Marginalization at the crossroads:

Exploring the experiences of queer students of color

Allison BrckaLorenz and Jana Clark

Indiana University

Abstract

Queer students of color present a unique combination of marginalized racial and sexual identities. In this large-scale multi-institutional study, we explore the engagement, perceptions of campus environment, and satisfaction of thousands of queer students of color. Results highlight some of the struggles and successes of this often-silenced group of students.

*Keywords*: queer students of color, engagement, intersectionality

Though research on the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) students in college is a growing body of work (Evans & Broido, 1999; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005; Sanlo, 2004), mirroring the dominant narrative of the LGBTQ community in the United States, much of the discourse focusing on queer students in higher education centers on White cisgender gay male students (Linley & Nguyen, 2015; D'Augelli, 1994; Cass, 1979; Brown, 2002). Models that go beyond merely lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity development to focus on gender variant students also remain predominantly White; students of color remain on the margins if included at all (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011; Misawa, 2010). Critical Race Theory, Queer Theory, and tenets of Intersectionality offer critical frameworks through which to examine the experience of non-heterosexual, or queer, students of color (QSOC).

Critical Race Theory (CRT) examines the historical roots of racial discrimination in the United States and identifies racism as an institutionalized norm that pervades society, countering the narrative that racism and racist acts are individual (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Largely because of the way value is ascribed to Whiteness, CRT lends a powerful and essential scholarly tool for "deconstruction, reconstruction, and construction: deconstruction of oppressive structures and discourses, reconstruction of human agency, and construction of equitable and socially just relations of power" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 9). By focusing on the daily lived experiences of people of color, CRT offers a framework of resistance to interrogate the ramifications of White supremacy in postsecondary education (Hughes & Giles, 2010).

Rooted in feminism, Queer Theory deconstructs traditional ideologies about sex and sexuality, especially those that view "straight" as normative. By challenging heteronormativity, it allows scholars to investigate the lived experiences of queer people and examine the connections between gender and sexuality (Halperin, 2003). It offers a way to redefine discussions about

sexuality and challenges its institutionalization within higher education. Like CRT, Queer

Theory is a critical framework that allows for deconstruction and questioning of field norms;

pushing scholars to research students who identify outside of dominant groups.

QSOC represent a unique combination of marginalized racial and sexual identities.

Crenshaw's (1989) concept of intersectionality, which looks at how a person's various social

identities overlap and how those intersections are affected by systems of oppression and/or

discrimination, aids researchers in understanding the ways in which larger social structures affect

college students' experiences.

Most studies on this population focus on Black gay and bisexual men who indicate they

often feel forced to choose between one of those two identities, but face marginalization based

on both. Harris (2003) describes this as a "double-burden," which students say precludes them

from turning to their fellow Black peers for support because of their sexual orientation or their

queer White peers because of their race (Goode-Cross & Good, 2009). In some cases, students

identified more as Black than gay because they often felt more victimized by racism than

homophobia. However, they also noted that when they experienced homophobia, it was typically

by their Black peers (Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011). QSOC, then, were more likely than their

white counterparts to conceal their sexual orientation in order to avoid harassment (Rankin,

2005). Despite queerness being a marginalized identity, researchers contend that it is not immune

to perpetuating the oppressions that exist in larger society; the double marginalization felt by

QSOC makes it increasingly hard for them to accept either/both of their identities (Teunis, 2007).

Researchers argue that focusing on "one-identity-at-a-time" is not enough; the field must honor

these students holistically and engage all of their multiple identities in order to adequately

support them (Goode-Cross & Good, 2009; Harper, Wardell & McGuire, 2011; Misawa, 2010; Teunis, 2007).

QSOC contend with the intersection of both their racial and sexual identities. Researchers have identified many ways in which these identities are both at odds with each other, while at the same time work in tandem to create a difficult environment for these students. It is imperative to investigate these identities through intersectional and critical frameworks such as CRT and Queer Theory to understand how they relate to undergraduate student engagement. As there are no other large-scale quantitative studies to guide specifics for this examination of QSOC, we look at this group in the aggregate to create a base for future research to explore with more nuance and detail. Specifically, this study seeks to examine engagement and perceptions of institutional support for QSOC by comparing academic engagement, campus support, and satisfaction of queer White students to QSOC. This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do queer students of color differ from queer White students on select demographics and characteristics?

2. How do queer students of color engage differently from their queer White peers on select indicators of academic engagement?

3. How do queer students of color perceive their campus environment, satisfaction, and developmental growth differently from their queer White peers?

**Methods**

**Data Source**

The data from this study come from the 2017 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE measures the time and effort that undergraduate first-years

and seniors at four-year colleges and universities invest in activities that relate to student learning

and development. More specifically, NSSE asks students how often they engage in various

effective educational practices, their perceptions of their college environment, how they spend

their time in and out of the classroom, and the quality of interactions they have at their

institution. In 2017, NSSE was administered at 725 four-year colleges and universities across the

United States and Canada resulting in around 517,000 student respondents. Participating

institutions and responding students reflect the diversity of four-year colleges and universities in

the United States with respect to institution characteristics and student demographics (NSSE,

2017).

**Respondents**

The respondents for this study consist of over 28,000 first-year and senior students who

responded to both the racial or ethnic identification question and identified as non-straight

(which we will refer to as "queer") on the sexual orientation question on the NSSE core survey.

Around two-thirds (62%) of these students identified as being queer and White, and around one-

third (38%) identified as being QSOC. Around one-fourth of these students (25%) identified as

men, about two-thirds identified as women (66%), with smaller proportions identifying with

another gender identity (7%) or preferring not to respond about gender identity (2%). A little

over half (54%) were seniors, and nearly all 92% were enrolled full time. The largest proportions

of students were majoring in or intending to major in Arts and Humanities (20%); Social

Sciences (17%); or Biological Sciences, Agriculture, and Natural Resources (12%). About two in

five students (42%) were first generation, and about a quarter (26%) started college at a different

institution. Around half (46%) of the respondents lived on campus, and about a quarter (26%)

reported a diagnosed disability or impairment. Very few of these students were on an institution-

sponsored athletic team (5%) or a member of a social fraternity or sorority (7%). For more

details about respondent characteristics by racial or ethnic identification, see Table 1.

**Measures**

       **Demographics**. A variety of demographic questions were used as part of this study, the

most critical being students' racial or ethnic identification and students' sexual orientation.

Queer White students and QSOC were identified by two survey questions. In the racial or ethnic

identification item, students were asked to select all categories that apply to them from the

following options: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American,

Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, Other, and I prefer not to

respond. We identified students of color as students who selected any options other than only

White or preferred not to respond. Students were asked to identify their sexual orientation by

choosing one of the following options: straight (heterosexual), bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer,

questioning or unsure, another sexual orientation, and I prefer not to respond. The queer students

in this study were those that did not select straight (heterosexual) or preferred not to respond.

Other demographics included in this study were gender identity, class standing, major field,

being an athlete, being in a fraternity or sorority, first-generation status, enrollment status,

transfer status, living situation, and reporting a diagnosed disability.

       **Engagement and Campus Environment**. The engagement and campus environment

outcomes studied here include NSSE's ten Engagement Indicators, aggregate measures created

from individual engagement items on the core NSSE survey. We placed these Engagement

Indicators into two groups: Academic Engagement (*Higher-Order Learning*, *Reflective &*

*Integrative Learning*, *Learning Strategies*, *Quantitative Reasoning*, *Collaborative Learning*,

*Discussions with Diverse Others*, and *Student-Faculty Interaction*) and Campus Environment

(*Effective Teaching Practices, Quality of Interactions,* and *Supportive Environment*). We also examined an additional aggregate measure of students' perceived gains and development while at their institution as well as two item individual satisfaction items. The first of these items asks students how they would evaluate their entire educational experience at their institution (*Excellent*, *Good*, *Fair*, *Poor*), and the second asks if students could start over again, would they go to the same institution they are currently attending (*Definitely yes, Probably yes, Probably no, Definitely no*). Although not an original part of our research questions, given our findings, we additionally examined the individual component items of the *Quality of Interactions* scale. These items asked about students' interactions with other students, advisors, faculty, staff, and administrative offices on a scale of *Poor*=1 to *Excellent*=7. More details about and component items of these measures can be found on the NSSE website nsse.indiana.edu. Queer students' average scores on these measures by racial or ethnic identification can be found in Table 2.

**Analyses**

To answer our first research question about how the QSOC and queer White students differed on select demographics and characteristics, we examined a series of Chi-Square tests comparing various demographics and characteristics by our two groups of queer students. Differences with adjusted residuals greater than 2 or less than -2 were considered notable. To answer our second and third research questions about how QSOC engage and perceive their environment differently than their queer White peers, we examined a series of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models. The dependent variable in all models was one of the NSSE aggregate measures of engagement, perceptions of campus environment, satisfaction measures, or the individual items in the *Quality of Interactions* scale. The key independent variable of interest was students' identification as a queer student of color or a queer White student. Other

independent variable controls included class level, gender identity, being an athlete, fraternity/sorority membership, first-generation status, major field, enrollment status, transfer status, living situation, and diagnosed disability. More information about the coding of individual variables can be found in Table 3.

**Limitations**

Although this study contained a large number of queer students, both White and students of color, we note that this masks the nuance between students with differing non-straight identities and the variations of racial/ethnic heritage within the pool of students of color. We do not assume that all queer students or QSOC are engaged at their institution in the same ways. Given the great diversity in how students self-identified for the sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identification questions, it is difficult to generalize about these students as a group both in this study and in the population in general. Because this study was intended as a broad base for future research to explore with more nuance and detail, the results from this study should be considered a general starting point for future studies looking within these categories and intersections as well as support for future studies to include racial/ethnic identification as a contributing characteristic for examining the experiences of queer students.

## Results

**How do queer students of color differ from queer White students on select demographics and characteristics?** There were no differences found between queer White students and QSOC by enrollment, athletic status, or membership in a social fraternity or sorority. QSOC were more likely to identify as men ($\chi^2(3)$=16.4, AR=3.3, $p$ = .001) and much more likely to be living in a residence farther than walking distance from their institution ($\chi^2(4)$=408.9, AR=13.3, $p$ < .001). They more often majored in Business ($\chi^2(11)$=160.9, AR=4.8,

$p < .001$); Communications, Media, and Public Relations (AR=2.2); Engineering (AR=2.4); Health Professions (AR=5.9); and Social Service Professions (AR=3.4).

Queer White students more likely majored in Arts & Humanities ($\chi^2(11)$=160.9, AR=-7.6, $p < .001$); Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Computer Science (AR=-2.6); and Education (AR=-5.9). Queer White students were also more likely to be first generation ($\chi^2(1)$=742.3, AR=-27.2, $p < .001$) and transfer ($\chi^2(1)$=43.1, AR=-6.6, $p < .001$) students. They were also more likely to live on ($\chi^2(4)$=408.9, AR=-10.4, $p < .001$) or within walking distance of their institution (AR=-9.8). They also were more likely to have been diagnosed with a disability or impairment ($\chi^2(2)$=360.9, AR=-15.7, $p < .001$). When looking at the follow-up items asking students to specify their disability(ies), the largest differences were seen in having a mental health disorder (queer White students: 13%, QSOC: 8%) and having more than one disability or impairment (queer White students: 9%, QSOC: 5%). For more details on the proportions of these demographics and characteristics by queer White students and QSOC, see Table 1.

**How do queer students of color engage differently from their queer White peers on select indicators of academic engagement?** Overall, QSOC were at least as or more academically engaged than their queer White peers. QSOC were doing more higher-order learning in their coursework (B = .528, $p < .01$), collaborating more with their peers (B = 1.009, $p < .001$), having more discussions with diverse others (B = .546, $p < .01$), and interacting more frequently with their faculty (B = .596, $p < .01$) than queer White students. There were no differences between QSOC and queer White students on doing reflective and integrative learning activities, quantitative reasoning activities, and using more effective learning strategies. More details about coefficients can be found in Table 4.

**How do queer students of color perceive their campus environment, satisfaction, and developmental growth differently from their queer White peers?** Overall, QSOC had similar views of their instructor's effective teaching practices and sense of their institution's support as queer White students, and they had higher perceptions of the gains they've made in various areas of skill and development (B = .479, $p < .01$) than queer White students. QSOC, however, had more negative reports of their quality of interactions with others (B = -1.520, $p < .001$), their rating of their entire educational experience (B = -.131, $p < .001$), and whether or not they would return to their same institution (B = -.133, $p < .001$). We looked further at the measure *Quality of Interactions* by examining all of the individual component items, and we found that QSOC had more negative interactions with other students (B = -.119, $p < .001$), advisors (B = -.132, $p < .001$), faculty (B = -.236, $p < .001$), staff (B = -.121, $p < .001$), and administrative offices (B = -.159, $p < .001$); all of the campus constituents asked about on the survey. More details about coefficients can be found in Table 4.

## Discussion

The results from this study open the door to better understanding a largely marginalized and understudied group of students. QSOC face discrimination on multiple aspects of their identity, their sexual orientation and/or gender identity as well as their racial identity, which can often lead to them struggling to find communities in which they feel they fully belong. The findings presented here support the mix of studies that focus on particular groups, such as Black gay and bisexual men, on a larger scale. We found evidence that reinforces the notion that QSOC are a population requiring their own body of literature to understand their experiences and find ways to support their success in higher education.

Seeing differences in basic demographics and characteristics such as living situation, first-generation status, and reports of diagnosed disabilities from their White peers shows us that racial or ethnic identification has an impact on the experiences of queer students. Students of color more often lived further away from their campus, perhaps adding to or being the product of the disconnect they felt in their interactions with others at their institution. The differing majors that queer White students and QSOC tended to be in might also be a signal of climate issues more strongly tied to race than sexual orientation. Future studies should look more closely at this interaction between race and sexual orientation within disciplines to better understand the intersection of these identities.

Additionally, while literature on QSOC often centers on the multiply marginalized and oppressed identities these students hold, such emphases amplify and codify a deficit perspective rather than a focus on the strength and resilience that these students carry with them to college. Overall QSOC were on par or more engaged than their queer White peers in challenging academic activities such as analyzing and applying knowledge to new situations, working with their peers on homework and preparing for exams, and interacting with their faculty outside of class. This is complemented by the finding that QSOC feel that the experience they've had at their institution has more strongly contributed to their gains in personal and social development, practical competence, and general education.

Still, there remain institutional barriers to engagement for QSOC; the struggle to find support is made more apparent with the findings of QSOC having more negative interactions with students, advisors, faculty, staff, and administrative offices. While these negative interactions may be a reflection of the double marginalization felt by QSOC (Teunis, 2007), they also implicate institutions as being responsible for these obstacles. Despite feeling a similar sense

of institutional emphasis on such things as providing support to help students succeed and

helping students manage their non-academic responsibilities, QSOC were less satisfied than their

queer White peers having a lower rating of their overall educational experience and being less

likely to return to their institution if they could start over.

**Recommendations**

Our study supports previous research, which argue that focusing on "one-identity-at-a-

time" is not enough; higher education must honor these students holistically and engage all of

their multiple identities in order to adequately support them (Goode-Cross & Good, 2009;

Harper, Wardell & McGuire, 2011; Misawa, 2010; Teunis, 2007). Institutions and their

stakeholders must help maintain and increase QSOC levels of engagement, supportive

environment, and satisfaction. Student peers, advisors, faculty, staff, and administrative offices

must engage with QSOC in ways that honor their intersectional identities and their unique needs.

One way to aid QSOC who are dealing with issues of minoritization in two ways, based on both

their race and their queer identity, is through Queer Race Pedagogy (QRP), an educational

approach that gets at the systemic issues related to the needs of QSOC (Misawa, 2010). Barnard

(2004) offered one of the first discussions of the intersection of queerness and race. The

examination illuminates race as inextricably sexualized, explicates sexuality as always racially

marked. As an extension of queer theory, Queer Race (Barnard, 2004) illustrates the social and

political implications of queerness as racialized.

Further expanding this theoretical approach to education and specifically pedagogy,

Misawa (2010) introduces a strategy that allows QSOC to discuss issues related to both of their

identities and their holistic experiences. It attends to the more complicated issues that QSOC deal

with in higher education and relies upon intersectional frameworks. It suggests practical changes

to be made in the academy to aid QSOC on college campuses. Misawa advises teachers to recognize how race, gender, and sexual orientation interact and are influenced by each other and advocates for the creation of multicultural safe spaces on campus where the issues these students face can be explored. Because most queer-themed programs in place within higher education come through LGBTQ+ campus centers, it is also important that this pedagogy moves beyond merely classroom discussion (faculty, student peers), but extends through to student affairs practices as well (advisors, staff, administrative offices).

And finally, future research should expand on this aggregate analysis of QSOC by looking within this broad group of students to see how students with differing non-straight orientations interact with students of varying racial/ethnic heritage. Additional aspects of identity, such as gender identity, religious affiliation, economic background, etc., should be considered as well, further complicating the intersections being examined. More large-scale quantitative analyses of students with intersectional identities can help to lay the foundation for data-driven decision making and institutional improvements on campuses as well as provide support for smaller, more targeted studies of students with specific intersecting identities.

**References**

Beemyn, G., & Rankin, S. (2011). *The lives of transgender people*. New York: Columbia

University Press.

Brown, M. (2012). Gender and sexuality: Intersectional anxieties. *Progress in Human

Geography, 36*(4), 541-550.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of

Homosexuality, 4*, 219–235.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique

of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of

Chicago Legal Forum*, *140*, 138-167.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of

lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, and D. Birman

(Eds.), *Human Diversity: Perspectives on People in Context*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (1999). Coming out in college residence halls: Negotiation,

meaning making, challenges, supports. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*,

658‑668.

Goode-Cross, D. T., & Good, G. E. (2009). Managing multiple-minority identities: African

American men who have sex with men at predominately White universities. *Journal of

Diversity in Higher Education*, *2*(2), 103-112.

Goode-Cross, D. T., & Tager, D. (2011). Negotiating multiple identities: How African American

gay and bisexual men persist at a predominantly White institution. *Journal of

Homosexuality*, *58*(9), 1235-1254.

Halperin, D. M. (2003). The normalization of queer theory. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *45*(2-4), 339-343.

Harper, S. R., Wardell, C. C., & McGuire, K. M. (2011). Man of multiple identities: Complex individuality and identity intersectionality among college men. In J. A. Laker & T. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp.     81-96). New York: Routledge

Harris, W. G. (2003). African American homosexual males on predominantly White college and university campuses. *Journal of African American Studies*, *7*(1), 47-56.

Hughes, R., & Giles, M. (2010). CRiT walking in higher education: Activating critical race theory in the academy. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, *13*(1), 41–57.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7–24

Linley, J. L., & Nguyen, D. J. (2015). LGBTQ experiences in curricular contexts. *New Directions for Student Services, 2015*: 41-53. doi: 10.1002/ss.20142

Misawa, M. (2010). Queer race pedagogy for educators in higher education: Dealing with power dynamics and positionality of QUEER students of color. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *3*(1), 26-35.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2017). NSSE 2017 Overview. Retrieved from nsse.indiana.edu.

Rankin, S. R. (2005), Campus climates for sexual minorities. *New Directions for Student Services, 2005*: 17–23. doi:10.1002/ss.170

Renn, K., & Bilodeau, B.L. (2005). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *NASPA Journal, 42*(3), 342-367.

Sanlo, R. (2004). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: Risk, resiliency, and retention.

*Journal of College Student Retention, 6*(1), 97-110.

Teunis, N. (2007). Sexual objectification and the construction of Whiteness in the gay male

community. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *9*(3), 263-275.

Table 1.
Select Respondent Characteristics

| | | Queer Students of Color (%) n=10,807 | Queer White Students (%) n=17,876 | Total (%) N=28,683 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Racial/Ethnic identification | American Indian or Alaska Native | 1.4 | -- | < 1.0 |
| | Asian | 16.6 | -- | 6.3 |
| | Black or African American | 18.0 | -- | 6.8 |
| | Hispanic or Latino | 24.6 | -- | 9.3 |
| | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 1.0 | -- | < 1.0 |
| | White | -- | 100.0 | 62.3 |
| | Other | 4.7 | -- | 1.8 |
| | Multiracial | 33.7 | -- | 12.7 |
| Sexual orientation | Bisexual | 43.1 | 44.8 | 44.2 |
| | Gay | 15.3 | 13.7 | 14.3 |
| | Lesbian | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.8 |
| | Queer | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.6 |
| | Questioning or unsure | 11.8 | 10.1 | 10.8 |
| | Another sexual orientation, please specify | 12.9 | 13.7 | 13.4 |
| Gender identity | Man | 26.5 | 24.7 | 25.4 |
| | Woman | 64.2 | 66.4 | 65.6 |
| | Another gender identity | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| | Prefer not to respond | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Class standing | Freshman (1st year) | 49.2 | 44.7 | 46.4 |
| | Senior (4th year) | 50.8 | 55.3 | 53.6 |
| Major field | Arts & Humanities | 18.1 | 21.9 | 20.4 |
| | Bio. Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources | 11.7 | 12.0 | 11.9 |
| | Phys. Sciences, Math, & Computer Science | 6.5 | 7.3 | 7.0 |
| | Social Sciences | 17.2 | 16.6 | 16.8 |
| | Business | 9.3 | 7.7 | 8.3 |
| | Communications, Media, & Public Relations | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.7 |
| | Education | 4.5 | 6.1 | 5.5 |
| | Engineering | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.5 |
| | Health Professions | 10.0 | 8.0 | 8.7 |
| | Social Service Professions | 5.6 | 4.7 | 5.0 |
| | All Other | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| Athlete | | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| Fraternity/ Sorority | | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| First-generation | | 52.2 | 35.8 | 41.9 |
| Enrolled full time | | 91.2 | 91.8 | 91.6 |
| Started elsewhere (transfer) | | 28.0 | 24.5 | 25.8 |
| Living situation | Living on campus (residence hall, dormitory, other campus housing, fraternity or sorority | 42.4 | 48.6 | 46.3 |
| | Living in a residence within walking distance of the institution, farther than walking distance of the institution, or none of the above | 57.6 | 51.4 | 53.7 |
| Disability | No | 74.7 | 65.8 | 69.2 |
| | Yes | 19.7 | 29.8 | 26.0 |
| | I prefer not to respond | 5.6 | 4.3 | 4.8 |

Table 2.
Engagement and Campus Environment Descriptives by Racial/Ethnic Identification

| | Queer Students of Color | | Queer White Students | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| **Engagement** | | | | | | |
| *Higher-Order Learning* | 39.76 | 13.73 | 39.32 | 13.03 | 39.49 | 13.30 |
| *Reflective & Integrative Learning* | 39.50 | 12.52 | 39.85 | 11.84 | 39.72 | 12.10 |
| *Quantitative Reasoning* | 27.86 | 16.34 | 27.27 | 16.09 | 27.49 | 16.18 |
| *Learning Strategies* | 37.61 | 14.32 | 37.34 | 13.98 | 37.44 | 14.11 |
| *Collaborative Learning* | 32.55 | 14.28 | 31.88 | 13.92 | 32.13 | 14.06 |
| *Discussions with Diverse Others* | 41.79 | 15.00 | 41.44 | 13.69 | 41.57 | 14.20 |
| *Student-Faculty Interaction* | 23.72 | 15.88 | 23.52 | 15.16 | 23.60 | 15.44 |
| **Campus Environment** | | | | | | |
| *Effective Teaching Practices* | 38.84 | 13.41 | 39.07 | 12.39 | 38.98 | 12.79 |
| *Quality of Interactions* | 39.92 | 12.63 | 41.52 | 11.08 | 40.92 | 11.72 |
| With students | 5.21 | 1.47 | 5.34 | 1.32 | 5.29 | 1.38 |
| With advisors | 4.99 | 1.76 | 5.13 | 1.71 | 5.08 | 1.73 |
| With faculty | 5.25 | 1.50 | 5.52 | 1.27 | 5.42 | 1.36 |
| With staff | 4.82 | 1.74 | 4.94 | 1.61 | 4.89 | 1.66 |
| With administrative offices | 4.65 | 1.77 | 4.79 | 1.63 | 4.73 | 1.69 |
| *Supportive Environment* | 33.99 | 14.13 | 33.84 | 12.91 | 33.90 | 13.38 |
| **Satisfaction** | | | | | | |
| *Perceived Gains* | 35.68 | 14.34 | 35.17 | 13.37 | 35.36 | 13.75 |
| Rating of entire educational experience | 3.09 | 0.79 | 3.23 | 0.74 | 3.18 | 0.77 |
| Return to the same institution | 3.06 | 0.88 | 3.20 | 0.84 | 3.15 | 0.86 |

Note: Individual items within aggregate measures (indicated by italics) were converted to a 0 to 60 scale and then averaged together to create scale scores. The individual items under *Quality of Interactions* are on a 1 (Poor) to 7 (Excellent) scale, and individual satisfaction items are on a 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) scale for ratings of their entire educational experience and a 1 (Definitely no) to 4 (Definitely yes) scale for whether or not they would return to their current institution if they could start over.

Table 3.
Student-Level Demographics and Variable Coding for Independent Variables

| Student-Level Demographic | | Variable Coding |
|---|---|---|
| Queer students of color | | Bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, questioning or unsure, another sexual orientation AND Native American, Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, other, multiracial = 1, *ELSE* = 0 |
| Class level (senior) | | Seniors=1, First-years=0 |
| Gender identity | Man | Man=1, *ELSE*=0 |
| | Woman | Woman=1, *ELSE*=0 |
| | Another gender identity | Another gender identity=1, *ELSE*=0 |
| | I prefer not to respond | I prefer not to respond (gender) =1, *ELSE*=0 |
| Athlete | | Yes=1, No=0 |
| Fraternity/ Sorority | | Yes=1, No=0 |
| First-generation | | Yes (at least one parent/guardian has completed a four-year degree)=1, No=0 |
| STEM major | | STEM=1, Non-STEM=0 |
| Enrolled full time | | Full-time=1, Part-time=0 |
| Started elsewhere (transfer) | | Started elsewhere=1, Started at institution=0 |
| Living situation | Living on campus (residence hall, dormitory, other campus housing, fraternity or sorority) | On campus=1, *ELSE*=0 |
| Disability | Yes | Disability yes=1, No=0 |

Table 4.
OLS Regression Coefficients for Queer Students of Color

| | Unstd. B | SE | β | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Engagement | | | | |
| *Higher-Order Learning* | .528 | .172 | .019 | ** |
| *Reflective & Integrative Learning* | .026 | .153 | .001 | |
| *Quantitative Reasoning* | .392 | .207 | .012 | |
| *Learning Strategies* | .052 | .183 | .002 | |
| *Collaborative Learning* | 1.009 | .179 | .035 | *** |
| *Discussions with Diverse Others* | .546 | .184 | .019 | ** |
| *Student-Faculty Interaction* | .596 | .196 | .019 | ** |
| Campus Environment | | | | |
| *Effective Teaching Practices* | -.240 | .165 | -.009 | |
| *Quality of Interactions* | -1.520 | .154 | -.063 | *** |
| With students | -.119 | .018 | -.042 | *** |
| With advisors | -.132 | .023 | -.037 | *** |
| With faculty | -.236 | .018 | -.084 | *** |
| With staff | -.121 | .023 | -.036 | *** |
| With administrative offices | -.159 | .022 | -.046 | *** |
| *Supportive Environment* | -.018 | .170 | -.001 | |
| Satisfaction | | | | |
| *Perceived Gains* | .479 | .174 | .017 | ** |
| Rating of entire educational experience | -.131 | .010 | -.084 | *** |
| Return to the same institution | -.133 | .011 | -.075 | *** |

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$. Dependent variables were standardized before entry into models so that unstandardized coefficients can be interpreted as effect sizes. Models controlled for student class standing, gender identity, being an athlete, fraternity or sorority membership, first-generation status, major field, enrollment status, transfer status, living situation, and reporting a diagnosed disability.