other religiously-affiliated colleges move their own initiatives forward as well. These institutions tend to be extremely committed to their religious mission and identity and value their ties to their major religious denominational affiliation. Practitioners at these institutions may also be struggling to demonstrate how they are simultaneously committed to their institutions' missions while seeking to establish support services for LGBT students on their campuses, and so the findings from this study might help them validate their own efforts. There will be important contextual differences between universities affiliated with other religious traditions than a Jesuit university, such as the

articulation of the school's mission or the involvement of external constituents, but there are likely broader similarities as well that allow the transferability of this study's results to these other settings.

Practitioners in LGBT affairs at secular institutions may also find the grassroots leadership frame useful in their own work. While this study focuses on the tensions produced at a Jesuit university stemming primarily from its religious affiliation, efforts to introduce change in any organizational setting can be perceived as disruptive and in conflict with the organization's mission. For example, a student affairs practitioner at a Research-I university pushing for more resources to be directed toward support services for LGBT students might encounter tremendous resistance from those who perceive this action to be in direct competition with support for research activities. As Kezar and Lester (2011) found relatively few differences by institutional type as to which activities best fostered grassroots leadership, the results from this study could also prove surprisingly transferrable to secular settings as well.

Finally, the findings of this study will be especially meaningful and significant for individuals who identify as both LGBT and Roman Catholic, whether at a Jesuit university or not. These people, like myself, have long struggled to integrate these two aspects of their identity and find a community that is welcoming and inclusive to their whole personal experience. Not only will this study provide validation for their experiences by exploring the work being done within Catholic institutions to address their concerns, but this study will provide insights into why and how these efforts can increase, providing implications for a blueprint to move this work forward.

CHAPTER 2

FRAMING THE STUDY

Very little empirical research is available that examines the unique mission and identity of Jesuit, Catholic colleges and universities in relation to how these institutions address LGBT issues. Given the exploratory nature of this study, I synthesized several streams of literature in order to assemble the state of research on topics related to LGBT grassroots mobilizing within Jesuit, Catholic universities. I examined campus climate research to determine how campus constituencies typically assess the need for change, and then I reviewed research related to the ways students, staff, and faculty in higher education mobilize around LGBT issues. Finally, I brought together research on addressing LGBT issues within Catholic higher education to highlight unique aspects of this sector of higher education that was not addressed in other literature.

Overall, my review demonstrated several significant limitations of the existing literature. Campus climate research is performed to identify a need for change to improve the climate for LGBT people, but campus climate studies rarely examine the efforts taking place to improve the climate. These studies are usually the result of grassroots leaders' efforts to make important climate-related concerns more visible to institutional leadership, and in that sense could be considered a tactic for addressing LGBT issues, but typically are not positioned within the literature as such. In addition, most research on LGBT mobilizing within higher education tends to frame these efforts through a social movement lens, which may be limited in its application to the setting of Catholic higher education. A grassroots leadership perspective acknowledges the commitment of faculty, staff, and students to the mission and identity of Catholic colleges and universities and recognizes the ongoing, everyday nature of their change work. Finally, research

on LGBT issues within Catholic settings focuses on specific initiatives at single institutions as opposed to examining broader organizational change around the issue.

This chapter is organized into two primary sections: the conceptual framework guiding this study and the review of prior literature. I first present a conceptual framework that illuminates assumptions regarding the nature of organizational change guiding this study, offers a brief critique of the social movement lens utilized in the literature to understand campus mobilization around LGBT concerns, and then I discuss tempered radicalism, grassroots leadership, and the diverse learning environments framework and their application in guiding the design and approach of this study. Discussing the conceptual framework prior to the literature review provides definitions for several concepts I refer to throughout my critique of the prior literature. The literature review then brings together research on assessing the campus climate for LGBT students; mobilization of students, faculty, and staff around addressing the concerns of LGBT campus communities; and tactics and strategies employed to address the concerns of LGBT communities within the unique environment of Catholic-affiliated colleges and universities.

Throughout this chapter, I switch among several iterations of the abbreviation used to refer to the LGBT community. When discussing specific studies or other published works, I will use the abbreviation used by the author of that work. When discussing programs, policies, or communities in general, I will use LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) as it is the most common form of the abbreviation. However, when I need to be specific, such as referring to a group of people who share a similar sexual orientation identity, I will use the abbreviation that most accurately describes that group. For instance, if I were describing only sexual minorities, I would use LGB or LGBQ as transgender is not a sexual orientation identity.

Conceptual Framework

Organizational Change

Before discussing the frameworks used to guide the design of this study, several assumptions and definitions related to organizational change need to be articulated that undergird the study's design and approach to understanding the phenomenon at hand. Change within an organization or a system can be understood as either an alteration to existing behaviors, structures, or processes, or as the introduction of an innovation such as a behavior, process, or idea never before observed within the system or organization (Bess & Dee, 2008; Damanpour & Evan, 1984; Zaltman & Duncan, 1977). Several paradigmatic perspectives form the foundation for various strands of research into organizational change in higher education (Kezar, 2012); this study is built primarily on interpretive and critical approaches to understanding organizational change. Interpretive approaches emphasize multiple perspectives on the change phenomenon and the importance of language and discourse to the ways people make meaning of change. In designing this study, I specifically view change as emergent (Weick, 2000); emergent change refers to the ways change happens within loosely coupled organizations like higher education where local units have enough decision-making discretion to implement adaptations within their respective units (Weick, 1976, 2000; Weick & Quinn, 1999). The broader organization then examines patterns among locally implemented adaptations to determine the need for broader, organization-wide changes in relation to these individualized efforts.

Critical theory adds the element of power to the analysis, considering the role of power dynamics, conflict, and competing interests as they contribute to change within organizations. Critical theorists view change as a political struggle, and that change is either mandated from above or suppressed if it arises from below (Lukes, 2005). Critical theory is also interested in the

agency of people within an organization to reconstruct power and work for change from the bottom-up, as grassroots activists. Critical theory augments emergent change models by offering a critique of existing power structures and the empowerment of workers to make decisions that challenge the status quo (Mumby, 2005). Kezar (2012) specifically encourages researchers to blend paradigms when designing studies to analyze organizational change, pointing to several points of convergence between interpretive and critical frameworks in terms of how they approach change. She also classified tempered radicals and grassroots leadership frameworks specifically as critical perspectives on organizational change in higher education. As a result, this study is both interpretive and critical in its approach to organizational change.

Social Movements within Organizations

The extant research on LGBT organizing has relied on theories pertaining to how social movements unfold within organizations, but in terms of this study, these frameworks may be inadequate or even inappropriate for understanding LGBT organizing within Catholic higher education. In general, social movement perspectives do have much to offer in terms of informing my analysis, but specific elements of the tempered radical and grassroots leadership frameworks make these perspectives even more relevant to this study.

Zald and Berger (1978) were the first to assemble a cohesive theory about social movements within organizations, though their focus was primarily on the corporate sector. Assuming that organizations may be analogous to the state in the nature of the relationship between the social movement and its target, they developed a typology of the types of social movements that take place within corporate hierarchical organizations and the dimensions along which they vary. These include organizational coups d'état, bureaucratic insurgencies, and mass movements. The dimensions along which these movements vary include breadth of the

movement, location of the actors within the organization, goals of the movement, tactics employed to achieve desired ends, actors' external linkages, and the duration of the conflict.

A coup d'état is a smaller group of actors at the highest levels of the organization (typically governance) who work with a governing board to oust the current leader. However, Zald and Berger (1978), at the time of writing, had yet to come across this type of social movement within the academy. The two types that have direct relevance to the academy were bureaucratic insurgency and mass movements. Generally, bureaucratic insurgents are professionals at middle levels of organizations who are not in official leadership positions, but have some decision-making discretion over budgetary or other resource allocation, who engage in actions that are either in opposition to official organizational procedures, or are at least neutral but perhaps not recommended. This type of social movement within an organization most closely resembles tempered radicalism and grassroots leadership, although it assumes a more adversarial relationship between actors and the organization's leadership. On the other hand, mass movements are large protest movements within organizations, and examples of mass movements provided by Zald and Berger include student protests during the Civil Rights Era (especially those that took place at Berkeley).They typically happen in larger organizations, at the grassroots level of the organizational hierarchy, and are characterized by the wide range of tactics used by actors, not excluding forms of violence. Zald and Berger also outlined several outcomes from each type of social movement, depending on how openly opposed the organization is to the movement's goals.

While this framework for understanding some social movements within organizations is helpful in terms of highlighting some key dimensions, even smaller Catholic universities are far more complex organizations than corporations; thus this typology is fairly limited in its

applicability. Arthur (2008) summarized the literature on social movements within organizations since Zeld and Berger's (1978) writing and outlined four important considerations for researchers: the timing of social movements within organizations, the actors involved with these movements, the strategies and tactics employed, and the resultant outcomes of these movements. One of the key characteristics of actors involved in movements is the degree to which they are considered organizational insiders or outsiders, defined by Katzenstein (1998) as the degree to which an activist is accountable to the organization. Arthur determined that though the literature on social movements within organizations is still developing, most research on these movements has been conducted within practice-oriented fields like business and law, using Meyerson's (2003) work on tempered radicalism as an example.

Rojas (2012) brought theory about social movements within organizations directly into the academy, defining the ways activists and their goals gain insider or outsider status. Specifically, activists involved in a social movement and the movement's goals may be construed by the activists themselves and the institution targeted by the movement as either academic or nonacademic, leading to a typology of four major classifications of social movements within higher education. These types include academic activists who push for academic goals, academic activists who push for nonacademic goals, nonacademic activists who push for academic goals, and nonacademic activists who push for nonacademic goals. Examples include: for the first type, the ethnic studies movement; in the second type, university scientists protesting nuclear war; in the third type, conservative activist groups filing lawsuits to invalidate affirmative action policies; and in the fourth type, environmental groups influencing campus recycling programs. Activists' goals then target a college or university at any or all of its multiple organizational levels: ongoing practices or institutional routines, the organization's structure, the field of higher

education, or even broader, such as political culture and even the state. Rojas also addresses the question as to what happens when movement goals and university goals are at odds. When there is conflict, however, Rojas uses the phrase "cooling out" to refer to the compromises and considerations undertaken by movement activists in order for the university to accept and implement their goals. Finally, Rojas hypothesized that in some cases the successes of broader social movements can affect related social movements within higher education, which provides further support for the importance of sociohistorical context in studying these movements.

While most of the research on social movements in organizations focuses on movements that occur within corporations, models resulting from research in other institutional settings also confirm many essential characteristics of these movements. Santoro and McGuire (1997) wrote about "institutional activists," referring to people who occupy positions within government and use their resources and power to enact movement goals through policy. Santoro and McGuire characterized institutional activists as organizational insiders working on outsider issues, in that they espouse the ideology of the broader social movement, they maintain ties to the communities and organizations connected to the movement, and they turn their commitment to the movement into political action. Santoro and McGuire asserted that "...institutional activists should be particularly important when movements face strong insider opposition to their policy goals" (p. 514). Grossman (2010) examined how educators within a school system used protest as a way to influence state policy that directly affected their day-to-day work. Three characteristics of their protest affected their ultimate success in influencing policy-making: capacity for mobilizing resources to assist in their efforts, political and institutional opportunities that aided their efforts, and framing their goals in a manner that appealed to influential legislators. However, these two movement frameworks are less concerned with longer-term institutional change, and instead are

focused on the attainment of immediate movement goals.

Mary Katzenstein (1990, 1998, 2010) studied feminist resistance and protest within the Catholic Church and the U.S. military and wrote about the ways feminists within these institutions engaged in both unobtrusive mobilization and protest to raise gender consciousness and push for organizational change. Concerned about sentiments throughout the 1980's and early 1990's that feminism was becoming irrelevant, Katzenstein argued that much feminist work was still happening, just not as widely visible as the protest movements from earlier decades. In particular, she pointed to the Catholic Church and the military as examples of male-dominated institutions where women were pushing for institutional change to enable fuller participation. The strategies that women activists employed within the military and the Catholic Church differed along two dimensions—the degree of radicalism of their goals, and whether their politics were more influence-seeking or discursive. Influence-seeking politics tend to be more conventional and seek advancement on behalf of an interest group, such as equal opportunities for women in the military, whereas discursive politics are intended to influence meaning-making, aimed at broader structural and cultural reform within institutions, like feminist women religious in the Catholic Church working to connect the Church's opposition to women's ordination to broader social oppression. Though Arthur (2008) characterized Katzenstein's work as focused on organizational change instead of specific policy or movement goals, and Katzenstein's work on women's resistance within the Catholic Church is relevant to this study, the opposition to LGBT issues faced in Catholic higher education is distinctly different from the more overt opposition to women's ordination within the Catholic Church.

Somewhat contrary to the preceding positions, Meyerson's (2003, 2008) framework of tempered radicalism takes the notion of social movements within organizations and places it into

an everyday context; namely, ordinary people engaged in leadership within organizations in ways they might not even recognize as leadership. The prior discussed literature tends to consider resistance within organizations as analogous to social movements in general, which fails to capture many of the less visible actions of organizational members concerned with contributing to change. In addition, the extant literature on LGBT mobilizing in higher education, especially Catholic higher education, suggests that much work toward change happens at an individual, grassroots level, through everyday interactions and exchanges. Finally, very little of the literature on social movements in organizations focuses on broader organizational change as a result of these movements; rather, these frameworks tend to focus on movements oriented toward specific, tangible goals. In contrast, Meyerson's framework includes an array of actions, differing in terms of visibility and impact, and her work serves as a foundation for Kezar and Lester's (2011) framework for grassroots leadership, one of the primary conceptual frameworks guiding this study.

Tempered Radicalism

Meyerson (2003, 2008) wrote about the ways people create change at work through their everyday, day-to-day interactions, activists who she termed "tempered radicals." She referred to these activists as "radicals" in that they espoused many of the ideologies and commitments of their counterparts involved in social movements outside of the corporate realm, but she referred to their radicalism as "tempered" in that they adjusted their tactics and strategies to be more effective at creating change within the organization. Tempered radicals strongly identify with their companies and often hold important positions within these organizations; as a result, they are simultaneously concerned with changing the environment and maintaining their position within the organization. This tension leads to a process of creating change that is often much less

visible, takes much more time and deliberation, and involves a greater degree of compromise than that of their social movement counterparts outside the organization. Tempered radicals also often feel conflicted between their dual commitments; many of their peers involved in broader social movements view their compromises hypocritically as being co-opted while their employers are frequently unsupportive of their actions toward change within the company. Meyerson's recognition of tempered radicals' commitments to and identification with their organizations is what makes her framework, and Kezar and Lester's (2011) grassroots leadership work, directly relevant to the design of this study.

Meyerson (2003, 2008) characterized the strategies used by tempered radicals to create change along a continuum of tempered radicalism defined by the visibility of the individual's tactics. At the least visible end are people who resist quietly in order to remain true to their identities. The actions employed by people who resist quietly include internal psychological resistance and expressions of identity, both of which are used to help the individual feel more authentic within a work environment that is perceived at odds with much of their core identity. A final form of quiet resistance is considered behind-the-scenes resistance, which can include involvement in a social movement outside the organization, helping others within the organization who face similar circumstances through strategies like mentoring, and findings ways to channel organizational resources to those who may not typically enjoy access to these opportunities for professional development.

More visible than quiet resistance is the tactic of turning a personal threat into an opportunity for learning and change (Meyerson, 2003, 2008). These threats tend to arise within interpersonal encounters and are typically more subtle, psychological threats. Power dynamics present within work situations can marginalize people in terms of their perception of agency to

respond in the moment, especially if the encounter is between a subordinate and supervisor. However, ways to approach these encounters with a degree of choice include recognizing the opportunity for learning within the encounter, acknowledging that remaining silent is a one choice among many options, reflecting on how the encounter is likely targeting only one aspect of identity and not one's entire self, and finding ways to distance oneself emotionally from the encounter to depersonalize it. These recommendations stemmed from methods participants employed to remain psychologically resilient in order to maintain commitment to their change agendas. Turning encounters into opportunities is also described by Meyerson's former colleague Maureen Scully as "identity deployment" when considered within the context of a stigmatized social identity (Creed & Scully, 2000). Creed and Scully wrote about the decisions LGBT employees make with regard to disclosing their sexual orientation identities in personal interactions depending on how they perceive the purpose of that disclosure.

Both Meyerson's (2003, 2008) discussion of turning threats into opportunities and Creed and Scully's (2000) discussion of deployment of identity through interpersonal encounters lead to the third type of tempered radical resistance that Meyerson found in her study. While the first two types of tempered radicalism focus more on individual encounters and tend to have an impact smaller in scope, this third type of tempered radicalism, broadening the impact through negotiation, extends the reach of these smaller wins. Many difficult encounters within organizations result from the tension among people's competing interests, and Meyerson identified four strategies her participants used to successfully negotiate broader organizational change: stepping back not only to gain emotional distance but also to determine the opportunity for broader organizational change, reflecting inward to discern one's values and nonnegotiables before entering negotiation, taking stock of others' interests to identify areas where both parties

could gain, and sometimes turning to third parties to help prepare for or mediate these negotiations.

      Similar to broadening the impact through negotiation is leveraging smaller wins toward larger goals (Meyerson, 2003, 2008). Both of these strategies turn many of the smaller-scope tactics of the first two strategies into the foundation for more widespread organizational change. In addition to negotiation, participants in Meyerson's study also spoke about starting small with their desire for organizational change and using these smaller gains as stepping stones toward greater goals. Meyerson cited Weick (1984) in referring to these smaller gains as "small wins." First, she argued that small wins allow people to develop self-efficacy around creating organizational change, and second, small wins engage people in tangible, measurable actions to observe even the smallest glimmer of a shift in organizational climate and culture. In order to position oneself to start achieving small wins, Meyerson discovered that her participants created visions that were flexible and responsive enough to be effective within the organization, which she termed "blurry" visions; they searched for opportunities for small wins on a regular, ongoing basis; they challenged the organization's level of tolerance for change by engaging in small acts of resistance to test how others might respond; they chose battles wisely in terms of scope and timing; and they designed many of these wins intentionally to provide feedback to the organization and facilitate learning—especially if they knew these acts of resistance would not initially succeed. Meyerson also wrote about the importance of framing small wins within the context and culture of the organization through providing alternative narratives, using the organization's language and discourse to speak about the need for change, and using multiple organizational media to convey messages about these efforts to create organizational change. All in all, the essence of these strategies is that through viewing a smaller problem, like an

interpersonal interaction, as part of a larger whole (system or organization), one can ascertain the value even in incremental progress.

Congruent with Meyerson's (2003, 2008) observation pertaining to issue framing, this tactic was also named within the broader literature on social movements as one of the most important strategies activists within organizations could employ to increase the effectiveness of their actions. Actors within social movements develop broader collective action frames to provide a shared sense of meaning among members of social movements to cultivate their motivation for mobilizing as well as a shared sense of identity with the movement (Benford & Snow, 2000). However, the literature that has examined social movements within organizations and institutions has pointed out that organizations are influenced in divergent ways as a result of being embedded within multiple environments (Scott, 1987; Tolbert & Hall, 2009). As a result, participants in social movements that work within organizations simultaneously develop framing for their efforts couched within the discourse and priorities of their target organizations to help organizational leaders navigate these competing pressures. In Raeburn's (2004a, 2004b) study of LGBT employee activists pushing for equitable partner benefits, their framing strategies included connecting the need for equity within the organization to the organization's profitability and image. In research on LGBT organizing within Catholic universities, framing strategies included connecting the need to support LGBT individuals and protect them from discrimination and harassment to the social justice values of the Catholic Church, especially as espoused by the individual colleges or universities themselves (Getz & Kirkley, 2003, 2006; Kirkley & Getz, 2007; McEntarfer, 2011; Perlis & Shapiro, 2001; Yoakam, 2006).

The final strategy Meyerson (2003, 2008) found within her study was the most visible strategy—organizing collective action. However, even though she terms this strategy as

"collective action," she still indicated that collective action within an organization does not mean open, visible, disruptive protest. Instead, she raised a distinction that tempered radicals often turned to collective action when they determined that a single voice, or small set of actors, would not be as effective in creating change as a larger group of people with a shared commitment to change. In other words, while collective action may be a final strategy used by a group of activists who face setback after setback in their individual efforts to create change within an organization, for others collective action is simply a pragmatic choice informed by knowledge about the environment and perceived efficacy of the action. Three conditions typically led to the use of collective action within organizations. These included organizing around a shared threat or opportunity, using individual action to ignite organizing, and organizing for personal and professional support, such as through affinity networks. Organizing collective action led to a number of unique dilemmas that tempered radicals typically did not face when acting alone or even with a small group of people, including negotiating the framing of issues among a group of people who hold a wide range of diverse perspectives and whether to seek institutional sanction for the collective group. Organizational sanction provides access to company resources and a generally good working relationship with leadership, but sanctioned networks also felt compelled to conform to company norms and their activities were monitored by the company as to their degree of political advocacy. Non-sanctioned networks faced far fewer restrictions around their activities and their purposes, but were disallowed from using company resources to organize and often had adversarial relationships with company leadership. Organizational sanction is significant within the higher education environment as well since students, faculty, and staff often organize into committees, clubs or organizations, or even informal networks around efforts for organizational change within the institution. For example, students at Georgetown University

sued for the right for official sanction for an LGBT student organization by the university in order to access campus resources for their activities (Dutile, 1988; Lacey, 1986), but many LGBT groups at Catholic institutions now feel restricted in their activities due to official recognition by a Catholic-affiliated institution (Maher, 2003; McEntarfer, 2011; Yoakam, 2006).

Meyerson's (2003, 2008) study, however, focused on the corporate sector and thus could not account for many of the organizational complexities and power dynamics that are characteristic of higher education. Nonetheless, her work provides a useful glimpse into the ways people engage in resistance within organizations as part of their everyday routines as opposed to a focus on change as solely the consequence of more visible protest. As a result, Kezar and Lester (2011) applied this framework as a lens for understanding how faculty and staff within institutions of higher education engage in grassroots leadership and push for organizational change as part of their everyday routines, whose work is the primary guiding theoretical framework for this study.

Grassroots Leadership in Higher Education

Responding to a gap in the higher education leadership literature on the ways leadership is enacted from the bottom-up (with respect to the structure of the organization), Kezar and Lester (2011) posited that staff and faculty working to achieve organizational change act as grassroots leaders as part of their day-to-day routines. They define grassroots leaders as people within an institution who do not hold formal positions of authority but are interested in organizational change that is often in conflict with the institutional status quo, and Kezar and Lester specifically applied Meyerson's (2003, 2008) tempered radicals framework to their study because of Meyerson's attention to tempered radicals' commitment to their organization's mission. They also distinguished grassroots leadership from the typical social movement lens

applied to studies of activism within institutions given the less visible, more community-based nature of grassroots leadership. A grassroots leadership lens could then account for the variety of ways faculty and staff engage in everyday resistance, including those ways that more closely resemble social movements.

From their study of grassroots leadership on six distinct campuses, Kezar and Lester (2011) developed a framework that organized grassroots leadership phenomena into three nested environmental levels: individual, group, and organizational. The concepts that fall within each of these levels have also been observed in prior research on social movements within institutions as well as Kezar and Lester's review of the literature on grassroots leadership. Through its consideration of the higher education environment as multi-layered, this framework is also ecological in nature which complements the other theoretical and conceptual frameworks I am applying to the design of this study. This discussion now turns to an explication of grassroots leadership phenomena within each of these levels.

Individual level phemonena. The phenomena studied at the individual level included motivation, identity, and resilience. Motivations can range from self-interest and passion to a sense of responsibility or commitment to change. Identity can affect one's approach to grassroots leadership, and this study in particular is concerned with the positionality of grassroots leaders both with respect to their sexual orientation identity as well as their religious affiliation. Identity is also central to this study given its focus on understanding how people organize around issues related to sexual orientation identity.

One very welcome contribution of Kezar and Lester's (2011) study was an examination of the ways grassroots leaders remained resilient despite the effort they expended in their commitment to organizational change and the resistance and other power dynamics they

navigated. Intrinsic sources of resilience included establishing a personal vision for change and maintaining a sense of belief and optimism that change was possible, maintaining a sense of personal balance and knowing when to draw the line between self-sacrifice and self-protection, engaging in inner reflection to remain true to one's values and sense of self, maintaining a sense of humor but also a realistic perspective on the institution's capacity for change, and enjoying the sense of satisfaction that results from making a difference in one's environment. Extrinsically, community participation was key to keeping grassroots leaders motivated, especially communities of like-minded activists or people who shared a sense of culture and/or background, strong ties to family, and work outside the institution in one's community. Community connections in particular are also important sources of motivation and resilience in the literature on social movements in organizations, and these connections are established for sexual minorities through affinity networks in particular as observed by Raeburn (2004a, 2004b) and Meyerson (2003, 2008) as well as research on LGBT organizing in higher education.

Group level phenomena. At the group level, Kezar and Lester (2011) illuminated the strategy and tactics of grassroots leaders as well as the types of power dynamics they faced. Kezar and Lester's group-level findings reflected many of the phenomena central to the concerns of researchers examining LGBT social movements within higher education. Strategy was defined as the overarching approach or principle taken by grassroots leaders to determine specific tactics to reach various goals, while tactics referred to the specific methods chosen by grassroots leaders to accomplish their goals. Participants overwhelmingly spoke about utilizing an educational or academic strategy that aligned with the academic mission of their respective campuses, which led to tactics like intellectual discourse or professional development on an issue championed by grassroots leaders, mentoring students or engaging them on an issue through the curriculum,

participation on hiring committees to encourage the hiring of like-minded people, obtaining

grants to garner resources and institutional legitimacy and then using data from research to paint

a picture as to the importance of a specific concern, and partnering with key external

stakeholders who were sympathetic to the grassroots leaders' cause.

Not surprisingly, grassroots leaders in Kezar and Lester's (2011) study encountered many

obstacles and challenges in working for change, including the need to navigate ever-present

power dynamics. First, Kezar and Lester defined power as "a person's ability to control the

environment around him- or herself, including the behavior of other people" (p. 41). They then

conceptualized influence as the act of using power to exert control, authority as the power

granted to a person legitimated by her or his position within the structure of the organization, and

power dynamics as the interactions between people as they try to assert control and power within

the environment. Grassroots leaders experienced power dynamics along a continuum from those

that were most overt and severe to those that were more covert and less severe but still extremely

painful and destructive. Along this continuum Kezar and Lester characterized five types of

power dynamics: overt oppression, observed through direct threats toward a person's position

within the organization; silencing, typically through denying the existence of a problem or

concealing the involvement of grassroots leaders in achieving a measure of change; controlling

behaviors, such as placing additional burdens on groups' organizing activities or preventing

involvement in change activities through the professional evaluation process; stalling tactics,

particularly through unexplained nonresponse from those with authority or convoluted processes

for receiving approval on proposed changes; and microaggressions, bullying and other

continuous abusive behaviors. To navigate these dynamics, grassroots leaders utilized several

approaches to move many of their goals forward: flying under the radar until conditions

improved, creating internal and external networks for information and resource sharing, developing coalitions with other groups sympathetic toward the cause, building bridges to gain influential allies, recognizing and naming power to reduce the ambiguity of these dynamics, making modest changes through small wins, and reframing issues to make them less controversial to those in authority. Many of these approaches to navigate power dynamics are present in research on LGBT organizing in Catholic higher education as well.

Organizational level phenomena. Finally, at the organizational level, Kezar and Lester (2011) observed leadership development, group formation, and structures and culture as contributing to an organization's capacity (or lack thereof) for grassroots leadership. Grassroots leadership was fostered through formal and informal leadership development, including opportunities to teach others grassroots tactics and strategies, like the development of affinity networks or coaching and mentoring of other faculty and staff. The effectiveness of these opportunities for leadership development was affected by the degree to which people can come together voluntarily, especially outside of the formal ways people are structured within the institution, such as their ability to serve on committees or join organizations. Lastly, institutional structures and culture have been identified throughout the literature on social movements in organizations as critical characteristics of organizations that are both targets of organizational change as well as catalysts. Structure refers to the policies and practices of a college or university that determine the provision of resources throughout the organization as well as organize formal authority and power, including hiring procedures, channels for shared governance, and professional evaluation and reward processes. Culture on the other hand refers to the norms, values, assumptions, and other shared meanings that guide the behavior of organizational members and provide shape to some of the institutional structures. Both of these institutional

characteristics are also shaped by the institution's specific mission and purpose, which is critical in the consideration of Catholic higher education.

In addition to grassroots leadership phenomena, Kezar and Lester (2011) provided insight into ways that bottom-up and top-down leadership could converge to create change together, the importance of grassroots leadership in a time when corporatization within higher education is increasing, and ways institutions can increase capacity for grassroots leadership, but these are of less concern to this study. Also, though this framework was developed to understand grassroots leadership among faculty and staff, I apply it to students in this study as well. While a student activism frame may more accurately reflect the experiences of student grassroots leaders in higher education in general (Rhoads, 1998), the literature suggests the type of activism that students engage in more closely resembles mass movements (Arthur, 2008; Zald & Berger, 1978). Zald and Berger specifically indicated mass movements are more likely in larger organizations, while Catholic colleges and universities tend to be much smaller institutions. Katzenstein's (1990, 1998) work on the women's movement within the Catholic Church lends support to applying a frame that considers mobilization within these institutions as unobtrusive, like Kezar and Lester's grassroots leadership work. Finally, the goals of LGBT faculty, staff, and students at a Catholic university are likely similar due to the smaller size of the organization and their shared sense of identity.

Lastly, central to Meyerson's (2003, 2008) definition of a tempered radical is the person's strong sense of identity with the organization's mission. Neither Meyerson's nor Kezar and Lester's (2011) work examined institutions with a mission as strongly defined and salient to the organization's identity as Jesuit colleges and universities (Currie, S.J., 2010, 2011; McKevitt, S.J., 1991). By applying these frames to the setting of a Jesuit university, this study further tests

and refines these frameworks to determine if this strong sense of mission and identity have an effect on grassroots leadership within this setting distinguishable from those institutions included in Kezar and Lester's study.

Campus Climate: Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments

Because grassroots leadership takes place within the campus environment, and this study is concerned with the campus climate for diversity, I turned to the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments to help conceptualize the campus environment (Hurtado et al., 2012). After an exhaustive review of existing models and instruments for conceptualizing and measuring campus climate for diversity, Hurtado et al. extended an earlier multidimensional, multicontextual model for the campus racial climate (Hurtado, Milem, et al., 1998) to depict the campus environment more comprehensively, improve the earlier model's applicability to a broader set of marginalized campus populations, and account for student outcomes from learning in a diverse environment. The Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) assumes students' multiple identities to be central to the learning process and also reflects the significance of faculty and staff members' multiple social identities. The model focuses on the experiences of students within an institution's curricular and co-curricular spheres of interaction, highlighting the dynamics that undergird these interactions and how those dynamics affect student learning outcomes. Additionally, the model is designed to reflect the ecological structure of the campus environment, including micro- and meso-levels within institutions as well as exo- and macro-levels of the environment in which an institution is situated. Finally, but most importantly, the model reflects a more complete set of the dimensions of the campus climate for diversity as well as its pervasiveness in influencing student experiences and outcomes. While student outcomes are important, this study is less focused on

36

student outcomes but rather situating grassroots leadership within the multiple levels of the campus environment.

Similar to the multi-layered nature of the aforementioned framework for grassroots leadership (Kezar & Lester, 2011), the MMDLE describes the campus environment as consisting of a series of layered and nested contexts. The MMDLE points to microsystems as involving individuals, their roles on campus, and the interactions between them. These interactions take place within mesosystems, which are conceptualized as the curricular and cocurricular spheres of interaction, and these interactions can be thought of as tactics themselves or as part of broader strategies engaged by grassroots leaders on campus. Encompassing these spheres of interaction is the campus climate for diversity, composed of five dimensions that will be discussed below. One strength of this campus climate model is its consideration of contexts and levels beyond the organizational that both situate the institution and affect grassroots leadership. The literature on LGBT issues in Catholic higher education indicates the exosystem of community context and external commitments is important to consider as this layer accounts for alumni involvement and local Church influence. The exosystem also includes associative networks which account for the strong isomorphic ties between Jesuit colleges and universities through organizations such as the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) and the Jesuit Association of Student Personnel Administrators (JASPA). The institution's macrosystem then includes the policy context, such as state and national law governing the institution's activities as well as the influence of broader Catholic Church authority over institutional governance, and its sociohistorical context, especially in terms of the current state of LGBT civil rights nationwide. All of these levels of the institutional environment will affect grassroots leadership within the institution and influence the campus climate for LGBT people.

As much of the effort toward organizational change on LGBT issues is directed toward changing the campus climate, this model is especially useful in its conceptualization of the multiple dimensions of campus climate, including individual- as well as organizational-level dimensions. Most prior work on the campus climate for LGBT people, as well as models for campus climate, omit consideration of all five of the dimensions explicated in the MMDLE; this model conceptualizes the climate for diversity more comprehensively. At the individual level are the psychological and behavioral dimensions, the two dimensions that Hurtado et al. (2012) note are most widely included in the extant literature. The psychological dimension refers to people's perceptions of the environment, of the state of relations between different social identity groups on campus, and of the extent of discrimination and intergroup conflict on campus. The behavioral dimension then reflects the actual interactions between people of different backgrounds and accounts for the context, frequency, and quality of these interactions. The behavioral dimension considers both formal interactions, or those that take place within campus-facilitated contexts like classes or student activities, and informal interactions, everyday interactions between people that happen outside these campus-facilitated spaces. Taken together, the psychological and behavioral dimensions provide the most immediate information about the state of the campus climate for different students.

However, broader systems and structures influence these individual-level dimensions to the extent that these other systems and structures can be considered to compose dimensions of the campus climate as well. Bridging the individual level and the organizational level of the campus climate is the compositional dimension. This dimension accounts for the numerical representation of people of diverse backgrounds on campus and thus the opportunity for interactions across difference. However, this dimension may be limited in its current definition in

terms of its applicability; critical mass is likely not as meaningful in terms of LGBT people as it is for people of different genders or racial/ethnic backgrounds due to the relatively stable and low representation of LGBT people in society at large (Gates, 2011). Instead, a slight modification to this dimension to consider the representation of *visible* LGBT students, faculty, and staff in relation to what might be considered a rational estimate of the size of the overall LGBT population on campus, may be more significant. Yoshino's (2006) concept of sexual orientation covering, the ways expression of a marginalized or stigmatized identity is socially controlled so as to conform to other norms within a particular environment, is relevant to this dimension. People can not only pass as heterosexual instead of revealing themselves to others as a sexual minority, but can also feel compelled to cover that identity even when their sexual minority status is known to others. The other organizational level dimensions are the structural and historical dimensions of campus climate. The structural dimension includes the policies and practices that can embed oppression into the fabric of the campus's organizational structure and thereby contribute to the perpetuation of broader inequities, like nondiscrimination policies, hiring procedures, and promotion and tenure processes. The historical dimension then refers to an institution's history of exclusion of various marginalized and stigmatized groups. Dilley's (2002) examination of the history of campus policy and practice used to control gay students and even remove them from campus demonstrates how this dimension leads to the silence around sexual orientation still experienced on many college campuses today. Additionally, this study will also extend the MMDLE by applying it to a religiously-affiliated university setting, especially given the ways the institution's religious affiliation affects the climate toward sexual minorities (Love, 1997, 1998; Maher, 2003).

<center>**Literature Review**</center>

This next section presents a review of several streams of literature that together convey what is known about LGBT grassroots leadership in Catholic higher education. These literatures include the campus climate for LGBT people; LGBT activism among students, faculty, and staff; and experiences working for change in Catholic higher education on LGBT issues. The chapter then concludes with a brief discussion of the conceptualization of this study.

Campus Climate

One of the primary ways institutions collect data on the need for organizational change, especially around issues pertaining to campus diversity, is through systematic study of the campus climate (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008). Campuses typically use climate studies to bring attention to injustices on campus as a catalyst for change. However, Rankin (2006) argued that despite the number of published and unpublished single-institution studies of the campus climate for sexual minorities, more research is needed to document the campus climate for LGBT people and connect experiences of campus climate to other outcomes to demonstrate the deleterious effect of a hostile environment on student outcomes. She attributes part of this problem to the fact that nearly no research exists on educational outcomes for LGBT people, especially student retention and persistence, as both individual institutions and national higher education research centers remain resistant to collecting information on sexual orientation demographics. Brown and Gortmaker (2009) posed ten important questions for designers of LGBT campus climate studies to consider due to the political and methodological issues posed by such studies. Overall, they recommended a consensus-building process that involves campus leadership and LGBT advocates in order to produce results that are both meaningful and lead to action. Finally, Ottenritter (2012) argued for an extension of existing frameworks for

<center>40</center>

understanding climate, identity development, and retention to community college students in order to understand the experiences of LGBT students in these institutional settings. She also determined many of these considerations could improve the climate for LGBT faculty and staff at community colleges as well. Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, and Cuellar (2008) determined, however, that little evidence exists to demonstrate these studies have resulted in measurable change in the climate. Campus climate research provides important information to institutional decision-makers, but could be further improved by connecting climate findings to organizational change.

A major aspect of the campus climate are the attitudes held within the student body, an aspect of the psychological dimension of the campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). These attitudes can be affected by the overall peer normative culture on a given campus. Finlay and Walther (2003) studied the relationship between religious affiliation and endorsement of homophobic views at a large, public, culturally conservative university in Texas. They found that while knowing other LGB people and the closeness of those relationships affects students' endorsement of homophobic views, their religious affiliations and gender were more significant predictors of these views. Specifically, men were more likely to be homophobic than women and conservative Protestants were more likely to be homophobic than other Christian affiliations and non-Christians. Interesting interactions between variables were discovered through separate analyses by gender. Among Catholic students, it appeared that men were more likely than non-affiliated students to hold homophobic views, but there was no difference for Catholic and non-affiliated women. In addition, the strongest predictor of homophobic views for women was frequency of religious service attendance whereas for men the strongest predictor remained a conservative Protestant affiliation. Finally, in looking at the correlations between frequency of

41

religious service attendance and homophobic views by religious affiliation, among the Christian groups the strongest correlation was found for Catholic students—those who attended services more frequently were more likely to endorse homophobic views. So while it is clear that gender influences students' attitudes toward LGBT issues in general, in terms of Catholic affiliation the relationship is complicated by level of religiosity and gender.

Other campus climate studies focus on the specific experiences and perceptions of sexual minorities, aspects of the behavioral and psychological dimensions of campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). In one of the few studies on the campus climate for LGBT students at religiously affiliated colleges and universities, Yarhouse, Stratton, Dean, and Brooke (2009) conducted an exploratory study into the experiences of sexual minorities at three member institutions of the Council on Christian Colleges and Universities. The study examined what the authors referred to as "sexual identity milestones," or life experiences that contribute to the development of sexual identity, campus climate, and the influence of religious affiliation on sexual identity. In terms of campus climate, they found that while students did perceive the climate to be negative, most of this finding was attributed to the attitudes and remarks of their peers, whereas students reported they rarely heard negative comments from faculty or staff. The authors also discovered that male students heard more remarks but were less likely to indicate the attitudes of their peers contributed to a difficult environment for sexual minorities, suggesting that male students minimized the homophobia in their environment and likely were less sensitive to their peers' affronts. While they establish that students' sexual orientation identities are affected by both their own religious affiliation as well as peer norms around religious expression, many of their findings are less relevant in a Catholic university setting given differences in the extent to which students are compelled to endorse the religious affiliation of the institution—Catholic colleges

42

and universities typically do not require of students declarations or statements of faith like many Christian institutions do (Maher, 2003; Wolff & Himes, 2010). However, their findings are useful given the important role of religion both in the experiences of individual students as well as at the organizational level in determining the level of support an institution is willing to provide.

Three recent studies examined campus climate in a manner with direct implications for this planned study. Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker, and Robinson-Keilig (2004) conducted an LGBT campus climate study at a Midwestern university using what they referred to as a "multiple perspectives" approach, comparing stratified samples of resident assistants, the general student body, faculty, and student affairs staff, with a convenience, snowball sample of LGBT students. They found LGBT students reported being more involved in LGBT events, having more knowledge of LGBT issues, and especially indicated perceiving more anti-LGBT bias on campus. In their comparisons of other groups, they found student affairs staff to be more likely to have confronted students about anti-LGBT remarks and were more interested in attending workshops on LGBT issues than faculty, while resident assistants reported greater change in their attitudes toward LGBT people over the past year than the broader student sample. In addition, among the general student body, women were more likely than men to report an interest in LGBT issues, perceive anti-LGBT attitudes on campus, and hold more positive attitudes toward LGBT people. Overall, the authors argued that this multiple perspectives approach allowed them to capture more thoroughly the heterogeneity in the campus climate than either a study of just LGBT students or the attitudes of heterosexual students, faculty, or staff, as was more common in prior research. While this study was quite limited, especially given the study instrument's composition solely of single-item measures and a focus on only the individual

dimensions of campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012), this advancement of a multiple

perspectives approach appears to be an important contribution to the literature on LGBT campus

climate.

Vaccaro (2012) extended this approach through her ethnography of the LGBT campus

climate at one institution by proposing the climate to be composed of multiple "microclimates"

as opposed to only an overall "macroclimate." Her ethnography took place over two years and

included interviews with faculty, staff, and student members of faculty, staff, graduate, and

undergraduate affinity networks in addition to observations and the collection of documents. She

determined each group seemed to perceive its own "microclimate" consisting of the

environments and interactions that people encounter on an ongoing everyday basis. As a result,

while the undergraduates perceived the overall campus climate to be their "microclimate" of

reference, each other group focused on their more narrow work environment in their assessment

of the climate. Graduate students spoke about the school in which their programs were located,

and staff were most concerned about their immediate coworkers and supervisors. Faculty also

reported their immediate departments to have the greatest influence on their perception of the

climate, but they included concern about general administrative support for LGBT-related

research and curricula and hostile interactions with students as other areas of concern as both of

these have an effect on promotion and tenure. Vaccaro's findings echo those of Sears (2002),

who determined faculty perceptions of the climate are primarily motivated by departmental

experiences and are only indirectly affected by broader campus nondiscrimination policies.

Vacarro's notion of "microclimates" also seems indicative of the dynamics within campus

spheres of interaction (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Finally, Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger, and Hope (2013) followed up Brown et al.'s (2004)

climate study with an updated version of the instrument used in that earlier study. This study, however, only surveyed LGBT students and used a single-item measure to assess perceptions of the campus climate. Their model demonstrated three experiences significantly predicted students' assessment of the campus climate—a loss of support from friends due to anti-LGBT bias, hiding one's LGBT identity from other students, and unfair treatment by instructors. The authors also found through a cluster analysis that one group of students was most likely to have considered leaving campus at some point—students who had lost friend and family support as a result of anti-LGBT bias, and whose living situations were especially affected by anti-LGBT bias. Despite similar weaknesses to the earlier study by Brown et al. (2004), their demonstration of the association between campus climate and various other experiences was an important strength of this study, especially with their inclusion of an item measuring how frequently students considered leaving campus. No data exists to track attrition, persistence, retention, or mobility of LGBT students (Rankin, 2006; Renn, 2010), so presenting even the association between climate, experiences, and risk of attrition makes an important contribution to the literature. However, campus climate is a latent construct composed of multiple dimensions (Hurtado et al., 2012), so any study that attempts to measure campus climate using a single item raises important questions about that item's validity. Granted, the authors' conclusions support earlier assertions that much of the experience of campus climate results from regular interpersonal interactions and likely arises within multiple microclimates in addition to the overall campus macroclimate. As a result, efforts to create change might want to start at these grassroots levels, where individuals experience daily interactions, to try to improve intergroup relations and interrupt the normative interactions that perpetuate homophobia and heterosexism in higher education.

   Heterosexual students. Since heterosexual students constitute a significant majority of

students in higher education, their attitudes and behaviors toward LGBT peers are a major component of the campus climate for LGBT students. Woodford, Silverschanz, Swank, Scherrer, and Raiz (2012) tested predictors of heterosexual student attitudes toward LGBT people and found that women, older students, White students (compared to Black students), and atheist and nonreligious students (compared to students from various Christian denominations) all held more positive views of LGBT people, though they strongly cautioned readers on interpreting their findings pertaining to race and age given a lack of consensus in the literature and limitations of their sampling design. They also found students who espoused more liberal political views, endorsed a biological basis for variation in sexual orientation and gender identity, and those with close relationships with LGBT people, like friends and family, to hold more positive views. While their findings need to be confirmed within other campus contexts, their recommendation for increased intergroup dialogue programs seemed especially sound in light of their findings. In a separate study, Woodford and his colleagues also tested the perpetuation and effects of a common sexual orientation microaggression using the aforementioned sample. They performed two different analyses, one that examined the effects of hearing the phrase, "That's so gay," on the well-being of LGB college students (Woodford, Howell, et al., 2012), and one that tested predictors of the frequency of the phrase's usage among heterosexual male college students (Woodford, Howell, Kulick, & Silverschanz, 2013). Nearly 90% of LGB college students had overheard the phrase, and 65% of heterosexual males reported using it at least once within the past year. The first analysis found significant relationships between frequency of headaches, problems with appetite, and feeling left out on campus for LGB college students who heard the phrase more often. Even though they did not find significant relationships between self esteem or anxiety and the frequency of hearing the phrase, the phrase not only contributed negatively to

LGB students' perceptions of the campus climate but also was significantly associated with deleterious physical health consequences. In their second analysis, the strongest predictor for how frequently heterosexual males used the phrase "that's so gay" on campus was how frequently they heard the phrase on campus; other predictors included a stronger discomfort with effeminate men and fewer LGB acquaintances. In other words, one of the biggest contributors to the perpetuation of this sexual orientation microaggression was the peer normative context— those who heard it more frequently were more likely to use it more frequently. Surprisingly, heterosexual men with more LGB acquaintances used the phrase less frequently, but no relationship was found for men with more LGB friends, suggesting another finding indicative of the peer normative context—these men may not know how acquaintances may perceive them for using the phrase as opposed to friends, and they likely do not want to be perceived as prejudiced. Another surprising finding was the lack of relationship between heterosexual males' views on the morality of same-sex relationships, support for legal protection against LGBT discrimination, or the biological basis of sexual orientation on men's frequency of usage. Again, if men's usage of the phrase is not connected to their attitudes toward LGBT people, usage of the phrase seems to be most regulated by the peer normative context.

Taken together, a hostile campus climate appears to be self-perpetuating and hold potentially harmful physical consequences for LGBT students. A final study examined the effects of a homophobic or heterosexist climate on heterosexual students. Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, and Magley (2008) tested relationships between heterosexist harassment, a term they used to refer to homophobic behaviors, and psychological and academic well-being outcomes for both sexual minority and heterosexual college students. They found that 39% of heterosexuals and 57% of sexual minorities reported experiencing any type of heterosexist harassment,

behavior which the authors divided into ambient harassment, or occurring in the environment around the student, or personal harassment, targeted toward the student. Sexual minority students reported levels of both ambient and personal harassment that were not significantly different from each other, but heterosexual students reported a significantly higher amount of ambient than personal harassment. Additionally, sexual minority students reported a significantly higher amount of personal harassment than heterosexual students, but both groups reported statistically similar levels of ambient harassment. Students who experienced both types of harassment faced more negative academic and psychological wellbeing outcomes than those who either experienced none or just ambient on all outcomes except substance abuse problems; students who experienced no harassment had fewer substance abuse problems than students who faced just ambient or both types in combination. The authors concluded that not only do both heterosexual and sexual minority students experience heterosexist harassment on campus, but these experiences also lead to reduced well-being for both groups. For heterosexual students, they attributed this to either being perceived as a sexual minority or stress associated with recognizing a climate hostile toward sexual minorities, which they attributed to bystander stress (Schneider, 1996).

In summary, while research on the campus climate for LGBT people continues to build, a major gap persists in terms of the experiences of students, faculty, and staff at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities. These studies are not as comprehensive in assessing the multiple dimensions of campus climate either. In addition, while campus climate studies have been used to argue for increased resources on a campus or a change in policy, what remains unclear is whether these studies are the primary method relied on by campus constituents to assess the need for change. In other words, students, faculty, and staff have mobilized on college

campuses to push for LGBT-affirmative change with and without direct empirical evidence of the state of the campus climate. Informed by their own experiences, LGBT people often first have to advocate for a study, or advocate for inclusion in other studies of campus experiences and climate. In other cases, they mobilize on an important issue or needed change that cannot wait for the results of a campus climate study. This next section will examine the factors contributing to student mobilization.

LGBT Students

Historical context. The richest body of literature on any LGBT constituent group in higher education is the literature on student experiences. While research on LGBT college students is relatively new, and lacking in many important aspects, much more research has been conducted on LGBT college students than either faculty or staff (Marine, 2011; Renn, 2010). In this section, I narrow my focus to student activism to identify ways students have contributed to organizational change. I begin with an overview of the historical context for student activism and then shift focus to recent studies that demonstrate newer directions in understanding dimensions of the LGBT college student activist experience. I explicitly examined college student activism for two reasons. The primary method college students contribute to organizational change is through activism as students do not face the same restrictions around their actions as faculty and staff (Rhoads, 1998). Secondly, the literature does not conceptualize student participation in organizational change as anything but activism; however, many of the strategies considered activism in the literature, such as organizing a network of support or strategically deploying one's LGBT identity, can likely be viewed as grassroots or tempered strategies as well.

Dilley (2002) provided an excellent overview of the ways college and university administrators used to control and suppress LGBT students before students were able to secure

nondiscrimination protections and the right to organize into gay-straight alliances. At first, influenced in particular by McCarthyism, students, faculty, or staff who were either known or suspected to be homosexual were dealt with in punitive ways, most frequently through expulsion. Administrators often included a notation on student transcripts as to the reason for the expulsion which prevented them from transferring to any other institution. College and university administrators, including student affairs professionals like deans of students, also engaged in covert "sting" operations to try to entrap men seeking sexual encounters with other men in public spaces on campus like restrooms and libraries. These sting operations persisted on many campuses through the 1980's and the 1990's, and it was clear these operations were not motivated by any widespread epidemic of sexual encounters in public spaces. As homosexuality began to be perceived as a mental health problem rather than a problem of deviance, student affairs practitioners in particular determined LGBT students should be treated individually by counselors and mental health professionals instead of dealt with through the disciplinary process. Many schools thus began recommending conversion therapy for homosexual students, especially religiously affiliated institutions. However, these treatments also subsided as the broader gay rights movement started making legal gains in terms of their right to assemble and to exercise free speech, and professional associations of psychologists and psychiatrists removed homosexuality from their lists of official mental disorders. Instead, schools resorted to legal challenges to prevent students from assembling and organizing, citing state anti-sodomy statutes as the basis for their concern that gay student organizations would undermine institutions' educational missions. These lawsuits formed the foundation of student activism that led to later actions aimed at holding colleges and universities accountable for providing a safe and inclusive campus climate, regardless of students' sexual orientations.

In one retrospective case study, Vaserfirer (2012) examined the establishment of a

student organization, Gay Student Services (GSS), at Texas A&M. He described the campus

climate as openly hostile, which he attributed to the campus's unique conservative culture as a

Senior Military College and the college's location in the socially conservative state of Texas. As

a result, students strategically balanced individual invisibility, to protect the confidentiality and

safety of GSS members, with group visibility, to help spread the word about GSS and attract new

members as well as to raise awareness among the greater campus community to the presence of

gay and lesbian students on campus. Over time the group became more visible, but students

involved with GSS were constantly concerned about employing too radical of tactics as they

recognized both the student body and the administration were hostile to the group. Outside of

pursuing a lawsuit to secure their right to organize, GSS avoided further controversy with the

administration through the utilization of more tempered resistance.

Rhoads (1994, 1998) also wrote about the importance of visibility, and the significance of

invisibility, to lesbian and gay students at Penn State university at the beginning of the 1990's.

Students at Penn State had prevailed in a lawsuit against the university in the 1970's over their

right to organize, but studies conducted by Professor Anthony D'Augelli demonstrated that the

climate at Penn State remained hostile toward LGB students (D'Augelli, 1989; D'Augelli &

Rose, 1990). A faculty committee chaired by Professor William Tierney made a recommendation

that the university add "sexual orientation" as a protected class within its nondiscrimination

statement, but the administration and the board of trustees refused to comply. Rhoads'

ethnography of gay and bisexual men at Penn State during this time chronicled the actions

students took to persuade the university governance to agree to add "sexual orientation" to the

university's nondiscrimination statement. Taking a page from the Queer Nation movement that

had developed a few years earlier to take more radical action against the government's failure to respond to the AIDS epidemic, a number of students embraced a queer identity, as opposed to gay, lesbian, or bisexual, in order to reflect their intentions to be visible and political on campus. During this time a presidential transition occurred at Penn State, and activists and grassroots leaders throughout the campus took advantage of this window of opportunity to gain approval for adding "sexual orientation" to the policy. In the end, to force an affirmative vote from the board of trustees, students met with a key player on the board to share their plans to take over the president's office and gain media attention if the board did not vote to approve the change. This seemed to be a key factor in the board ultimately supporting the clause.

Contemporary activism. While in the past students needed to engage in activism to gain the attention of administrators and bring visibility to their concerns, college campuses have become far more inclusive of and welcoming to LGBT students in recent years, primarily seen through the increase in student organizations and campus LGBT resource centers (Sanlo, Rankin, & Schoenberg, 2002). Yet college campuses are not free from homophobia or heterosexism, and so many students continue to work to improve the campus climate. Longerbeam, Inkelas, Johnson, and Lee (2007) conducted an exploratory study using the dataset developed from the National Study of Living/Learning Programs (NSLLP) to identify differences in college experiences by sexual orientation, and found that lesbian and gay students were most likely to engage in political and social activism, followed by bisexual students, and then their heterosexual peers. They also determined lesbian and gay students were most likely to report growth in critical thinking and liberal learning, a measure similar in meaning to a pluralistic orientation. Longerbeam and her colleagues determined that the growth in critical thinking and liberal learning among lesbians and gay men likely stemmed from the challenges they face on

campus as sexual minorities as well as cognitive development resulting from making meaning of a sexual minority identity. Their data are limited in that they are all residential students who are primarily first- and second-year students, but their findings offer a window into differences between LGB students and their heterosexual peers that had not been able to be captured previously as the NSLLP survey was one of the first national surveys of college students to collect student demographic data on sexual orientation.

Another study examined the reasons gay and lesbian college students become involved in the broader gay and lesbian rights movement (Swank & Fahs, 2012). Swank and Fahs found students who endorsed less modern heterosexism, had a stronger activist identity, more feminist friends, and a stronger network of activist peers were all more likely to participate in LGBT activism. In other words, framing and mobilizing experiences made a difference in students' likelihood of participating in activism, but their available resources, such as income or background, did not. Unfortunately, data collection methods for this study were extremely flawed as the authors distributed one set of surveys to college students engaged in anti-war protests on three campuses and a second set to students whose professors agreed to distribute surveys in class at three other campuses. The authors used these samples to try to develop a dataset with high representation of activists and non-activists, but the comparability of the samples is questionable and no information about generalizability is provided. Also, the authors did not collect information on sexual orientation demographics which would have been important in determining the differences between "activists" and "non-activists." Regardless, the results seem plausible, but should be interpreted with caution and in conjunction with similar findings.

Although the literature on student participation in LGBT activism appears to still be

developing, in the following sections I will cover three aspects of contemporary activism demonstrated in recent literature—LGBT versus queer identity, activism and organizing resulting from the experience of the intersection of oppressions, and heterosexual students' involvement in LGBT activism. Each of these factors plays a role in the tactics and strategies used by college students today and represent increasing recognition of the diversity of voices and experiences by colleges and universities.

LGBT versus queer. As described by Rhoads (1994, 1998), one of the most prominent ways students made their identities more visible as sexual minorities was through the donning of a queer identity/politics and intentionally making the personal political (Hanisch, 1970). These dynamics around visibility and politicization continue to play out as students make sense of their sexual orientation in college. First, Gortmaker and Brown (2006) examined the effect on students' experiences of disclosing one's sexual orientation publicly on campus. Students who were more out were more likely to perceive the campus climate as negative and that they were treated unfairly by administrators in comparison to more closeted students. However, these students were also more likely to be knowledgeable of gay and lesbian issues, have access to a network of lesbian and gay peers, and be involved in gay and lesbian issues on campus, a measure that accounted for both social and political activities. Overall, even though the findings from this study are extremely limited in their generalizability due to a small sample, single institution, and analysis limited to descriptive statistics, the authors provide an argument that a first step toward student activism and involvement is developing greater comfort with disclosing sexual orientation publicly on campus. Renn (2007) analyzed data from a prior study conducted with Bilodeau (2005a, 2005b) to understand the types of LGBT leadership identities developed by students who lead LGBT student organizations. Bringing together the Leadership Identity

Development (LID) model (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005) with a typology of non-heterosexual males developed by Dilley (2005), Renn developed a model of LGBT student leadership that demonstrated how involvement led to greater visibility on campus as an LGBT leader, which fuels students' desire to become even more involved as an LGBT leader on campus. Renn also determined two important dimensions of LGBT student leadership; one was the difference between seeing oneself as a leader or as an activist, and the other was whether students considered themselves as queer or as LGBT, in a similar manner to Rhoads's work. Overall, visibility as an LGBT or queer person is an important variable for students in the process of working for change on campus.

Intersections of oppression. Recent work has also looked into the multiple marginalized identities of LGBT students and thereby their experience of the intersection of oppressions. Friedman and Leaper (2010) studied the relationship between different forms of discrimination and commitment to collective action among a sample of lesbian, bisexual, and queer women from universities in California. First, they argued that lesbian, bisexual, and queer women experience a gendered form of heterosexism distinct from both heterosexism and sexism and validated this construct as statistically independent of heterosexism and sexism. Then in regression models they determined that gendered heterosexism predicted a commitment to both feminist and LGBQ activism net of heterosexism, sexism, and an interaction term between the two. Overall, the authors argued that experiences of discrimination increase lesbian, bisexual, and queer women's identification with social identity groups (women and LGBQ people), and that increased identification with these social identity groups as well as experiences of discrimination are significant antecedents of lesbian, bisexual, and queer women's commitment to feminist and LGBQ activism. In other words, in a college environment with a sexist and

heterosexist climate, lesbian, bisexual, and queer women may be spurred to engage in collective action, and that the discrimination they experience is unique to that of heterosexual women and sexual minority men.

Revilla (2010) explored a case study of a student organization for queer Latina women at UCLA called Raza Womyn, oriented as a space for this group of women to deal with and respond to the intersecting oppressions they experienced as women, students of color, Latinas, and working class. Two women in particular had been members of MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán) and La Familia de UCLA (a Latina/o LGBT organization) but found the politics of both groups to be divisive and competitive. These two women came to Raza Womyn to practice multidimensional activism, or an activism concerned with countering oppression in multiple dimensions. As a result, while the organization's membership remained small, the study participants spoke about how the organization provided them the space they needed to learn how engage activism simultaneously focused on multiple oppressions. These women's experiences reflected Friedman and Leaper's (2010) assertion that the intersection of oppression produces a qualitatively different type of discrimination than any of the individual dimensions operating alone or a consideration of multiple oppressions in an additive sense. In addition, the women in Raza Womyn felt as though they were retaining each other in the academy, stepping in to support each other in ways the university was not fulfilling its retention and diversity goals.

However, doing this support work can have unintended negative consequences for students, especially students dealing with simultaneous multiple oppressions. Vaccaro and Mena (2011) conducted a phenomenological study of queer student activists of color at a single predominantly White institution to understand the consequences of engaging in this activism to

their mental health. They found that students faced a multitude of internal and external demands that placed intense pressure on them emotionally and physically. Students not only faced pressures to be successful academically, but they also faced internal and external pressure to create change on campus, support other queer students of color on campus, engage in their own personal growth and development, and meet obligations to their families. All these pressures to provide for others left students frequently feeling isolated and lonely, leading several to suicidal ideation. Students knew they should scale back and balance their obligations in a healthier manner, but they rarely put this knowledge into practice with the exception of time needed to fulfill family obligations. In their efforts to hold the campus accountable for not fulfilling its obligations to support and retain all students, as well as attending to their peers' support needs, these student activists were being stretched so thin so as for them to nearly break, physically. Although student activists have been critical in the efforts to change higher education organizations toward greater LGBT inclusion and participation, institutions need to remember that students cannot take over work the institution should be expected to fulfill.

Heterosexual students. The final area of recent research into LGBT student activism has been around the involvement of heterosexual students in this work. Scholars have identified this as an important area as heterosexuals comprise the vast majority of people in the United States, and thus are critical to the success of any LGBT political gains either now or in the future (Lax & Phillips, 2009; Pappas, Mendez, & Herrick, 2009). Broido (2000) identified three ways heterosexual allies contribute to the creation of an LGBT-inclusive campus environment; namely, through providing direct personal support for their LGBT peers, through educating other heterosexuals on allyship, and through institutional advocacy that supports change in programs, policies, and practices. Because this heterosexual allyship is necessary, scholars have been

concerned with identifying the characteristics and antecedents that lead heterosexuals to involvement in LGBT activism to understand ways institutions might encourage heterosexual students to participate. Goldstein and Davis (2010) examined the characteristics and experiences of heterosexual students who were members of an LGBT student organization at a small liberal arts college. In terms of LGBT activism, heterosexual students who had been aware of LGBT discrimination before joining the organization were more likely to engage in LGBT activism, as well as students who were also involved in sexism- and racism-related activism. However, approximately one-third of the participants were concerned about being perceived as LGBT themselves if they spoke out on LGBT issues, and half expressed that when attending an LGBT event they felt compelled to clarify their sexual orientation as heterosexual, though more than a third did not mind being perceived as LGBT. Finally, students who had contact with LGB people before college were more likely to participate in both LGBT and sexism-related activism. Taken together, knowing LGB people and having awareness of LGBT discrimination were important antecedents to heterosexual college students joining an LGBT student organization.

Montgomery and Stewart (2012) brought together two studies examining the effects of heterosexual college students' attitudes toward awareness of heterosexual privilege and resistance to heteronormativity on their likelihood of engaging in LGBT activism. The first study was focused on gender differences in a recent sample of college students to see how male and female heterosexuals might differ in terms of the relationship between their awareness of heterosexism and likelihood of acting on behalf of LGBT others. Women scored higher than men on awareness of heterosexual privilege and resistance to heteronormativity, but not on their engagement in LGBT activism. In a regression model predicting engagement in LGBT activism, both awareness of heterosexual privilege and resistance to heteronormativity predicted

58

engagement in LGBT activism, and an interaction between gender and awareness of heterosexual privilege demonstrated that an increased awareness of heterosexual privilege made women more likely to engage in LGBT activism, but the relationship was not present for men. In their second study, Montgomery and Stewart surveyed three cohorts of heterosexual women alumnae of the University of Michigan to identify differences in ascription to heterosexist norms by age, including a combined sample from the classes of 1951 and 1952, a sample from the class of 1972, and a sample from the class of 1992. They found the oldest generation was significantly more likely to endorse heteronormative views than either of the younger generations, but found no statistical difference between the younger generations. They also found women who scored lower on endorsing heteronormativity were more likely to engage in LGBT activism, but in comparing across the three cohorts, this relationship did not hold statistically for the oldest generation. So in addition to differences by gender, Montgomery and Stewart found differences by age in terms of recognition of heterosexism and engagement in LGBT activism among heterosexuals.

Two other studies applied Ajzen's (1991, 2011) theory of planned behavior to examine antecedents to heterosexuals' likelihood of signing a petition in favor of an LGBT-related cause. Wilkinson and Sagarin (2010) developed a structural equation model from data collected in psychology courses at a single institution to test the direct and indirect effects of students' attitudes, endorsement of traditional moral norms, self-identity as an activist, and perceived behavioral control on their intentions to sign a petition in favor of constructing a new LGBT center on campus and then later their behavior in signing a simulated electronic petition. Heterosexual students who more positively perceived both the construction of a new LGBT center and their involvement in signing a petition in favor of doing so were more likely to sign a

petition, as were those students who had a stronger sense of self-concept as an activist. What was unclear was whether these attitudes or self-concept were developed prior to entering college, or if there were influences on campus that played a role in shaping these heterosexual students' intentions to sign a pro-LGBT petition. Swank, Woodford, and Lim (2013) performed a similar analysis using a resource framework for political participation to identify other predictors of heterosexual college students' intentions to sign a petition in favor of extending employment nondiscrimination protections to LGBT people. This study actually conducted two regression analyses on two samples of students, one composed of all heterosexual students and the other of sexual minorities. Large majorities of both groups were willing to sign the petition, averaging more than 80% across the entire sample. For sexual minorities, being a graduate student, being less transphobic, having a stronger liberal political identity, and being more comfortable disclosing one's sexual orientation publicly all predicted a higher likelihood of intentions to sign the petition. For heterosexual students, ascribing to either measure of heterosexist beliefs or to transphobia led to a lower likelihood of intending to sign the petition while a stronger liberal political identity led to a higher likelihood. Given Montgomery and Stewart's (2012) finding regarding gender differences, in both samples in Swank et al.'s study, gender became non-significant after the set of attitude variables (i.e. holding more heterosexual or transphobic views, liberal political identity) was entered. In the heterosexual sample, a set of variables measuring religious affiliation and religiosity which were significantly and negatively related to intentions to sign when they entered also lost significance when the set of attitude variables entered. The authors took this to mean heterosexual college women are more likely to engage in LGBT activism because they are more likely to reject heterosexism and transphobia, and religious background influenced the ways students assessed the legitimacy of cultural scripts (framing)

about sexual orientation, which then led to differences in their likelihood of engaging in LGBT activism. Taken together, colleges and universities may influence heterosexual students' attitudes toward LGBT people and issues by encouraging critical questioning of their frames around sexual orientation issues, particularly calling heterosexist norms into question. Colleges and universities may also expect that heterosexual students who are already questioning these traditional frames of reference regarding sexual orientation will be more likely to engage in LGBT activism.

In summary, the literature on college student mobilizing has found a multitude of reasons college students become involved in LGBT activism, the significance of visibility with respect to the effectiveness of their efforts, and the ways identity and background shape students' participation in activism. Gender, race, and sexual orientation are all salient characteristics in shaping students' perspectives on LGBT issues as well as their willingness to mobilize, and participation in LGBT activism can lead to participation in other social justice action as well. In addition, individual interactions with peers appear to have a stronger influence on LGBT students' assessment of campus climate and safety, and thus their need to mobilize. Also, the ways students frame LGBT issues and identities appear to be the strongest predictors of their willingness to take action. However, many of the strategies and tactics available to students are likely not available to staff or faculty given the additional institutional constraints on their rights to protest and advocate—not the least of which are concerns about maintaining their employment. Faculty and staff may need to consider more tempered or grassroots tactics to push for change on campus.

LGBT Faculty

Faculty disclosure. For LGBT faculty, as with each other constituent group, openness

about their sexual minority identities in the work environment is important for

general psychological well-being, having consequences for productivity as well as relationships

with departmental colleagues and others across campus (Liddle, Kunkel, Kick, & Hauenstein,

1998; Waldo & Kemp, 1997). Additionally, faculty need to be able to come out and disclose

their sexual orientations publicly because their visibility is important to the well-being and needs

of their students, especially their LGBT students (Liddle et al., 1998; Martin, 1996). In

particular, gay and lesbian faculty are visible role models for gay and lesbian students, and the

ways an institution treats its gay and lesbian faculty signals to students how they might expected

to be treated on campus.

However, Martin (1996) and Dolan (1998) point to several protections gay and lesbian

faculty need in order to feel confident that they will not be adversely affected on the basis of

their sexual orientation at their respective institutions, particularly for those faculty working in

states or municipalities that do not afford legal or policy protections on the basis of sexual

orientation. These protections include nondiscrimination policies that cover sexual orientation

(and for transgender faculty, gender identity and expression), equitable benefits policies for

faculty with same-sex partners, sustained visibility to administrators and other campus leaders of

issues affecting LGBT people, empowerment of heterosexual colleagues to speak out in support

of their LGBT colleagues, and support networks for gay and lesbian faculty to find community.

LaSala, Jenkins, Wheeler, and Fredriksen-Goldsen (2008) added that networking with other

LGBT scholars and, for those conducting LGBT research, other LGBT researchers also provides

much-needed support, allowing these faculty to flourish.

Another factor in faculty members' decisions to disclose their sexual orientations is their

assessment of the institutional climate for LGBT faculty. Sears (2002) studied education faculty

members' perceptions of institutional climate to define dimensions of the climate for faculty. Sears first determined three factors *a priori* from his set of survey items to test the effects of perceived support at the unit and institutional levels, and decisions made at the unit and campus levels on faculty perceptions of climate. He found only perceived support at the unit level significantly (and positively) predicted assessment of the campus climate in the final regression model. In a second analysis, Sears used exploratory factor analysis to allow his survey items to load onto factors and developed four factors similar to but distinct from his *a priori* factors: faculty activism in response to discrimination, campus homophobia, perceptions of one's immediate work environment, and level of public disclosure of sexual orientation. From this analysis, only perceptions of one's immediate work environment, a factor very similar to perceived support at the unit level, significantly predicted faculty perceptions of campus climate. Sears concluded that faculty perceptions of the institutional climate stem from experiences within their individual departments. He determined: "My understanding of organizational change and fifteen years in working at a conservative public higher education institution [together] lead me to conclude that a personal, grass-roots approach is more likely to result in long-term and genuine transformation of the institutional climate" (p. 32).

Liddle et al. (1998) also studied the climate for LGB faculty; they produced a concept map of the experiences of LGB psychology faculty members. Their map produced nine clusters of phrases faculty used to describe their environment along two axes—how positive or negative their experiences were and whether they were referring to an internal experience or one that was more external and interpersonal. One of the nine clusters was uninterpretable; the other eight were personal gratification, role demands and rewards, appreciation and support from others, challenges or burdens, legitimacy or presence in the institution, external threats, feelings of

anxiety or isolation, and issues stemming from one's outness. In general, faculty found the positive experiences were more representative of their own personal experiences more so than the negative experiences, even though all were indicative of what they faced being openly LGB psychology faculty.

Consequences of disclosure for faculty. A set of studies on the experiences of faculty pointed to potential consequences faculty face for disclosure of their sexual orientation identities on campus. LaSala et al. (2008) synthesized work presented at a meeting of social work researchers who research LGBT issues and confirmed the psychological benefits of being open about one's sexual orientation. However, sometimes faculty recognized it was psychologically (and possibly physically) safer to "pass" as heterosexual to survive in very hostile environments. The primary consequence LaSala et al. identified for faculty who disclose their sexual orientations is tokenism, being perceived as the "voice" for a minority group, leading to increased requests for service on committees, involvement in campus diversity efforts, and mentoring more students than colleagues are expected, despite the token's actual area of expertise. LaSala et al. also articulated consequences for scholars who conduct LGBT research; namely, LGBT scholarship is subject to a heightened degree of scrutiny, including that LGBT scholarship is perceived to lack objectivity, that LGBT scholarship is too radical, and that LGBT scholarship is neither fundable nor contributes to one's case for tenure. The problem is if one's mentors or tenure reviewers hold these views, they can be very damaging to an LGBT scholar's prospects for promotion and tenure, and faculty have reported facing difficulty in the tenure process for conducting LGBT research (Taylor & Raeburn, 1995). With the increased legitimacy of LGBT and queer studies in the academy, however, these experiences are likely decreasing.

In addition to the perceptions of their colleagues and administrators, faculty also face

consequences in coming out to students, especially in the classroom. Russ, Simonds, and Hunt (2002) studied the relationship between faculty disclosure in the classroom and students' perceptions of faculty credibility and amount learned in the classroom. Using a guest lecturer who varied his sexual orientation in presentations to multiple sections of a communications course, the authors found students in the sections where the lecturer came out as gay rated his competence and character lower than the other students, and rated their perceived learning much lower. An analysis of student comments demonstrated while students were no more or less likely to comment on the lecturer's strengths whether he presented as gay or heterosexual, students were four times more likely to comment on his weaknesses when he came out as gay, and more often used stereotypical descriptors, such as "flamboyant," "liberal," and "biased," to describe his presentation skills. Russ, Simonds, and Hunt concluded that students' prejudices likely affect their evaluation of openly LGB faculty, and, given the importance of student evaluations in promotion and tenure, institutions should be cognizant of the potential for prejudice clouding students' evaluations.

Jennings (2010b), however, compared the course evaluations of three faculty who each identified as lesbian, bisexual female, and transgender to test for significant differences between a course where the faculty member disclosed and a course where the faculty member did not. He found no differences in course evaluations for these faculty except that students in courses where the faculty member disclosed evaluated their professors higher on how well graded materials reflected course objectives (which Jennings somewhat dismissed as the p-value for this finding was 0.049, making it nearly non-significant). He concluded that negative bias on faculty evaluations was not a likely consequence for faculty for disclosing; however, all three faculty taught classes in the humanities, and the courses he compared were not different sections of the

same course but completely different courses all together. While it is encouraging that he did not find significant differences, particularly significantly negative consequences associated with coming out, research still has not demonstrated whether students are more likely to evaluate faculty poorly when they disclose their sexual orientation in the classroom.

Finally, McDonough (2002), through the lens of her personal story of employment as a tenure-track faculty member, earning tenure, and later serving as department chair overseeing the hiring, tenure, and promotion process of others, provides an overview of the risks inherent to the tenure process for gay and lesbian faculty. The risks she identified were similar to those observed in other work, including physical and psychological safety, exclusion from personal and professional networks, and the devaluing of LGBT scholarship. Besides helping new faculty navigate these potential pitfalls, she focuses on the opportunity for department chairs to support the professional development of new faculty who belong to stigmatized and marginalized groups and provide mentoring toward these novices' career success.

Faculty activism and grassroots leadership. While "coming out" by college and university faculty has been framed as a political act in and of itself (Elliott, 1996; Griffin, 1992; Russ et al., 2002), a distinction still exists between disclosure of one's sexual orientation and engaging in campus LGBT advocacy or activism. Taylor and Raeburn (1995), following up a 1981 study of LGB members of the American Sociological Association, studied the consequences faced by LGB faculty for both disclosing their sexual orientations on campus and for engaging in LGBT advocacy work. Messinger (2011) then extended this work examining the life histories of faculty, including both LGB and heterosexual, who had engaged in LGBT advocacy on their campuses collected for a larger study by the AAUP.

Together, Taylor and Raeburn (1995) and Messinger (2011) uncovered nine career

consequences for faculty related to disclosure of their sexual orientations, but even more alarmingly, that LGB faculty who engaged in advocacy work reported these to a greater extent. First, faculty reported discrimination in the hiring process, especially if their curricula vitae demonstrated scholarly work on lesbian and gay issues. A second consequence for faculty was bias throughout the tenure and promotion process, already a consequence for simply being lesbian or gay, but augmented by the ways involvement in LGBT activism or a record of scholarly work on LGBT topics can further affect the perceptions of one's tenure review committee. Exclusion from social and personal networks is another concern that LGBT faculty face in general for being open about their sexual orientations and/or gender identities, but involvement in LGBT advocacy or activism makes an openly gay or lesbian faculty member even *more* visibly gay or lesbian. The problem is these opportunities affect professional development and especially promotion and tenure. Also, similar to LaSala et al. (2008), a fourth consequence LGBT faculty activists faced was devaluation of their work on LGBT topics. As mentioned below, conducting LGBT research is one way faculty engage in LGBT advocacy and resistance, but this work carries consequences when one's colleagues hold stereotypes about the rigor and significance of LGBT work. Faculty who engage in LGBT advocacy also face much harassment and intimidation from their colleagues, administrators, and even students, and sometimes external harassment, including the local media, community members, and even political leaders at the local, state, and, in a few cases, national levels.

In spite of these risks, Messinger (2011) named the motivations that drove faculty to engage in LGBT advocacy, including their own awareness of and experience with LGBT concerns on campus, a general commitment to addressing social justice issues, or a compelling personal interest like the need to cover one's domestic partner's healthcare. Taylor and Raeburn

(1995) enumerated many of the common strategies faculty employ in their advocacy and activist work, which Messinger organized into a continuum based on their level of confrontation—very similar to Meyerson's (2003, 2008) continuum of tempered radicalism. While many cited coming out as an act of political resistance, others spoke about advising gay and lesbian student organizations, mentoring gay and lesbian students, and writing on gay and lesbian topics. Faculty also pushed for LGBT-affirmative changes at their institutions. In others words, despite the risk, faculty felt it important to engage in this work and push for meaningful change on their individual campuses. Finally, Messinger included individual and contextual factors that played a role in the decisions faculty made about their LGBT advocacy, such as self-efficacy in making a difference, level of outness on campus, and resources available to facilitate activism, like official LGBT groups, listservs, academic programs, or research funding.

Lastly, Bacon (2006) provided a rich case study regarding the establishment of a queer studies program at her institution of employment that demonstrates one of the primary tensions inherent in engaging in LGBT advocacy in higher education. She used three examples from her work at her university to represent the core of the debate between scholars who engage in LGBT studies work and scholars who engage in queer theory work: the level of radicalism that can be tolerated by the academy. In the first, two anti-LGBT bias incidents called into question institutional policies and practices protecting free speech, placing these policies and practices into conflict with the role of the institution in countering speech that contributes to a hostile campus climate (like a homophobic preacher who came to campus and shouted homophobic slurs at students). Bacon's other two examples relate to the classroom and the introduction of LGBT-related materials to the classroom environment—the debate over what to call the LGBT studies minor as well as structurally which department to house it in, and tensions inherent to

coming out in the classroom while introducing the notion that identity may be not as stable as students may perceive it to be. Bacon's examples recall the debate within Renn's (2007) and Rhoads's (1994, 1998) studies over the utility of claiming an LGBT identity or adopting a queer one toward the goal of a more inclusive campus environment. However, according to Bacon, among faculty, this debate is between those who espouse a sense of identity politics and those whose politics eschew identity all together. In general, Bacon tried to demonstrate how it was important to engage in both types of work simultaneously, and the compromises she detailed were indicative of the way faculty radicalism has become tempered as it conflicted with the status quo of the institution. She also provided some insight into the challenges educators face when they engage in one of the most common forms of faculty advocacy—the introduction of LGBT issues into the curriculum.

LGBT topics in the classroom. Evans (2000) argued that creating safer environments for LGB students is of utmost concern for college faculty as these students are actively resolving developmental processes related to their sexual orientations that require psychological and cognitive resources and thus need support in order to be able to focus on their learning. Faculty can create more supportive learning environments in many ways, including establishing a classroom climate that is safer for LGB students and introducing LGBT-related material into the curriculum (Furrow, 2012). A safer classroom environment encourages LGB students to be out, and engagement with both LGB peers as well as a diverse curriculum both lead to improved attitudes toward LGB peers among heterosexual college students (Engberg, Hurtado, & Smith, 2007). However, it can be unclear as to the extent to which LGBT issues are addressed in the curriculum as much of this work happens through the decisions individual faculty make about their course syllabi (Jennings, 2010a, 2012).

Two studies focused specifically on the introduction of LGBT issues into family studies courses, an area where LGBT issues would be of direct relevance, given the increased visibility of LGBT families and youth in society. Fletcher and Russell (2001) identified six of the most pressing challenges faculty face in introducing LGBT content into family studies courses culled from their own experience teaching on these topics and relevant literature. Kuvalanka, Goldberg, and Oswald (2013) extended this work by collecting empirical evidence of the experiences of family studies faculty in introducing LGBT material, including challenges, strategies, and faculty perceptions of the overall climate for teaching LGBT issues. Between the two studies, they developed an extensive list of challenges faculty face when teaching on LGBT topics: lack of student exposure to accurate information about LGBT experiences, selecting topics for lecture without trying to cover too much at once, students' intolerance and resistance to LGBT topics, avoiding generalizations about LGBT people, relating LGBT topics to the lives of students, the instructor's own comfort in teaching about LGBT issues, handling students' religious views on LGBT issues, student hesitancy to share negative or ignorant views, colleagues' limited inclusion of LGBT topics in their courses, and feeling powerless to effect change. Kuvalanka et al. then tested how the instructor's perception of the climate for teaching about LGBT issues affected which challenges faculty cited and which strategies they employed. Faculty in less affirming climates tended to use strategies that fostered empathy within students, while those in more affirming climates were faced with establishing a classroom climate where all views, including divergent views, were welcome and discussed. Across the board, though, the biggest challenge faculty faced was negativity and ignorance among students, even though in the most affirming climates students were generally very receptive to learning about LGBT issues. Another issue that emerged was that for many of these faculty their commitment to teaching about LGBT

issues was an individual commitment; even though openly LGBT faculty may be more likely to push for greater inclusion of LGBT topics in the curriculum (Bacon, 2006), the presence of openly LGB faculty was not related to the likelihood of inclusion of LGBT topics across the curriculum in either teacher preparation or educational leadership programs (Jennings, 2010a, 2012). It's very possible that individual actions to include LGBT topics in one's syllabus represents a more tempered form of advocacy for greater inclusion of LGBT topics across the curriculum than a more visible push for curricular reforms.

Finally, Furrow (2012) interviewed LGBT students in composition classes and writing faculty who teach LGBT topics in their writing classes to identify recommendations for faculty to consider regarding the introduction of these topics into their syllabi. Students recommended faculty educate themselves on LGBT issues, set a tone of safety and inclusion within the first few days of the course, establish strong rapport with students, and, for LGBT faculty, to come out as a way to counter students' feelings of isolation. Faculty provided similar recommendations, like establishing the tone and expectations for respect and inclusion early, but also recommended modeling their expectations for students and seeking out consultation to improve teaching and classroom management. Both groups stressed that faculty had a professional responsibility to create a safe learning environment for all students.

This notion of professional responsibility carried over into other strategies faculty employed to engage in LGBT activism. Ryan, Broad, Walsh, and Nutter (2013) studied the experiences of faculty and staff at one institution who participated in an LGBT ally training program. The authors were interested in the ways participants framed their motivations for participating in the program, and found that faculty and staff referred to their motivations in very different ways than encouraged by the program itself. The training curriculum included helping

71

participants understand their own personal development as an ally to LGBT students (and broader LGBT communities), encouraging them to tell their own personal stories of becoming allies. However, participants framed their motivations in terms of a professional commitment to allyship; as educators they felt a professional responsibility to create a safe learning environment for all students. Ryan et al. determined their findings to be potentially indicative of cultural expectations around professionalism within this particular institution. They point to criticism from more radical activists of this type of ally work as side-stepping deeper institutional problems by applying a short-term solution to systemic heterosexism as well as applying an approach to anti-prejudice work that fosters a paternalistic attitude toward LGBT students. However, they counter this argument by suggesting what the ally program participants are actually doing by framing their allyship as a professional responsibility to students is couching their participation in the program within the educational mission of the institution as a way of legitimizing their work. In other words, program participants are strategically framing their radical actions of creating a more inclusive campus climate in a manner that affords it institutional legitimacy—tempering their radicalism. In addition, tempering one's radicalism within a culture of professionalism may be even more imperative for college and university staff who do not enjoy the protections of tenure and only in certain cases are protected by unionization.

In summary, the consequences faculty face in disclosing their sexual orientations on campus can be compounded when they engage in any type of LGBT activism or advocacy. However, the actions they take, especially in the classroom, can have a significant effect on the experiences of students, especially when LGBT faculty serve as visible role models to LGBT students on campus. In order to be visible, faculty need policy-level protections in addition to

tenure to feel professionally safe in coming out, but, more importantly, faculty need a safe and supportive climate within their immediate departments in order to feel psychologically safe to be out. Grassroots efforts to improve the local working conditions of faculty may be a significant method for addressing these needs.

LGBT Staff

Experiences of LGBT student affairs staff. Very little has been written on the experience of being lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender as a college or university staff member, let alone the types of grassroots leadership, activism, or advocacy staff members can engage in. Of the scant writing on this topic, the literature has focused on the experiences of student affairs professionals, leaving the experiences of other administrative staff unexamined. Regardless, much of the experiences of student affairs professionals reflect what other staff members face, in contrast to faculty who are often, but not always, eligible for tenure. In this section I first focus on the extant literature on the experiences of LGBT student affairs professionals, and then turn to the management and human resources literature to identify other grassroots tactics and strategies available to LGBT staff.

One of the first writings on the experiences of LGB student affairs professionals was a chapter by Cullen and Smart (1991) that outlined the major issues this group of professionals faced in the field. This chapter extensively covered coming out and drove home the point that greater visibility of LGB people and their concerns in the student affairs field was crucial to the field becoming more inclusive of LGB experiences. However, consistent with writing on what LGB faculty face, they pointed out several of the consequences student affairs professionals face simply by disclosing their sexual orientation in the workplace, including formal and informal discrimination and the risk of having one's sexual orientation "outed" by others. They also

covered issues facing LGB employees who have domestic partners, the lack of legal protections for people of minority sexual orientations, and concerns LGB employees have about the job search and employment processes. Finally, Cullen and Smart argued that providing environments where LGB student affairs employees could be open and integrate their sexual orientation into their professional identity should be a responsibility of all student affairs professionals and organizations—just as LGB faculty can serve as mentors to and advocates for LGB students (Bacon, 2006; Evans, 2000; Furrow, 2012; Messinger, 2011; Taylor & Raeburn, 1995), LGB student affairs and other staff can also serve in this capacity.

Cullen and Smart's (1991) chapter likely educated many student affairs staff and administrators as to the experiences of their LGB colleagues, but a study of the experiences this group of professionals face had yet to be performed. James Croteau and colleagues conducted several studies in the 1990s on the experiences of LGB professionals in the higher education workplace, and two of these studies focused on LGB student affairs professionals. First they studied the job search experiences of LGB student affairs professionals (Croteau & Von Destinon, 1994). They surveyed LGB student affairs professionals at the 1992 meetings of the two national student affairs professional associations (NASPA and ACPA) and found while nearly 90% of the sample felt campus support for LGB issues at prospective employment sites influenced their job search decisions, one-quarter reported discrimination in the job search process. However, a chi-square analysis determined that those who had disclosed their sexual orientations during the job search were far more likely to report discrimination than those who had not. Additionally, their qualitative data revealed participants were often unsure how being open about their sexual orientation might affect their job search process, and so they often resorted to indirect means to glean information from prospective employers about campus LGB

support.

The second study examined the experiences of LGB student affairs professionals in the

workplace (Croteau & Lark, 1995). Croteau and Lark surveyed members of ACPA's Standing

Committee on LGBT Awareness and determined that more than three-quarters of respondents

reported their overall experience on the job to be positive, but nearly 60% also reported having

experienced discrimination on the job at least once. Similar to the first study, LGB student affairs

staff members who were more open about their sexual orientations were also more likely to

report discrimination, but they were also much more satisfied with their level of disclosure than

their more closeted peers. Respondents reported very similar types of discrimination as those in

the first study as well as in studies on LGB faculty experiences (Messinger, 2011; Taylor &

Raeburn, 1995): discrimination in promotion and performance evaluation, harassment and

intimidation, "outing" in the workplace, exclusion from professional and personal networks, and

microaggressions. In spite of this, Croteau and Lark concluded that despite how common

discrimination was, there are likely counterbalances in the work environment that help LGB

student affairs professionals deal with these issues in their work on campus. In addition, support

in the student affairs field from other professionals was far more significant for participants than

their experiences of discrimination. However, while I would argue these findings can also apply

to the experiences of other administrative staff members in higher education, this literature does

not directly address their experiences.

Finally, this literature is over 20 years old; the student affairs field has changed

dramatically since the mid-1990s, as is suggested by the only scholarly writing on LGBT student

affairs professionals since 1995, Sanlo's (2000) overview of the emerging field within student

affairs of LGBT resource professionals (also covered in Sanlo et al., 2002). Even though the

University of Michigan opened the first campus LGBT resource center in 1971, the development of these resource centers accelerated through the 1990s. These offices were typically established in response to one of the most important needs identified in earlier literature on LGBT issues in higher education (e.g., Croteau & Lark, 1995; Croteau & Von Destinon, 1994; Cullen & Smart, 1991)—the presence of these offices makes LGBT identities and issues far more visible on college and university campuses. In addition to summarizing the history of LGBT resources in higher education, Sanlo (2000) also compiled from interviews with LGBT resource professionals the requisite qualifications for assuming these roles. Directors indicated they needed to be campus leaders on LGBT issues and advocate for the needs of LGBT students and their centers. Many of these directors had also been LGBT activists both within and outside higher education prior to assuming these roles. What is important in relation to the prior work on LGB student affairs professionals is that over 90% of these center directors identified as lesbian or gay—while this might indicate a more welcoming work environment for LGBT student affairs employees, Sanlo did not explore personal satisfaction with this role, and the high representation of LGBT people among center directors could be indicative of tokenism within the student affairs field. Overall, though, the presence of a visible office dedicated to supporting LGBT students and full-time professional roles to staff these offices is an example of a positive change in the student affairs field—and higher education in general—compared to just ten years prior. Yet the literature has since been silent on the experiences of LGBT staff and staff grassroots leadership on LGBT issues.

Grassroots strategies available to student affairs and administrative staff. Even though there is scant empirical evidence of the ways staff act as grassroots leaders on LGBT issues, the literature does include ways staff *could* act as grassroots leaders on these issues.

Washington and Evans (1991) impressed upon the student affairs field why practitioners should become allies to LGBT students and colleagues. They defined an ally as someone who belongs to a dominant group, like heterosexuals, who commit themselves to ending oppression along that dimension of identity—homophobia and heterosexism. Their chapter focused on some of the major challenges heterosexuals face that discourage their involvement in LGBT advocacy, but emphasize the benefits to both the person who acts as an ally and society in general as a result of fighting oppression. This writing was published many years before the proliferation of LGBT ally training programs (Ryan et al., 2013), so allyship may have been even more of a grassroots strategy in earlier eras in higher education than it might be considered now.

Rhoads and Black (1995) also wrote about the ways student affairs staff might consider fighting oppression in their professional spheres of influence. Drawing from Giroux's (1988) work on teachers and K-12 administrators as "transformative educators," they argued for the application of this frame to student affairs work. They pointed to a critical cultural perspective as a third philosophical wave driving student affairs work, following the influence of the *in loco parentis* and developmental theory perspectives, and provided an overview of the theoretical schools of thought driving the critical cultural work emerging in the field of student affairs. They concluded that as scholars continue to critique existing student development theories, enrollments become more diverse, and diversity and anti-oppression work continues to be legitimized and institutionalized within the field, introducing a transformative educator organizing framework to student affairs would be useful for the field to further encourage work that destabilizes the higher education status quo.

Building support for this perspective, Chen and Rhoads (2013) explored the ways faculty and staff become allies for undocumented students as transformative intellectuals. They found

that student activism was a catalyst for faculty and staff engagement, similar to prior work by Rhoads (1994, 1998); that staff and faculty confronted institutional contradictions and raised their colleagues' awareness of the issues undocumented students faced, congruent with Love's (1997, 1998) examination of LGBT grassroots leadership at a Catholic university; that faculty and staff championed more supportive policies and programs; and that staff and faculty partnered with external organizations and communities to meet undocumented students' needs in spite of institutional limitations. In general, they found staff and faculty acted as transformative intellectuals engaged in transformative resistance, and since only six of the 23 participants in this study were faculty, these experiences were likely representative of grassroots strategies available to staff to work on critical issues. Additionally, the stigma around being undocumented is similar in many ways to the stigma surrounding being a sexual minority, especially the invisibility of one's status as either undocumented or a sexual minority, so the findings from this study have much to say about the ways LGBT issues could be addressed among staff in higher education. In fact, Chen and Rhoads pointed to the similarities between the development of support for undocumented students in higher education and support for LGBT students.

Unlike their faculty colleagues or students on campus, student affairs practitioners and other staff members face a unique dilemma when it comes to their own involvement in social movements that take place on campus. Wolf-Wendel, Twombly, Nemeth Tuttle, and Gaston-Gayles (2004) collected stories from student affairs professionals who worked on college campuses through the Civil Rights and Vietnam War protest eras. Student affairs practitioners often sympathized with their students' concerns and sometimes even acted at their own discretion against the wishes of the institution's leadership; however, one dean at Northwestern who did so to allow a Black student to live closer to campus rather than in South Chicago was later

78

dismissed for subverting policy and taking action on an issue controversial to the university. Wolf-Wendel et al. found that student affairs administrators of all levels were caught between their responsibilities to their institutions and their understanding of and sympathy for the causes for which students are agitating. However, the possibility was raised that one way student affairs staff work as grassroots leaders on issues of personal concern to them is through supporting student activists, even in a subversive or behind-the-scenes manner, in their efforts to create change on campus.

Workplace activism. As very little research has looked into the ways campus staff engage in activism, advocacy, or even grassroots leadership, I also reviewed studies on LGBT activism within the workplace to see what light these findings may shed on ways staff could engage in change movements. Raeburn (2004a, 2004b) surveyed LGBT activists and executive leaders at 94 Fortune 1000 companies and interviewed 69 employee members of workplace LGBT networks, in addition to collecting data from other sources, to examine the role of workplace activists in securing equitable benefits policies for same-sex domestic partners and adding sexual orientation to companies' nondiscrimination policies. In particular, she pointed ways LGBT employees shared their personal stories will colleagues and executives, using their stories to engage in the emotional work needed to elicit sympathy and win influential people over to their cause, and making allies more visible to the rest of the organization, particularly influential allies in positions of power or authority. Activists found framing LGBT issues in ways that aligned with corporate goals to be extremely important as company leaders wanted a business reason for adopting equitable benefits policies. As a result, activists developed a profits-oriented frame that connected providing equitable partner benefits to worker productivity, better recruitment and retention of talented employees, and the potential marketability of the company

to the broader LGBT community. Activists then brought these two frames together through frame blending to argue that "doing the right thing is good for the bottom line...equality makes good business sense" (Raeburn, 2004a, l. 3026).

Creed and Scully (2000) also examined the concept of identity deployment as a strategy for workplace activists to champion equitable benefits policies and sexual orientation inclusive nondiscrimination policies in the workplace. Even though their study was conducted contemporaneous to Raeburn's (2004a, 2004b), they tease out identity deployment further than Raeburn to delineate the different ways employee activists use disclosure of their sexual orientation and related personal experiences toward change within the work environment, framing these actions as different types of encounters (Goffman, 1969). Encounters, in terms of how they apply Goffman's concept to this study, refer to the strategic ways people use interpersonal interactions to reveal invisible social identities, and are often sites of "micromobilizing" within broader social movements (Gamson, Fireman, & Rytina, 1982). Encounters can be used to confront taken-for-granted social frameworks that undergird discrimination, thereby questioning the legitimacy of existing social arrangements of power and privilege with ramifications that extend from the interpersonal to the institutional level. Their three types of encounters include claiming encounters, moments when the speaker in the encounter simply wants to reveal her identity to the listener; educative encounters, intended to be educative in nature and instrumental in design; and advocacy encounters, the use of one's personal story as an explicit means to an end. However, despite the inclusion of advocacy encounters, both Raeburn and Creed and Scully distinguish action in the workplace from collective action in the broader LGBT rights movement—the strategies deployed in the workplace are not only noticeably more tempered than those of their activist counterparts, but

sometimes are deliberately more tempered to invoke a perception by organizational leadership that workplace activists are not as radical as their external peers.

In summary, a gap in the literature exists pertaining to the experiences of LGBT staff, student affairs or otherwise, in higher education. While studies in the early 1990's first brought the experiences of LGBT student affairs practitioners to light, and the development of LGBT resource professional roles signaled a major shift toward an LGBT-inclusive campus climate, much of the important grassroots work of campus staff has remained unexamined in the literature. Despite this gap, insights from workplace activism provide possibilities for grassroots tactics and strategies that may be available to staff and point to the importance of localized efforts, similar to the experiences of faculty, that focus on work unit level experiences and interpersonal interactions.

Mentoring: Connecting Faculty and Staff Grassroots Leadership to the Student Experience

As observed in the literature on faculty and staff grassroots leadership, faculty and/or staff often use these strategies to improve the experience of LGBT students. They might not feel as empowered to act on their own behalf, but faculty and staff often feel a professional sense of responsibility to provide a welcoming and supportive environment for LGBT students. Martin (1996) argued that openly gay or lesbian faculty play a role in improving the climate for students primarily by mentoring gay and lesbian students within their disciplines as well as across the campus. Lark and Croteau (1998) studied the mentoring experiences of LGB psychology doctoral students by faculty in their program. They identified two interactive themes that characterized students' mentoring relationships: students' level of outness and their comfort with LGB issues in the learning environment, specifically their perceptions of safety. Lark and Croteau then recommended that psychology faculty, and faculty in other programs, ensure they

demonstrate to LGB students their level of support. Faculty should also be aware that students are at different stages in their identity development, even in doctoral programs; awareness of students' comfort levels can signal to faculty when they might need to refer a student for counseling. Finally, while openly LGB faculty members should be open and serve as a role model for LGB doctoral students, they also need to set boundaries when their time and energy is limited.

More recently, Russell and Horne (2009) explored the role of sexual orientation in the mentoring relationship between faculty and students through a review of research on sexual orientation and mentoring and arrived at several recommendations for faculty to consider that align with those of Lark and Croteau (1998). Their recommendations included the need for faculty to establish appropriate boundaries with students, but to be cognizant of what "appropriateness" might mean given the context of a sexual minority student. If faculty insist that sexual orientation is a purely private matter, these attitudes contribute to the invisibility and marginalization of LGB students. Russell and Horne also point to the ways stigma is ever-present in the mentoring relationship, and can manifest in very subtle ways, such as discouraging students from studying LGBT-related topics, the lack of visible LGBT faculty and other mentors, and the exclusion of LGBT topics in the curriculum. Russell and Horne also pointed out the likelihood of generational differences between mentors and students regardless of the sexual orientation of the mentor; older mentors may be less comfortable with younger students' usage of the term "queer" but should also be aware of the reasons students may use terms like "queer." Finally, mentoring is not a panacea for heterosexist and homophobic prejudice; mentoring cannot replace the broader systemic work needed to dismantle these prejudices that pervade institutional and social structures.

Using data from the National Study of Living/Learning Programs, Garvey and Inkelas (2012) tested relationships between LGB student interactions with faculty or staff and their satisfaction with these interactions. First, they found a significant difference between LGB students and heterosexual students in terms of their satisfaction with staff and faculty interactions—LGB students reported a slightly higher level of satisfaction than their heterosexual peers. In a regression model with the entire student sample, they found that attending class, course-related faculty interactions, and faculty mentoring all related to higher levels of satisfaction with interactions with faculty and staff. Other findings included that men were more satisfied than women, bisexual students were more satisfied than heterosexual students, Latina/o and Asian/Pacific Islander students were less satisfied than White students, and college GPA and involvement in student organizations negatively related to satisfaction. However, Garvey and Inkelas did not necessarily determine what led to greater levels of satisfaction among sexual minorities, but rather experiences that contributed net of sexual orientation. So while it appeared that the difference between heterosexual and sexual minority students may have been attributed to a difference between bisexual and heterosexual students based on the regression model, running separate models with heterosexual and LGB students would have provided more insight into what contributes to increased satisfaction for LGB students. Additionally, their dependent variable was a composite measure incorporating items that examined students' satisfaction with interactions with both faculty and staff. Students interact with faculty and staff in very different ways and in very different spaces, and so while their findings that attending class, interacting with faculty for course-related reasons, and receiving mentoring from faculty all related to higher satisfaction are convincing, these findings provide little insight into satisfaction with staff interactions. This limitation is unfortunate given the dearth of information about the role of

college and university staff, especially student affairs practitioners, on organizational change in higher education around LGBT issues. Regardless, students with higher levels of engagement appear to be more satisfied in their interactions.

Culture and Climate of Catholic Colleges and Universities

When considered together, a solid body of literature exists on the various tactics and strategies, ranging from those that are very tempered to those that are far more visible and radical, that faculty, staff, and students can use to improve the experiences of LGBT members of campus communities, even though some of these tactics have yet to be observed in higher education. Unfortunately, very little of the literature examines the environment in Catholic higher education. Typically, when students, faculty, or staff from Catholic colleges are included, their experiences are folded into larger samples. However, the environment within Catholic higher education leads to important considerations when determining how grassroots leadership on improving the climate for LGBT people could take place. As described in the introduction, there is a tension inherent to the Catholic Church's teachings on homosexuality. On the one hand, Church authority refers to homosexuality as "intrinsically disordered" and same-sex sexual activity as "gravely immoral" (Catholic Church, 1994). As a result, the Church has spoken out frequently on matters pertaining to gay rights that would run contrary to these positions, publicly opposing efforts to remove legal penalties against adults who engage in consensual same-sex sexual activity, to legally recognize the committed relationships of two adults of the same sex, and to allow same-sex couples to adopt children. The Church has also publicly denounced Catholic groups formed to support gay and lesbian Catholics that do not unambiguously uphold and transmit Catholic teachings on homosexuality (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, 1986). Taken together, one would not be surprised that there is a perception that the

Catholic Church is unequivocal in its condemnation of homosexuality and, by extension, lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals (Maher, 2003).

Yet, on the other hand, the Church has also spoken extensively about the dignity of the human person and the importance of fundamental human rights for all people, with no exceptions. Nearly every document on homosexuality issued by either the Vatican or by the conference of American bishops has included some sort of statement on the dignity of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people and their need to live free from prejudice and discrimination (Catholic Church, 1994). The American bishops have spoken more emphatically on the matter than the Vatican, stating that Catholics need to welcome lesbian, gay, and bisexual Catholics into Catholic communities, to learn to eradicate their own homophobia and other prejudice, and to model and teach respect for lesbian, gay, and bisexual people to their children (National Conference of Catholic Bishops & Bishops' Committee on Marriage and Family, 1997). Parents are called to embrace their lesbian, gay, and bisexual children as part of their family and treat them with compassion. Catholic schools are implored to teach that sexuality is an inherent aspect of one's human nature, and homosexuality should be discussed within the context of the Catholic tradition in a manner that respects the struggle lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth are undergoing as they come to understand their sexual orientation. While one might not conclude that the Catholic Church is completely affirming in its messages about lesbian, gay, and bisexual people, one is also unable to conclude that the Church indisputably condemns homosexuality either.

Maher's (2003) synthesis of Church documents on homosexuality between 1975 and 1997 demonstrates this tension between the Vatican's emphasis on the morality of homosexual activity and the American bishops' focus on providing pastoral care for lesbian, gay, and bisexual Catholics, and has deep implications for Catholic education in the United States. While his focus

85

was on the issues facing educators and administrators at Catholic high schools who try to address LGBT issues on campus, the tension and, arguably, contradiction he pointed to also affects the environmental context at Catholic colleges and universities. In particular, Love (1997) identified several contradictions and paradoxes that arise in a Catholic university setting emanating directly from this tension in Catholic doctrine. He argued that change could only come about by making these contradictions and paradoxes more visible, compelling university administrators to address them. Love (1997) pointed to three contradictions that arose in his study of efforts to establish a gay-straight alliance at one Catholic university. The first was that although the university's mission called for a holistic education, lesbian, gay, and bisexual students felt isolated, threatened, fearful, and generally unsupported at the institution. Second, the university had recently publicly committed to improving the institution's diversity, but refused to consider sexual orientation diversity as part of its overall goals in the process. Finally, while many students relied on individual conscience in some matters of social moral concerns, like divorce or birth control, these same students readily invoked Church teaching when articulating their position on homosexuality and LGB rights. Taken together, Love assessed that members of this university community likely did not fully understand the Catholic Church's position regarding lesbian, gay, and bisexual people, and thus their perceptions maintained the invisibility of the LGBT community's concerns.

However, Love (1997) also pointed to several paradoxical and surprising sources of support for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students at this Catholic university. The first was that the most visible support for LGB students on campus came from those departments with the strongest ties to the Catholic Church—the campus ministry office and the department of religious studies, people on campus that had the most comprehensive understanding of the

86

Church's position. Another paradox was that the institution's leadership was unable to lead on this issue due to its intense concern about peripheral influences, like alumni and donors, who might retaliate against the university should it appear to act in violation of its Catholic mission. As a result of these tensions, Love (1998) named several barriers and opportunities at the university that practitioners face when attempting to work on LGB issues. Most notably, he referred to the university's Catholic identity as both a barrier and an opportunity, and he wrote about the influence of external constituents as a significant barrier, at least for leadership. In terms of Catholic identity, this characteristic was only a barrier when people who were opposed to efforts to support LGB students cited Catholicism as their basis for opposition, but it also became an opportunity when campus community members versed in Church teaching viewed it as a call to the university to improve the experiences of LGB students on campus. Maher and Sever (2007) also found similar barriers in their study of educators in Chicago-area Catholic high schools implementing policies and programs to support LGBT students, but they determined parents and local Church authorities to be more significant external influences than would be observed in higher education.

Student attitudes at Catholic colleges and universities. Similar to other studies on the peer normative environment (Finlay & Walther, 2003; Woodford, Silverschanz, et al., 2012; Yarhouse et al., 2009), Maher (2004; with Sever and Pichler, 2008) surveyed students at two different Catholic universities to get a sense of what attitudes are like among students at these institutions. The first was conducted in 1995 with entering college freshmen at a Midwestern, Catholic university (Maher, 2004), focused on the relationship between their attitudes toward LGB people and their backgrounds prior to entering college. He found that males held more negative views than females, graduates of Catholic high schools held more positive views than

87

graduates of non-Catholic high schools (a group he indicated consisting overwhelmingly of public high school graduates), and graduates of coeducational Catholic high schools holding more positive views than graduates of single-sex Catholic high schools. Maher, Sever, and Pichler (2008) then surveyed students living in residence halls at Loyola University Chicago, a Jesuit university, in the mid-2000's to determine how their attitudes toward the morality of homosexuality relate to attitudes on other social moral concerns as well as perspectives on deference to Church authority when determining one's stance on these issues. They found no relationship between students' attitudes toward homosexuality and perspectives on discrimination, but they found that attitude toward homosexuality related to one's deference to Church authority and it related teachings about sexuality. Overall, in contrast to the 1995 study, they found that students were fairly unlikely to agree that homosexuality was immoral, but they did still determine a difference by gender that men were more likely to find homosexuality to be immoral than women. Focus groups then determined that individuals were more likely to rely on individual conscience in terms of their attitudes toward homosexuality as students were likely to know someone who is lesbian, gay, or bisexual, possibly even a friend. They also speculated that expectations of masculinity for men were driving the gender difference in attitude toward homosexuality.

Ways Catholic colleges and universities are addressing LGBT issues. Even though homophobia and heterosexism have been present within Catholic higher education for decades (if not longer), serious efforts to combat these concerns have become visible only within the last forty years. One of the most influential was the effort by students at Georgetown University to establish student organizations for undergraduates and for law students (Dutile, 1988; Lacey, 1986). After the university refused to allow these groups to receive official recognition as student

organizations, the students sued the university under the newly enacted Human Rights Act in the District of Columbia that provided protection against discrimination on the basis of several classes, including sexual orientation. After one court ruled in favor of the students, and a second in favor of Georgetown, the DC Court of Appeals became the final arbiter in the case, issuing seven separate opinions that both upheld the university's right to refuse the student organization recognition but also upheld the students' right to access campus resources in pursuit of their right to assemble. The Court found that the university had the right to deny the organization recognition due to its right to religious liberty, but that the university had discriminated against the students on the basis of their sexual orientation—rather than the stated goals of the two student organizations—in determining their eligibility for official recognition. Only the undergraduate organization explicitly stated it planned to provide a space where students could develop an understanding of sexuality as guided by their individual consciences on the matter, whereas the law school organization had no such goal. As such, the Court determined the university was acting on a stereotype based on sexual orientation in their determination of the groups' lack of eligibility for recognition. As a result, students have generally been able to organize LGBT clubs at Catholic universities provided they define the organization within the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

Even still, establishing an LGBT club or organization at a Catholic university is not an easy process. Love's (1997, 1998) study of one Catholic university followed the work of a group of students, faculty, and staff in their pursuit of establishing a club; ultimately, after the students graduated, the movement lost momentum and the club was never formalized. However, there are several examples in the literature of efforts to establish clubs, policies, or other programs at Catholic universities that were successful, aimed at identifying the organizational factors that

contributed to the effort's success. Getz and Kirkley (2003, 2006; Kirkley & Getz, 2007) were part of a group at the University of San Diego who, after observing multiple incidents of bias and harassment toward the LGBT community on campus throughout the 1990s, received a grant to establish programs aimed at improving the campus climate. Their work focused on one of the efforts that resulted from the grant, the Rainbow Educators Program, which trains students, staff, and faculty to lead educational workshops and presentations on the LGBT community for various campus groups and classes. Getz and Kirkley identified three factors that contributed to the ongoing success of the Rainbow Educators Program—working very closely with the university administration, grounding their work in the Catholic mission and identity of USD, and focusing on dialogue and learning from personal experience. As a result, student Rainbow Educators reported that the campus climate had begun improving, mainly by making sexual orientation a more visible topic on campus. By committing themselves to the institution's mission and focusing on education, they have been able to reach thousands of USD community members since the program began in 1999.

Perlis and Shapiro (2001) wrote about their involvement in a small, mid-Atlantic Catholic college's efforts to change its culture to be more open to diversity, especially sexual orientation diversity. While they had the fortune of having a supportive college President and upper-level administration, they still found that working closely with the administration and grounding their efforts in the college's Catholic values, which they cited as hospitality and compassion, contributed to their success. They also found that by making sexual orientation more visible and providing spaces for LGBT students, faculty, and staff to receive support, people felt more comfortable coming out and the climate began to improve.

Yoakam (2006) outlined the ways St. John's University, and its sister institution, the

College of St. Benedict, provide support and resources for LGBT students on campus. St. John's is a small Benedictine college in a rural area of Minnesota about 80 miles from the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area, and supporters of LGBT issues on campus invoke the university's Benedictine affiliation as justification for providing LGBT given the Benedictine values of respect and hospitality. While the article was not explicitly an empirical study, Yoakam summarized many of the services the university provides for LGBT students as well as findings from campus climate research. The university provided more support than many other Catholic universities, like Safe Zone training, an LGBT student organization, and an LGBT faculty and staff organization, but also lagged behind others through the lack of an LGBT resource center or staff member, equitable partner benefits for employees, or visible LGBT community of students. In general, Yoakam pointed out the variety among Catholic universities in terms of their support for the LGBT community as well as the differences that seem to exist between those affiliated with particular Catholic orders, like the Jesuits or Benedictines, and other Catholic institutions.

Finally, McEntarfer (2011) studied three religiously-affiliated colleges to identify factors important to the formation of gay-straight alliance student organizations. She began by examining the Catholic university where she served as an adjunct and helped advise students forming a gay-straight alliance, and then interviewed colleagues at another Catholic university as well as a mainline Protestant university to highlight common themes across all three. Using Social Movement Theory as a guiding framework, she found that the way students framed the issue to meet administrative concerns about Catholic identity, mobilized resources to network and build support, and took advantage of critical incidents as political leverage all contributed to their success. McEntarfer also pointed to the importance of resilience and leadership development among students who try to pursue these types of actions at Catholic colleges, as

91

students were often not prepared to deal with protracted negotiations with the administration. As students are socialized in heterosexist environments, many face much internalized homophobia that leads them to be quite willing to accept compromises or other terms handed down by powerful administrators when pressing their concerns, like not using the words gay, lesbian, or pride in their organization's name or not using the university's name in their advertising due to administrative concerns over perceptions of the institution's Catholic identity. Even though these compromises contribute to the ongoing invisibility of LGBT issues in Catholic higher education, they also demonstrate the power of institutional Catholic mission and identity when developing strategies for combating heterosexism and homophobia in Catholic higher education.

In summary, even though many of the aspects of LGBT organizing captured in earlier sections of this literature review may apply to the grassroots leadership strategies of students, faculty, and staff pursuing LGBT advocacy in Catholic higher education, the Catholic identity and affiliation of the institution is a powerful force that can both be a barrier to and opportunity for students, faculty and staff in Catholic higher education. Additionally, great diversity exists among Catholic colleges and universities; those affiliated with a religious order, like Jesuit or Benedictine universities, may provide unique opportunities for LGBT organizing given the unique commitments of these orders to a special set of values, such as hospitality or social justice (Currie, S.J., 2010, 2011; McEntarfer, 2011; Yoakam, 2006). As Raeburn (2004a, 2004b) indicated the importance of framing LGBT rights within the profit-seeking goals of corporations, framing LGBT organizing within the Catholic identity and commitments of Jesuit institutions would be critical in developing successful outreach efforts.

Summary

While LGBT grassroots leadership has been studied in many contexts among a diversity

of actors, a gap persists in terms of understanding the grassroots efforts undertaken in Catholic higher education to improve the climate for LGBT people within that environment. As a result, this study stands to contribute to the literature in several ways. First, this study not only examines grassroots leadership phenomena within a Catholic university, but specifically at a Jesuit university, which Yoakam (2006) expected would be more responsive to the needs of LGBT students, faculty, and staff. Second, this study uses a case study approach; most previous work relied on fewer types of sources of evidence which does not offer the opportunity to triangulate findings to a greater extent. Finally, this study examines how a Jesuit university responds to the needs of its LGBT communities as grassroots leadership, which may be more relevant to the Jesuit, Catholic setting than a social movement perspective.

Taken together, this study conceptualizes LGBT organizing within Jesuit, Catholic higher education as grassroots leadership within a multi-layered institutional environment. Overall, the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE) helps identify the locations where grassroots leadership takes place (Hurtado et al., 2012), while the grassroots leadership framework helps illuminate how actors within the institution are responding to the needs of its LGBT communities (Kezar & Lester, 2011). The grassroots leadership framework is especially useful given how grassroots tactics and strategies can remain invisible, even to those who engage them. The MMDLE then draws attention to the curricular and co-curricular spheres of interaction, where most grassroots leadership phenomena are expected to be observed.

In addition, as both perspectives emphasize the ecological structure of the higher education environment, both call attention to phenomena that takes place within each nested layer constituting the institution's structure. These layers include the individual, group, and organizational levels, and the MMDLE also includes external influences such as the sociohistoric

93

context and external commitments. For instance, one influential sociohistoric event has been the commencement of Pope Francis's papacy, and the literature suggested the institution's external commitments to alumni and Catholic Church leaders are important factors. The grassroots leadership lens, grounded within a tempered radicalism framework, also considers the well-developed institutional identity and affiliation with the Catholic Church as well as the likelihood that grassroots leaders also strongly identify with that mission. Finally, the MMDLE includes the multiple dimensions of campus climate—improving the campus climate for LGBT people is the overarching goal of the campus grassroots leaders' ongoing efforts.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Paradigmatic Assumptions

As with any research, a set of axiological, ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions, or a *paradigm*, guides the research design for this study (Creswell, 2009; Mertens, 2009; Patton, 2002). *Axiology* refers to assumptions regarding the nature of ethics and values; *ontology* to the nature of reality and how reality can be known; *epistemology* refers to the nature of knowledge and the relationship between people as "knowers" and that which "would-be-known;" and *methodology* refers to the resulting approaches or strategies appropriate for systematic inquiry (Mertens, 2009). The framework I employ to examine grassroots leadership in higher education is concerned with the multiple perspectives of grassroots leaders as well as their encounters with power and power dynamics (Kezar & Lester, 2011). As a result, this study operates within constructivist and critical paradigms. Constructivist research assumes that knowledge about reality is socially constructed, that people construct multiple realities which may or may not be consistent with each other, and that "truth" has meaning to the extent that it represents a general consensus among multiple constructions of reality, as opposed to some measure of reality that can be objectively reached (Patton, 2002). Constructivist assumptions can also be referred to as "interpretive" in terms of their focus on people's perspectives and the meaning they construct of different types of phenomena (Kezar, 2012; Merriam, 2009).

Paired with a constructivist or interpretive perspective are assumptions grounded in critical theory given this study's focus on power and power dynamics. Critical theorists call attention to power relations and how injustice and oppression shape people's experiences (Patton,

2002). In particular, this study operates within the *transformative* paradigm given its concern with the experiences of a marginalized and stigmatized community, its focus on an analysis of asymmetric power dynamics and relationships, my intention to connect the results of empirical inquiry to efforts toward organizational change, and the use of theory that is transformative in nature to develop the research approach (Mertens, 2009). Mertens also emphasizes the significance of *axiology* in transformative research as compared to research that operates within other paradigms; given the awareness of transformative research to discrimination and oppression, transformative researchers obligate themselves to an ethics that is considerate of cultural differences and concerned for those people most vulnerable in society throughout the research process. Mertens thus encourages researchers to consider themselves as working in partnership with members of the community they are studying. Mertens (2009) also indicated a study need not measure transformation or lead directly to action or change in order to be considered transformative; as such, this study's exploration of current conditions and practices also advances a transformative agenda.

Research Purpose and Questions

The overall purpose of this study is to explore how students, faculty, and staff at a Jesuit, Catholic university address the need for organizational change toward creating a welcoming, inclusive environment for LGBT individuals, as well as the tactics and strategies they engage to enact this change. The research questions guiding this study are:

1. How do students, faculty, and staff determine the need for organizational change in terms of creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for LGBT individuals at a Jesuit, Catholic university?

2. What are the strategies and tactics employed by these campus constituents to precipitate organizational change?

3. How do their multiple social identities, like sexual orientation or Catholic affiliation, influence their perceptions of the need for change as well as the institution's role in addressing these issues?

4. What power dynamics affect the efficacy of strategies and/or tactics to improve campus responsiveness to LGBT issues?

Study Design and Methods

A case study approach. As I am interested in a contemporary phenomenon and the real-world context in which it unfolds, I employed a case study approach for this study (Yin, 2014). The case study approach is recommended when the boundaries between the phenomenon under study and contextual factors may be somewhat indistinguishable, and in situations where many more variables of interest are present than the number of available sources of data. As a result, case study methods encourage the use of multiple sources of evidence to allow for data triangulation and the reliance on theoretical propositions developed *a priori* to guide data collection and analysis. Case studies are also ideal for testing or modifying existing theories, such as the frameworks applied to the design of this study. Yin indicates that one of the most challenging aspects of case study work is bounding the case to distinguish it from its context. For this study, the case is the phenomenon of grassroots leadership at the study site institution and people who engage in grassroots efforts constitute the case. All other people as well as other information and phenomena establish the case's context. Mertens (2009) includes case study research as an important method by which transformative research can be conducted.

The case study approach can call for a focus on a single case or a comparison across multiple cases. A case study should utilize a single-case design when there is a compelling research or theoretical interest in exploring a specific case in depth. Yin (2014) provides several rationales for using a single-case design, including a *critical* case, generally a case whose characteristics are critical for testing the assumptions or propositions of a guiding theory; an *extreme* or *unusual* case, a case so different from the norm that it warrants study on its own; a *typical* or *common* case, a case where a phenomenon can be studied under everyday circumstances and conditions; a *revelatory* case, or a case that had been previously inaccessible to social science research; or a *longitudinal* case, the study of a case over a period of time. Given my interest in the complexity and particularity of a phenomenon situated within a specific institutional context, a single-case design was most appropriate. Specifically, this study examines campus climate and grassroots leadership both at the organizational level and within the organization at the group and individual levels, including embedded group-level cross-case syntheses comparing the experiences of Catholic participants with non-Catholic participants, and LGBQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer or questioning) participants with heterosexual. A multiple-case design could be of use in comparing the study site to other religiously affiliated institutions, but is beyond the scope of this project.

Site selection. Given the focus of both Meyerson's (2003, 2008) tempered radicals and Kezar and Lester's (2011) grassroots leadership frameworks on everyday contexts, I selected a site that could represent a common or typical case for this study (Yin, 2014). Even though every potential study site is unique in multiple ways, and my concern with contextual influences emanates from a desire to illuminate aspects of this case that could be considered unique, I distinguish a common or typical case as one that could not be considered *extreme* (Yin, 2014).

An extreme case could be either exemplary or deviant, but differs from what one might consider to be ordinary or everyday to the extent that its individual idiosyncrasies could not be easily distinguished from the phenomenon of interest to the researcher. For instance, Georgetown University might be considered an extreme case given the university's national reputation, its recent coverage in the media regarding the extent of its services for LGBT students (Spencer, 2013), and its history having faced a high-profile lawsuit following the university's denial of official recognition to an LGBT student organization (Dutile, 1988; Lacey, 1986). I would thus not consider Georgetown to be a typical case.

I used several criteria to determine selection of a site for the purposes of this study. Yoakam's (2006) overview of LGBT services at St. John's University/College of St. Benedict demonstrates how SJU-CSB might be considered a typical case. He spoke about how the colleges provided more LGBT services than many other Catholic-affiliated universities, but still lagged behind others who offered a much broader array of programs and services than SJU-CSB. He also indicated that the universities were located outside of an urban area where no visible LGBT community existed; meaning LGBT people were not particularly drawn to the university as a result of its location. In addition, Messinger (2011) outlined a number of resources that facilitate advocacy and activism among faculty, including the presence of a women's or gender studies program and staff and faculty networks, in addition to student resources like clubs or organizations and LGBT resource centers (Sanlo et al., 2002). Finally, given Raeburn's (2004a) organizational opportunities framework, I also considered the external policy context in terms of the influence state and local legislation protecting LGBT people may have on grassroots leadership at the institution. For instance, as 20 of the 28 Jesuit universities are located in states

that recognize marriage equality, I determined it to be more typical to select one in a state with marriage equality than one without.

The site I selected for this study is Chardin University (a pseudonym), a small, master's comprehensive institution of less than 5000 undergraduates, nearly 60% of whom are women and more than 1 in 5 are students of color. Over half of the student body identifies as Roman Catholic. The university has a student LGBT organization, a campus LGBT resource center, a women's studies academic program, and a nondiscrimination statement that includes protection on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression. The university is not located in an urban center, but is also not located in a rural setting—it is situated within a mid-size city in a state that recognizes marriage equality and provides protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. The city has a somewhat visible LGBT community, but nowhere to the extent that an urban area would enjoy, such as the presence of an identifiable LGBT neighborhood or business district.

In addition to the rationale outlined above, I also chose Chardin University for convenience of access to the campus for the purposes of this study. Convenience sampling can help conserve research resources, like time, money, or effort, in order to extract the most data from a given case, but without other criteria for selection may also result in an information-poor case with low transferability or dependability (Merriam, 2009). I have several personal and professional contacts at the university who facilitated access to the study site, including providing advocacy for my work with key administrators at the site.

The selection of "Chardin" for the pseudonym for this case study was not by accident or chance in any manner. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was a Jesuit priest and theologian who was also trained as a paleontologist and, at the turn of the twentieth century, was involved in research

100

on early hominids (Aczel, 2007). As a result, his paleontological work placed him at odds with the Roman Catholic Church hierarchy over the conflict between the Church's teachings on creation and the emerging scientific theory of evolution. He was exiled to China where he was allowed to continue his work in paleontology, where he most notably was involved with the excavation that discovered Peking Man. Chardin's theological work in particular was suppressed by the Church for many years because of his efforts to bridge science and faith, and he has only recently begun to be recognized by the Church again as an important theologian (Aczel, 2007). Chardin's work draws a parallel with efforts pertaining to the inclusion of the LGBT community in the Roman Catholic Church because, yet again, Church teachings are coming into conflict with new understandings of the human condition gained through lived experience and social science. Many people at my study site are engaged in "bridge" work, like Chardin, to model LGBT inclusion in the Roman Catholic Church.

Unit of analysis. The overall unit of analysis in this study is the university itself as a single case study, but I also analyzed embedded sub-cases at multiple levels—namely, individual and group levels (Yin, 2014). While the overall case includes people who engage in grassroots leadership on LGBT issues at the institution, per my earlier definition of the case boundaries, subunits within this case helped me address my other research questions pertaining to social identities and roles on campus. Social identity subunits included sexual orientation, such as whether a person identifies as a sexual minority (LGBQ) or not, and religious affiliation, whether a person identifies as Roman Catholic or not. Other embedded cases included different constituent groups based on campus role; namely, students, faculty, and staff. These subunits of analysis allowed me to conduct cross-case syntheses within themes where I identified salient differences in the findings.

Data Sources and Sample

  Case study research typically includes many more variables of interest than points of data available to "measure" those variables due to three conditions—the in-depth nature of case study inquiry, the inclusion of contextual information, and consideration of events as they unfold over time (Yin, 2014). As a result, the triangulation of multiple sources of data, often collected via different methods of inquiry, is characteristic of case study research. In this study I relied on interviews, document analysis, and participant-observations as sources of data which are detailed throughout the following section. Data were collected over three weeks; I spent one week in mid-August 2014 on campus conducting an initial set of interviews with staff and administrators who anticipated being otherwise occupied during fall semester, and I spent two weeks in November 2014 performing the majority of data collection, including my participant-observations. Together I spent 14 days on campus. I also performed one interview via Skype after the site visit for a participant who was unavailable during the visit.

  Sample and Interviews. As I am most interested in the perceptions and meanings of grassroots leaders, my primary source of data was semi-structured, in-depth interviews with faculty, staff, and students at Chardin University (Merriam, 2009). Participants were selected using a purposeful sampling strategy in order to ensure representation from among the various groups of interest to the study and to capture divergent and convergent perspectives (Patton, 2002). My sampling strategy helped maximize variation along the dimensions of my intended subunits of analysis—sexual orientation, religious affiliation, and campus role—and so the techniques I employed included criterion sampling, snowball sampling, and theory-based sampling.

Given the very specific demographic variables of interest to this study, criterion sampling was used to identify people who meet specific criteria with respect to the purposes of this study (Patton, 2002). In this case, two of those criteria are identifying as a sexual minority or being religiously affiliated with the Catholic Church, given the study's focus on LGBT issues at a Catholic-affiliated university. Other marginalized identities may matter as well, but the focus of my sampling procedure is on the two social identities directly pertaining to the purpose of this study. Recruiting people who meet these criteria was conducted through systematic means such as inviting members of existing campus groups, like the LGBT student organization, or identifying my existing contacts at the institution who meet these criteria. At Chardin University, there is an LGBT student organization, an LGBT Resource center, an advisory board for the LGBT center composed primarily of faculty and staff, and a Safe Space program whose faculty and staff participants are featured in a directory provided by the LGBT center. Chardin also features a very active and visible campus ministry office as well as several student organizations focused on faith and spirituality. During one of my participant-observations of the LGBT student organization I also recruited student participants by making an announcement during the meeting.

In addition, to identify people who meet these criteria, I utilized snowball sampling by requesting participant recommendations from my contacts at the institution and people who participated in the study (Patton, 2002). This technique allowed me to increase the diversity of participants within each of the campus constituency groups, especially faculty and staff. Snowball sampling has been an especially important technique for conducting LGBT research as historically there have been relatively few systematic ways to identify groups of LGBT people (e.g., student organizations, faculty or staff committees, and ally programs), and the invisible

nature of sexual orientation makes LGBT populations more difficult to reach for research purposes (Meyer & Wilson, 2009; Penrod, Preston, Cain, & Starks, 2003; Sullivan & Losberg, 2003).

Finally, given my focus on grassroots leadership, my conceptual framework also required me to include participants who manifest this specific theoretical construct (Patton, 2002), or theory-based sampling. In other words, I needed to find people who have engaged in some form of grassroots leadership as defined by either Kezar and Lester (2011) or Meyerson (2003, 2008), regardless of their other social identities. However, this criterion will be especially crucial for the inclusion of heterosexual and non-Catholic participants. Specifically, I produced a flyer that was distributed via email and in print on campus to help identify people who were somehow involved in LGBT issues, even in less visible ways. By combining these techniques—criterion, snowball, and theory-based sampling—I was able to recruit a sample of grassroots leaders diverse in sexual orientation identities, religious affiliations, and campus roles for participation in this study.

In addition to interviews with campus grassroots leaders, I also interviewed administrators who can serve as key informants to enrich the case's context and provide broader knowledge of the campus and its diversity initiatives, especially fleshing out the historical, structural, and cultural context for this case study (Hurtado et al., 2012; Yin, 2014). Administrators hold formal positions of authority and influence change within colleges and universities from the top-down, as opposed to grassroots leaders, who work for organizational change from the bottom-up (Kezar & Lester, 2011). I identified administrators who oversee divisions where much grassroots leadership on LGBT issues takes place, or who hold important roles in relation to the university's Jesuit, Catholic identity. These administrators' perspectives helped triangulate the case study evidence to provide a more complete portrait as to the

organizational change that has taken place at Chardin. I also found several of these administrators had engaged in grassroots tactics themselves, especially those with greater longevity at the institution, which helped enrich my findings.

The final sample size for this study included 52 people—43 grassroots leaders and 9 administrators. As the line between staff member and administrator can be blurry given the manner by which positional authority is distributed throughout the hierarchy of the university, I generally considered participants at the director-level or lower to be grassroots leaders, especially directors within the student affairs division. Directors within student affairs at Chardin have frequent contact with students, are physically located within their program spaces, whereas student affairs administrators at higher levels in the reporting structure are located within the student affairs division's administrative offices and oversee the allocation of budgetary resources. Of the 43 participants in the primary sample, 24 identified as LGBQ and 18 as Catholic. Table 3.1 details the demographic composition of the final sample. With regard to the demographics of my study sample, I use LGBQ specifically and solely to describe participants' sexual orientation identities instead of LGBT since I conducted cross-case analyses by sexual orientation group. Transgender identity is not a sexual orientation and thus should not be considered as such in a comparison by sexual orientation; if transgender people participate in the study they will be classified in the analysis with whichever sexual orientation group they identify, LGBQ or heterosexual. However, I will continue to use the abbreviation LGBT to refer generally to communities, programs, or policies as Chardin University uses this abbreviation.

Table 3.1

Sample demographic composition

Religious Affiliation	Sexual Orientation		
	Heterosexual	LGBQ	Grand Total

Student	3	11	14
Catholic	1	4	5
No	2	7	9
Faculty	8	8	16
Catholic	3	2	5
No	5	6	11
Staff	8	5	13
Catholic	6	2	8
No	2	3	5
Grand Total	19	24	43

Faculty. Table 3.2 displays the pseudonyms for the faculty participants in this study and how each was classified by social identity group for analysis. Of the 16 faculty participants, as displayed above, eight each identified as LGBQ and heterosexual, and 5 identified as Catholic while 11 identified as non-Catholic. Four identified as male and twelve as female, and the median length of time employed at Chardin was 11.5 years. Four faculty held the rank of professor, while five were associate professors and seven were either assistant professors or contingent faculty. Four faculty members taught in professional programs while the other twelve taught in the arts and sciences, and ten faculty participants were affiliated with the women's studies program at Chardin.

Table 3.2

Faculty sample (n=16)

Pseudonym	Sexual Identity Group	Catholic Affiliation
Joy	LGBQ	No
Monica	LGBQ	No
Lee Ann	LGBQ	No
Samantha	LGBQ	No
Aubrey	LGBQ	No
Lilian	LGBQ	Catholic

Barbara	LGBQ	No
Kevin	LGBQ	Catholic
Paul	Heterosexual	Catholic
Anthony	Heterosexual	No
Lola	Heterosexual	No
Margaret	Heterosexual	Catholic
Naomi	Heterosexual	No
Olivia	Heterosexual	No
Grace	Heterosexual	Catholic
Matthew	Heterosexual	No

Staff. An overview of the sample of staff participants is provided in Table 3.3. Five of the 13 staff participants identified as LGBQ, and eight identified as Catholic. Seven of the staff participants identified as female, and staff median length of employment at Chardin was two years, with four having been hired within the past year. Five were employed in entry-level or coordinator positions, two held the rank of specialist, and six were directors, four directly in student affairs and one under academic affairs overseeing a student support department. Eight staff participants either worked in student affairs or in a department that provided student support services, two were employed in the law school, and three worked in other administrative units on campus.

Table 3.3

Staff sample (n=13)

Pseudonym	Sexual Identity Group	Catholic Affiliation
Jesse	LGBQ	No
Kyle	LGBQ	Catholic
Emily	LGBQ	No
Ben	LGBQ	No
Brandon	LGBQ	Catholic
Tom	Heterosexual	Catholic
Liz	Heterosexual	Catholic
Sebastian	Heterosexual	Catholic
Hannah	Heterosexual	No

Ariel	Heterosexual	Catholic
Claire	Heterosexual	No
Zachary	Heterosexual	Catholic
Tammy	Heterosexual	Catholic

Students. Table 3.4 provides an overview of how students were classified for analysis. Of the 14 student participants, only three identified as heterosexual, and five as Catholic. Nine identified as female, and among the undergraduates the median age was 21. Twelve were undergraduate students and two were law students, and of the undergraduate students, seven were fourth-year students, one each were third- and second-year students, and three were first-year students. Three undergraduates were majoring in applied or professional programs; the other nine indicated majors in the arts and sciences. Of all twelve undergraduates, only two were majoring in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) fields.

Table 3.4

Student sample (n=14)

Pseudonym	Sexual Identity Group	Catholic Affiliation
Taylor	LGBQ	No
Alice	LGBQ	No
Madeline	LGBQ	No
Amelia	LGBQ	No
Jacquelyn	LGBQ	Catholic
Kristopher	LGBQ	Catholic
Ari	LGBQ	Catholic
Mackenzie	LGBQ	No
Leah	LGBQ	No
Ashley	LGBQ	No
Rob	LGBQ	Catholic
Kenny	Heterosexual	No
Aven	Heterosexual	Catholic
Marion	Heterosexual	No

Administrators. An overview of the sample of administrators interviewed for this study is presented in Table 3.5. I only included Catholic affiliation in this table because all nine administrators identified as heterosexual. Six of the administrators identified as Catholic, five identified as female, and the median length of employment was seven years. In addition, five of the administrators were in student affairs while the other four were in areas including academic affairs and the mission and ministry division.

Table 3.5

Administrator sample (n=9)

Pseudonym	Catholic Affiliation
Gina	Catholic
Cathy	Catholic
William	Catholic
Stephanie	Catholic
George	Catholic
Deborah	Catholic
Esther	No
Eugene	No
Dan	No

All interviews followed a semi-structured, in-depth protocol in order to gather data on a similar set of topics across all participants, but in a manner flexible enough to allow for exploration of individual experiences to a greater depth (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). Interviews covered areas such as participants' perceptions of the campus climate for LGBT people and the consequent need for organizational change, their perceptions of the institution's role in addressing these issues, and the ways in which they act as grassroots leaders or tempered radicals to enact organizational change in both visible and invisible ways. I also asked about the power dynamics they navigate, their reasons for attending or working at Chardin, their motivation for involvement in LGBT issues, and sources of resilience that help them remain

committed to their efforts. The protocols, located in Appendices B-E, include very similar sets of questions but are slightly modified for each constituent groups so that the questions are meaningful to and appropriate for the person being interviewed as well as cognizant of any wider cultural or power implications of the language I employ to conduct interviews (Mertens, 2009). I took extensive notes throughout interviews which informed my follow-up questions during each interview as well as my analysis. Additionally, pre-interview demographic questionnaires were provided to each participant and are located in Appendices H-J.

Document review. As mentioned earlier, a case study requires multiple sources of evidence to build a rich, in-depth case (Yin, 2014). In addition to data I collected through interviews, a second source of data was the review of campus documents and archival records. I collected official documents from the university, examined relevant web pages on the school's website, and reviewed recent reports on the campus climate. A list of documents I reviewed is located in Appendix F. Documents provide a rich source of information that cannot be directly observed, and provide insight into specific portrayals of the organization to various audiences (Patton, 2002). Documents can also lead to new avenues of inquiry to explore through observation and interview, and several of the documents I reviewed were used during the initial stages of data collection to familiarize myself with the campus setting prior to my site visits and to identify possible participants or opportunities for participant-observation. For my analysis, I relied primarily documents stating institution's identity and mission, especially given the salience of the Catholic organizational identity of Catholic colleges and universities within the literature (Kirkley & Getz, 2007; Love, 1997, 1998; Maher & Sever, 2007; Yoakam, 2006), campus climate reports, student newspaper articles, and the university's website for data. Yin (2014) also recommends paying attention to the intended audience and purpose for which documents were

110

created as part of the review process to avoid overstating or misrepresenting the significance of any specific document collected during the study.

I also performed a "web scrape," systematically searching the university web site for key words ("LGBT," "lesbian," "gay," "bisexual," "transgender," and "queer") and documenting all web pages where these key words were utilized. In order to do so, I utilized a web browser extension available for the Mozilla Firefox browser called OutWit Hub, version 4. This software can be configured to collect different types of information from web pages. For this study I configured it to collect the web page titles, URLs, and page descriptions resulting from an advanced Google search of the university website for my key words. The data collected by the software was then exported to a spreadsheet to aid in sorting through the search results. After excluding irrelevant web links, I was able to use the documents and web pages I uncovered to identify more potential participants and departments for inclusion in the study. The "web scrape" also assured me that I had comprehensively examined the university website for instances of LGBT-related issues. This "web scrape" technique also allowed me to find every article published by the student newspaper published within the past ten years which used the set of key words of interest to this study.

Participant-observations. A third source of data was direct participant-observations to allow me to examine the *process* of grassroots leadership at Chardin University in its everyday, real-world setting (Patton, 2002; Yin, 2014). Participant-observations offer the researcher the opportunity to observe phenomena from a perspective that is fully immersed in that phenomena; however, as an outsider, I was also attuned to aspects of the setting that may have been invisible to participants (Patton, 2002). Observations were focused on interactions between study participants, the dynamics of these interactions, the language used and the meanings behind

111

them, and important symbols that may go unrecognized by those native to the setting. To observe the process of grassroots leadership, I attended two undergraduate LGBT student organization meetings, one LGBT law student organization meeting, and a webinar hosted by the LGBT center for staff and faculty on best practices for supporting LGBTQ students in Jesuit higher education. I used the site observation guide located in Appendix G to capture my observations and took extensive field notes during each observation. Attending the undergraduate meetings was most helpful because of the length at which students spoke about how important this organization was to their motivation and resilience to engage in grassroots tactics—I was able to experience first-hand the level of support in the room and observe the students organizing campus activities, like their transgender awareness events. The other two observations added less; the webinar was helpful as an example of professional development and the law school organization offered an example of how the law students have access to a network, but these observations were most useful for triangulating participant comments.

Positionality of the researcher. As the researcher is the primary tool in qualitative research, reflection on my positionality as a researcher is critical in revealing the contribution of my voice to the process of co-constructing the findings from this study (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Patton, 2002). Also, given this study's grounding in transformative assumptions about research, issues such as power, trust, and reciprocity resulting from the researcher's position relative to study participants must be taken into account throughout all stages of research design and implementation (Mertens, 2009). I identify as both a gay male and as Roman Catholic, and I attended two Catholic universities for my bachelor's and master's degrees. I also maintain personal and professional relationships with many people employed at Jesuit colleges and universities. As a result, my positionality offered me unique opportunities to establish rapport

and trust with study participants that possibly led to richer data than someone approaching this study from a different position (Patton, 2002). Specifically, I found my prior experience with Catholic higher education ensured participants of my sensitivity to the unique tensions that arise when addressing LGBT issues on Catholic campuses, and my undergraduate experiences having been involved in LGBT issues at a Catholic university afforded me rapport and trust with student participants in particular. However, these experiences can introduce bias into my understanding of the phenomenon at hand as well (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). The critical nature of this study does not necessarily consider this bias or subjectivity to be problematic, but requires the researcher to be even more self-reflexive and intentional in bringing these assumptions to light and setting them aside as necessary (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). In order to do so, I engaged in constant reflection on my identities and experiences while collecting and analyzing data to identify ways my assumptions are being made manifest (Patton, 2002), and my attention to trustworthiness, which is described later, also helped minimize unseen influences of bias.

Data Analysis

Analysis of case study data took place both during and following data collection, as is characteristic of qualitative research (Merriam, 2009; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Patton, 2002). All interviews were recorded and transcribed, and I engaged in extensive memo-writing throughout data collection and analysis. Analytic memos are narratives employed by the researcher to capture emerging insights into the phenomenon under study and start making sense of the data (Miles et al., 2014). Charmaz (2006) identified memo-writing as critical for qualitative research because written memos are the first step through which the researcher analyzes the data at hand. These memos then become drafts of sections of the full case study report, and offer insight and possible new directions for data collection as the case study

develops. All documents, including transcriptions, campus documents, and field notes from observations, were typed as necessary and imported into MaxQDA version 11 for organization and analysis. Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) like MaxQDA can be especially useful for organizing data, coding, and analysis, and Yin (2014) specifically recommends the use of software to build a case study database for organizing all study data. However, even with the use of CAQDAS the researcher remains primarily responsible for the analysis and interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009).

Coding. Both emergent and deductive coding methods were employed to analyze the data. Before data collection, a set of *a priori* deductive codes were identified and defined from the literature review and conceptual framework guiding this study, which Miles et al. (2014) refers to as provisional codes. As one of the purposes of this case study was to explore and test the applicability of existing theory to one particular case, these provisional codes were essential for identifying related segments of data.

Recognizing that the existing theory may also be limited in explaining the findings from this study, this set of codes were then refined and expanded with codes, themes, and categories identified through the process of emergent coding. Emergent, or open, coding is an inductive process that allows codes, themes, and categories to "emerge" from the data (Miles et al., 2014; Patton, 2002). Emergent codes were captured through several phases of the data collection process and focused on concepts or themes not captured within the study's guiding conceptual frameworks. First, I reviewed documents and pages on the university website prior to my site visit to familiarize myself with the campus, and I engaged in memo-writing to capture my initial insights gathered from these documents. Second, I captured insights gathered during interviews and site observations through extensive field notes. Third, prior to coding, I printed out the

transcripts from the initial nine interviews performed during August 2014. This set of interviews included two students, two staff members, one faculty member, and four administrators. I used these transcripts to engage in "pre-coding," or the process of "circling, highlighting, bolding, underlining, or coloring rich or significant participant quotes or passages that strike you" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 19). Memo-writing helped capture insights gained from this step in the coding process. Finally, all documents and transcripts were read through multiple times to determine emergent codes and themes as well, and emergent codes were allowed to arise during the coding phase.

I coded every document using an open approach, receptive to any theoretical possibilities or potential relevance of segments of text to the purpose of the study to allow for emergent coding to take place (Charmaz, 2006; Merriam, 2009; Miles et al., 2014). I began with the set of administrator transcripts, which helped refine codes prior to coding transcripts for the grassroots leaders. When emergent codes arose, I reviewed previously coded documents to determine whether the emergent code may be relevant to segments of those documents as well. At the conclusion of the coding process I reviewed my coding of the nine administrator transcripts to check for consistency, where I only made minor adjustments when needed to capture more context within a coded segment. In addition, I allowed for simultaneous coding, or coding a segment of data with two or more codes, where multiple meanings within segments of data necessitated more than one code (Saldaña, 2013). For instance, I often applied codes to help identify segments of text pertaining to specific campus programs or events in addition to how these programs or events related to the framework of the study.

Analysis. The purpose of my analysis was both to build the overall case description as well as articulate distinctions that emerged from the embedded subunits within the case. I

followed a series of steps leading to the development of the overall case study as well as the cross-case analyses among the embedded subunits to highlight differences and similarities in perspective. First, I employed the *constant-comparative* method in order to further refine the definitions of codes and themes as well as develop broader categories that connect and relate codes to each other (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 2009). The constant-comparative method involves the comparison of one section of data with another to determine similarities and differences, building toward more theoretical concepts (Charmaz, 2006). In order to do so, I extracted all coded segments for a particular code of interest and read through the coded data within each constituent group (students, faculty, staff, and administrators), making any adjustments to the coding as necessary. My analysis software also allowed me to annotate codes with definitions and other considerations pertaining to the assignment of codes to data segments that arose during this phase.

After I examined coded segments, I then reorganized codes into themes and categories based on how codes conceptually grouped together and on my preliminary depiction of the overall case study. Qualitative researchers often find the need for recoding and recategorization as they reflect more deeply on their data and understand how different concepts relate or how categories may lend themselves to further division (Saldaña, 2013). Yin (2014) recommends organizing a case study according to a descriptive framework as one analytic strategy for making sense of the case study data. This reorganization was guided by the purpose and scope of the study, the study's conceptual framework, the manner in which the codes related to one another, and preliminary insights gained through data collection and initial analysis. This second cycle of coding allowed me to organize the codes in a manner that would allow for a meaningful

depiction of the overall case study as well as prepare for my planned embedded cross-case syntheses.

Following the reorganization and recategorization of codes, I wrote summaries for each participant within each code, which I placed into matrices for clustering and cross-case syntheses. Clustering is the process of organizing and reducing qualitative data by grouping related segments together to help conceptualize different aspects or dimensions of phenomena (Miles et al., 2014). In this case, clustering helped organize the participant summaries and thereby the coded segments to more comprehensively portray different aspects or dimensions of each theme within the case study description.

Matrices also included grouping variables pertaining to the embedded subunits within this case study, such as constituent group, sexual orientation group, and religious affiliation group. I was then able to sort matrices by each of these groups to make contrasts and comparisons between the groups to determine whether salient differences were present in the data and thus perform cross-case syntheses (Miles et al., 2014). Where I found meaningful differences I followed analysis procedures recommended by Yin (2014) for cross-case synthesis. Cross-case syntheses treat each case, or embedded subunit, as an individual case study before comparing between or across cases. Miles et al. (2014) recommend cross-case analyses as a method for deepening understanding or explanation of a phenomenon under study. To perform cross-case syntheses, I separated matrices by the relevant grouping variable, like sexual orientation group, and then performed clustering and analysis within each group before making comparisons between the groups to identify points of convergence and divergence (Yin, 2014).

Although I relied primarily on interview data for this study, document review and participant-observation were useful throughout my analysis for triangulation of findings in

addition to familiarizing myself with the study site prior to data collection and analysis (Miles et al., 2014). Documents pertaining to the university's mission, identity, and culture were coded and used to identify definitions for common campus terminology, and articles from the student newspaper were coded to triangulate information provided by participants about events or incidents that had happened on campus. Campus climate reports were also coded to help triangulate observations made by participants about the campus climate. Participant-observation allowed me to experience first-hand much of the phenomena that arose in interviews, and I commented on my own reactions and experiences in my presentation of the findings.

Overall, Yin (2014) identified four principles for high-quality case study analysis. These include attention to *all evidence*, consideration of *plausible rival explanations*, addressing the *most significant aspect of the case*, and reliance on the researcher's *prior expert knowledge* to assure a high-quality analysis. In order to ensure I considered all evidence, I collected data until I was confident I had reached saturation. Given the exploratory nature of this case study, I was less interested in generating causal explanations as I was in depicting the complexity of the campus climate and grassroots leadership at Chardin; nonetheless, I developed protocols in a manner to identify as many factors as possible contributing to the case study. My data reduction strategies, especially in terms of reorganizing and recategorizing the data to produce a meaningful depiction of the case study, resulted from me honing on what was most significant about this case study, and reflection on my prior experience as well as review of the literature afforded me the prior, expert knowledge needed to make sense of what I uncovered through this study.

Trustworthiness

Yin (2014) outlines four criteria along which the quality of a case study's research design can be evaluated; however, I prefer Merriam's (2009) presentation of these criteria as the three

chief concerns for ensuring the trustworthiness of a qualitative study to its audience because Yin's presentation resembles concepts more applicable to quantitative research. Nonetheless, these concerns are credibility, which Yin refers to as internal and construct validity; transferability, which is called external validity by Yin; and consistency, which Yin labels reliability. Researchers can employ various tactics to ensure a study's trustworthiness along each of these dimensions. Trustworthiness is also crucial in transformative research as it reflects the degree to which study participants can be confident in how well the study's findings represent their experiences (Mertens, 2009).

      Credibility. Credibility is the notion that the data collected indeed reflect the reality they intend to represent (Merriam, 2009). The notion of credibility recognizes that our meanings and constructions will never provide any direct measure of reality, if it even can be measured, but rather will correspond with people's interpretations of reality. One method by which credibility is enhanced is through *triangulation*, or the gathering of evidence from multiple sources to confirm emerging findings. Triangulation of data is characteristic of case study methods (Yin, 2014), and thus is already built into the design of this study. A second is *member checking*, or the solicitation of study participants' feedback on the researcher's interpretations of the data. Member checking involves research participants in the process of data analysis and interpretation, an essential component of transformative research (Mertens, 2009). I employed member checking through making transcripts available to participants for review and by providing drafts of the findings to participants for feedback. Member checking also allowed participants to review the extent to which their confidentiality was protected, and for several participants in vulnerable positions I met their requests to strengthen their confidentiality.

A third method to help establish credibility is allowing for *adequate engagement with data collection*, or the process of developing a thorough understanding of the data, collecting data until findings become saturated, and looking for contradictory or divergent explanations (Merriam, 2009). This method is also built into case study design given the thorough nature of a case study (Yin, 2014), but I also worked toward saturation in my findings by interviewing a large number of participants until I determined I was no longer gaining new insights, particularly evidenced through my observation that several participants spoke to me about the same incidents or phenomena from different perspectives. Reflection on the researcher's position with respect to the data, or *reflexivity*, is a fourth method, which was discussed earlier. Finally, a last method for ensuring credibility is through *peer review*, an inherent aspect of the dissertation process. Peer review or examination includes consultations with colleagues on the process of the study, the congruency of emerging findings with the raw data, and the researcher's interpretations (Merriam, 2009), all of which happens between my dissertation chair and me, and eventually among the committee.

Consistency. A second concern for ensuring trustworthiness is the extent to which findings are consistent with the data collected (Merriam, 2009), or, given the data collected, the results make sense to the study's audience. The main method by which consistency, or dependability, is ensured is through the development of an *audit trail*; that is, a thorough and detailed description of the study design, methods, data collection, and analysis as well as any instruments used throughout the process. The main method through which consistency is assured in this study is through the final write-up of the dissertation, as well as the set of analysis documents produced through the analysis and write-up phases. Yin (2014) also recommended

120

developing a case study database where all materials used to build the case are stored and organized, which I maintained through the use of MaxQDA analysis software.

      Transferability. Finally, Merriam (2009) provides several methods for ensuring the transferability of a study's findings. Transferability refers to the extent to which a study's findings might be applicable in settings other than that in which the study was conducted. The first recommendation is to use *thick description*, or a very detailed and descriptive account of the study setting and findings. This method is achieved in how I write up my findings, especially with an attention to detail and inclusion of quotes or other examples of evidence directly culled from the case study (Patton, 2002). Additionally, the inclusion of detailed contextual information, characteristic of the case study approach, compels the researcher to employ thick description (Yin, 2014). The second is to achieve *maximum variation in sampling*, which I also built into the design of this case study. Collecting data from a wide diversity of people or situations helps extend a study's findings beyond the immediate context in which they were developed. Yin (2014) also recommends with single-case studies the application of theory to the study's design to improve the *analytic generalizability*—generalizability to a set of theoretical propositions, a distinct concept from the notion of generalizability in quantitative, positivist research—of a study's findings. I accomplished this through having developed my conceptual framework *a priori*.

Limitations

      However, as no single study is able to fully capture all that can be known about a particular phenomenon, this study is limited in many ways that can affect the broader conclusions that could be drawn from this study's particular findings. First, the results from the case study are only representative of the perspectives of those who participated in the study and

are not assuredly generalizable to the campus at which this study will be conducted, let alone any broader population or universe of people. However, as mentioned earlier, Yin (2014) notes that the findings from case study research are only intended for analytic generalization, not for generalization to a definable population of people, also known as statistical generalization. Additionally, qualitative research is not intended to be generalizable in nature, but rather transferable to other contexts.

Second, as this is a single-case design, a likelihood exists that findings from this case may represent unique idiosyncrasies of the site at which the study will be conducted that could have been better parsed out through a multiple-case design. However, with my intention of developing a thorough, detailed, and descriptive case study, thick description of the unique characteristics of this case will assist readers in separating the case's context from findings that would be relevant in other settings or to the study's guiding conceptual framework. A third limitation of case study design is the level of resources required to develop a thorough, rich case study, which I addressed through conducting the study at a familiar site, recruiting a large number of participants, and devoting significant time to data collection. Finally, each method of data collection included in the study's design employed to collect evidence carries inherent limitations, but the nature of a case study to rely on the triangulation of multiple sources of evidence addresses any concern that may arise from one particular method's limitations (Yin, 2014).

CHAPTER 4

THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

The next two chapters detail the findings of this study. For this first chapter, I present findings related to the setting, specifically the campus climate and power dynamics facing participants in this study. This chapter offers insight into many of the issues that faculty, staff, and students have identified as key problems facing the LGBT community at Chardin University. As a result, this chapter focuses on organizational and group level phenomena that "set the stage" for individual-level findings around tactics, motivation, and resilience, covered in the next chapter. Again, I use LGBQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer/questioning) only when specifically referring to participant identities, such as in my comparisons between LGBQ and heterosexual participants. I otherwise use LGBT as is commonly used at Chardin.

The Setting

To contextualize findings from interviews with study participants, a review of the university's primary guiding documents—its mission statement and guiding document on Jesuit identity—provided important definitions for terms and phrases used by participants. Some of this discussion has been generalized to help protect the identity of the institution. First, the university speaks of its mission as educational, expecting academic excellence from students enrolled in both academic and professional programs. A second important concept is the university's commitment to development of the whole person, rooted in the Jesuit tradition of *cura personalis*, Latin for "care of the whole person." Holistic education is a hallmark of Jesuit education. Fourth, the mission statement includes the cultivation of several values among students, among which is included social justice, also similar to the institution's peer Jesuit universities. The Jesuit order has historically been involved in outreach and service, especially to

those on the margins of society, and these values are thus enshrined in the university mission statement.

In addition, all 28 Jesuit universities were asked by the Jesuit Conference of the United States in 2008 to formulate a guiding document affirming each university's Jesuit identity. Chardin University's guiding document on its Jesuit identity details what it means for the university to claim that organizational identity. The document provides crucial guidance for university governance by articulating the roles of the university President and the Board of Trustees, and the responsibilities of these constituents with respect to each other, the local Catholic Church, and the governing Jesuit Province. Jesuit universities are considered apostolic works of the Society of Jesus, and thus the President of the university serves as both the chief executive officer of the university and the director of a Jesuit work. As a result, the President is both selected by the Board of Trustees and missioned by the Provincial of the governing Jesuit Province. Additionally, this document clarifies that the university's relationship with the Catholic Church, and thereby its claim to a Catholic identity, is mediated by the local Bishop. One example is that many of the faith activities provided on campus fall under the jurisdiction of the local Catholic diocese due to the Bishop's pastoral responsibilities to people and institutions within the diocese. The statement also explicitly defines university characteristics and values that allow it to claim an identity as Jesuit, Catholic, and humanistic. For instance, as a Jesuit university, the university is committed to the promotion of justice; as a Catholic university, Chardin provides experiences that allow students to engage with the values and doctrines of the Catholic Church; and as a humanistic university, it engages students in self-exploration and the development of character. This statement is far more detailed than the mission statement, and enumerates many of the university's external commitments.

Participant interviews also revealed several aspects of the university's culture beyond those defined by its governing documents, and one aspect in particular is important to note prior to discussing the study's findings. Many participants described the university as having a relational culture, explained by one administrator as the university being "built on relationships," and by one student who felt, upon first visiting the campus, "I was taken aback with the community." Several students spoke about siblings, parents, or other family members who had also attended Chardin, and people mentioned staff and faculty who have had their children attend Chardin as well. The university's relational culture, also called the "Chardin experience," was incredibly salient when administrators, staff, and faculty questioned whether LGBT students were having that same experience as their heterosexual and cisgender peers. Students were concerned about this to an extent, but, as discussed in the next chapter, LGBT students found ways to create a culture that resembled the relational ideals of the institution within their own spaces, regardless of whether they found that within the broader campus.

Finally, to contextualize findings about the LGBT campus climate, a review of recent campus climate reports at the institution highlighted issues that constituents felt most needed attention. One of those areas was the experience of LGBT students. Faculty identified issues related to sexual orientation as the most problematic for the campus, and LGBT students reported many more experiences of bias and harassment than their heterosexual peers. In fact, LGBT students reported the highest rate of experiences of bias and harassment among all groups of students disaggregated within one of the reports. The findings in this next section dig into those experiences further to provide a more nuanced picture as to how the campus LGBT community, and their heterosexual allies, experience and describe the climate.

Campus Climate: Varying Perceptions

"I think you could ask 10 LGBT students and they might all say something a little bit different," said Jesse, a staff member who has worked with many LGBT students at Chardin. She was referring to the ways that students' state of sexual orientation identity development affects their perceptions of the environment around them. This quote exemplifies what I learned about the campus climate from the various participants I interviewed; namely, that the climate is more welcoming than it may have been in the past, there are still ways the climate needs to improve to be more inclusive, and perceptions of the climate vary to some extent among individual participants. In this section, I examine many of these differences in perception, including differences between those who identify as LGBT and those who do not, some of the key issues that affect perception of the climate, internal factors that have contributed to a shift in the climate, and external influences that have affected changes in how welcoming people perceive the climate to be.

Preconceptions about the Climate

Several people reflected that their preconceptions about the climate at Chardin prior to applying or seeking employment at the university were different than the way they experience the climate to be as part of the community. One student, Mackenzie, in her first year at Chardin, said, "The first time I was on campus with my girlfriend, I wouldn't hold her hand 'cause I was scared." These preconceptions were shaped by perceptions of how welcoming the broader Catholic Church is to LGBT people, especially for students who grew up Catholic. Ari, a fourth-year student, said about his family's parish, "The priest is great, but he was so, like, Cardinal Burke status, anti-homosexual. He called it a 'demonizing bestiality sin' and all this stuff." As a result, Ari felt, "When I got here, I was surprised at just how open it was, because I didn't know

anything about the Jesuit culture or anything like that when I first got here." Ari also mentioned these experiences had caused him to struggle with his sexual orientation prior to attending Chardin, and therefore was grateful to find a supportive community where he could integrate being bisexual with his deep devotion to Catholicism.

Employees also expressed some trepidation about seeking employment at Chardin. Most of the faculty and staff I spoke with, especially those hired in recent years, were fairly open about their sexual orientations, and often married or in a domestic partnership with a same-sex partner. Employees are also likely at a very different stage in their sexual orientation identity development than students; many of these LGBQ employees experienced the same identity exploration and development processes that current students face when they themselves were undergraduates. However, the university's Catholic affiliation gave a few employees pause about whether they might need to conceal their orientation during the hiring process, or possibly during much of their tenure with the university. Barbara, a faculty member, described, "Although I was really happy to get the job at Chardin, and there are a lot of things that made me a good fit for Chardin, I was really worried about the campus climate, and I was worried about the Jesuit identity because I come from an entirely secular background." She continued, "I was worried about the Catholic identity. I was worried about being gay on campus." For those in relationships, like Ben, a staff member, and Joy, a faculty member, these prospective employees faced the added concern that they had partners who needed coverage under their employee benefits plans. Joy said, "When I was first signing up for benefits, I asked about if it was possible to get benefits for a domestic partner, and was asking the person in benefits, and she said, 'That's never going to happen here, it's a Jesuit university.'" The university changed this policy when the state began legally recognizing same-sex marriages within the past five years, so this is no longer

127

a concern or different experience.

In addition to perceptions related to the university's Catholic identity, the university is located in Sunny Falls (a pseudonym), a city with a metropolitan area around a half-million people that has a reputation for being somewhat politically conservative and not very LGBT-friendly. Although there is a small, vibrant LGBT community in the city, other areas of the state are viewed as very LGBT-friendly and thus are more of a draw for LGBT people who move to or live in the state. Brandon, a staff member, had lived in one of these LGBT-friendly areas before seeking employment at Chardin, and mentioned how his gay friends in particular disparaged his decision to move to Sunny Falls and work at Chardin. As a result, he said, "I expected to come in, and it to be this very staunch, pristine, very septic, or a place where no one talked about anything…I had this really, I guess, bad idea of what it was gonna be like to come work here." He was concerned because his gay friends viewed both Chardin and Sunny Falls to be unwelcoming for LGBT people, which gave him a less-than-favorable impression starting his job.

Fortunately, both Brandon and Ari quickly discovered the climate to be quite different than they had anticipated. Brandon found "it doesn't seem to be as oppressive or as closed-minded as people make it out to be." He conceded that "there's a very small [LGBT] community here. I think that's what you're gonna get at a private Catholic school," but he nevertheless found the climate to be generally welcoming to the LGBT community. Ari, a fourth-year student, concurred:

> So I get here, and I'm terrified. I'm like, how out can I be? How out can people be here; is this a thing? And then the first thing I saw was for the club fair during orientation—[the LGBT student organization] was one of the first tables out there, and it was just decked

out in rainbows, and I was like, "Oh! That's a thing!" I have to say, overall, it's rather

open and rather welcoming.

Due to the discrepancy between their expectations and their campus experience, both

Brandon, a staff member, and Leah, a fourth-year student, felt the university should convey to

prospective students and employees the resources and community available on campus for

LGBT people. Their concern was that many people might overlook Chardin out of concerns

about the climate. Leah stated, "I don't think anybody should not come here because they're

afraid of that climate being here on campus because I don't see it." Brandon added, in response to

his friends' comments, "I would like to be able to say to them, 'No, actually, it's a really

inclusive place, and it's a really welcoming place… You have this perception of them for

whatever reason, but the reality is a lot different than that.'" However, even Brandon recognized

that he had only been recently employed at the university, and he did not have first-hand

experience as to what it is like to be an LGBT student at Chardin.

External Influences on the Climate

Although, as will be discussed later, participants felt the climate at Chardin to be fairly

positive, especially those who have observed shifts in the climate over the past few years, people

identified several external factors that have contributed greatly to these shifts. These factors

included statements from Pope Francis regarding the Church's pastoral response to LGBT

Catholics, changes in social attitudes and advances in LGBT rights, and what several people

referred to as "the type of student who attends Chardin." These factors may affect the climate for

the LGBT community to an even greater extent than campus efforts, though no participant

described campus efforts as having little effect.

Pope Francis. An important symbolic factor contributing to the climate are recent

statements from Pope Francis regarding the Church's pastoral response to LGBT Catholics. Participants spoke about feeling more empowered to create an LGBT-inclusive environment as a result of many of his statements on the matter. For instance, Gina, an administrator, said, "So how can you say, 'Well, that's not the Catholic way,' when you have a quote from the Pope, who is our spiritual leader in every sense of the imagination."

A few participants specifically referenced the recent Synod of Bishops on the Family as another sign that the Church is contemplating new directions for pastoral outreach to LGBT Catholics. Aubrey, a faculty member, said, "Well, if you look at what happened recently with Pope Francis, and the comments about ways, you know, [gifts] that LGBT people have to offer the Church, and the reaction against that, I think it really does depend on the leadership within the church in some ways," in reference to one of the drafts of a document from the Synod that spoke about the gifts of gay and lesbian Catholics. Kevin, another faculty member, added:

I think right now what Chardin should be doing as a Catholic and Jesuit university is they should be latching onto that with full force, and they should be welcoming the dialogues about what it means—what does the family mean in the modern world? What does sexuality mean in the modern world from this perspective?

However, the influence of the Pope's statements appear to be more aspirational than directly guiding university support for its LGBT community, because, as Tom, a staff member, said, "[The Pope] will speak to the media with very loving words; will he go in and change the Biblical texts and the canonical law? Can anyone? Probably not. But it's a loosening of the sort of stronghold of like, 'This is right and wrong.'" In other words, the teachings have not changed; the Pope is simply recommending a change in tone as to how priests and others with pastoral responsibilities address issues around sexual orientation. So the shift is not so much in the

university's concern about official Church teachings, but rather the Synod may provide the university a new framework for aligning its LGBT resources with its Catholic identity.

Sociohistoric context. One of the biggest contributing factors to the campus climate is the shift in social attitudes towards homosexuality and LGBT rights over the past two decades. As Lola, a faculty participant, noted:

> No single issue has American public opinion changed on so dramatically than the issue of gay marriage. In the last 5 years, certainly the last 10 years, depending on what point in time you look at the public opinion data, it flip-flops. It's remarked on all the time how dramatic that change has been.

Paul, another faculty member, noticed among students throughout the early 2000s, "The balance [of opinion] had shifted to a majority of people were for gay marriage, but they didn't know other people were for gay marriage." However, he has since stopped teaching on the issue of marriage equality in favor of other controversial issues because the topic no longer presented conflict. Matthew also found in his classes that within the past year or two he could no longer find a student willing to take the conservative side on marriage equality to debate the issue. As a result, many participants felt the climate has shifted because the university is enrolling more students supportive of LGBT rights.

Granted, these changes are in no way uniform. Lee Ann, a faculty member, noted that despite changes in society, and on the campus itself, students still face a great amount of difficulty being LGBT at home:

> I see the most from the stories of the students who have shared over the last couple of years is that we could be living in 2014, and have a really progressive campus, and have gay marriage, and all this stuff that is so different from last times when I came out, but it

131

still matters so much what our families think. That, and if our families are not supportive, and for a fair number of our students, I don't believe, my perspective is that the families are not supportive, or they haven't made it a supportive environment…and so in that sense I'm not so sure how much has changed since 1994. I think families are still families, parents still are not excited to have gay children and that still comes through quite prominently in different ways and different degrees.

Although shifts in social attitudes mean students are more likely to enter the university already supportive of the LGBT community, individual students still face very repressive backgrounds that can affect their experience at Chardin, a salient issue on campus given the type of student who attends the university.

"The type of student who attends Chardin." Although many people cited broader shifts in social attitudes as contributing to the campus climate, Barbara noted, "It's become much easier, I think, to be a gay student on this campus. I don't think there's nearly the kind of stigma, but I still think Chardin is well behind the way the rest of the country is changing in terms of its attitudes towards sexual orientation." One reason the university may appear to lag behind broader shifts in social attitudes is "the type of student who attends Chardin." As a religiously affiliated university located in a smaller city, the university enrolls more students with conservative religious views and draws its student body from smaller, more rural and suburban areas than may be expected at a larger, secular, and/or urban university.

As a result, LGBQ students noticed they were the first openly LGBT person many of their peers had ever encountered. Kristopher, a fourth-year student, indicated, "Freshman year I had several people tell me that I was the first gay person they had ever met, or the first gay Catholic they had ever met." However, one indicator to him that the climate was changing was

132

the frequency with which he received these types of comments. He continued, "I think in terms of visibility, there's been a huge shift in that I feel like everyone at Chardin that I talk to knows an LGBT person other than me. I'm not the first-ever gay person they've ever met in their entire lives." He also attributed this to the student population at Chardin, saying, "I think part of it is just the demographic Chardin draws from, in terms of having a higher proportion of people who are homeschooled or people who come from more conservative Catholic backgrounds."

Marion, a heterosexual fourth-year student, acknowledged the way she was emblematic of this type of student. She grew up in Sunny Falls, and commented on the lack of diversity, racial and otherwise, at her high school. As a result, when she started at Chardin, the university was the most diverse environment she had ever encountered. She said:

> As a freshman going in my first year, there's a few things that I felt like it was impossible for me to not encounter, and those were alcohol, partying—because I lived in [the co-ed residence hall]—and people who were different from me. That encompassed people of color, who I really didn't know any. There was like four kids in my high school who were not White. Also, the LGBT community. When I say LGBT community, it wasn't like they walked around with a banner saying, "Hello, this is us." It was more about constantly encountering individuals who said that they were from that community, and talked openly about it, and brought it up in class.

She commented that these individual interactions had a tremendous impact on her experience, helping her develop a deeper understanding of her peers who were different from her. Marion cited these interactions as strengthening her commitments to LGBT allyship.

Climate for LGBT Students

Having explicated external factors contributing to the campus climate, including

preconceptions of the climate at Chardin, the rest of this section presents findings that depict the current climate at Chardin University. Most of these findings were related to the climate for LGBT students; most people, employees included, discussed their perceptions of what it is/may be like to be a student at Chardin who identified as LGBT. After presenting findings related to the LGBT student experience, I present findings pertaining to the LGBQ employee experience, recognizing that participants only spoke about sexual orientation here, and then finally additional points that emerged from the perspective of heterosexual participants.

Compositional diversity. One factor shaping the climate for LGBT students is the compositional diversity of Chardin. Many people pointed not just to the relatively small LGBT community as a factor, but a general lack of diversity, especially with respect to race, ethnicity, and religious affiliation, as shaping students' interactions across difference, and affecting feelings of isolation among minority students. In addition, because sexual orientation is typically not a visually identifiable characteristic, the LGBT community can seem much smaller than it may be in reality, regardless of the environment.

Tom, a staff member, remarked on his perception of the representation of LGBT students at Chardin. At a prior institution, he perceived the representation of LGBT students to be around 10-15% of the student body, most likely an overestimation, whereas he said about Chardin, "But then I came here—broad sweeping generalization—and I feel like the LGBT population is like, hovers around 4 or 5%. And maybe there are more, and they are closeted." Without actual figures, his estimation provides greater insight into the relative visibility of the campus LGBT community as opposed to actual representation. Jacquelyn, a bisexual third-year student, also perceived very few LGBT students on campus prior to joining the LGBT student organization. She said, "It's amazing how many people now I see in the school, like there is a lot of us." In

particular, she mentioned her fencing class where she described the enrollment to be about one-third LGBT.

The campus's lack of racial diversity was another factor identified as contributing to the climate for the LGBT community because the experiences of students of color on campus tended to reflect the ways students from any marginalized group were treated on campus. Amelia, a first-year student, reflected, "We're mostly straight, I'm assuming; we're mostly White or mostly Catholic, and there's no, I haven't really seen any effort, not necessarily to change that, but to accept the people on the margins." Taylor, a fourth-year student, added, "We are on a predominantly White upper middle class campus…in a lot of ways you don't see the marginalization that you typically would see outside."

Another area of compositional diversity that was frequently cited as affecting the climate was campus religious diversity. However, unlike the ways students pointed to the campus's lack of racial diversity as leading to problematic interactions across difference, students cited the university's *plurality*, instead of a *majority*, of Catholic students to explain why the university's Catholic identity was not an obstacle to creating a welcoming, inclusive campus environment for LGBT students. Alice, a fourth-year student, said, "We take three religion classes, but four philosophy classes, because it is more about learning about other people and learning about how you fit instead of, 'Everyone needs to be Catholic.' You know, less than half of the school is Catholic." Madeline added, "And that's something they talk about when you come to visit is that only 50% of our student body is Catholic, and it's okay if you are not Catholic." These students found administrators often used this fact about a plurality of Catholics on campus as an example of the way the university welcomes a diversity of worldviews, including people of any faith background as well as atheists or others without religious affiliation.

On the other hand, at the law school, participants pointed to a high representation of

Mormon students among the law student body as potentially affecting the climate. Emily, a staff

member, mentioned that the Chardin law school tends to enroll a significant number of Mormon

students because of its religious affiliation and location in a community known to be "family

friendly." Ashley, a law student, did indicate some tension simmered between the LGBT law

student organization and the Mormon law student organization, but this tension has not persisted

to the extent that LGBT students feel unsafe or threatened in any way. She said, "There's some

hostility towards like Mormons, and from them [Mormons], so it depends. But, I mean, I haven't

seen too much of it."

Perceptions. LGBQ students generally observed the climate to be welcoming, but were

also attuned to the ways the climate could be improved. For instance, two students described the

climate as supportive and welcoming, pointing to the large, public events hosted by the LGBT

student organization on campus. Leah stated, "I've been continuously impressed with when we

have very open events, like open in that everybody can see what's going on, 'cause we're on the

steps of the student center…there seems to be a lot of people that will stop by our table and

everything." Jacquelyn highlighted a moment during the club's National Coming Out Day event

as indicative of her peers' support:

> Even when we had our National Pride Coming Out Day, like, about a month ago I think it
>
> was, there was this awesome moment, that it made me just so happy. You know the song
>
> "Same Love," by Macklemore? There's that one line, "There's no freedom until we're
>
> equal, damn right I support it." There was a bunch of people there for [another event],
>
> and everyone's kind of just like humming along to the song. On that line, not even
>
> choreographed, the entirety of people in the student center were just like, "Damn right I

support it!" I was like, "Holy God. That was awesome." Everyone at the gay-straight

alliance table were like, "That just happened," and it was, like, a really cool moment.

In addition to these large events, both Leah and Jacquelyn have experienced a general

sense of support for LGBT people among the student body. Leah suspects, "I know there is a lot

of people who are either allies or supportive of the community, but just either don't stop at our

table. They're the unseen people, but I know they exist on campus." She thinks there may be

relatively fewer supporters at Chardin than on other campuses, but she believes a great deal of

latent support exists. Jacquelyn encountered some of this latent support when she first came out

on campus. She said, "I would definitely say that it is an open place, and from what I have seen,

even my super conservative Catholic friends, the ones who know about me, but surprisingly okay

with it. Well I shouldn't say surprisingly, but I was surprised at that time." Even though she may

have expected her peers to be uncomfortable with her bisexual identity due to their religious

beliefs, her experience demonstrated they were still supportive of her.

Although both Jacquelyn and Leah experience the climate to be generally welcoming and

supportive, they still identified caveats where they recognize the climate could be improved.

Leah indicated she is not very out about her sexual orientation as bisexual on campus, and thus,

"I'd probably have a completely different experience if I wasn't passing, I guess, as straight on

campus." Jacquelyn also stated that she thought the campus environment could still improve

from "accepting" to "affirming."

In comparison, Kristopher, a fourth-year student, and Mackenzie, a first-year student,

perceive their peers to be somewhat indifferent on the issue of sexual orientation. Kristopher

described this indifference as supportive, because "that's what I think should be the goal, is that

people shouldn't really care one way or the other about someone's sexual orientation or gender

identity or gender expression or any of the above." Mackenzie interpreted it as "an automatic acceptance. It's just, 'Hey, that's something you are, whatever,' which I like a lot." She nonetheless added, "Chardin is one of the more open Catholic schools. The climate here for LGBT is extremely different from that of Stewart's, [a nearby Protestant-affiliated college], where it's, just honestly, 'Don't talk,' or there's fear for your safety." Further, Madeline, a fourth-year student, and Amelia, a first-year student, described the climate more as, using a metaphor Madeline provided, "walking the fence," between two somewhat contradictory attitudes. Madeline clarified, "Yep, that exists, the gay-straight alliance's a thing, LGBT Resource Center's a thing, but we are a little uncomfortable talking about it." Amelia described, "I think most people aren't homophobic in the sense of, like, as outrageously as you might hear about, like, in the news or something, but there's a lot of microaggressions." On the surface most people claim to be supportive of the LGBT community, but many, often unknowingly, act in ways that demonstrate a lingering ignorance or systemic homophobia. Amelia attributed this paradox somewhat to a higher proportion of students at Chardin who lean politically conservative, but are not necessarily opposed to LGBT rights. She also felt that while "I don't think Chardin is a kind of place where people would openly be like, 'You're going to hell,' or that type of stuff, but I think there could be some social kind of like 'alienation,' sort of." Among even these six students, perceptions of the climate may be generally positive, but vary quite widely, as Jesse suggested in the quote I used to open this section.

As LGBQ student leaders, Taylor and Kristopher both expressed concern that a more indifferent campus climate may lead to apathy toward issues that LGBT students currently face on campus. One issue in particular is the lack of trans-inclusive facilities, such as a lack of public gender-neutral restrooms. Taylor stated:

It's getting better, but at the same time I see a lot of complacency. I see a lot of, "We already have this, so we're not going to push the envelope." Or, "You have a gay-straight alliance; why do you need XYZ on top of that?" For example, yes we got a gay-straight alliance, but we only have one public gender-neutral bathroom in the entire campus.

In addition to strides that have been made for LGBT students on campus, both Kristopher and Taylor pointed to broader social changes as contributing to the complacency they perceive among their peers. Even though, as I described, these changes have made a positive impact on the overall climate, Taylor said, "A lot of that I think is because people believe, because things are getting better, marriage equality-wise, and it's a hot topic, and it's in the courts, and it's doing this that somehow we don't need to push the envelope." Kristopher added, "There is this apathy, and especially, I think, among people in our age group, it's this idea that just because every year numerically has a different number at the end that things are inevitably getting better or more morally progressive—is not true." Both feel the university, and society in general, still have much work ahead in terms of full participation and inclusion of the LGBT community.

Finally, Kristopher added that his experience of the climate differed between the times when he has been in relationships and when he has been single. He said:

As someone who had a boyfriend at certain times over the last four years, and has been single at certain times over the last four years, it's a completely different experience, I feel like, being in a gay relationship on campus versus being a gay single person—an LGBT single person on campus.

Much of this could be attributed to the difference in the visibility of his sexual orientation when walking around campus with a boyfriend than walking around campus on his own. Grace, a faculty member, reflected on the experience of a former Chardin student, recalling, "He said, 'I

feel like I can *be* gay at Chardin as long as I'm very circumspect about it. Meaning I can't *act* gay.' And by that he didn't mean, you know, belt out Barbra Streisand songs. He meant, you know, have relationships, talk about his crushes." Kristopher's experience may suggest the comments of this former student are still relevant now. His peers may be comfortable with LGBT people, but not with expressions of LGBT affection.

Interactions. LGBQ students' perceptions of the climate primarily emerged from their interactions with their peers; most found interactions with their peers to either be positive or at least neutral. Ari said, "I guess maybe not everyone is pro-LGBT. There's definitely—I know people that are not, on this campus, but I think it's a very 'live and let live' sort of attitude with it." He continued, "It creates sort of this environment of, even if you don't accept it, you live and let live and accept that your friend or your partner in the class might be 'that way,' and nobody's actively demonizing you for it—at least in public." Amelia also mentioned she had experienced very little hostility on campus, primarily because most of her friends were also members of the LGBT student organization. With some exception, students' interactions with their peers suggested a general attitude of acceptance of the LGBT community among the student body.

In addition, at least three people mentioned they had seen at least one, if not more, same-sex couple openly holding hands while walking around campus. Ben, a staff member, fondly recalled, "And I've actually seen a lesbian couple, students, walking hand-in-hand on campus. I thought, 'Oh, that's so cute!'" Margaret, a heterosexual faculty member, mentioned, semi-humorously, "I'm at the point where I have a lesbian couple in my feminist ethics class and I want to tell them to stop holding hands because I'd tell any heterosexual couple to stop holding hands." Alice herself mentioned she sometimes walked around campus hand-in-hand with her girlfriend. She said:

I am not afraid to walk across campus holding my girlfriend's hand, but there is a lot of

ignorance. Not necessarily on purpose about LGBT, and there is a lot of people that just

do not understand or have never been exposed to it before. I mean, [we] get looked at a

lot. We get like double takes, I mean, not really harassment, but people notice.

Even though she may not feel completely comfortable publicly expressing her sexual orientation,

Alice does not find her peers' reactions to be hostile or threatening in any way.

In spite of experiencing mostly positive interactions, students have still faced some

degree of exclusion by their peers for being LGBQ. Ari, a bisexual student, spoke about being

ostracized by a couple of his peers after revealing his sexual orientation to them. He said:

I enjoy very hyper-masculine things. I haven't missed a Super Bowl since I was 13, you

know, I go out for any sports. My favorite thing to do is go out and play sports with other

guys, and I had this group of guys in my freshman dorm that I hung out with all the time.

But when I finally got fed up one day of hiding it and came out to them, they were very—

most of them were very accepting, but I did lose a fair amount of friends from it who just,

they weren't accepting. They didn't actively demonize me for it; they just kind of

distanced themselves.

He continued:

It did hurt at first, because I did really like those guys, but then when it came—I realized

they weren't worth it in the end. I'm okay with having lost them as friends. I still, if I see

them on campus, we don't make eye contact. I'm cool with that, you know? If they can't

accept me for who I am, that's their problem. And though it hurt at the time, because I

was still an 18-year-old trying to figure out his way in college—who cares [now]?

However, this experience was fairly rare among student participants, and Ari mentioned that he

also found a strong community of peers within the LGBT student organization.

Brandon, a staff member in student affairs, described it as "fortunate" how infrequently he has had to intervene in LGBT-related bias incidents. He also pointed to the ways student organizations with divergent viewpoints, like the LGBT student organization and the pro-life student organization, hold events at the student center on the same day with little conflict as an indicator of the state of interactions across diversity at Chardin. He said, "I didn't think that would happen, and, in my eyes, I thought, 'Wow. This place is a little bit more open than I think people are giving it credit for.'" However, Brandon qualified this statement by pointing out the issue he and most participants identified that LGBT students face most frequently at Chardin: "I think there are a lot of those microaggressions, and I think that comes more from the students. I think trying to—we could do a better job, I think, of educating our students about, in general, microaggressions."

Microaggressions. One of the most pressing issues LGBQ students face at Chardin is how prevalent microaggressions are. These incidents ranged from more subtle and less hostile behaviors like making broad heterosexist assumptions about groups of students to more hostile interactions like openly expressing disapproval of LGBT people or LGBT issues. As an example of a more subtle microaggression, Kristopher described the ways his chorus director often makes assumptions about the sexual orientation of the men in the group. He quoted his director as saying, "Oh, gentleman, the ladies will love this," or, "Oh, gentleman, ladies will love it if you sing this song like this," or, "All the girls will be crazy about this," remarks clearly made with very good intentions. However, Kristopher described the way such statements make him feel as one of very few, if not the only, gay men in the group. He described, "The hardest thing about being gay is not, in my experience, is not any overt discrimination that I face, it's just constantly

142

being reminded every single day that you're not like everyone else." The challenge he faces as a sexual minority then, is whether or not he should speak up about it, especially in situations where he as a student would be confronting a faculty or staff member.

The most common form of microaggression that LGBQ students face at Chardin is language, such as students carelessly using homophobic slurs when joking with their peers, or expressing disdain with the phrase, "That's so gay." Jesse, a staff member, said, "I think the biggest problem we have right now are not the overt actions of discrimination and harassment, it is the microaggressions. So it is walking through campus and hearing somebody say, 'Fag.'" Amelia added, "My personal experience is just like mostly people saying, like, 'Oh, that's so gay,' or like stuff like that." Jesse's main concern was the ubiquity of this language, especially throughout the residence halls. She stated:

> So it's just negotiating spaces, and being bombarded by those microaggressions, going into res halls, where they also are hearing that, in this space that should be home…a place that you can remove yourself from the bombardment of society, right? And I think it is challenging on a college campus when the res halls are filled with microaggressions and language; where does that safe retreat then happen?

"Outing," or revealing someone's sexual orientation without their permission, is a type of microaggression that can have severe and possibly traumatic consequences for LGBQ students. Jacquelyn had an experience before she was out to most of her friends when her roommate overheard a Skype call between Jacquelyn and another friend. Through her eavesdropping, her roommate determined Jacquelyn had been keeping a very personal secret from her, and the roommate was hurt that Jacquelyn had not been open with her about that secret. After an intense interrogation over lunch, Jacquelyn's roommate and several other friends determined that

Jacquelyn identified as bisexual, and "outed" her to others in the cafeteria at lunch and at dinner the same day. Jacquelyn remembered:

> But I still wish I could've come out on my own time rather than just, "Oh my God. This is your sexuality," and then, actually she mentioned to another friend, "Hey, I know Jacquelyn's secret but I can't tell you." And then I actually got outed twice that day. So I got outed at both lunch and dinner because it was a different group of people; it's like, "Hey, what's your secret?" "Oh I found it at lunch. This is her secret." I was like, "You bastard."

Jacquelyn took the whole incident in stride, even laughing when she told me the story. But through her words I could discern she was incredibly hurt by the experience, and that her roommate had no idea the damage she had done to Jacquelyn's psychological safety on campus. In the time since the incident, Jacquelyn has come to forgive her roommate for her ignorance, recognizing that her roommate had not acted out of malice or hatred. In fact, they are planning to continue living together. However, Jacquelyn is unsure whether her roommate yet grasps the severity of what happened, and how traumatized she was in the moment when her sexual orientation was revealed publicly for the first time.

Overt aggressions. Beyond microaggressions, LGBQ students continue to face overt aggression directed toward them because of their sexual identities. These experiences are far rarer than the microaggressions they face, yet can still have a major impact on their experience, especially in their assessment of the campus climate. Mackenzie, a student, brought up an incident common to college campuses where she encountered preachers yelling at students statements like all LGBT people were doomed to hell. Usually, Mackenzie would tune out the message and continue on her way, but she noticed some of her peers had joined in. She said,

144

"But when students participate with them, like, 'What are you doing? You should know better. This is your university. You know people.'" She found it hurtful that members of her community had joined the preachers, even though they weren't personally targeting her.

Samantha, a faculty member, shared about two incidences of anonymous vandalism. In one instance, after wrapping up an evening class she found someone had let the air out of her front motorcycle tire. She said, "Yeah, that was not good. I barely made it to, I think, it was a Conoco Station, not too far from here without killing myself." She had a separate experience where someone had written "dyke" on one of the chalkboards in a classroom where she was about to teach. However, those were the only two incidents she experienced, and she has otherwise encountered a great deal of support on campus. No students spoke about facing vandalism as an overt form of discrimination.

Student-faculty interactions. The climate within the classroom is another issue that students, as well as some staff and faculty, pointed to as a significant, but not widespread, problem. The biggest concern is that many faculty are either unprepared or unwilling, or both, to respond to offensive anti-LGBT remarks or jokes from students. Jesse, a staff member, found this to be a common experience among many of the students she works with. She explained:

> And I think that it happens for a number of reasons, I think, one, with some faculty
> there's just not awareness: the lens is not on, and so it is literally going over their heads.
> They do not realize students in their classes are being damaged. I think some people are
> aware of it, but it can be a tough conversation to have. They may not feel equipped to
> unpackage it and really confront the behavior in the moment. It is easier to be silent, and
> just think, "Okay, let's just let it go and move on. I have a number of things I have to get
> through on my syllabus, in my course, and this is going to take time."

Faculty often avoid addressing issues related to the climate when they teach courses where they perceive the issue to be irrelevant to the subject matter, and thus believe the problem should be handled outside the classroom. Many participants pointed to the sciences and engineering where this attitude is prevalent, and further, Paul, a faculty member, felt it may even be inappropriate for a faculty member in these areas to raise such issues when the matter is not as directly connected to the curriculum. However, Ben, a staff member, said, "The only time I ever had kind of an issue is when a student came to me and said that they were walking through the school of engineering and there was a 'marriage is one man and one woman' bumper sticker on the wall and a couple of other kind of anti-gay slogan type of things." Regardless of whether LGBT issues are relevant to the course material, these issues pervade the environment nonetheless.

In addition to being unwilling or unprepared, some classroom behavior can completely slip past faculty members' attention depending on the size of the class and the structure of the course. Olivia, a faculty member who has been active in efforts to address campus climate, mentioned that even in her classes, climate-related problems often slip past her awareness. Students only bring them to her attention after the conclusion of the term. Samantha has found students often confine their discontent to social media, though fairly infrequently.

One interesting observation was that many faculty members mentioned how students had become less likely to vocalize homophobic views in the classroom. Participants speculated as to whether changes in social attitudes really meant more people were supportive of the LGBT community and LGBT rights, or whether what changed was that it was now socially unacceptable to voice homophobic views. As a result, several faculty felt they were less aware of what their students were going through because they were hearing less in the classroom. For

instance, Aubrey said, "I've never felt attacked in the way I know some of our students have, and maybe I'm just immune to it, maybe I'm just not seeing it because I don't know what students say." Joy, a law faculty member, also observed, "People aren't going to pull out their bad behavior in front of faculty members. Not if they're smart." Lilian elaborated why she thought students were simply keeping their views to themselves, "I've had students privately say to me, 'No one was willing to defend this, but in the dorms, we still see people who are hostile.' I think it's become less acceptable to say these things in a classroom, but nonetheless in their private lives with their peers, there's still issues." Participants still felt that student attitudes have shifted with broader changes in social attitudes, but they questioned as to whether their perception of students' pro-LGBT views were skewed by a lower likelihood that those who espouse homophobic views will express those views.

LGBQ Faculty

Parallel to students, LGBQ faculty and staff also face a climate that affects their experiences at Chardin University. Similar to students, LGBQ faculty and staff generally perceived a positive and welcoming climate, but different than students, departmental climate was more salient for employees than overall campus climate. This next section provides findings related to faculty perceptions of the climate at Chardin. Staff participants did comment on the climate, but as the sample contains more LGBQ faculty members (8) than staff members (5), and LGBQ faculty commented in much more detail on the climate than staff, this section focuses on faculty experiences. Also, many staff members work in student affairs roles and thus spoke at greater length, and often solely, on the experiences of students. Finally, faculty were the group with the longest tenure at Chardin, with a median length of employment of 11.5 years, and thus many had witnessed the ways the climate had changed over several years, if not decades. Staff

and administrators on average had been employed for fewer years on average (staff median length of employment was 2 years; administrators 7 years), although there were a few participants who had been with the university for many years as well.

For two faculty members who have worked at Chardin for several years, both observed a significant shift in the climate. Lilian pointed to a recent change in university leadership as a turning point: "I mean after that, I was just very—much more open and relaxed. The whole environment of the university had changed." In fact, many people pointed to changes in several leadership roles at the university within the previous five years as having a tremendous influence on the general climate, in addition to that for the LGBT community. Barbara, who identifies as queer, felt the climate at Chardin has never affected her in any adverse way, though she did observe a difference between her experience and that of another of her colleagues, who identified as lesbian and who started at the university at the same time as her: "It was always confusing to me that it was the same people who were supportive of me and weren't supportive of her, and yet it still felt like it was a gay issue." Her colleague has since left the university. For both Barbara and Lilian, in reflection on their tenure at Chardin, the climate has never been more welcoming of the LGBT community than it is now, despite the ways both participants acknowledged where improvements could be made.

For three of the newer LGBQ faculty, they described the climate to be open and welcoming, but their relative newness to the campus and their status as untenured affected the ways their individual experiences were influenced by the climate. Lee Ann spoke about the support she has observed from the university administration. For instance, when members of the Westboro Baptist Church came to protest near the campus, she said, "The campus had totally rallied, anti-them, and, you know, these really nice protests. It was rainbow flags, and the

president spoke, and it was really a big deal. And that also set a certain—that sent a message about the campus climate and everything."

Monica and Kevin have been a bit more cautious in navigating the campus climate. Although Monica is fairly out, she is cautious in many of her interactions with administrators and colleagues outside her department to avoid instigating unnecessary controversy prior to her tenure review. Kevin, on the other hand, has remained fairly closeted due to arriving under a department chair, who has since left the university, who had a reputation for being fairly homophobic. He recalled one instance where he heard his chair make a homophobic remark about a student:

> I'm embarrassed that in those first two years I didn't step up and advocate for a student
> who was—I forget what the comment was; something about "pink slippers," or
> something like that, and clear allusion to sexuality. I thought, "This is not okay."

However, being a relatively new faculty member at the time, and given the university's Catholic affiliation, Kevin was unsure as to how advisable raising a complaint about his department chair may have been. After his chair left the university, Kevin noticed, "I didn't realize how much it was affecting me." He recently participated in the university Safe Space training program and plans to become a more visible mentor for LGBT students on campus.

Heterosexual Participants

Heterosexual participants made many similar observations about the campus climate as their LGBQ colleagues and peers. Most heterosexual participants perceived the climate through observations of the ways their LGBQ colleagues were treated on campus, but several assessed the status of the climate through the ways their own expression of support for LGBT issues was received by other colleagues. Several of these experiences demonstrated differences in how

149

being heterosexual shaped their perceptions.

   Staff members. Heterosexual staff members tended to focus more on the current state of the climate since, as mentioned earlier, most were relatively new to the campus. For instance, Claire found the climate to be very warm, especially in contrast to her own undergraduate experience. Claire had a lesbian roommate in college and shared how "cold" the climate had been for her roommate. In comparison, upon first visiting Chardin during the hiring process, Claire described, "It was a very different experience to have it so open and warmly welcomed— granted that this is like a few decades later but still it was very different." She mentioned she has heard third-hand about LGBT staff or students experiencing marginalization, but has never heard about any incident directly. Zachary also described the climate as positive for a similar reason, saying, "I really don't hear of very many, if any—I don't know if I've heard any acts of violence." Sebastian described the climate as positive, but recognized that the university still has room to improve, because "we would like to be recognized as the Jesuit university in the region that is very, very inclusive."

   On the other hand, two other heterosexual staff members focused on ways the university needs to improve the environment for the campus LGBT community. Liz has had some experience with efforts to address the campus climate, and described the climate as "stalled," or "stagnated." Her perception is that "maybe it's slow and reflective for the last couple of years trying to decide what to do next… This stagnation might just be kind of one of those places where there's a lot going on underground to form networks." Liz felt these networks may lead to the next development in terms of how inclusive and welcoming the climate will become. Hannah is often attuned to the experiences of marginalized groups on campus due to the area of her work. She stated, "I think anything here, if you're different, is a little bit, you know, disconcerting to

people." With respect to the LGBT community in particular, she added, "So I think that there are a lot of caring professors who do really want to make sure that LGBT students are included, but I still think as a Catholic school, there's some tension there." Although people from all underrepresented and marginalized groups at Chardin face a climate that could be more welcoming, the campus LGBT community faces unique challenges stemming from the university's Catholic affiliation.

Faculty members. Heterosexual faculty, like their LGBQ colleagues, tended to contextualize their impressions of the current climate by pointing to the ways they have observed it change over the years. Grace in particular referred to the climate as repressive when she first started teaching at Chardin, because "it was a rare person in those categories, faculty, staff, or student, who was out." With respect to the first faculty member she knew who was openly LGBT, Grace said, "Some people in the department did [have a problem], but I think there were enough people in the department who thought this has to be about her professional performance and she was a spectacular teacher." She added that faculty in any minority group who were among the first hired at Chardin have historically had to overcompensate due to colleagues' stereotypes; "that's part of what happens, you know, when new kinds of people emerge."

Faculty now find the climate to be much more open and welcoming, though they also readily recognize that the environment is not fully LGBT-affirming. Both Olivia and Margaret used temperature metaphors to describe the climate. Olivia referred to it as "coolish warm, headed toward warm but still cool," and Margaret described it as "lukewarm," meaning, "It's not cold anymore, right, but it's certainly not cozy." For Olivia, this assessment was due to two factors. The first is how the climate varies across the campus: "In some areas, I would say it's hostile." The second is a structural problem, the way heterosexism is embedded throughout the

campus culture: "I wish that obliviousness to the heteronormativity of campus, I wish we could do more about that." She added, "And as I say that, I recognize that I can do a lot from my own perspective, that I need to do a better job." Olivia is not only attuned to the variation in how her LGBQ colleagues may experience the climate across campus, but is aware that she herself might be contributing to the overall climate.

Students. Heterosexual students, like Kenny, also perceive the campus climate as generally positive and accepting for his LGBQ peers. However, Kenny also noted the ways being heterosexual meant he was privy to some of the homophobia that persists among students that they do not express publicly or in front of people who may potentially identify as LGBT. He said, "There is a language used around campus, like I know myself and other people are actively working on, you know, people still use the word 'fag' as like a punch line for something." He specifically mentioned hearing homophobic slurs from his friends, adding, "One of them was my roommate last year, and he's great, he's nice, and like, but sometimes, yeah like sometimes the punch lines to their jokes… They would just use 'fag' or, 'That's so gay,' and things like that." Kenny spoke about his efforts to stop this behavior, but he felt his attempts were not successful because he found his friends began censoring themselves around him in response, and he also spends less time with them now than he had before.

Heterosexuals can also be anti-LGBT targets. In addition to witnessing the ways their LGBQ colleagues and peers are treated, heterosexual participants also provided examples of ways they themselves can be targeted by anti-LGBT bias. First, heterosexuals can be targeted for expressing support for LGBT causes or communities. Margaret spoke about how she was initially concerned when she first posted her Safe Space placard that the sign might be defaced or removed from her door. She was one of the first faculty members to do so, and, being relatively

152

new at the time, was unsure as to how colleagues or students may respond. She said, "For the first month or so when that Safe Space sign was up, every morning I would come into the building and say to myself, 'Please, let it still be there. Please, let it still be there. Please, let it still be there.'" She continued, gratefully, "Still there. It's never been taken down." Although Margaret recognized the potential for being targeted, no heterosexual participants spoke about being threatened for expressing LGBT support.

More alarming than the potential of being targeted for expressing support for the LGBT community is the possibility of being targeted due to being perceived to be LGBT. Kenny had a friend who found herself in a very unsafe situation in her residence hall when other students in her hall spread a rumor about her being a lesbian. Kenny recounted:

When she was a freshman, the rumor got out that she was lesbian, and she was on an all-girls floor. And she is, like, kind of a tomboy, sort of, you know, and so I'm assuming that's where that like started from or stemmed from, but like that was terrible for her. She just described, "Yes, that wasn't fun, I didn't enjoy that at all, and that really like disconnected me completely from like the rest, like, from that, you know, that hall."

In addition to his friend's concern about what might have resulted from being perceived as a lesbian by her peers, Kenny also wondered what that situation might have been like had his friend actually identified as a lesbian. He said, "Let's say like, like, if that had been true, and it's been true of someone else, like, is that the same thing? Is that how they're treated also? Are they just completely like removed?" Kenny never indicated his friend faced any further consequences, and she continued to attend Chardin, but he recognized how damaging that experience was for her as well as how damaging it could have been for someone who identified as LGBT.

Aven, a first-year heterosexual student, was once himself harassed on campus with a

homophobic slur. It was early in his first year at Chardin, and he had been walking to one of the eateries on campus to get a sandwich. He described, "Then a car pulled up and they were, I guess, taunting me. They were like, 'Hey, faggot.' I just kept on walking. I just walked back to my dorm, but I don't think they were students. Yeah, that was my first week." He added that nothing further came of the situation, but it completely caught him off-guard, and affected his perception of the campus climate for some time.

Although participants described the campus climate for the LGBT community at Chardin to be generally welcoming, many pointed to areas where the climate still needed to improve. These areas became targets to be addressed by participants in grassroots activities aimed at addressing LGBT issues on campus. However, in addition to the ways participants felt the campus needed to change, they also spoke about the types of power dynamics they needed to navigate in order to successfully influence organizational change.

Power Dynamics

Primarily faculty and staff, but also a few students, spoke of navigating a set of power dynamics as they worked to try to improve the campus climate for the LGBT community. These power dynamics ranged from far more overt efforts at suppressing participants' involvement to subtle slights that reinforced the entrenchment of some of the resistance they faced on campus. Although many examples of power dynamics were those exerted by administrators toward faculty, staff, and sometimes students, administrators themselves also spoke about the types of power dynamics they faced in their roles. Two major points emerge from the experiences that participants in the study shared with me. The first is that the resistance that participants have faced on campus has diminished in recent years. This is especially so with regard to many of the more overt negative reactions that might have been more commonly encountered under previous

154

university leadership. The second is that power dynamics at Chardin are shaped by the institution's Catholic identity. The stated motivation for most of the resistance to LGBT-supportive efforts is concern about the university's Catholic identity. Many powerful constituents and stakeholders fear that an LGBT-supportive climate will be seen as evidence of a diminished Catholic identity at the university that may be detrimental to its organizational health. This section is organized according to Kezar and Lester's (2011) taxonomy of power dynamics, arranged from most to least severe, beginning with examples of overt oppression.

Overt Oppression

Participants shared very few examples of overt oppression exerted by someone within the university against a colleague or peer as a form of suppression. Ten participants mentioned one profound situation from several years ago when a tenure-track faculty member began transitioning from female to male; the climate on campus became so hostile for him that he left before he achieved tenure. Several participants recalled hearing about hostility from the then-president and other members of the university leadership who were concerned about the effect having a transgender faculty member may have on the university's Catholic image. Cathy, an administrator, mentioned that this faculty member was one of the most well-liked faculty members among the students, but "just because she was changing to a male, people wanted her out of here. We couldn't have someone like that; it would ruin the reputation, or whatever." William, another administrator, added that the insensitivity demonstrated throughout the development of a process to assist this faculty member with his transition drove that faculty member to leave. For example, William said, "They tried to associate, you know, trying to create a unisex bathroom and all this other stuff as an accommodation that the disability support office would do." William's point was that the institution demonstrated deep discomfort with having a

tenured transgender faculty member, and that resistance ultimately convinced him that leaving the university was his best option.

In comparison, several participants provided examples of overt, hostile oppression from external actors directed toward individual faculty members or administrators. One faculty member mentioned being featured in an alumni publication, and the story mentioned her family, including her children and her wife. Although the story upset several external constituents, this faculty member told me she received one particularly threatening email that she immediately forwarded to the administration. Both the Academic Vice President and the university President contacted her immediately to express their support and concern for her safety and the safety of her family.

One female administrator shared with me that she had also been a target in an overt attack by an external actor, and added, "But when you get to sexual identity issues, it's particularly vicious towards the women." For instance, when the job description for the LGBT center director was posted, "this individual saw the ad and sent it to me with a note saying, 'This would of course be perfect for you since you *are*, obviously,' and then went on and on and on." A second administrator shared an example of one very specific threat early in his tenure at Chardin that made him and campus security nervous about his safety on campus. He recalled, "One time I actually had a threat against me because somebody had said, they're trying to figure out where it came from, was, 'We know where you park your car.'" The director of campus security actually recommended he rearrange his work hours so he could leave campus before dark, but he responded, "I'm not going to change my life because I'm being threatened," especially in the wintertime when it can get dark pretty early in the evening. The concern arose from the fact that a very active White Supremacist group had been located within a thirty minute drive of Chardin

during that time, and these threats mirrored those made by this group against others in the community; however, the group has since relocated.

Concern about these types of threats persists as a reality for many participants. Although joking, Barbara, a faculty member, raised the point that she might receive death threats as soon as her proposed LGBT course is officially included in the Chardin course catalog. She laughed when she said, "Mostly a joke, if I don't get at least three death threats when that hits the catalog, I'm gonna feel disappointed." Her joking suggested she recognizes these types of threats have never resulted in physical harm, but acknowledging the likelihood of receiving these threats also helps her psychologically prepare to deal with any that she may receive.

"Catholic Police"

A second dynamic that resembles more overt oppression, but typically manifests in less overt ways is the bullying and intimidation many participants spoke about receiving from colleagues and peers who one administrator referred to as the "Catholic police." Participants who had worked at Chardin longer spoke about the resistance they faced from students and faculty who openly confronted them about initiatives perceived as undermining the university's Catholic image. These power dynamics were especially evident with respect to LGBT issues because, for many of these students and faculty, even tacit affirmation of LGBT identities is understood to be in direct conflict with Catholic Church teaching. Newer faculty and staff, as well as current students, spoke very little about bullying or intimidation framed around the school's Catholic identity. The practice seems to have been far more prevalent under previous university presidents who chose to promote and emphasize a different articulation of the institution's Catholic identity.

Student incivility. Two long-standing faculty members recalled instances where students openly confronted them or their colleagues either one-on-one or in public forums about teaching

ideas these students felt were in conflict with Catholic doctrine. Grace recalled, "There were some students who told me, basically, get out." She continued:

> But there's one student who was here…when he'd see me anywhere he would pull out the giant book of the Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church, and, sort of, you know, remind me, because he had told me in some public meeting that we both attended that if I would read it 30 minutes every day, you know, I could possibly be saved. And one of my colleagues told me, "Why don't you ever get up and say, 'Listen you little twerp! I am 40 years older than you are!'" And I said, I thought, "Well I don't think that would be a good thing to do."

Students also signed up for these faculty members' courses to disrupt them, as Lilian remembered, "They signed up for those classes to be a presence in the class, and made themselves quite visible and challenged faculty. In some cases, [they] really made the classroom environment very difficult because of the way in which they participated in class." However, Lilian added that the problem was not that these students were challenging faculty in classes. She said:

> Of course I want students to challenge everything that's being said. I hope that in challenging it, they're open to exploring different points of view. These students weren't open in any way. They weren't challenging things in order to engage. They were challenging things simply to disrupt. That was difficult.

Lilian added that these students frequently alerted external organizations, like the Cardinal Newman Society, which aims to publicly shame Catholic colleges and universities they feel are openly defying their Catholic affiliations, about activities at Chardin these students perceive to be flouting Church teaching.

158

Staff members also spoke about being targets for this kind of intimidation from students. One staff counseling member recalled being interviewed for a student publication about services provided by the counseling office. He said, "They came here and they were asking, 'What if you had a student who was maybe struggling with his or her sexual orientation, would you provide gay-friendly therapy or therapy that is more in line with the "traditional teachings of the church"?'" He replied:

> I very openly said, "We will provide services that are 'friendly,' if that's what you want to call it, that are validating of the experience of the student and that embrace their full humanity and that doesn't, in any way, negate their sexual identity or orientation." And some of these students were ready to go and publish that in their magazines and they were really very adversarial to the services that we're providing.

However, this staff member cautioned the students about the possible consequences of publishing the story in the manner they intended. He expressed his concern that the article would contribute to the stigmatization of LGBT students on campus, and, as a result, he recalled, "I'm glad that students finally desisted and they stopped that type of campaign they were launching." This dynamic appears to have subsided as only longer term faculty and staff recalled these interactions, with several mentioning they no longer face this type of behavior.

One of the likely reasons that student-initiated bullying has diminished is due to one of the factors influencing the climate. Students who attend Chardin are more likely to support LGBT rights, and those who do not, are less likely to voice those opinions. An additional reason, though, is the development of an external organization, Concerned Stakeholders in Chardin University (a pseudonym), dedicated to what they refer to as "preserving and recovering" the university's Catholic identity. The group consists of benefactors, parents, alumni, including those

159

aforementioned students who raised issues with faculty and staff, and other "friends" of the university, and was formed around the time the university appointed its first lay President. The group maintains a blog on their website where they write about activities at Chardin they feel conflict with the university's Catholic identity, and they encourage others who share their concerns to become involved in the organization. Current students are possibly affiliated with the organization, but neither the organization's website nor any participant interviews offered examples of this.

Another reason these behaviors are less common is that the current administration actively opposes efforts to use the Catholic identity of the university as a rationale for any discrimination. As one administrator remarked, "It continues to take work on the part of the people, and the Mission division, and my division, and such, to help people realize that you cannot use the 'Catholic card' to be exclusive—that it's not okay."

Faculty intimidation. Several faculty on campus, who are also concerned about the university's Catholic identity, are fairly vocal about their discontent as well. Again, longer-serving faculty recalled times when departments, like Lilian's, were more polarized between what she described as those who wanted a more welcoming climate and those "who really felt this was a chance to really reclaim a Catholic identity." Grace found her colleagues who aligned with such a vision felt "you're either a Catholic, or you're in some weird cafeteria that we get to boot you out of. And I just, I don't accept that." Faculty have been less likely to directly confront each other in the same manner that students confronted faculty, but they make themselves heard in other ways, such as sending emails over faculty listservs or placing posters and bumper stickers on their office doors and walls.

Most alarmingly, though, is that faculty and administrators are not the only targets of

faculty intimidation. Several students spoke about an incident when members of the undergraduate LGBT student organization were targeted by a faculty member who acted in a surprisingly threatening manner. Students have wanted to organize a drag show on campus for several years, but staff members concerned about the possibility of controversy or negative backlash have stalled efforts to organize such an event. As an alternative, the students decided to organize a smaller event that focused on raising awareness around issues of gender expression during their larger week of events they collectively call, "Pride Week." For the event, two students dressed in drag, and two others dressed androgynously. Their purpose was to provide information for their peers about the history of gender expression within the LGBT community and to demonstrate the relationship between gender expression and gender identity.

One of the student leaders, Taylor, told me that several of the students' peers took pictures at the event, most often with the students who were participating, which was welcomed by the event organizers. So when an older man stopped by the event and took out his phone to take pictures, she and others were not alarmed. However, this man stood there for about ten to fifteen minutes recording a video, instead of taking pictures, without saying anything to the participants. That was when Taylor and her peers began to worry about the person's intentions. She recalled one of her fellow participants asking her, "'Do you know what's going on?' I was like, 'No, I don't know anything was going on.'" Taylor and her peers were concerned that this person possibly intended to harm the group of students holding the event. The next day, a staff member spoke with Taylor and the other student leaders about the incident because, as Taylor described, "He was a faculty member, and he sent in the photos and video to the university president in an uproar that students were dressed in drag." Although the person who filmed the event meant to use the footage to bully the president into reprimanding the students for the event,

161

this faculty member was likely unaware of the ways his behavior also threatened students on his own campus. Even though he meant the students no direct harm, his actions were an abuse of the power differential that exists between faculty and students in an educational setting.

Silencing

One of the more common forms of power dynamics at Chardin is silencing around LGBT issues. Most silencing behaviors are rooted in a similar concern about the university's Catholic image, identity, and reputation, as described earlier. In fact, most of the aforementioned intimidation and bullying is a form of silencing because those dynamics are meant to coerce the university into ceasing its LGBT-affirming activities. However, this section presents dynamics intended to silence university constituents around LGBT issues, especially by those in positions of power on campus, whereas the previous section focused on individuals who felt empowered or personally responsible to "police" the Catholic identity of Chardin.

One of the most recognizable ways the LGBT community at Chardin University has been silenced is through the name of the undergraduate LGBT student organization. When the organization was established, one of the stipulations from the Board of Trustees was, as one administrator recalled, "It can't have 'gay' or 'lesbian' in its name." Otherwise the student club would be more recognizably LGBT-affirmative to external stakeholders which the Board was concerned may affect the reputation of the university. In recent years, as the climate has shifted, students again raised the issue of the name of the organization, but, as one administrator said, "If we started to mess with that right now, only because of what I'd gone through to get it, it could have been dissolved." She recognized how unpopular that decision was among the students, as she continued, "I think that hurt my reputation a little bit because I don't think the students— they thought that I was not supportive of them. But it was, when you say, for the long-term good,

or common good." Even more recently, the faculty advisor to the group also raised the issue, offering to fight for a name change. However, at this point the students responded that they liked the name—the group identity had crystallized. Although I am unable to include the name here, Appendix A includes the names of each Jesuit university's undergraduate LGBT student organization(s), which features examples of these euphemistic names. On the other hand, participants noted that when the LGBT center was established, the climate was different, and the center was able to use the words "lesbian," "gay," "bisexual," and "transgender" in its name.

Silenced individuals. In addition to issues around naming programs, three people provided examples of ways they were silenced by administrators around LGBT issues. Grace, a faculty member, found herself in a disagreement with a former president over a quote she made in the student newspaper about a need for campus support for LGBT students. She recalled, "I think the quote was something like, 'We have to get past this, and we have to recognize that what it means to be a follower of Jesus is to be welcoming.'" She found that although the then-president was concerned that all students feel safe and welcome on campus, he also did not want any type of public message from the university that might suggest open support of LGBT people. She said, "Students come here and it would be okay for them [to be gay], but we never have to act to make it okay or change anything in the way we talked about ourselves, allowed them to talk about themselves, and I was just saying, 'We can't continue that.'"

William, an administrator, mentioned several examples of ways he was silenced around LGBT issues. One instance was when he tried to include "sexual orientation" as a protected class in the university's diversity statement as part of a strategic planning process. He recalled:

Well I got criticized for it initially here, because [everyone] was going, "Well, it's a grocery list, oh my God! Now you're going to throw in the kitchen sink! How far do you

163

take this?" And I would say to them, at the time, "As far as we need to take it to create

the consciousness that will result in greater levels of inclusivity and equity and ultimately

justice." This faith in the promotion of justice, tying it back to the mission. So I included

sexual orientation and gender identity. And it got removed.

In the end, he was successful at including sexual orientation and gender identity, but only after a

series of drafts of the plan were reviewed, and several rounds of him reinserting, and others

removing, the phrases. In contrast, Joy, a faculty member, mentioned a time when the law faculty

were voting on approval of a nondiscrimination statement that included sexual orientation as a

protected class. One faculty member made a motion to strike "sexual orientation" from the

statement during the deliberation. She described, "Nobody even seconded it. Not even willing to

debate it. Not even willing to talk about it."

Finally, even Hannah, a staff member, was cautioned about using less direct language

regarding student behavior when leading trainings for staff and faculty. As she remembered, "I

think at one training I said something like, 'Students have sex, and students drink.' And I was

told that that was a 'no-no'; I had to say, 'Students *may* have sex, and we don't encourage them

to engage in this behavior.'" Although it might have aligned better with the culture that

administrators strove to promote on campus, Hannah felt direct language would have been more

effective.

External resistance. Participants also spoke about the various ways external

stakeholders attempted to coerce the university into ceasing LGBT-related programming and

activities. Jesse spoke about a faculty colleague who had invited a speaker to talk about LGBT

demographics in the United States. As a result, as Jesse recounted, "What happened over this

program is a source of concern for her, that her Dean started getting calls from outside the

university saying, 'How can you do this? This cannot happen at Chardin.'" Jesse recognized this colleague was unsure how this reaction might affect her in her tenure review process. Esther, an administrator, also spoke about external resistance, recalling, "We had a transgender awareness week last year, and I'm not sure if it was a Trustee, or if it was an external benefactor, but our colleagues in University Advancement were getting calls from people who were concerned about that. 'Was that in keeping with our mission to have a week like that?'" Fortunately, since the event organizers had spent much time meeting with key administrative allies on campus, a set of talking points that framed the event within the context of the university mission was provided to the advancement office for them to engage with external concerns.

As a result of external resistance, administrators have been cautious about how visible the university's LGBT programming is to the outside community. They recognize that there are already people within the university who funnel this information to external constituents, especially Concerned Stakeholders in Chardin University, but they also acknowledge that, for the most part, external partners allow the administration autonomy to manage the university's affairs. However, one way administrators maintain control over the external visibility of LGBT programming is through deliberately not advertising the university's LGBT efforts to benefactors, alumni, and other friends of the university. Claire, who works in development, spoke about what might happen were she to propose sharing the story of an LGBT student with benefactors as part of the university's efforts to engage donors. She said, "I have to run everything through my boss…so, again, there's that line with donors." However, she speculated:

> That we know what they want to hear and don't want to hear—that's very much an
> assumption; that when I run the ideas up the flagpole it's not necessarily because we
> know our donors feel one way or another about LGBT issues, we're just assuming.

In other words, the university would prefer to tread lightly with such matters out of fear of risking a major gift or losing an important benefactor, even though, in many cases, donors may be impartial to such efforts, or possibly interested in supporting LGBT programming. Maintaining control over external visibility of the university's LGBT programming may also contribute to an unintended side effect mentioned earlier, the preconceptions prospective employees and students have about how LGBT-friendly the environment is at Chardin.

Controlling Behaviors

Controlling behaviors were the most prevalent form of power dynamics described by participants. Controlling behaviors also varied the most across the constituent groups in the sample—faculty, staff and students—and central administrators themselves also provided a few examples of ways they have encountered these behaviors. This section is arranged by constituent group to highlight differences among the groups in terms of the controlling behaviors they faced.

Staff. The controlling behaviors that staff members encounter affect their individual job security more directly, as staff lack the protections of academic freedom and stability of tenure that faculty enjoy. Tammy provided an example of an encounter with a former supervisor that demonstrated how her supervisor could assert authority over even what was displayed in Tammy's workspace. She had purchased a t-shirt with an LGBT-affirming message to support a fundraiser for the LGBT student organization, and she had placed the t-shirt on her desk in a manner where, unintentionally, the message on the shirt was visible. She recalled, "My supervisor asked me to put it away because she didn't want any employers or students to be offended." Tammy complied with the request, but she also wondered, "Why is this a concern to you? If you're on a school campus, it's going to be diverse. Why can't we just say, 'Okay, this person is just fine with supporting everyone'?" Her supervisor has since retired, but, as a result

of that experience, she described, "I went to the Safe Space training and they give you a sign for your door. I don't have my own door, but I put it up on my cabinet. I did ask my supervisor, and she was just fine with it."

Other staff members who work in more autonomous roles also recognized the ways their advocacy for LGBT issues could place them in a professionally jeopardizing position. Jesse outlined several consequences staff members face, saying:

Somebody will be held accountable for things that blow up. If I am not fired, I might not have a budget. There are ways that we get silenced without it overtly being, "You got fired"; it's just, "Well, you're going to be here, but we are going to give you a thousand dollars next year to do everything you need to do."

Emily mentioned that the event approval process is another way administrators exert control over the activities of staff, specifically by placing stipulations on events they may deem controversial by requiring "both sides" be presented. Ariel added that, by simply deeming an event "controversial," administrators can choose which activities need tighter control; one change she was hoping to see on campus in the near future, as a result of continued discussion with administrators, was "one day students are able to have certain events that currently deemed as 'controversial' in a way that they will feel like they don't have to be told to 'tone down' or to really consider an event for next year." She was not speaking about any event in particular, but given my conversations with students, this statement absolutely applied to their efforts to organize a drag show.

Faculty. While the controlling behaviors staff members face tend to manifest at the individual level as direct threats to their position or ability to do their job in the organization, faculty members spoke about group- or organizational-level dynamics that demonstrated ways

167

administrators tried to circumvent academic freedom in order to wrest control over controversial events that they were concerned might alarm external constituents. Again, these behaviors have become less of a concern in recent years, but persist to some extent.

Division between student and academic affairs. Two of the most controversial events that faculty spoke about were the invitation, and subsequent cancellation, of a speaker from Planned Parenthood and performances of the play, *The Vagina Monologues*. Both were especially flashpoints on campus under previous administrations; under the current administration permission has been granted to perform *The Vagina Monologues* on campus, though Planned Parenthood still appears to be off-limits—granted, no one provided any current instances involving Planned Parenthood. Both events provide insight into how the student-academic affairs divide can be used to control controversial activities.

The earliest event was the invitation of the speaker from Planned Parenthood. As Lilian recalled:

> I remember the Women's Studies Student Group invited Planned Parenthood to campus, not to talk about abortions, but just to talk about women's health. [The former president], in a rather dramatic fashion, cancelled that visit. That created a—students were very upset about that, Women's Studies faculty were very upset about that.

Since the student club had invited the speaker, approval of the event fell under student affairs, whose activities are not protected by academic freedom. However, one of the faculty members fought back. Lola remembered, "But then [Grace] was able to have the person speak in her class. So they wanted to tell me that we have academic freedom in our classrooms, but then it's these public events where it, maybe you'll be able to do things, maybe you won't, censorship kicks in." Barbara summarized this dynamic:

Institutionally, it's a weird position being a faculty member because in some ways I have

enormous power. I have a very credible voice. I have levers in my hand. In other ways,

I'm not part of the administration. I can say things, I can make things public, I can clarify

things, but I can't change policy. It's very rare that I can change policy directly, especially

with LGBTQ issues because that's seen as a student [affairs] issue, not a faculty issue, at

least at Chardin. I think that kind of compartmentalization has been on purpose in the past

because I think administration had more control over student [affairs] than over faculty

because, again, I have freedom and I have protected rights that student [affairs] doesn't.

Barbara contextualized this point using her involvement in early campus performances of *The Vagina Monologues* as an example. She said:

When I was caught up in the whole *Vagina Monologues* disaster, that's when I realized

just how strategic the student [affairs]-faculty divide is because as long as that was a

faculty-sponsored academic event, they couldn't touch it. They fought tooth and nail to

make it a student [affairs] cultural event because then it was under an entirely different

set of guidelines and principles. As soon as they were able to make that shift, *Vagina*

Monologues went away for a year.

She suspected, "I don't know if this is something that's been sort of brilliantly socially engineered

by the university in ways I don't see…or if it's convenient for them." However, she noted that

under the current administration, the Academic Vice President ensured the event was hosted on

campus for the first time. Barbara continued, "The following year it was on campus, but it was

on campus because we had a new AVP who made the argument it was under her jurisdiction, not

under student [affairs], said, 'This is an *academic*, not a cultural event.'"

   "Self-hate mail." An additional dynamic that a Catholic university such as Chardin faces

169

is its relationship with the local Bishop. As mentioned earlier, the Bishop mediates the

university's standing with the Catholic Church, and thus is consulted on issues that could raise

external concern about the university's Catholic identity. Faculty spoke about an event where

they felt students were obligated to make compromises with the administration above and

beyond what would normally have been expected of students because the Bishop had become

involved due to his concern over the content of the presentation. A speaker had been invited to

share her story about how she was affected by not being able to legally marry her late same-sex

partner when her partner passed away. This speaker had become an advocate for marriage

equality in the state, and the Bishop was concerned that she may share views that directly

conflicted with Church teachings on marriage. Though the Bishop was unable to persuade the

university administration to cancel the event, the administration agreed to make sure a Jesuit

priest presented the official Catholic Church teaching on marriage equality at the event as a

compromise.

However, several faculty members felt there was no need to present the official Church

teaching seeing as the speaker was not there to advocate for marriage equality. Grace asked,

"What 'other side' is there to allowing this person to tell us her story, right? She wasn't coming

with, you know, buttons supporting [marriage equality]." In addition, the event organizers were

unable to locate a Jesuit priest who would stand up in front of the audience and clarify Church

teaching on marriage equality. Jesuits who were sympathetic to the LGBT community felt such a

presentation would be dehumanizing, and Jesuits who agreed with Church teachings on the

matter were concerned about hostility from those in attendance. The event was nearly cancelled

were it not for a last-minute decision to distribute a letter from the Bishop about marriage

equality at the event as a way of ensuring the Church's position was clarified. Lilian recalled,

from a conversation with Grace about the matter, "They ended up having to hand out a page, which Grace said just—infuriated her, 'cause she said it was just telling students, 'Okay, you have to hand out this self-hate mail. Here, have some more hate mail,' which they did." Monica added that one of the organizers was required to read the letter before the event began. She recounted, "Oh, my God, her hands were shaking, she was so mad as she read this statement about the Catholic church's official position on same-sex marriage, and [the speaker] wasn't even there to talk about same-sex marriage."

Jesuits as legitimating authority. As a way of deflecting criticism and resistance from the local Bishop or others concerned with the university's Catholic identity, several people mentioned how critical it was to have a Jesuit priest or representative of campus ministry present at LGBT events as a way to navigate some of these power dynamics, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. However, a couple participants found this imperative to be a controlling behavior exercised by the administration. This conclusion was drawn primarily from comparisons of the process for LGBT programs to be approved to that required of other types of programs. Eugene, an administrator, provided an example: "If [the outdoors club] wants to do a program, nobody needs to get permission from the office of the ministry, or you don't need to feel like you have to have, to ally with the office of the ministry." One faculty member in a professional graduate program also commented on how LGBT graduate students have regularly been asked to have a Catholic priest present when they organize events "to, you know, deliver a 'balanced message.'" Not that participants did not recognize the utility of partnering with Jesuits or the campus ministry office, but many noted that LGBT programs were required to do so much more frequently than any other organization on campus. Anthony, a faculty member, summarized this dynamic: "LGBT students have had to explain themselves to the administration

in sometimes excruciating detail in order to have their club activities accepted… The students

had to really go through that effort that we just didn't require of other students to be able to claim

some space to have student life on that issue, on their identity."

Additionally, even Jesuits who partner with LGBT students to host programs are not

protected from criticism. Paul spoke about a Jesuit administrator who previously worked at

Chardin who had maintained a fairly high profile as being welcoming to the LGBT community.

However, Paul added that his support for the LGBT community was "enough to get him into

trouble occasionally." Kyle, a staff member, also spoke about this particular administrator,

saying, "[He] got some negative pushback because he spoke very conflictedly being a Jesuit and

saying pretty much that…there is nothing wrong with being gay or lesbian." No one indicated

that the reason this administrator left Chardin was his support for the LGBT community, but

being a priest did not mean he was immune from criticism for it, possibly adding to the challenge

faced when approaching Jesuit priests about partnership for LGBT events.

Students. Students described the clubs and organizations procedures as a type of

controlling mechanism due to the effect of these procedures on their capacity for group

formation. Clearly a set of protocols and policies are needed in order to manage the complexities

of overseeing hundreds of student clubs. The office also provides training to student leaders each

year to help them navigate the process to allow them to more efficiently run their clubs and

organize events. In spite of this, student leaders can still experience them as a type of controlling

behavior because these policies can inadvertently disparately affect their capacity for building

community. Taylor mentioned that the LGBT student organization had been recently reclassified

from a cultural club to an awareness club, a categorization reserved for organizations that are

more political in nature (e.g. the pro-life club, the Young Democrats). Alice found this

reclassification meant the LGBT organization was subject to more scrutiny than they had been as a cultural club. She said, "So, we got moved to an activism club, which does not put us like under the [student government] diversity chairs. So we get a lot of pushback about events about transgender, about bisexuality, about all this stuff, because technically we are not a diversity group anymore."

Leah brought up another much more benign, but nonetheless frustrating, dynamic that the LGBT student organization leaders face in processing paperwork for events. Completing the required paperwork for any event on campus, ranging from the bigger, more visible events to much simpler community-building activities like movie nights, takes a great deal of time. She said:

> There's a lot of hoops that you do have to jump through with the student body association that, I think, stifle clubs. I understand the purpose for them, but I do think that they stifle the amount of things that clubs can do. Even having a game night is 30 minutes of paperwork for us. Just to have a game night under [the LGBT student organization]'s name, compared to, "Come hang out at my apartment, and have game night."

The student leaders agreed that the process was necessary, but Taylor suggested these procedures may adversely affect the cultural clubs that host more community-building events. Student leaders find these procedures do not allow them as much flexibility in responding to the fluctuation of students' needs regarding cultivating community.

Administrators. Although administrators are usually the source of power dynamics, given their responsibilities to the university and its overall health, several administrators also spoke about dynamics they encountered as they strove to support LGBT programming or events on campus. As William stated, "Like the military and like the Catholic Church, where

173

[resistance] comes from is higher up the food chain. It always comes up from ultimately the President or the Cabinet here." In other words, administrators are organizationally located within a reporting structure, and are frequently held accountable for issues that could affect the reputation of the university.

In some cases, a person is simply told "no." William provided two examples, that when he wanted to write a grant to an LGBT foundation and when he initially proposed collecting data on the campus climate his requests were denied with little explanation. As a result, Esther mentioned there were times "we did a lot of 'doing' and asking for forgiveness later," a tactic that frequently led to trouble. William provided another example where he and one of the Jesuits on campus disseminated informational brochures on LGBT issues throughout the residence halls prior to orientation. The brochures were confiscated before the halls opened to students and parents. William recounted, "They did this janitorial thing. They just went and told somebody, 'You need to pick—make sure they're not disseminated to parents and to students.'" Like staff, Esther indicated that because administrators are not protected by tenure like faculty, "I remember, you know, wondering if I was going to put my job in jeopardy sometimes. I actually did."

As mentioned earlier, one administrator recounted the dynamics that affected the process of establishing the LGBT student organization on campus. First of all, the process reached the Board of Trustees, a level of scrutiny no other club has faced, because administrators kept moving the decision up the university reporting structure out of concern for the university's reputation. The process also lasted six years from when the proposal was first considered by the Board of Trustees to the point where the Board approved the club constitution. During that time, this particular administrator asked students to testify to the Board, both in favor of establishing

the club and against approval, and the local Bishop provided a letter of support for establishing the organization, again, to deflect criticism that recognizing an LGBT student organization diminishes the university's Catholic identity. She found the student testimonies to be the most influential aspect of the process, as she recalled, "I tell you, the gay men were so articulate and compassionate about why something was needed here that I've even had [Trustees] come up to me, what, twenty years later, and say, 'Remember when we had that discussion?'" Finally, students were still required to compromise on issues like the club name, as mentioned earlier, and language was written into the constitution requiring the club to affirm that its activities would adhere to Catholic Church teachings on homosexuality. These compromises led to the club's first president resigning immediately after the club was approved, but the club has existed at Chardin since. However, this situation provides an excellent example of the ways leadership has tried to exert control over LGBT activities out of fear that openly affirming the campus LGBT community will erode the university's Catholic reputation.

Stalling Tactics

> **Faculty.** Another power dynamic that participants spoke about as fairly common were stalling tactics, though, again, these dynamics appear to have become less prevalent as well. The only faculty members who spoke about stalling tactics were those involved in organized, grassroots efforts to raise awareness of LGBT issues. For instance, Anthony mentioned a situation from several years ago when he was involved in an effort to petition the administration to ensure "sexual orientation" was included as a protected class in any administrative or policy document where such protection was warranted. A grassroots group of faculty, staff, and students had organized to develop a set of demands around greater protection for the campus LGBT community, and Anthony described the resistance that group had faced. He stated:

175

Some of the resistance was administrators who didn't want to be seen to be resisting but

wanted it to go away…they would invite us in to talk to the purpose of making as few

concessions [on their part] as possible, and playing out the clock 'til May when

everybody goes off for the summer and forgets about things.

He felt that the group was able to influence some change, but the group did not continue its

efforts the following academic year.

Students. Like faculty, the only students who spoke about facing stalling tactics were

those who were involved in some form of leadership roles as they dealt with the administration

over procuring resources or approving events on behalf of the LGBT student clubs. At the law

school, Ashley mentioned her biggest source of frustration was reluctance from administrators to

work with her on organizing events for the LGBT law student organization. She said:

I've tried to meet with the administration at least two or three times, and no one will meet

with me about it. I'm like, "Oh, this is a great project for us. I want to get people

involved; I want to get faculty involved." And they just are like not picking up on any of

that. They're like, "Oh yeah, we'll talk about that; we'll talk about that."

In her experience, administrators and faculty often defer conversations for an indefinite

amount of time, which derails her efforts at organizing events. For example, Ashley planned a

trip for members of the LGBT law student organization to attend a banquet for the state-wide

LGBT legal professional association. She asked the administration for resources to cover two

tickets for the banquet, as the students were planning to cover their own travel expenses, but

found people kept delaying making a decision on her request. She stated further, "Finally, we

had to pull the 'We feel kind of marginalized' card on them. And that got a little bit of money,

which was good, and helpful, so we did end up being able to go. But just getting to that point, it

was just unbelievable." She did not find the administration to be in any way opposed to the event, but she felt that she had to use some tactic to try to push her request higher on someone's priority list in order to procure the resources in a timely manner.

As mentioned earlier, one of the bigger events the undergraduate LGBT student organization would like to host on campus is a drag show. The club has been unable to organize a drag show though because, as staff and administrators mentioned, the students have not yet been willing to invest the amount of time necessary to solicit support from key administrative allies. However, according to students, some of the reason these conversations have not happened is because staff and administrators have delayed these conversations themselves. Taylor, a student leader, said, "Everyone seems to be shutting down my conversations, so I might as well just do something that's more in-your-face and a little bit more pointed, and being like, how far can I push it a little bit?" As a result, instead of waiting for these conversations to happen, she decided to fill out the paperwork to request holding the drag show and press the issue through the process. The request was understandably denied, as Taylor described, "So when I push for the drag event, they were going to hold off on their decision based on, they were going to talk to [the LGBT center director] about it. She and I hadn't talked about it, so there's a lot of miscommunication." Taylor was frustrated because, although she had not spoken with the LGBT center director about this particular request, she had spoken with her about a drag show before, saying, "So I got mad at [her] because, I was like, we've been trying to do this for two years!" Taylor ultimately conceded that the planning needs to take most of a year, especially in terms of having conversations with key people on campus. However, she stated:

> I was like, darn it. You're right, darn it, like, you know, in a kind of frustrated kind of
> way. So the fact that it's going to take us a year of like working and planning and

processing to possibly get a drag show when [other Jesuit universities get] to do one every year, that's frustrating me, that's just really frustrating.

The "other side" of stalling tactics. Several administrators I spoke with offered insight into what it meant to be on the "other side" of dynamics perceived to be stalling tactics by staff, faculty, and students. For William, the only times he ever encouraged students to slow a process down were either when he felt the students may be putting themselves into an unsafe position given the climate on campus, or if he felt students were not quite ready for protracted negotiations with the administration over having an event approved. Other administrators realized they were ultimately accountable to university leadership if an event is perceived to be misaligned with the university's Catholic identity. Gina described her responsibility when overseeing the approval process for student events, saying, "I think having the conversation, like, what's your intent on bringing these individuals to campus? Why? … It's more the questioning, to make sure I understand, so when I get the question, I can say, 'This is their thought process; this is why they brought them in.'"

For Eugene, when the LGBT student organization proposed the idea of a drag show, he responded, "Okay, maybe let's sit back and really talk about what it is that you wanted to accomplish by a drag show. How does it, do you normally dress in drag?" His concern was that students were interested more in the sense of accomplishment of finally having a drag show at Chardin, or the associated "shock" it may instigate among some members of the Chardin community, than they were in thinking through aligning the program with the university's mission. He continued, "So have we slowed things down? … We do similar things to make sure that our students are [developing programs] in a way that is thoughtful and appropriate for the university context, and for Chardin's culture." Eugene did not doubt that a mission-aligned

reason existed for hosting a drag show on campus, but he felt the students had not taken the time to fully consider how they might align the event with the university's mission.

Despite being the primary "stallers" on campus, administrators also faced times when their own efforts to support the campus LGBT community were stalled by others on campus. Eugene described being involved in a discussion about establishing policy to provide more trans-friendly campus facilities, especially in housing. He stated, "[I] felt a little bit of pushback around, 'Is this the right time to have that conversation? Well, don't we already have a practice in place? Isn't a practice good enough?'" The pushback he experienced may not have been incredibly severe, but demonstrated the ways some people felt, to them, the effort to change policy in a manner that would only affect a very small number of students was not as valuable a use of their time when they felt the current system was working fine.

Microaggressions and Other Subtle Slights

In addition to the various anti-LGBT microaggressions that permeate the campus climate, faculty, staff, and administrators described ways their efforts to promote change on campus were met with microaggressions and other subtle slights that demonstrated their colleagues' resistance to their efforts. During a campus conversation about supporting the LGBT community many years ago, Grace recalled, "One Jesuit actually said, 'Let's acknowledge the "ick" factor here.'" She continued, "For him it was about one part fitting into another part organized by God to be one way…and anything else is just 'icky,' and we all agree on that how disturbing this is even to think about. I don't find it disturbing actually. Maybe I spent less time thinking about it, right?" Again, these type of comments from university employees have since subsided.

One staff member found herself in a situation where a colleague approached this staff member's Dean about her personal life. Her colleague raised an issue over a post she made on

social media about being in a polyamorous relationship. She said, "Somebody, and I still don't know who, but somebody had complained about the fact that I was using word 'poly' publicly, and I was advertising [what he considered to be] my infidelity." The complainant was particularly concerned that she was, as this staff member stated, "not upholding Catholic standards." The Dean did call her into her office, but only to make her aware of what had happened, not to criticize or punish her for being in a polyamorous relationship. Her Dean was supportive, but this staff member also visited with Human Resources to better understand her rights in the situation. HR assured her that her performance could not be judged on the basis of non-merit factors, and her relationships were considered a non-merit factor. However, this staff member still felt the situation could have ended very differently had her Dean not been supportive of her.

Finally, Esther, an administrator, maintains an artifact from one of the microaggressions she has faced in her time at Chardin. In response to one of my questions, she pointed behind me to her bookshelf, and said, "Look at the far left, over there. You see the book on the corner there? Do you know how I got that?" The book was a copy of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. She continued, "I got that book because it was given to me by a former director of campus ministry because they were concerned about how I was—my programming was maybe not in alignment with Catholic doctrine. So they thought I should have that book." This experience is another example of the former "Catholic police" on campus, although in this case Esther faced condescension instead of intimidation. She has held onto that book ever since.

Fortunately, most of these power dynamics have subsided in recent years in tandem with shifts in the campus climate, likely indicating that as society has changed, the university has become less concerned about adverse consequences, especially from powerful external actors,

from its involvement in LGBT activities. In addition, many of these dynamics were enacted by administrators who, though sympathetic to the LGBT community, were simultaneously accountable to other authorities with deep concern about the university's Catholic image. As a result, within this environment participants cultivated a series of strategies and tactics that allow them to navigate many of the power dynamics they confronted and address some of the most pressing issues facing the LGBT community on campus, which is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

GRASSROOTS LEADERS

In the previous chapter, I discussed findings that described factors contributing to the environment that study participants faced, such as the campus climate and power dynamics. This chapter examines study participants respond to those conditions. The first section explores the reasons participants initially came to Chardin for work or school, to establish their commitment to the university, and then their motivation for being involved in LGBT issues. Second, I outline the various individual- and group-level tactics that participants used to address LGBT issues on campus. The chapter then closes with a discussion of participants' various sources of resilience, both extrinsic and intrinsic, to understand how they remain committed to their advocacy. Overall, the students, faculty, and staff who participated in this study care deeply about Chardin University and want to ensure the university lives up to its ideals in providing an inclusive, welcoming environment for the campus LGBT community.

Motivation

Reasons for Coming to Chardin

In order to understand participants' motivation for being involved in efforts to address LGBT issues, I first asked participants about their reasons for either seeking employment at Chardin, or enrolling as a student. Through the various personal and professional (or academic) reasons participants named, it was quite evident that these grassroots leaders are deeply committed to the mission of Chardin. Since participants spoke about a common perception among those people most resistant to their LGBT efforts that participants' involvement in these efforts undermined the university's mission, I felt it important to establish their commitment to the university's mission through uncovering their reasons for choosing to attend or work at

Chardin. These reasons then serve as a foundation for their motivation to be involved in efforts on campus, especially for those participants who were motivated by the university's mission to be involved in LGBT issues. In this section, I enumerate the various reasons participants chose to come to the university.

Religious affiliation. Several students, faculty, and administrators cited the university's Catholic affiliation as a primary reason they chose Chardin over other options for school or work. Four Catholic participants in particular felt a Catholic university would provide them space to deepen their faith commitments. Kristopher, a student, had gone to Catholic schools his entire life and identified very strongly with his Catholic faith. He said, "I felt like a Catholic education was something I wanted to have going forward, because I feel like it gives a unique space to explore some more profound questions about life that maybe my friends at public schools didn't really get to explore." For him, one of those deeper questions was bridging being gay and Catholic, two of his most salient social identities. Sebastian, a staff member, had been working at a secular institution but wanted to return to a Catholic-affiliated institution specifically because the environment aligned with his worldview. Two faculty members, Lilian and Kevin, are practicing Catholics and were also drawn to Chardin because of its Catholic affiliation, as Lilian described, "One of the things that brought me to a Catholic university is that I did want to be in a place where the spiritual dimension was included, and where there was a commitment to educating students in a holistic way." Kevin mentioned being involved in ministry work prior to working at Chardin and, though his job was not specifically in ministry, knew his teaching could intersect with ministry in many ways.

Non-Catholic participants like Mackenzie and Madeline, both LGBQ students, were drawn to the university's Catholic religious affiliation despite not identifying as practicing

Catholics. Mackenzie grew up in a Christian household, so she found the religious setting to be familiar, though she mentioned she no longer practiced her faith. Madeline, who identifies strongly with her Methodist faith, considered Chardin because, "I really like that there was campus ministry, and a big campus group of people, where I could explore faith because I went to public high school, and that's not really something we got to do." Matthew, a heterosexual faculty member, was also attracted to the religious affiliation of Chardin because of his own devotion to his faith background, similarly to Madeline, as were two administrators, Dan and Eugene.

Integration. Two heterosexual, Catholic faculty members spoke about why the religious affiliation of Chardin had been so important to them in choosing to work at the university. For Margaret, she had determined that a Jesuit, Catholic university would offer her a sense of work-life integration that aligned her personal values with her professional work. She declared:

> I hate with a passion, a seething hot passion, the phrase "work-life balance" because I really—what I seek isn't balance. I seek integration…because my life is not made up of discrete things that get balanced: it's a comprehensive, holistic thing, and I can't compartmentalize those aspects.

Grace told me the story about how she first started teaching at Chardin, an experience that demonstrates a profound example of this "work-life integration" that Margaret cited. Although Grace initially came to Chardin as a spousal hire, her husband grew ill very early in his tenure at Chardin and ultimately passed away at the young age of 32. Throughout his illness and passing, nuns, Jesuits, and students from the Chardin community became very involved in their lives providing support, childcare, and healthcare to Grace and her family to assist them through this difficult time. After he passed, she briefly considered moving back closer to their families,

184

but the support that had been demonstrated by the Chardin community for Grace and her family had been overwhelming. Grace remembered, "The Sisters who were nurses took care of him at home for the last few weeks of his life. ...it was hard for me to imagine just saying goodbye to all that." Instead of leaving the community after his death, she accepted a full-time position teaching courses, and, after she completed her doctorate, was moved into a tenure-track position.

Familiarity with Catholic education. Amelia, Taylor, and Kristopher, all students, had attended Catholic high schools before enrolling in Chardin, so they were fairly familiar with a Catholic educational environment and were interested in continuing that experience when they enrolled in college. Taylor was especially excited about the possibility of continuing her Catholic education in a more LGBT-affirming environment:

> I had a couple of friends who I had been in youth group with who are a couple of grades older than me who had come here and they had loved it. And they were also gay and so it was like, okay, you know, here is a Catholic campus that's appreciating, or attempting to appreciate, its LGBT community, and I came from a high school that had nothing. We had no gay-straight alliance, we had nothing. We weren't even recognized, or the topic wasn't even discussed in our ethics classes. Again, it was just not something we talked about. So to come to a Catholic campus where we even existed openly, it was awesome.

University mission. Another reason cited by faculty and staff as an important reason they chose to work at Chardin was the university mission. Neither Lola nor Joy had been very familiar with the university before working at Chardin, but both turned to the university mission to understand the ethos and culture of the institution when they were applying. Joy said, "I read the mission statement, and I absolutely loved it, and I thought this is a thing that I could believe in." For Lola, the mission statement was "a big part of why I didn't just apply for the job, but I

185

really wanted the job." Several staff members also mentioned the university mission as an important reason they chose to work at Chardin. For Jesse, "It basically aligned my personal values and let me get paid for doing work that I would do without getting paid."

Brandon had interned at another Jesuit university, and found, "Wow, we really care about the students, and everything that we do is for the students," which to him was a stark contrast from his previous large state university. Hannah was also excited about how mission-driven her work would be in comparison to the larger, public universities where she worked previously. Claire also felt a similar difference moving from a corporate environment to the Chardin University setting, stating, "Particularly a Jesuit university was appealing, the feeling that I was serving something that did more good than feeding the profits in the pockets of someone." She felt the mission was inspiring and allowed her to engage in work that she felt made a difference. Esther, an administrator, also found, "I was really inspired by the mission. I thought, you know, here is an educational institution that gets it, that has a strong alignment and soul in concern about social justice."

Teaching mission. The university's educational mission and especially its emphasis on teaching were appealing to several faculty members like Anthony, who felt the university would be a friendly place to develop as a faculty member. Olivia had earned her doctorate at a large, public, research-intensive university, and was drawn to Chardin because, as she recalled, "The smallness of the school appealed after teaching at [my doctorate-granting institution], teaching to an auditorium of 300 students. Not that that was bad, but I just looked forward to smaller classes, getting to know my students." Aubrey stated the university had a reputation for having smart students, and Kevin described one of the strengths of teaching at Chardin as having a student body who were "eager, malleable in a positive way, open to challenge and really interested in

186

community." Lilian added that teaching at Chardin allowed her the opportunity to teach upper division courses each semester as opposed to teaching at a larger institution where she would have been expected to teach primarily introductory courses in her discipline.

Previous connections to Chardin. Many participants mentioned some prior affiliation with the university, such as having Chardin alumni in their families, as a reason for enrolling in or working at the university. Both Ari and Alice had grandfathers who had graduated from Chardin. Ari, who grew up in Sunny Falls, mentioned spending much time on campus in his youth and how he felt "fated" to attend Chardin at some point, while Alice spoke about her grandfather's influence on her college search: "When I was looking at colleges, he was all about me coming up to Sunny Falls, and we came up here, and I fell in love with it." For staff members Tom and Kyle, seeking employment at Chardin was easy because they had attended Chardin as undergraduates and thus were already familiar with the campus culture and environment. For instance, Kyle mentioned, "I knew people here, I think that was part of it too. I knew people that work at the university; it would be almost an easier transition to come back to a place you know." In addition, Paul, a faculty member, and Deborah and Stephanie, administrators, had also attended as undergraduates.

Location. Several participants cited the location as a reason they chose Chardin for work or school. Mackenzie grew up in Sunny Falls and her sister also attends Chardin; she said, "It's like home, and I didn't want to leave home." Marion, who also grew up in Sunny Falls, wanted to attend college farther away, but, she stated, "I ended up, because of financial reasons, and also because of the nature of my family, I felt like I needed to be near them to kind of help take care of a couple different situations there." Two faculty members and one administrator cited the need to live near family as a reason for seeking employment at Chardin. For instance, Barbara wanted

187

to remain within commuting distance of her family, and Samantha explained, "I was dating a woman who lived up here, and at that time, we determined we did want to live together. So yeah, it was really helpful that all of a sudden here is Chardin asking for people to come teach." Cathy, an administrator, was originally from the region, and at the time she sought to work at Chardin, she wanted to return because her grandparents still lived nearby. Ariel had not grown up in Sunny Falls specifically, but she grew up in a region of the state not far from the town, so moving to Sunny Falls meant she could live closer to her family. Two faculty members also mentioned an interest in the location but moved to the city from other areas of the country. Olivia found that Sunny Falls offered a good school system for her children yet was a city that, in her estimation, was of a good size. Finally, Aubrey chose to work at Chardin because, as she described, "When I came out of graduate school I was looking for a job either near the ocean or in the mountains." Aubrey was not from the area, but was seeking the quality of life living in Sunny Falls could offer.

For both Ben and Monica, who identify as LGBQ, working at Chardin also had important but divergent implications for their relationships. Ben moved to Sunny Falls with his partner to live near family before the state recognized same-sex relationships in any legal manner. As such, he was unable to add his partner to his employee benefits plan to ensure his partner had healthcare coverage. Ben became involved in lobbying the university administration to consider adopting a policy that allowed employees to cover same-sex partners under their benefits plans. On the other hand, Monica came to Chardin after state law changed around legal recognition for same-sex relationships. She said, "At that time, I had a domestic partnership with my current partner, and we knew that leaving the state might mean that we wouldn't be able to have that." Where Ben was initially worried that taking a job at Chardin would leave his family vulnerable,

Monica took a job at Chardin because it meant her family would be less vulnerable.

Others wanted to attend college in the state, but not specifically Sunny Falls. Aven and Leah, both students, had grown up in the state and thus had some familiarity with the university. For Aven, choosing Chardin meant attending a college where few, if any, of his graduating high school class would be attending, compared to universities closer to home. Leah mentioned high school teachers who had attended Chardin who encouraged her to apply. She added, "I had had some family friends' kids who had come here. I was like, 'Okay, I'll apply, go tour.'" Although she did not grow up in the state, Ashley chose Chardin for law school because she wanted to live in the state. She recalled, "I was just always fond of this state in general, just because it's more liberal, and there seemed to be a lot going on here."

Sense of community. The university's strong sense of community and relational culture also enticed several students to attend Chardin. Jacquelyn applied to Chardin because it was far from where she grew up and offered a variety of majors she was interested in, but what pushed Chardin over the top for her was, as she recounted, "I came for both a preview day and just once on my own to see if it was all it was cracked up to be or if it was a bunch of BS during preview day. And both times everyone was super welcoming." Ari enjoys the smaller size of Chardin, especially in terms of the student-to-faculty ratio. Kenny felt attending Chardin would push him in his own development, stating, "I wasn't very involved in high school, and so maybe it was like a really important element for me to come here, or go somewhere where I felt like I would be pushed to be involved." I asked if his experience matched his perception, and he replied, "It's exactly what I've gotten." Finally, Marion had the opportunity to attend another university in Sunny Falls for free, but she chose Chardin instead because of the student community. In particular, Marion said, "If I'm going to stay in Sunny Falls, I need to start to meet people who

are different, who look different, who talk different, who have different ideas, have different opinions." Although many participants made reference to a lack of diversity at Chardin, Marion indicated her other option for college was even less diverse.

Pragmatic reasons. Students, staff, and faculty also had very pragmatic reasons they chose Chardin over other options for school or employment. Taylor mentioned that Chardin offered the best financial aid package of all her options for college. Several students mentioned the availability of different majors—Kristopher and Ari wanted to study subjects like religious studies or classical civilizations, which made attending a Catholic university optimal for them while Jacquelyn cited the overall breadth of majors available in case she found herself in the situation where she wanted to change her major. Marion and Alice praised the reputation of the university's teaching program, and Mackenzie spoke about how widely recognized the business school was. Both law student participants mentioned the law school's reputation for public interest law and were able to secure financial support because of their interest in that area.

One of the main reasons faculty cited for working at Chardin was they were offered tenure-track positions. Anthony and Margaret described the job search process as less about them deciding from a number of options and more about their options being dictated by the academic job market in their disciplines. Anthony said, "I'm in a field where faculty jobs are pretty scarce, so I don't know that it was a choice from among a wide range of options," and Margaret added, "You apply for lots of jobs, you get few bites, and then you have to sort of decide." Every faculty member had additional reasons for working at Chardin beyond simply securing an offer, but this aspect of their job search process was incredibly prominent in their decision-making.

Staff members cited the opportunity to develop professionally as an important reason in addition to the many personal reasons they sought employment at Chardin. Tom sought his

190

position as a way to expand his professional repertoire beyond the student affairs area he worked in as a graduate student. He said, "It allowed me to stay in something I knew and liked, which was Jesuit higher ed, but also gave me latitude to try something different." Kyle wanted to return to higher education after finishing his master's program because he had taught high school during his graduate program and found "the people were not as warm, and they weren't as welcoming, but they also, I don't think, were eager to improve and develop." Ariel found her position provided her "with a sense that we want to move forward in terms of being able to create an inclusive community open to the dialogue, wanting to have the conversation happen, so that's why I decided that this was perfect for me." Jesse was excited that she had the opportunity to lead a student affairs area that had faced inconsistent leadership in the past, and thus she was able to establish the legacy and contributions of her department moving forward.

Motivation for Addressing LGBT Issues

After establishing that participants were deeply committed to the university, I asked about their motivations for being involved in LGBT issues on campus. For LGBQ participants, their motivation was very personal as they directly identified with the issues, while for heterosexuals, their involvement tended to be motivated by knowing someone who identified as LGBT. This section is divided into the two sexual orientation groups—LGBQ and heterosexual—to highlight the different sources of motivation for participants in their efforts to improve the climate for the LGBT community.

LGBQ Students

Family. Several LGBQ students ascribed their motivation for being involved in LGBT issues to their family background. Both of Taylor's parents are politically active, and she learned, "You fight for what you believe in, and that's something that I learned from a very, very

191

young age. … And you never accept things the way they are because things can always get better, things can always be better." Kristopher cited the example his mother set with her own commitment to service. He remembered, "My entire life, she was involved in soup kitchens and being on the parish council. She's done prison ministry my entire life and walked the talk as a Catholic."

The climate that students experienced in their households also contributed to their motivation to be involved on campus. Amelia grew up in a very supportive home and said, "For me, for someone who's so comfortable in themselves to come here and be uncomfortable, I can't imagine what it's like for someone who…is just like uncomfortable and doesn't have people they can talk to about it." Amelia has thus made herself available to her LGBT peers as a support resource. Alice has also made herself a resource to her peers to help them through the coming out process because of her own experience trying to understand what it meant to be bisexual, and then helping her family understand as well. She recalled, "They are super supportive, but…they don't get it. They don't really understand, but they are willing to learn, and the resource center and [the gay-straight alliance] has provided me with the resources to go home and talk to my parents about it." On the other hand, Mackenzie found it more difficult to be open about her sexual orientation at home because her family is more conservative and religious. Her involvement at Chardin then was, as she described, "Part of it is I personally need an outlet…I think it prompted me to be more out here and be able to do what I wouldn't be able to do or say at home."

Pre-college academic experiences. Ari was affected by an experience he had in high school that influenced his motivation to be involved in LGBT issues in college. He recalled, "I have a friend who had extensive injuries from a beating that he received because he came out,

and he was on the football team." His friend did not suffer permanent injuries, but Ari was incredibly frustrated both at the administrative response, which was only to put the offenders on suspension, as well as the general lack of awareness among the student body that such an attack had taken place. As mentioned earlier, Taylor was motivated to be involved by the general silence around LGBT issues in her high school.

Involvement in church. Church was another institution where students' experiences prior to college fueled their motivation to be involved in making a difference for their peers. As described earlier in this chapter, Madeline deeply identifies with her Methodist faith, and mentioned the broader debates happening within the United Methodist Church over how the Church should respond pastorally to the presence of LGBT people among the faithful. Those churches that take a more affirmative stance to welcome LGBT Methodists consider themselves to be "reconciling" communities. In her own home church, Madeline stated, "My church has divided services about who is reconciling and who is not, and it's this really big conversation." She described how these divisions have created deep emotional and psychological wounds for the LGBT faithful that she is passionate about healing. Madeline invoked campus ministry at Chardin as an example of a faith community that is working to be welcoming and inclusive for LGBT students. She said, "The simple fact that like the campus ministry office doesn't have to be a safe space, but it is, and they did that on their own, that was their choice…I think that's a great resource to start doing that." Kristopher also mentioned cultivating more LGBT-affirming faith communities as one of his motivations.

LGBQ Staff and Faculty

Personal advocacy. LGBQ staff and faculty also named several reasons for being involved in LGBT issues on campus, many of which related to providing support in their

193

professional roles for LGBT students. However, Ben also mentioned his involvement was personal, motivated by his need to advocate for himself and his family when he initially could not cover his partner under his employee benefits plan. He described, "We were at risk. I mean, my husband, my family were at risk. If he had gotten sick or something, then we would be bankrupted, essentially. So that's a very deeply personal reason to be involved." Fortunately, after the state began legally recognizing same-sex relationships, university policy followed this change.

Provide a better experience for students. Two staff members recalled growing up under very anti-LGBT conditions and were motivated to ensure current students never faced such oppression. Ben recalled, "As a child, I grew up in a very conservative, ultra-conservative [community], and probably, in the '80s, I would have been killed if I had been open and out." He ultimately moved away from his home community to find other LGBT people to help build a positive sense of identity as a gay man. Emily also grew up in a small conservative, religious community, remembering, "My best friend in high school had his parents point a shot gun at his face when he came out to them, and said, 'If you're gay, you're not my son, leave.' And so he moved in with us for the last six months of high school." For both Ben and Emily, they realized how critical college can be for students as a respite from oppressive conditions at home.

In addition, staff and faculty wanted to provide students the LGBQ role models that they themselves lacked when they were in college. Samantha, a faculty member, had limited access to role models when she came out, and said, "So being the open lesbian professor, I couldn't wait for that role model to come. I had to just do it, and that's probably been the mantra of my life in some ways: I have to be the person I want to be and not to wait for society to catch up." Emily, who attended a Catholic college and was involved in establishing a gay-straight alliance at the

institution proclaimed, "I cannot stand for a Catholic institution not supporting the humanity of their students, which is why we spent a year and a half fighting all the way up through the diocese to get a GSA established at [my college], which was a challenge, to put it mildly." Kyle, who attended Chardin as an undergraduate, remembered, "I was really affected by the number of students that came out to me as a student at CU. … So that really struck me though, I thought, this is so weird that there are so many people out there that feel like they can't talk about it." Each of these staff and faculty were motivated to provide students the resources they themselves had needed when they were undergraduates. Two younger LGBQ participants had generally supportive experiences as undergraduates, but still wanted to provide an even more affirming environment for current students. Kevin, a faculty member, remembered, "I've gone through this path. I struggled at a Catholic university myself as an undergraduate, and that's where I kind of had my self-discovery. I was fortunate to have friends and mentors that were supportive." Brandon described the LGBT community at his undergraduate institution as very small, and wondered if having access to a larger community would have helped him become comfortable with his sexual identity sooner. He concluded, "I want to make sure that it's a better experience for the students than I had, even though I didn't have a bad experience."

Innate commitment to social justice. Aubrey, Barbara, and Jesse all described their involvement in LGBT issues as stemming from an innate commitment to social justice. Aubrey provided an example from when she was in high school and the administration nearly dismantled the volleyball team when they could not find someone to coach it. As a high school student, she approached the principal and told him, "Well you have to find somebody; otherwise you are violating Title IX." Barbara asserted, "I see [the LGBT climate] as a fundamental student rights and student health issue that all people have a right to live in a healthy, productive environment

195

and that right is that much more guaranteed when they are paying so much money on the promise that they are going to be given an education." She felt the university may not conceive the issue in this sense, but, for her, that understanding drives any action she takes on behalf of the LGBT community. Jesse enrolled in college after recovering from a life-threatening head injury as a way of determining what she wanted to do with her life. Through her college's diversity requirement Jesse was introduced to gender and LGBT studies, which she discovered, "What that class did is it actually gave me a theoretical foundation and structure for of all my personal ideologies that I had always felt, but it put it into this structure that I could then actually verbalize and kind of more formalize those ideas." Jesse's motivation stems from an alignment between what she now does for a living (working at Chardin) and what she values and believes in her life.

Heterosexual Participants

Close contact. One of the more prominent sources of motivation for heterosexual participants to become involved in addressing LGBT issues was through knowing friends or family members who identified as LGBT. For instance, Sebastian mentioned relatives who identified as gay or lesbian as one source of his motivation to be involved in LGBT issues. He said, "I can go back in my own Latino culture, individuals who lived double lives who were in the shadows hiding their true identities because of homophobia, because of a very machista culture. So I have seen that, I have lived that, witnessing their suffering and their experience." Claire recalled her college roommate who identified as lesbian: "She taught me about the triangle and she put it out on our door and I was excited because she was a wonderful person. I really loved her; she was very sweet and really a great friend in a place I felt I had none." When Claire visited Chardin for her job interview, she noticed the Safe Space placards posted on doors all

over campus and became the first person in her department to complete the training and post her placard. Tammy spoke about a time in her childhood when her father had taken in a teenager who had been kicked out by his parents for being gay. She recalled, "When I was about seven somebody came to stay with us. All I know is his name was Kevin. His mom had kicked him out because she found out that he was gay. He came to stay with us for a few weeks." That act of compassion remained in Tammy's memory when her own son, as a teenager, came out as gay.

One of the most powerful examples was Marion, a heterosexual student who grew up in a fairly religious household. When Marion was around 12 years old, her godmother came out as lesbian, and her parents forbid Marion's godmother from spending time with her. Struggling with the situation a few years later, Marion contacted her godmother despite her parents' edict and reestablished contact. Fortunately for Marion, her parents felt that since she was already 15 years old at that point, they decided to allow her to visit her godmother. These visits provided Marion the opportunity to speak with her godmother, who was incredibly open and warm and helped her understand as best she could. As a result, Marion invited her godmother to her high school graduation, where her parents apologized and rectified the initial situation. This reconciliation proved to be somewhat providential as Marion recalled, "Then the summer between my sophomore and junior year, my older sister came out. She came out as bisexual. It was something that she thought was gonna rock the boat in our family, and it didn't. The reason that it didn't, and my mom said this, is because the foundation had been laid." These experiences formed the primary reason Marion is involved with LGBT issues at Chardin.

Critical incidents. Two heterosexual faculty members were also motivated to make a difference on campus for the LGBT community in response to critical incidents that negatively affected the climate. Anthony became involved in organizing a movement on campus to raise

197

attention to the need for policy protections for LGBT people in response to a series of anti-LGBT speakers brought by student organizations to deliver public presentations to the community. The faculty member who organized the Safe Space program at Chardin was also spurred to action by a critical incident that had taken place at a university sporting event. She recalled, "I came to campus the next day and I talked to my students because I was irate, and I had one student who sent me an email that made me cry." That student asked her to send his story to the faculty listserv about how important it had been to him that she brought the incident up in her classes because "it had ruined his senior year." In response, this faculty member took charge of establishing the Safe Space program on campus.

Other forms of oppression. Several heterosexual participants cited other ways they experienced oppression as motivating their desire to work to end anti-LGBT oppression. Paul's motivation stemmed from the stigmatization he has faced living with depression, and Ariel mentioned her commitment to LGBT issues originated from having been undocumented and understanding the need for coalition-building to achieve social justice. Hannah shared how when her grandparents were imprisoned during the Holocaust, her grandfather in particular was imprisoned in a concentration camp with gay men. She recalled, "My grandfather was in the camp with some homosexuals, and he wanted to make sure that everybody survived, and nobody was prosecuted for who and what they were." Hannah said her grandfather always told her, "You should go into a career about civil justice and civil rights, because what happened to us can't happen to anybody else." Matthew found his experiences growing up within his religious tradition mirrored those of the LGBT community. During graduate school, he took a class with a professor whose expertise included sexuality and reflected on his own background:

> I felt really marginalized from my own religion because I'm obviously not White, and I

really struggled with a lot of the basic tenets…

And I felt like every time that she talked about LGBT issues, I felt that same feeling that

this is the group that I understand and I feel for because I know what that little piece of it

in religion is like.

As a result, LGBT issues became part of his scholarly agenda.

Commitment to social justice. For several heterosexual participants, although they may

or may not have important people in their lives who identify as LGBT, their motivation to be

involved in LGBT issues is grounded in a deeper commitment to social justice. As a faculty

member, Lola strives to be critical in her work and educate herself on issues, especially when she

may find her own viewpoints challenged by the experiences of an oppressed minority. She

mentioned a recent story in *The New York Times* about transgender students attending Wellesley,

which caught her interest given her background having attended single-sex schools. She said,

"My gut, my knee jerk, my instant reaction is, 'No.' But then the people from Wellesley are

saying, 'Well come on, we've always been about creating space for different sexual identities.

We don't want to become marginalizers, right?'" Liz cited her working class background as the

source of her commitment to social justice issues, like LGBT issues, and has devoted her career

to social justice concerns, including both her work at Chardin and her work with previous

employers, such as Goodwill Industries. Both Sebastian and Tom cited their professional values

as contributing to their personal motivation to be involved in LGBT issues. Sebastian said, "We

have really taken advocacy as part of our professional identity," and Tom added, in addition to

his direct professional responsibilities, "How can I still be in service to these other things, when

the data, the campus climate survey, show me there's still a problem?"

Unlike other heterosexual participants in this study, Kenny was one of only two

heterosexual participants (Matthew was the other) who became involved with LGBT issues in spite of not knowing anyone who identified as LGBT. After he told me about being involved in his high school GSA, I specifically asked whether he had friends or family members who identified as LGBT that spurred his interest in the club. He did not, saying, "I don't think people should be treated wrongly for something that like isn't like an issue, really, as it just kind of ticks me off when people do that. And, so, yeah, I got into GSA to like further educate myself a little bit." Kenny did reveal his older brother influenced his motivation because they frequently discussed political issues when they were younger. However, Kenny actually apologized to me for not having some profound story about a friend or incident that motivated his involvement. I commented that it was even more remarkable that he had no "qualifying experience" that led to his involvement: he was intrinsically motivated to learn from difference.

Tactics

Students, faculty, staff, and even administrators named a number of tactics they employ in their efforts to address the campus climate for the LGBT community. Many of these tactics mirrored those outlined by Kezar and Lester (2011); some were considered tactics by the participants but had been framed by Kezar and Lester as approaches to navigate institutional power dynamics. Finally I uncovered a few tactics that were specific to LGBT issues that did not align with Kezar and Lester's grassroots leadership tactics, but rather mapped onto Meyerson's (2003, 2008) most tempered tactic of "resisting quietly and staying true to one's 'self.'" These include tactics such as storytelling or one-on-one interactions, which I refer to as self-expression. This next section presents the range of tactics employed by grassroots leaders at Chardin, starting with self-expression, progressing to grassroots leadership tactics, and finally discussing tactics used to navigate institutional power dynamics, described in Chapter 4.

Self-Expression

Two types of tactics were best described as self-expression because they tend to be employed in one-on-one encounters and relate to conveying one's identity and values to others. The first was referred to by one heterosexual participant as "the daily witness," or carrying oneself with a sense of integrity and authenticity that communicates support for LGBT issues and approachability to LGBT colleagues and peers, and the second was storytelling. This section is organized by group to highlight the primary differences in how self-expression was deployed on campus, particularly as students spoke about engaging self-expression far more than they engaged any other tactic.

LGBQ students. Self-expression was most often used by students because the only students who mentioned any type of grassroots leadership tactics were student leaders who organized events and worked with staff and faculty. Otherwise the most involvement students tended to have in addressing LGBT issues was through sharing their own experiences with their peers, or by confronting their peers' offensive remarks. This section examines how students spoke about making a difference through their interactions and the stories they share with their peers.

Living out "the daily witness": One-on-one interactions. Among LGBQ students, especially those who did not hold a leadership position on campus, one-on-one interactions were the area they felt most effective. Mackenzie, as a first-year student in particular, described her capacity for influencing change as, "Let me influence all I can where I stand. Someone told me once, 'You work where you are first before going anywhere else.' Here's where I am. Here's what I'm gonna do while I can." Amelia added, "I know it's hard because it's not like a big campus, but there's no way that I could know everyone and so, I think, I'm limited in the sense

201

that, like, I can be friends with a lot of people, and I can talk to them about it, but I can't make every single person accepting." Madeline felt by being involved in the LGBT student organization, supporting the LGBT center, and speaking up as necessary were all small actions she could take to help influence change on campus.

A second way LGBT undergraduates utilized one-on-one interactions to make a difference was through being a resource to their peers, especially when they could mentor or role model for other LGBT students. Amelia elaborated:

I want to be seen as someone that they can come to, and so, in the gay-straight alliance, but then, also, outside of the gay-straight alliance, just like in the school, I [try] to make myself seen as an ally, if not more, so that if people were having trouble with anything they could come to me, and just be that, for now.

Jacquelyn provided examples of ways she acted as a resource both to support her LGBT peers and to educate her heterosexual peers. First, by coming out as bisexual, Jacquelyn felt she contributed to ending the invisibility of bisexuality on campus. She also mentioned a time she encouraged a peer who identified as asexual to join the LGBT student organization, reassuring that student, "Okay, I know you feel this way, but I promise you, we want you, you belong, you're a person, so you should come and try this out." Finally, Jacquelyn added, "I'm not one of the people that's like huge, starting political activism, but like I do a lot of like one-on-one things. And I find I answer, like I said, a lot of questions for people because [they think] bisexuality is just so strange."

Confronting microaggressions. Several students spoke about directly confronting their peers over offensive remarks as a tactic they employ in their one-on-one interactions to affect the environment on campus. For instance, Mackenzie stated, "When people say something, I call

them out. I'm big on it." Alice mentioned calling people out can be incredibly effective in classes, especially with first-year students who may not have been confronted about homophobic remarks in the past. She elaborated, "When I hear freshman boys being like, 'That is so gay,' and I call them out, and you almost see like the light click in the back of their, like that is—'I did not realize that, like I did not realize saying that was as awful and derogatory as it is.'" Also, as described in Chapter 4, Kenny, a heterosexual student, regularly employs this tactic of confronting his peers in situations where he overhears homophobic and heterosexist remarks, but expressed concern that his efforts were not as effective as he would prefer.

  Storytelling and identity deployment. Storytelling and identity deployment, or intentional disclosure of identity (Creed & Scully, 2000), was effective in one-on-one situations to cultivate empathy in peers or colleagues. Students used this tactic most in situations where they perceived their peers to be unaware that an LGBT person was present in the space. Alice found that she and her LGBT peers often felt compelled to come out in classes to counter their classmates' assumptions. She described:

> You can sit in the back of the classroom and everyone assumes you are straight. You can almost overhear conversations before you chime in, and people being like, "Well, I don't see why we're talking about it," blah, blah, blah, and I could raise my hand and be like, "As a bisexual woman also dating a woman, I can say that this is how it comes across from the LGBT community."

Kristopher added that in the classroom, sometimes openly identifying as gay places a qualifier on any statement he makes about gender or sexuality. He said, "This is a consistent problem I deal with, where I feel like the second people find out I'm gay, they can dismiss my opinions about things…it no longer becomes a rational or reasonable opinion, because it's an

angry minority." In contrast, by waiting to disclose until later in the semester, he found, "I think that was effective, because I think it forced people to realize that they had agreed with a lot of other things I had said, and then all of a sudden hear that I had this other perspective that I was coming from or this other perspective to bring to the table in terms of sexuality."

Kristopher also spoke about the use of storytelling to help educate his peers because "when someone tells you their story of what it was like for them to come out, or their story of what it was like for them to realize that they were gender nonconforming, or whatever it is, that sticks with you." Kristopher provided an example of storytelling in a retreat setting where he volunteered to give a talk about identity. He hadn't told anyone on the retreat that he identified as gay, but his talk ended up focusing on his struggle being both gay and Catholic:

> I gave this talk at the retreat, and every single one of [the participants] wanted to talk to me about it further. Every single one of them wanted to hear more about my story. Every single one of them was so supportive of how much courage it must have taken, from their perspective, to share that story. All of the freshman that were in my small group all had something to say about it, too. It prompted so many conversations I don't think would have happened outside of that context.

LGBQ student leaders were frequently asked to present their stories in different venues to help raise their peers' awareness about what it means to be LGBT at Chardin. For instance, Taylor mentioned being asked to sit on a diversity panel for a residence hall program and to be interviewed by students in a campus leadership program for a class project. She actually felt flattered by the request, but Leah mentioned being a student leader can be more challenging for her as she is not as out as her fellow student leaders. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter 4, one of the most effective tactics used to convince the Board of Trustees to support establishing an

LGBT student organization was through student presentations of their personal stories before the Board.

LGBQ faculty and staff. LGBQ faculty and staff also spoke about instances where they employed self-expression. For employees, "the daily witness" meant being open and authentic in their interactions with their colleagues and students, and identity deployment took that authenticity one step further by making sure to correct the assumptions made by others about their sexual orientations. This section examines how LGBQ faculty and staff described authenticity in their interactions with others as a tactic to effect change, and how being authentic often required intentional disclosure. I omitted storytelling as a tactic for LGBQ faculty and staff; only LGBQ faculty spoke about sharing their personal experiences as a tactic, but they spoke about this tactic in the context of their teaching. As a result, faculty storytelling in the classroom is discussed later under the tactic of "leveraging the curriculum."

Living out "the daily witness": Authenticity. LGBQ participants engaged in "the daily witness" by being open about their sexual orientations in ways that affected their colleagues' and peers' assumptions about the LGBT community. For example, Joy described it as, "Being a community member that people can respect…and behaving in a way that I would think anybody would want to behave as a part of the community, interested in the well-being of everybody here, and wanting to contribute and all that kind of stuff." Ben found "being openly gay and visible was the best, and developing a reputation of someone who gets things done and is trustworthy and has integrity and is also, by the way, gay, I think has been the most successful strategy for me." Brandon, a staff member, also felt that being out and visible in his daily interactions was important, but to him, what made a difference was his authenticity. He elaborated:

The Brandon that my friends get when we're out at the bars, the Brandon that people get

when they're in meetings with me or when they're interacting with me at lunch—I think

by being open about who I am as far as my orientation is concerned—I think that's a

really big deal on a campus.

LGBQ staff members also included support for students as part of their daily witness.

Jesse provided the example of a work study student she supervised who indicated, "I was like a

surrogate mother to her. …I had no idea I impacted her like that." Emily spoke about making

sure students knew she was a safe person they could confide in, and Brandon and Kyle, who both

work in student affairs, found much of their daily interactions with students included responding

to language-related microaggressions. For example, Brandon mentioned, "I am very big on

inclusive language, and so whenever I hear people using words or saying something to someone

that I don't think is appropriate, I call them out on it."

Identity deployment. Two LGBQ employees provided examples of ways they engage in

identity deployment. Ben, a staff member, found he frequently needs to correct the assumptions

of other people about the sex of his spouse. He said, "People would come up and see my ring

now and say, 'Oh, your wife…' 'No, no. I have a husband.' They respond, 'Oh—that's nice. I

guess that's possible now.'" Monica, a faculty member, is strategic about how she discloses her

identity as bisexual in campus spaces outside her department due to caution around institutional

power dynamics to avoid disrupting her promotion and tenure review process. She speaks with

her students about these decisions as a type of activism, concluding, "Just my being in this

institution, with all of the various identities that I have, is a form of insurgency."

Heterosexual participants. Heterosexual participants' use of self-expression also

centered on an innate desire to convey a sense of openness and authenticity to their colleagues

and peers, but unlike LGBQ participants whose actions focused on making their sexual identities

more visible, heterosexual participants' employment of these tactics was focused on conveying support for the LGBT community. In terms of "the daily witness," for heterosexual participants this meant demonstrating their allyship through their daily interactions, and storytelling was used to help amplify LGBT voices or call attention to critical issues. This section presents examples of how heterosexual participants utilized allyship and storytelling to make a difference at Chardin.

Living out "the daily witness": Allyship. The primary way heterosexual participants engaged in "the daily witness" was through allyship with LGBT people. For instance, Margaret finds making herself approachable for LGBT students to be a moral responsibility, recalling an instance where an openly gay student asked her to share a statement with her colleagues. What she found most important was, as she said, "The only thing I did is make myself trustworthy for that young man." Further, both Margaret and Lola felt they were approachable for LGBT students because their personal values and sense of integrity compel them to carry themselves in a congruent manner. Lola described, "Little things like that, I think, are really what's most important—is that I talk the talk and walk the walk, and that people know it." Naomi, a faculty member in a graduate professional program, indicated, "I think language is really important. When I'm talking, that my language is very open and affirming, I think that's probably the biggest part of my advocacy." As a result, LGBT students recognize Naomi as someone they can trust and talk to if they are facing any major issue.

Claire and Tammy, as staff members, also identified approachability for LGBT students as an important way they make a difference. Although she has little contact with students, Claire mentioned that it was personally important to her that any students who work in her office know she is supportive of LGBT issues and thus someone they could talk to if needed. Tammy provided an example of how she tries to be sensitive in her work to the needs of LGBT students.

When she connects students with employers for internships, for instance, Tammy considers, "If this student comes to this small town, am I putting that person in danger?" She double-checks with students to determine whether her assumptions are unfounded, but this awareness is always present for Tammy.

Tom, a staff member, and Marion, a student, both engage in allyship through identifying areas where a perspective or voice is missing from a discussion. Tom described:

Most people will get sexual assault and power-based personal violence as a women's issue, but if I can be the person that, the "canary in the coal mine" that goes, "Yeah, but you know there's a fair number of men who've been wronged, and there's a fair number of sexual minorities who are not getting talked about, in the typical way that this gets brought up."

Similar to Tom, Marion spoke about attending meetings, like student government meetings, and making sure to raise issues on behalf of voices she finds are not represented at the table. More importantly, as a heterosexual, Marion stated, "I have to be a little bit careful because I am not a person—I'm an ally, so I can't talk about being bisexual in the same way that [someone else] can." Naomi concurred, "I don't want to overstep my boundaries in the same respect as I have heterosexual privilege." As allies, Tammy and Tom shared examples of actions directed at the behavior of their heterosexual colleagues in addition to supporting LGBT students. Tammy described her influence on her colleagues as "modeling behaviors that you'd like to see in other people." Tom makes sure his direct reports know they are welcome, and more so are encouraged, to attend Safe Space training and other LGBT activities.

Storytelling. Heterosexual participants do not have their own stories about being LGBT to share, but can be called on to amplify the stories of their LGBT peers and colleagues or tell

stories to draw attention to critical issues facing the campus LGBT community. As mentioned earlier, Margaret recalled one time a student approached her with a statement he wanted to make to the faculty. With this student's permission, Margaret shared his story with the entire faculty at Chardin, which generated an outpouring of support from many of her colleagues. Many commended Margaret for her courage in sharing his story with the entire faculty, which likely took some gumption, but Margaret responded, "No, it's not me. It's my student."

Claire added that storytelling is used by the development office to engage donors, and that one possible area for effecting change is through telling the stories of LGBT students who benefit from these donors' philanthropy. Although she indicated that development had not yet tried to engage LGBT alumni giving in an active way, she felt collecting these stories was one way she could effect change in her role:

> It's going to be through those stories, where my opportunity is to make change. And to share what's going on within that community, and how it affects all sides of who Chardin is, and who goes to school here, and who works here, who we are as a community.

In addition to sharing stories about LGBT lives, Tom mentioned he tells stories about critical incidents that have happened at the university as a way of preserving institutional memory. He has found, as students and employees change, there are "[incidents] most everybody's forgotten from the collective consciousness of campus." Through storytelling Tom can continually call his colleagues' attention back to areas where the university still needs to change and grow as an organization.

Grassroots Leadership Tactics

Although self-expression was widely used among participants, especially students, a range of tactics were identified that aligned with those identified by Kezar and Lester (2011) as

209

important tactics for grassroots leadership relevant to the culture of higher education. Several of these tactics were utilized or shaped in a manner that reflected the university's Jesuit, Catholic identity. This next section outlines these grassroots leadership tactics and how they were employed.

Promoting intellectual discourse. One important tactic was offering opportunities for intellectual discourse around LGBT issues. Faculty in particular spoke about intellectual discourse because this tactic related directly to the scholarly activities that faculty already engage in as part of their professional responsibilities. Given her affiliation with the women's studies program at Chardin, Aubrey invoked the department's goals around incorporating the examination of both sexuality and gender into their work. She said, "I try to be pretty aware of offering as many LGBT type events or programming on campus as we do feminist events. …we couldn't call [the department] sexuality studies—I don't think Chardin is quite ready for that—but it is it's very much a part of what we do in our classes."

In particular, framing events as opportunities for intellectual discourse allows faculty and other campus grassroots leaders to host controversial programs under the protection of academic freedom. The best example of this is the controversy that has continued to surround campus performances of *The Vagina Monologues* at Chardin as well as at numerous other Catholic universities throughout the United States. Aubrey noted, "*The Vagina Monologues*, that was just huge, you know, and the way we were finally able to do it on campus was as part of this huge educational week-long series of events."

In addition to hosting public opportunities for intellectual discourse, Anthony described how discourse was used by the group of faculty, staff, and students he was involved with who had gathered to push for more open and visible affirmation of the LGBT community by the

Chardin university administration. Discourse was used to reach a shared understanding of the group's goals and purpose since many people involved had not been familiar with previous efforts to improve the climate. Anthony recalled, "Look, I'm coming a little bit from the outside here, I'm not somebody who'd been working with the gay-straight alliance for years." The group even deliberated whether or not they would commit to a public campaign, and in the end they developed a petition that included a statement of equality and a set of requests for people to sign to send to the administration.

As a more unorthodox example of intellectual discourse, one Jesuit priest mentioned he has no hesitation talking about the LGBT community during a homily at Mass. He felt this was one area where he had the greatest capacity to influence change because "plenty of students are there and a lot of faculty; the university president and his wife go there pretty regularly." In one example, he spoke about how the LGBT community was one of many groups that Catholics tend to unfairly stereotype. Kyle added that part of Chardin's commitment to *cura personalis* is care for students' intellectual development and that opportunities to discuss important moral issues are one method by which faculty and staff affect students' development.

Stephanie, an administrator, felt that Catholic universities, especially within Jesuit higher education with its very rich educational tradition, were in the best position to help shape Catholic thinking on significant moral issues. She stated, "We are the thinking arm of the church, and so [one way is through] being reflective and pushing the conversation further theologically around human sexuality in general even, and then specifically around homosexuality and dynamics within the US Church in particular." Sebastian also suggested that the university might consider inviting a high profile speaker with a theologically-grounded viewpoint who challenges the status quo as a way to engage the community in a conversation about LGBT issues:

For example, there is this prominent Jesuit, former Jesuit, that I highly admire who was

one of the celebrated leaders in the LGBT community, former Father John McNeill,

and…all of the intellectual work that he has published, and the advocacy that he does

nationally. But let's bring John McNeill. I assure you that the conservative elements here

at the university would oppose that, you know. But what about being that daring to raise

awareness?

To provide some context, John McNeill had been an ordained Jesuit priest who was later

removed from ministry and defrocked for refusing to cease his LGBT advocacy (McNeill, 1993).

Sebastian's point was that opportunities for intellectual discourse could be used not only to raise

awareness to LGBT experiences in general, but to push people's thinking around how the

Catholic Church itself might respond to LGBT issues in a different way.

Although intellectual discourse was used as a tactic to address LGBT issues, intellectual

discourse can also be used to promulgate anti-LGBT views as well. Naomi mentioned a program

where one of the graduate student organizations brought a speaker to present an argument against

legal recognition of marriages between same-sex couples. However, Naomi described, "That's

the only time I remember in recent history where a potential LGBT issue ended up not being an

issue. There were so many people there that were supportive…the LGBT student organizations

definitely rallied to get support there." Although the event could have had an adverse effect on

the climate, the outcome actually ended up demonstrating the level of LGBT support within the

graduate program.

Providing professional development. Where intellectual discourse focuses on bigger

picture issues pertaining to the LGBT community, opportunities for professional development

help increase the capacity of faculty and staff to respond to the needs of the LGBT community.

For instance, Jesse, Liz, and Monica all identified as an important need faculty readiness to respond to students' insensitive and offensive remarks in the classroom in productive ways. As such, two faculty members pointed to a faculty development program aimed at preparing faculty for addressing these difficult teaching moments. Aubrey spoke about being involved in this program, which features discussion groups to help faculty strategize both how to address microaggressions in the classroom and how to "approach topics that make you or students feel uncomfortable, ways to push; how to deal with those topics in the classroom, in a productive way." These discussion groups support each other and hold each other accountable to the program's goals, but individual members have also become resources for their own departments, as Olivia elaborated, "Group [members] have, at least in their departments, come to be the person you go to and say, 'This happened in my class, what would you have done?'" Olivia felt, in tandem with the Safe Space program, this group has made important contributions toward improving the classroom climate at Chardin.

Participants in graduate professional schools also mentioned a few professional development programs specific to their programs as opportunities to raise LGBT awareness. Ashley mentioned that the law school hosts a Continuing Legal Education (CLE) program where local attorneys and other speakers are invited to address students and faculty, proposing, "I think if there was more diversity as far as what the events that they were bringing in here, and the people that they're bringing in here to participate in those events, I think would be very helpful." Naomi, a faculty member, suggested screening films dealing with themes pertaining to issues of discrimination during her department's all-faculty meetings. Although opportunities for professional development can be an important tactic for influencing change, another graduate program faculty member recognized one of the largest barriers to providing professional

213

development opportunities for faculty is the question as to whether faculty or administrators are responsible for ensuring these opportunities are offered. He felt that the administration should take a leadership role in providing opportunities to learn about diversity, "but maybe their feeling is that this is something that should be faculty-driven, and the people with the interest will sort of 'pop up,' which is fine. But then there needs to be strong administrative support if that's the expectation. And I'm not sure that that's always the case."

Offering Safe Space training. The most commonly discussed professional development opportunity at Chardin was the university Safe Space program. Safe Space is a training program that familiarizes participants with vocabulary associated with the LGBT community as well as provides tools for supporting LGBT students and intervening when problematic interactions occur. Safe Space is an incredibly visible program at Chardin because participants post a placard on their office door after completing the training, and most of the university leadership has participated in the program. I was struck while walking around the campus as to how many Safe space placards are visible throughout the campus, including on an ROTC faculty member's door.

One administrator mentioned to me that one of the most important reasons the Safe Space training program has been so successful is that it was instigated by a faculty member. As mentioned earlier, following a very public critical incident, this faculty member felt compelled to respond in some way to improve the climate. She was relatively new on campus, and so she was concerned about how her involvement might affect her tenure and promotion process, but, as she recounted, "I remember talking to my department chair here at that time, and he said, 'No one's going to give you any pushback for this.'" Her chair even offered to take responsibility for the program should she encounter any adverse consequences from establishing the program. In spite of her initial trepidation, not only has the program become incredibly popular, her involvement

became an influential artifact of her impact in her tenure review file. Several faculty members mentioned their participation in Safe Space training, including Margaret, Naomi, Aubrey, and Lola.

Faculty spoke about the ways they perceived the program's success. Joy said, "It seems like it just gradually got to be a warmer kind of climate so that now there are trainings that the LGBT center does for staff and faculty members, and then they gave you that nice little thing you can put outside your door." Grace found that the program made visible the network of support for the LGBT community, stating, "There were inspiring examples from people who were willing to openly advocate and undertake to do the Safe Space training, put the stickers up on their doors so that people know. So that's one change. I think it was more than just kind of a secret underground." Olivia mentioned the Safe Space training has helped in efforts to improve faculty responses to offensive remarks in the classroom. She also added, "I know of one faculty member who hates the signs. He says that implies that other spaces on campus aren't safe. And I think, 'Yes, that is what it is implies. So go to training and get a sign.'"

In spite of its success, a couple staff member participants pointed out some of the ways Safe Space has been limited and could be further improved to have an even more effective impact on campus. For instance, Tom felt that Safe Space attendance could be more strongly compelled, explaining, "Safe Space training probably works best when it's elective, but there's a—it's kind of like Title IX. There's a basic level of knowledge everybody should be required to be brought up to." Liz also felt that the wholly voluntary nature of Safe Space training led to a situation where "we have pockets of help, but, again, it's not strategic." Tammy suggested that the university ought to provide incentives for high participation in Safe Space, similar to the manner in which the university promotes participation in the campus emergency notification

system. A second limitation of the Safe Space program is its relative inaccessibility for faculty and staff in graduate professional programs. Many of these programs are located in buildings physically located some distance from the center of campus. Emily, a law school staff member, noted that attending events or trainings on the main campus can be difficult for law school employees because of the time required for both the training and the walk to the main campus. A graduate program faculty member suggested the idea of providing a truncated version of Safe Space training in his department, but has not yet been able to make that happen.

Students. For students, seeing the proliferation of placards around campus contributes to a more welcoming campus climate at Chardin. Taylor said, "But that's great, I mean, to walk by an entire department, and see that 90% of the doors have got a Safe Space training sticker on it; that's awesome." Madeline, Taylor, and Leah also spoke how the climate differed among academic departments based on the number of faculty within a department who have displayed a placard on their doors. Madeline identified English as a department where nearly all the faculty are Safe Space trained, while Leah mentioned that very few engineering faculty members have Safe Space placards.

The question of whether Safe Space training should be mandatory or voluntary was raised by students as well in relation to student resident assistants. RAs are offered the opportunity to participate in Safe Space training, and Kenny, who worked as an RA, mentioned that an introduction to the LGBT center and the Safe Space program is provided as part of mandatory RA training. However, as RAs are not required to attend Safe Space training, Madeline felt this led to a situation where the preparedness level among RAs varied greatly by individual. Alice found this inconsistency in preparedness to be especially problematic, as she explained, "I think that is really dangerous, especially if you are in charge of freshman who are

new, and do not know the climate of the area, and they come to you as their RA, and you do not know how to deal with the situation." Both Alice and Madeline felt that faculty, staff, and student employees should be required to undergo some degree of Safe Space training given how much the climate can affect students' experiences.

Leveraging the curriculum. As mentioned in the discussion of intellectual discourse, faculty spoke about the protections they enjoy under academic freedom in many of their scholarly activities. One area where faculty made it clear their activities were protected was the classroom. When Lola was hired, she said her colleagues assured her, "Within your classroom you can do what you want: we want you to know that." Samantha further explained, "As long as there is respectable academic work in an area, then I get to bring it into class." Faculty leveraged the curriculum to increase the visibility of LGBT issues in several ways. This section will first describe the various ways faculty brought LGBT topics into their courses or the broader curriculum, and then provide examples of pedagogical methods for leveraging the curriculum to raise students' awareness.

Teaching LGBT topics or courses. First, faculty leveraged the curriculum through the development of LGBT courses or teaching LGBT content within existing courses. As proposing new courses can be a lengthy process, the least common method was the development of stand-alone LGBT courses. I only came across three examples of LGBT courses: one faculty member teaches an LGBT studies course, another negotiated a course on sexuality into her contract when she was hired, and a third is planning to offer a course on queer theory. While the latter two courses are or will be officially listed in the university catalog, the LGBT studies course was initially introduced as a special topics seminar, despite being fully supported by the sociology department, establishing it "under the radar" of the administration. At this point, the faculty

217

member teaching the course believes she could obtain a course number for the course, but "I just haven't taken the time to do the paperwork."

Another method faculty used to leverage the curriculum was through teaching LGBT topics or texts in their existing courses. For instance, Olivia teaches about employment discrimination and includes discussion on how sex discrimination is covered under federal law, but sexual orientation discrimination is not. Paul used to include marriage equality as a topic in his courses because the subject had once been contentious among students, but has shifted to other topics, like LGBT representation in the media, because "[marriage equality] just wasn't generating any controversy." A third manner in which faculty have incorporated LGBT topics into the curriculum is through the use of LGBT examples when teaching broader concepts. Both Margaret and Anthony mentioned including same-sex couples when discussing concepts that relate to relationships or family, and Joy spoke about including an example from her own professional experience working with a transgender client that had a profound impact on her: "I have often talked about the case that I had representing a transgender client because that was so, it made me look at things so outside my ordinary way of thinking."

Paul in particular felt his inclusion of LGBT texts to be effective "because I wasn't speaking in my own voice." However, for LGBQ faculty, the examples they include are often stories from their own personal experiences, and, in sharing these experiences, they come out to their classes. Lee Ann discloses her sexual orientation in class each semester both to demonstrate courage as a role model for her LGBT students and to serve as an example of someone who has integrated her strong faith background with her sexual identity. Monica intentionally chooses mundane examples from her own life, such as filing taxes, because these experiences are relatable to most students, but also, as she said:

For the LGBT students in particular, I think it's very, very empowering for them to see

somebody in the classroom who is talking about experience without necessarily going

through the ritual of a coming out story, and having the conversation be centered around,

not that there isn't pain, but have it be centered around pain and rejection, and all of those

kinds of narratives that I think are really common in their experience of engaging with

the LGBT community as sort of their entrance point.

Although LGBT faculty felt comfortable teaching about LGBT topics and sharing their lives

with students, Aubrey mentioned an added scrutiny LGBT faculty face from students that their

heterosexual colleagues do not. She said, "Sometimes I feel a little, 'Oh, you're just teaching this

text because you're queer.'"

Students appreciated faculty being willing to be vulnerable and share their personal

experiences in the classroom. Samantha recalled a student who told her, "I just came out to my

parents over the summer, and I wanted to tell you that it's so nice to have you be so open in class

and have a good, happy life." Alice, a student, mentioned a professor who came out in one of her

religious studies courses and recalled, "She very much opened it up, and I think it was a good

experience for a lot of the kids because they were rattled at first, like, 'What do I say to that?' but

I think it was good for them to be challenged that way." Alice felt both validated by having an

LGBT role model in the classroom, but was also encouraged by the ways her peers' assumptions

were challenged as well.

Using pedagogy. Beyond the inclusion of LGBT perspectives within the content of a

course, faculty also used their pedagogical approach to model LGBT inclusion for their students.

Matthew refers to his approach as the "pervasive method" because "in every class that I have, I

intentionally call attention to orientation, gender identity, privilege around those identities; I

work in problems, I talk about different clients that they'll have and their needs, and just make it, I try as hard as I can to not only spread it, but normalize it." Anthony added, "When I started my career you had anthologies with readings, pro and con: 'Is it okay to be homosexual?' You know what I mean? That just seems a different world. So now, it's more like, 'As we all know, it's not okay to discriminate against people because…'" Samantha approaches her teaching from the assumption that students are already accepting of LGBT people:

So I am always bringing [LGBT topics] into class and just assuming that if they are still wrestling with, "Is this what God wants, or not?", whatever they are wrestling with personally and emotionally, I am light-years ahead of that in giving them the overall sociological picture of our lives. And whatever happens behind the scenes, and however they work that out between them and their faith, or how they were raised, or whatever belief system they are wrestling with, I am always here, ahead. Whether they think it's right or wrong to be gay, I am telling them [get over it; there are more significant issues like] parents are pushing their children out onto the street to prostitute.

A second pedagogical method faculty cited is through creating moments of discomfort in the classroom that push students out of their psychological and emotional comfort zones to encourage them to think about LGBT issues, and other social issues, in more complex ways. For instance, Margaret felt, "I don't consider [pushback from students to be] real pushback because it's my job, and particularly at a Jesuit university, but as an educator in general, to make students uncomfortable, to disrupt their categories and to explain to them that their thinking can't be black and white when it deals with humanity." Monica creates these moments of discomfort in the classroom to foster in students the tolerance for ambiguity required for engaging in social justice work outside the classroom:

[Students in my introductory course have] had eight, nine weeks of listening to me help define a whole bunch of social problems that some of them have been aware of a little piece of it. And then they realize, "Oh my God, there's so much more," and they get really angry, and they want to move on to, "How do we fix it? Tell me how I fix this!" And it's also really important to me that they do; I say, "Okay, cool it, sit down; if it were easy to fix it'd be done. We're not going to be able to cover it in three weeks in an intro class, and I'm not going to have the answer for you, and I don't have the answers." And I want them to feel comfortable with that. In fact, I think it's a really good thing that the moment that we think we have all the answers is the moment we've turned into the oppressor.

One way Samantha pushes students' comfort zones is through centering the experiences of people in targeted social identity groups in her courses. For instance, she said, "I'd rather hear the African-American kid talk about her experience coming here to a big ol' White school with a bunch of White kids, and constantly putting that in their faces…and none of the kids want to hear more apologies about, 'I am a White guy, I feel like you're being really threatening…' Who the hell cares! We're past that!" However, as students' attitudes toward homosexuality shift toward greater acceptance, Barbara noted that her efforts to create moments of discomfort in the classroom have become less effective. She noted, "In some ways it was so much easier when you could count on there being a couple of students who would just be, you know, bigots. Then [I would think], 'Okay. Now I've got something concrete to push against.' That's less and less true."

Faculty also incorporate into courses skills and tools for taking action on issues as a third pedagogical method for leveraging the curriculum. Joy includes cultural competence as an

important skill taught in her professional ethics class by having students consider issues through a cross-cultural analysis framework. Olivia helps her students envision ways they might influence their future workplaces through understanding how "you are not allowed to tell people how to feel or what their beliefs need to be. But you are allowed to say, 'When you're at work, here's how you will behave.'"

One final pedagogical method faculty indicated was attention to the climate in the classroom. Aubrey and Matthew provided examples of ways they structure the class environment to be comfortable enough for students to be vulnerable, take risks, and be open to learning from their mistakes. Aubrey described how she responds to unintentionally offensive remarks made by students in class, saying, "If there is a comment, it's often, I would call it a kind of microaggression; the person saying it probably doesn't recognize they are being heteronormative. There's a way of calling attention to, 'Let's investigate what you just said. Let's talk about the language you just used.'" Matthew added that students who come from more religious backgrounds will frequently enroll in his courses because he himself identifies as deeply religious. They tell him, "This is exactly the kind of class that I wanted because I feel safe that it's rooted in religion and religious ideas, but at the same time, we can actually really engage with these ideas, and I don't have to be scared or embarrassed or have people think that I'm a bad person because I just want to talk about these things, and be vulnerable." Monica also mentioned she makes it a point to teach vocabulary and terminology for discussing LGBT issues, but is cautious that her efforts to help students use the correct terminology does not come across as "policing" what students say in the classroom. She said, "I would rather use dialogue as a corrective rather than have any kind of prescriptive, 'This is how we will speak about this,' because, I think, that does turn students away who I want to pull in."

Mentoring students. Outside of the classroom, faculty and staff mentored students in their efforts to address issues pertaining to the climate for the LGBT community on campus. One manner in which faculty and staff mentored students was through assisting them, behind the scenes, with their organizing efforts to raise issues. For example, Kyle works in student affairs and spoke about how his role allows him to support students in bringing awareness to important issues on campus, including LGBT issues. As a staff member, he is able to help them navigate the political context of the university. Aubrey, a faculty member, said, "There have been ways in which I have sort of, I don't want to say clandestinely, but offered students ideas for how to deal with things that were happening on campus, or sort of been in the background in student organizing efforts and those kinds of things." Students involved in both the LGBT and feminist student organizations have expressed their frustration to her over the university's continual opposition to the formation of a pro-choice student organization. On a day that the pro-life student organization was holding events related to pro-life issues, Aubrey noted, "Somehow [the students] miraculously ended up with pink tee shirts from Planned Parenthood that they all wore around campus. How they got those tee shirts, I am not sure…" Joy also added one way she offers "behind the scenes" mentorship is through funneling information about community events in the broader Sunny Falls LGBT community to the law school organization. However, in order to be in the position to mentor LGBT students, Brandon argued, "I think giving staff and faculty an opportunity to be out and to be proud and to be engaged in the community through that capacity is only going to benefit our students, to say, 'Look. You can make it through this,' or 'Here's someone that you can go talk to.'"

Two heterosexual faculty members spoke about divergent mentoring experiences in their attempts to support the campus LGBT student organizations. On the one hand, Matthew had

attempted to connect LGBT graduate students with broader professional development resources when he first began working at Chardin, but quickly realized these students faced a great deal of resistance and tension on campus. He found, "They were more interested in either a social support club or just survival. And so I think that was hard. So I kind of backed off after the first year or so." On the other hand, Margaret found among the undergraduates, "The kids in the gay-straight alliance were angry, and it was heartbreaking for me to see how angry they were and how they isolated themselves." She worked to persuade the organization's president that their isolation was potentially hurting them, but the president was insistent that her anger, and that of her peers, was justified. However, after she graduated, Margaret met this now-alumna over coffee, and recalled, "She said, 'You were totally right. And you know what? My life is so much better [now] that I'm not angry anymore.' And I said, 'Good. I'm very glad to hear that.'"

Tammy, a heterosexual staff member at the law school, commented on the significance of the work the law school prepares students to enter. She said, "There are many students that want to go into politics, that want to go into policy—that want to make change. I think we have an obligation to model [for] and educate students to treat everyone fairly." Recognizing that law schools prepare future judges, politicians, and lawmakers, Tammy felt the law school has an obligation to imbue within graduates a deep sense of social justice and ethical decision-making.

Attending student programs. Within the theme of mentoring students was attending and supporting students' programs, a less direct way for faculty and staff to provide mentoring for students. For Ariel, a newer staff member, attendance at LGBT events provided her the opportunity to meet and get to know LGBT students and student leaders. Hannah and Tom spoke about the importance of showing up to events as an active manifestation of their commitment to allyship beyond the passive display of their Safe Space placards. Lee Ann, a faculty member,

224

mentioned she always makes a point of attending the LGBT student organization meeting that occurs in conjunction with National Coming Out Day where students tell their coming out stories because "I think it's really important to witness people's stories." Two administrators noted the symbolic significance of their attendance at events because their presence demonstrates to students the importance to university leadership of being welcoming and inclusive. Gina stated, "I've tried to attend as many events as I can," and Esther added, "A big part of the job at this level is showing up." She continued, "It's symbolic to students; it's symbolic to people. I show up—I can't go to all of the center's events, but I go to most of them, and I check in with the director."

My favorite example of faculty and staff participation in student events was the drag show that the LGBT law student organization hosts each year. Tammy, a staff member, mentioned, "I'll be involved and take my group: my moms, my wino group, my soccer moms, and take them all to the to the drag show night." Joy shared, "There's always a faculty number too. So dancing in the faculty number, that's another way I get involved."

Using research to build a case. One important tactic that participants used to advocate for an improved campus climate was evidence collected by the campus climate committee on the climate for LGBT students. However, the discussion around collecting data on the needs of the LGBT community tended to be more aspirational than descriptive as efforts to conduct this research were still relatively nascent. One problem at Chardin is that very little data is collected on the LGBT community in general. For instance, Tom stated, somewhat tongue-in-cheek, "We ask them their food preferences, we don't ask them their other preferences, when we're gathering data about our students."

Liz described how she successfully used data to build a case for increased staffing and

services within her own department. She developed an evaluation model that helped her more accurately depict the workload associated with an individual student contact, such as the number of phone calls required to resolve an issue. Using this model Liz was able to argue for increased staffing in her department, and felt this type of model may be useful for the LGBT center as well in developing its story around the need for services and the office's current capacity for meeting that need. Esther, an administrator, also mentioned how collecting data had been crucial in the LGBT center's early years, saying, "You're talking about the need for services: how many LGBT students and allies were coming and utilizing the services, were coming to the events, versus how much funding we were receiving, for example." She felt it was helpful to then compare the resource level of the LGBT center to other offices to argue for greater equity in program allocations.

Power Dynamic Navigation Tactics

Developing and cultivating networks. One of the most important tactics employed by participants in this study was developing and cultivating networks among like-minded peers and colleagues both to influence change and to offer a sense of community. In general, given the relational culture at Chardin University, formal networks, like committees, and informal relationships were fairly common. This section will first examine networks among faculty and staff, followed by a discussion of the LGBT student organization as a critical student network.

Faculty and staff networks. One of the most common forms of networks for employees on campus was committee work. Ben mentioned he initially became involved in LGBT issues through the advisory committee that helped guide the LGBT center following its establishment, as did Paul, a faculty member. Sebastian added that many staff members in his department sit on university-wide committees where they regularly meet with colleagues across the campus as well

as administrators, offering a unique opportunity to advocate on a critical issue. In addition to these formal networks, Liz mentioned the existence of a less formal but institutionally-facilitated network of people from minority backgrounds and their allies that used to meet regularly on campus over lunch. She stated one of the campus climate committee's goals is to reinstate this group and encourage its growth. Brandon also added he has made more informal connections across campus with like-minded people who he feels would offer him a great deal of support in any endeavor he wishes to undergo to influence change.

Diffusion of responsibility. One of the primary strengths of cultivating networks of LGBT support is to diffuse responsibility for responding to LGBT concerns beyond the LGBT center. Ariel argued, "Because if it's only [my] department or the LGBTQ research department that are expected to provide educational opportunities, then we are not on our way to create an inclusive community." To her, the consequences of not diffusing this responsibility include diminishing the institution's capacity for carrying out its mission commitment to a holistic education. As a result, decentralizing the responsibility for providing LGBT support beyond the center could contribute to what Liz referred to as a "tapestry" of support across campus, woven among the various campus departments and their commitment to diversity. Although a fairly strong network of support currently exists, Liz speculated that targeted hires in places like the counseling center would provide greater flexibility within the university to meet LGBT students' needs. Building networks also facilitates the collaboration necessary to organize specific programs or reach other goals. For example, Zachary and Jesse mentioned that collaboration with campus ministry on the LGBT center's annual retreat provides the event much-needed financial and spiritual resources as well as alignment with the university's mission activities.

However, forming networks of support for LGBT issues is not without challenges.

227

Faculty cited structural barriers that made it difficult to build bridges with both staff and students on campus. For instance, Barbara mentioned the students meet at 9 pm on a weeknight, to which she said, "That's a really good way to make sure your advisors are not coming to meetings." Lilian hoped for more connections between faculty and student affairs, saying, "What we do in the classroom, obviously, I think that's important, but I think that student development has much more possibility of connecting to students outside the classroom, in the dorms, and in co-curricular events." However, given differences in job responsibilities and institutional reporting structures, Lilian recognized that collaboration between divisions can be incredibly challenging.

LGBT student organization as a network. Although not described by students explicitly as a tactic, the undergraduate LGBT student organization at Chardin can be conceptualized as a grassroots network that both supports LGBT students and helps them raise awareness to issues on campus. I did meet with two law school participants and attended one meeting of the LGBT law student organization, and the organization does provide an important support network for law students, but I learned much more about the undergraduate club given the number of undergraduates I interviewed. My observation from attending two meetings was that the club provides students the sense of community many participants defined as the "Chardin experience" that staff and faculty feared LGBT students were missing. For instance, club leaders often structure meetings to foster relationships among members: "We try to do like movie and pizza nights with just the [club] members so that when people show up, they are seeing the same faces or seeing people that they know weren't going to judge them." In turn, Madeline described meetings as, "It's just a very supporting community where you know that you can go and just be like, 'Okay, I don't have to be anything besides myself right now.'" The organization also provides a place of support as a way to empower members to take risks, especially in terms of

228

being more open about being LGBT. Jacquelyn remembered a friend say to her, after she began

coming out, "You're going to the gay-straight alliance, right?" She was tentative at first, saying,

"Should I?" to which her friend responded, "Yes, you're going to the gay-straight alliance."

Alice added that the leadership strives to create an environment where, "We will not make

people like come out just for the sake of it, but encouraging people being like, no matter what

happens, like this group is here for you."

Beyond providing support, the LGBT student organization provides students a structure

within which they can organize events to raise awareness to LGBT issues on campus and

approach university leadership in ways individual students may be less able. As mentioned

earlier, several students noted their capacity to influence change as an individual was fairly

limited. However, Jacquelyn stated:

> But if a whole bunch of people, and this is where—before I said that having the allies is a
>
> big thing, if people see it's not just the queers wanting equal rights, all these straight
>
> people also think it's a thing…it must be something that we might want to stand behind as
>
> well.

Working with influential allies. Since faculty, administrators, and even Jesuit priests

have access to different types of power within the university, these influential allies were cited as

critical for influencing change on LGBT issues on campus. Faculty enjoy tenure protections and

academic freedom, administrators hold positional authority, and Jesuit priests offer a legitimating

presence through their connection to the university's Catholic identity. In this section I present

some of the effect these allies have had on efforts to address LGBT issues at Chardin, with a

subsection emphasizing the influence of Jesuit priests and other allies in ministry.

Faculty. Faculty were cited by both staff and administrators as key allies because of their

academic freedom protections. Tom, a staff member, mentioned that partnering with faculty on some new initiative or venture was critical in terms of navigating the university power structure. Esther and Stephanie, both administrators, emphasized how faculty can protect controversial programs, as Stephanie described, "If you can put it under the banner of academic freedom, then that would maybe give you some more flexibility than if you were just coming purely from a student affairs side." William also noted that faculty initiatives often have a greater sense of legitimacy given how central faculty are to the university's educational mission.

Faculty participants also acknowledged their roles as influential allies on campus. Aubrey stated, "I can be a voice for some people who maybe don't feel as confident or as safe," such as broaching with an administrator the subject of why the LGBT center was not included on a particular committee. Matthew mentioned a situation where students were not allowed to show a documentary about a transgender person's employment and child custody difficulties because a Jesuit priest was not present, and "some of the professors…stepped forward, jumped in, and advocated for the students with the administration." However, Barbara lamented, "I think the LGBTQ community at this campus doesn't always recognize that there's a huge number of faculty members who are actively interested, not just in being allies, but in actively making things better." She mentioned she would always be willing to take up an issue if a student were to present her with a problem and ask her to intervene.

Administrators. A second set of influential allies on campus are administrators because of their positional authority. As mentioned earlier, most of the university leadership is Safe Space trained which is symbolically important in establishing an LGBT-inclusive climate. Jesse said, "If you want people to create a culture of inclusiveness and to be educated in a visible support network, you better be one yourself." Aubrey mentioned earlier that hosting events under

the protections of academic freedom was a powerful tool, but in the case of *The Vagina Monologues* what tipped the scale in terms of securing permission to perform the play on campus was the support of the Academic Vice President. Administrative allies can also advocate for issues that need to be raised higher in the university reporting structure. Liz mentioned, "If [the campus climate committee] brings some kind of advisement forward I think there is way more chance that it's going to be mentioned among other vice presidents, maybe even be extended into other units." Because of their influence, Margaret, a faculty member, added she ensures she maintains good working relationships with several administrators.

Engaging influential allies. In order to gain support and buy-in from influential allies for an LGBT-related effort, participants mentioned the need to spend time building relationships with these important stakeholders, as Jesse explained, "I will never intentionally do something I know is going to explode or be controversial. But we might have people that perceive this being [controversial, and so I respond,] 'But here is why it is not,' and educating the stakeholders on those dynamics." As an example, Ben mentioned, "We had a lot of pushback on doing a retreat, an LGBT retreat because I was requesting funds for something that's titled LGBT." In response, the retreat organizers consulted with a couple Jesuit administrators on campus, "and once we did that, we made the request again, in partnership with the campus ministry office. It went back up and got approved."

Finally, these allies can also serve as advocates for individuals facing adversity on campus. As mentioned in Chapter 4, one staff member faced a personal issue when one of her colleagues approached her Dean about her personal life, raising an issue over a post this staff member made on social media about her polyamorous relationship. Her Dean met with her to both make her aware that this colleague raised the issue and to offer support. Matthew and

231

Margaret both spoke about the ways administrators provided them protection to engage in LGBT-related work before being tenured. Margaret recalled her department chair telling her, "If you don't feel safe doing this, I will do it. And when you get tenure, I will hand you the spear." Given that level of support, Margaret took charge of the initiative herself.

Student government. Two students, Leah and Ari, named student government as an influential ally because they control the resources the LGBT student organization requires for hosting events on campus. Leah said, "I have been overwhelmed with how supportive student government has been in supporting things. They're paying for all of our fees to have our retreat." Leah felt this was because the club could demonstrate how their activities directly supported the university's mission. Kyle, a staff member, added that student government can be a critical ally because members of student government, especially the student body president, frequently meet with university administration.

"Put the Jesuit out front." Although in Chapter 4 I critiqued the requirement to partner with Jesuit priests as a legitimizing power dynamic, allying with Jesuit priests and campus ministry staff was also an effective tactic for study participants. William, an administrator, mentioned that, for the most part, the Jesuit priests on campus can be relied on as allies for efforts to support the LGBT community. He said, "I think I'd stake my claim that I could say, and I'm exaggerating—maybe I'm not exaggerating—to make my point: 99.9% of the time, they're on board. They're an ally and they get it." Grace, a faculty member, mentioned that Jesuit allies provide a legitimating presence for controversial programs like *The Vagina Monologues* because they offer a Catholic defense for these programs. Gina, an administrator, further explained, "[The Jesuits] really can talk and explain why that's important, and how that is Ignatian and does relate to the Jesuit, Catholic identity. By having them name it, that gives it

more power."

As such, several Jesuits on campus are willing to be called on when needed to serve as allies for LGBT programming. Cathy mentioned one Jesuit in particular who was willing to publicly defend the university's efforts to support LGBT students, describing, "He would go in front of the television—we would put the Jesuit out front. I thought it was a great strategy because it brought the Church."

"When Jesuits get bold." Students in particular were excited and inspired by moments when Jesuit priests demonstrated LGBT allyship because of their preconceptions about the Catholic Church before coming to Chardin. For instance, when Ari spoke about the church he attended with his family, he mentioned the priest was incredibly anti-LGBT in his homilies. In contrast, he said about the Jesuits at Chardin, "I've had, I think, the most support that—as an LGBT student, and interacting with the LGBT community I've ever gotten, has been from the Jesuits themselves." Taylor mentioned the LGBT-affirming Mass organized by campus ministry and the LGBT center each year to honor LGBT victims of hate crimes and suicide. She recalled the presiding Jesuit invoking, "We call on the larger Church community and the larger community for compassion for them, for their souls, and for ourselves to act in compassion." To her, "Those moments, those are awesome, especially when the Jesuits get bold."

Framing issues as congruent with university mission. One final prominent tactic grassroots leaders relied on was framing issues as congruent with the university mission in response to concerns that LGBT activities conflicted with that mission. However, participants noted that they did not necessarily need to "reframe" efforts as congruent with the mission; Matthew stated, "If people really embrace in every sense the Jesuit mission, it completely dovetails and aligns very nicely with LGBT students' needs, but not everybody really has that

vision." They noted that efforts to support the LGBT community were already congruent; this tactic was thus more about making those frames more evident and obvious.

One area where the mission fit was obvious to participants was the university's commitment to holistic education, or *cura personalis*, which Brandon, a staff member, felt led to Jesuit universities' student-centered educational approach. Claire added, "When we talk about the whole person, all these things that make up the mission, it didn't come with these little side notes that exclude anyone. I can't see any reason why the conversation should exclude anyone from the 'Chardin experience.'" For Naomi and Jesse, the work then is to make the mission alignment of LGBT efforts explicit. Jesse described this as, "I plagiarize with liberty. … I do not recap it, I do not summarize it, I reply, 'This is what you say, right here.'" Naomi expounded, "We're going to make you live out the mission that you profess to have. If there is pushback, we can examine it using Jesuit 'tools' like reflection."

Naomi and Aubrey pointed to the mission value of social justice as a second opening for supporting efforts around LGBT issues within the university mission statement. Naomi said, "My teaching and the activities that I choose to get involved with on campus are probably the best ways that I can effectuate change. But these efforts have to be performed incrementally, and they always have to be framed within the mission value of social justice." Aubrey further explained, "That's the way you make the argument about LGBT issues, the way you make an argument about women's issues, all of those issues on a Jesuit campus, is you use social justice and the mission statement." She jokingly recalled how previous administrations often grew frustrated over how easily faculty and staff could push back against their resistance by directly quoting the mission statement.

In addition to mission alignment, both Grace and Margaret pointed out the Jesuit,

Catholic affiliation of the university meant that students did not expect their education to be value-neutral. Monica also found, in contrast with the students she previously taught at a large, public, secular institution, who often took issue with her teaching feminist perspectives in the classroom:

> The students here do not expect a value-free education. They expect that they're going to see values in the classroom. They don't always expect that they're going to be feminist values, but it makes my work easier because I do not have to take that first step of convincing them that it's okay that there are values here in this classroom.

Administrators also offered perspective on this tactic of framing LGBT issues as congruent with the university mission. First, William agreed with several participants mentioned earlier; the Jesuit mission readily compels the university to engage in efforts to support its LGBT community. Deborah added that one of the reasons administrators recently revised the mission statement and earlier had crafted the guiding document that expresses the university's identity as Jesuit and Catholic was to provide more effective guiding documents for university governance. As a result, this "narrative structure," as she called it, provides the necessary framing to align LGBT efforts with the university's mission.

Sources of Resilience

Finally, participants shared their sources of resilience that help them maintain their commitment to advocacy on campus. These sources of resilience tended to strengthen participants' motivation for being involved in LGBT issues; for many, their sources of resilience were the same factors mentioned earlier that initially motivated them to become involved. In this section, I will first detail the sources that faculty and staff provided, then those of students, due to thematic differences identified between the two groups.

Faculty and Staff

Extrinsic. One important source of resilience for faculty and staff was their families. Although Kevin and Samantha, both faculty members, did mention parents and extended family, faculty and staff more frequently referred to children and partners. Hannah reflected, "I'm doing this for people like my daughter, who can walk across a college campus and be safer. So if in 10 years when she goes to college, it's safer, then I've succeeded." Claire, who already had two children and was expecting a third, added, "Knowing that someday [my children] may be walking onto a campus…whatever their orientation is, when they figure out who they are and how they want to be in the world, I want them to find it a welcoming place." Both Lee Ann and Samantha cited their partners, and Ben, a staff member, said, "But resilience is really with my partner, well, my husband. Today's our fifth month anniversary of our wedding. So that's really my resilience, the love that we have and the home that we've created and our family." Hannah actually received a text message of support from her husband during our interview and explained that she had been having a difficult week, and Joy also mentioned support from her husband as a source. Emily's response began with her pointing to a set of pictures she has on her wall of everyone she considers to be part of her family.

After family, faculty and staff mentioned friends and colleagues who they can turn to for support. Kevin has a few close friends in town he can rely on for encouragement, and Aubrey and Naomi referenced the important sense of validation they receive through their networks of friends. Joy in particular talked about the importance of spending time with queer friends, explaining, "[They] have had to consider questions more deeply than other people have had to and I think that really gives us something that, it's like it builds resonating chambers or something, I don't know." Tom, a staff member, and Matthew, a faculty member, cited their

broader professional networks as a source of resilience. In addition to off-campus friendships, Ben mentioned that he often de-stresses with his team, and Zachary frequently attends theater events with his colleagues from campus. Lilian and Grace described their departmental colleagues as essential because, as Grace stated, "It was just really so reassuring that I'm not out here by myself, but there are these other people doing this kind of work, so colleagues and the companionship."

Staff members mentioned being reenergized by students through witnessing their accomplishments. Sebastian told a very poignant story about one such student:

> For example, the openly gay student who was in the law school a couple of years ago, who was from another metropolitan city and who was feeling very disillusioned, in despair and possibly depressed because of personal problems, but also as a Mormon student who couldn't be out as openly in his religious community and was navigating all of these aspects of his identity. But then seeing that student in May graduating, getting his diploma, and then moving to another city where he is going to be an agent of change.

He concluded, "So I think that is for me the source of inspiration. That is for me what sustains me, and nurtures me."

One last extrinsic source of resilience for faculty and staff was their involvement in community groups and organizations. Joy, who specifically sought out ways to be involved in the community that she found fun and creative, said, "I'm involved in different singing and other kind of performance things—that's probably the main thing." Aubrey has been involved on the board of the local LGBT youth center, and stated, "I was actually able to fill two tables [at their annual fundraiser] almost entirely with people from Chardin." Being involved in the community provided her, as she explained, "Finding other people who are committed to the same things that

237

you are committed to."

Several faculty members spoke about their involvement in faith communities as critical to maintaining their sense of resilience in their work. Grace mentioned that her faith has been sustaining for her, and she has participated in Catholic faith programs where she finds, as she described, "there's always these sort of dissenters." Kevin, who identifies as Roman Catholic, became involved in an Episcopal church in Sunny Falls because it was difficult for him to find an LGBT-affirming Catholic parish. Lilian belongs to an Ecumenical Catholic Communion community, a Church that tends to be more progressive on social issues than the Roman Catholic Church but holds similar beliefs and practices. She and her partner were married in their community, and she said, "It gives me hope because I see, there's no reason you can't be religious, and even I would want to say, Catholic, and gay." Joy belongs to a Unity Church that teaches, as she explained, "It's 'new thought,' and the idea behind new thought is I can choose to have a new thought about this." Joy has found this operating principle to be incredibly useful in her life.

Intrinsic. Whereas the aforementioned sources were external to faculty and staff, participants also named several intrinsic sources of resilience that have helped them remain resilient in their efforts. The most significant of these was finding a sense of balance. Hannah mentioned she found balance by establishing strict boundaries between her work and home lives: "I don't take the work home."Another important way participants found balance was through outdoor activities and travel. Tom finds a sense of renewal in taking the opportunity to get out of town every once in a while, and Ben specifically identified Puerto Vallarta as a place he and his husband go to relax and decompress. Barbara pointed to a picture of her dog on her phone and said, "I'm not being rude, that's how I recommit, my puppy, on a personal level, sure. Go hiking

238

with the dog. Get into the woods. That's how I recommit. Go someplace with a warm ocean. Do some snorkeling." Liz very directly stated, "How else do I recharge? I go away from here, very far away from here, and I don't take my cell phone with me."

In addition to balance between their personal and private lives, two faculty members mentioned the need for balance within their professional roles. Barbara mentioned her committee work, though rewarding, was also exhausting, and had to step down from one committee to refocus on other professional responsibilities. Lola added, "I had to decide a long time ago, I'm not doing anything for the environment." However, she qualified:

I actually physically hug trees; I just said I spend a lot of time in nature. I am all for sensible energy policy and I recycle maniacally: I scrub out the peanut butter. But I am saying in my work, at a certain point, I had to be, "You know what? I have to give that issue to somebody else because there are just not enough hours in the day."

Balance also offered participants some resilience by providing them emotional and psychological distance from issues. Matthew, who identifies as heterosexual, found, "I don't get worn down as much which is part of the reason that I chose to fight this battle [LGBT issues]. I get worn down all the time on race-related issues because that's actually stuff that's personally affecting me."

Self-care, especially in terms of physical health, was important for maintaining balance. Both Tammy and Brandon spoke about their need to rest and relax outside work hours, and Hannah mentioned on Saturdays she and her family "just chill out and watch football." Monica identified herself as an introvert and found rest was critical for her to recharge after spending great amounts of energy teaching:

I was watching a lecture by bell hooks a couple of weeks ago in which she described her

process of recharging, and it resonated so deeply with me. She said that she lives the "slug life." Not the "thug life," the "slug life," and that, she said, "I take lots of naps." I'm a pretty introverted person, and my teaching requires me to be very extroverted, and I need that time to just recharge. And so I'm really rigid about, I try to really rigid about when I'm working and when I'm not working, and to not let those things bleed together.

William and Kevin spoke about the importance of care for their physical health to maintaining their sense of resilience. William mentioned, "I run. I live down by the river, so I like to be by the earth. I go by the earth, and I go for runs and walks, and bicycling, and kayaking, and just being outside, being outdoors." He also humorously added that he enjoys a fine glass of single-malt scotch, but that physical exercise was far more important for his resilience.

Faith was another source of resilience that offered participants a sense of balance. Kyle found Jesuit spirituality revitalized him because of how it connected faith to service. Lee Ann specifically mentioned prayer and meditation as sources of resilience for her, and Samantha added, "My faith system is very renewing in that I am always thinking about it, and whether I am meditating on it specifically, or reading for guidance and inspiration from Buddhist teachings, I think all of that really fits very well with how I see the world." Grace finds moments throughout the day to pray, such as when riding the bus. William described small rituals he participates in during the day that help center him, like, "If I'm coming to work in the morning…and I go past the statue of St. Ignatius here, I bless myself and I say the prayer inscribed." Margaret found her faith provides her with perspective that rebuilds her sense of resilience and commitment to her efforts. She explained, "Look, I'm not a hopeful person by disposition. For me being hopeful is a sheer act of will. But that too, right, knowing that I have a choice about where I spend my time

and my efforts, and knowing that even if I don't realize it in my lifetime, any progress still counts as progress."

Other participants appealed to their personal core values. Anthony, a tenured faculty member, said, "My wife and my friends say, my source of resilience is I don't really care what people think of what I'm saying." He finds he has no fear speaking up on issues when he deems necessary. Margaret added, "If Chardin was the kind of place that would not give me tenure because of [my involvement in LGBT issues], it was not the kind of place I wanted tenure at." Margaret's sense of integrity mattered more to her than her job. William, an administrator, bluntly appealed to his own optimism: "I've been doing this a long time. I've seen a lot of shit. My resilience is around believing that shit is compost, and that compost is fertilizer, and that fertilizer, and that fertilizer will help things grow." Esther, another administrator, engaged in personal reflection to draw out the lessons learned from overcoming professional struggles, saying, "I think I'm a much more skillful administrator, I guess you could say, for that experience than I otherwise would have been if I didn't have the experience."

Finally, one last source of resilience for employees at Chardin is when they observe their efforts have made a difference. Ariel stated, "My resiliency comes from my hearing [students'] experiences, negative, and also positive, and being able to say, alright, this is how I'm able to affect that positive change." Paul, a faculty member, felt, "I would say that I find energy [being involved in LGBT issues] simply because it's the civil rights issue of the day, and it makes me feel somewhat courageous." He finds personally modeling LGBT acceptance and affirmation on campus to be energizing. Olivia felt a small sense of pride when her graduate student commented to her about the change in the LGBT climate he observed in comparison to when he was an undergraduate, and Samantha said, "Having those [LGBT] kids come to me who tell me I make a

difference, obviously really does help, and I'm very grateful to them."

However, Barbara indicated that work on LGBT issues still needs to continue on campus. She said, "How do I recommit to the larger ethical issues that I see going on on this campus? That one I haven't figured out the answer to because I don't feel as if the ethical imperative has gone away."

Students

Extrinsic. For students, their primary extrinsic source of resilience is their relationships with family and peers. Marion named her godmother and sister as both her motivation and sources of resilience, saying, "I think that if I fell off the wagon, if I stopped going to [the gay-straight alliance], if I stopped advocating, if I stopped talking about these things, I would let them down so much." Taylor and Kristopher, who both identify as sexual minorities, cited the support of family members as critical to helping them maintain a sense of resilience and commitment to their advocacy. Finally, similar to several staff and faculty, Taylor and Alice both cited their girlfriends as a personal source of resilience for them. Alice provided an example when she needed to decompress after a particularly stressful day at work. She recalled:

> I used to work in retail at the mall, and there is just a lot of really crazy people there, and I had to deal with lot of homophobia at work. And so I would come home, and we decompress and I would be like, "This is what happened at work today." And she would be like, "Well, have you thought about talking to them? Have you thought about doing this?" And same goes for her. If she has had a really crappy day and she is like, "I was out grocery shopping and I mentioned you and someone started being weird about it." We can decompress, we can be like, "Well, you know what? That is one person; we can do this."

Alice felt that she may have otherwise had a more difficult time being out without having someone like her girlfriend to provide support.

Although family provided important support, students most frequently named their friends as a source of resilience, as Rob, Mackenzie, Ari, and Kristopher did. In addition to friends more generally, Mackenzie mentioned her rugby team: "I fricking love those girls. There's automatically 30 other girls that are gonna support me through it, that have been open, that have been accepting, that stinking love my girlfriend. That means a lot to me." Kristopher also has a very specific niche of friends who he can rely on for validation because they all identify as gay and Catholic:

> If you were to ask me to rank the two most important parts of who I am in terms of a conscious thought process about my identity, I would say my faith as a Catholic and my identity as a gay person. Having other people who understand that specific intersection of identities is so important.

Kristopher finds that other friends don't understand him in the same way as his gay Catholic friends. He often finds his LGBT friends perceive him as too Catholic, but identifying as gay means he is not Catholic enough for many of his Catholic friends.

One of the most important places LGBT students find a source of resilience is through the relationships they build with their peers and friends who belong to the campus LGBT student organization. As mentioned earlier, students who attend Chardin speak about how much the campus culture is built on relationships, and one important area where LGBT students form relationships with their peers and find a sense of community is through the LGBT student organization. Mackenzie explained, "It's nice to be able to go and talk with people who have similar struggles, who have similar characteristics." For Madeline, spending time with her

friends in the club allows her a sense of respite from the environment she otherwise encounters on campus. She described, "It's just a very supporting community where you know that you can go and just be like, 'Okay, I don't have to be anything besides myself right now.'"

Taylor was exceptionally passionate about the LGBT student organization. She said, "I live for Wednesday nights," referring to the night of the week the club met. She described her experience:

> I walked in with one other friend, and I've walked out with a partner. And the entire group of us that started going freshman year still go, and are still friends and live in the same two houses, three houses down from each other and are still together and still a group of people, so that's awesome. That to me is awesome.

Intrinsic. One important intrinsic source of resilience for students was their faith. For instance, Ari declared, defiantly, "Well, for me, as being the staunch Catholic that I am, regardless of whatever the Church may say about me, I think a big thing for me to recharge is to either go to Mass or just spend some time alone in quiet prayer." Taylor added that her faith provided her with core values that compel her to engage in LGBT work, describing, "The call of my faith is to work on behalf of the marginalized, and to work to end those marginalizations and to end all of that, and to fight it tooth and nail, and amongst a school that maybe at times creates barriers on purpose." Kristopher revealed:

> My faith is a huge aspect of how I find my resilience. I pray every morning before I leave my house, before I leave my room. That's really important to me. I pray every night before I go to bed. I try to read my Bible on a fairly regular basis. I'm not as good about that as I used to be. My faith is a huge area that I find resilience.

A second intrinsic source of resilience for students was making a difference, especially

since the difference they were making was in the lives of their peers and friends. Ashley mentioned, "I'm constantly reminded, 'Oh this needs to get done, and this needs to get done and this needs to get done.' That's motivating for me, seeing situations where there isn't justice being had…particularly with LGBT issues." Alice described, "Where I find resilience is the support of everyone else, is coming back into this group and realizing like these are people I would fight for. This is worth it, because I get to be with these people and these people feel free to be who they are as well." Taylor added, "There have been kids, students who have come up to [my girlfriend] and I either separately or together and gone, 'You guys give me hope as a couple; you give me hope that I can find love, that I can be happy, and then I can be out, be accepted.' That's empowering."

However, Aven, a heterosexual student of color, provided one of the most profound reflections on being able to find respite from the struggle against anti-LGBT oppression. In response to my question about sources of resilience, he responded:

I don't know…when you're a minority, you can't really step back from it because it's something you wake up, you live with, you are constantly—especially, you're constantly faced with the fact you're not part of the majority. In a sense it's inescapable.

In spite of this, he added, "I guess if I go home, since it's full of so much diversity, I just feel like normal." Although he felt people who identify as minorities may never truly find respite from the climate around them, what is most important is that people have a space or a niche where they can find belonging and validation.

Summary

Chapter 4 discussed findings related to the campus environment, including the campus climate and power dynamics faced by grassroots leaders, and this chapter explored participants'

motivations, tactics, and sources of resilience. The campus climate appears to have improved, and to be continuing to improve, and was described as far more welcoming for the LGBT community than at any previous point in the university's history. This is due in part to the changing sociohistorical events as well as concerted efforts within the institution to work towards change. Although participants described several power dynamics they have faced on campus, as society becomes more accepting and the campus climate shifts, many of the dynamics of oppression are diminishing or changing and requiring new tactics. Students, faculty, and staff are invested in the Jesuit, Catholic mission of Chardin University, evident both in their motivations and the type of tactics chosen to address LGBT issues on campus, yet maintain various strategies for remaining resilient and committed to their advocacy. For many, the Jesuit, Catholic mission and vision are one source that sustains their resilience and commitment to advocacy work. Although participants recognized the climate has room to improve, students, faculty, and staff are energized by the progress that has been achieved to this point.

To me, what stands out the most is how salient the university's Catholic, Jesuit identity is for participants in their work. Many are deeply religious, and their reasons for being involved in LGBT issues stem from their religious identities. In addition, the university's religious affiliation enables faculty and staff to engage LGBT issues in ways that could not be employed on secular campuses, particularly framing issues within a set of institutional values. Given the current literature on LGBT issues in Catholic higher education, one may have expected the university's religious affiliation to be the highest barrier for participants to surmount in their efforts to support the LGBT community. Instead, at Chardin University, the religious tradition enlivens grassroots resistance on LGBT issues in myriad and surprising ways. This resistance unfortunately remains somewhat veiled to those external to the organization because Chardin

offers one model for bridging the tension within the Catholic Church over LGBT issues, parallel to how Pierre Teilhard de Chardin once worked to bridge Church teachings with new insights into human evolution.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) communities on college campuses has improved significantly in recent years (Marine, 2011), though homophobia and heterosexism persist within higher education (Rankin et al., 2010; Renn, 2010). Further, LGBT students, faculty, and staff continue to be alienated at religiously affiliated colleges and universities due to policies and practices that systematically penalize people for expressing their sexual identities (Wolff, Himes, Kwon, & Bollinger, 2012). The intent of these policies is to promote behaviors in alignment with the moral teachings of the institution's religious denomination, such as forbidding sexual activity between two people of the same sex, but these policies are often interpreted as excluding the expression of sexual minority identities altogether and thereby excluding the possibility of providing programmatic support (Wolff & Himes, 2010). Catholic colleges and universities operate under similar constraints, but university employees and students are typically not required to adhere to Church teachings, and Church teachings implore Catholics to end unjust discrimination against the LGBT community (Catholic Church, 1994). Therefore, Catholic institutions respond differently to LGBT issues on campus (Maher, 2003). Jesuit colleges and universities in particular have a mission commitment to social justice as well as an openness to engaging the tensions that arise between Church teachings and society (Currie, S.J., 2011; McKevitt, S.J., 1991), and thus Jesuit universities have tended to be more LGBT-affirming in their work. However, little empirical evidence has been collected to document how Jesuit colleges and universities address LGBT issues within a Catholic context. The purpose of this study then was to explore how a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues.

Positionality

As discussed in Chapter 3, in qualitative research the researcher becomes the primary tool through which analysis occurs (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002), and thus I reflected on my positionality in relation to the participants in this study. Now that the study has concluded, I would like to return to my reflection on positionality to comment on observations I made during data collection and analysis. As mentioned, I indicated that I identify as openly gay and Roman Catholic, and I approached this study as an informed outsider given my background having attended two Catholic universities. I had also been involved in LGBT organizing when I was an undergraduate, so I felt a distinct sense of rapport with the students I interviewed given our common experiences. My background in Catholic higher education and familiarity with the Roman Catholic Church helped me establish a sense of trust with faculty, staff, and administrator participants as they appreciated my understanding of the complexities of engaging in LGBT work on a Catholic campus. In addition, I could draw from my experience as a student affairs practitioner in LGBT affairs at a Catholic university when interviewing faculty and staff about their grassroots tactics. Finally, I had initially intended to visit the campus as an observer, but after being asked to speak on campus in various settings, my observations became participant-observations. For example, I attended two meetings of the undergraduate LGBT student organization, after inquiring with the club's leaders for permission to attend, and I was asked to spend much of the meeting talking about my research and my past experiences in Catholic higher education. Not only did this presentation help foster trust with students, which encouraged them to participate in interviews, but it also gave me an entry point for taking part in the meetings and obtain richer data than I may otherwise have collected as a passive observer.

Summary of Findings

This study made several contributions to the literature on LGBT organizing within Catholic higher education as well as the other streams of literature I reviewed in Chapter 2. This section summarizes the key findings pertaining to each of the original research questions with discussion on how they relate to prior research to highlight several of these contributions.

Research Question 1

How do students, faculty, and staff determine the need for organizational change in terms of creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for LGBT individuals at a Jesuit, Catholic university?

In order to contextualize the tactics employed to address LGBT issues, I first needed to establish what some of those issues were. This first question was developed to assess the campus climate and major issues facing the LGBT community at Chardin University. Identifying the state of the climate and major issues on campus help establish specific areas of the campus environment participants feel need to change for Chardin to be more welcoming and inclusive for LGBT students, faculty, and staff. Participants spoke about the campus climate for the LGBT community at Chardin University as generally welcoming. One reason faculty and staff offered for this perception was that, as the student body changed over the years, student attitudes toward the LGBT community gradually shifted in tandem with broader shifts in social acceptance of the LGBT community, even though one faculty participant felt attitudes at Chardin tended to lag behind social attitudes to an extent. Maher, Sever, and Pichler (2008) had observed a similar trend when comparing their study of student attitudes at Loyola University Chicago to an earlier study Maher had conducted in 1995 at an unnamed Midwestern Catholic university (Maher, 2004). Students in the 2008 study were less likely to agree that homosexuality was immoral than

students in the 1995 study, and my findings appear to extend this trend, at least in terms of how welcome LGBT students feel at Chardin University. One significant contribution of my study was I collected these data after 2012, a milestone year for LGBT rights in the United States. In 2012, pro-marriage equality ballot initiatives were passed for the first time by voters in three states (Brumfield, 2012), and public support for marriage equality reached majority support in the United States (McCarthy, 2014). In addition, I also performed this study after the election of Pope Francis, another event that was cited by participants as contributing to the positive climate on campus. Although the Pope has not indicated any intentions to reform Church teachings on homosexuality, participants felt his comments on gay priests and LGBT Catholics have had a symbolic effect on the culture within the Catholic Church.

In spite of a generally welcoming climate, participants also pointed to areas where issues for the LGBT community persisted and the environment still needed to be improved. One of the most pressing issues that students faced was the perpetuation of anti-LGBT microaggressions on campus, especially through their peers' use of language in generally careless ways. For instance, several participants recalled their peers telling homophobic jokes, and others mentioned frequently hearing the phrase, "That's so gay," on campus. This particular microaggression has also been associated with negative physical health outcomes for LGBT students, such as increased headaches and poor appetite, as well as perceptions of a hostile climate (Woodford, Howell, et al., 2012). As a result, one of the most common tactics employed, particularly among students, was directly confronting their offending peers. Similar to what Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker, and Robinson-Keilig (2004) found in their study of one institution's campus climate, student affairs staff members frequently mentioned confronting students over their verbal microaggressions, as did at least one faculty member. Additionally, faculty and staff

unpreparedness to respond to anti-LGBT microaggressions was another important issue raised by participants, an issue that a couple faculty participants mentioned was being addressed through a faculty development program offered through the campus teaching and learning center. Further, one heterosexual student who confronted his peers over homophobic jokes wondered still whether his peers actually changed their behavior, or if they instead began monitoring their behavior around him.

However, as Rankin et al. (2010) argued, college students continue to face harassment and other overt aggression on campus. Indeed, students at Chardin also reported a few instances of overt aggression they faced from their peers. Overt aggression was far less prevalent than microaggressions on campus, but one student in particular reported how a classmate of hers had created such a hostile environment in one of her classes that she brought the issue to her professor and filed a complaint through the campus bias reporting system. Fortunately, she was able to find resolution of this particular issue through these channels, unlike the broader dissatisfaction LGBT students express about campus policies and procedures for addressing bias (Rankin et al., 2010).

In addition to specific issues that persisted within the campus environment, the climate was described as varying across the campus by department or physical space. Faculty and staff mentioned their LGBT colleagues in other departments and offices likely have different experiences based on the attitudes of their coworkers employed within those particular offices, and students spoke about differences they encountered within the multiple spaces they inhabit on campus, such as differences between the classroom and the residence halls. These findings support assertions by Sears (2002) and Vaccaro (2012) that conceptualize the overall climate for faculty and staff to consist of "microclimates" within their particular offices or departments, and

that departmental climate is most salient to faculty and staff. However, unlike Vaccaro, who argued that undergraduates form their perception of the campus climate as emanating from the whole campus, students in this study recognized the ways the climate varied across different spaces on campus. Much of this difference might stem from Vaccaro's finding that students encountered anti-LGBT hostility in every space on campus, whereas students here could identify spaces where they either were buffered from anti-LGBT hostility or, if hostility were expressed, the offender would be confronted by a peer or university employee. These microclimates appeared to permeate students' curricular and co-curricular spheres of interactions (Hurtado et al., 2012), such as residence halls or classrooms. The visible presence of Safe Space placards also influenced how students perceived the climate within various departments and offices on campus, especially since the training program itself had been identified as an important tactic for improving the climate.

Finally, heterosexual participants were also attuned to some of the hostility in the climate towards their LGBT peers and colleagues. One student spoke about a heterosexual friend who was targeted with rumors of being a lesbian, one faculty participant mentioned concern over being targeted for posting her Safe Space placard on her office door, and one student even reported being targeted on campus with a homophobic slur. Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, and Magley (2008) also argued that identifying as heterosexual does not necessarily shield students from the deleterious academic and psychological well-being outcomes affected by a homophobic campus climate. No one described what I would consider to be bystander stress, which was offered as one explanation by Silverschanz et al. for this effect, but my findings did demonstrate heterosexuals recognized a heightened risk of being targeted by anti-LGBT bias for simply supporting LGBT rights or appearing to be a member of the LGBT community. Further, this

study builds on Silverschanz et al.'s work by demonstrating that in spite of these potential

negative effects on their well-being, heterosexual participants continued to resist and act as allies

to the campus LGBT community, demonstrating the importance of cultivating resilience.

Research Question 2

What are the strategies and tactics employed by these campus constituents to precipitate

organizational change?

In response to issues raised by participants in relation to the campus climate, many tactics

emerged that describe the ways faculty, staff, and students are involved in addressing LGBT

issues on campus. Most of these tactics aligned with those delineated by Kezar and Lester

(2011), including promoting intellectual discourse, leveraging the curriculum, mentoring

students, using research to build a case, developing and cultivating networks, working with

influential allies, and reframing issues. However, several of these tactics were either employed in

a manner tailored to the religiously affiliated setting of the campus, like partnering with Jesuit

priests and framing LGBT issues as congruent with the university mission, or corresponded with

some of the more tempered activities described by Meyerson (2003, 2008), such as making a

difference through one-on-one interactions, demonstrating allyship, living authentically, and

storytelling.

One of the most common tactics that participants engaged was self-expression,

specifically storytelling and allyship, making a difference through everyday, one-on-one

interactions similarly to Meyerson's (2003, 2008) tactic of "resisting quietly and staying true to

one's 'self.'" Storytelling involved identity deployment, which Creed and Scully (2000) had

identified as ways LGBT people disclose their sexual identities through different types of

encounters to raise awareness of, educate on, and advocate for LGBT issues. Storytelling was

254

also used to retain institutional memory by longer-serving faculty and staff sharing stories about past LGBT incidents with students and newer colleagues. Primarily students, though a few staff and faculty as well, cited making a difference through their daily, one-to-one interactions, which one participant termed "the daily witness." For students, this tactic was often exercised as direct confrontations with peers who make offensive remarks, and for staff and faculty, many defined this tactic as demonstrating trustworthiness to LGBT students and colleagues. For heterosexual participants, their "daily witness" was allyship, engaging in very similar behaviors as those proscribed by Broido (2000) as ways heterosexuals can act as allies to the LGBT community. Heterosexuals also noted their limitations in their ability to be allies due to their recognition of heterosexual privilege; this awareness had also been observed by Montgomery and Stewart (2012) as a predictor for engagement in LGBT advocacy among heterosexuals. For LGBT participants, "the daily witness" meant challenging others' assumptions and being willing to educate peers, similar to educative and advocacy encounters, two forms of identity deployment (Creed & Scully, 2000). These tactics of self-expression were not included in the literature on LGBT activism and grassroots leadership on campus because they were not organized efforts and they were not aimed at a specific movement goal (e.g., Kezar & Lester, 2011; Renn, 2007; Rhoads, 1998; Taylor & Raeburn, 1995), but they do resemble one-on-one strategies used within the broader LGBT rights movement to reduce anti-LGBT stigma and advance support for LGBT causes like marriage equality or nondiscrimination laws (Bernstein, 1997, 2002).

Many of the tactics that participants reported were similar to the grassroots leadership tactics outlined by Kezar and Lester (2011), though I found a few areas of divergence. Grassroots leadership tactics were also nearly completely utilized by faculty and staff; the only students who mentioned engaging in any type of grassroots leadership tactic were student leaders

because they most directly worked with faculty and staff, and then the most common tactic they employed was mentoring their peers toward becoming the next student leaders. Faculty and staff cited opportunities for intellectual discourse, professional development, leveraging the curriculum, mentoring students, and research. Of these, the most widely covered area in the literature is on teaching LGBT topics in the classroom. Faculty at Chardin University incorporated LGBT topics through developing LGBT courses, teaching LGBT texts, or using LGBT examples when explaining broader concepts. Notably, where Fletcher and Russell (2001) and Kuvalanka, Goldberg, and Oswald (2013) identified challenges faculty faced in introducing LGBT materials to students, primarily around students' comfort and knowledge levels on LGBT topics, faculty at Chardin said they approach the topic as though students have the requisite knowledge and assume students who struggle with accepting LGBT issues will engage in that work outside the classroom. Inclusion of LGBT topics in the curriculum likely places Chardin at the vanguard of Catholic higher education, given the visible and permanent nature of institutionalizing LGBT courses within the official curriculum.

The classroom is the sphere of interaction where faculty have the most influence over the climate. Between teaching LGBT topics, modeling LGBT inclusion, and attention to the classroom environment, faculty directly affected the microclimate for students within their classrooms. Also, similar to Martin (1996) and Liddle, Kunkel, Kick, and Hauenstein (1998), LGBT faculty at Chardin felt disclosing their sexual identities in their classrooms was important for mentoring LGBT students. Teaching LGBT topics can indirectly affect the broader campus climate by raising students' awareness to LGBT concerns, but students noted the direct effect on their own comfort by having an LGBT professor in the classroom or taking a class that openly discussed LGBT issues.

Besides the curriculum, opportunities for professional development were also important because the university offers a very visible, popular Safe Space program. I found the Safe Space program to be the most effective tactic on campus for influencing the climate due to the myriad ways participants described the program's impact. Faculty felt the Safe Space program contributed in important ways to an improved campus climate as well as improved practice in the classroom handling difficult moments, and students were especially encouraged by the proliferation of Safe Space placards around the campus, though noting inconsistencies between departments in terms of faculty and staff participation in the program. One participant also pointed out the symbolic significance of having all of the university leadership Safe Space trained. The success of the campus Safe Space program mirrored the success of Rainbow Educators Program at the University of San Diego (Getz & Kirkley, 2003, 2006; Kirkley & Getz, 2007), following a similar strategy of tying the program to the university's educational mission. This study adds support to Getz & Kirkley's work on the Rainbow Educators Program and Yoakam's (2006) overview of LGBT resources at St. John's University/College of St. Benedict to compel Catholic colleges and universities to ensure Safe Space or Safe Zone type programming is available to build a network of allies on campus. In addition to professional development, a staff member and an administrator posited that the university could employ opportunities for intellectual discourse as a way to push forward Catholic thinking on LGBT issues. They cited the strong educational tradition and theological resources enjoyed by Jesuit universities that could be leveraged to host programs on new ways of welcoming LGBT communities in the Church.

Participants also spoke about tactics that Kezar and Lester (2011) had classified as strategies for navigating institutional power dynamics. These tactics included developing

networks, engaging influential allies, and reframing issues. The Safe Space program helped make the network of LGBT support on campus more visible and diffuse responsibility for responding to LGBT issues beyond solely the purview of the LGBT center, and the LGBT student organization served as a critical network of peer support for students. Although participants provided many different examples of engaging influential allies and reframing issues, these two tactics were utilized in a manner that was crafted to align with the university's religiously affiliated context. In terms of influential allies, participants named Jesuit priests and campus ministry staff as allies who could speak to the Church's position on LGBT issues and were also willing to publicly support the campus LGBT community; as one administrator put it, "We would put the Jesuit out front." Love (1997, 1998) had also found the campus ministry office at his study site to be an important support resource for students, but I found that Jesuit priests at Chardin were further willing to publicly defend the university's efforts toward LGBT inclusion. This finding may be unique to Jesuit higher education as other orders of priests may be less willing to take such a public stance on a controversial issue, but the Jesuits' willingness to serve as influential allies was important. Influential allies were also important for participants facing power dynamics due to their relative status on campus; the best example is the staff member whose dean offered critical support when another colleague raised an issue with her social media postings. This finding further supports McDonough's (2002) assertion that deans serve as an ally to and advocate for their LGBT department members.

Framing LGBT issues as congruent with the mission of a Catholic university is one of the most critical tactics identified in the literature (Kirkley & Getz, 2007; Perlis & Shapiro, 2001; Yoakam, 2006), but participants at Chardin University spoke about issue framing in a very different manner than described in these studies. Framing was perceived as imperative—several

participants indicated that if an LGBT initiative could not be justified within the context of the university mission, that initiative would find little support from university administration because it would be indefensible against external criticism, such as from benefactors or the local Bishop. However, instead of engaging in an exercise to actively construct a frame for a given LGBT initiative that aligned with the university mission, participants stated that these initiatives already flowed from the mission—sometimes that mission alignment needed only to be made more explicit. This finding could be a factor of the current climate at Chardin, as several participants indicated greater difficulties facing LGBT organizing in the past, but participants cited commitments to a holistic education and social justice as well as the Jesuit practice of engaging with culture as reasons why mission alignment for LGBT programs was already present. Even still, as in the case of the speaker to whose presentation the Bishop objected, providing mission-oriented framing for a LBGT program may still not counter all of the resistance to a specific program.

Research Question 3

How do their multiple social identities, like sexual orientation or Catholic affiliation, influence their perceptions of the need for change as well as the institution's role in addressing these issues?

In terms of the perceived need for change, participants' perceptions of the climate differed somewhat on the basis of sexual orientation. LGBT students spoke the most in depth about the climate they faced, especially in terms of the microaggressions and overt aggressions they experienced on campus. First, several LGBT participants had some trepidation in even coming to the university, especially those who were unfamiliar with the university's religious affiliation. Second, LGBT students felt the climate to be generally welcoming, but they identified

areas where the climate could be improved, and the experience of the climate was not uniform across campus or by individual participant. Third, LGBT faculty had noted how much the climate had shifted on campus in recent years, but LGBT faculty were also attuned to the ways the climate within departments could vary widely. This suggests that LGBT faculty also employ different tactics and strategies because of the variable departmental climate, which can be explored further in the future. Heterosexuals, in contrast, were more likely to comment on the broader campus climate yet were attuned to several of the concerns of their LGBT colleagues and peers. Further, several heterosexual participants were sensitive to the fact they possess heterosexual privilege and thus do not have first-hand experience of what it is like to be LGBT at Chardin. These differences by sexual orientation group were congruent with Brown et al.'s (2004) findings that LGBT students were more aware of issues than the general student body, and these findings help extend this work by offering qualitative insight into what these experiences are like in comparison to Brown et al.'s survey approach. In addition, very few studies have examined heterosexuals' perceptions of the climate for the LGBT community; this study makes a contribution to the LGBT campus climate literature by offering insight into the perceptions of heterosexuals involved in LGBT issues on this particular campus. As the vast majority of campus community members likely identify as heterosexual (Gates, 2011), campus LGBT communities rely on the allyship of heterosexuals to raise awareness about LGBT issues and help bring about campus change (Broido, 2000).

A second experience that differed by sexual orientation was motivation for being involved in LGBT issues. LGBQ participants were unsurprisingly involved in LGBT issues because of their personal identification with these issues, whereas heterosexual participants tended to be involved in LGBT issues due to knowing a friend or family member who identified

as LGBT. For LGBQ students, participation in the LGBT student organization strengthened their involvement in addressing LGBT issues, similar to Swank and Fahs' (2012) finding that gay and lesbian students are more likely to be involved in LGBT political advocacy when they have stronger networks of activist peers and greater numbers of feminist friends. In fact, the LGBT student organization has very strong ties to the women's studies program at Chardin; for instance, the student group meets at the women's studies program offices. For heterosexual students, important precursors of these students participating in LGBT student organizations include knowing sexual minorities and having prior awareness of LGBT discrimination (Goldstein & Davis, 2010), and heterosexual students are more likely to support pro-LGBT campus petitions when they have a stronger sense of an activist identity and ascribe to liberal political views (Swank et al., 2013; Wilkinson & Sagarin, 2010), similar to what I found in this study.

Further, this study contributes to our understanding of motivation for participation in LGBT issues on campus in several ways. In terms of LGBT student participation in campus LGBT issues, this study elaborates on the reasons students become involved, especially on a religiously affiliated campus, by uncovering Church-related reasons for involvement such as a desire to influence faith communities to become more LGBT-affirming. In terms of heterosexual participation, this study offers qualitative insight into the ways heterosexuals become aware of anti-LGBT discrimination prior to involvement in LGBT issues, and explores the ways heterosexuals' experiences with other forms of oppression, like racism, cultivate allyship with the LGBT community, leading to coalition-building.

On the basis of religious affiliation, although Catholic participants named specific Catholic-related reasons for choosing to attend or work at Chardin as well as sources of

resilience, more significant differences were observed between participants who identified as religious and participants who were not very religious, if at all. First, both Catholic and non-Catholic participants who were highly religious were drawn to Chardin because the university incorporated faith and spirituality into the educational experience. On the other hand, less religious participants expressed some trepidation about the religious affiliation of the university prior to coming to Chardin. Second, religious participants also indicated their personal faith and/or their faith communities were sources of resilience that helped them remain committed to LGBT issues and social justice in general. Third, several religious participants indicated their faith systems motivated them to be involved in LGBT issues because of personal values grounded within their religious belief systems like a commitment to social justice and the imperative to address the needs of marginalized groups. Finally, several religious participants were either concerned with integrating sexual and religious identities, or the broader issue of LGBT acceptance within communities of faith. In this sense, one major contribution this study makes to the literature is that faculty, staff, and students can be drawn to Catholic universities and involved in LGBT issues for deeply religious reasons, and that people involved in LGBT issues at Catholic universities are also strongly committed to their universities' Catholic identities and missions. In addition, where Yarhouse, Stratton, Dean, and Brooke (2009) determined among students at evangelical Christian institutions that students' sexual identities were affected by their religious identities, this study extends those findings to a Jesuit, Catholic university to posit that students in these settings are not only affected by their religious upbringings but attend Catholic universities to find ways to integrate these two aspects of self.

Religious diversity on campus also had an effect on the campus climate. Law students pointed to a high proportion of Mormon students in the law school as a source of some

262

intergroup conflict with LGBT students, and undergraduates indicated their peers who grew up in more conservative religious environments were more likely to hold anti-LGBT beliefs and viewpoints. Although Maher et al. (2008) determined among undergraduates at Loyola University Chicago that students from Catholic high schools held more positive views of the LGBT community, Finlay and Walther (2003) found a very strong correlation between religiosity, as measured by frequency of attendance at religious services, and homophobic views for Catholic students at a large, public, culturally conservative university. Yarhouse et al. (2009) had also found students at three evangelical Christian colleges who identified as more religious tended to hold more homophobic views than their peers. This study helps complicate these statistical relationships by offering examples of very religious people who are also supportive of the LGBT community, and suggests that campus climate studies ought to consider the religious composition of campuses, especially at religiously affiliated colleges and universities, as a contributing factor.

Research Question 4

What power dynamics affect the efficacy of strategies and/or tactics to improve campus responsiveness to LGBT issues?

This study makes an important contribution to the literature in how I conceptualized the resistance participants faced on campus as a set of power dynamics exerted by other organizational actors. Love's (1997, 1998) study also identified barriers to LGBT organizing at a Catholic university, but his analysis did not explore the nature of the dynamics of these barriers in depth. I found participants encountered several dynamics on campus, although rather than affecting the efficacy of tactics to address LGBT issues, participants shaped their tactics as a way to navigate these dynamics, and thus one could argue their tactics were fairly effective,

demonstrated by the extent of LGBT resources available on campus. In addition, I found these power dynamics were becoming far less common as the environment has become more welcoming and inclusive, yet most of the power dynamics that participants continued to encounter were still driven by the institution's Catholic identity. Specifically, actors who exerted power dynamics out of opposition to the university offering LGBT support were concerned that engaging in LGBT issues undermines the university's Catholic identity, which thereby undermines the university's organizational health. The dynamics participants faced on campus ranged from overt oppression to more subtle microaggressions, similar to the range delineated by Kezar and Lester (2011), with examples of these dynamics manifesting in very specific ways due to the religious affiliation of the campus. Typically this resistance was countered by framing LGBT issues as congruent with the university's Jesuit, Catholic mission, but one dynamic was bullying or intimidation of faculty and staff, typically by other colleagues or external actors, through attempts to embarrass the university by funneling information to external organizations. This bullying and intimidation remained fairly rare, and was typically employed by a small number of individuals known for this behavior, so grassroots leaders tended to ignore this resistance if possible. Participants also mentioned, until recently, they also faced intimidation from students who would disrupt their classes or confront them in public forums over their loyalty to the university's Catholic identity. Faculty did not indicate these students disrupted classes specifically pertaining to LGBT topics, but fewer courses covered LGBT topics during the sociohistoric period when students were more frequently engaged in these disruptions. Love (1997, 1998) indicated that university leadership at his site faced external resistance, similar to Chardin, but did not mention any type of internal resistance from students similar to what participants shared with me. Participants felt this student behavior was somewhat an anomaly

264

that was an artifact of the more conservative, orthodox Catholic perspective of a previous

university administration; however, participants had also indicated that college students in

general have become more accepting of the LGBT community.

I also noted two controlling behaviors that participants mentioned that flowed directly

from the university's Catholic affiliation. The first, also congruent with Love (1997, 1998), was

demonstrated in how the Bishop exerted influence on an LGBT-related campus event by

requiring the organizers to present the Church's stance on marriage equality. In this case the

faculty and staff who had been involved in organizing the event, although affording an

opportunity for intellectual discourse, felt this compromise diminished the quality and

effectiveness of the event. The second dynamic had actually been identified by participants as a

tactic, but I simultaneously reframed this tactic as a power dynamic—the involvement of Jesuit

priests or campus ministry staff as influential allies when organizing LGBT programs. This tactic

had also been identified as an important resource by Love. A couple of participants pointed out

that the LGBT Center and student organization were expected or even required to partner with

Jesuit priests or ministry staff for legitimacy far more frequently than other groups on campus,

suggesting the LGBT community at Chardin faces unique systematic barriers to organizing

events and programs on the basis that these activities take up issues pertaining to sexual

orientation and/or gender identity.

Although Kezar and Lester (2011) argued that students have access to less tempered

tactics for effecting change on campus than faculty and particularly staff, several participants

mentioned students at Chardin tended to be far less confrontational on important issues than they

had observed in other campus contexts. Several participants speculated that the strong sense of

community on campus led to a culture of non-confrontation on campus they dubbed as "Chardin

nice": two faculty participants in particular felt students were too willing to accept compromises with administrators they deemed to be unjust to LGBT students, like the "self-hate mail," as Grace referred to the Bishop's statement on marriage equality. Given "the type of student who attends Chardin" as coming from more sheltered, rural, and religious backgrounds, these students may be less likely to challenge authority, and would thus be unprepared and unwilling to engage in prolonged negotiations with university administration over LGBT issues, similar to what McEntarfer (2011) found among students at the Catholic universities in her study. This reluctance to engage in confrontation could help explain why students typically only engaged in self-expression and shied away from more overt, organized efforts to effect change. However, administrators who students perceive to be LGBT-affirming have also used their authority to stall or cease student efforts to enact change on LGBT issues. For example, one administrator noted her reluctance to support students' proposal to change the name of the LGBT student organization to one that was more evident of its LGBT focus, and, in another, undergraduate student leaders' efforts to organize a drag show have been consistently delayed and stalled. These power dynamics also likely affect students' sense of agency to use more visible and organized tactics to influence change on campus.

Overall, this study contributes to the literature in several ways. First, this study updates prior literature on student experiences given the dramatic shifts that have taken place in social attitudes toward the LGBT community in recent years. Second, this study builds upon previous literature on ways faculty, staff, and students work to effect change on LGBT issues on college and university campuses by highlighting a wider range of tactics employed and particularly adding staff members' voices to the literature in ways previous work has not addressed. Third, the extant literature had not articulated the ways anti-LGBT resistance manifests as power

dynamics exerted by powerful organizational actors, especially those dynamics specific to Catholic campuses. Finally, this study highlighted the investment of faculty, staff, and students in the university's mission, and uncovered the sources of motivation and resilience that help these grassroots leaders remain resilient in their efforts to transform the campus environment.

Theoretical Contributions

In addition to contributions to the literature, this study offers deeper insight into several theoretical perspectives that I had drawn from to develop the framework for this study. First, because most of the structural changes, like the establishment of the LGBT center or adding "sexual orientation" to the university's nondiscrimination statement, happened many years before the study, organizational change at Chardin on LGBT issues was best understood as emergent (Weick, 2000). This means broader organizational changes are more gradual (Kezar & Lester, 2011), but at the same time change is happening on an ongoing basis through everyday interactions and the various programs and courses offered at the university. This extends the theory of organizational change in previous work. Additionally, Lukes' (2005) conceptualization of change as a political struggle between competing interests was useful to understand how the university's Catholic identity shaped power dynamics. Those with power in the organization and powerful external actors tended to exert resistance to LGBT initiatives out of a concern that such activities undermined the university's affiliation with the Roman Catholic Church, but on the other hand, grassroots leaders on campus found anti-LGBT oppression to be an important social justice concern on campus and felt the university's Catholic values compelled the institution to provide a welcoming environment.

The tempered radicals (Meyerson, 2003, 2008) and grassroots leadership frames (Kezar & Lester, 2011) were incredibly useful as most of what participants described as their tactics for

267

addressing LGBT issues were their everyday, one-on-one interactions. Although I relied more heavily on Kezar and Lester's work than Meyerson's, Meyerson's tempered radicals framework helped me more fully conceptualize the tactics used in this case study where participants described tactics that more closely resembled their most tempered tactics for change—resisting quietly and turning personal threats into opportunities. Kezar and Lester specifically mentioned that Meyerson's framework was less relevant to the higher education setting than they had initially anticipated; findings from this study suggest that application of the grassroots leadership framework to specific types of change efforts may involve some customization or adaptation. For example, as this study was focused on an identity-based movement, tactics for self-expression of identity and values should be expected to be relevant, whereas Kezar and Lester's study looked across several types of grassroots leadership movements. In addition, my findings underscored the need to highlight grassroots leaders' commitment to their institutions, which Meyerson included in her definition of a tempered radical, which then influenced Kezar and Lester's definition of a grassroots leader. However, given that much of the resistance around LGBT issues originated out of a concern that grassroots leaders were undermining the university's mission, emphasizing their investment in that mission was a critical counter-narrative that may not have been as salient in Kezar and Lester's study.

Kezar and Lester's (2011) inclusion of power dynamics, motivation, and sources of resilience were especially relevant and allowed this study to make important contributions to the literature on campus LGBT organizing. Previous work on Catholic universities had identified organizational barriers to LGBT organizing (Love, 1997, 1998), tactics for establishing programs (Getz & Kirkley, 2003, 2006; Kirkley & Getz, 2007; McEntarfer, 2011; Perlis & Shapiro, 2001), and student preparedness for handling administrative resistance (McEntarfer, 2011), but this

study was able to articulate the mechanisms by which powerful actors exerted influence and control, and more importantly, the motivation and resilience that sustains grassroots leaders in their efforts. These latter two phenomena, motivation and resilience, help capture grassroots leaders' sense of agency to demonstrate how they persist in their efforts despite the psychological, physiological, spiritual, and emotional toll of engaging in change work.

The multidimensional model for diverse learning environments (MMDLE) was also a very useful frame for conceptualizing the campus environment (Hurtado et al., 2012), and this study lends additional considerations for application of the MMDLE. First, the inclusion of the sociohistoric context and external commitments was incredibly relevant both for examining the LGBT climate and for an analysis of the Catholic university setting. The sociohistoric context provided insight into reasons the climate had shifted in response to changes in broader social attitudes on LGBT issues, while accounting for external commitments called attention to the university's relationships with alumni, donors, governing bodies, and the Catholic Church hierarchy. These external commitments, especially to governing bodies, donors, and the local Bishop, were all sources of power dynamics faced by participants at Chardin.

The model's conceptualization of the campus climate as five distinct dimensions was also useful in illustrating how participants perceived the climate as well as various factors in the environment that influenced the campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). Both individual level dimensions, the psychological and the behavioral, were especially relevant given how much the study focused on participant experiences. The compositional dimension also proved useful, though not in the manner I had anticipated when developing the study. In my discussion of the framework, I suspected that the representation of visible LGBT people on campus would affect participants' perceptions of whether the climate was more welcoming or more hostile. However,

what I found was influential with relation to the compositional dimension was the diversity of

religious affiliation represented on campus, and not sexual orientation. When the compositional

dimension was first developed, the emphasis was on racial/ethnic representation and its influence

on the frequency and quality of interracial interactions (Hurtado, Milem, et al., 1998). However,

future applications of this model should consider representation of worldviews, such as

expressed through religious or political affiliations, as contributing to the campus climate,

especially through intergroup conflict or debate.

As mentioned earlier, this study found evidence of campus "microclimates" that either

make up the broader organizational climate or are experienced in addition to the overall climate.

Vaccaro (2012) had noted that graduate students, faculty, and staff are also most attuned to their

individual departmental climates, but unlike Vaccaro, students in this study also observed

differences in climate among departments and other campus spaces. The MMDLE

conceptualizes two spheres of interaction, the curricular and co-curricular, where students

interact with each other as well as faculty and staff (Hurtado et al., 2012); the findings from this

study additionally suggest distinct climates may be experienced within these spheres of

interaction.

Sears (2002) speculated that because the climate for LGBT faculty is experienced at the

departmental level, what Vaccaro (2012) called a microclimate, grassroots tactics may be the

most effective at addressing and improving the climate. By bringing together the MMDLE with

the framework for grassroots leadership (Hurtado et al., 2012; Kezar & Lester, 2011), findings

from this study help support this assertion. Grassroots leadership tactics are engaged within the

MMDLE's spheres of interaction—the curriculum and the co-curriculum—which are also the

locations where microclimates are experienced. Although the MMDLE argues that broader

organizational policies and structures also affect the overall campus climate in significant ways, efforts to address the experiences of students, as well as faculty and staff, in the spaces they inhabit on campus can have a more direct and immediate impact to improve those experiences. These efforts to address the climate at the meso-level of the institution can be conceptualized as grassroots leadership tactics and suggests areas for future research based on department, discipline, or work units.

<div align="center">

Implications

</div>

Research

       The findings from this study lead to a set of implications for both practice and research within the field of higher education. One important research implication from this study is further support for the use of a case study approach when examining issues related to campus climate. Case studies call for the triangulation of several kinds of evidence, like interviews, document analysis, and observations (Yin, 2014), that can help concretize the multiple dimensions of campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). A case study approach also allowed for broader inclusion of campus voices, such as faculty, staff, and students, which led to some crystallization on issues that are perceived differently by each of these groups, such as understanding the tactic of allying with influential Jesuits as a power dynamic in addition to a tactic for addressing LGBT issues. The inclusion of multiple voices also allowed me to conceptualize the campus from different levels as I interviewed a wide range of participants: students, administrators, and newer and longer-serving employees.

       A second implication for research is further support for higher education researchers to apply critical frameworks from the management literature to their scholarly work. Although higher education has been criticized in the past for quickly adopting management "fads" that

may not have been well-suited for the educational environment and even fell out of favor within the corporate sector (Birnbaum, 2000), critical voices in the management literature may provide new insights into organizational change in higher education, especially as higher education faces increased privatization and academic capitalism (Kezar & Lester, 2011). In this study in particular, Meyerson's (2003, 2008) tempered radicals framework was also useful because of the constraints participants faced due to the university's Catholic affiliation. Critical voices in the management literature may be essential for organizational actors in colleges and universities to maintain resistance on important justice concerns as the representation of contingent faculty and administrators increases, and tenured faculty, who enjoy academic freedom protections, decreases (Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2011).

Areas for future research. One important area for future research is replication of this study across other Jesuit and Catholic universities. Although I chose Chardin University because of its utility as a typical case, the cultures and climates among all 28 Jesuit colleges and universities likely varies to a great extent, and replicating this study at some of the more extreme cases could provide important contrasts with this institution in terms of both climate and strategies/tactics for change. In addition, given assertions by McEntarfer (2011), Yoakam (2006), and this study's view that Catholic universities affiliated with religious orders (Jesuit) approach LGBT issues differently than other Catholic universities, replication of this study at diocesan Catholic universities could explore this proposition further and identify where those differences may be.

A second area for future research is replication of this study at other kinds of religiously affiliated universities. LGBT students at evangelical Christian colleges and universities continue to face hostile campus climates (Yarhouse et al., 2009), primarily because of policies that

272

expressly forbid same-sex sexual activity and sometimes prohibit openly identifying as a sexual minority (Wolff & Himes, 2010). As a result, these campuses are likely ripe for examination of the behind-the-scenes or under-the-radar tactics that students, staff, and faculty employ to offer support to the LGBT community. For instance, groups of LGBT alumni from several evangelical colleges, such as Bob Jones University, Wheaton College, and George Fox University, have recently formed an organization (Joyce, 2014), suggesting some type of underground support network likely existed—and still exists—at these institutions that allowed students to connect. Replication of a study like this at colleges like these could shed light on that resistance.

As change is both gradual and emergent (Weick, 2000), I found it difficult to determine whether there were causal relationships between specific grassroots tactics and the type of change they effected on campus. Although participants perceived specific tactics to be more salient or important, such as the Safe Space program and framing issues as mission-congruent, I did not have specific evidence of the effect certain tactics had on the environment. Another future direction to extend the findings from this study would be to perform longitudinal analyses, possibly ethnographic in nature, to document how organizational change results from specific grassroots leadership tactics. Kezar and Lester (2011) also noted in their study that participants were often hesitant to assess whether their grassroots efforts were successful because in many cases their efforts toward creating change were still in progress, and they posited that evaluating these tactics as successful or unsuccessful may be of little meaning given how gradually change occurs. Longitudinal, in-depth work could be useful in understanding the connections between different types of grassroots tactics and their contributions to organizational change.

Practice

The most important implication for practice from this study is the delineation of a set of

273

tactics that could be implemented at Catholic colleges and universities to address LGBT issues. In particular, several tactics were identified that had been shaped specifically in alignment with unique aspects of this university's Jesuit, Catholic environment and would likely transfer to other Jesuit and possibly other Catholic universities as well. One important tactic was the Safe Space program given the various ways participants described the program's impact on the LGBT campus climate as well as the success of similar programs at other Catholic universities (Getz & Kirkley, 2006; Yoakam, 2006). Safe Space programs are likely well-suited for a Catholic university setting because of their educational focus, and Getz and Kirkley mentioned their program includes an overview of Catholic Church teaching on LGBT issues. However, as participants in this study noted that faculty involvement in the development of the Safe Space program was likely a contributing factor to its success, practitioners on other Catholic campuses where the proposal of a Safe Space program would be considered controversial should ensure faculty involvement in such a proposal.

A second tactic that participants both in this study and in those of Love (1997, 1998), Kirkley and Getz (2007), and McEntarfer (2011) found imperative when engaging in LGBT issues on Catholic campuses was framing issues as congruent with the university's mission. Again, practitioners at Jesuit universities are likely already using this tactic to build organizational support for LGBT efforts, and they would likely concur with participants in this study that addressing LGBT issues is inherent to the Jesuit mission. However, practitioners will likely find it useful to engage in the exercise of making the mission alignment of LGBT programs more explicit in order to respond to possible concern or resistance from internal and external stakeholders. For practitioners at other types of Catholic universities, depending on the construction of their universities' missions, they may find their organizational missions to be

274

more constrained with respect to how controversial issues like LGBT concerns fit within that framework. Practitioners on these campuses may thus find aligning programs with their institutional missions to be more of a challenge; however, even participants in my study spoke about relying on Jesuit priests and campus ministry for assistance in constructing Catholic frameworks for LGBT issues. Practitioners at other Catholic universities may be able to rely on similar influential allies as resources for assistance with mission alignment, as well as practitioners on other religiously affiliated campuses.

Another implication for practice is the necessity of sources of resilience in order to remain committed to change work. For participants, their sources of resilience were vital in keeping them balanced, energized, and motivated to engage not just in LGBT work but, for many participants, a broad range of justice issues on campus. Confronting power dynamics and resistance is incredibly draining, especially when that resistance includes overt aggressions personally directed at grassroots leaders. Students in particular are often unprepared for administrative resistance and protracted negotiations because they have not built up as much resilience as faculty or staff members who have been engaged in change efforts for years. Practitioners may want to consider identifying or cultivating sources of resilience that will keep them sustained in their efforts given the ongoing, emergent, and gradual nature of the change process.

Faculty in this study were both grassroots leaders and influential allies. Tenured faculty in particular enjoy academic freedom protections that allow them to engage in work that might be controversial or possibly conflict with the university's mission that other employees and students would be unable to lead. Faculty at Chardin wanted to use their tenure protections to fight for change on campus and to help host academically valuable but controversial programs

275

that student groups and staff members may be unable to organize. As guiding documents from the Roman Catholic Church emphasize the importance of academic freedom at Catholic colleges and universities as essential to the Catholic educational tradition (Pope John Paul II, 1990), faculty at other Catholic universities ought to consider how they might leverage their tenure protections toward fostering change on LGBT issues on campus. One area where faculty could make a deep cultural impact on campus is through introducing courses that cover LGBT topics, or adding stand-alone LGBT courses to the university catalog. Faculty at other religiously affiliated colleges and universities may enjoy similar freedoms, though their academic freedom may be more constrained on evangelical campuses where they are required to publicly endorse the teachings of the religious affiliation of the institution.

Finally, several participants spoke about the current sociohistoric moment as deeply affecting the climate on campus. The nation sits on the brink of a Supreme Court decision establishing marriage equality as nationwide law (Denniston, 2015), and the Catholic Church is headed by a Pope who has called on the Church to provide pastoral care for the LGBT community in a different manner (Donadio, 2013). Although this latter development has not led to changes in Church teachings on homosexuality, these shifts will continue to influence campus climate through the changing attitudes of the students who enter each year and the law and policy context within which Catholic universities will find themselves in the future. At Chardin, university governance extended spousal partner benefits to employees' same-sex spouses, and several other Jesuit and Catholic universities have done the same. However, as religiously affiliated institutions, Catholic universities are not required to comply with these laws, meaning many likely refuse to offer these benefits as a matter of religious objection. Leadership in Catholic higher education needs to reconsider how university policy responds to shifts in LGBT

276

rights as these policies convey a message to students and employees about the value of the LGBT community on campus. Given recent statements from the Synod of Bishops on the Family about honoring the gifts of LGBT Catholics (Erdő, 2014), providing a welcoming and inclusive environment offers Catholic universities the opportunities to honor those gifts and work toward influencing the broader Catholic Church's teachings on and valuing of LGBT identities and experiences.

Conclusion

"Who am I to judge?" said Pope Francis on a plane in 2013 in response to a reporter's question about the issue of gay priests (Donadio, 2013). Although the climate within higher education for the LGBT community has improved in the past couple of decades (Marine, 2011), homophobia and heterosexism continue to pervade college campuses (Blumenfeld, 2000; Rankin et al., 2010; Renn, 2010). LGBT faculty, staff, and students at religiously affiliated colleges and universities have been especially challenged to provide welcoming and inclusive environments for their campus LGBT communities (Love, 1997, 1998; Wolff & Himes, 2010). However, just as the recent Synod of Bishops on the Family has exhorted the Catholic Church to reconsider how the faithful pastorally respond to LGBT Catholics in their faith communities (Erdő, 2014), Jesuit colleges and universities are offering an example to other Catholic and religiously affiliated institutions new ways to welcome the LGBT community on campus. Instead of passing judgment on LGBT people through policies that exclude, such as that which led a Baptist college to require a lesbian student to repay her financial aid after being expelled for her relationship with another woman (Grasgreen, 2013), institutions like Chardin offer a different model for religiously affiliated colleges and universities to welcome their campus LGBT communities. Through grassroots tactics and strategies aligned with the institution's mission and crafted to

277

navigate the unique power dynamics within Catholic higher education, Chardin offers an example of a Catholic community that is pushing thought and pastoral care forward within the Church, attentive to the question raised by the recent Synod on the Family, "Homosexuals have gifts and qualities to offer to the Christian community. Are we capable of providing for these people, guaranteeing them a place of fellowship in our communities?" (Erdő, 2014, para. 50). The answer is yes, at least at places like Chardin where values of social justice prevail.

Summary of LGBT support for undergraduates at American Jesuit colleges and universities

	Non-discrimination statement covers:	Undergraduate student organization	LGBT resource office?
Boston College	Sexual orientation	Allies	No
Canisius College	Sexual orientation	Unity	No
College of the Holy Cross	Sexual orientation; Gender identity	ABiGaLe Allies	No
Creighton University	Sexual orientation	Gender and Sexuality Alliance	No
Fairfield University	Sexual orientation	Alliance	No
Fordham University	Sexual orientation	PRIDE Alliance	No
Georgetown University	Sexual orientation; Gender identity or expression	GUPride	Yes
Gonzaga University	Sexual orientation; Gender identity or expression	HERO	Yes
John Carroll University	Sexual orientation	Allies	No
Le Moyne College	Sexual orientation	CARE	No
Loyola Marymount University	Sexual orientation; Gender identity	Gender-Sexuality Alliance	Yes
Loyola University Chicago	Sexual orientation; Gender identity	Advocate	No
Loyola University Maryland	Sexual orientation	Spectrum	No
Loyola University New Orleans	Sexual orientation	Etcetera	No
Marquette University	Sexual orientation	Gender Sexuality Alliance	Yes
Regis University	Sexual orientation	Gay Straight Alliance	No

Rockhurst University	Sexual orientation	UNITY	No
St. Joseph's University	Sexual orientation	Gay Straight Alliance	No
St. Louis University	Sexual orientation	Rainbow Alliance	No
St. Peter's University	Sexual orientation	PRIDE	No
Santa Clara University	Sexual orientation	Gay and Lesbian Alliance	No
Seattle University	Sexual orientation; Gender identity	Triangle Club	Yes
Spring Hill College	Sexual orientation	PRIDE	No
University of Detroit Mercy	Sexual orientation	Gay-Straight Alliance	No
University of San Francisco	Sexual orientation; Gender identity	Queer Alliance	Yes
The University of Scranton	Sexual orientation	Scranton Inclusion	No
Wheeling Jesuit University	Not included	Life Gets Better Together Alliance	No
Xavier University	Sexual orientation; Gender identity or expression	Xavier Alliance	No

Note: All information in this table was pulled from each university's website and thus is subject to that information made publicly available through each website.

Appendix B

Interview Protocol for Campus Staff

Introduction and consent (key points):

    a. Thank you for participating
    b. Information collected for research purposes only
    c. Recording of interview, "off the record" comments
    d. Interview should last 60-90 minutes
    e. Confidentiality will be protected in writing up findings
    f. Purpose of study: how a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues
    g. Purpose of interview: understanding grassroots leadership
    h. Especially interested in examples and stories to illustrate statements
    i. Questions about study or interview
    j. Consent form
    k. Complete demographic questionnaire, determine pseudonym
    l. Speak loudly and clearly for the recording

Background Information

1. Why did you seek employment at Chardin University?
    a. Probes: personal reasons, professional reasons
2. Tell me about your position at Chardin University. How does working on LGBT issues fit into your job description?

How do students, faculty, and staff determine the need for organizational change in terms of creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for LGBT individuals at a Jesuit, Catholic university? (RQ1)

1. What is the campus climate like for LGBT people at Chardin University?
    a. Probes: history of LGBT exclusion, how LGBT people are treated, how LGBT people perceive the climate, representation of visible LGBT people on campus, policies and practices to improve environment for LGBT people
2. What are the most pressing issues facing LGBT students at Chardin University? LGBT staff? LGBT faculty?
    a. (If LGBT) What would you say has been the most severe professional consequence you have faced at Chardin University for being openly L/G/B?
3. In the time you have been employed here, in what ways has the institution changed in terms of addressing these issues?
    a. Follow up: In what ways does the institution still need to change to address the needs of its LGBT communities?

What are the strategies and tactics employed by these campus constituents to precipitate organizational change? (RQ2)

1. Are you involved in change efforts to improve the campus climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students at Chardin University? What motivated your involvement?
2. What actions have you taken to bring about change on these issues on campus?
    a. Probes: visible actions, invisible or behind-the-scenes actions, individual interactions, advocacy, organizing with others; overall strategy

How do their multiple social identities, like sexual orientation or Catholic affiliation, influence their perceptions of the need for change as well as the institution's role in addressing these issues? (RQ3)

1. How would you describe Chardin University's role in addressing the issues you raised?
    a. Probes: specific responsibilities
2. In what ways do the institution's Jesuit mission and values open opportunities to address the issues you raised? In what ways do they serve as barriers?
    a. Follow-up: Catholic identity/affiliation

What power dynamics affect the efficacy of strategies and/or tactics to improve campus responsiveness to LGBT issues? (RQ4)

1. Can you describe for me a time when you faced resistance to your efforts to address LGBT issues?
    a. Follow-up: At times when you have encountered resistance, how have you dealt with it?
2. In what ways do you feel empowered to act for change on LGBT issues at Chardin University? In what ways do you feel limited in your capacity to act for change?
    a. Probes: sexual orientation identity, religious affiliation
3. Where do you find resilience in order to remain committed to your change efforts and to Chardin University?
    a. Probes: on campus, off campus

Do you have anything else to add that we have not yet covered related to the purpose of the study?

Thank you for participating in the interview.

Appendix C

Interview Protocol for Faculty

Introduction and consent (key points):

    a. Thank you for participating
    b. Information collected for research purposes only
    c. Recording of interview, "off the record" comments
    d. Interview should last 60-90 minutes
    e. Confidentiality will be protected in writing up findings
    f. Purpose of study: how a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues
    g. Purpose of interview: understanding grassroots leadership
    h. Especially interested in examples and stories to illustrate statements
    i. Questions about study or interview
    j. Consent form
    k. Complete demographic questionnaire, determine pseudonym
    l. Speak loudly and clearly for the recording

Background Information

1. Why did you seek employment at Chardin University?
    a. Probes: personal reasons, professional reasons

Assessing the Need for Organizational Change (RQ1)

1. What is the campus climate like for LGBT people at Chardin University?
    a. Probes: history of LGBT exclusion, how LGBT people are treated, how LGBT people perceive the climate, representation of visible LGBT people on campus, policies and practices to improve environment for LGBT people
2. What are the most pressing issues facing LGBT faculty at Chardin University? LGBT students? LGBT staff?
    a. (If LGBT) What would you say has been the most severe professional consequence you have faced at Chardin University for being openly L/G/B?
3. In the time you have been employed here, in what ways has the institution changed in terms of addressing these issues?
    a. Follow up: In what ways does the institution still need to change to address the needs of its LGBT communities?

Strategies and Tactics (RQ2)

1. Are you involved in change efforts to improve the campus climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students at Chardin University? What motivated your involvement?
2. What actions have you taken to bring about change on these issues on campus?

283

      a. Follow up: Do you research or teach about LGBT topics?

      b. Probes: visible actions, invisible or behind-the-scenes actions, individual interactions, advocacy, organizing with others; overall strategy

Influence of Social Identities (RQ3)

1. How would you describe Chardin University's role in addressing the issues you raised?
   a. Probes: specific responsibilities
2. In what ways do the institution's Jesuit mission and values open opportunities to address the issues you've raised? In what ways do they serve as barriers?
   a. Follow-up: Catholic identity/affiliation

Efficacy of Strategies and Tactics (RQ4)

1. Can you describe for me a time when you faced resistance to your efforts to address LGBT issues?
   a. Follow-up: At times when you have encountered resistance, how have you dealt with it?
2. In what ways do you feel empowered to act for change on LGBT issues at Chardin University? In what ways do you feel limited in your capacity to act for change?
   a. Probes: sexual orientation identity, religious affiliation
3. Where do you find resilience in order to remain committed to your change efforts and to Chardin University?
   a. Probes: on campus, off campus

Do you have anything else to add that we have not yet covered related to the purpose of the study?

Thank you for participating in the interview.

Appendix D

Interview Protocol for Students

Introduction and consent (key points):

a. Thank you for participating
b. Information collected for research purposes only
c. Recording of interview, "off the record" comments
d. Interview should last 60-90 minutes
e. Confidentiality will be protected in writing up findings
f. Purpose of study: how a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues
g. Purpose of interview: understanding grassroots leadership
h. Especially interested in examples and stories to illustrate statements
i. Questions about study or interview
j. Consent form
k. Complete demographic questionnaire, determine pseudonym
l. Speak loudly and clearly for the recording

Background Information

1. Why did you decide to enroll at Chardin University?
   a. Probes: personal reasons, professional reasons

Assessing the Need for Organizational Change (RQ1)

1. What is the campus climate like for LGBT people at Chardin University?
   a. Probes: past climate for LGBT people, how LGBT people are treated, how LGBT people perceive the climate, do you see visible LGBT people on campus, policies or programs to improve environment for LGBT people
2. What are the most pressing issues facing LGBT students at Chardin University? LGBT faculty? LGBT staff?
   a. (If LGBT) If you have experienced any, what would you say has been the most severe social consequence you have faced at Chardin University for being openly L/G/B?
3. Since you first started attending, in what ways has the institution changed in terms of addressing these issues?
   a. Follow up: In what ways does the institution still need to change to address the needs of its LGBT communities?

Strategies and Tactics (RQ2)

1. Are you involved in change efforts to improve the campus climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students at Chardin University? What motivated your involvement?

2. What actions have you taken to bring about change on these issues on campus?
    a. Probes: visible actions, invisible or behind-the-scenes actions, individual interactions, advocacy, organizing with others; overall strategy

Influence of Social Identities (RQ3)

1. How would you describe Chardin University's role in addressing the issues you raised?
    a. Probes: specific responsibilities
2. In what ways do the institution's Jesuit mission and values open opportunities to address the issues you've raised? In what ways do they serve as barriers?
    a. Follow-up: Catholic identity/affiliation

Efficacy of Strategies and Tactics (RQ4)

1. Can you describe for me a time when you faced resistance to your efforts to address LGBT issues?
    a. Follow-up: At times when you have encountered resistance, how have you dealt with it?
2. In what ways do you feel empowered to act for change on LGBT issues at Chardin University? In what ways do you feel limited in your capacity to act for change?
    a. Probes: sexual orientation identity, religious affiliation
3. Where do you find resilience in order to remain committed to your change efforts and to Chardin University?
    a. Probes: on campus, off campus

Do you have anything else to add that we have not yet covered related to the purpose of the study?

Thank you for participating in the interview.

Appendix E

Interview Protocol for Administrators

Introduction and consent (key points):

a. Thank you for participating
b. Information collected for research purposes only
c. Recording of interview, "off the record" comments
d. Interview should last 60-90 minutes
e. Confidentiality will be protected in writing up findings
f. Purpose of study: how a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues
g. Purpose of interview: understanding grassroots leadership
h. Especially interested in examples and stories to illustrate statements
i. Questions about study or interview
j. Consent form
k. Complete demographic questionnaire, determine pseudonym
l. Speak loudly and clearly for the recording

Background Information

1. Why did you seek employment at Chardin University?
   a. Probes: personal reasons, professional reasons
2. Tell me about your position at Chardin University. How might work on LGBT issues fit into your job description?

Assessing the Need for Organizational Change (RQ1)

1. How would you describe the climate for LGBT people at Chardin University?
   a. Probes: history of LGBT exclusion, how LGBT people are treated, how LGBT people perceive the climate, representation of visible LGBT people on campus, policies and practices to improve environment for LGBT people
2. What would you say are the most pressing issues facing LGBT students at Chardin University? LGBT staff? LGBT faculty?
   a. (If LGBT) What would you say has been the most severe professional consequence you have faced at Chardin University for being openly L/G/B?
3. In the time you have been employed here, in what ways has the institution changed in terms of addressing these issues?
   a. Follow up: In what ways does the institution still need to change to address the needs of its LGBT communities?

Strategies and Tactics (RQ2)

1. What actions have you observed that have been taken to bring about change on these issues on campus?
    a. Probes: visible actions, invisible or behind-the-scenes actions, individual interactions, advocacy, organizing with others; overall strategy
2. Who are key people that come to mind that you know are engaged in work addressing these issues faced by LGBT students, faculty, and staff?
    a. Probe: what do they do

Influence of Social Identities (RQ3)

1. How would you describe Chardin University's role in addressing the issues you raised?
    a. Probes: specific responsibilities
2. In what ways do the institution's Jesuit mission and values open opportunities to address the issues you raised? In what ways do they serve as barriers?
    a. Follow-up: Catholic identity/affiliation

Efficacy of Strategies and Tactics (RQ4)

1. Have you ever had to stop or slow down a grassroots LGBT effort because you, or someone you reported to, felt it was inappropriate or untimely for this campus? What was that experience like?
2. Can you describe for me a time when you faced resistance to your efforts to address LGBT issues?
    a. Follow-up: At times when you have encountered resistance, how have you dealt with it?
3. In what ways do you find efforts to address LGBT issues are supported or encouraged at Chardin University? In what ways are they marginalized?

Do you have anything else to add that we have not yet covered related to the purpose of the study?

Thank you for participating in the interview.

Appendix F

List of Documents Reviewed

    I.   University Mission Statement
   II.   University Guiding Document on Jesuit Identity (generalized name)
  III.   University Nondiscrimination Statement
  IV.   University Strategic Plan
   V.   University History
  VI.   University Website
        a. Office of the President
        b. Office of Mission
        c. Office of Intercultural Relations
        d. Student Development Division
            i. LGBT Resource Center
           ii. Multicultural Education Center
          iii. Student Activities – clubs and organizations
        e. University Ministry
        f. Academic Departments
            i. Catholic Studies
           ii. Philosophy
          iii. Psychology
          iv. Sociology
           v. Women's and Gender Studies
        g. Institute for Hate Studies
        h. Campus Climate Committee
        i. Chardin University News Service
        j. Harassment and Discrimination Incident Report Form
 VII.   Course Syllabi
VIII.   Facts and Figures (2013 CU Factbook)
  IX.   Student Newspaper Articles
        a. Articles pertaining to LGBT campus climate
        b. Articles pertaining to LGBT-related activities and events
   X.   Campus Climate Reports
  XI.   Alumni Magazine(s)

Appendix G

Observation Guide

Date/Time of Observation: _____

Location of Observation: _____

Participants Involved in Observation: _____

Purpose of Observation: _____

_____

Descriptive Notes:

1. **Setting**. Describe the physical environment.

2. **Participants**. Who are they? What are their roles? How do they interact? What dynamics are present?

3. **Planned Activities**. What activities are going on? What aspects of the process appear planned, and which seem unplanned?

4. **Informal Interactions**. Who interacts with whom? What is the nature of those interactions? How are they provoked? What dynamics are present in these interactions?

5. **Communication patterns**. What is the content of conversations going on? Who speaks to whom? What is the tone of the conversation? What are some key words used by participants?

6. **Culture**. Describe the norms or assumptions observed in the setting. What symbols are apparent? How are LGBT identities represented, or the institution's Jesuit identity reflected, in the setting? Which values seem prominent in this setting?

7. **My Behavior**. How am I reacting to the environment? What am I feeling as this activity/interaction occurs? How does the climate in this environment feel?

Appendix H

Staff/Administrator Demographic Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire. Do not place specifically identifying information about yourself on this form, such as your name, birthdate, or contact information. Provision of this information is strictly voluntary; leave any spaces blank for information you wish not to provide. The researcher can answer any questions you have about why specific information is being collected. This document will remain confidential throughout the process of the study, and will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Please write your preferred pseudonym here:

What is your sexual orientation identity?

(If LGB) How "out" are you on campus?
(1 – hardly at all; 5 – out to most everyone)   1   2   3   4   5

What is your religious affiliation?

How frequently do you attend services/practice?

Never   Once or twice a year
Monthly   Weekly
More than once per week

Title of position at Chardin:

Department and division:

When were you first employed at Chardin?

What is your racial/ethnic background?

What is your gender identity?

Appendix I

Faculty Demographic Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire. Do not place specifically identifying information about yourself on this form, such as your name, birthdate, or contact information. Provision of this information is strictly voluntary; leave any spaces blank for information you wish not to provide. The researcher can answer any questions you have about why specific information is being collected. This document will remain confidential throughout the process of the study, and will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Please write your preferred pseudonym here:

_____

What is your sexual orientation identity?

_____

(If LGB) How "out" are you on campus?
(1 – hardly at all; 5 – out to most everyone)   1   2   3   4   5

What is your religious affiliation?

_____

How frequently do you attend services/practice?

Never   Once or twice a year
Monthly   Weekly
More than once per week

Academic title at Chardin:

_____

Department and division:

_____

When were you first employed at Chardin?

_____

What is your racial/ethnic background?

_____

What is your gender identity?

_____

Appendix J

Student Demographic Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire. Do not place specifically identifying information about yourself on this form, such as your name, birthdate, or contact information. Provision of this information is strictly voluntary; leave any spaces blank for information you wish not to provide. The researcher can answer any questions you have about why specific information is being collected. This document will remain confidential throughout the process of the study, and will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Please write your preferred pseudonym here:

What is your sexual orientation identity?

(If LGB) How "out" are you on campus?
(1 – hardly at all; 5 – out to most everyone)   1   2   3   4   5

What is your religious affiliation?

Never	Once or twice a year

How frequently do you attend services/practice?   Monthly   Weekly
                                                       More than once per week

Age:

Major:

Anticipated graduation year:

What is your racial/ethnic background?

What is your gender identity?

References

Aczel, A. (2007). *The Jesuit and the skull: Teilhard de Chardin, evolution, and the search for Peking Man*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179–211. http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behavior. In P. A. M. V. Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 438–459). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Arthur, M. M. L. (2008). Social movements in organizations. *Sociology Compass*, *2*(3), 1014–1030. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00106.x

Bacon, J. (2006). Teaching queer theory at a normal school. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *52*(1-2), 257–283. http://doi.org/10.1300/J082v52n01_11

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*(1), 611–639. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Bernstein, M. (1997). Celebration and supression: The strategic uses of identity by the lesbian and gay movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(3), 531–565. http://doi.org/10.1086/231250

Bernstein, M. (2002). Identities and politics: Toward a historical understanding of the lesbian and gay movement. *Social Science History*, *26*(3), 531–581.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization theories for effective policy and practice. Volume II, Dynamics of the system*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(1), 1–16. http://doi.org/10.2307/2649279

Blumenfeld, W. J. (2000). How homophobia hurts everyone. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 267–275). New York City: Routledge.

Broido, E. M. (2000). Ways of being an ally to lesbian, gay, and bisexual students. In V. A. Wall & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Toward Acceptance: Sexual Orientation Issues on Campus*. Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Association.

Brown, R. D., Clarke, B., Gortmaker, V., & Robinson-Keilig, R. (2004). Assessing the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) students using a multiple perspectives approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, *45*(1), 8–26. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2004.0003

Brown, R. D., & Gortmaker, V. J. (2009). Assessing campus climates for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students: Methodological and political issues. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *6*(4), 416–435. http://doi.org/10.1080/19361650903296429

Brumfield, B. (2012, November 7). Voters approve same-sex marriage for the first time. Retrieved April 23, 2015, from http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/07/politics/pol-same-sex-marriage/index.html

Callegher, J. D. (2010). Attitudes toward homosexuality among Catholic-educated university graduates. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice*, *13*(3), 306–328.

Catholic Church. (1994). *Catechism of the Catholic Church.* Liguori, MO: Liguori Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chen, A. C.-R., & Rhoads, R. A. (2013). *Staff and faculty allies as transformative intellectuals in support of undocumented students*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Creed, W. E. D., & Scully, M. A. (2000). Songs of ourselves: Employees' deployment of social identity in workplace encounters. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*(4), 391–412. http://doi.org/10.1177/105649260000900410

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Croteau, J. M., & Lark, J. S. (1995). A qualitative investigation of biased and exemplary student affairs practice concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues. *Journal of College Student Development*, *36*(5), 472–482.

Croteau, J. M., & Von Destinon, M. (1994). A national survey of job search experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*(1), 40–45.

Cullen, M., & Smart, J. (1991). Issues of gay, lesbian, and bisexual student affairs professionals. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 179–194). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Currie, S.J., C. L. (2010). Some distinctive features of Jesuit higher education today. *Journal of Catholic Higher Education*, *29*(1), 113–129.

Currie, S.J., C. L. (2011). Pursuing Jesuit, Catholic identity and mission at U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, *14*(3), 346–357.

Damanpour, F., & Evan, W. M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: The

    problem of "organizational lag." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *29*(3), 392–409.

    http://doi.org/10.2307/2393031

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989). 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., & Rose, M. L. (1990). Homophobia in a university community: Attitudes and

    experiences of heterosexual freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development*, *31*(6),

    484–491.

Denniston, L. (2015, January 16). Court will rule on same-sex marriage. Retrieved April 23,

    2015, from http://www.scotusblog.com/2015/01/court-will-rule-on-same-sex-marriage/

Dilley, P. (2002). 20th century postsecondary practices and policies to control gay students. *The*

    Review of Higher Education, *25*(4), 409–431. http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0018

Dilley, P. (2005). Which way out? A typology of non-heterosexual male collegiate identities.

    The Journal of Higher Education, *76*(1), 56–88. http://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2005.0004

Dolan, J. (1998). Gay and lesbian professors: Out on campus. *Academe*, *84*(5), 40–45.

Donadio, R. (2013, July 29). On gay priests, Pope Francis asks, "Who am I to judge?." *The New*

    York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/

Drake, B. (2013). *As more Americans have contacts with gays and lesbians, social acceptance*

    rises. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from

    http://www.pewresearch.org/

Dutile, F. N. (1988). God and gays at Georgetown: Observations on *Gay Rights Coalition of*

    Georgetown University Law Center v. Georgetown University. *Journal of College and*

    University Law, *15*(1), 1–20.

Eckholm, E. (2011, April 18). Gay rights at Christian colleges face suppression. *The New York Times*. New York City. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/

Elliott, M. (1996). Coming out in the classroom: A return to the hard place. *College English*, *58*(6), 693–708. http://doi.org/10.2307/378394

Engberg, M. E., Hurtado, S., & Smith, G. C. (2007). Developing attitudes of acceptance toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual peers: Enlightenment, contact, and the college experience. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *4*(3), 49–77. http://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n03_05

Erdő, P. C. (2014). *Relatio post disceptationem*. Vatican City: Eleventh General Assembly, 2014 Synod of Bishops on the Family. Retrieved from http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2014/10/13/0751/03037. html

Evans, N. J. (2000). Creating a positive learning environment for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2000*(82), 81–87. http://doi.org/10.1002/tl.8208

Finlay, B., & Walther, C. S. (2003). The relation of religious affiliation, service attendance, and other factors to homophobic attitudes among university students. *Review of Religious Research*, *44*(4), 370–393. http://doi.org/10.2307/3512216

Fletcher, A. C., & Russell, S. T. (2001). Incorporating issues of sexual orientation in the classroom: Challenges and solutions. *Family Relations*, *50*(1), 34–40. http://doi.org/10.2307/585772

Friedman, C., & Leaper, C. (2010). Sexual minority college women's experiences with

    discrimination: Relations with identity and collective action. *Psychology of Women*

    Quarterly, *34*(2), 152–164. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01558.x

Furrow, H. (2012). LGBT students in the college composition classroom. *Journal of*

    Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, *6*(3), 145–159.

Gamson, W. A., Fireman, B., & Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with unjust authority*. Homewood,

    IL: Dorsey Press.

Ganss, G. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Ignatius of Loyola: The Spiritual Exercises and selected works*. New

    York City: Paulist Press.

Garvey, J. C., & Inkelas, K. K. (2012). Exploring relationships between sexual orientation and

    satisfaction with faculty and staff interactions. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *59*(8), 1167–

    1190. http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.712846

Gates, G. J. (2011). *How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender?*. Los

    Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu

Getz, C., & Kirkley, E. A. (2003, April). Queering the ethical school: A model for sexual

    orientation education at a religiously-affiliated institution. Retrieved from

    http://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED479167&id=ED479167

Getz, C., & Kirkley, E. A. (2006). Shaking up the status quo: Challenging intolerance of the

    lesbian, gay and bisexual community at a private Roman Catholic university. *College*

    Student Journal, *40*(4), 857.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*.

    Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Goffman, E. (1969). *Strategic interaction.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goldstein, S. B., & Davis, D. S. (2010). Heterosexual allies: A descriptive profile. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *43*(4), 478–494. http://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2010.505464

Gortmaker, V. J., & Brown, R. D. (2006). Out of the college closet: Differences in perceptions and experiences among out and closeted lesbian and gay students. *College Student Journal*, *40*(3), 606.

Grasgreen, A. (2013, June 13). Expelled for sexuality, and sent a bill. *Inside Higher Ed*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/

Griffin, P. (1992). From hiding out to coming out. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *22*(3-4), 167–196. http://doi.org/10.1300/J082v22n03_07

Grossman, F. D. (2010). Dissent from within: How educational insiders use protest to create policy change. *Educational Policy*, *24*(4), 655–686. http://doi.org/10.1177/0895904809335110

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hanisch, C. (1970). The personal is political. In S. Firestone & A. Koedt (Eds.), *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation: Major writings of the radical feminists.* New York City: Radical Feminism.

Hatmaker, J. (2013, August 31). Vagueness on gay issues conflicts Messiah students. *New England Cable News*. Newton, MA. Retrieved from http://www.necn.com/

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 27, pp. 41–122). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

Hurtado, S., Griffin, K. A., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(4), 204–221. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014009

Hurtado, S., Maestas, R., Hill, L., Inkelas, K., Wathington, H. D., & Waterson, E. (1998). *Perspectives on the climate for diversity: Findings and suggested recommendations for the Texas A & M University campus community*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(3), 279–302.

Idígoras, J. I. T. (1994). *Ignatius of Loyola: The pilgrim saint*. (C. M. Buckley, S.J., Trans.). Chicago, IL: Loyola Press.

Israely, J. (2008, December 23). The Pope's Christmas condemnation of transsexuals. *Time*, (Online). Retrieved from http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1868390,00.html

Jennings, T. (2010a). "Out" gay and lesbian faculty and the inclusion of sexual orientation topics in teacher preparation programmes in the USA. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *14*(3), 269–287. http://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504531

Jennings, T. (2010b). Teaching "out" in the university: An investigation into the effects of

    lesbian, bisexual, and transgender faculty self-disclosure upon student evaluations of

    faculty teaching effectiveness in the USA. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*,

    14(4), 325–339. http://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504556

Jennings, T. (2012). Sexual orientation topics in educational leadership programmes across the

    USA. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *16*(1), 1–23.

    http://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903518208

Joyce, K. (2014, February 14). LGBT Christian college students fight for a voice. *The Daily

    Beast*. Retrieved from http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/14/lgbt-christian-

    college-students-fight-for-a-voice.html

Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1997). *A Legal guide for student affairs professionals* (1st ed). San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Katzenstein, M. F. (1990). Feminism within American institutions: Unobtrusive mobilization in

    the 1980s. *Signs*, *16*(1), 27–54.

Katzenstein, M. F. (1998). *Faithful and fearless: Moving feminist protest inside the church and

    military*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Katzenstein, M. F. (2010). Protest moves inside institutions. In M. L. Krook & S. Childs (Eds.),

    Women, gender, and politics: A reader (pp. 47–53). New York City: Oxford University

    Press.

Kezar, A. (2012). Organizational change in a global, postmodern world. In M. N. Bastedo (Ed.),

    The organization of higher education: Managing colleges for a new era (Kindle, pp.

    181–224). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2011). *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: An examination of grassroots leaders in higher education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kirkley, E. A., & Getz, C. (2007). A model for sexual orientation education at a religiously affiliated institution. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *4*(3), 113–119. http://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n03_07

Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(6), 593–611. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0061

Kuvalanka, K. A., Goldberg, A. E., & Oswald, R. F. (2013). Incorporating LGBTQ issues into family courses: Instructor challenges and strategies relative to perceived teaching climate. *Family Relations*, *62*(5), 699–713. http://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12034

Lacey, L. J. (1986). *Gay Rights Coalition v. Georgetown University*: Constitutional values on a collision course. *Oregon Law Review*, *64*, 409–455.

Lark, J. S., & Croteau, J. M. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual doctoral students' mentoring relationships with faculty in counseling psychology: A qualitative study. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *26*(5), 754–776. http://doi.org/10.1177/0011000098265004

LaSala, M. C., Jenkins, D. A., Wheeler, D. P., & Fredriksen-Goldsen, K. I. (2008). LGBT faculty, research, and researchers: Risks and rewards. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *20*(3), 253–267. http://doi.org/10.1080/10538720802235351

Lax, J. R., & Phillips, J. H. (2009). Gay rights in the states: Public opinion and policy responsiveness. *American Political Science Review*, *103*(03), 367. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990050

Liddle, B. J., Kunkel, M. A., Kick, S. L., & Hauenstein, A. L. (1998). The gay, lesbian, and

    bisexual psychology faculty experience: A concept map. *Teaching of Psychology*, *25*(1),

    19.

Longerbeam, S. D., Inkelas, K. K., Johnson, D. R., & Lee, Z. S. (2007). Lesbian, gay, and

    bisexual college student experiences: An exploratory   study. *Journal of College Student*

    Development, *48*(2), 215–230. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0017

Love, P. G. (1997). Contradiction and paradox: Attempting to change the culture of sexual

    orientation at a small Catholic college. *Review of Higher Education*, *20*(4), 381–98.

Love, P. G. (1998). Cultural barriers facing lesbian, gay, and bisexual students at a Catholic

    college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(3), 298–323.

    http://doi.org/10.2307/2649190

Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view* (2nd ed.). New York City: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maher, M. J. (2003). Some background on addressing the topic of homosexuality in Catholic

    education. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, *6*(4), 498–515.

Maher, M. J. (2004). Catholic high school students' attitudes toward homosexuality: A snapshot

    of incoming college freshmen. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*,

    7(4). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce/vol7/iss4/4

Maher, M. J., & Sever, L. M. (2007). What educators in Catholic schools might expect when

    addressing gay and lesbian issues: A study of needs and barriers. *Journal of Gay &*

    Lesbian Issues in Education, *4*(3), 79–111. http://doi.org/10.1300/J367v04n03_06

Maher, M. J., Sever, L. M., & Pichler, S. (2008). How Catholic college students think about

    homosexuality: The connection between authority and sexuality. *Journal of*

    Homosexuality, *55*(3), 325–349. http://doi.org/10.1080/00918360802345065

Marine, S. (2011). Stonewall's legacy: Bisexual, gay, lesbian, and transgender students in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *37*(4), 1–145. http://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.3704

Martin, J. I. (1996). Gay and lesbian faculty in social work. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *3*(4), 1–12. http://doi.org/10.1300/J041v03n04_01

McCarthy, J. (2014, May 21). Same-Sex Marriage Support Reaches New High at 55%. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/169640/sex-marriage-support-reaches-new-high.aspx

McDonough, P. M. (2002). Resisting common injustice: Tenure politics, department politics, gay and lesbian politics. In J. E. Cooper & D. D. Stevens (Eds.), *Tenure in the Sacred Grove: Issues and Strategies for Women and Minority Faculty* (pp. 127–143). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

McEntarfer, H. K. (2011). "Not going away": Approaches used by students, faculty, and staff members to create gay–straight alliances at three religiously affiliated universities. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *8*(4), 309–331. http://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2011.607623

McKevitt, S.J., G. (1991). Jesuit higher education in the United States. *Mid-America: An Historical Review*, *73*(3), 209–226.

McNeill, J. J. (1993). *The Church and the homosexual* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. New York City: Guilford Press.

Messinger, L. (2011). A qualitative analysis of faculty advocacy on LGBT issues on campus. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*(9), 1281–1305. http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.605740

Meyer, I. H., & Wilson, P. A. (2009). Sampling lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(1), 23–31. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014587

Meyerson, D. E. (2003). *Tempered radicals: How everyday leaders inspire change at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Meyerson, D. E. (2008). *Rocking the boat: How to effect change without making trouble*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Montgomery, S. A., & Stewart, A. J. (2012). Privileged allies in lesbian and gay rights activism: Gender, generation, and resistance to heteronormativity. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(1), 162–177. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01742.x

Mumby, D. K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organization studies: A dialectical approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*(1), 19–44. http://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276558

National Conference of Catholic Bishops, & Bishops' Committee on Marriage and Family. (1997). *Always our children: A pastoral message to parents of homosexual children and suggestions for pastoral ministers*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Notre Dame announces plans for LGBT student organization after extensive push. (2012, December 5). *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/05/notre-dame-gay-student-organization_n_2245695.html

O'Loughlin, M. (2013, June 18). Being gay at a Catholic university. *Religion & Politics*. St. Louis, MO. Retrieved from http://religionandpolitics.org/

Ottenritter, N. (2012). Crafting a caring and inclusive environment for LGBTQ community college students, faculty, and staff. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *36*(7), 531–538. http://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2012.664094

Pappas, C., Mendez, J., & Herrick, R. (2009). The negative effects of populism on gay and lesbian rights. *Social Science Quarterly*, *90*(1), 150–163. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00608.x

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Penrod, J., Preston, D. B., Cain, R. E., & Starks, M. T. (2003). A discussion of chain referral as a method of sampling hard-to-reach populations. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, *14*(2), 100–107. http://doi.org/10.1177/1043659602250614

Perlis, S. M., & Shapiro, J. P. (2001, November). *Understanding interconnections between cultural differences: A social justice imperative for educational administrators.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED467730

Pope John Paul II. (1990). *Ex Corde Ecclesiae: Apostolic Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on Catholic Universities*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/

Raeburn, N. C. (2004a). *Changing corporate America from inside out: Lesbian and gay workplace rights* (Kindle). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Raeburn, N. C. (2004b). Working it out: The emergence and diffusion of the workplace

    movement for lesbian, gay, and bisexual rights. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts*

    and Change, *25*, 187–230. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-786X(04)25008-X

Rankin, S. R. (2006). LGBTQA students on campus: Is higher education making the grade?

    Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, *3*(2-3), 111–117.

    http://doi.org/10.1300/J367v03n02_11

Rankin, S. R., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education*

    for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride.

    Retrieved from www.campuspride.org

Renn, K. A. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay,

    bisexual, transgender, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal*

    of College Student Development, *48*(3), 311–330. http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0029

Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the

    field. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(2), 132–141.

    http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10362579

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. (2005a). Queer student leaders: An exploratory case study of

    identity development and LGBT student involvement at a Midwestern research

    university. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *2*(4), 49–71.

    http://doi.org/10.1300/J367v02n04_04

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. L. (2005b). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay,

    bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *NASPA Journal*, *42*(3), 342–367.

Revilla, A. T. (2010). Raza Womyn—Making it safe to be queer: Student organizations as retention tools in higher education. *Black Women, Gender & Families*, *4*(1). http://doi.org/10.1353/bwg.0.0017

Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (1997). Academic Capitalism, Managed Professionals, and Supply-Side Higher Education. *Social Text*, (51), 9–38. http://doi.org/10.2307/466645

Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Coming out in college: The struggle for a queer identity*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Black, M. A. (1995). Student affairs practitioners as transformative educators: Advancing a critical cultural perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, *36*(5), 413–21.

Rojas, F. (2012). Social movements and the university. In M. N. Bastedo (Ed.), *The organization of higher education: Managing colleges for a new era* (Kindle, pp. 256–277). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Russell, G. M., & Horne, S. G. (2009). Finding equilibrium: Mentoring, sexual orientation, and gender identity. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *40*(2), 194–200. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0011860

Russ, T., Simonds, C., & Hunt, S. (2002). Coming out in the classroom...an occupational hazard?: The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. *Communication Education*, *51*(3), 311–324. http://doi.org/10.1080/03634520216516

Ryan, M., Broad, K. L., Walsh, C. F., & Nutter, K. L. (2013). Professional allies: The storying of allies to LGBTQ students on a college campus. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(1), 83–104. http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.735942

Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. (1975). *Persona Humana: Declaration on certain questions concerning sexual ethics*. Vatican City: Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/

Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. (1986). *Letter to the bishops of the Catholic Church on the pastoral care of homosexual persons*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers [Kindle Ed.]* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sanlo, R. L. (2000). The LGBT campus resource center director: The new profession in student affairs. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *37*(3). http://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1113

Sanlo, R. L., Rankin, S., & Schoenberg, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Our place on campus: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender services and programs in higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Santoro, W. A., & McGuire, G. M. (1997). Social movement insiders: The impact of institutional activists on affirmative action and comparable worth policies. *Social Problems*, *44*, 503.

Schneider, K. T. (1996). *Bystander stress: The effect of organizational tolerance of sexual harassment on victims' coworkers* (Dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana-Champaign, IL. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2142/23259

Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *32*(4), 493–511. http://doi.org/10.2307/2392880

Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *43*(1), 11–37. http://doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01_02

Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, *58*(3/4), 179–191. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2011). Markets in higher education: Trends in academic capitalism. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd ed, pp. 433–464). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spadaro, S.J., A. (2013, September 30). A big heart open to God. *America Magazine*, (Online). Retrieved from http://americamagazine.org/pope-interview

Spencer, K. (2013, July 30). A rainbow over Catholic colleges: How Georgetown became a gay-friendly campus. *The New York Times*. New York City. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/

St. Ignatius of Loyola. (1991). Selections from the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus. In G. E. Ganss (Ed.), *Ignatius of Loyola: The Spiritual Exercises and selected works* (Reprinted, pp. 271–321). New York City: Paulist Press.

Sullivan, G., & Losberg, W. (2003). A study of sampling in research in the field of lesbian and gay studies. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *15*(1-2), 147–162. http://doi.org/10.1300/J041v15n01_10

Swank, E., & Fahs, B. (2012). Resources, social networks, and collective action frames of

    college students who join the gay and lesbian rights movement. *Journal of*

    Homosexuality, *59*(1), 67–89. http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.614908

Swank, E., Woodford, M. R., & Lim, C. (2013). Antecedents of pro-LGBT advocacy among

    sexual minority and heterosexual college students. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*,

    10(4), 317–332. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-013-0136-3

Taylor, V., & Raeburn, N. C. (1995). Identity politics as high-risk activism: Career consequences

    for lesbian, gay, and bisexual Sociologists. *Social Problems*, *42*(2), 252–273.

    http://doi.org/10.2307/3096904

Tetreault, P. A., Fette, R., Meidlinger, P. C., & Hope, D. (2013). Perceptions of campus climate

    by sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(7), 947–964.

    http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.774874

Tierney, W. G. (1992). Building academic communities of difference. *Change*, *24*(2), 40.

Tolbert, P. S., & Hall, R. H. (2009). *Organizations: Structures, processes, and outcomes* (10th

    ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An

    exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student*

    Affairs Research and Practice, *49*(4), 429–446.

Vaccaro, A., & Mena, J. A. (2011). It's not burnout, it's more: Queer college activists of color

    and mental health. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, *15*(4), 339–367.

    http://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2011.600656

Vaserfirer, A. (2012). (In)visibility in lesbian and gay student organizing: The case of Gay

    Student Services. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *59*(4), 610–627.

    http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.665706

Waldo, C. R., & Kemp, J. L. (1997). Should I come out to my students? An empirical

    investigation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *34*(2), 79–94.

    http://doi.org/10.1300/J082v34n02_04

Washington, J., & Evans, N. J. (1991). Becoming an ally. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.),

    Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians and bisexuals on campus (pp. 195–204). Alexandria,

    VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative*

    Science Quarterly, *21*(1), 1–19. http://doi.org/10.2307/2391875

Weick, K. E. (1984). Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. *American*

    Psychologist, *39*(1), 40–49. http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.39.1.40

Weick, K. E. (2000). Emergent change as a universal in organizations. In M. Beer & N. Nohria

    (Eds.), *Breaking the code of change* (pp. 223–241). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of*

    Psychology, *50*(1), 361–386. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.361

Wilkinson, W. W., & Sagarin, B. J. (2010). Psychological antecedents of heterosexuals' pro-gay

    activism behavior. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *57*(7), 878–894.

    http://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2010.494908

Wolff, J. R., & Himes, H. L. (2010). Purposeful exclusion of sexual minority youth in Christian

    higher education: The implications of discrimination. *Christian Higher Education*, *9*(5),

    439–460.

Wolff, J. R., Himes, H. L., Kwon, E. M., & Bollinger, R. A. (2012). Evangelical Christian
college students and attitudes toward gay rights: A California university sample. *Journal
of LGBT Youth*, *9*(3), 200–224.

Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Twombly, S. B., Nemeth Tuttle, K., & Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2004).
Reflecting back, looking forward: Civil rights and student affairs. Washington, DC:
NASPA.

Woodford, M. R., Howell, M. L., Kulick, A., & Silverschanz, P. (2013). "That's so gay":
Heterosexual male undergraduates and the perpetuation of sexual orientation
microagressions on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *28*(2), 416–435.
http://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512454719

Woodford, M. R., Howell, M. L., Silverschanz, P., & Yu, L. (2012). "That's so gay!":
Examining the covariates of hearing this expression among gay, lesbian, and bisexual
college students. *Journal of American College Health*, *60*(6), 429.
http://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2012.673519

Woodford, M. R., Silverschanz, P., Swank, E., Scherrer, K. S., & Raiz, L. (2012). Predictors of
heterosexual college students' attitudes toward LGBT people. *Journal of LGBT Youth*,
9(4), 297–320. http://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2012.716697

Yarhouse, M. A., Stratton, S. P., Dean, J. B., & Brooke, H. L. (2009). Listening to sexual
minorities on Christian college campuses. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, *37*(2), 96–
113.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:
SAGE.

Yoakam, J. (2006). Resources for gay and bisexual students in a Catholic college. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *14*(3), 311–321. http://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1403.311

Yoshino, K. (2006). *Covering: The hidden assault on our civil rights*. New York City: Random House.

Zald, M. N., & Berger, M. A. (1978). Social movements in organizations: Coup d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(4), 823–861.

Zaltman, G., & Duncan, R. (1977). *Strategies for planned change*. New York City: Wiley.