

Religious Intolerance on Campus: A Multi-Institution Study

Cynthia Broderick

Kevin Fosnacht

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education,
Houston, TX, November 2017.

Religious Intolerance on Campus: A Multi-Institution Study**Abstract**

Incidents of religious intolerance and discrimination have become too common in American society and today's college campuses are not immune to these incidents. Previous research has shown the negative influence of perceived hostile campus cultures on students' overall learning and development. This study investigated the religious and spiritual discrimination experiences of college and university students. With particular attention paid to students' self-identified religious/spiritual identities, the study found that students who identify with a non-Christian, World faith tradition experienced a greater number of discriminatory acts than their Christian peers. Additionally, the results show that a greater respect for beliefs on campus was negatively correlated with experiencing acts of religious intolerance. In contrast, increased comfort in expressing religious and spirituality beliefs on campus was positively related to greater incidents of religious intolerance.

Keywords: Religion, Spirituality, Discrimination, Intolerance, Inter-religious Dialogue

Religious Intolerance on Campus: A Multi-Institution Study

Discriminatory incidents against religious minorities have become increasingly common in American society. A recent 2017 Pew Research Center study found that 75% of Muslims believed there was “a lot of discrimination against Muslims in the United States” and 48% said they had “experienced at least one incident of discrimination in the past twelve months” (Pew Research Center, 2017). College campuses are not immune to these experiences of religious discrimination. Students from various faith traditions have been victims of incidents of religious discrimination and Jewish and Muslim students are particularly vulnerable to being targeted (Bauer-Wolf, 2017; Dreid, 2016; Flaherty, 2016). While much research has focused on understanding the campus climate for racial and ethnic minorities and women (Hurtado & Harper, 2007; Mayhew et al., 2016), research on how religion influences campus climate perceptions is comparatively rare.

The research on acts of racial intolerance has demonstrated that discriminatory acts have deleterious effects on students’ academic outcomes (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007; Museus, Nichols, & Lambert, 2008), yet overt acts based on religion have not been extensively studied. Such a literature gap is surprising due to the importance of religion in the identity formation of young adults (Furrow, King, & White, 2004; King, 2003). Previous research indicates that religion is an important factor to many students and influences their well-being (Higher Education Research Institute, 2005; Small & Bowman, 2011). Additionally, perceptions of the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate have been demonstrated to be an important factor in how students perceive the overall campus climate (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017). Fully understanding the role religion plays in the college

experience is imperative due to the increasing religious diversity among young adults (Pew Research Center, 2015) and the heightened focus on religion in our polity through the abortion debates, war on terror, and, more recently, the calls for a Muslim immigration “ban.”

Consequently, we used data from a large, multi-institutional sample of bachelor’s-seeking students to investigate how often students reported experiencing religious intolerance. This work builds upon a previous study (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017), where we found that roughly one in four students experienced religious intolerance at least once in the past year. Furthermore, we found that the religious and spirituality dimensions of the campus climate accounted for a substantial and unique portion of students’ perceptions of the overall campus climate.

Literature Review

Over the past two decades, research has increasingly focused on the influence of religion and spirituality on the college student experience. Within this area, students’ spiritual growth has been a commonly researched topic (Bowman & Small, 2010, 2012a, 2012b; Cole & Ahmadi, 2010; Paredes-Collins, 2014; Small & Bowman, 2011). Other frequent lines of inquiry have focused on the relationship between religion and participation in religious and spirituality activities, and how integration into the spiritual life impacts persistence at religious colleges and universities (Gonyea & Kuh, 2006; Morris, Smith, & Cejda, 2003; Patten & Rice, 2009; Speers, 2008). Mayhew and Bryant (2013) found that students from majority and minority faith traditions who participated in religious/spiritual co-curricular activities had a more positive worldview commitment, whereas participation by non-religious students had no comparable association. More recently, several studies have focused on how religion and spirituality shape students perceptions of the campus climate and provided more insight into an understudied aspect of the campus climate (Bowman & Toms Smedley, 2013; Mayhew, Bowman, &

Rockenbach, 2014; Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017; in press; Rockenbach & Mayhew, 2014; Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Bowman, 2015).

Critical campus dynamics like structural worldview diversity, the psychological climate, and engagement in various religious activities have been positively associated with an overall satisfaction with the spiritual campus climate (Rockenbach & Mayhew, 2014). Rockenbach and Mayhew (2014) also found differences in perceptions of the spirituality campus climate by race, but that levels of satisfaction across the religious/worldview identities were generally consistent. Subsequent research revealed that atheists perceived a less positive campus climate for nonreligious individuals, and that “strength of commitment to worldview is associated with perceiving a positive climate for nonreligious individuals on campus” (Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Bowman, 2015). Previous research also found that many Christians felt unwelcome on campus (Magolda & Gross, 2009; Moran, 2007). Therefore, Christians may conversely feel that non-religious students are more accepted by their campuses than members of their own faith. These studies show the complexities of religious/spiritual identities and perceptions of campus climate.

Fosnacht & Broderick (2017) further explored the role of the religious/spiritual dimensions of campus climate to students’ perception of the overall campus climate. After holding constant other variables, this study indicated approximately 15% of the variance in the overall campus climate was accounted for by two measures of the campus climate related to religion and spirituality: respect of beliefs and expression of beliefs. This study also found few differences in students’ perceptions of overall campus climate by the different religion/spirituality identities after accounting for students’ perception of the respect for and comfort in expressing their religious beliefs. A second study by Fosnacht and Broderick (In press) examined the relationship between religion, attending a religiously-affiliated institution,

and students' perceptions of the religious campus climate. This study found few differences by religion and institution type in students' perception that their religious and spiritual beliefs were respected at their institution. However, Christians felt more comfortable expressing their beliefs on campus than members of other faith groups. Furthermore, students attending religiously-affiliated institutions felt more comfortable expressing their beliefs than students attending secular institutions. These results indicated that the relationship between religion and comfort in expressing religiously beliefs was moderated by institution type as the association between religion and the spirituality campus climate varied by institution type.

In addition to the campus climate studies in light of students' religious beliefs or spirituality, another area of emerging research relates to the influence of interfaith dialogue engagement on college campuses. Often the topic of interfaith dialogue is discussed within explorations of the concept of Christian privilege, and in particular institutional attempts at exploring this form of privilege with students (Edwards, 2017; Fairchild & Blumfeld, 2007; Larson & Shady, 2012). Research has shown the positive effects that both formal and informal interreligious dialogue opportunities have on the campus environment, particularly for student from minority religious groups or with no religion/spirituality identities. Park and Bowman (2015) found that, "religion appears to function as a form of both bridging and bonding capital in the university environment. Religiosity bonds close same-race friendships and bridges students of different races via [cross-racial interaction]" (p. 32). Rockenbach and colleagues (2015) also found a positive association between interfaith engagements like attending a multi-faith celebration or participating in service opportunities with individuals of other faith identities, and a greater pluralistic orientation. The influence of religion and spirituality on campus climate, along with the importance of formal and informal interfaith dialogue opportunities is apparent,

yet incidents of religious discrimination still happen on today's campuses. This study highlights the pervasiveness of religious discrimination on campus and the factors associated with its prevalence.

Theoretical Framework

Our study adapted Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, and Allen's (1999) campus climate framework to incorporate religious diversity as a guiding theoretical framework. The original framework focuses on racial and ethnic diversity and can be used as a guide to improve the campus climate for racial minority students. It focuses on identifying and delimiting the various factor that shape students' perceptions of the campus climate. The four factors are: the historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and behaviors. We adapted the framework to focus on the role religion and spirituality play in the campus climate.

Purpose

Guided by Hurtado and colleague's (1999) campus climate framework, we sought to investigate the correlates of being the victim of religious intolerance. The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How frequently do students experience religious intolerance?
2. What student and institutional characteristics are related with experiencing religious intolerance?
3. How does the religious campus climate influence students' frequency of experiencing religious intolerance?

Methods

Data

To answer these questions, we utilized data derived from the 2016 administration of the National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE). NSSE is a large, multi-institutional student survey focusing on students' participation in educationally beneficial activities and the perception of the campus climate, among other topics. The survey is annually administered to first-year and senior students attending bachelor's-granting institutions throughout North America. Our analyses used data from the 2016 administration as a subset of schools (38 in total) received an additional item set focusing on the religious and spirituality campus climate that was appended to the end of the core NSSE instrument. The institutions chosen to receive the additional items were randomly chosen from a pool of institutions that did not elect to append two additional item sets (modules or consortia) to NSSE. A total of 4,495 first-year and 6,670 senior students responded to the supplemental item set. The response rate for both the first-year and senior samples was 21%.

The respondents attended a diverse mix of institutions. About 40% of the sample attended an institution that awarded doctoral degrees, another 40% attended master's-granting institutions, while the remaining proportion attended baccalaureate colleges. One in four students attended a religiously-affiliated institution, 15% attended a private, non-sectarian institution, while 60% attended a public institution. One in ten students attended a minority serving institution. About 8% of the sample attended an institution with an undergraduate enrollment less than 1,000, 45% attended an institution with an undergraduate enrollment between 1,000 and 4,999 students, 9% attended institutions with enrollments between 5,000 and 9,999 students, while 38% attended an institution with an enrollment of 10,000 or more.

Roughly 70% of the respondents were female. Most of the students were enrolled full-time. Roughly two-thirds of the sample was White, while African Americans and Latina/os each

comprised 11% of the sample. About 4% of the respondents were Asian or a Pacific Islander and 4% were international. The remaining students were Native American, multi-racial, or of an unknown race. Sixty-two percent of the sample was Christian, 5% of a non-Christian world faith (e.g., Jewish, Islamic, Hindu, Humanist), and 21% were unaffiliated with a religion or an atheist. About 11% of the sample preferred not to provide their religious/spirituality identity.

Our dependent variable was the frequency in which a student experienced an act of religious intolerance and was captured in the supplemental items focusing on the religious and spirituality campus climate. The item was worded as “during the current school year, how many times have you experienced religious intolerance?” and the respondents could select from the following options: never, 1-3 times, 4-6 times, 7-9 times, and 10 or more times. From the additional item set, we also utilized data on students’ religion. The religious/spiritual identity question included 28 possible response options; therefore, we recoded this variable into four categories: Christian, non-Christian world faith, the unaffiliated, and prefer not to respond. Both the response options and categorization scheme used the methodology created for the Pew Research Center’s (2015) Religious Landscape Study. We also created two institution-level measures of the spirituality and religious campus climate using variables captured in the supplemental item set. These variables, respect for beliefs and expression of beliefs, were initially created as student-level factors via a factor analysis and subsequently aggregated to the institution level for this analysis by taking the group mean. The Cronbach’s alpha (at the student level) of respect for beliefs was .87 for both the first-year and senior samples. The reliability of expression of beliefs (at the student level) was .79 for the first-year sample and .81 for the senior sample. Additional information on the validity of these constructs is available in Fosnacht and Broderick (2017).

In addition to the spirituality items, we utilized data from the core NSSE instrument. We used data on a variety of student characteristics captured on the survey like age, parental education, educational aspiration, greek-life participation, and major field. Data on students' sex, race/ethnicity, class standing, and enrollment intensity were provided by the respondents' institutions. We also utilize data on the characteristics of the respondents' institutions. In addition to the campus climate aggregated variables previously mentioned, we obtained institutional control, Basic 2010 Carnegie Classification (aggregated), , and undergraduate enrollment from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education project (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, n.d.). We also obtained religious affiliation (coded as yes/no; all religiously-affiliated schools were affiliated with a Christian religion) from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.) and institutional selectivity from Barron's Educational Series (2012) ratings.

Analyses

To answer our research questions, we began by examining the frequency distribution of our dependent variable (frequency of religious intolerance) and bivariate crosstabulations of the dependent variable by religion, sex, race/ethnicity, and institutional control. Next, we constructed multivariate regression models that predicted the number of times a student experienced religious intolerance. As this variable was collected in ranges, we started by estimating multivariate ordinal regression models. However, our preliminary analyses indicated that some of the variables in our model did not satisfy the Brant (1990) test of proportional odds, which is an important assumption of the ordinal logistic regression model. Consequently, we used a partial proportional odds regression model that constrained the estimates for independent variables that passed a Wald test for equivalent coefficients across categories, but allowed the estimates to vary

across categories for variables that did not pass the test. These models were calculated using Williams' (2006) user-written command for Stata. Furthermore, due to the low percentage of respondents in the three highest categories of the dependent variable (see the results for more detail), we collapsed the frequency of religious intolerance variable into three categories: never, 1 to 3 times, and 4 or more times. Furthermore, we created separate models for first-year and senior students. Due to the nesting of students within institutions, our models used robust standard errors that accounted for the violation of the independence assumption. We also utilized the survey weight supplied by NSSE that adjusts for nonresponse due to sex, enrollment status, class standing, and institution size. Our regression model included the student and institutional characteristics described in the data section.

Results

Descriptive Results

Table 1 contains the percentage distribution of experiencing acts of religious intolerance by selected characteristics for first-year and senior students. Roughly, three out of four first-year students never experienced religious intolerance during the current academic year. However, one in five students reported experiencing between one and three acts of intolerance. One in twenty students experiences four to six acts of intolerance, while about 4 percent of first-year students experienced at least seven acts of intolerance. Members of a non-Christian, world faith experienced religious intolerance at higher rates than their peers as four in ten first-year students reporting at least one act of intolerance. The distribution did not vary substantially by sex. Students in the catch-all "other" racial category reported experiencing slightly more acts of religious intolerance than the average student. However, the distribution did not vary

substantially between the other racial/ethnic categories. Students attending public institutions reported slightly more frequent acts of intolerance than their peers attending private institutions.

Among seniors, about one out of four students experienced at least one incident of religious intolerance during the past year. Seventeen percent of seniors experienced one to three acts of intolerance. Four percent experienced between four to six acts of intolerance, while 3% were the victims of seven or more acts of intolerance. Members of a non-Christian, world faith reported experiencing more acts of religious intolerance than the average student. The distribution for Christians, the unaffiliated, and those who preferred not to respond did not vary substantially compared to the average student. The distribution did not vary substantially by sex. The distribution for White seniors mirrored the distribution for the average student. However, Asian and Pacific Islander and international seniors reported experiencing religious intolerance more frequently than the average senior, while Black students reported less frequent acts of religious intolerance than average. Hispanic and Latina/o seniors experienced acts of religious intolerance at a higher rate than the average student. Seniors attending public and non-sectarian reported experiencing acts of religious intolerance at a rate that mirrored the average student. However, seniors attending religiously-affiliated institutions were slightly more likely to experience religious intolerance than the typical senior.

Multivariate Results

After examining the descriptive results, we estimated partial ordinal logistic regression models that predict the frequency of experiencing religious intolerance for first-year and senior students, separately. The results from these models are displayed in Table 2. We converted the estimates into proportional odds ratios by exponentiating the ordered logit coefficients. The proportional odds ratios are analogous to the odds ratios frequently used in binary logistic

regression, but indicate the odds of moving to the higher group. However, as some variables did not meet the assumptions of the proportional odds models, we allowed some coefficients to vary across categories and these compare the indicated category to the highest category (experienced four or more acts of religious intolerance). We describe the results separately for first-year and senior students below. All results presented are after other variables were held constant.

First-year students. First-year students who were members of a non-Christian, world faith were substantially more likely to experience religious intolerance than Christian students. In substantive terms, these students were twice as likely to experience 1 to 3 acts of religious intolerance and 4 or more incidents of religious intolerance as Christian students. No significant differences were observed between Christians and the unaffiliated and prefer not to respond groups. On-campus students were more likely experience acts of religious intolerance than their peers who lived off-campus. Age was positively correlated with experiencing religious intolerance, as for a 10 year increase in age, the odds of experiencing at least 10 acts of religious intolerance were 1.3 higher. Asian and Pacific Islanders, African Americans, and Hispanic and Latina/os were less likely to experience at least 10 acts of religious intolerance than their White peers. First-generation students were less likely experience religious intolerance than students with a parent who earned at least a bachelor's degree. Students who did not aspire to earn a bachelor's degree were more likely to experience four or more acts of religious intolerance. Similarly, students aspiring to earn a doctoral degree experienced four or more acts of religious intolerance at higher rates than students aspiring to earn a bachelor's degree. Transfer students were more likely to experience frequent acts of religious intolerance than students who initially started at their institution. Compared to students majoring in the social sciences, student majoring in business, engineering, and the health professions were less likely experience acts of

religious intolerance. No other major group was significantly more likely to experience religious intolerance than social science majors. Students enrolled full-time were nearly two and a half more times likely to experience at least 1 incident of religious intolerance. No other student characteristic was significantly associated with experiencing religious intolerance.

Among the institutional characteristics, we did not observe a significant relationship between institutional control and experiencing religious intolerance. Similarly, no significant relationship was found for Basic 2015 Carnegie Classification and selectivity as measured by Barron's rating. However, attending a larger institution was positively associated with experiencing religious intolerance. We also included two institutional aggregates for students' perceptions of the respect for religious beliefs at their institution and comfort in expressing their religious beliefs in our model. The institutional mean for respect for beliefs was negatively correlated with religious intolerance as a standard deviation increase in this measure was associated with a .18 odds of experiencing religious intolerance. In contrast, comfort in expressing religious beliefs was associated with an increase in the odds of experiencing religious intolerance by a factor of 3.60.

Seniors. Seniors who were a member of a non-Christian, world faith were 1.52 times more likely than Christians to experience at least one incident of religious intolerance. However, the same group had twice the odds of being the victim of at least four incidents of intolerance. Additionally, students who preferred not to provide their religion were 1.31 times as likely to experience four or more acts of intolerance. Males were 1.40 times as likely to experience four or more acts of intolerance. On-campus residents experienced acts of religious intolerance at a rate 1.32 times higher than off-campus students. Greek-life participants were more likely to experience acts of intolerance than non-participants. An increase of age of 10 years was

associated with a reduction in experiencing religious intolerance by a factor of .78. African American students were less likely than Whites to report experiencing religious intolerance. However, the catch-all race category of “other” was associated with a higher likelihood of experiencing intolerance. First-generation students were less likely to experience religious intolerance than their peers whom had a parent that earned a bachelor’s degree. Seniors not expecting to earn a bachelor’s degree and seniors expecting to earn a doctoral or professional degree were more likely to experience religious intolerance. Transfer students were less likely to be the victims of religious intolerance than students who started at their institution. Seniors who earned mostly Bs experienced more frequent acts of religious intolerance than their peers who earned mostly As. Seniors majoring in the biological sciences, physical sciences, business, engineering, and health professions experienced less acts of religious intolerance than social science majors. No other student characteristics included in our models were significantly associated with acts of religious intolerance for seniors after we held other characteristics constant.

Seniors who attended private, non-sectarian institutions experienced acts of religious intolerance at a rate 1.62 times higher than students enrolled at public institutions. Students attending master’s-granting institutions were the victims of acts of religious intolerance at a rate 1.34 times higher than students enrolled at doctoral institutions. Institutional selectivity, as measured by Barron’s rating, was negatively correlated with experiencing religious intolerance. Institution size was positively associated with the frequency of experiencing religious intolerance. Finally, the institutional aggregate of students comfort in expressing their religious beliefs was positively correlated with experiencing religious intolerance, as a standard deviation

change in this measure was associated with an increase in the odds of being the victim of religious intolerance by a factor of 3.

Discussion

Religion and spirituality have become increasingly important topics in our polity. The makeup of the nation's religious preferences has diversified and religion plays a central role in various societal debates ranging from abortion to the war on terror to Trump's Muslim ban. College students are not immune from being influenced by these external forces as a series of high profile incidents of religious intolerance have occurred at various higher education institutions (Bauer-Wolf, 2017; Dreid, 2016; Flaherty, 2016). Additionally, much research has demonstrated the negative effects of racial intolerance and poor campus climates play on educational outcomes (Fries-Britt & Turner, 2001; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007; Hurtado et al., 1999; Hurtado & Harper, 2007; Museus et al., 2008). Despite this context, investigations into how often students experience religious intolerance are exceedingly rare.

In a previous study, we demonstrated that religion and spirituality account for a substantial proportion of the variance in how students' perceive the overall campus climate (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017). Consequently, we investigated an important behavioral aspect of how students perceive the religious and spirituality campus climate: the frequency of experiencing acts of religious intolerance. We found that roughly one in four students experienced at least one act of religious intolerance in the past school year. The frequency of being the victim of these acts varied across student characteristics. Forty-one percent of first-year students and 36% of seniors that were members of a non-Christian, world faith experienced acts of religiously-based intolerance. One in 12 first-year students from this population also reported experiencing 10 or more incidents, indicating such acts are not one-off, isolated incidents. We

also created multivariate regression models that allowed us to examine how multiple factors were related to the frequency of experiencing religious intolerance. After we held other factors constant, members of non-Christian, world faith groups were roughly twice as likely to experience religious intolerance as Christians, confirming our descriptive findings.

Our multivariate results also unveiled a second substantial finding: the religious and spirituality campus climate plays both a positive and negative role in the frequency of experiencing religious intolerance. Not surprisingly, students' perceptions of the respect for their religious beliefs (measured at the campus level) was related to experiencing less frequent acts of religious intolerance. However, students' comfort in expressing their religious beliefs (also measured at the campus level) was strongly associated with an increased probability of experiencing religious intolerance. These results in combination indicate that respect for religious and spirituality beliefs reduces intolerance, but the frequency that religion and spirituality are discussed on campus leads to more incidents of religious intolerance. This finding points to the importance of fostering respect for different religious and spiritual beliefs when topics involving religion and spirituality are discussed both in- and out-side of the classroom. It also highlights a greater need for greater intentionality and training by facilitators of these interfaith engagement opportunities, a point echoed by Rockenbach and colleagues (2015): "if interfaith engagement is a meaningful endeavor...inclusivity is critical" (p. 51).

Other findings from our multivariate results reinforce the role engagement on religious topics play in the frequency that students experience acts of religious intolerance. Students majoring in field less likely to discuss topics related religion and spirituality were significantly less likely to report experiencing acts of religious in tolerance. Furthermore, first-year students reported experiencing religious intolerance at a higher rate than seniors. A likely cause for this

relationship is the general education classes taken by first-year students, which increase their probability of being exposed to discussions related to religion and spirituality. Additionally, students living on-campus were more likely to experience religious intolerance, which we believe is caused by more frequent exposure to campus life like informal discussions or protests which may invoke religious hostility.

Our findings provoke two main questions for future research. Our findings could prompt some to believe that an easy way to reduce acts of religious intolerance is to simply remove discussions related to religion from the curriculum and discourage students from attending events related to religious pluralism. We believe that this approach would have more harmful consequences as it would fail to prepare our students to interact with others from different backgrounds for when they enter the workforce and to participate in our democracy. Yet, the results indicate that too frequent discussions of topics related to religion can have deleterious effects on students. Consequently, future research should attempt to investigate what is the right balance?

A second line of inquiry should investigate how institutions can take steps to reduce acts of religious intolerance on their campus. The primary program currently available are intergroup (interfaith) dialogues. These programs bring students together from different faith traditions and promote better understanding between through dialogue guided by a trained facilitator. How effective are interfaith programs in promoting interfaith understanding? Should such experiences be required of all students?

Conclusion

Given the strong connection between a positive campus climate and student persistence, it is critical that college campuses engage in intentional dialogues around the issue of religion

and spirituality. Through curricular and co-curricular opportunities, it is imperative that institutions address the issue of religious and spiritual intolerance on today's college campus, and foster campuses that value religious pluralism and collaboration. It is imperative that all colleges and universities intentionally address issues of religious and spiritual diversity and actively strive to reduce, and hopefully eliminate, these incidents of religious discrimination.

References

- Brant, R. (1990) Assessing proportionality in the proportional odds model for ordinal logistic regression. *Biometrics*, 46, 1171–1178.
- Barron's Educational Series (2015). *Profiles of American colleges 2016* (32nd ed.). Hauppauge, NY: Author.
- Bauer-Wolf, J. (June 29, 2017). The bias that a college ignores? *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/06/29/lawsuit-highlights-jewish-students-frustrations-san-francisco-state>
- Bowman, N. A., & Small, J. L. (2010). Do college students who identify with a privileged religion experience greater spiritual development? Exploring individual and institutional dynamics. *Research in Higher Education*, 51, 595-614. doi: 10.1007/s11162.010.9175.2
- Bowman, N. A., & Small, J. L. (2012a). Exploring a hidden form of minority status: College students' religious affiliation and well-being. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53, 491-509. doi: 10.1353/csd.2012.0050
- Bowman, N., & Small, J. (2012b). The experiences and spiritual growth of religiously privileged and religiously marginalized college students. In N. A. Bowman (Ed.) *Spirituality in College Students' Lives: Translating Research into Practice* (pp. 19-34). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Bowman, N. A., & Smedley, C. T. (2013). The forgotten minority: examining religious affiliation and university satisfaction. *Higher Education*, 65, 745-760.
- Cole, D., & Ahmadi, S. (2010). Reconsidering campus diversity: An examination of Muslim students' experiences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 81, 121-139.
- Dreid, N. (November 10, 2016). Muslim students are reportedly attacked on campuses in wake

- of election. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/muslim-students-are-reportedly-attacked-on-campus-in-wake-of-election/115475>
- Edwards, S. (2017). Intergroup dialogue & religious identity: Attempting to raise awareness of Christian privilege & religious oppression. *Multicultural Education*, 24(2), 18-24.
- Fairchild, E.E., & Blumenfeld, W.J. (2007). Traversing boundaries: Dialogues on Christian privilege, religious oppression, and religious pluralism among believers and non-believers. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 26(2), 177-185.
- Fries-Britt, S. L., & Turner, B. (2001). Facing stereotypes: A case study of Black students on a White campus. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 420-429.
- Flaherty, C. (November 28, 2016). Jewish professors targeted. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/11/28/two-jewish-professors-different-campus-are-harassed-anti-semitic-threats>
- Fosnacht, K. & Broderick, C. (2017). *An Overlooked Factor? How Religion and Spirituality Influence Students' Perception of the Campus Climate*. Manuscript in review.
- Fosnacht, K. & Broderick, C. (In press). The Role of Religion and Institution Type in Seniors' Perceptions of the Religious and Spiritual Campus Climate. *Journal of College and Character*.
- Furrow, J. L., King, P. E., & White, K. (2004). Religion and positive youth development: Identity, meaning, and prosocial concerns. *Applied Developmental Science*, 8(1), 17-26.

- Gonyea, R.M. & Kuh, G.D. (2006). Independent colleges and student engagement: Do religious affiliation and institution type matter? Retrieved from http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/cic_nsse_report_june_2006.pdf
- Greer, T. M., & Chwalisz, K. (2007). Minority-related stressors and coping processes among African American college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 388-404.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (2005). The spiritual life of college students: A national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from http://spirituality.ucla.edu/docs/reports/Spiritual_Life_College_Students_Full_Report.pdf
- Hurtado, S. & Harper, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, 7-24. doi: 10.1002/ss.254
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 26(8).
- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (n.d.). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2015 edition [Data file and codebook] Bloomington, IN: Author.
- King, P. E. (2003). Religion and identity: The role of ideological, social, and spiritual contexts. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(3), 197-204.
- Larson, M.H. & Shady, S.L. (2012). Confronting the complexities of Christian privilege through interfaith dialogue. *Journal of College and Character*, 13(2). Doi:10.1515/jcc-2012-1824

- Long, J. S. & Freese, J. (2014). *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata* (3rd ed.). College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Magolda, P. M., & Gross, K. E. (2009). *It's all about Jesus! Faith as an oppositional collegiate subculture*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Mayhew, M.J. & Bryant, A.N. (2013). Achievement or arrest? The influence of the collegiate religious and spiritual climate on students' worldview commitment. *Research in Higher Education*, 54, 63-84. doi:10.1007/s11162-012-9262-7
- Mayhew, M. J., Bowman, N., & Rockenbach, A. B. (2014). Silencing whom?: Linking campus climates for religious, spiritual, and worldview diversity to student worldviews. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85, 219-242.
- Mayhew, M. J., Rockenbach, A. N., Bowman, N. A., Seifert, T. A., Wolniak, G. C., Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. Y. (2016). *How college affects students (Vol. 3): 21st century evidence that higher education works*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moran, C. D. (2007). The public identity work of evangelical Christian students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 418-434.
- Morris, J. M., Smith, A. B., & Cejda, B. D. (2003). Spiritual integration as a predictor of persistence at Christian institutions of higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 2, 341-351. doi: 10.1080/15363750390246105
- Museus, S. D., Nichols, A. H. & Lambert, A. D. (2008). Racial Differences in the Effects of Campus Racial Climate on Degree Completion: A Structural Equation Model. *The Review of Higher Education*. 32(1), 107-134.

- Paredes-Collins, K. (2014). Campus climate for diversity as a predictor of spiritual development at Christian colleges. *Religion & Education*, 41, 171-193.
doi:10.1080/15507394.2013.86420
- Park, J.J. & Bowman, N.A. (2015). Religion as bridging or bonding social capital: Race, religion, and cross-racial interaction for college students. *Sociology of Education*, 88(1), 20-37. doi: 10.1177/0038040714560172
- Patten, T. A., & Rice, N. D. (2009). Religious minorities and persistence at a systemic religiously affiliated university. *Christian Higher Education*, 8(1), 42-53. doi: 10.1080/15363750802349323
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *America's Changing Religious Landscape*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape/>.
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *U.S. Muslims Concerned About Their Place in Society, but Continue to Believe in the American Dream*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/2017/07/26/findings-from-pew-research-centers-2017-survey-of-us-muslims/>
- Rockenbach, A. B., & Mayhew, M. J. (2014). The campus spiritual climate: Predictors of satisfaction among students with diverse worldviews. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55, 41-62. doi: 10.1353/csd.2014.0002
- Rockenbach, A. N., Mayhew, M. J., & Bowman, N. A. (2015). Perceptions of the campus climate for nonreligious students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 56, 181-186.
doi:10.1353/csd.2015.0021

- Rockenbach, A.N., Mayhew, M.J., Morin, S., Crandall, R.E., & Selznick, B. (2015). Fostering the pluralism orientation of college students through interfaith co-curricular engagement. *The Review of Higher Education*, 39(1), 25-58. doi:10.1353/rhe.2015.0040
- Small, J. & Bowman, N. (2011). Religious commitment, skepticism, and struggle among U.S. college students: The impact of majority/minority religious affiliation and institutional type. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, 154-174. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5906.2010.01557x
- Speers, S. (2008). The secular thesis revisited: Religious life on the secular college campus today. *Journal of College and Character*, 10, 1-11. doi: 10.2202/1940-1639.1056
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* [Data file and codebook]. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/UseTheData>
- Williams, R. (2006). Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *Stata Journal*, 6(1), 58-82.

Table 1

Percentage distribution of experiencing religious intolerance during the current school year by selected characteristics for first-year and senior students

| | Never | 1-3 times | 4-6 times | 7-9 times | 10+ times |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| First-year | | | | | |
| Overall | 73 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Religion</i> | | | | | |
| Christian | 74 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| World faith | 59 | 23 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| Unaffiliated | 72 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Prefer not to respond | 74 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Sex</i> | | | | | |
| Female | 73 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Male | 73 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| <i>Race/ethnicity</i> | | | | | |
| White | 73 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 72 | 19 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| Black | 75 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latina/o | 75 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| International | 73 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Other | 68 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| <i>Institutional control</i> | | | | | |
| Public | 72 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Non-sectarian | 76 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Religiously-affiliated | 74 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Senior | | | | | |
| Overall | 76 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| <i>Religion</i> | | | | | |
| Christian | 77 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| World faith | 64 | 22 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Unaffiliated | 75 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Prefer not to respond | 78 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Sex</i> | | | | | |
| Female | 77 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Male | 74 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Race/ethnicity</i> | | | | | |
| White | 76 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 69 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| Black | 81 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

| | Never | 1-3 times | 4-6 times | 7-9 times | 10+ times |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Hispanic/Latina/o | 71 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| International | 68 | 21 | 8 | 1 | 3 |
| Other | 75 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 3 |
| <i>Institutional control</i> | | | | | |
| Public | 76 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Non-sectarian | 77 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Religiously-affiliated | 74 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Table 2.

Odds ratios from partial proportional odds ordered logit models of experiencing religious intolerance for first-year and senior students

| | First-year students | | | Seniors | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| | Constrained | Never vs 1+ | 3 or less vs. 4 or more | Constrained | Never vs. 1+ | 3 or less vs. 4 or more |
| Religion (Ref: Christian) | | | | | | |
| World faith | 2.01** | | | | 1.52* | 2.14*** |
| Unaffiliated | 0.95 | | | 1.01 | | |
| Prefer not to respond | 1.06 | | | | 1.02 | 1.31* |
| Male | 0.90 | | | | 1.06 | 1.40*** |
| On-campus resident | 1.43** | | | 1.32*** | | |
| Greek-life member | 1.08 | | | 1.25* | | |
| Age (10 years) | 1.31** | | | 0.78** | | |
| Race/ethnicity (Ref: White) | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Isl. | 0.81* | | | 1.12 | | |
| Black | 0.75* | | | 0.70** | | |
| Hispanic/Latina/o | 0.65*** | | | 1.20 | | |
| International | 0.86 | | | 1.14 | | |
| Other | 1.29 | | | 1.31*** | | |
| First-generation | | 0.87* | 1.07 | 0.83*** | | |
| Educational aspirations (Ref: Bachelor's) | | | | | | |
| Some college | | 1.22 | 2.37*** | 1.52** | | |
| Master's | 1.14 | | | 1.11 | | |
| Doctoral/professional | | 1.12 | 1.42** | 1.52*** | | |
| Transfer student | 1.25* | | | 0.78** | | |
| Grades (Ref: Mostly As) | | | | | | |
| Mostly Bs | 1.18 | | | 1.16** | | |
| Mostly Cs or lower | 1.13 | | | 1.16 | | |
| Major field (Ref: Social Science) | | | | | | |
| Arts & Humanities | 0.79 | | | 0.97 | | |
| Biological Sciences | 0.83 | | | 0.60** | | |
| Physical Sciences | 0.75 | | | 0.63*** | | |
| Business | 0.74* | | | 0.56*** | | |
| Communications | 1.01 | | | 0.86 | | |
| Education | 0.79 | | | 0.82 | | |
| Engineering | 0.61*** | | | 0.76** | | |
| Health Professions | 0.65** | | | 0.53*** | | |

| | First-year students | | | Seniors | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | Constrained | Never vs 1+ | 3 or less vs. 4 or more | Constrained | Never vs. 1+ | 3 or less vs. 4 or more |
| Social Service Prof. | 0.77 | | | 0.96 | | |
| All Other | | 0.70 | 1.25 | 0.87 | | |
| Undecided | 1.04 | | | 0.58 | | |
| Full-time | | 2.40** | 1.45 | 1.03 | | |
| Institutional control (Ref: Public) | | | | | | |
| Non-sectarian | 1.04 | | | 1.62** | | |
| Religiously-affiliated | 0.77 | | | 1.21 | | |
| Basic 2015 Carnegie Classification (aggregated; Ref: Doctoral) | | | | | | |
| Master's | 0.85 | | | 1.34*** | | |
| Baccalaureate | 0.95 | | | 1.20 | | |
| Barron's rating | 0.99 | | | 0.86** | | |
| UG Enrollment (1,000s) | 1.03*** | | | | 1.05*** | 1.06*** |
| Respect for beliefs (inst. mean; z-scored) | 0.18*** | | | 0.66 | | |
| Expression of beliefs (inst. mean; z-scored) | 3.60** | | | 3.01*** | | |
| <i>N</i> | 4,280 | | | 6,358 | | |
| Pseudo <i>R</i> ² | 0.05 | | | 0.05 | | |

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Note: Proportional odds ratios; Constrained indicates that the variable was held constant across the models.