3-4-2008

The Interrelatedness of Homosexual Identity Development and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Students at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus

Frederic Drury Baker
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd

Part of the American Studies Commons

Scholar Commons Citation
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/127

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.
The Interrelatedness of Homosexual Identity Development and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Students at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus

by

Frederic Drury Baker

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education
College of Education
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Michael Mills, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Thomas Miller, Ed.D.
Donald Dellow, Ed.D.
James King, Ed.D.

Date of Approval:
March 4, 2008

Keywords: Education, Environment, Queer, Questioning, GIQ

© Copyright, 2008, Frederic Drury Baker
Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of many individuals. Collectively, they have supported, challenged, listened, and advised me throughout this incredible process. For their contributions towards this effort, I would like to extend sincere thanks to the following individuals:

To the Co-chairs of my dissertation committee, Dr. Michael Mills and Dr. Thomas Miller, and the members of my committee, Dr. Donald Dellow and Dr. Thomas King; thank you for support, suggestions, advisement, and patience.

To my friend, Dr. Patricia Van Den Berg, for her assistance with the statistical analysis and the support of my overall study.

To Dr. Stephen Brady, who allowed me to use the GIQ for this study free of charge.

To the graduate students in the Department of Research and Measurement for their assistance in statistical analysis.

To my friends at Keeling and Associates, LLC for the use of internet survey software necessary to complete the study.

To my friend and colleague Dorie Paine, who went through the process a year before me and advised me well.

To my many friends and colleagues in Tampa and across the nation who supported me through the process; who listened when frustrations mounted, and who celebrate the completion of this process with me. Valerie, Tom, Rob, Lance, Todd, Kevin, Mike, David, and Sperl.

To my family, immediate and extended, for your constant love, support, and reassurance throughout my doctoral process.
Dedication

This dissertation study is dedicated to my parents, Francis Wayne Baker and Marion Drury Baker. As professional educators their entire lives, they instilled a love of learning in all their children, and emphasized the value of education not only for our personal betterment, but for the advancement of society as a whole. My entire life, my parents have sacrificed their money, time and energy to support the educational needs and goals not only of their children, but their 6 grandchildren as well. The unconditional love and dedication to family has been demonstrated consistently throughout their lives, which positively impacted not only the immediate family members but all those who associate with the Baker family.

I am eternally grateful for the understanding, enlightenment, and unquestioning devotion my parents have shown me throughout my life. It is this devotion that has empowered me to stretch beyond my boundaries and tackle lofty goals such as completing a doctoral degree. Completion of this journey would not have happened without you.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables iii

Abstract v

Chapter One - Introduction 1
  Introduction 1
  Conceptual Framework 4
  Population and Sample 8
  Problem Statement 8
  Significance of Study 10
  Research Questions 12
  Delimitations 12
  Limitations 12

Chapter Two - Review of the Literature 14
  Introduction 14
  Literature Regarding Campus Climate 14
  Literature Regarding Identity development 28

Chapter Three - Method 38
  Introduction 38
  Research Questions 38
  Research Design 38
  Population and Sample 39
  Variables 40
  Instruments/Measures 40
  Reliability Measures for This Sample 45
  Data Collection Procedures 47
  Data Analysis Procedures 48
  Threats to Reliability, Validity, and Generalizability 49

Chapter Four - Results 51
  Introduction 51
  Demographic Information of Respondents 51
  Research Question One- What are Perceptions Among GLBT Students of the Campus Climate for GLBT students? 54
Research Question Two – Is Campus Climate for GLBT Students at USF Perceived Differently by Heterosexual, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, or Transgender Students? 61
Research Question Three- Does the Identity Level of GLB Students Relate to the Perceptions of Campus Climate? 68
Validation of Gay Identity Questionnaire for Identity Levels One and Two 74

Chapter Five – Implications 76

Introduction/Summary 76
Conclusions 77
Implications 78
Recommendations for Practice 80
Recommendation for Further Research 85

References 89

Appendices 95
Appendix A: Assessment of Campus Climate for GLBT Students 96
Appendix B: Gay Identity Questionnaire 99

About the Author End Page
List of Tables

Table 1  Reliability measure for the campus climate survey 46
Table 2  Reliability measures for the gay identity questionnaire (GIQ) 46
Table 3  Demographic characteristics of respondents 52
Table 4  Living arrangements of respondents 53
Table 5  Number and percents of GLBTQ group members who responded yes to questions regarding campus experiences 55
Table 6  Percents of GLBTQ group who responded very unlikely through very likely to questions on feelings about campus climate 56
Table 7  Percents of GLBTQ group who responded strongly agree through strongly disagree to questions regarding feelings about campus responses 58
Table 8  Distribution of responses by factors 63
Table 9  Data of feelings about campus climate by sexual orientation identified 64
Table 10 Analysis of variance for campus climate feelings by sexual orientation identified 65
Table 11 ANOVA of feelings about campus climate by sexual orientation with larger mean in group one 65
Table 12 Distribution of campus responses to discrimination by sexual orientation 66
Table 13 Analysis of variance for campus responses to discrimination by sexual orientation 67
Table 14 ANOVA of campus responses to discrimination by sexual orientation with larger mean in group one 67
Table 15 Identity level by self identified sexual orientation 69
### Climate perceptions/Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 16</td>
<td>Mean scores for feelings about campus climate by identity stage</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 17</td>
<td>ANOVA for campus climate feelings by identity stage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 18</td>
<td>ANOVA for campus climate feelings by identity stage Contrasted</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 19</td>
<td>Mean scores for administrative responses to GLBT issues by identity level</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 20</td>
<td>ANOVA for campus responses by identity stages</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 21</td>
<td>ANOVA for campus responses by identity stages contrasted</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 22</td>
<td>Identity stage reliability scores and number of respondents</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interrelatedness of Homosexual Identity Development and Perceptions of Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Students at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus

by Frederic Drury Baker

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of campus climate at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender students. Specifically, the study determined if there was any relationship between level of homosexual identity development acquired and perceptions of campus climate. If a relationship existed, it would influence the way that campus climate perceptions would be analyzed in future studies.

The population was the undergraduate student body at the University of South Florida taking at least six credit hours in the fall semester 2007. An online survey was created with two instruments that have been validated in previous studies, one on campus climate and one that identified identity level. The campus instrument was completed by all respondents, while only those self identifying as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or questioning were directed to the identity level instrument.

Of the 31,030 email solicitations sent out to eligible students, 2345 students responded and completed the survey. Of those, 228 were from gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning students. Research questions sought to reveal the campus climate perceptions of GLBTQ students; to determine if perceptions varied between gay, lesbian,
bisexual, questioning, and heterosexual students; and to determine if there was a relationship between homosexual identity development and perceptions of campus climate.

Conclusions of the study include perceptions of campus climate at USF are more positive than those reported in the results of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Study conducted by Rankin (2003). Additionally, administrative responses to GLBT issues are not visible to students. The research also noted that significant differences exist between the perceptions of campus climate for GLBTQ students between the heterosexual and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning students. Finally, the level of homosexual identity development attained has a significant relationship with perceptions of campus climate.

The results of this study will impact the focus and delivery of student services, training, and diversity initiatives at the university. Future opportunities for advancing the knowledge of the subject matter include further development of the GIQ identity development instrument, and expanding the question of identity development and campus climate perceptions to a nationwide study.
Chapter One

Introduction

*Introduction*

College and University administrators have been continually challenged with meeting the needs of an ever-changing student population. For most of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, higher education was made available to an increasingly diverse student population. With these population shifts also came great change in the campus environment for students. Students who have never been exposed to different cultures, races, and religions are suddenly living, learning and working together. Additionally, societal evolution has increased the visibility of groups that were previously hidden, such as gay students; men whose primary sexual preference are men; lesbian students, women whose primary sexual preference are women, bisexual students; those who do not identify a specific sexual gender preference; and transgender students; who are biologically one gender but who identify as being of another gender. These non heterosexual students have been clustered together in acronyms that often alter the order of the groups, such as GLBT and LGBT.

Higher education administrators make decisions each day in an effort to support learning at their institutions. Many of these decisions influence the campus climate of the institution. Campus climate has been described by Bauer (1998) as “the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members” (p.2).
Kuh, Pace, & Vesper’s (1997) national study demonstrated that the social and relational environment of the campus has significant influence on students’ mastery of general education skills, as well as an understanding of the arts, literature, and humanities. Covering 75 institutions of varying type, the impact was also significant when controlling for such variables as academic preparation, socio-economic status, and other environmental factors.

A positive perception of the academic environment within the classroom is a strong indicator of student success and learning (Hirschy & Wilson, 2002). To ensure that students are challenged academically and personally, institutions need to develop and sustain learning environments that challenge, redefine and affirm new perceptions of identity, cultivate student leaders, and foster a sense of community (Tatum, 2004). Additionally, it has been found that students who participate in a classroom that is considered safe increased the range and depth of the topics they learned (Holley & Steiner, 2005).

The increase in diversity in the American higher education system has impacted the campus climate of higher education institutions across the country. Demographic shifts within institutions have resulted in newly visible, substantial populations of students whose academic and developmental needs are different from the perceptions derived from more a traditional view of student populations. Rankin (2003) described the term heterosexism as” the assumption of the inherent superiority of heterosexuality, an obliviousness to the lives and experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people, and the presumption that all people are, or should be, heterosexual (p.6).
The impact of heterosexism has been documented on college campuses. Several studies have shown that the campus climate for GLBT students is particularly unwelcoming, prejudicial, and even hostile (Rankin, 2003; McRee & Cooper, 1998; Malaney, Williams, & Geller 1997). Rankin (2003) conducted a large, comprehensive study that included participation from 10 campuses across the country; while McRee & Cooper (1998) and Malaney, Williams, and Geller (1997) studied institutions within the southeast and northeast regions, respectively. All of these studies reported a less than satisfactory campus environment for GLBT students.

Previous studies on campus climate for GLBT students (Clark, 2002; Rankin, 2003; Noack, 2004) have focused on the need for a supportive and welcoming university climate in order to assist students’ education and personal growth. While these studies were significant in informing the public of issues that GLBT students face, this and other studies failed to examine the identity development level of participants and determine the impact that each level had on the perceptions of campus climate. This study will measure the campus climate, while also identifying the self-reported level of homosexual identity development of respondents as theorized by Cass. Statistical analyses of the interrelatedness of identity development and campus climate perceptions will determine if there is empirical support for such a relationship. If a relationship is found, it will provide a new frame in which to review campus climate and ways to improve it. With identity theory serving as a framework for how a person orients his or her self to the world, it is critical that how he or she views the world is taken into consideration when assessing data on perceptions of campus environment.
Negative learning and climate perceptions affect all students; however, repercussions are especially significant for students who identify as GLBT, as traditional age college students are at a critical time in development of their sexual identity (Levine and Evans, 1991). The importance of identity development has been noted by leading psychosocial theorists such as Chickering and Reisser (1993) who include identity development as an individual factor of growth within their seven vector model. Specific to the GLBT community, recent theorists have furthered the understanding of the identity process, and outlined environmental factors that contribute to it (Cass, 1979, Troiden, 1979, D’Augelli, 1994).

**Conceptual Framework**

Person environment theories attempt to explain the impact that physical, social, organizational, and cultural constructions have on individual and group behavior. A theory extensively cited within student affairs research was proposed by Kurt Lewin (1936). Lewin’s theory can be described simply as behavior is a function of a person interacting with the environment. Since its inception, it has been utilized as student development, or psychosocial theories, developed in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Scholarly work, including Chickering & Reisser’s (1993) seven vectors of development, and Perry’s(1970) cognitive development model, have been developed by incorporating the environment and development into one theory.

Rodgers (1990) has restated Lewin’s original model and incorporated a developmental theory within its parameters. The expanded theory can be expressed by:

\[ Bp = f (Pd \times Es). \]
With these additions, $B_p$ is the probability of facilitating growth within a specific type of development. $P_d$ is the developmental level of a person in a given developmental area, and $E_s$ is the external stimuli of the environment attributed to the developmental component being assessed according to the theory (p 32). For the purposes of this study, the equation was read as follows:

$$(B_p) = \text{the probability of facilitating homosexual identity development is a } (f) \text{ function of the } (P_d) \text{ level of homosexual identity development acquired by a student and that student’s interaction within the environment } (E_s).$$

This enhanced version of Lewin’s theory will use an identity development model to evaluate the current level of identity assimilation achieved. Identity development models for gay, lesbian, and bisexual people have been developed by many theorists (Cass, 1979, Troiden, 1979, D’Augelli, 1994). These models vary in their influence of psychological and sociological forces on identity development, as well as the framework in which to explain identity growth. Evans, Forney, & Guido-Debrito (1998) describe the two most researched models as being Cass’s (1979) stage model and D’Augelli’s (1994) interactive processes model. Cass’s model describes six stages of identity acceptance and acclimation, while D’Augelli concentrates on the processes that interact over time and are constantly shifting. While both models have merit, Cass’s model has been validated by research studies (Cass, 1984; Brady & Busse, 1994) with more than one acceptable measurement instrument documented. Additionally, Cass is accepted as a leading homosexual identity theory by respected scholars (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).
Therefore, Cass’s model of identity development will serve as the theoretical benchmark for this study.

Cass’ (1979) model is based on the framework of interpersonal congruence theory. Movement through the stages is achieved when the incongruence between behaviors and current sense of identity is rectified, resulting in reassignment of ones sexual identity over stages. Progress through the stages can be stopped at any stage through a condition labeled “identity foreclosure” (p.223) where the incongruence is rectified by retreat from identity growth, denying further progress within the model.

The model is comprised of six stages, which are sequential in nature. The initial stage, identity confusion, is where the first homosexual thoughts and feelings are realized. This process begins with individuals acknowledging that their behavior may be considered homosexual. After a period of self questioning, if positive feelings remain, the person moves to stage two, identity comparison. During this stage, the inner perception of identity is in conflict with external perceptions of the identity. The person tentatively commits to the possibility of a homosexual self. Positive interactions further growth along the stage, while negative feelings may invoke foreclosure and self-hatred. A heterosexual public image is upheld.

Stage three of this model is identity tolerance. Private self image is tolerated, and contact with a gay community increases, while conflict exists with ones’ public image. Persons in this stage perceive positive acceptance from homosexuals, and begin to move away from contact exclusively with heterosexual counterparts. By the end of the third stage, the subject is capable of saying “I am a homosexual” (p.231). Moving to the
fourth stage, *identity acceptance* is indicated by behavior that validates homosexual identity. Contact with the gay community is frequent, and initial disclosure to select others occurs. Often this stage serves as a comfort zone for subjects. Passing as heterosexual in the outside world is a routine coping strategy, while privately operating as a homosexual within specific subgroups. If this behavior continues, the discourse between self perception as homosexual and the public perception as heterosexual, create a shifting of self perceptions and assimilation. Movement into stage five is likely. If the discourse is low, identity foreclosure occurs and the subject remains in stage four.

The fifth, or *identity pride*, stage is marked by a shift in perception of the heterosexual world to negative in nature, causing a retreat to contacts only with those who are homosexual. Continued negative responses from heterosexual contacts and positive support from homosexual contacts strengthen this belief. This stage is symbolic of activists, who perceive the gay subculture as positive and are seeking to challenge the establishment. After the negativity and anger of stage five subsides, the subject moves into stage six, *identity synthesis*. Common values are seen in both the heterosexual and homosexual worlds, and sexual identity retreats to become merely a part of the entire identity, rather than the main component. The “us” versus “them” mentality no longer dominates (p. 234). This final stage is demonstrated by a fully integrated sense of a homosexual self being seamlessly entrenched into one’s overall identity.

This model has been demonstrated to be an effective portrait of identity for both gay and lesbian populations (Cass, 1984; Brady & Bussey, 1994), and noted to be applicable to the bisexual population as well (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DeBrito, 1998).
The more recently acknowledged group of transgender people has not been significantly discussed in either model, nor tested empirically to date. It is likely that identity development among transgender people will follow a different path. Therefore, this study will not include that subgroup.

Population and Sample

The study took place at the University of South Florida’s Tampa campus, and was open to all undergraduate students who are registered for the fall 2006 semester. The data collected was used to determine how students perceived the campus climate for GLBT members of the campus, and consisted of two instruments. The first was a quantitative measurement to assess campus climate that has been validated nationally; the second survey determined identity level as defined by the Cass (1979) model of identity development. These instruments were administered through the internet, hosted by a server that is not associated with the campus that was studied. Only respondents who self identified as anything other than heterosexual or transgender were directed to the second instrument that determines identity development. Descriptive statistics were reported to determine perceptions of climate, while inferential statistical describe any significant correlation between the identity development of GLB individuals and their perceptions of campus climate.

Problem Statement

National, regional, and local studies have demonstrated that college campus climate’s for GLBT students are less than satisfactory in areas of inclusion, safety, and acceptance (Rankin, 2003, McRee and Cooper, 1998, and Cavendish, 2004). Rankin
(2003) conducted a nationwide study of campus climate at colleges and universities, in conjunction with the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. With its national scope, the study quickly became seen as a benchmark to assess institutional climate perceptions for GLBT students. Noack (2004) utilized a modified version of this instrument to determine the perceptions of climate at Texas A&M, and recently the University of Illinois-Chicago hired Dr. Rankin to conduct a more in depth study in the Spring of 2005 (S.R. Rankin, personal communication, March 17, 2006). In 2002, the University of South Florida (USF) conducted a campus climate survey of faculty and staff administered via the internet with an instrument developed in house prior to the Rankin national study. The results of this study were released in spring 2004 and showed that a majority of respondents felt that the climate of USF was not supportive or even tolerant of GLBT students. Only 42% of the respondents felt that USF provided opportunities to increase understanding of GLBT issues, and 66.7 percent of GLBT respondents felt that they avoided disclosing sexuality for a fear of consequences (Cavendish, 2004). This impacts the institution’s ability to foster a positive learning environment for all its students. While the survey was of great assistance in determining that a problem existed in the eyes of the faculty and staff, the instrument was too broad to properly investigate the factors that may have led GLBT faculty and staff to feel unsupported or even unsafe in being public with their sexual orientation on campus. Additionally, the survey was not administered to students, who make up the largest percentage of any campus population.

What is not known is the current campus climate at the University of South Florida as perceived by GLBT students, and if membership in these particular subgroups
Climate perceptions/Identity

(gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender) has a relationship with the perceptions of campus climate. Additionally, homosexual identity development level as identified by students has not been investigated as a possible factor in perceptions of campus climate at this campus or in previous studies. The work of Vivienne Cass (1979, 1984) has shown that environment plays a central role in the integration of a homosexual identity into one's overall perception of self for gay, lesbian, and possibly bisexual students. Empirical research has validated that point; however, few if any studies have reversed the study, attempting to quantify the relationships between homosexual identity development level and perceptions of the campus climate for GLB students. Transgender students have more complex identity factors that have not been quantified within the Cass model, and will not be included in that inquiry. With a central construct of identity theory being how people orient themselves to the outside world, this concept of identity is likely to have an impact on how one perceives the environment around them.

Significance of Study

In researching the subject of campus climate, key theoretical models and research studies have emerged as significant. The college years are critical in the development of student identity (Chickering and Reiser, 1993) particularly for students who are developing identities as gay, lesbians, and bisexuals (Levine and Evans, 1991). Campus climates that are supportive of underrepresented groups can assist in that development (Rankin, 2003). Particularly, campus climate has been theorized as having a significant impact on the development of homosexual identity development (Cass, 1984, Levine & Evans, 1991). Person-environment theory, complemented by a homosexual identity
development model, provided the theoretical foundation that framed this research project. If a significant relationship between the two theories was established, it will provide a new factor to be considered when analyzing data in future studies. By understanding the current perceptions of campus climate and the developmental levels that shape students perceptions, administrators could develop an intentional program to impact the campus climate and better meet the needs of an often overlooked student population. This will not only enhance the environment for classroom learning, but will assist GLBT students in progressing towards a fully integrated identity as a non heterosexual person.

With institutions of higher education being challenged by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (1995) to create and articulate a commitment to the promotion of diversity, this study served as an indicator of how inclusive GLBT students perceive the USF campus environment to be. Additionally, it identified if gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students perceive the campus climate differently. Finally, it determined if identity development level of students has significant relationship with perceptions of campus climate.

With documented evidence that the social and relational environment impacts students learning and data confirming that the environment at institutions of higher education is less than positive, administrators are obligated to determine the factors that impact campus climate perceptions. Further understanding of these perceptions can lead to the development of a concrete action plan to address the issue of climate, and assist in meeting the educational goals of colleges and universities in the process.
Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions among GLBT students of the campus climate for GLBT students?

2. Is campus climate for GLBT students at USF perceived differently by heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students?

3. Does the identity level of GLB students relate to their perceptions of campus climate?

Delimitations

The populations for which this study will be applicable will be undergraduate college students at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus who are taking at least six credit hours in the fall 2006 term. The instruments assessed the perceptions of campus climate for GLBT students and sought to determine if a relationship exists between subgroup membership, identity development, and perceptions of campus climate. While the instrument and procedures can be replicated elsewhere, the factors that lead to campus climate perceptions are unique to this campus, the time of the study, and student population studied.

Limitations

One significant limitation to the study is that it is dependent on students to self identify and disclose their sexual orientation. Many stigmas are placed upon students who label themselves anything but heterosexual, most of which are negative. Therefore, the ability for students to be completely forthright in their disclosure of sexual identity is not assured, thereby affecting internal validity. Additionally, the sample utilized for
statistical analyses may not be fully representative of the entire population at USF due to the stigmata discussed above. To obtain as representative a sample as possible, the survey was distributed to the entire student population who are enrolled in a minimum of six credit hours. It is expected that students who are more comfortable with their sexual orientation are more likely to participate than those who choose to conceal their orientation, possibly impacting the results, particularly in regards to equal numbers of participants in each of Cass’s six identity levels. Previous studies could not validate the first two stages of Cass’s model due to insufficient numbers of respondents in those categories, so reliability of the GIQ for those stages is unknown. Finally, there is no control over any significant events that may occur on the campus during the time of the study that may have substantial influence on GLBT student’s perception of the campus climate.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Introduction

This section will outline research studies that have been influential on the topics of campus climate in general, campus climate for GLBT students, and identity development of GLB students. First, the importance of campus environments to overall learning will be discussed, followed by studies of climate in general as well as those targeted at specific sub populations within the institution. Greater attention will be focused on the research studies that provide background knowledge to the variables investigated in this study: campus climate perceptions for GLBT students and identity development among GLB students. When appropriate, implications of each study that influenced the design of this investigation will be discussed.

Literature Regarding Campus Climate

The intentional design of learning environments goes beyond the bricks and mortar used to construct the facilities that house classrooms. Student affairs practitioners as a whole have identified serving the needs of all members of the campus community as an ethical practice, embracing diversity rather than narrowing its scope (American College Personnel Association, 1990). Campus climate, as defined by Bauer (1998), is made up “of current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members” (p.2). Intentional efforts to impact the institutional environment must
incorporate an understanding of student motivations and backgrounds in order to be truly successful. To better understand our student population, many institutions of higher education participate in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), described by Cress and Sax (1998) and housed at the University of California at Los Angeles. Initiated in 1966, this annual study of incoming freshman from across the country is used to profile the background characteristics, attitudes, values, educational achievement, and future goals of incoming students (p.65). This longitudinal study tracks trends, slow and/or rapid change, and is used in determining the expectations and perceptions that students have regarding their upcoming college experience.

Historically, non heterosexuals have been operating in unsafe environments. In the United States, growing political unrest and violence against gay citizens caused the federal government to enact legislation that would track violence acts perpetrated due to sexual orientation (Comstock, 1991). For the college student, the perceptions of feeling safe are two fold. Students have a need to feel safe from physical harm, and also feel respected by their peers within the educational setting to fully interact within the learning environment (Holley & Steiner, 2005). The value of a positive campus environment, particularly the social and relational aspects, has been shown to be a significant indicator of student learning. Kuh et al (1997) studied educational process indicators that impacted students by motivating them to spend more time in behaviors known to support learning. Results included the fact that cooperation among students, a key factor in the definition of campus climate, was a significant indicator of student gains in this study. Without a
safe, inclusive, cooperative learning environment, GLBT student’s ability to realize those learning gains will be compromised.

Another key consideration when discussing learning and environment is safety. Physical safety within the campus environment is a critical issue for GLBT students. Finn and McNeil (1987) reported that gay and lesbian people are more often targeted for hate crimes than other underrepresented groups. The environment outside our campuses creates an assumption that the campus climate is similar. Unless steps are taken to demonstrate that campus climates are more accepting than general society, student learning will be impacted. Holley and Steiner (2005) studied the characteristics of faculty, peers, the physical building, and self that influenced a feeling of safety, or a feeling of insecurity, within the classroom. Findings suggested that developing guidelines for classroom interaction that are based on respect for individual views and open discussions foster the type of environment that a majority of students will find safe. The researchers note that striving for a safe classroom may be unachievable due to the wide diversity of students and attitudes; however, the pursuit of a “safer” (p.61) classroom is a goal that should be given priority.

The importance of a positive campus environment was studied by Cheng (2004), who sought to gain insight into community at a private institution in New York City. The survey was web based, contained twenty six questions, and was administered to freshman through juniors within the colleges of arts and sciences as well as engineering. The dependent variable was the statement “there is a strong sense of campus community at this institution” (p.220) and student responses varied on a four point scale to each
question. Thirty eight percent of the eligible students participated in the study. Cheng focused his inquiry on two main questions: What defines students’ sense of community, and what can educators and administrators do to build community on campus?

The results were analyzed in a three part process, including descriptive statistics to demonstrate overall reactions to specific aspects of campus life. A second process included an exploratory factor analysis to determine underlying dimensions of community issues. Finally, multiple regressions were run to examine the relationships between community associated variables and students overall sense of campus community. Results indicated that for students to feel a sense of community, they require to be treated in a caring way, to be valued as individuals, as well as being accepted as a part of the community (p.227). The largest negative influence on a student’s sense of community was a feeling of loneliness. The researcher challenges administrators to engage students and faculty in learning, foster positive relationships among ethnic groups, and provide an open environment where free expression is encouraged and respected.

Campus climate, especially in terms of studies of diverse populations, is a hot topic on many campuses (Shenkle, Snyder, and Bauer, 1998). Studies have involved assessing the entire campus for cultural diversity sensitivity (Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, & Der-Karabetian, 2000), and individual campus or specific cultural subgroups (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Noack, 2004; Rankin 2003; Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Clark 2002). Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, clear information about minority experiences within institutions of higher learning is discussed. These studies describe multiple experiences
within a similar context for members of unique and separate minority groups. While each study is unique in design and sample, specific perceptions of campus climate are clearly similar.

Using a mixed methods approach, Morrow, Burris-Kitchen, & Der-Karabetian (2000) studied climate at the University of LaVerne, with the intention of obtaining specific insight into climate perceptions among various minority groups. The researchers used quantitative data obtained by two measures: the ACT student survey and a locally designed instrument to assess the climate for diversity. One question was taken from the ACT survey that specifically asked “how satisfied are you with the racial harmony at this college?” Results showed 77% of the faculty and student respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with racial harmony on campus. Significant differences were noted in the way that individual racial groups experienced discrimination, with Blacks and Latino’s finding race more of a barrier than Caucasian students. A second portion of this study used qualitative focus groups in an effort to complement and enhance the qualitative data. The researchers found that the data obtained from focus groups supported the statistics generated quantitatively, and added to the understanding of the statistics due to specific examples of why students answered questions the way that they did.

While several minority groups have documented less than ideal campus environments for their specific group, unique issues are presented within the GLBT community. GLBT students are often faced with being a member of two minority groups: one based on race, another by sexual orientation. Evans and Wall (1991) describe the nuances of GLBT student experiences in areas such as residence halls, Greek
organizations and GLBT student organizations, as well as address secondary issues of race and gender that magnify GLBT issues. Race and sexuality issues are present at historically black colleges and universities (Black issues in higher education, 2002) as well as traditionally white universities. Rasmussen (2004) discusses the choices people of two minorities make in regards to going public with their sexuality. Akanke, who wrote of her experience as a student who was black and gay explained: “Being closeted is not a choice I wish to make. Nevertheless, because of the pervasiveness of racism, it is one that I choose to make. Being black, however, is not a choice” (as cited in Rasmusen, 2004).

It has been documented that GLBT students face an unsafe campus climate at universities across the country (McRee & Cooper, 1998; Rankin 2003). Hurtado, Carter, and Kardia (1998) explain that students within this population are subject to a hostile campus climate, and reported the following problems as presented by DeVries and LaSalle (1993): fears for their physical safety, frequent occurrences of disparaging remarks, anti gay graffiti, and a high degree of false information and stereotypes in student attitudes. Additionally, they noted the lack of visibility of gay role models, conflicts in class regarding the topic of sexual orientation or responses to it when a student comes out in class, and students feeling as if they need to censor themselves in classroom environments or academic activities for fear of repercussions. Finally, they noted a lack of integration of sexual orientation into the curriculum, and a lack of institutional policies addressing these climates issues coupled with a lack of awareness of such policies when they do exist.
The issues faced by GLBT students on college campuses are unique to their minority group, and therefore have attracted the attention of a number of researchers. Perhaps the most well known study was conducted by Rankin (2003). This nationwide survey of campus climate for GLBT students was sponsored by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF). Thirty institutions were solicited to participate in the survey, with fourteen actually completing the entire process. Four of the institutions were private, ten were public. All the institutions had visible GLBT centers located within the campus. 1,669 total surveys were received from students, faculty, and staff/administrators, both online and in paper formats. The instrument consisted of thirty six quantitative questions, with a mix of likert and check box questions. Additionally, one open ended question asked for any suggestions to improve campus climate at that particular institution. At the conclusion of the study, Rankin completed a factor analysis.

Within the theme of lived oppressive experiences, results showed that fifty one percent of respondents failed to disclose their sexual orientation for fear of repercussions, and nineteen percent feared for their physical safety due to their sexual orientation gender identity (Rankin, 2003, p 24). Under perceptions of anti GLBT oppression on campus, thirty six percent of GLBT undergraduate students reported that they have experienced harassment within the past year for being GLBT. Finally, under institution actions, forty one percent of respondents indicated that the campus was not addressing issues of sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Rankin study was part of a long term project through the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, which began gathering data on campus climate in 1988. The 2003
study was one of the largest and most comprehensive studies on the subject, and Dr. Rankin has adapted this instrument for use at other institutions and in several dissertation studies. Due to the scope of this nationwide study, follow up projects have used these national figures as benchmarks for comparisons with their own institutions (Noack, 2004).

Noack (2004) studied the campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students at Texas A&M University as perceived by the faculty and staff of the institution. The study sought to identify and describe the current campus climate and look at differences in perceptions based on university position, demographic subgroup, and the amount of interaction with members of the GLBT community. Surveying a random sample of administrators, faculty, and professional staff, she administered a standard measure of campus climate for minorities, *the assessment of climate for underrepresented groups*, developed by Susan R. Rankin, PhD (p.iii). Out of 1020 surveys distributed, the response rate was forty seven percent.

Findings included that, when compared to standardized national campus climate figures, Texas A&M’s climate was more negative for these students. Additionally, significant interactions between race and perception of climate of GLBT students were noted, indicating experiences were also influenced by being a member of a racial and sexual minority. Finally, this research confirmed that an individual’s attitudes and behaviors towards GLBT persons were positively influenced by the frequency of contact that person had with members of the targeted population.

Campus climate was also studied at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell (UML). Clark (2002) interviewed both students and faculty in order to ascertain the
climate for GLBT students and to determine any progress within the climate from an earlier study, which concluded the invisibility of the GLBT population contributed to the homophobia on campus. Since 1994, several initiatives had helped erase that invisibility, including the establishment of a GLBT center on campus, a gay straight employee network, and a safe zone program to educate faculty and staff about how to provide resources for GLBT students.

To measure the changes in climate, twelve faculty/staff and eight students participated in interviews, which sought information in five general campus climate areas: feelings of acceptance and inclusion; respect; visibility; fairness; and safety. The sample population was chosen based on two criteria: because their were known to be GLBT or GLBT allies, or they held pivotal positions within the university that impacted campus climate, as staff from residence life, campus police, counseling center, athletics, student activities, as well as faculty members. Students were selected for the study after responding to a call for participants advertised throughout campus and through the student GLBT group, Spectrum. Interviews were completed during the summer and fall of 2001. The sample proved to be strongly female, with only two of twelve students and one of eight faculty/staff members identifying as male (p.19).

The results indicate that, overall, the campus was judged to be reasonably supportive of the GLBT community and students felt that the climate was accepting despite the fact that several anti-gay incidents occurred while the data was being collected. The researcher explains these incidents as a backlash to the growing visibility of the GLBT population on the campus. The incidents were viewed as random acts of
graffiti that were not targeted at individuals. The university administration or student government offered no formal response to the series of backlash incidents. Ironically, despite the acts, most students described the climate as satisfactory, and felt that university officials were supportive.

Climate studies have also been done within the southeastern region of the country. McRee & Cooper (1998) studied the campus environment for GLB students at public and private institutions with the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) region three. Transgender student issues were not included in the sample. The authors developed surveys that were then modified by five chief student affairs officers outside of region three. Survey questions were a series of open-ended quantitative questions with an opportunity for open-ended responses afforded beneath each quantitative response. The anonymous instrument was mailed to voting delegates at each of the 262 institutions within the region. 122 surveys were returned, for a 46.5% return rate.

Variables studied included location and activity level of organizations: use of campus resources, campus funding, academic support, contact with faculty and staff, GLBT organizations relationship to other departments, availability of printed resources, number of hate crimes, and non discrimination statements. Results for selected variables studied are outlined as follows:

**Campus funding:** Institutional funding was reported by sixty four percent of the organizations, with the largest provider of funds being from student government organizations (seventy nine percent).
**Academic support and contact with faculty and staff:** Only eight percent of the institutions had gay or lesbian study courses, while fourteen percent reported GLB content being present in regular courses. Three fourths of the schools that presented GLB content were public.

**Availability of printed resources:** Only eleven percent of institutions responding reported that library collection policies and active subscriptions supported GLB interests.

**Hate crimes:** The mean number of hate crimes reported per institution was 5.3. Within the study, hate crimes included gay bashing, faculty reprimand for homophobic behavior, roommate harassment, vandalism, destruction of property, and verbal assaults and threatening phone calls.

**Non-discrimination statements:** Thirty nine percent of the respondent institution’s non discrimination statements included sexual orientation.

These results are similar to the results reported in the Rankin (2003) national study. Additionally, significantly low responses occurred in the areas of interest outlined, lived oppressed experiences and university response to issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. Finally, this study further supports the theme areas that were factored in the Rankin study, and will be addressed in the design of this investigation.

Limitations to the study included that some respondents had to answer questions according to their “best guess” (electronic p.3) about programs and services due to limited knowledge of contact with those services. Another factor that may skew the results was that a majority of the institutions that responded to the study were larger public institutions that contained more human and programmatic resources for students.
than other schools, as well as more members of NASPA. A majority of the conclusions outlined above were gleamed from the quantitative answers to the surveys. Conclusions suggest that institutions need to do a better job of addressing the number of hate crimes to increase the level of satisfaction with the learning environment provided by the institution. Additionally, the authors outline the need for more faculty staff mentoring programs, which have been proven in previous studies to be effective. Only forty percent of respondents currently have such a program in place.

Central Florida universities are not immune from the heterosexist paradigm that has been demonstrated by campus climates studies outside the state. The University of North Florida student government president was accused of bias when he denied funding to a program sponsored by the campus gay and lesbian student organization. (Pride, SG, 2004). While the funding was ultimately restored, the student government president felt he needed to veto the funding due to his moral beliefs.

These studies demonstrate that campus climate for GLBT students are generally less than satisfactory, with unique problems within the overall climate being exacerbated on individual campuses. While much has been written about the state of climate today, few studies have been done that measure the impact of interventions to improve the perceptions of climate on campus. A common intervention that is seen on a large number of college campuses is a safe zone program, which identifies supportive faculty and staff within the university community (Tubbs, 2004). Addressing this need, Evans (2002) conducted a study at Iowa State University, which had established a “safe zone” program for faculty and staff five years earlier. The goals of the program included increased
visibility for LGBT people and concerns, and for increased support and awareness of the issues facing LGBT people.

The safe zone program consisted of faculty and staff volunteering to display a sticker symbolizing that they were safe individuals to discuss GLBT issues. Due to the goals of the program, interested participants did not receive formal training on how to be an ally to these groups, but received an informational brochure about the implications of posting this sticker. As this was an initial study into the efficacy of such mentor programs, an exploratory, qualitative approach was used based on a constructivist philosophy. An ethnographic methodology was used to describe and interpret the culture on the campus.

The research team consisted of a heterosexual lead evaluator, as well as three members of the LGBT student population, including a lesbian graduate student, gay male undergraduate, and a transgender undergraduate. Data collection was obtained by extensive immersion in the field, from spring of 1998 and into the summer. Final observations were made in the fall after a preliminary report was shared with the university community. Ethnographic interviews were used, with each interview being recorded and transcribed. Additionally, student research team members canvassed all academic buildings on campus for the amount of safe zone stickers visible in each, and to get a sense of the climate portrayed by other artifacts.

Project planners, participants, and LGBT students were interviewed to assess the impact of the program on their perceptions of campus climate. Additionally, initial interviewees were also asked for names of others who might provide different or
interesting perspectives regarding the impact of the program. Forty two individuals were interviewed (p.526).

Data analysis included the coding of all transcripts of interviews, with each member of the research team agreeing to the coding categories. These included perceived goals of the project, sources of information regarding the project, motivation for posting stickers, impressions of the sticker, reactions to the process for obtaining a sticker, issues within posting stickers, a debate that arose within student government, positive and negative effects of the project on campus, personal effects of the project, interactions and reactions of others, personal reactions, perceptions of LGBT reactions, perceptions of heterosexual reactions, perceptions of administrators reactions and suggestions. These categories where then broken down by respondent groups such as LGBT male and female students, LGBT faculty and staff, male and female heterosexual faculty and staff, and male and female heterosexual students (p.526-527). Findings included a higher visibility of LGBT individuals, a more positive outlook on climate, and increased perceptions of support for LGBT students.

This study is significant in the overall concept of this study, as it shows the impact that campus interventions can have on improving the climate for GLBT students. It validates that indeed university programs can alter and improve the climate through education and assimilation programs. Additionally, it is a factor to consider when making comparisons between institutions relative to overall campus climate.

From reviewing the literature on campus climate, it is clear that a negative perception of campus climate can impede the learning environment in many dimensions,
ranging from identity development to campus engagement and safety. Thus it becomes the duty of administrators within higher education; it is our duty to work to ensure that each student has the best possible experience while engaged with our academic community. Only then are we truly working towards a more pluralistic society that accepts and values our similarities and our differences.

**Literature Regarding Identity Development**

A key component of feeling accepted within a campus environment is respect for one’s individuality. Hanrick, Evans, and Schuh (2002) describe several theories targeting the development of identity and its impact on development. Development of overall identity may be impacted by the level of identity achieved through assimilation of minority subgroup identity. A comprehensive model of minority identity development is advanced by Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1999). Based on stages, this theory describes the assimilation and accommodation of ones ethnic identity in the context of a greater society. Stages include:

- **Conformity** - where people hold a negative view of their ethnic group and buy into labels placed on them by society,
- **Dissonance** – marked by confusion of beliefs and values due to negative experiences based on ethnicity
- **Resistance** – time when white culture is rejected by the individual and embracing of cultural traditions associated with their ethnicity
- **Introspection** – people see themselves as individuals, and create their own assessment of positives and negatives of majority and minority
cultures

- Synergistic Awareness – the level at which one’s individual identity draws minority cultural sources, as well as understanding the majority culture has positive influences as well (p.27-35)

Another category of students whose oppression can impact their ability to develop positive identity is gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. Bilodeau and Renn (2005) reviewed current identity development models that frame the integration of GLBT identity into one’s overall sense of identity. Beginning with stage models that signaled the beginning of sexual orientation identity theories (Cass, 1979), the authors expand the discussion beyond stage measurements into non-linear models (D’Augelli, 1991). Additionally, the impact of being a member of another underrepresented group and its impact on GLBT identity development was discussed. The models range from psychosocial models such as Cass (1979, 1984) to specific explanation of GLBT identity development in relation to higher education (D’Augelli, 1994), which consider diverse environmental factors into the formation of identity development. Finally, non empirical theories that document perspectives of non heterosexual identities (feminist, postmodern, and queer) are outlined.

One of the earliest models of gay identity development was proposed by Cass in 1979, and validated by her research in 1984. The model is comprised of six stages, which are sequential in nature. The theory is based on two assumptions: that identity is acquired through a developmental process and that the locus for stability of, and change in, behavior lies in the interaction process that occurs between individuals and their
environment. The model uses a framework of interpersonal congruence theory, which holds that stability and change in behavior are dependent on the congruence or incongruence that exists within the individual’s interpersonal environment. Stability is maintained when the perception of the individual and environment is congruent; growth is achieved by resolving the incongruence between ones identity and the environmental definition of that identity.

The initial stage, identity confusion, is where the first homosexual thoughts and feelings are realized. After a period of self questioning, if positive feelings remain, the student moves to stage two, identity comparison. The inner perception of identity is in conflict with external perceptions of the identity. Positive interactions further growth along the stage, while negative feelings may invoke disclosure and self-hatred. A heterosexual public image is upheld.

Stage three of this model is identity tolerance. Private self image is tolerated, and contact with gay community increases, while conflict exists with public image. Moving to the fourth stage, identity acceptance is indicative of behavior that validates homosexual identity. Contact with the gay community is frequent, and initial disclosure to select others occurs. Often this stage is comfortable for people to stay. If continued discourse between self perception and that of others is high, movement into phase five is likely. This identity pride stage is marked by a shift in perception of the heterosexual world that is negative in nature, causing a retreat to contacts with those who are homosexual. Continued negative responses from heterosexual contacts strengthen this belief. After the negativity and anger of stage five subsides, the student moves into stage
six, identity synthesis. Commonalities of values are seen in both the heterosexual and homosexual worlds, and sexual identity retreats to a part of the entire identity, rather than the main component. As a whole, growth and development through these stages occurs through awareness, exploration, and acceptance (p. 187-188).

Cass (1984) conducted a quantitative research study based on her theoretical model of identity development in the hopes of validating her theoretical model proposed in 1979. The sample was made up of 227 subjects, who were identified through private social functions, a homosexual rights march, counseling centers, newspaper advertisements, and personal acquaintances. The research design did not require random selection of participants. 109 males and 69 females returned the responses for a 78.4% response rate. Only 12 respondents out of the 178 received were unable to be defined by one stage of the model, and those surveys were excluded from the final analysis. The biographical information provided by the respondents determined that there was no significant difference in any of the stages by gender, occupation, religious upbringing, and age of first labeling of self as a homosexual (p.155).

The study consisted of two instruments, a stage allocation measure and homosexual identity questionnaire. The first instrument contained seven one-paragraph descriptions of possible ways respondents feel about homosexuality and their perceptions of the role it plays within their overall identity. The seven choices represent each of the six stages as well as a pre-stage paragraph. Instructions were to select the paragraph that best fit the way they saw themselves at the time of the instrument’s completion. The
homosexual identity questionnaire contained 210 questions that framed the components outlined in her theoretic framework.

In scoring the questionnaire, the researcher predicted how members of each stage would respond the each question, which was compared with the self allocation of stage made in the first instrument. If a respondent self identified as being in stage one, the answer to the question that most resembled a stage one answer would be correct, while all others incorrect. This was repeated for each question in the survey, and was unique to the self identified stage as reported in the first instrument. Each identity questionnaire was then scored through a computer based answer key created for the stage identified. The across groups hypothesis was that subjects at each stage would obtain the highest scores on the profile of their particular self-identified stage compared with other stages, and that scores would decrease progressively as you moved away from the correct stage (p.158)

Results were derived by determining the number of correct scores in relation to the self-identified stage, and the dissonance between that stage and correct answers for the other five stages. Respondents from stages one, five, and six were significant at the .05 level. Stages two and four were very nearly significant at the same level, but stage three respondents were unsupportive of the hypothesis (p. 159). This was explained as being impacted by the similarity and reversal of scores of profiles one and two, and for profiles five and six as they moved further from their actual identity stage. Additionally, the stage three group followed the predicted order of means on five of six stages, but the differences in the means were too small to be significant.
The results validate that participants were more likely to acknowledge the hypothesized ideal description of their stage more closely than other stages in terms of their behavior. There is also a greater tendency for participants at a particular stage to show similarity to their hypothesized profile when compared with subjects at other stages. This suggests that individuals who acknowledge homosexuality to be present in their lives can be distinguished by the characteristics that are theorized within Cass’ model. Additionally, the findings also support that the grouping of individuals by stage will follow the order predicted by the theoretical model.

Later research on sexual identity development provided another, more compact, instrument that was validated as determining the identity level according to the Cass model. Brady and Busse (1994) developed an instrument known as the Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ) that was designed to measure sexual identity development. Made up exclusively of true/false questions, the forty-five question survey delineates seven questions that are indicative of each identity stage, along with three questions mixed in to validate the existence of same sex attraction. The instrument was validated during a study that consisted of 225 respondents, who had a median age of 28.8 years. The sample was gathered in southern California in 1983, and the majority of respondents were non-Hispanic white men. The entire sample indicated that they have had homosexual thoughts, feelings, or sexual actions. 196 of the 225 respondents were included in the data analysis, with twenty-nine subjects excluded due to either being in a stage that had too few subjects to be validated or the responses indicated a dual stage result.
Results of the study indicated that the instrument was valid for four out of the six stages within the Cass model, with stages one and two obtaining too few responses to be statistically quantified. The researchers suggest new ways of recruiting subjects who are reluctant to participate in studies in which homosexual labels are involved, as individuals in stages one and two of the model have not yet self-identified as a member of the population despite having some feelings that would be objectively labeled non-heterosexual. Additionally, the data suggested that the homosexual identity formation may actually be stated more simply as a two-stage process, with stage one consisting of Cass stage’s one-three and stage two consisting of Cass’s stage’s four-six.

Other researchers have used the Cass model for formal research on the impact of identity development on other variables. Al–Timini (2003) studied the effect of identity development and perceived university environment on the adjustment to college of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at universities in the United States. The design of the study included three separate instruments: the gay identity questionnaire (GIQ), the student adaptation to college questionnaire (SACQ), and the university environment scale (UES). The GIQ is a 45 question true/false quantitative measure that assigns respondents to a stage level within the Cass model; The SACQ is a self-reported measure of college adjustment, and contains 67 questions with 9 point Likert scales as possible answers; the UES is self-reported 16 question measure that uses Likert scales based on a range of seven.

Participants were obtained by contacting colleges and universities in the US that were listed in online directories of LGBT programs across the country. Center directors
were sent a letter encouraging them to promote the study to their students. Packets of the three surveys were then sent to center directors to be distributed to their students. Only gay, lesbian, and bisexual students within each institution were considered for the sample. Snowball sampling within each institution was encouraged by the investigator as way to reach out to other students who may not have been affiliated with a LGBT program at the institution. The students then sent back the packets to the researcher. 325 survey packets were mailed out, with 102 being returned for a response rate of 32%.

Results indicated a correlation with a particular stage of identity development, Cass’s stage three, identity tolerance. The greater the number of items endorsed in stage three, the more likely student’s were to score lower on the college adjustment scale. This was true for all but one stage of the adjustment scale. The researcher explains this phenomenon by the fact that stage three deals with students who have “multiple personae” (p.42), or a public and private sense of themselves. Strong positive correlations also exist between perceived university environment and overall college adjustment. Perceptions of university environment were found to be the most significant predictor of college adjustment even after testing a number of predictor variables. This study reinforces previous research that indicates that perceptions of campus climate can impact the rate at which students adjust to the college environment, and provides interesting data in terms of identity development and its role in adjustment to a new environment. Clearly, a more targeted study that isolates the interrelatedness of identity development and campus climate would provide more useful data for student affairs practitioners to guide their work.
D’Augelli (1991, 1994) developed an alternate model of GLBT identity development that defines identity as a social construction, based on the experiences of the individual within their environment. Rather than establishing sequential stages as Cass theorizes, D’Augelli’s life span model establishes six interactive processes that help to define ones sexual identity. They include:

1. *Exiting heterosexual identity* – shedding the belief that one is heterosexual and the ability to express to others that they are GLBT.

2. *Developing a personal lesbian/gay/bisexual identity status* – the process of finding your own truth of the gay experience through “thoughts, feelings, and desires” (D’Augelli, 1994a, p.325), while challenging the internal stereotypes of what the gay experience is with others within the community.

3. *Developing a lesbian/gay/bisexual societal identity* – the process of establishing a network of people who are accepting of their sexual orientation and to whom the individual has disclosed their orientation.

4. *Becoming a lesbian/gay/bisexual offspring* – the process of coming out to parental figures and the redefinition of that relationship following the disclosure.

5. *Developing a lesbian/gay/bisexual intimacy status* – the ability to enter into an intimate non heterosexual relationship. Noted challenges include the social and legal issues surrounding homosexuality, which can be a barrier to full growth within this process.
6. *Entering a lesbian/gay/bisexual community* – the process of joining and engaging the social and/or political arena of the gay community. This process involves substantial risk to those in less than supportive environments.

The strengths of this model are that it takes into account the divergent personal experiences and continually changing environment that GLBT individuals operate in. The focus on process, instead of stages, is also more adaptive to many more people. The shortcomings, however, include the fact that any assessment of this model would take a significant longitudinal study, as the model progresses over a lifetime. In addition, the fact that no study has validated the constructs of the theory, and no instrument has been a valid measure of the processes of the theory, makes this identity theory incongruent with the design of the study. Therefore, the Cass (1984) model of identity development, along with the Brady-Busse (1994) gay identity questionnaire, will be used in determining the identity progression of the subjects in the study.

Identity development, as a psychological construct impacted significantly by environment, is a complex area to study. Many theories exist in an attempt to explain how individuals come to view themselves in relation to the outer world. GLBT individuals have a unique situation in which their identity undergoes significant moderation outside of the realm that heterosexual people experience. Determining if any relationship exists between identity development and how students perceive their learning environment is an important step in furthering the understanding of the many complex factors that make up perceptions of campus climate.
Chapter Three

Method

Introduction

The following sections will outline the research questions that are driving the study, as well as outline the methodology; including variables, instruments, population and sample, as well as data collection and analysis procedures. All methodology outlined within this chapter has been approved by the University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Research Questions

There are three research questions that were addressed within this study:

1. What are the perceptions among GLBT students of the campus climate for GLBT students?

2. Is campus climate for GLBT students at USF perceived differently by heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students?

3. Does the identity level of GLB students relate to the perceptions of campus climate?

Research Design

This study expands on previous research completed on campus climate for GLBT students as well as an identity development model for that population. Designed as a quantitative study comprised of two individual instruments, the instruments employed were a Campus Climate Survey developed by Rankin (2003) and the Gay Identity
Questionnaire (GIQ) designed by Brady & Busse (1994). The Rankin instrument provided data on campus climate perceptions for GLBT students, and has been used in a nationwide study as well as individual campus environments. The Brady/Busse model assessed the level of homosexual identity that has been attained by respondents according to the identity model theorized by Cass (1979). Both instruments were accessible online through an off campus provider, snapsurveys.com. Respondents were provided the instruments simultaneously. All students began with the Rankin climate survey. Only students who self identified as any category other than heterosexual or transgender on the Rankin survey were administered the GIQ after the climate survey was completed.

Population and Sample

The population being studied is undergraduate university students who are taking at least one class at the University of South Florida, Tampa campus. The sample consisted of undergraduate university students from the University of South Florida, Tampa campus, taking at least six credit hours in the 2006 fall term, who completed the surveys. 2,429 students responded to the campus climate instrument. Of that sample, 225 GLB students responded to the identity questionnaire as well.

Data obtained remained confidential and participant’s data was stored sequentially to ensure that data can be correlated between the two instruments. Each student who was registered for six or more credits in the 2006 fall term was sent an email asking them to complete the survey in December of 2006, with a follow up email sent out January 11, 2007. Statistical power was achieved by these electronic mail solicitations,
eliminating the need for any intentional snowball sampling of the GLBT student population.

A power analysis was performed using Cohen’s (1992) criterion of power at .80, with a medium effect size of .25, alpha set at .05. To ensure adequate power for the planned repeated measures ANOVA for question two and one way ANOVA for question three, a minimum sample of 210 respondents completing both instruments was needed. Of the 228 responses received for the identity question, 212 were complete and 198 passed the validity check within the GIQ and were assigned to stages.

Variables

In answering question one, I conducted a descriptive analysis focusing on the three areas of inquiry noted in the Rankin (2003) study; lived oppressive experiences, perceptions of anti GLBT oppression on campus, and institutional actions. For question two, an inferential analysis was conducted between the variables of campus climate perceptions and the self identified sexual orientation of students to determine if a relationship existed. Finally, question three was analyzed inferentially by determining if a relationship existed between the variables of campus climate perceptions within the Rankin areas of inquiry noted above and the six identity levels as outlined by Vivienne Cass.

Instruments/Measures

Two instruments were used to gather data for this study. The first, The Assessment of Campus Climate for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons, was used for assessing campus environment. Rankin (2002) used the instrument in a
national survey on campus climate for GLBT students. The assessment contained three areas of inquiry: Campus experiences; feelings about campus climate; campus response to GLBT issues; and a section on background demographic information. Section one, campus experiences, had 8 questions which were closed ended, and offered students 2-9 choices for their response. Section two, feelings about campus climate, had eight questions with a five point likert-type scale responses ranging from very unlikely to very likely. Section three, campus response, had eight questions with a five point likert-type scale responses ranging from strongly agree through strongly disagree. Section four, had eleven questions about demographic information, including a question that asks the respondent to self identify their sexual orientation. One final open ended question asked for suggestions for improving campus climate. A copy of the instrument is located in Appendix A.

I selected this instrument for several reasons. First, it has been used nationally in a study that will serve as an effective benchmark to assess the climate of University of South Florida against other campuses and established national norms. Second, Noack (2004) used it in another study similar in scope at Texas A&M University. Rankin and colleagues reported adequate internal consistency reliability for the entire measure, with correlation coefficients between r= .45- r =.60. Similarly, the stability of the instrument has been assured by experts in the field who consulted with Rankin on the national study. Finally, discrete factors were isolated by a factor analysis conducted by the researcher.

Fifteen items were used for the analysis: Questions 2-1 through 2-8 and Questions 3-1 through 3-7. The survey questions in Part 1 (Campus experiences) were not analyzed,
as factor analysis is not appropriate for dichotomous items; factor analysis is appropriate only for items with Likert-type response scales. Likewise, questions 3-8a through 3-8k were excluded from the analysis as the responses were essentially dichotomous.

The factor analysis was conducted on the fifteen items using Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation. Factors with Eigen values over 1 were extracted. In analyzing each factor, items whose factor loadings were .40 or higher in one factor were retained. Items that loaded on more than one factor at .40 or higher were eliminated.

The first factor analysis yielded four factors explaining 69.2% of the variance. However, in reviewing the factor composition of the four-factor solution, one factor was comprised only of one item – an item that ideally should have been retained in another factor. The factor analysis was rerun, forcing SPSS to extract only three factors. In forcing a three-factor solution, the $R^2$ decreased to 62.5%. The three-factor solution seemed more reasonable to Rankin than the four-factor solution, and the following three factors (with the factor composition) are explained below. Question 2.5 was eliminated from inclusion in any of the factors because it loaded on two factors at .40 or higher.

Factor 1: Harassment of GLBT Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability (alpha) = .893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1. Gay men are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2. Lesbians are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3. Bisexual persons are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4. Transgender persons are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Avoidance Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability (alpha) = .757</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5. Avoidance behaviors due to GLBT identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6. I conceal my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid harassment.
Q2.7. I conceal my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid discrimination.
Q2.8. I stay away from areas of campus where GLBT persons congregate for fear of being labeled.

Factor 3: Institutional Response  
Reliability (alpha) = .841

Q3.1. The institution thoroughly addresses campus issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity.
Q3.2. The institution has visible leadership from the administration regarding sexual orientation/gender identity issues on campus.
Q3.3. The curriculum adequately represents the contributions of LGBT persons.
Q3.4. The climate of the classes I have taken or the job site where I work are accepting of LGBT persons.
Q3.5. The institution provides visible resources on LGBT issues and concerns.
Q3.6. The institution has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment.
Q3.7. The institution has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT discrimination.

For factors 1 and 3 (Harassment of GLBT Persons and Institutional Response), the reliability analysis suggests appropriate and strong factor scales (i.e., the reliability coefficients are .893 and .841, respectively). The reliability analysis examined the effects of deleting items from the scales, and for factors 1 and 3 the original scale compositions provided the strongest reliability for each scale.

For factor 2, Avoidance Behaviors, deleting question 2.8 actually increased the reliability of that particular scale to .887, though it left only a two-item factor. Conceptually, question 2.8 seems to “hang” with the other items, although inclusion of the item lowers the reliability to .757. A scale reliability of .757 is still acceptable; therefore it is suggested to retain the original three-item scale (S.R. Rankin, personal communication, January 6, 2007).
This thirty-nine question instrument provided data in a number of areas. It directly provided data in assessing overall campus climate (research question one); and whether the environment is experienced differently by gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students (research question two). Additionally, data from this survey was compared with identity development results from the second instrument (research question three).

This instrument was utilized through an agreement with the instrument creator, Dr. Susan Rankin, for a fee of $2500. Modifications include placing the instrument online, providing confidentiality information as required by IRB guidelines, and adding another possible response under the sexual identity question, which allowed for a “questioning” response. Additionally, the questions were renumbered from the original instrument, with background information questions 4-2 through 4-11 asked at the beginning of the survey. Question 4-1, “what is your gender”, was inadvertently omitted by the researcher when duplicating the instrument online, with the transgender option being added under sexual identity in order to direct only the target respondents to the second instrument.

The Gay Identity Questionnaire, developed by Brady & Busse (1994) was administered subsequently to students within the sample who self identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or questioning on the Rankin survey. This forty five question instrument has been validated for determining the identity levels of four out of the six levels of Cass’s identity model. The questions are randomly ordered, and directed at targeting a specific level of Cass’ model. Of the forty five questions, forty two are used
to assess identity level, with each of the six stages being represented by seven questions, randomly ordered. The remaining three questions serve as validity checks, to ensure that respondents can be labeled as homosexual. One of the three validity check questions needed to be answered affirmatively for the response to be considered valid. Stage totals are tallied and the stage with the truest responses is considered the respondent’s identity level. If two levels were equally represented, a dual stage level is reported, and the response is taken out of the final analysis. The measure has been found to be a valid and reliable way to examine the coming out process theorized by Cass. The measurement designer reports that it has been used in a number of dissertations and theses nationwide.

Inter item consistency scores were reported by Brady for each of the six Cass stages. Stage one and two did not contain enough respondents to perform statistical analyses. The follow reliabilities were reported for the remaining four stages:

Stage 3 - $r = .76$; Stage 4 – $r = .71$; Stage 5, $r = .44$; and Stage 6 - $r = .78$.

Written approval to use this instrument has been obtained by its creator, Dr. Stephen Brady, via electronic mail.

Reliability Measures for This Sample

Sample reliability measures for the Campus Climate survey and the Gay Identity Questionnaire in this study are outlined in tables 1-2. By including all students in the target population, a significant number of questioning students responded to the survey, allowing for reliability statistics to be generated for the GIQ that were not yet validated. Table 1 represents the reliabilities reported by Rankin for the national study, and
contrasts that with the results from this sample. It is clear that this sample provided similar results as reported by Rankin, with strong reliability indicators.

Table 1

Reliability Measures for the Campus Climate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Scales</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Previously Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Experiences</td>
<td>KR-20=.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 - 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about Campus Climate</td>
<td>Alpha = .816</td>
<td>Alpha = .893 - .757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 - 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Responses to GLBT Issues</td>
<td>Alpha = .846</td>
<td>Alpha = .841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 - 3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*specific questions located in instrument in appendix 1

Table 2

Reliability Measures of the Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cass Stage Designation and Corresponding Questions</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>KR-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6, 17, 20, 25, 28, 31, 37</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1, 12, 21, 23, 24, 29, 32</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11, 15, 16, 18, 27, 33, 42</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2, 3, 7, 14, 35, 36, 44</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5, 8, 9, 26, 34, 38, 41</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10, 13, 19, 30, 39, 43, 45</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Specific questions located in appendix 2
Table 2 demonstrates previously reported reliabilities for the GIQ as well as the reliabilities reported from this sample. Due to this study’s design, a larger number of respondents who identified as stage 1 or two were reported, which enabled reliability tests to be conducted on the sample. The Kuder-Richardson test, or KR-20 test was performed on this sample with very reliable results being returned for all stages with the exception of stage 5, which showed similarly poor $r$ values as the original study. These results are very significant as it demonstrates the reliability of the entire measure, which was previously unknown.

Data Collection Procedures

The Rankin and Brady & Busse instruments were administered sequentially online, and made available to all undergraduate students at the University of South Florida who are enrolled for a minimum of six credit hours in the fall 2006 semester. Approval/support was obtained from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who facilitated the release of student email addresses to the researcher through the university registrar. Only students who requested confidential records, took only online courses, and those registered for less than six credit hours in the fall 2006 semester were excluded. The campus climate instrument served to isolate any non heterosexual respondents and direct them to the second survey, the GIQ. Respondents who identified as heterosexual or transgender were not administered the GIQ. Students who chose to respond to the instrument were given information on the purpose of the study, and provided with instructions for instrument completion, including an estimated time of completion, along with a statement that the data was collected confidentially.
The instruments were available for sixty days for students to complete. Email solicitations were sent in early December 2006, and again in early January 2007, with January 31st being the deadline for responses to be included in the sample. The instruments were hosted online through a third party vendor, snapsurveys.com, with the researcher being responsible for placing the instruments online and retrieving the data at the conclusion of the survey period.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis revolved around the most appropriate statistical method pertaining to each research question. For the first question, I computed descriptive statistics on the campus climate data. The remaining questions were addressed through inferential statistical analysis which included one way and repeated measures ANOVA.

For question one, descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the three subscales identified in the Rankin instrument. This included frequencies, sample size, mean, standard deviation, degree of skewness and kurtosis of the distribution, as well as any outliers or extreme data. These results addressed the question of campus climate perceptions as outlined in research question one.

For research question two, a five by two ANOVA was conducted on the heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning populations and their perceptions of campus climate in two of the focus areas; climate perceptions and administrative response. Due to the low response of transgender students (three), those responses were calculated with the questioning group. For these calculations, alpha was set to .05, with
effect size detected set at the medium level. Questions showing significant difference are reported and results discussed in the implications chapter.

Finally, for research question three, a six by one ANOVA was calculated between the campus climate perceptions and the results of the six stages of identity development as determined by the Brady & Busse identity level instrument. This will determine if any of the identity levels show a correlation to any of the three focus areas of campus climate; lived oppressed experiences, perceptions of anti GLBT oppression on campus, and administrative response. Representative questions within each area were selected for the analysis. To determine if a correlation exists, alpha was set to .05, with effect size detected set at the medium level.

**Threats to reliability, validity and generalizability**

The study was structured in a manner that will support student confidentiality while also maintaining efforts to overcome possible threats to reliability, validity and generalizability. In terms of reliability and validity, both instruments have been utilized in national and localized research studies, and have been found to be adequately reliable and valid. To avoid any threat, the instruments will be placed online in the same format and worded exactly as the paper instruments, with only the modifications alluded to earlier. Finally both instruments had expert evaluation within their respective fields, have been modified after feedback, and define critical terms.

One threat to the validity of the data was the dependence on self disclosure of the respondents’ sexual orientation. Many stigmatisms and negative connotations are still connected with labeling oneself gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. To reduce this
possibility, sexual orientation was not asked on the climate survey until the end of the survey, with questioning and transgender options added. Only those who describe themselves as anything but heterosexual or transgender were allowed to proceed to the identity survey. One final threat to reliability was the possibility of multiple entries from an anonymous student. While this threat is very unlikely, data was assessed prior to being analyzed to search for similar entries that are clearly duplicates.

In terms of generalizability, it was important to have as random a sample as possible, while also encouraging participants specifically from the GLBT community at USF. The instrument was made available to all students, regardless of sexual orientation, who met minimum standard for credit hours in an effort to gather as broad a sample as possible. I was prepared to conduct purposeful follow up with student organizations and university support systems that cater to GLBT students in case a large enough sample size was not achieved through the random sample. However, a large enough sample was achieved through random methods, so intentional follow up with GLBT community members was not needed to ensure adequate power for inferential statistics. These efforts will ensure that the study is as generalizable to as many other populations/institutions as possible. The results of the campus climate research questions can be generalizable to other state supported metropolitan research-one universities in the southeast, while the interrelatedness of identity development and campus climate perceptions would be generalizable to other GLBT college students across the nation.
Chapter Four

Results

*Introduction*

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus, and determine if those perceptions varied between the subgroups. Additionally, identity development level was assessed to determine if a relationship existed between perceptions of campus climate and level of GLBT identity development attained. The data included in the study were obtained by internet survey from December 2006 through January 2007 with two email prompts sent out to the target population.

*Demographic information of respondents*

Basic demographic information was collected on all respondents and is reported in Table 3. With the target group in this study being undergraduate students taking at least six credit hours of courses, question two (position at the university) served as a means of eliminating non-undergraduate students from the sample. Participants included 2,322 undergraduates who were over the age of 18. Any responses from students under the age of 18, or responses from anyone who selected a position at the university other than undergraduate student were not considered. Four students did not complete more than 15 questions from the survey, and were eliminated. The actual number of useable responses was 2,318.
Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>1515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-32</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-52</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53+</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnicities</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning/uncertain</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (65.5%) were aged 18-22; the age-group most consider traditional-aged college students. The next largest age-group was 22-32 years,
comprising 25.4% of the survey respondents. Five students did not answer this question.

White/Caucasian was the largest racial/ethnic group, with 67% of the sample, followed by 10% African American/Black, 9.6% Chicano/Latino/Hispanic, 6.4% Mixed Ethnicities, 5.6% Asian/Pacific Islander, .9% Middle Eastern, and .6% American Indian/Alaskan Native.

The vast majority of the respondents were full-time undergraduate students (83.8%), with the remainder (16.2%) identifying as part-time. The breakdown of respondents by self-identified sexual orientation was overwhelmingly heterosexual, with non-heterosexuals making up slightly more than nine percent of the sample. Noticeably absent from the demographic characteristics are gender breakdowns. Researcher error in transcribing the paper instrument to an online instrument led to the omission of that question from the instrument; therefore further analysis based on gender was not possible. However, gender was not one of the variables targeted by any of the research questions.

Table 4

*Living arrangements of respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where do you live?</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus residence hall</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus apartment</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity or Sorority house</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family student housing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 breaks down the living arrangement of students who responded to the survey. The largest group lived off campus (80.6%), followed by 11.6% on campus residence hall, 5.8% on campus apartment, 1.5% fraternity or sorority house, and less than one percent in family student housing. Six respondents did not answer this question. Cumulatively, almost 20% of the respondents lived in some form of university housing. This differs from the overall undergraduate population at the Tampa campus of USF, in which 14.8% of undergraduates chose to live on campus for the fall 2006 semester (University of South Florida, 2007) which is greater than the proportion of residential students in the overall undergraduate population.

With a larger than proportionate resident student response rate, further investigation into the same was needed to ensure the sample contained similar proportions of resident students in the GLBT and heterosexual populations. A larger resident student population in the GLBT group had the possibility to skew the results of the questions two and three. The data demonstrated that 21.6% of the GLBT group lived on campus, compared with 19.3% for the heterosexual group. These proportions are similar and no not pose any threat to the validity of the results of the research questions.

Results for Research Question One - What are the Perceptions Among GLBT Students of the Campus Climate for GLBT Students?

To determine the climate perceptions of the GLBT population, respondents who self-identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, questioning, or transgender were grouped and named GLBTQ group. The questioning respondents were added into this group due to their self-identification as non-heterosexual. Heterosexual perceptions of campus climate for GLBTQ students were not examined in this question. Each factor as outlined by
Rankin (2003) was examined and presented separately in tables in this section.

Additionally, results from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) study conducted by Rankin (2003) are contrasted with results from this study.

Table 5

*Number and percents of GLBTQ group members who responded yes to questions regarding campus experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>GLBTQ Group (n = 228)</th>
<th>NGLTF study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided disclosing my sexual orientation/gender identity to an instructor, TA, administrator, or supervisor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a victim of harassment due to my sexual orientation/sexual identity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Undergraduate students only*

Campus experiences of GLBTQ respondents are presented in Table 5. Results indicate that 11.8% of GLBTQ respondents feared for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation/gender identity; 41.7% concealed their sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation, 28.5% avoided disclosing their sexual orientation/gender identity to an instructor, TA, administrator, or supervisor, and 12.7% reported being a victim of harassment due to their sexual orientation/gender identity. The numbers are
particularly concerning when placed in the context of an educational setting, where 42% of the population hides their orientation to avoid intimidation, and 13% experienced actual harassment on campus.

Table 6.

_Percents of GLBTQ group who responded very unlikely through very likely to questions on feelings about campus climate._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay men are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexuals are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender are harassed on campus due to their sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fear for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conceal my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid harassment</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stay away from areas of campus where GLBT persons congregate for fear of being labeled</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the concern regarding these results, the negative experiences of GLBTQ students at USF are less frequent than the totals from the NGLTF study conducted by Rankin (2003). Clearly there is work to be done; however, the results indicate USF students experience less discrimination than their national counterparts (p.25-27).

Table 6 displays the results of the GLBTQ group’s feelings about campus climate at the university. When asked if they felt students were harassed due to their sexual orientation/gender identity, 42.1% of respondents felt that it was likely or very likely that gay men are harassed on campus, while 29.4% felt lesbians were harassed, and 22.4% felt that bisexuals were harassed. Fifty-four percent of GLBTQ respondents felt that transgender students were harassed for their gender identity. It is clear from these results that students perceive that transgender students and gay men are more likely to be harassed than lesbians or bisexuals.

In terms of physical safety, 9.3% were likely to fear for their physical safety due to their sexual orientation/gender identity. Thirty-seven percent were likely or very likely to conceal their sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid harassment, and 11% were either likely or very likely to avoid areas of campus where GLBTQ persons congregate for fear of being labeled. Conversely, 79.8% of GLBTQ students were unlikely or very unlikely to fear for their physical safety, 54% were unlikely or very unlikely to conceal their sexual orientation to avoid harassment, and 77.6% were unlikely or very unlikely to stay away from areas of campus where GLBTQ persons congregated.

The results demonstrate that GLBTQ students at USF are less likely than not to conceal their orientation in an attempt to avoid harassment, and are not afraid to be
Climate perceptions/Identity

present in areas where GLBTQ members congregate. The campus climate perceptions from respondents indicate lower scores on perceptions of environment than the national study that utilized this same instrument, where 51% of the sample reported that they were likely to conceal their orientation to avoid harassment, and where 19% feared for their physical safety (Rankin, 2003 p.25).

Table 7.

*Percents of GLBTQ group who responded strongly agree through strongly disagree to questions regarding feelings about campus responses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College/University thoroughly addresses issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College/University has visible leadership from the administration regarding sexual orientation/gender identity issues</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum adequately represents the contributions of LGBT persons</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The climate of the classes I have taken or the job site where I work are accepting of LGBT persons</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University provides visible resources on LGBT issues and concerns</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 displays the responses of GLBTQ students and their perceptions of campus responses to GLBT issues. Eighteen percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the university addresses issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity, whereas 37.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The largest number of respondents, 44.7%, were uncertain. In terms of visible leadership from the administration regarding sexual orientation/gender identity issues, 22.8% agreed or strongly agreed that it was visible, with 38.6% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The largest single group of respondents (38.6%) were unsure if the administration showed visible leadership on this issue, similar to results of other questions in this table.

This clearly demonstrates that the GLBT community represented by this sample has seen less than satisfactory leadership from the university administration on issues of sexual orientation identity. Less than 25% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the university demonstrated leadership in addressing these issues. Whether this is due to an actual lack of leadership or a breakdown in communicating that commitment to the USF community on GLBT issues could not be determined based on the data collected.

Perceptions of the climate in the classroom environment on campus provided insight into areas directly impacted by faculty. Sixty one percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the climate was supportive of GLBT issues, with only 15.4% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. However, more students disagreed and strongly disagreed (33.8%) that the university provides visible resources on GLBT issues and concerns than those who agreed or strongly agreed (27.6%). Finally, only 11.0% of
students agreed or strongly agreed that the University has a rapid response system for incidents of GLBT harassment, while 12.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The most common response was that of uncertainty (76.3%) about the university response system to address reports of harassment. With nearly 10% of this sample self-identifying as non-heterosexual, this group makes up a clear presence within the student body; yet the results indicate that they remain a forgotten minority. This indicates that more education regarding available, established resources for victims of GLBT harassment needs to occur.

Compared with the national study, USF students are less likely to report positive feelings about campus responses to GLBTQ issues. Nationally, 37% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their institution thoroughly addressed issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity, compared with 18% of USF students. The most striking disparity among the national and USF results in campus responses was to the statement “The University provides visible resources on LGBT issues and concerns”. Nationally, 71% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while only 23% of respondents to this study felt that way. The results clearly indicate that students at USF perceive their administration support in GLBTQ issues much less favorably than the respondents in the national study.

Overall, the results for campus climate perceptions for GLBTQ students showed mixed perceptions among the three areas of inquiry. While experiences with discrimination are lower than the national study, they still indicate that a population of students do not feel safe and have experienced harassment. Feelings about campus
climate at USF show less perceptions of harassment than that of the national study, but there are still substantial numbers of USF students who feel that the campus climate is unwelcoming to the point that they hide their sexual orientation to avoid intimidation. Finally, the perceptions of campus responses to GLBTQ issues are much lower than those of the national study. This disparity is partially explained by the fact that schools in the national study all had GLBT resource centers on campus. Additionally, USF is a larger, urban, research one institution that is being compared to a diverse group of institutions in the national study, which may explain some of that difference. However, it remains clear that administrators at other institutions are more effective than those at USF at demonstrating support for GLBT concerns.

Results from Research Question Two - Is Campus Climate for GLBT Students at USF Perceived Differently by Heterosexual, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, or Transgender Students?

In addressing question two, responses were broken down into three main areas of inquiry as outlined in the climate instrument: campus experiences, feelings about campus climate, and campus responses to GLBT issues. Questions within each area of inquiry where then tallied, with mean scores for each area computed. Ranges for each area were unique. Questions 9 – 13 from the survey represented campus experiences. Responses to these questions were “yes” or “no,” and were assigned a 0 for no, and 1 for yes, with a range of 0-5. Thus, a relatively high score in this range indicates that people had experienced more of the events asked about in the five questions.

Questions 17- 24 (disregarding question 21) represented feelings about campus climate, and were tallied by assigning values of 1-5 to the likert scale answers of “very
unlikely” through “very likely,” with a range of 8-40. A lower mean score would trend towards the unlikely range of the scale, with the higher mean scores trending towards “very likely” responses. With the questions asked in this section, a “very likely” response would indicate more perceived discrimination.

Questions 25-31 represented feelings about campus responses, and were tallied by assigning values of 1-5 to the likert scale answers of “strongly agree” through “strongly disagree,” with a range of 7-35. A lower mean score would trend towards the agree range of the scale; with the higher mean scores trending towards disagree responses. Thus high scores would indicate more negative feelings about campus responses regarding GLBT issues. Only three students identified as transgender; therefore that group was not examined due to insufficient numbers of responses.

Table 8 details the distribution of responses to the campus climate survey by the three areas of inquiry identified by the Rankin instrument. The figure for campus experiences only includes the non-heterosexual respondents as the questions specifically related to personal experiences of discrimination based on sexual orientation, and including the responses of heterosexuals led to a largely skewed sample for that factor. The overall sample showed relatively normal skewness and kurtosis in the distribution of campus experiences, campus climate and administrative responses variables. The data were screened for violations of assumptions to conduct an ANOVA; no violations were noted.
Table 8

*Distribution of Responses by Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Experiences*</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings About Campus Climate</td>
<td>2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Responses</td>
<td>2287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only non heterosexual respondents*

In determining if perceptions of campus climate vary significantly between the heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning groups, two statistical measures were used due to the format of the questionnaire. For campus experiences, the data is dichotomous and the largest population (heterosexual) was very unlikely to experience discrimination due to their sexual orientation. Therefore, it was not examined for differences between the groups.

Table 9 displays the data regarding feelings about campus climate by sexual orientation identified. The distribution of the sample showed normal skewness among all the populations, and only a moderate leptokurtic kurtosis among the heterosexual population. A mean score that was lower in this variable would indicate a perception of a more positive campus climate, while a higher score indicates a perception of a discriminatory environment. Heterosexual respondents viewed the environment for GLBT students much more favorably than any of the other groups.

The results of the ANOVA comparing campus climate feelings scores by sexual orientation identified are outlined in Table 10. Since two ANOVAS were being
conducted to answer this question, a bonferroni adjustment was used to counter the larger chance for error. Therefore, significance was determined at the .025 level rather than .05. Significant differences were noted among the populations identified \[ F(4,2279) = 84.59, \ p < .0001 \]. A tukey test was then conducted to look for significant differences between the individual groups at the 95% confidence level. Significant differences were noted between heterosexual students and all of the non heterosexual groups, and are displayed in Table 11. The only significant difference noted between groups that did not include heterosexual students was between gay and questioning students.

Table 9

Data of feelings about campus climate by sexual orientation identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>Ku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.402</td>
<td>6.044</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.200</td>
<td>5.306</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.437</td>
<td>8.011</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>15.871</td>
<td>4.398</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>6.362</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that heterosexual students perceive the environment for GLBTQ students much differently than the GLBTQ students themselves perceive. This demonstrates the failure of heterosexual students to observe the types of harassment and discrimination experienced by non heterosexuals, including stereotypical portrayals of GLBTQ persons. Questioning students, who do not identify as heterosexual or GLBT, also demonstrated significantly different perceptions of campus climate than gay men, indicating a lack of awareness of what the experience for gay men is like.
Table 10

*Analysis of Variance for Campus Climate Feelings by Sexual Orientation Identified*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>7198.945</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1799.736</td>
<td>84.59</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>48400.632</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>1309.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55599.578</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from this analysis also need to be further dissected to completely understand the results. One possibility for the lower mean score from heterosexual respondents is the large number of “uncertain” responses from the heterosexual students in this sample. While this may explain some of the statistical figures, it still underscores the need for education regarding a student population that significant portions of the population are “uncertain” about.

Table 11

*ANOVA of Feelings about campus climate by Sexual Orientation with larger mean score in group one*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Group Two</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>3.110*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>7.328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>6.566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>5.531*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>4.217*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
Campus responses to discrimination of GLBT students yielded similar results as the campus climate perceptions, and are displayed in Table 12. Heterosexual respondents had the lowest mean score of 19.54, while gay men had the highest with 23.06. In this analysis, a lower score would mean higher satisfaction with campus responses to discrimination, and a higher score would indicate more dissatisfaction with the campus response.

Distributions of responses to this factor were normal with the exception of the heterosexual group, which were significantly leptokurtic. This can be explained due to the significantly large number of “uncertain” responses to this factor, which fall in the middle of the likert scale. Skewness results also showed normal distribution figures. The data were screened for violations of assumptions to conduct an ANOVA; no violations were noted.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>Ku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20.844</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>-0.290</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.066</td>
<td>4.870</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.875</td>
<td>5.505</td>
<td>-0.466</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>19.544</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>2.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.145</td>
<td>4.178</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>1.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ANOVA was performed on mean scores for campus responses to discrimination and sexual orientation identified. Relevant data from the ANOVA is outlined in Table 13. This analysis showed a significant difference among the mean
scores of the different orientations identified. To determine which groups had significantly different means between the groups, a tukey test was conducted with alpha set to .05. Since two ANOVAS were conducted to answer this question, a bonferroni adjustment was used to counter the larger chance for error. Therefore, significance was determined at the .025 level rather than .05.

Table 13

*Analysis of Variance for Campus Responses to Discrimination by Sexual Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>986.068</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>246.517</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>34220.156</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>15.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35206.224</td>
<td>2271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

*ANOVA of campus responses to discrimination by Sexual Orientation with larger mean in group one*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Group Two</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2.222*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>3.522*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>1.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>.0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1.601*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1.299*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Table 14 outlines the differences between groups and the mean difference noted. Significant differences are indicated. Similar to the campus climate feelings analysis, the only significant difference among non heterosexual groups included gay men, but in this
analysis it was the bisexual, not questioning population, that showed significant mean difference. Also, the previous difference between the Lesbian and Heterosexual groups was not repeated.

It is clear from these results that heterosexual students perceive the campus climate differently than non heterosexual students. The data analysis indicated significant differences between heterosexuals and all other groups in feelings about campus climate. This incongruence of perceptions also was demonstrated in analysis of perceptions of campus responses to GLBT issues. The differences between heterosexual and all other groups except the lesbian population showed significance. This demonstrates a clear disconnect between heterosexuals and non heterosexuals in terms of perception of campus environment for GLBTQ students. Additionally, within the non heterosexual populations, gay men report less satisfaction with administrative responses than other non heterosexual groups.

*Results from Research Question Three - Does the Identity Level of GLB Students Relate to the Perceptions of Campus Climate?*

Of the 2,385 valid responses, 230 students self identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or questioning and were administered the online GIQ. It was completed by 225 of them. Two hundred nine of those respondents answered all 45 GIQ questions completely whereas sixteen respondents left at least one question blank. A mean imputation was performed for these sixteen respondents, with the mean score of the responses for that stage inserted into the missing question. Respondents who scored the same in more than one stage were eliminated from the sample, in keeping with established research
protocols that utilized the GIQ (Brady, 1994). Additionally, respondents who failed to answer any of the three validity questions from the GIQ were eliminated from the sample. Twenty-five responses did not pass the validity checks built into the measure. Two were missing more one question for stage and were removed from the sample, leaving 198 valid responses that were placed into stages. The data were screened for violations of assumptions to conduct an ANOVA; no violations were noted.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Level</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals          | 60  | 30.0    | 28       | 14.0        | 71    | 35.5  | 41   | 20.5 | 200  | 100  |

*Left more than one stage question per stage blank, not assigned a stage

Table 15 shows descriptive statistics for the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning groups that were administered the GIQ. Numbers of respondents are displayed by sexual orientation and identity level. The results demonstrate clearly that students who score in stages one and two identify themselves as bisexual or questioning, and do not see themselves as gay or lesbian. This reflects the level of identity acceptance...
outlined by Cass (1979) and quantified by the instrument. Additionally, a clear trend towards fewer questioning students scoring in the higher identity stages is noted. Two respondents who identified as questioning did not pass the validity tests of the GIQ and were not counted in the final total.

As with research question 2, two separate ANOVA’s were conducted for this research question, one addressing feelings about campus climate and the other addressing campus responses, to examine if any relationship existed with those perceptions and respondent’s self-identified identity level. Because multiple ANOVA’s were performed on this sample, a Bonferroni adjustment was performed. Therefore, to determine significance with 95% confidence, $p$-values would need to be <.025.

The descriptive statistics for feelings about campus climate by identity stage are displayed in Table 16. For the feelings about campus climate factor, a higher mean score indicates more negative perceptions of campus climate for GLBT students. The mean scores increase from stage one through four, then drop back at stage six. The data were screened for violations of assumptions to conduct an ANOVA; no violations were noted.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Stage</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*range 8-40
The first ANOVA compared feelings about campus climate with Identity level assigned according to the Cass model. The results from the ANOVA are outlined in Table 17. The results [F (5,183) = 6.90, p < .0001] indicated a significant difference among the six different Cass stages in relation to campus climate feelings.

To determine where the significance was found between the six stages, the researcher referred back to the original study that created the GIQ. Brady (1994) suggested that instead of a six stage model for identity formation, his data indicated a two stage model, collapsing stages one, two, and three into one stage, and four five, and six being another. A contrast ANOVA was conducted by grouping the stages in this manner. The results of the contrast are located in Table 17. Other combinations of collapsing stages to determine significant differences were not explored. Results from the contrast reveal a significant difference in campus climate feelings between stages one, two, and three versus stages four, five and six. This result is congruent with the interpretation of the results expressed by Brady in 1994.

To determine the level of the effect size, a manual calculation was performed to determine the magnitude of the significance noted in the contrast. The calculation, \( L_1 = 0.33(\text{mean for stage 1}) + 0.33(\text{mean for stage 2}) + 0.33(\text{mean for stage 3}) - 0.33(\text{mean for stage 4}) - 0.33(\text{mean for stage 5}) - 0.33(\text{mean for stage 6}) \) determines the raw effect size, which is then divided by the root mean square error (MSE) for actual effect size (\( f \)). For this ANOVA, the \( f \) value = 0.48, describing a large effect size according to Cohen (1992). This further emphasizes the relationship between homosexual identity development and
feelings about campus climate, and demonstrates the need to take this factor into consideration when interpreting perceptions of campus climate feelings.

Table 17

**Analysis of Variance for Campus Climate Feelings by Identity Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Level</td>
<td>1162.876</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>232.575</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6164.657</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>33.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7327.534</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

**Analysis of Variance for Campus Climate Feelings by Identity Stages Contrasted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Contrast SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1,2,3 vs 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>226.243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>226.243</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores for participants responses to GLBT administrative issues sorted by identity level scored are outlined in Table 19. For the administrative responses factor, a higher mean score indicates more negative perceptions of responses for GLBT issues. Similarly to the feeling about campus climate factor, the mean scores increase from stage one through four, then drop back at stage six. The data were screened for violations of assumptions to conduct an ANOVA; no violations were noted. A second ANOVA was performed on campus responses to discrimination and harassment and identity stage. As with question two, a Bonferroni adjustment was performed since two ANOVA’s were conducted on the data. Therefore, to determine significance with 95% confidence, \( p \) values would need to be \(<.025\). A result of \( [F (5,185) =2.50 p=.032] \) was obtained, indicating that the differences between identity stages and administrative responses was not significant when considering the Bonferroni adjustment among the stages for campus
responses. The results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 20. With this result being close to significant, a contrast ANOVA was performed in the same fashion as with the campus climate feelings variable, contrasting the results for levels 1, 2 and 3 with the result from levels 4, 5 and 6. Other combinations of collapsing stages to determine significant differences were not explored.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Stage</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*range of 7-35

Table 21 shows the results of the contrast ANOVA between stages one, two and three and four, five, and six. Significant differences are noted between these groups with a p value of .0042. A manual calculation, as detailed previously, was performed to determine the magnitude of the effect, which produced an f value of 0.50. Cohen (1992) sets a large effect size for this statistic at .40, indicating a large effect size for this ANOVA. This is significant for demonstrating the relationship between homosexual identity formation and perceptions of campus responses to discrimination. Additionally, when considered with the significant result for feelings of campus climate, further strengthens the overall result that GLB identity development impacts perceptions of campus climate in general.
Table 20

*Analysis of Variance for Campus Responses by Identity Stages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Level</td>
<td>280.212</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.042</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4691.355</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5038.504</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*Analysis of Variance for Campus Responses by Identity Stages Contrasted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Contrast SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1, 2, 3, vs.</td>
<td>188.631</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188.631</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validation of Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ) for Identity Levels One and Two

In chapter three it was noted that the GIQ had not been validated in its initial study due to lack of a significant number of responses from participants who scored in stages one and two. This was due to the methodology employed to obtain the original GIQ research sample, where gay men were asked to complete the instrument. In order to obtain significant numbers of respondents for all stages, this study targeted all undergraduate students, including males and females. Students who self identified as any sexual orientation other than transgender or heterosexual were administered the GIQ.

Table 22

*Identity stage reliability scores and number of respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Stage</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The addition of “questioning” to the options for identifying sexual orientation provided an additional label that more accurately described respondents who are in the early stages of homosexual identity development. With the inclusion of the questioning students, the sample provided significant number of responses needed to validate the GIQ in all stages, particularly stages one and two. Additionally, the online format in which the instrument was administered allowed for anonymous self identifying of the respondents’ sexual orientation, which increased the likelihood of questioning students to check an identity other than heterosexual.

To determine reliability measures for the GIQ, the Kuder-Richardson or KR-20 test was used. As shown in Table 22, stage one of the GIQ obtained an $r = .762$, while stage two obtained and $r = .728$. These results indicate that the GIQ a very reliable measure of stages one and two of the Cass model, and are in line with previously obtained $r$ values for stages three-six identified in Table 2. The data also reflect a lower $r$ value for stage 5, which is similar to the $r$ value that was reported by Brady (1994). This is a significant finding that will assist future researchers in quantitative studies involving sexual identity. Additionally, previous researchers who used the GIQ can review their results with greater confidence than initially thought.
Chapter Five
Implications

Introduction/Summary

This purpose of this study was to address three research questions:

- What are the perceptions among GLBT students of the campus climate for GLBT students?
- Is campus climate for GLBT students at USF perceived differently by heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students?
- Does the identity level of GLB students relate to the perceptions of campus climate?

To answer these questions, the researcher used pre-established instruments: the Rankin Assessment of Campus Climate and the Gay Identity Questionnaire. The population studied was undergraduate students taking six credits or more at the University of South Florida, Tampa Campus in the fall of 2006. The instruments were administered online with slight modifications as outlined in the previous chapters. A total of 2,318 useable responses were received from the campus climate assessment, with 228 of those respondents also completing the identity questionnaire. Findings included the validation of the GIQ for the first two stages of Cass’s identity theory, which previous studies had not confirmed, and significant differences in perceptions of campus climate among the subgroups studied. Finally, significant differences in perceptions of campus climate were
noted among respondents who scored higher and lower on the GIQ. From these results, the study was able to answer all three questions conclusively.

Conclusions

The data analysis of this study supports several key conclusions to the research questions. These conclusions are outlined below in italics with supporting information provided below.

- *Perceptions of Campus Climate at USF are more positive than those reported in the results of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Study conducted by Rankin (2003)*

USF students report fewer oppressive experiences, a lower percentage of negative perceptions of the campus climate, and less satisfaction with administrative responses to GLBT issues. This is positive affirmation that the campus is perceived as less oppressive than others when compared to the national study. However, the majority of GLBTQ respondents felt that transgendered students were likely to be harassed, and over 40% felt that gay men were likely to be harassed. Within the positive results there is still work to be done.

- *Administrative responses to GLBT Issues are not visible to students*

Regarding administrative responses, there is a clear indication from the results that the administration needs to address GLBT issues in a visible fashion that is clearly communicated to the students. Three-fourths of GLBTQ students reported “uncertain” when asked if the university has a rapid response system for incidents of GLBT harassment. Additionally, only one third of GLBTQ students felt that the university
provided visible resources on GLBT issues and concerns. Finally, the most common response to questions regarding administrative responses was “uncertain,” which either communicates indifference by the administration, or indicates that administrators’ efforts to communicate support for GLBT students is not effective.

- Significant differences exist between the perceptions of campus climate for GLBTQ students between the heterosexual and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning students.

The data clearly shows that heterosexual students do not have the same perceptions of campus climate for GLBT students as the GLBT students have themselves. This is especially clear between heterosexual students and gay men. Further research should be conducted to determine the reasons for this dissonance. Number of experiences and contact with GLBTQ students would be a starting point.

- The level of homosexual identity development attained has a significant relationship with perceptions of campus climate.

The results of this study validate Brady’s (1994) findings that Cass’ theory of homosexual identity development can be quantifiably expressed in a two stage model. Significant differences with large effect sizes in feelings about campus climate and administrative responses were observed in this study when identity stages 1,2,3 and 4,5,6 were contrasted. The results are important to future research as this validates a relationship between identity level and perceptions of campus climate, which should be addressed when designing future studies.

Implications for Theory

The implications of this study in terms of theory are significant. First, the design and sample of the study were such that the validation of a previously invalidated
instrument was achieved. The Gay Identity Questionnaire, in its original form, was validated for all six theoretical stages of the Cass Homosexual identity formation theory. Additionally, the significant relationships between identity stage and perceptions of campus climate were quantified by using the same collapsing of Cass’ six stage model into two stages as reported by Brady (1994).

Brady suggested that homosexual identity formation may be a two stage process rather than a six step process as theorized by Cass (1979). Brady’s stage one consists of Cass’s stages one through three, and is characterized by respondents that are unclear or do not like their homosexual identity. Brady’s stage two consists of Cass’s stages four through six, where respondents know about, approve of, and embody their homosexual identity. By demonstrating significant differences in perceptions by identity level, these findings provide additional support for a simplified application of the Cass Model into a two stage model of homosexual identity development that allows less subtle but significant distinctions within the population sampled. This simpler application of the Cass model provides new opportunities for theoretical development of sexual identity and understanding of a very complex human phenomenon.

Noting the current age of the GIQ (thirteen years), and the progression of language regarding how non heterosexual students identify themselves, an updating of this instrument would provide new opportunities for quantifiable data regarding identity development that more recent models have attempted to achieve qualitatively. Terms such as “queer” and “questioning” have become labels with which many students identify, but are not currently used on the existing version of the GIQ.
Second, this study was centered on a theoretical framework which purports that the probability of facilitating homosexual identity development is a function of the level of homosexual identity development acquired by a student and that student’s interaction within the environment. The results of this study have shown that there is a significant relationship between identity development and perceptions of campus climate, and students who have a further developed sense of non-heterosexual identity view the campus climate more negatively up to stage six. When placed in the theoretical framework equation, the results indicate that reducing the negative perceptions of campus climate may assist in the probability of identity development increasing. This provides a unique challenge to administrators that are looking to create an environment that facilitates identity development, and will be discussed further in implications for practice.

Finally, the results demonstrate that the Cass model remains an important tool in understanding the process of identity development for sexual minorities. Modern theorists, such as D’Augelli and others have created comprehensive frameworks for understanding the lifelong process of identity development and the many factors which impact said development. The Cass model, and specifically the simplified application used to determine significance in this study, provides a simpler but effective mode for assessing identity development and its relationship to variables being researched.

*Implications for Practice*

This study provided data regarding perceptions of campus climate for GLBT students at the USF Tampa campus, but the implications for practice can also be of use to administrators across the country. While the specific recommendations outlined below
are unique to the USF Tampa and the results of the study, more general themes are applicable to institutions who are dealing with parallel issues. Analysis of these data identifies clear issues that need to be addressed to improve the learning environment of non-heterosexuals at the institution. While the results are generally more positive than a recent national study, there is a clear need to improve both the content and the communication of university initiatives in this area.

Conclusions of this study document that students perceive the administration at USF is not providing visible leadership on GLBT issues and is not communicating effectively its system of addressing incidents of GLBT harassment. A recommendation to address both of these issues is the establishment of a GLBT resource center. Currently, a graduate student in the Office of Multicultural Affairs is the only dedicated resource to serving the GLBT community specifically. Given the unique issues surrounding the acceptance of GLBT students, such as religious and political factors, the addition of a GLBT resource center would clearly demonstrate USF’s commitment to this population. Additionally, this center could also promote existing initiatives and resources, such as the safe zone program and procedures for filing complaints to the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity have not been clearly disseminated to all students.

Additional recommendations include additions to the curriculum that expose students to GLBT issues and accomplishments in history and today. The results indicate that only 18% of respondents felt that the curriculum adequately covered the contributions of GLBT individuals. Additional exposure to the GLBT community in an academic setting may advance the understanding of this population’s issues as well as
accomplishments in varied disciplines. USF has brought a number of individuals to speak on GLBT issues through its lecture series recently, including Judy Shepard, mother of Matthew Shepard, the student who was slain at the University of Wyoming. Author Augusten Burroughs was also part of the series. Continued support for lectures on GLBT issues will compliment additions to the academic curriculum.

Campus climate perceptions for GLBT students were significantly different between several subgroups of students, particularly heterosexuals. Their perception of campus climate for non heterosexual students was markedly different from GLBT students. Educational initiatives through both the academic and co-curricular structures to educate heterosexuals on the experiences of GLBT students in particular and all underrepresented groups in general, will serve to enlighten majority groups of the type of experiences minority students face at USF.

An effective way of initiating climate change among the larger student population is to identify key student subgroups that are influential on the student body at large, such as athletes, greek students, and student government leaders. Prior research by Nowack (2004) indicated that respondents are less likely to hold negative stereotypes about sexual minorities the more they are exposed to individuals from those groups personally. A targeted ally building program among influential student groups for GLBT students would impact the overall climate in a positive way.

The results also indicate that students perceive gay men and transgender students to experience harassment at higher levels than other sexual minority groups, such as lesbians and bisexuals. One possibility for this difference in perception can be attributed
to campus attitudes regarding gender identity, where students who fail to live up to traditional male roles within society are harassed at a greater rate than females. The University can communicate an institutional value on gender identity by expanding the non discrimination statement to specifically include these members of the University community, which is currently limited to sexual orientation in general. Additionally, educational initiatives that target gender role issues can be administered in a broader sense by including transgender students’ issues in traditional male-female gender role discussions.

Significant differences between perceptions of campus climate and homosexual identity development demonstrate that as homosexual identity attainment increases, so does the perception of harassment and discrimination on campus, up to stage five. This may be due to negative experiences that they have personally witnessed while incorporating their identity, or the realization that social and academic structures are not meeting the unique needs of the GLBT population.

While the general trend from stage one through five is towards a more negative view of climate, students who identified as Cass stage six showed similar mean scores to students who identified at level three. One explanation of the lower score is that students with a fully integrated sense of homosexual identity have become more accustomed to their role as a sexual minority and have discovered the resources to effectively cope with their minority status. These resources, both socially and administrative in nature, assist the most “out” students, while students with a less developed sense of identity fail to see those resources and continue to perceive the climate with skepticism. Unless these
perceptions are reversed, students questioning their sexual orientation will continue to face a campus environment that is not as conducive to growth in identity development, and increases the likelihood of negative behaviors that contribute to students’ “identity foreclosure” as described by Cass (1979).

This study has provided specific information to assist administrators at USF with improving the campus climate perceptions for GLBT students at the Tampa campus. However, campuses across the country experience similar issues. This study has identified new facets of campus climate perceptions that can improve the effectiveness of campus environment initiatives being undertaken. These implications are presented in a generalized form for application at a variety of institutions.

Perhaps the most important implication from this study is the validation of the relationship between identity development and campus climate perceptions. As institutions seek to conduct their own campus climate studies, it is recommended that identity level of the respondents be factored into the methodology employed. Just as an imbalance of other variables, such as residency and class status can impact the distribution of results, this study has shown that identity level of respondents is a key factor to include in study design. A disproportionate number of students at either end of the identity development spectrum can skew the results.

Another implication is to address campus climate from an institution wide frame, including academic and student affairs constituents. The results demonstrated that GBLT issues are not effectively incorporated into the curriculum, and that social structures
within student life need improvement to reduce the perceptions of harassment. No one initiative can correct the problem unless it involves the entire institution.

*Implications for Further Research*

The results of this study have provided answers to the three questions it was designed to answer. They also have created new opportunities for inquiry to further study the GLBTQ population. Further research opportunities center on the outcomes of this study: The validation of the Gay Identity Questionnaire, the duplication of a two phase simplification of the Cass model as initially reported by Brady (1994), the relationship between identity development and perceptions of campus climate, and suggestions for modifications to the GIQ for future studies. Additionally, further study that takes into account additional variables such as race and gender may provide additional insight into this complex framework.

The design of this study resulted in a large enough sample size to validate the effectiveness of the GIQ in determining participant’s identity level in stages one through six. Previously, the GIQ had only been validated in stages three through six. This has significant impacts on its ability to be used for future studies. Additionally, it allows researchers who used the GIQ previously to reexamine their research with greater confidence in the results. With the newer homosexual identity development models (D’Augelli, 1994) being developed, requiring longitudinal qualitative measures to determine identity development, the GIQ proves that effective, statistically verifiable results can be obtained and analyzed immediately for research studies in which the Cass theory is a viable framework.
The results of this study applied Brady’s (1994) findings that suggest a simplified interpretation of the Cass model with two stages of identity development is effective in quantifying differences between levels of identity development that aren’t displayed among six stages. In analyzing the data from this study, significant differences were found between mean scores of campus climate perceptions and identity level in general. A contrast ANOVA verified that the difference was explained by grouping the six stages into two as Brady suggested. When the ANOVA and tukey tests were run among all six stages, no significance difference was noted between any of the six, despite having an overall significant result. This may be the result of not having large enough sample size to statistically validate the differences among the six stages, or may be that the effects themselves are not detectable unless the simpler interpretation is used. Future research involving the GIQ should also investigate all possible grouping of the stages to determine if a different combination other than the one used in this analysis would more fully explain the significant result.

Of the twentyfive GIQ students who didn’t pass the validity questions of the GIQ, six were bisexual, four were lesbian, and fifteen were questioning. Noting that Brady’s study was originally targeting gay men, an update to the instrument would improve its effectiveness. The validity questions in the current GIQ use terms such as “homosexual” and “gay” which many students today do not identify with. Terms such as “queer”, “questioning” and others do not hold the same negative connotations as gay and homosexual, yet still describe non heterosexual identities. Refinement of the terminology
as well as an update of questions in a two stage format would reinvent the GIQ for future studies.

Finally, the environmental impacts on identity development have been previously documented. However, the results of this study have shown that homosexual identity development has a significant relationship to how students perceive the environment in which they are learning. Students with a more developed sense of identity, up to stage five, had a higher mean score on questions regarding feelings about campus climate. Those higher scores indicate a greater perception of harassment and discrimination, perhaps caused by their growing acceptance of their identity as a non heterosexual person, and the internalization of discrimination originally seen as impacting others is now viewed as impacting them. Now that this identity development and climate perception relationship has been established, future research needs to examine what interventions within the environment are effective in altering perceptions of campus climate, which may in turn impact identity development by reducing the likelihood of events that cause identity foreclosure. While this progression towards identity development causes perceptions of campus climate to seem initially negative, the results show achieving the final stage of identity development actually reduces the negative perceptions scores to a lower level.

This study did not examine racial or gender subgroups specifically to determine any differences between identity development and climate perceptions. Given the complex nature of overall identity development, further study into the specific impact of these student characteristics will provide additional data that will benefit development of
targeted initiatives among racial subgroups and of women and men. Data from this study indicated that gay men and transgender students were perceived to experience harassment and discrimination at significantly higher rates than other sexual minorities, which may indicate a gender issue that impacts the student experience at USF.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Assessment of Campus Climate for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons

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

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

Questions concerning this project should be directed to:

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

© Copyright 2000, Rankin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1. Campus experiences</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>1-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the past year, have you experienced the following?</td>
<td>Feared for my physical safety because of my sexual orientation/gender identity?</td>
<td>Concealed my sexual orientation/gender identity to avoid intimidation?</td>
<td>Avoided disclosing my sexual orientation/gender identity to an instructor, TA, administrator, or supervisor due to a fear of negative consequences, harassment, or discrimination.</td>
<td>Been denied University/College employment or promotion due to my sexual orientation/gender identity?</td>
<td>Was a victim of harassment due to my sexual orientation/gender identity.</td>
<td>In what form was this harassment? (Mark all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Harassment refers to conduct that has interfered unreasonably with your ability to work or learn on this campus or has created an offensive, hostile, intimidating working or learning environment. Discrimination refers to a prejudicial bias.</td>
<td>○ Yes</td>
<td>○ Yes</td>
<td>○ Yes</td>
<td>○ Yes</td>
<td>○ Yes</td>
<td>○ derogatory remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ No</td>
<td>○ No</td>
<td>○ No</td>
<td>○ No</td>
<td>○ No</td>
<td>○ threats to expose your sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ pressure to be silent about your sexual orientation/gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ direct or indirect verbal harassment or threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ denial of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ written comments (e.g., anti-LGBT flyers, publications, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ anti-LGBT, gay, bisexual, or transgender graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ threats of physical violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ actual physical assault or injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○ other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1-7 Where did this harassment occur? (Mark all that apply)
- in a class
- in a residence hall
- in a campus office
- in a public space on campus (e.g., student union)
- while working at a College/University job
- while walking on campus

1-8 Who was the source of this harassment? (Mark all that apply)
- student
- faculty
- teaching assistant
- resident assistant
- administrator
- staff member
- campus police
don't know

Part 3. Campus response
Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. Mark one for each line using the following scale:

3-1 The College/University thoroughly addresses campus issues related to sexual orientation/gender identity.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree

3-2 The College/University has visible leadership from the administration regarding sexual orientation/gender identity issues on campus.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree

3-3 The curriculum adequately represents the contributions of LGBT persons.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree

3-4 The climate of the classes I have taken or the job site where I work are accepting of LGBT persons.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree

3-5 The College/University provides visible resources on LGBT issues and concerns.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree

3-6 The College/University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT harassment.

Strongly agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly disagree
Appendix A (continued)

3.7 The College/University has a rapid response system for incidents of LGBT discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Please rate the campus climate in general using the following scale:

- Friendly
- Communicative
- Concerned
- Respectful
- Cooperative
- Competitive
- Improving
- Accessible to Persons with Disabilities
- Inaccessible to Persons with Disabilities

4.1 What is your gender?
- Female
- Male
- transgender

4.2 What is your sexual identity?
- Bisexual
- Gay
- Lesbian
- Heterosexual
- Uncertain

4.3 What is your age?
- 22 and under
- 23–32
- 33–42
- 43–52
- 53 and over

4.4 What is your position?
- Undergraduate student
- Professional student (e.g., law, medicine)
- Graduate student
- Staff
- Administrator
- Faculty

4.5 Are you full-time or part-time?
- Full-time
- Part-time

4.6 Do you have a disability that substantially limits a major life activity (such as seeing, hearing, learning, walking)?
- Yes
- No

4.7 With what racial/ethnic group do you identify? (If you are of a multi-racial/multi-ethnic background, mark all that apply.)
- African American/Black
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Hispanic/Latino
- White/Caucasian

4.8 What is your citizenship status?
- US citizen - born in the United States
- US citizen - naturalized
- Permanent resident (immigrant)
- International (F-1 or J-1 visa)

4.9 Place yourself on the following continuum with 5 being out to everyone personally and professionally, 4 being out to a few friends/family members, 3 being out to a few close friends, and 1 being totally closeted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.10 To whom are you most attracted?
- Women
- Men
- Both men and women

4.11 If you are a student, where do you live?
- Residence hall
- Other campus housing (e.g., co-op)
- Off campus
- Family student housing
- Fraternity or sorority house
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### APPENDIX A

**GAY IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE (GIQ)**

DIRECTIONS: Please read each of the following statements carefully and then circle whether you feel the statements are true (T) or false (F) for you at this point in time. A statement is circled as true if the entire statement is true, otherwise it is circled as false.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F_____ (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F_____ (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F_____ (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F_____ (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F_____ (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOURNAL OF HOMOSEXUALITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I doubt that I am homosexual, but still am confused about who I am sexually.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I do not want most heterosexuals to know that I am definitely homosexual.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am very proud to be gay and make it known to everyone around me.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I don’t have much contact with heterosexuals and can’t say that I miss it.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I generally feel comfortable being the only gay person in a group of heterosexuals.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I’m probably homosexual, even though I maintain a heterosexual image in both my personal and public life.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I have disclosed to 1 or 2 people (very few) that I have homosexual feelings, although I’m not sure I’m homosexual.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am not as angry about society’s treatment of gays because even though I’ve told everyone about my gayness, they have responded well.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am definitely homosexual but I do not share that knowledge with most people.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. I don’t mind if homosexuals know that I have homosexual thoughts and feelings, but I don’t want others to know. T F____(20)

16. More than likely I’m homosexual, although I’m not positive about it yet. T F____(21)

17. I don’t act like most homosexuals do, so I doubt that I’m homosexual. T F____(22)

18. I’m probably homosexual, but I’m not sure yet. T F____(23)

19. I am openly gay and fully integrated into heterosexual society. T F____(24)

20. I don’t think that I’m homosexual. T F____(25)

21. I don’t feel I’m heterosexual or homosexual. T F____(26)

22. I have thoughts I would label as homosexual. T F____(27)

23. I don’t want people to know that I may be homosexual, although I’m not sure if I am homosexual or not. T F____(28)

24. I may be homosexual and I am upset at the thought of it. T F____(29)

25. The topic of homosexuality does not relate to me personally. T F____(30)
Appendix B (continued)

26. I frequently confront people about their irrational, homophobic (fear of homosexuality) feelings.  
   T      F____(31)

27. Getting in touch with homosexuals is something I feel I need to do, even though I’m not sure I want to.  
   T      F____(32)

28. I have homosexual thoughts and feelings but I doubt that I’m homosexual.  
   T      F____(33)

29. I dread having to deal with the fact that I may be homosexual.  
   T      F____(34)

30. I am proud and open with everyone about being gay, but it isn’t the major focus of my life.  
   T      F____(35)

31. I probably am heterosexual or non-sexual.  
   T      F____(36)

32. I am experimenting with my same sex, because I don’t know what my sexual preference is.  
   T      F____(37)

33. I feel accepted by homosexual friends and acquaintances, even though I’m not sure I’m homosexual.  
   T      F____(38)

34. I frequently express to others, anger over heterosexuals’ oppression of me and other gays.  
   T      F____(39)

35. I have not told most of the people at work that I am definitely homosexual.  
   T      F____(40)
Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>T/F</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I accept but would not say I am proud of the fact that I am definitely homosexual.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I cannot imagine sharing my homosexual feelings with anyone.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Most heterosexuals are not credible sources of help for me.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I am openly gay around gays and heterosexuals.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I engage in sexual behavior I would label as homosexual.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I am not about to stay hidden as gay for anyone.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I tolerate rather than accept my homosexual thoughts and feelings.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>My heterosexual friends, family, and associates think of me as a person who happens to be gay, rather than as a gay person.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Even though I am definitely homosexual, I have not told my family.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I am openly gay with everyone, but it doesn't make me feel all that different from heterosexuals.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F____(50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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