

Advancing Truth: Expanding our Knowledge of LGBTQ+ Faculty

Allison BrckaLorenz

Kyle Fassett

Ryan Merckle

Indiana University Bloomington

Abstract

Most research about queerness at colleges and universities has been aimed at examining the student experience. Research on queer faculty often has quantitative limitations, has grown outdated, or is qualitative in nature. From this, we know that the experiences of queer faculty are often difficult. Through a large-scale, multi-institution, multi-year investigation of LGBQ+ faculty, this study aims to give an overview of the academic lives of these understudied academics. We investigate who they are, at what kinds of institutions are they employed, and different ways that they contribute to undergraduate education. With this story, we hope to strengthen the voices of qualitative studies and encourage higher education to think more broadly about notions of diversity and identity.

Advancing Truth: Expanding our Knowledge of LGBQ+ Faculty

Much research about queerness, specifically with regard to sexual orientation, at colleges and universities has been aimed at examining the student experience (D'Augelli, 1989; Garvey, BrckaLorenz, Latopolski & Hurtado, 2018; Lark & Croteau, 1998), and many that do focus on faculty have been qualitative research (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Vaccaro, 2012). Quantitative research is limited, has grown dated, or lacked large sample sizes due to historical data collection practices (re: Sears, 2002). Institutions have come a long way since the charge for non-discrimination policies was central to the movement of queer faculty. Yet, the implementation of such advancements at the university level often does not reflect the climate for queer faculty (d'Emilio, 1990; Vaccaro, 2012). Queerness frequently is not represented in the mission statements of institutions under the broad umbrella term of diversity (Morrish & O'Mara, 2011). Climate studies of LGBQ+ faculty perceptions of institutions are needed to help administrators positively shape environments.

Historically, queer academics have been pushed to the margins as sexuality was constructed as a dichotomy of straight and non-straight thus othering queerness (Fox, 2007). More recently, queer faculty members find the curriculum of higher education institutions to be heterosexist as they do not have queer studies departments or the content is suppressed by the institutional climate (Vaccaro, 2012). For example, Yale University turned down a donation aiming to establish a gay studies program because it did not believe in adding this identity-based study (Arenson, 1997). Queer studies urges us to comment on the invisibility of heterosexuality as it is considered normative (McRuer, 2003). Additionally, queer faculty members, regardless if they teach in a queer studies program, are considered "second-class" (Dolan, 1998, p. 40). "LGBTQ faculty do not count as minorities, according to most human resources policies" (Morrish & O'Mara, 2011, p. 982). Sears (2002) found, however, faculty members at private institutions believe the climate is more affirming or tolerant than public institutions. Although shifts in national conversations have led to improvements for the quality of queer lives, such as the

LGBQ+ FACULTY

repeal of Don't Ask Don't Tell and marriage equality, continued research is needed on faculty members with marginalized sexual identities (CNN, 2018).

It should be noted in summarizing what we know from the literature, we reuse the original terminology used by authors to identify queer respondents, such as LGBT, LGBTQ, etc., to honor and acknowledge previous studies' language while this study will use the term LGBQ+; our study is strictly an examination of faculty members' by sexual identity, and we do so to avoid the conflation of gender and sexual identities. Often trans-spectrum, genderqueer, or gender variant individuals are grouped with people holding queer sexual identities which results in hiding the unique challenges and experiences people in these groups face. We strive to provide clarity in emphasizing our focus on faculty members' sexual identities while acknowledging that although gender identity will additionally play a role in the stories of our respondents, we do not explore that aspect of their identities in this study.

Our Current Understanding

Campus climate studies have paved the way forward for understanding the experiences of queer educators and their experiences due to pejorative institutional environments fueling climate studies focusing on queer student experiences (Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker, & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Garvey & Rankin, 2015; Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002). In a climate study about LGBTQ faculty and staff, however, Blumenfeld, Weber, and Rankin (2016) found 77 percent of respondents felt discomfort within their departments. Additionally, 14 percent of queer spectrum students, staff, and faculty felt their safety threatened at institutions, and 41 percent remained in the closet unable to live their authentic lives. Although research combining results of students, staff, and faculty make it difficult to understand the true experience of each population, this message of intolerance and unacceptance is widespread with nearly one-fifth of reported issues of harassment on campuses aimed toward LGBTQ individuals (Blumenfeld, Weber, & Rankin, 2016).

LGBQ+ FACULTY

The climate at colleges and universities often do not provide an atmosphere of belonging for queer faculty; it explicitly and implicitly discriminates against them (Rankin, 1998). For example, due to religious policies at some colleges and universities queer faculty members may be prohibited from employment (Stewart, & Howard-Hamilton, 2014). Although overt messages such as these can make the discrimination clear, often the experiences of queer faculty are difficult as they face internal pressure to decipher cues of acceptance of their sexual orientation (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009). For example, while it is difficult to prove, many faculty believe the content of their work pertaining to queer research can affect their tenure status (Dolan, 1998). As a faculty members' personal support is considered a strong predictor of their perception of institutional climate (Sears, 2002), it follows that much of LGBQ+ faculty members' negative perceptions of institutional climate come from the lack of support they face as individuals.

Although the faculty sense of institutional climate is important for their identity and success as faculty, the true home of faculty is often in their specific disciplinary field or department. Researchers have found STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields to be less welcoming of LGBT individuals while the humanities and social sciences are more inviting (Linley & Nguyen, 2015). It is a common experience for queer science and engineering faculty to feel negative climates because heterosexuality is assumed, and many faculty only come out when they have reached a specific rank (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009). Linley and Nguyen (2015) posited the positivist nature of STEM fields casts aside the spectrum of gender and sexuality thus negating potentially salient aspects of queer identities. In more concrete terms, LGBT faculty have mentioned that their straight peers have even expressed anxiety over sharing a room with them at conferences or of queer faculty bringing their partners to dinners, openly rejecting both their person and their partner. This is important and helps to explain why out faculty members are still a growing population (Sears, 2002). Although some fields may do better than others, it is clear more localized issues in departments and disciplinary fields can affect larger

LGBQ+ FACULTY

perceptions of institutional climate and additionally create issues for the students with which LGBQ+ faculty interact.

The challenges faced by LGBQ+ faculty create another layer of difficulty for graduate students preparing to be faculty members. Lark and Croteau (1998) found openly LGB doctoral psychology students often looked for openly queer faculty to be mentors, and LGBT faculty members often served as mentors for their straight students and colleagues who come to them for support or tips on how to speak to other queer individuals (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009). With many faculty unwilling or uncomfortable with being out as faculty, it creates an absence of role models and mentors for the next generation of queer faculty, and although it should not be LGBQ+ faculty members' responsibility to teach the straight community about queer issues, it does create a situation where such learning is much less likely to occur.

Our Purpose

It is clear that the lives and work of LGBQ+ faculty is rooted in disdain, but we would like to take this opportunity to create a new narrative. Given the lack of large-scale, current, quantitative information about queer faculty, this study aims to give an overview of the scholarly characteristics of these understudied academics in a positive light. Most importantly, we want to recognize them, to acknowledge that we see, hear, and honor them. We want to elevate their presence in higher education, to better understand their context through an examination of their faculty characteristics and places of employment, and to highlight their contributions to undergraduate education. Through and from this research we hope to strengthen the voices of qualitative studies and encourage people to think more broadly about notions of diversity and identity. The following research questions guided this study:

1. Who are today's LGBQ+ faculty?

LGBQ+ FACULTY

2. At what kinds of institutions are LGBQ+ faculty employed?
3. How are LGBQ+ faculty contributing to undergraduate education?

In the following section we describe our data and respondents, the measures we examined, and the analyses we performed to try to answer these questions. Although limited in various ways, we hope that this study helps to provide a base for future quantitative studies and to give strength to future qualitative studies of LGBQ+ faculty.

Methodology

The data for this study come from the 2014-2018 administrations of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). FSSE was designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement, which is administered to undergraduate students. The purpose of FSSE is to measure faculty and instructor perceptions of and involvement in undergraduate student engagement at four-year colleges and universities. More specifically, FSSE focuses on the nature and frequency of student-faculty interactions, faculty emphasis on educational practices that are empirically linked with students' learning and development, faculty values for institutional support and high-impact practice participation, and how faculty organize their time both in and out of the classroom. In the five years of data examined here, 412 institutions administered FSSE; if an institution administered FSSE in more than one year in that time, we used their most recent year of participation. Although nearly 58,000 faculty responded to FSSE in that time, the respondents in this study were limited to the nearly 50,000 faculty who responded to the question asking about their sexual orientation.

Respondents

Roughly 5% of faculty respondents identified as bisexual, gay, lesbian, questioning or unsure of their sexual orientation, or another sexual orientation than those listed. We will refer to those faculty, the focus of our study, as LGBQ+ faculty. Around one in ten (12%) faculty respondents selected that they

LGBQ+ FACULTY

preferred not to identify their sexual orientation, leaving around four in five (83%) identifying as non-LGBQ+. See Tables 1 and 2 for more details about these respondents and the institutional characteristics at which they are employed by sexual orientation, respectively.

Measures

A key variable of interest in this study is faculty member's identification as LGBQ+. The FSSE survey asks respondents which of the following best describes their sexual orientation: *Straight (heterosexual); Bisexual; Gay; Lesbian; Queer; Questioning or unsure; Another sexual orientation-please specify; or, I prefer not to respond*. Other faculty demographics include disciplinary field, academic rank, tenure status, age, gender identity, and racial/ethnic identification. For details regarding the categories within each of the demographic and individual characteristics, see Table 1. Institutional characteristics include Basic Carnegie Classification, institutional control (public or private), institution size (based on undergraduate enrollment), Barron's selectivity rank, and geographic region of the institution. For details regarding categories within the institutional characteristics, see Table 2.

Outcome measures for contribution to undergraduate engagement include several FSSE scales. These FSSE scales are unidimensional constructs based on factor analyses. The overall scale scores are derived by transforming the individual item scores into a 60-point score, then averaging the transformed item scores together. The following scales were included in our analyses.

- *Reflective & Integrative Learning*: This scale, based on seven items, asks faculty to rate the importance of students connecting course content with their own world and the context around them in addition to examining issues from other's perspectives. Response options include *Not important, Somewhat important, Important, Very Important*.
- *Diverse Discussions with Others*: This scale, based on four items, asks faculty to indicate how much opportunity students have to interact with other students whose background does not

LGBQ+ FACULTY

match their own including race, economic status, religion, and political beliefs. Response options include *Very little, Some, Quite a bit, Very much*.

- *Student-Faculty Interaction*: This scale, based on four items, asks faculty to indicate the frequency they interact with students outside of class and how often they discuss academic or career plans. Response options include *Never, Sometimes, Often, and Very Often*.
- *Effective Teaching Practices*: This scale, based on eight items, asks faculty to indicate the extent to which they organize content, illustrate with examples, and outline objectives and standards for the students. Response options include *Very little, Some, Quite a bit, Very much*.
- *Quality of Interactions*: This scale, based on five items, asks faculty to indicate their own perceptions of student interactions with other students, academic advisors, other faculty, student services staff, and lastly, other administrators. Response options include a seven-point scale where 1 is poor and 7 is excellent.
- *Supportive Environment*: This scale, based on eight items, asks faculty to indicate how important it is to them that the institution increase its emphasis on supporting students' wellbeing and social interactions, academic success, family responsibilities, and overall wellness. Response options include *Not important, Somewhat important, Important, Very Important*.

The last grouping of items used in our analyses focused on the amount of time spent on activities. These items ask faculty to estimate the time, in hours, spent in a typical 7-day week. These activities include teaching courses; advising students; research, creative, or scholarly activities; and service activities. Response options include *0 hours to More than 10 hours*.

Analyses

To answer each of our research questions, we computed a series of chi-square (χ^2) analyses and adjusted standardized residuals. We considered standardized residuals greater than 2 or less than -2 to

LGBQ+ FACULTY

be notable differences (Agresti & Finley, 2009). All analyses used three categories for sexual orientation: LGBQ+, not LGBQ+, and those that preferred not to identify their sexual orientation. To answer our first research question about who are today's LGBQ+ faculty, we used demographics from Table 1 to look for representation of LGBQ+ faculty. To answer our second research question about the institutions at which LGBQ+ are employed, we used characteristics from Table 2 to look for representation of LGBQ+ faculty. To answer our final research question about how LGBQ+ faculty are contributing to undergraduate education, we used measures from Table 5 to look for representation of LGBQ+ faculty in high, moderate, or low groupings on each measure. The outcome measures were divided into terciles (3-quantiles) based on percentile scores.

Limitations

Institutions self-select to participate in FSSE and can select their own faculty samples, which may limit generalizability. Although the participating institutions and respondents mirror the profile of U.S. bachelor's-granting colleges and universities and faculty (FSSE, 2018), one notable difference is FSSE's underrepresentation of part-time and adjunct faculty. Additionally, faculty choose one course which they are teaching or taught during the current school year to respond to questions about their teaching practices, so these results may not represent all the courses they teach. Some groups of faculty were small, such as those that identified as American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander, so interpretations about those populations should be made with caution. Similarly, LGBQ+ faculty were aggregated together for analyses even though they collectively represent a variety of identities (bisexual, gay, lesbian, etc.) which may mean that results do not apply evenly to all subpopulations of the LGBQ+ community, and this variation should be further examined in future research. Finally, some faculty may be hesitant to identify themselves as LGBQ+ given chilly climates (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009); in FSSE, faculty responses are anonymous to the institution, which may alleviate this concern.

Our Findings

1. Who are today's LGBQ+ faculty?

LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in Arts & Humanities (AR=14.8); Social Sciences (AR=7.3); and Communications, Media, and Public Relations fields (AR=2.6). They are underrepresented in Business (AR=-9.0); Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Computer Science (AR=-7.0); Engineering (AR=-6.5); Health Professions (AR=-5.2); and Education (AR=-3.9) fields. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in Assistant (AR=5.6) and Associate (AR=2.0) Professor ranks and underrepresented in the Full Professor (AR=-6.6) rank. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented as faculty on the tenure track (AR=5.6) and underrepresented at institutions without a tenure system (AR=-5.7). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in younger age categories, 34 or younger (AR=10.5) and 34-44 (AR=5.0), and underrepresented in older age categories, 55-64 (AR=-7.3) and 65 or older (AR=-9.4). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in identifying with a non-cisgender gender identity (AR=31.5) and as women (AR=3.0) and are underrepresented as men (AR=-3.6) and those preferring not to indicate their gender identity (AR=-5.0). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented as faculty also identifying as White (AR=7.5), multiracial (AR=7.1), Hispanic or Latino (AR=3.4), and Other (AR=2.2). LGBQ+ faculty are underrepresented as faculty also identifying as Asian (AR=-6.1), Black or African American (AR=-4.5), or those that prefer not to indicate their racial/ethnic identification (AR=-10.6). For more details on these analyses, see Table 3.

2. At what kinds of institutions are LGBQ+ faculty employed?

LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented at Baccalaureate Colleges with Arts & Sciences focus (AR=4.1) and at R1 Doctoral Universities with the highest research activity (AR=2.7). LGBQ+ faculty are underrepresented at Baccalaureate Colleges with a diverse focus (AR=-4.8). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented at public institutions (AR=7.5) and underrepresented at private institutions (AR=-7.5). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented at very large institutions (10,000 or more undergraduates enrolled)

LGBQ+ FACULTY

and underrepresented at small (1,000-2,499 undergraduates, AR=-3.3) and medium (2,500-4,999 undergraduates, AR=-3.1) institutions. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented at very competitive institutions (AR=3.1) and underrepresented at noncompetitive (AR=-2.7) and less competitive (AR=-2.3) institutions. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in the Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA; AR=10.2) and Mid East (DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA; AR=2.1) regions. LGBQ+ faculty are underrepresented in the Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD; AR=-4.2), outlying areas (AR=-3.7), Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV; AR=-3.4), Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX; AR=-3.1), and Rocky Mountain (CO, ID, MT, UT, WY; AR=-2.2) regions. For more details on these analyses, see Table 4.

3. How are LGBQ+ faculty contributing to undergraduate education?

Course practice. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented (AR=8.7) in the high tercile of *Reflective & Integrative Learning* indicating that they find it highly important that students participate in course activities that promote student reflection and integration of ideas. They are additionally overrepresented (AR=2.4) in the high tercile of *Discussions with Diverse Others* indicating that they provide substantial opportunities for students to engage in discussions with people who are different from them. LGBQ+ faculty are also overrepresented in the high (AR=6.5) and middle (AR=2.4) tercile of *Supportive Environment* indicating they find it highly important that institutions increase their support of undergraduate students in a variety of ways. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in the low tercile (AR=2.6) of *Effective Teaching Practices* indicating that they have a lower perception of how much they use clear and effective teaching practices. They are also overrepresented in the low tercile of *Quality of Interactions* (AR=8.4) indicating that they perceive students' interactions with others on campus to be of lower quality. For more details on these analyses, see Table 5.

Time spent on professorial activities. LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in the high tercile of time spent on service activities (committee work, administrative duties, etc.; AR=4.4) and of time spent

LGBQ+ FACULTY

on research, creative, or scholarly activities (AR=2.2). LGBQ+ faculty are overrepresented in the middle tercile for time spent on teaching activities (preparing, teaching class sessions, grading, meeting with students outside of class, etc.; AR=3.8) and in the low tercile for time spent advising students (AR=2.6). For more details on these analyses, see Table 5.

Discussion and Implications

The findings from this study give us the briefest of looks at today's LGBQ+ faculty. Some of our findings are not surprising and support what we know from the literature such as their underrepresentation in less welcoming fields (Linley & Nguyen, 2015). As researchers in the field of education, the underrepresentation of LGBQ+ faculty in education is particularly disappointing. As our data largely focuses on the disciplines prominent in undergraduate education, the field of education is largely focused on K-12 education which may signal issues with queer people and subjects in schools. It is worth celebrating, however, that LGBQ+ faculty are represented to some extent in all fields. Despite chilly climates or other barriers, we do find them appointed in fields across the academy. There is no field where some of them, at least, have not found their way as faculty. That they are underrepresented and likely facing extreme struggles in these fields, however, means that we must remain vigilant in understanding their experiences. Their underrepresentation in certain fields may be a starting point for institutions to investigate and alleviate climate issues, but given the widespread discrimination of LGBQ+ individuals (Blumenfeld, Weber, & Rankin, 2016), no disciplinary area is off the hook to work harder for creating and maintaining a welcoming and supportive environment for LGBQ+ faculty. It is not enough for institutions or departments to create a policy or encourage inclusivity and equity on paper, institutions need to proactively and deliberately embody these messages throughout the culture of the existing broken systems we currently have (d'Emilio, 1990).

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Although their overrepresentation in certain academic ranks may be a cause for concern, their tendency to be younger may be a hopeful sign that things may be changing in the near future. We do see an overrepresentation of LGBQ+ faculty as Assistant Professors but on the tenure track, so it is our hope that over time, this newest generation of LGBQ+ faculty will continue to climb the academic ladder to achieve higher ranks and a tenure status. Although it is possible that this is actually a sign that LGBQ+ faculty are stuck in their current positions, facing the difficulty of advancement found in other studies (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Dolan, 1998). One particular point of contention in advancement is LGBQ+ faculty whose scholarly activities focus on queer topics. LGBQ+ faculty may face a compounded penalty if both who they are and what they study is under attack. Institutions and programs need to be clear that queer scholarship needs to be accepted and supported as well (d'Emilio, 1990). In the spirit of telling a brighter story, we hope that the former scenario is true and that as newer LGBQ+ faculty find pathways to success that it can provide a healthier environment and safer space for more established LGBQ+ faculty to be out and successful as well.

It is also important to note the LGBQ+ faculty often identify with other traditionally marginalized identities (being faculty of color, gender variant, etc.) that might further make their experiences difficult. We know that faculty of color, women, and trans-spectrum or gender variant individuals already face inequities and persecution in higher education, and the intersection of these identities likely makes navigating and creating paths to support and success even more difficult. Feeling that not only one, but several salient aspects of your identity are unacceptable to the academy can make survival and ability to thrive near impossible. LGBQ+ faculty with marginalized racial/ethnic identities may face additional intersectional challenges as certain racial/ethnic cultures have their own complicated histories with queerness. Finding barriers of acceptance embedded within one of your own identities will likely provide LGBQ+ faculty with internal conflicts in addition to external conflicts.

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Disproportionate representations of LGBQ+ faculty at different types of institutions likely signals more climate issues. LGBQ+ faculty tend to be in larger research universities or arts-focused institutions in particular regions of the country. Although this finding may not be surprising, it should strongly communicate to other institutions where a more notable effort is needed. It makes sense that LGBQ+ faculty would be more represented at smaller liberal institutions or larger research universities that are more likely located in larger, more accepting cities. Contrary to the finding that private institutions are more affirming of queer identities (Sears, 2002), we find an overrepresentation of LGBQ+ faculty at public institutions. This likely speaks to an oversimplification of the impact of private/public control has versus other factors, for example, large research universities are more likely to be publicly controlled, and that may play a larger role in climate perceptions of LGBQ+ faculty. Their overrepresentation in more liberal and accepting areas of the country also makes sense as LGBQ+ faculty are more likely to want to be located in communities, states, and regions in which laws and policies, in addition to the people, are supportive of their identity and lives. Creating growth and movement towards inclusion in the most difficult places will require a focused and intentional agenda to break and reshape social norms.

Findings about LGBQ+ faculty contributions to undergraduate education are both a cause for celebration and concern. These faculty highly value reflective and integrative learning practices, creating opportunities for discussion across difference, and finding ways to support students. These findings suggest that LGBQ+ faculty are important influences on students' exposure to diverse voices and students' ability to understand and work with others. These are highly desirable skills for students entering the workforce and society. This important offering to the undergraduate experience, along with LGBQ+ faculty members' greater value for supporting students, may speak to LGBQ+ faculty experiences with feeling isolated and unsupported. Their struggle to belong likely leads them to put effort towards furthering students' understanding and acceptance of difference. Similar to the experiences of other

LGBQ+ FACULTY

marginalized faculty, such as women of color (Turner, González, Wong, 2011), LGBQ+ faculty may feel responsible for picking up the slack of their colleagues with respect to representing diverse voices, a responsibility that they should not bear alone.

We note that LGBQ+ faculty spend a notable amount of time on research, teaching, and service, the activities critical to scholarly productivity. But they seem to doubt their ability to be effective teachers which aligns with other research showing faculty with minoritized gender or sexual identities fear receiving poor course evaluations due to their identity (Vaccaro, 2012). Nothing inherent about an LGBQ+ identity should lead to lesser use of good teaching practices so future research should explore how these perceptions of lesser quality teaching form. Fear of and retaliation in student evaluations could certainly explain these perceptions, but the general chilly climate for LGBQ+ faculty at institutions and within departments could also contribute to self-doubt in a variety of ways. Regardless, centers dedicated to the improvement of teaching practices or faculty development as educators should take note of the additional challenges LGBQ+ faculty might be facing in their self-evaluation as educators when creating training or programming for faculty.

LGBQ+ faculty's lower sense of the quality of students' interactions with others provides another avenue worth exploring in future research. This perception may stem from their overall perception of hostile climates but could also signal their closer relationships with LGBQ+ students who are facing similar issues with acceptance on campus. Knowing how this lowered sense of quality relationships with students and others on campus comes from can better position the creation of resources to assist in improving those interactions. Another somewhat confusing result comes in seeing that LGBQ+ faculty are spending less time advising students. With their attention and contributions to students given in other ways, it is unexpected that they would not perform, or even over perform, in an advising role. Perhaps their mentorship tends to take a more unofficial route or in their

LGBQ+ FACULTY

overrepresentation at certain institution types (i.e., research universities) they are less likely to have an official advising role as a faculty member.

Minimizing homophobia and heterosexism on campus can and should be done in a variety of ways: through non-discrimination policies, embedding queer scholarship in curriculum, hiring queer faculty, highlighting the achievements of queer faculty, and ultimately developing a positive institutional culture (d'Emilio 1990; Dolan, 1997; Rankin, 1998; Sears, 2002). "... speaking about gay oppression involves not only addressing injustice in the abstract but also acknowledging the emotional toll it levies on particular individuals and the institutions of which they are a part" (d'Emilio, 1990, p. 18). Vaccaro (2012) found departmental culture is what shaped the perception of the climate for queer faculty. Many faculty members felt safe in their own departments but not in the larger university environment. Garvey et. al. (2018) recommend that faculty confront bigotry in classrooms, and it is only fair to do the same for faculty when in the presence of discriminatory colleagues and policies. It should not be the responsibility of LGBQ+ faculty to confront these issues on their own. The academy as a whole needs to step up and care for these faculty who are present all around us, sometimes openly and proud, but sometimes hidden and afraid. In doing this study, we hope that we open the door for future quantitative analyses to go further with more rigor and challenging questions and to provide a base of support to qualitative narratives that explain how and why these situations occur. Only with more information and celebration of our LGBQ+ colleagues can we change.

References

- Agresti, A. & Finley, B. (2009). *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences (4th edition)*. New York:Pearson.
- Arenson, K. (1997). Writing own script, Yale refuses Kramer's millions for gay studies. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/1997/07/09/nyregion/writing-own-script-yale-refuses-kramer-s-millions-for-gay-studies.html>
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2009). "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal*, 21(2), 85-103.
- Blumenfeld, W. J., Weber, G. N. & Rankin, S. (2016). In our own voice: Campus climate as a mediating factor in the persistence of LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education. In P. Chamness Miller & E. Mikulec (Eds.), *Queering classrooms: Personal narratives and educational practices to support LGBTQ youth in schools*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Brown, R. D., Clarke, B., Gortmaker, V., & Robinson-Keilig, R. (2004). Assessing the Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender (GLBT) Students Using a Multiple Perspectives Approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(1), 8–26.
- <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2004.0003>
- CNN. (2018). LGBT rights milestones fast facts. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2015/06/19/us/lgbt-rights-milestones-fast-facts/index.html>
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1989). Lesbians' and gay men's experiences of discrimination and harassment in a university community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(3), 317-321.
- d'Emilio, J. (1990). The campus environment for gay and lesbian life. *Academe*, 76(1), 16-19.
- Dolan, J. (1998). Out on campus. *Academe*, 84(5), 40.
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement. (2018). FSSE 2018 Overview. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Center for Postsecondary Research.

LGBQ+ FACULTY

- Fox, C. (2007). From transaction to transformation: (En)countering white heteronormativity in “safe spaces.” *National Council of Teachers of English*, 69(5), 496-511.
- Garber, L. (1994). *Tilting the tower: Lesbians/teaching/queer subjects*. Routledge.
- Garvey, J. C., & Rankin, S. R. (2015). The influence of campus experiences on the level of outness among trans-spectrum and queer-spectrum students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(3), 374–393.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.977113>
- Garvey, J. C. & BrckaLorenz, A. & Latopolski, K. & Hurtado, S. S. (2018). High-impact practices and student–faculty interactions for students across sexual orientations. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(2), 210-226.
- Hinrichs, D. W., & Rosenberg, P. J. (2002). Attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual persons among heterosexual liberal arts college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 61–84.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01_04
- Jones Jr, R. G., & Calafell, B. M. (2012). Contesting neoliberalism through critical pedagogy, intersectional reflexivity, and personal narrative: Queer tales of academia. *Journal of homosexuality*, 59(7), 957-981.
- Kane, M. D. (2013). Finding “safe” campuses: Predicting the presence of LGBT student groups at North Carolina colleges and universities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(6), 828–852.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.774837>
- Lark, J. S., & Croteau, J. M. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual doctoral students' mentoring relationships with faculty in counseling psychology: A qualitative study. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26(5), 754-776.
- Linley, J. L., & Nguyen, D. J. (2015). LGBTQ experiences in curricular contexts. *New directions for student services*, 2015(152), 41-53.
- McRuer, R. (2003). As good as it gets: Queer theory and critical disability. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and*

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Gay Studies, 9, 79–105. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/40800>

Morrish, L., & O'Mara, K. (2011). Queering the discourse of diversity. *Journal of homosexuality*, 58(6-7), 974-991.

Nowlan, B. (2001). Teaching and working as an openly gay faculty member at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. *The Radical Teacher*, 60, 27-33.

Rankin, S. (1998). Queering campus: Understanding and transforming climate. *Metropolitan Universities*, 9(4), 29-38.

Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty: What is the pivotal frame of reference? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11-37.

Stewart, D-L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2015). Engaging lesbian, gay, and bisexual students on college campuses. In S. J. Quaye & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations* (pp. 121–134). Routledge New York, NY.

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wong, K. (2011). Faculty women of color: The critical nexus of race and gender. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 199-211.

Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for LGBT faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(4), 429-446.

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Table 1. Select Faculty Demographics and Characteristics by Sexual Orientation

		LGBQ+ (%)	Not LGBQ+ (%)	I prefer not to respond (%)	Total (%)
Disciplinary area	Arts & Humanities	34.7	21.6	25.7	22.8
	Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	6.3	7.2	7.2	7.1
	Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Sciences	6.9	11.1	12.2	11.0
	Social Sciences	16.7	11.9	11.3	12.1
	Business	4.6	9.9	9.8	9.6
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	4.6	3.7	3.3	3.7
	Education	6.9	9.4	7.9	9.1
	Engineering	1.8	4.4	4.8	4.3
	Health Professions	7.2	10.7	7.9	10.2
	Social Service Professions	4.0	3.7	2.6	3.6
	Other disciplines	6.4	6.3	7.4	6.4
Academic rank	Full Professor	19.7	25.6	27.5	25.5
	Associate Professor	25.4	23.4	25.1	23.7
	Assistant Professor	29.0	23.9	24.1	24.1
	Full-time Lecturer/Instructor	11.4	12.7	11.1	12.5
	Part-time Lecturer/Instructor	14.5	14.5	12.2	14.2
Tenure status	No tenure system at this institution	8.6	12.3	13.3	12.3
	Not on tenure track, but this institution has a tenure system	33.4	33.4	28.6	32.9
	On tenure track but not tenured	21.0	16.8	16.7	17.0
	Tenured	36.9	37.4	41.4	37.9
Age	34 or younger	18.1	11.5	9.3	11.6
	35-44	28.2	24.0	22.7	24.1
	45-54	27.7	25.9	28.0	26.2
	55-64	20.1	26.4	28.9	26.3
	65 or older	5.9	12.2	11.1	11.8
Gender identity	Man	42.8	48.5	32.1	46.2
	Woman	51.2	50.6	31.8	48.4
	Another gender identity	3.0	< 1	< 1	< 1
	I prefer not to respond	3.0	< 1	36.0	5.2
Racial/ethnic identification	American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
	Asian	2.4	5.3	4.1	5.0
	Black or African American	3.5	6.1	2.4	5.5
	Hispanic or Latino	4.4	3.4	1.8	3.3
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
	White	78.3	77.6	29.2	71.8
	Other	2.1	1.4	2.3	1.6
	Multiracial	5.1	2.8	1.8	2.8
I prefer not to respond	3.5	2.8	57.7	9.5	

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Table 2. Select Institution Characteristics by Sexual Orientation

		LGBQ+ (%)	Not LGBQ+ (%)	I prefer not to respond (%)	Total (%)
Carnegie classification	R1: Doctoral U's—Highest research activity	10.4	9.0	7.7	8.9
	R2: Doctoral U's—Higher research activity	12.4	12.5	13.1	12.6
	R3: Doctoral U's—Moderate research activity	13.4	12.1	12.2	12.2
	M1: Master's C&U—Larger programs	32.1	32.8	33.3	32.9
	M2: Master's C&U—Medium programs	9.3	9.5	9.4	9.5
	M3: Master's C&U—Smaller programs	4.2	4.8	5.4	4.9
	Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences focus	10.2	8.0	7.3	8.0
	Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields	5.3	7.9	7.4	7.7
	Other Carnegie categories	2.7	3.2	4.0	3.3
Control	Public	67.7	60.0	61.8	60.6
	Private	32.3	40.0	38.2	39.4
Institution size (based on undergraduate enrollment)	Very Small (fewer than 1,000)	3.8	4.7	4.6	4.6
	Small (1,000-2,499)	14.9	17.5	17.0	17.3
	Medium (2,500-4,999)	16.3	18.8	18.6	18.6
	Large (5,000-9,999)	28.2	27.9	30.7	28.3
	Very Large (10,000 or more)	36.7	31.1	29.1	31.2
Barron's selectivity	Noncompetitive	2.1	3.0	3.7	3.0
	Less competitive	14.7	16.3	17.4	16.3
	Competitive	51.3	51.5	51.4	51.5
	Very competitive	22.6	20.2	18.9	20.1
	Highly competitive	7.2	7.2	6.9	7.1
	Most competitive	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.9
Institutional region	New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)	5.8	4.9	5.8	5.1
	Mid East (DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA)	18.3	16.5	18.5	16.8
	Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)	14.9	14.7	13.8	14.6
	Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)	10.3	13.3	12.3	13.0
	Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)	23.1	26.2	25.8	26.0
	Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX)	7.0	8.8	8.2	8.7
	Rocky Mountains (CO, ID, MT, UT, WY)	2.1	2.9	2.6	2.8
	Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)	17.0	10.6	9.8	10.9
	Outlying Areas	< 1	1.1	1.2	1.1
Canada	1.3	1.1	2.0	1.2	

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Table 3. Chi-Square Statistics for Differences in Faculty Demographics by Faculty Sexual Orientation

	Standardized Residual			<i>n</i>	<i>df</i>	χ^2 sig
	<i>LGBQ+</i>	<i>Not LGBQ+</i>	<i>I prefer not to respond</i>			
<i>Disciplinary Area</i>				49,102	20	552.8****
Arts & Humanities	14.8	-13.6	5.6			
Bio Sci, Agric, & Nat Resources	-1.7	0.7	0.3			
Phys Sci, Math, & Comp Sci	-7.0	1.5	3.0			
Social Sciences	7.3	-2.5	-2.1			
Business	-9.0	4.8	0.5			
Comm, Media, & Pub Relations	2.6	0.0	-1.8			
Education	-3.9	5.2	-3.4			
Engineering	-6.5	2.0	2.1			
Health Professions	-5.2	8.4	-6.2			
Social Service Professions	1.1	3.3	-4.6			
Other disciplines	0.0	-2.7	3.2			
<i>Academic Rank</i>				45,654	8	104.2****
Full Professor	-6.6	0.6	3.7			
Associate Professor	2.0	-3.5	2.7			
Assistant Professor	5.6	-3.2	-0.2			
Full-time Lecturer/Instructor	-1.6	3.8	-3.4			
Part-time Lecturer/Instructor	0.4	3.7	-4.6			
<i>Tenure Status</i>				48,808	6	116.9****
No tenure system	-5.7	1.0	2.7			
Not on tenure track	0.6	6.0	-7.4			
On tenure track	5.6	-2.6	-0.8			
Tenured	-1.0	-4.5	5.9			
<i>Age</i>				46,968	8	276.8****
34 or younger	10.5	-2.1	-5.3			
35-44	5.0	-1.1	-2.4			
45-54	1.7	-3.5	2.9			
55-64	-7.3	0.9	4.3			
65 or older	-9.4	7.0	-1.5			
<i>Gender Identity</i>				49,077	6	14,089.5****
Man	-3.6	22.3	-23.4			
Woman	3.0	21.7	-27.2			
Another gender identity	31.5	-17.1	-1.6			
I prefer not to respond	-5.0	-95.5	114.3			
<i>Racial/Ethnic Identification</i>				48,664	16	18,448.1****
American Indian or Alaska Native	-0.2	-0.8	1.1			
Asian	-6.1	6.5	-3.4			
Black or African American	-4.5	12.3	-11.2			
Hispanic or Latino	3.4	3.7	-6.6			
Native HI or other Pacific Islander	1.7	-0.9	-0.1			
White	7.5	62.2	-77.3			
Other	2.2	-5.6	5.0			
Multiracial	7.1	0.2	-5.1			
I prefer not to respond	-10.6	-109.8	134.6			

Key: *****p* < .001

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Table 4. Chi-Square Statistics for Differences in Faculty Demographics by Faculty Sexual Orientation

	Standardized Residual			<i>n</i>	<i>df</i>	χ^2 sig
	<i>LGBQ+</i>	<i>Not LGBQ+</i>	<i>I prefer not to respond</i>			
<i>Carnegie Classification</i>				48,776	16	81.0***
Doctoral U's—Highest research activity	2.7	1.3	-3.3			
Doctoral U's—Higher research activity	-0.3	-1.0	1.3			
Doctoral U's—Moderate research activity	1.9	-1.1	0.0			
Master's C&U—Larger programs	-0.8	-0.2	0.8			
Master's C&U—Medium programs	-0.3	0.4	-0.2			
Master's C&U—Smaller programs	-1.5	-0.9	2.1			
Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences focus	4.1	-0.6	-2.1			
Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields	-4.8	3.7	-1.0			
Other Carnegie categories	-1.6	-1.9	3.4			
<i>Control</i>				48,653	2	63.4***
Public	7.5	-6.2	2.0			
Private	-7.5	6.2	-2.0			
<i>Institution size</i>				48,653	8	68.0***
Very Small (fewer than 1,000)	-1.9	1.3	-0.2			
Small (1,000-2,499)	-3.3	2.5	-0.7			
Medium (2,500-4,999)	-3.1	1.9	-0.1			
Large (5,000-9,999)	-0.1	-3.8	4.4			
Very Large (10,000 or more)	6.2	-0.6	-3.6			
<i>Barron's Selectivity</i>				45,415	10	36.4***
Noncompetitive	-2.7	-0.9	2.9			
Less competitive	-2.3	-0.7	2.4			
Competitive	-0.2	0.2	-0.1			
Very competitive	3.1	0.3	-2.5			
Highly competitive	0.2	0.6	-0.8			
Most competitive	0.9	0.5	-1.2			
<i>Institutional Region</i>				49,515	18	221.2***
New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)	1.7	-3.5	2.9			
Mid East (DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA)	2.1	-4.5	3.8			
Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)	0.4	1.3	-1.7			
Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)	-4.2	3.9	-1.7			
Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)	-3.4	2.3	-0.4			
Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX)	-3.1	3.0	-1.4			
Rocky Mountains (CO, ID, MT, UT, WY)	-2.2	1.9	-0.7			
Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)	10.2	-3.5	-2.9			
Outlying Areas	-3.7	1.4	0.9			
Canada	0.4	-5.3	5.8			

Key: ****p* < .001

LGBQ+ FACULTY

Table 5. Chi-Square Statistics for Differences in Faculty Activity by Faculty Sexual Orientation

	Standardized Residual			n	df	χ^2 sig
	LGBQ+	Not LGBQ+	I prefer not to respond			
<i>Reflective & Integrative Learning</i>				45,356	4	121.1***
Low importance	-8.8	1.1	4.8			
Moderate importance	-0.4	2.0	-2.0			
High importance	8.7	-3.0	-2.6			
<i>Diverse Discussions with Others</i>				43,840	4	33.0***
Low course opportunity	-4.3	1.6	1.1			
Moderate course opportunity	1.3	2.4	-3.7			
High course opportunity	2.4	-3.9	2.8			
<i>Student-Faculty Interaction</i>				44,888	4	10.7***
Low frequency	-1.6	2.1	-1.4			
Moderate frequency	0.8	0.6	-1.2			
High frequency	0.7	-2.8	2.8			
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>				45,701	4	54.4***
Low substantial perception	2.6	3.0	-5.2			
Moderate substantial perception	1.1	0.2	-0.9			
High substantial perception	-3.7	-3.2	6.2			
<i>Quality of Interactions</i>				47,971	4	257.3***
Low quality perceptions	8.4	-15.1	11.8			
Moderate quality perceptions	-0.8	3.3	-3.2			
High quality perceptions	-7.7	12.2	-8.9			
<i>Supportive Environment</i>				49,201	4	175.8***
Low importance	-8.9	-3.5	10.1			
Moderate importance	2.4	1.2	-3.0			
High importance	6.5	2.2	-7.0			
<i>Time spent on teaching activities</i>				49,227	4	104.1***
Low hours	-3.1	8.2	-7.4			
Moderate hours	3.8	-2.6	0.4			
High hours	-0.9	-6.5	8.1			
<i>Time spent on advising students</i>				48,906	4	52.1***
Low hours	2.6	2.1	-4.2			
Moderate hours	0.3	2.7	-3.3			
High hours	-2.1	-4.2	6.3			
<i>Time spent on research, creative, or scholarly activities</i>				48,882	4	79.1***
Low hours	-2.3	7.4	-7.0			
Moderate hours	0.1	0.7	-0.9			
High hours	2.2	-8.1	7.9			
<i>Time spent on service activities</i>				48,848	4	36.7***
Low hours	-4.0	5.0	-3.0			
Moderate hours	-0.2	-0.1	0.3			
High hours	4.4	-5.1	3.0			

Key: *** $p < .001$