SEXUALITY DEMOGRAPHICS AND THE COLLEGE ADMISSIONS PROCESS:

IMPLICATIONS OF ASKING APPLICANTS TO REVEAL

THEIR SEXUAL ORIENTATION

By

F. Lee Casson

Valerie Rutledge
Dean of the College of Health, Education
and Professional Studies
(Chair)

Ted Miller
UC Foundation Professor
(Committee Member)

Vicki Petzko
UC Foundation Professor
(Committee Member)

Laura Dubek
Professor, Department of English
Middle Tennessee State University
(Committee Member)

SEXUALITY DEMOGRAPHICS AND THE COLLEGE ADMISSIONS PROCESS:

IMPLICATIONS OF ASKING APPLICANTS TO REVEAL

THEIR SEXUAL ORIENTATION

By

F. Lee Casson

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree of
Doctorate in Education

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 2014

ABSTRACT

Many universities and colleges are considering if potential students should disclose their sexual orientation when filling out an application for admission. This recent trend, however, has generated a debate among administrators who work directly with LGBT students: What, they wonder, are the various positive and negative implications of quantifying sexual orientation? To address this question, this study utilized a descriptive design and looked at a national LGBT organization of educators, a non-generalizable population of approximately 700 members, in order to identify, categorize, exemplify, and describe the complex issues surrounding a sexual-orientation demographic. The methodology included a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures that were delivered through a seventeen-item, on-line questionnaire. Quantitative responses were analyzed with frequency distributions, percent distributions, disaggregation, and cross tabulations. Qualitative responses relied upon coded assessment derived from grounded theory. Descriptive statistics, for instance, showed that 90% of respondents were aware of the trend and that 41% worked at an institution that had considered adding to its application a demographic for sexual orientation. Descriptive statistics also indicated that respondents were divided among their levels of support for this trend at their own institutions and within academe in general. Coded assessment of the qualitative responses revealed numerous beneficial and detrimental concerns associated with a sexual-orientation demographic.

DEDICATION

To Julius, whenever and wherever I find you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A dissertation is essentially a collective effort, and I must formally acknowledge the following individuals for their wisdom, advice, kindness, friendship, and support. First to Patricia Baines: You know that you, like, totally rock because you helped with all the bits and pieces. Secondly to my UTC friends, including my committee members (for obvious reasons), other faculty members (especially Dr. Beth Crawford for her assistance with EndNote), and fellow doctoral students (especially Jody Love Hancock and Lindy Blazek): I struggled, screamed, and stammered, yet you consistently offered guidance and encouragement—and most of all patience and compassion. Thirdly to my other wonderful, dear friends, especially to Kathleen Bryan Herron (who is, of course, pretty *and* smart!), Wendy Headrick, Greg Gardner, Shan Overton, and Ramona Burton: You are my touchstones, those very individuals to whom I turn when life gets nasty—and even when it is blissful and good. Also to Mom, Dad, and Nancy: They are not without notice, your love, friendship, and support—emotional and, of course, financial. Fourthly to Dr. Laura Dubek: Without you, I reason, this dissertation would never have happened; you encouraged me to teach gay and lesbian literature, and from this endeavor came the genesis for this important study. And lastly to Dr. Verbie Prevost: You illustrated the power of extraordinary pedagogy, a skill that continues to influence my own teaching and scholarship, even twenty years after a master's degree in English literature.

And there is a final note of gratitude, one given to life's guilty little pleasures—to those very things that magically and momentarily remove us from the humdrum. What would I have

done without the Tour de France, *Downton Abbey*, *Torchwood*, PBS, and scores of books—many

literary and scholarly, some commercial—that opened windows into the human condition and

foreign, long-ago worlds? Ah, to live vicariously—even enviously! Perhaps that is the ultimate

panacea to the day-to-day grind and, yes, to the interminable dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS, Acquired Immunodeficiency Virus

APA, American Psychological Association

DOMA, Defense of Marriage Act

ERIC, Education Resources Information Center

FERPA, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

HIPAA, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

HIV, Human Immunodeficiency Virus

IRB, Institutional Review Board

LGBT, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (also GLBT, LGBTQ, LGBTQ+, and any combination thereof)

Q, Question (for instance Q1 or Q2, in reference to this study's questionnaire)

RR, Response Rate

SOGI, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

LIST OF SYMBOLS

N, population

n, sub-population

M, mean

SD, standard deviation

χ^2, chi square

df, degrees of freedom

p, probability

≈, approximately equal to

≤, less than or equal to

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This chapter provides an overview of a study that explored the implications of asking

students to reveal their sexual orientation within a college application. Eleven sections guide this

chapter: an introduction of the recent trend started at Elmhurst College, a brief background of

the trend, the statement of this study's central research problem, the rationale of the study, the

significance of the study, the methodology, research questions, delimitations, limitations,

terminology, and the organization of the study.

Introduction

It was a deceptively simple question, one first posed by the admissions office at Elmhurst

College, a private school in suburban Chicago affiliated with the United Church of Christ, to

potential students, prior to the Fall 2011 semester: "Would you consider yourself a member of

the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) community?" ("Elmhurst College: Application

for admission," 2012, p. 3). This single question, however, ignited a sociopolitical firestorm that

immediately swept the country. On various listservs and in the pages of *The Chronicle of Higher*

Education, administrators and educators considered the weighty implications of this

demographical conundrum: Might other students, they wondered, simply check "yes" to be

considered for minority scholarships? In publications such as *The Chicago Tribune*, *The*

Huffington Post, and *The National Review*, journalists and media pundits fanned the flames,

dispensing scores of articles that portrayed both positive and negative editorial slants. And on

AMERICAblog and *The New York Times* online, gay-rights advocates and eager students joined

the conversation, praising Elmhurst's step toward promoting equality (e.g., Beauchamp, 2011;

Ruiz, 2011). The collective response was comprehensive and swift.

 A content analysis of these various articles indicated that support for Elmhurst was

overwhelmingly favorable. The college's president, S. Alan Ray, led the charge during an

interview with CNN:

> We took this step in an effort to better serve each of our students as a unique person [and . . . it] also allows us to live out our commitments to cultural diversity, social justice, and mutual respect among all persons, and the dignity of every individual. These are among the core values of this institution. They provide the foundation for all of our academic, student, and community programs. (Martinez, 2011, para. 6)

As with every debatable topic, a rebuttal is inevitable, and *The National Review*'s Harden (2011)

attacked the college through the magazine's column entitled "Phi Beta Cons: The Right Takes

on Higher Education":

> I guess you could say that sex pays at Elmhurst College—at least, certain kinds of sex. I wonder, will Elmhurst administrators demand proof of sexual orientation before handing out these valuable scholarships? If so, what sort of proof will students be asked to give? In an era of student-loan sugar daddies, students these days are doing all sort of things to pay for college. In keeping with the spirit of the times, heterosexual Elmhurst students facing potentially crushing loan burdens may be compelled to consider 'broader' sexual horizons. (paras. 3-5)

Along with the conservative media, even academe itself cast a critical eye—and *The Columbia*

Chronicle, a publication of Columbia College (another private school in Chicago), offered a

cautionary editorial: "As the first college to take this step, Elmhurst is headed in the right

direction, but the administration should keep in mind that well-intentioned ideas can be just a

step away from very misguided practices" ("Elmhurst College asks applicants for sexual

orientation," 2011, para. 10). Aware of these criticisms, Elmhurst's president was quick to

clarify the college's intention, explaining that all students receive equal treatment when applying

for academic awards: "[We] do [not] . . . deprive any deserving student of a scholarship. We

offer scholarships of varying kinds to all qualifying admitted students . . . . Thus one student's

gain is not another student's loss" (Ray, 2011, para. 8).

Controversy notwithstanding, some students showed their support of Elmhurst and spoke

eagerly with the media, such as Ally Vertigan, who explained to *The Chicago Tribune*: "I am so

proud of my college. I think that [ours] is a great step contextually, within the nation" (Mannion,

2011, para. 4). Later, Vertigan confirmed her views in an interview with Fox News: "It is

important if for the sole reason that Elmhurst is letting people know that diversity is more than

just what color your skin is or what language you speak" ("Most colleges not ready to ask about

LGBT status," 2011, para. 15). Nevertheless, the media largely overlooked students' opinions as

the bulk of coverage relied heavily upon advice from educators, gay-rights activists, and

conservative reviewers. Numerous articles within *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside

Higher Ed* illustrated the extent of the one-sided coverage. Ironically, students at Elmhurst were

overwhelmingly ignored within the national debate—especially within the academic media (e.g.,

Hoover, 2011; Jaschik, 2010, 2011; Ray, 2011). At Elmhurst, however, some students

eventually shared their opinions through *The Leader*, their student-run newspaper: Anna Filipic

argued "that [the policy] was cool that it puts us more on the map," yet Pedro Mercado

considered it a "little intrusive" because LGBT students are "labeled" immediately as they begin

their freshmen year (Montes, 2011, paras. 3-6). Students at other institutions also joined the

debate, turning to their own newspapers, such as the one at California State University, Long

Beach: "While the criticisms [of Elmhurst] are definitely valid, it is easy to see that this measure

would help meet LGBT [interests] . . . on campus better by knowing how big the community is" (Carillo, 2012, para. 13).

Inundated with media coverage at the local, regional, and national levels—which included both academic and mainstream publications—Elmhurst's president took an additional stand in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* to justify the new policy:

> [T]he [media] coverage also occasioned some commentary that challenged our wisdom and motivation. That the new application question produced some controversy will not surprise anyone familiar with online comment strings and call-in radio, which too often are more about heat than light. The application question had placed us in the middle of a national discussion about diversity and sexual identity—one that continues to stir passions and challenge established beliefs. Perhaps the most common question I heard from our supportive but surprised friends was simply this: Why did we do it? One way of explaining is simply to quote our application, which notes that Elmhurst is 'committed to diversity and connecting underrepresented students with valuable resources on campus.' For years we have asked students about their personal interests, high-school activities, and faith traditions, among other things, so we can connect them with campus support and gauge their eligibility for certain opportunities, including scholarships. (Ray, 2011, paras. 4-5).

The president's remarks reinforced the college's commitments to diversity—those institutional clarifications that appear within two locations: (a) on its application for admission: "Elmhurst welcomes and affirms all persons with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, religion, faith perspective, nationality, sexual orientation, gender identities, and gender expression to the full life of the College" ("Elmhurst College: Application for admission," 2012, p. 2); and (b) on its website: "We embrace individual expression in an atmosphere of mutual respect, and we see our differences as sources of strength" ("Elmhurst College: A celebration of diversity," n. d., para. 1). Statements like these are frequently tied to an institution's mission statement—those lofty, all-encompassing statements that nonetheless oblige educators to adjoin principle to procedure (Meachem, 2008). In fact, many would note that Elmhurst College was simply carrying out one of its primary goals as an educational institution: "to [promote] cultural diversity, mutual respect

among all persons, compassion for others, honest and open communication, and fairness and

integrity in all that we do" ("Elmhurst College: Mission, vision, and core values," 2013, para. 7).

The president finished the editorial within *The Chronicle of Higher Education* by asking

colleagues to consider the matter further:

> One of the unanticipated benefits of this episode is the opportunity it has afforded
> Elmhurst to clearly communicate two of its core values—its unyielding commitment to
> diversity and profound respect for individuals—to people who previously were
> unfamiliar with us. I think that those around the country who read or heard about
> Elmhurst for the first time as a result of our application question encountered a principled
> institution in the process of uncovering new ways to do right by its students. We are
> hoping the discussion that resulted from our action encourages other colleges and
> universities to follow our lead. (Ray, 2011, para. 13).

The president's clarification was particularly noteworthy in that it is part of a deliberative effort

within higher education: a sustained commitment to pluralism, a belief that demographic

diversification and academic enrichment are both complementary and necessary (e.g., Akombo,

2013; Clark, 2011; Green & Barblan, 2004). Pluralist politics within academe were brought to

light by Clark Kerr (1963), a former chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, in the

book *The Uses of the University.* Kerr's innovative approach to education, argues Loss (2012),

continues to shape higher education's persistent pursuit of diversity:

> Access practically any college or university web page and somewhere on that page will
> be a diversity link. Follow it and enter a world of diversity policies and procedures,
> initiatives and programming, advocacy groups and allied organizations. These are the
> new political uses of the university in the twenty-first century. (p. 544)

Upon reading comments like these, many educators would likely agree that Elmhurst was simply

addressing the needs of a student population that continues to diversify itself through

demographical demarcations, which also include those for sexual orientation and gender

identification, such as heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, cisgender, and even

questioning.

Despite Elmhurst's intentions, and even its most vociferous challengers, one fact remained: This straightforward question—"Would you consider yourself a member of the LGBT community?" ("Elmhurst College: Application for admission," 2012, p. 3)—generated a collective, national debate, which will influence institutional policy for years to come. Clarifying this notion, Shane L. Windmeyer, Executive Director of Campus Pride, an LGBT advocacy group focused on higher education, summarized the significance of the college's move: "In the next [decade] we'll look back and ask why colleges didn't make this change much sooner" (Ring, 2011, para. 6). Einhaus, Viento, and Croteau (2004) share this concern:

> Openly LGBT students will be savvy in their consideration of institutions, and admissions professionals will need to be able to thoroughly and honestly communicate to these students, and sometimes their parents, what it might be like to be an LGBT student on their campus. (p. 14)

As LGBT students continue to navigate the admissions process over the next decade, however, they will face an inescapable reality: Elmhurst College opened the equivalent of Pandora's Box, and its contents have scattered from institution to institution, issuing a contentious, passionate dialogue among educators, students, and dozens of primary and secondary stakeholders.

Background to the Problem

Throughout the decades higher education has fought demographical battles, often restricting equal access to academic and personal development by erecting various institutional impediments against sex (e.g., "Women's Status in Higher Education," 2011), race (e.g., Anderson, 2005; Perez, 2010), socioeconomic status (e.g., Ballinger, 2007; Bergerson, 2009), and religious affiliation (e.g., Mixon, Lyon, & Beaty, 2004). Students who belong to these groups have nonetheless drastically altered higher education, especially over the last fifty years, and have influenced academe's commitment to pluralism—which now includes an increased

recognition of LGBT students (e.g., Loss, 2012). The contemporary socio-sexual climate within

higher education is exponentially more progressive and open-minded when compared to

previous decades:

> [Over the years] we have come to know a great deal about the ways the LGBT students develop and grow, and accordingly, to create services and programs to empower them in their quest for belonging. [Our work with LGBT students] has, like the [gay] movement itself, been a gradual process of defining and refining our knowledge and in turn the policies and practices that foster belonging. (Marine, 2011, p. 3)

LGBT students have recently encountered extraordinary advances: "[Their opportunities have]

burgeoned with an increase in programming, support services, and visibility . . . and the face and

experience of [these] students is different than it was ten—or even five—years ago" (Bazarsky,

2007, p. vii). Today, LGBT students actively participate within various institutional

opportunities designed specifically for them, perhaps majoring in gay-and lesbian studies or

attending regional and national LGBT conferences, such as those held by the following

organizations: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Southern Association

for College Student Affairs, National Academic Advising Association, American College

Personnel Association, American Library Association, Special Libraries Association, Gay and

Lesbian Medical Association, American Psychological Association, Modern Language

Association, Association for Theatre in Higher Education.

     Many LGBT students also find social support, entertainment, and meaningful

connections to their campuses through programs like Safe Zone and Lavender Graduation—a

ceremony that recognizes the contributions of an institution's LGBT students—and through

organizations like Sigma Phi Beta and Delta Lambda Phi, two national fraternities for gay men,

and Gamma Rho Lambda, a national sorority for lesbians (e.g, Alvarez & Schneider, 2008;

Evans, 2002; Hauswirth, 2006; Penn, 2008; Sanlo, 2000; Wantanabe, 1996). Additionally,

LGBT allies—students, faculty members, and administrators—assemble within their schools and communities to promote tolerance and equality. Alongside their LGBT confederates, they organize groups like the Gay-Straight Alliance (http://gsanetwork.org); schedule programs like National Coming Out Day (www.campuspride.org); and commemorate historical events like the Laramie Project, which honors Matthew Sheppard, a student at the University of Wyoming who was murdered in 1998 during a brutal hate-crime assault (www.matthewshepard.org). These kinds of academic, social, and professional advancements, however, do not overshadow a troubled past within academe: Gay and lesbian students formerly traveled a dangerous road, one fraught with controversy and iron-willed resistance, and in many ways their journey toward acceptance still continues today—even as they apply for admission at many institutions.

Statement of the Problem

Elmhurst College's recent decision influenced other schools to take notice. In 2012, the University of Iowa became the first public university to include a question about sexual orientation and gender identity on its application (Hoover, 2012), and at the University of Pennsylvania, admissions officers now examine essays for evidence of applicants' sexual orientation (Steinberg, 2010; Young, 2011). At the University of California and California State University, however, administrators are still deliberating whether or not to adopt the practice (Gordon, 2012). Aside from these developments, the Common Application—a national organization representing a few hundred schools and their admissions processes—recently chose not to include a demographic for sexual orientation and gender identity, reasoning that "colleges have other ways to indicate support for applicants who are gay or who do [not] identify with

traditional gender categories, and that adding the questions could pose problems" (Jaschik, 2011, para. 1).

The Common Application may have issued its decision after considering a few noteworthy reservations: Could this kind of demographic harm LGBT students, perhaps "outing" them to homophobic administrators, faculty members, and fellow students—or even to unsuspecting parents? Could confidential information accidentally enter the public realm, despite clear legal restrictions from the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (1974), also known as FERPA? Or could institutions overlook more fundamental concerns for LGBT students, like homophobia, marginalization, stigmatization, and discrimination? Other potential consequences also come to light, especially when an admissions staff shares data with other offices on campus: Might residence life corral LGBT students into a single "queer" dormitory in order to protect them from harm? Might an obsessive administrator frighten LGBT students, say, with an email that explicitly warns against HIV/AIDS? Or might an LGBT office bombard potential students with junk mail and excessive good will, advertising countless diversity initiatives, scholarship opportunities, and specialized organizations? Questions like these clearly highlight a fundamental problem for LGBT administrators to consider: Despite good intentions, higher education could forward an irresponsible admissions policy when trying to serve effectively and compassionately its LGBT students.

The Common Application may have also anticipated another troubling matter: Not all admissions counselors consistently behave ethically, even when guided by codes of conduct and federal mandates, such as FERPA (1974). Hodum and James (2010) explain: "[Holding] substantial autonomy with regard to the manner in which they carry out their responsibilities . . . [these officers] could freely follow their own idiosyncratic whims, deciding for themselves

9

which behaviors [from applicants] were appropriate or inappropriate [for admission]" (p. 320). Although Hodum and James (2010) do not address arbitrary decisions regarding an applicant's sexual orientation or gender identity, their findings indicate that certain factors matter greatly and that marginalization and discrimination never disappear entirely, despite institutional safeguards and professional initiatives for objectivity.

Thus, the intention of this dissertation was to ascertain the various positive and negative implications that surround a demographic for sexual orientation in a college application. These implications were identified by members of a national LGBT organization of educators and student-affairs administrators (referred to as the Organization throughout Chapter One), who understood the myriad complexities of the LGBT movement in academe. These implications were important not only to the evolution of LGBT research but also to the current dialogue between the following groups: (a) administrators who currently identify LGBT students within applications and essays; (b) administrators who plan to implement a policy that asks applicants to reveal their sexual orientation and gender identity; (c) additional educators and faculty members who invite specialized guidance; and (d) LGBT students who self-identify within an application.

Rationale of the Study

Hundreds of institutions serve LGBT students via outreach programs delivered through offices with names like LGBT Life, LGBT Resource Center, and Campus Pride Center. These offices regularly advance the following objectives: to address and respond to homophobia within the campus community, to educate the campus's various stakeholders about LGBT issues, to foster diversity, and to provide a sense of community. Outreach programs also ensure that students receive the benefits of educational best practices—those kinds of personalized services

that promote learning, scholarship, friendship, self-potential, and self-actualization—and make

any campus a safer, less-discriminatory place (Marine, 2011; Sanlo, Rankin, & Schoenberg,

2002).

Although LGBT outreach services are relatively common within academe, very few

institutions have considered Elmhurst's approach—that is, to target LGBT students *before*

arriving on campus rather than *afterwards*. According to Jaschik (2010), the admissions process

and retention efforts forge a complementary relationship: "[C]olleges use demographic

information to reach out to students—before admissions decisions have been made—to tell them

about programs and services for various group" (para. 9). By mining demographic data during

the admissions process, institutions are able to connect enrollees with various on-campus

organizations, like religious and cultural groups, and to develop a better understanding of their

student bodies. Thus, any student who identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender while

filling out an application could subsequently receive LGBT materials from the institution. The

Chief Diversity Officer at the University of Iowa explains how the practice works: "What we've

heard from students, especially LGBT students, is that they don't find out about support services

and organizations until they've been here for a year or two. [Sending out LGBT information

after receiving an application] allows us to [increase our] personal outreach" (Hoover, 2012,

para. 8). Outreach programs that connect other marginalized populations to critical extra-

curricular services have generated positive results (Adams, 2012; Johnson, Takesue, & Chen,

2007; Schmidt, 2009) as have those programs that address LGBT students of color and other

intersectional identities (Abes, 2012; Patton, Shahjahan, & Osei-Kofi, 2010; Poynter &

Washington, 2005; Schueler, Hoffman, & Peterson, 2013). Any institution that seeks to quantify

sexual orientation and gender identity, some would argue, is behaving in a similar fashion: It is

simply trying to connect LGBT students to the campus-community at large and to track their

academic progress from matriculation through graduation (Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012;

Newhouse, 2013).

Despite the benefits of quantifying sexual orientation, another question still remains:

Does this policy actually benefit LGBT students? Some authorities would quickly issue an

opposing argument, like the hypothetical one that appears in *The Gay and Lesbian Guide to*

College Life:

> Certainly, many colleges offer a safe and empowering space for students to explore their
> sexuality and gender identity. But for high school students, who haven't yet had a chance
> to reinvent themselves on a liberating college campus, the process of coming out can be
> fraught with extreme anxiety about not fitting in, being an embarrassment to their loved
> ones, or being ostracized by the local community. (Baez, Howd, & Pepper, 2007, p. 11)

Although institutions offer outreach programs to provide educational best practices, the

psychobiological foundations of sexual orientation and gender identity rarely issue simple

conclusions about the LGBT on-campus experience. Any institution that quantifies sexual

orientation and gender identity could unintentionally harm LGBT students—as well as the very

administrators who work with these individuals.   Thus, the LGBT establishment could benefit

from a comprehensive study that looks at the various positive and negative implications that

surround the quantification of sexual orientation.

Significance of the Study

Glatthorn and Joyner (2005) stipulate that any study must meet three conditions: (a) to

"[extend] existing knowledge," (b) to "[change] prevailing beliefs," and (c) to "[provide] greater

depth of knowledge about previously studied phenomena" (p. 19). The precise intersection of

sexual orientation, demographics, and the admissions process satisfies these criteria. First, this

study "extends existing knowledge" (p. 19). Although thousands of researchers have addressed sexual orientation and higher education (in large part, since the early 1980s), few have received the opportunity to examine sexual orientation and the admissions process. Secondly, this study "changes prevailing beliefs" (p. 19) about the LGBT collegiate experience by urging educators to address various instructional opportunities and administrative challenges should they consider or even follow Elmhurst College's lead. Finally, this topic "provides greater depth of knowledge about previously studied phenomena" (p. 19). Indeed, an academic niche already speaks to sexual orientation, gender identification, and the college admissions process (Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012; Cox, 2012; Young, 2011). Yet a professional organization of LGBT administrators has yet to share its collective advice on the matter.

Methodology Overview

Following IRB approval (see Appendix A), this study used a descriptive design (Anastas, 1999) in order to study a single population—an unnamed national LGBT organization in higher education, which consisted of approximately 700 members—and to discover how this group viewed the quantification of sexual orientation within a college application. A sample, however, was not drawn since cluster sampling or systematic sampling would have generated too few potential subjects. Two significant factors dictated this particular population: Participants held the necessary expertise in order to comment effectively upon the issue at hand, and they did not experience any harm during the study since they were either allies or members of the LGBT community. This study's descriptive design allowed self-selected members of the organization to identify, categorize, exemplify, and describe the complex issues surrounding a sexual-orientation demographic when responding to a 17-item questionnaire, which included Likert

13

scales, multiple-choice options, and open-ended answers (see Appendix B). To test legibility, readability, serviceability to the LGBT community, and time-to-complete, the questionnaire underwent two pilot studies at a regional university: first with non-randomly selected English faculty members, then with an LGBT faculty group. After the questionnaire was vetted, it was then given to the Organization: first to members of the Executive Board; then to rank-and-file members via Qualtrics, a private webhost for scholarly and commercial surveys. The questionnaire was available during a five-week period, from August 25, 2013, through September 30, 2013. The study also included four additional measures: (a) an initial, electronic invitation to participate along with informed consent (see Appendix C); (b) subsequent reminders through email; (c) an inducement for participation; and (d) interaction through social media in order to increase the response rate. After the collection of data, quantitative responses were analyzed with descriptive statistics; qualitative responses with coded assessment, derived from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967); and other discoveries with cross tabulations and non-parametric testing. Qualtrics conducted all descriptive statistics and prepared all cross tabulations; findings were then displayed in tabular formats that included both numerical and written explanations.

Research Questions

Nine research questions guided this descriptive study's examination of the Organization and its members:

1. Are members of the Organization aware that other institutions have recently asked, or are considering asking, potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for college admission?

2. How many institutions represented by the Organization have considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?

3. Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *at their own institutions*?

4. What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *at their own institutions*?

5. Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *within academe in general*?

6. What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *within academe in general*?

7. Do members believe that their institutions would support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?

8. What reasons do members give to explain their institutions' willingness, or lack of willingness, to support such a policy?

9. Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general? These demographics include: institutional enrollment, Carnegie classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of position, duration of position, function of position, duration of LGBT experience, and duration of membership within the Organization.

Delimitations

This study was delimited through the following controls: (a) a non-randomly selected population that included approximately 700 members of a national LGBT organization in higher education; (b) a literature review that examined four areas—the history surrounding the LGBT on-campus experience, contemporary trends involving LGBT students, legal matters affecting LGBT individuals, and ethical considerations addressing LGBT students due to FERPA; (c) a methodology that relied upon a descriptive design; and (d) an on-line, seventeen-item questionnaire that contained a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures (i.e., Likert scales, multiple-choice options, and open-ended prompts).

Limitations

This study also recognized the following limitations. First, the population, a national LGBT organization in higher education, was not randomly-selected (see Population, Chapter Three, for a comprehensive discussion), and the results were not generalizable to the whole of higher education. Secondly, the study's questionnaire perhaps generated incomplete and/or or overtly subjective responses due to the following concerns: (a) open-ended questions (i.e., some respondents might not have been wordsmiths); (b) an on-line presence (i.e., some respondents might have experienced difficulty when navigating various listservs, webpages, and webhosts); and (c) nomenclature germane to the LGBT community (i.e., some respondents might have found the term *sexual orientation*, as well as the LGBT acronym, to be semantically charged and/or restrictive). Finally, several factors, despite rigorous efforts to solicit participation, may have affected the response rate: a lack of enthusiasm, a hectic work schedule, or forgetfulness.

Terminology

Numerous terms were used within this study to denote sexual orientation, gender identity, sexuality, the LGBT acronym, and other LGBT matters. These terms appear alphabetically within the following list:

1. *Ally* is a "person, though usually not gay . . . , who is a supporter of LGBTQ people and their rights" (Baez et al., 2007, p. 23).

2. *Bisexual* is a term for an "individual who is physically, romantically, and/or emotionally attracted to men and women" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 6).

3. *Cisgender* is a term that refers to people whose self-identity matches the gender that corresponds to their biological sex (e.g., Stryker, 2008).

4. *Coming out* is "[a] lifelong process of [revealing one's sexual orientation to others]. People forge a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender identity first to themselves and then . . . reveal it to others" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 6). The process, however, is not standardized—meaning that it differs, often drastically, from person to person. The contemporary use of the term originated in the 1960s, and it replaced a similar expression: "*coming into* the homosexual world" (Bronski, 2011, p. 209).

5. *External homophobia* is a term used to explain heterosexuals' irrational fear of LGBTs. Dermer, Smith, and Barto (2010) explain that external homophobia "include[s] the notion of dread of being in close quarters with lesbians and gay men, as well as an irrational fear, hatred, and intolerance by heterosexuals" (p. 327).

6. *Gay* is a term for a "[man] whose enduring physical, romantic, and/or emotional attraction is to other men" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 7).

7.   *Gender identity* is a term that indicates "[o]ne's internal, personal sense of being a man or a woman (or a boy or a girl)" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 8).

8.   *Heterosexism* is a conventional attitude supporting the notion "that all people are heterosexual and that heterosexuality is superior and more desirable than homosexuality or bisexuality" ("Fact and information sheet about heterosexism," n. d., para. 1). Heterosexism appears, for instance, within the following situations: (a) looking upon LGBT individuals as mere sexual beings rather than complex people with lives apart from their sexual orientation or gender identity; (b) forcing LGBT people to assume the initiative for coming out; and/or (c) not understanding that heterosexuality is politically reinforced by giving legal rights for marriage, finance, and other such things, while legally denying LGBT individuals the right to marriage, jobs, child custody, *etc*. To complicate matters for LGBT individuals, Blackburn and Smith (2010) warn that heterosexism is often "more subtle" than internal and external homophobia (p. 625).

9.   *Heterosexuals* and *heterosexuality* are terms that apply to men and women who do not express same-sex feelings and/or relationships.

10.   *Homonegativity* is an alternate term for internal homophobia. Dermer et al. (2010) add that internal homophobia "may not be technically appropriate in that phobia connotes fear of self rather than highlighting [*temporary* (italics added)] feelings of shame, guilt, or anger" (p. 328).

11.   *Homosexual* and *homosexuality* are antiquated terms (generally speaking) that denote gay men/lesbians and other individuals (a) who experience same-sex attraction and/or have sex with members of the same sex; and/or (b) who forward non-normative expressions of gender. Baez et al. (2007) note that term is largely impolite: "Gone are the days of using

18

the word 'homosexual' to describe anyone with an attraction to someone of the same sex"

(p. 22). The term, in fact, is pejorative, especially when used to ridicule sexual

orientation and identity, as illustrated in the following quotation from a typical 1950's

medical journal: "The primary function of the homosexual group is psychological in that

it provides a social context within which the homosexual can find acceptance as a

homosexual and collective support for his deviant behavior" (Leznoff & Westley, 1956).

Despite recognizing the negative connotations of both terms, this researcher uses these

outdated words on occasion—along with *heterosexuality* and *heterosexuals*—when

discussing either historical events or simple facts, especially those that occurred pre-

Stonewall (see also Homophobia and Academe, 1920s-1950s, Chapter Two).

12.   *Internal homophobia* is a term used to indicate LGBTs' frustration with their sexual

orientation or gender identity. This situation is often the result of various societal,

familial, political, religious, cultural, and/or economic causes. Dermer et al. (2010) add

that internalized homophobia "entails accepting the dominant society's prejudice against

sexual minorities and turning those values and attitudes inward" (p. 328). Both terms—

internal and external homophobia—are extensions of the generic descriptive called

homophobia, a construct first coined by Weinberg (1972) upon examining how certain

individuals actually feared gay men and lesbians, much like an agoraphobic fears social

contact and wide-open spaces.

13.   *Intersectionality* is a theory that explains how various marginalized demographics join

forces in order to construct additional difficulties for individuals. For instance, a student

who is gay *and* Jewish might encounter more social problems than if he were only

Jewish—or only gay, for that matter (e.g., Blackburn & Smith, 2010). Moreover, inter*section*ality should not be confused with inter*sexu*ality.

14.	*Intersexuality* is an "umbrella term for various forms of atypical [sexual] development . . . that comprise different congenital conditions in which the development of chromosomal, gonadal, or anatomical sex is [uncharacteristic]" (Schweizer, Brunner, Schutzmann, Schonbucher, & Richter-Appelt, 2009, p. 189).

15.	*In-the-closet* is a phrase used for any LGB individual who refuses to acknowledge his/her sexual orientation or cannot do so because of various external pressures.

16.	*LGBT* is an acronym for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender community. In some sections of this study, the acronym expands: (a) Q for *questioning* one's own sexual orientation or for *queer*, (b) I for *intersex*, and (c) A for *allies*. In other places, the acronym *GLBT* sometimes appears, simply because other researchers have used an alternate arrangement of letters. The reason for the flip-flop within LGBT scholarship— that is, the reversal of the G and L—is partially explained by the editorial staff at *The Advocate*, a bi-monthly newsmagazine for the LGBT community: "[We use] LGBT, not GLBT . . . [because] for many lesbians it's a reminder that gay women are not simply a subset of the larger male world but rather their own distinct community of individuals" ("Alphabet soup," 2012, para. 1). Despite the use of LGBT or GLBT or BGLT (alpha order) or LGBTQI, one fact remains: "[T]he terms and labels in use today are more numerous and more multifaceted than even five years ago" (Phoenix, 2007, p. 21).

17.	*LGBT administrators* is a generic descriptive used to refer to all individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity, who work with or advocate for LGBT students in higher education.

18. *LGBT outreach* is an extracurricular program that focuses exclusively upon LGBT
     matters. These services originate (usually) within an LGBT center located on campus.

19. *LGBT studies* is an academic program that emphasizes scholarship and the historical and
     contemporary experiences of LGBT individuals and that critically analyzes sexual
     orientation, gender, and culture/politics as they relate to the LGBT movement.

20. *Lesbian* is a term for a "woman whose enduring physical, romantic, and/or emotional
     attraction is to other women" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 7).

21. *Openly gay* is a descriptive for "people who self-identify as lesbian or gay in their
     personal, public, and professional lives" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 7).

22. *Pluralism* is a belief that institutions should strive to accomplish the following objectives:
     (a) "to be open to different intellectual perspectives," (b) "to serve as safe spaces for
     debate," and (c) "to maintain diversity of race, gender, and ethnicity" (Green & Barblan,
     2004, pp. 6-7).

23. *Queer* is a term that refers to the LGBT population at large—as in "queer students" or the
     "queer community." Although the term has historically been a derogatory reference
     toward any gay man or lesbian, it has since been reclaimed by various LGBT groups
     (Baez et al., 2007; Sanlo, 1998), and it often appears (a) within such phrases as "queer
     studies" and "queer student alliance" and (b) within LGBT academic discourse, as in
     "[we need] to think about queering the state" (Duggan, 1994). Other individuals and
     groups, however, avoid the term altogether, like Oregon State University, which now
     uses the more-favorable "Pride Center" rather than the less-euphemistic "Queer Resource
     Center" (e.g., Marine, 2011).

24. *Questioning* is a "man or woman unsure of [his/her sexual orientation] or same gender attractions" (Baez et al., 2007, p. 25).

25. *Sexual orientation* is a term used to indicate "an individual's enduring physical, romantic, and/or emotional attraction to members of the same and/or opposite sex, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and heterosexual . . . orientations" ("GLAAD media reference guide," 2010, p. 7). Sexual orientation, however, is *not* to be confused with *sexual preference*, a term that holds negative connotations in that "preference" suggests that sexual orientation is merely a fleeting choice. *Sexual orientation* is also not to be confused with *sexual lifestyle*, a descriptive that also includes undesirable undertones. Moreover, the terms *sexual orientation* and *gender identity* are not interchangeable: The previous term explains how an individual feels about "others of the same sex (homosexuality), opposite sex (heterosexuality), or both sexes (bisexuality);" and the latter term "reflects whether one identifies as male or female" (Cawthon, 2004, p. 38).

26. *Straight* is a slang term for any heterosexual. The descriptive, however, is gaining respectability as it appears not only within casual discussions but even within professional and scholarly conversations. Recently in *The Huffington Post*, for instance, Goodman (2012) reasons that "straight" people would "benefit from acceptance and equal rights for LGBT people" (para. 1).

27. *Transgender* is a term that refers to people whose self-identity does not match the gender that corresponds to their biological sex (Stryker, 2008). The term *transgender* does not appear as transgender*ed*—wherein the *ed* indicates the act of *becoming* rather than *being*—and it is used in place of *transsexual*, an often offensive descriptive.

Organization of the Study

      This dissertation includes five chapters. Chapter One introduces the central problem of this study: to discover the various positive and negative implications that surround the quantification of sexual orientation within a college application as identified by members of a national organization of LGBT administrators. Chapter Two reviews the cultural, political, and historical evolution of the LGBT movement in higher education, focusing on such topics as institutionalized homophobia, seminal LGBT events, on-campus LGBT visibility, and LGBT legal considerations, which include various landmark federal court cases as well as a discussion of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (1974), also known as FERPA. Chapter Three outlines the methodology of a descriptive study (Anastas, 1999) that examined how the aforesaid organization considered the quantification of sexual orientation. Chapter Four presents this study's findings, which were analyzed with descriptive statistics, non-parametric testing, cross-tabulations, and coded assessment, a process derived from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Lastly, Chapter Five examines this study's primary findings and provides recommendations for LGBT researchers and administrators who are considering whether or not to quantify sexual orientation during the college-admissions process.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a historical and contemporary context for understanding the

quantification of sexual orientation within a college application. Five areas frame this context: a

historical retrospective of the LGBT collegiate experience, current trends involving LGBT

students, legal considerations for working with LGBT students, ethical matters and the Federal

Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and a conclusion.

Historical Retrospective

This first section of Chapter Two includes the following five subsections: Homophobia

and Academe, 1920s -1950s; the Gay-and-Lesbian Collegiate Experience Reflected Through

Representative Literature and Biography, 1950s-1960s; Campus Unrest and the 1960s; the

Stonewall Legacy and the Modern LGBT Movement; and Higher Education and the LGBT

Movement Forge a New Relationship, 1970s-2000s.

Homophobia and Academe, 1920s-1950s

By enacting a policy that accounts for sexual orientation and gender identity within the

application process, Elmhurst College recognized the troubled history surrounding the LGBT

collegiate experience. In one telling instance during the 1920s, Harvard University embarked

upon an attack of its homosexual students following the suicide of Cyril Wilcox, a student who

feared that his same-sex affections would be discovered by prying officials. To purge its rosters

of homosexuals—and to rid itself of a nasty scandal—the university went on the attack: "The

dean particularly wanted the names of all [gay] students [an informant] observed visiting

[certain] room[s] . . . and of those he recalled having seen there in the past" (Wright, 2005, p.

47). With these clandestine reports, the university quickly expelled reputed and actual

homosexuals, men whose lives ended in social ruin and in some cases suicide.

Marine (2011) makes clear the severity of this witch hunt—one that had spread far

beyond the provincial confines of Harvard University: "Expulsion of students believed to be gay

was a commonly adopted practice among colleges in the early to mid-twentieth century and

signaled a belief that homosexuality was caused by the influence of those determined to spread

its ills" (p. 15). Chauncey (1994) shares these concerns, yet explains a few slight modifications:

> [B]efore the 1930s much of gay life had been governed by an informal 'understanding'
> fashioned through constant skirmishes over the uses of public sites, which allowed queer
> men to socialize in public only so long as they did nothing to draw attention to
> themselves as homosexuals" (p. 356).

Thus, public and private lives rarely converged, and gay men—called "third-sexers," "inverts,"

"pansies," "sissies," and "queers" (Chauncey, 1994) since "gay" did not enter the colloquial

exchange until the 1940s (Bronski, 2011)—had few people to consult for advice and guidance.

Most psychiatrists, psychologists, legislators, clergymen, community leaders, and academics

cooperatively erected an impenetrable barrier, defending the heterosexual tradition and its

inherent familial, political, governmental, religious, scholarly, medical, cultural, and legal

jurisdictions (Bronski, 2011; Chauncey, 1994; Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Dilley, 2002;

Duberman, 1993; Johnson, 2004; Lewis, 2001; Marine, 2011). Philip Wylie (1936, as cited in

Bronski, 2011) echoes this collective sentiment in *Generation of Vipers*, an exposé of American

culture, and argues that homosexual activity was "'common in the navy, the army, and in

colleges [italics added] both for men and women'" (p. 164). Wylie (1936, as cited in Bronski, 2011) specifically mentions the armed forces—a dangerous place for any gay man or lesbian, who, for instance, could receive a court martial for verification or even suspicion of homosexuality and who would then no longer reap the educational benefits of the GI Bill (Bronski, 2011; Loftin, 2012).

During the 1950s and 1960s, gay-and-lesbian coeds continued to feel the pinch of a society that had grown increasingly mistrustful of their sexual orientation, in large part due to the "McCarthy era crackdowns on anything considered deviant" (Marine, 2011, p. 12). This period, argues Faderman (1991), was "perhaps the worst time in [American] history for women to be in love with women" (p. 157). McCarthyism, as it applied to gay men and lesbians, included a sociopolitical undertaking frequently called the "Lavender Scare," a process through which thou- sands of gay men and lesbians were ignominiously removed from governmental positions during the Eisenhower administration—and well into the 1970s (Johnson, 2004; Lewis, 2001). McCarthyism dominated the political stage for only a few years until the politician's untimely death in 1957, yet its effects were far-reaching (Hachmeister, 2011), especially when coupled with the medical community's prohibitive stance against homosexuality (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011).

Sturgis and Adams (1978), through their meta-analysis of earlier research regarding homosexuality in the mid-twentieth century, exemplify the typical attitude of medical professionals previous to the 1970s: "[The] argument that the homosexual seeks treatment primarily because of social pressures appears to neglect the possibility that there are clients who may actually wish to alter their preference to be congruent with their values" (p. 168). In another study, Simon and Gagnon (1967) even admit to blatant subjectivity within their qualitative

investigation: "[W]e have allowed the homosexual's sexual object choice to dominate and control our imagery of him and have let this aspect of his total life experience appear to determine all of his products, concerns, and activities" (p. 60). Meanwhile, other researchers appeared totally baffled by homosexuality, their muddled explanations, for instance, indicating rather simplistic conclusions: "[I]f homosexuality is a condition, then people either have it or do not have it. Many scientists and ordinary people assume that there are two kinds of people in the world: homosexuals and heterosexuals" (McIntosh, 1968, p. 68). Even still, some researchers found homosexuality utterly fascinating and often treated gay men like exotic zoo creatures, probing them for secrets concealed within shadowy lairs and urban habitats (Humphreys, 1970; Leznoff & Westley, 1956; Newton, 1972; Reiss, 1961).

American society remained quite curious about homosexuality—in part because of these divergent medical diagnoses—yet people were mesmerized by a seminal work called *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Kinsey, 1948), which depicted multiple aspects of sexuality, including substantial evidence of homosexuality (Bronski, 2011; Mondimore, 1996). Kinsey's (1948) discoveries, argues Loftin (2012), influenced not just a heterosexual readership: "[Statistical data and anecdotal reports also] emboldened gay people's sense of collective identity [and] reminded them of their large numbers" (p. 4). Despite certain (in)valid findings within Kinsey's study and various scientific journals, one fact still remained: "Heterosexuality was painstakingly constructed by the medical profession [whereas h]omosexuality was scrutinized, pathologized, and policed" (Bronski, 2011, p. 129). Indeed, the political and medical establishments led to intense homophobia within both heterosexual and homosexual communities, and academe itself behaved quite similarly, also believing that homosexuality could be cured through regular psychoanalysis and/or aversion therapy—or, worse, through

27

electroshock treatment, institutional confinement, and even occipital lobotomies (Davis &

Heilbroner, 2011).

The Gay-and-Lesbian Collegiate Experience Reflected Through Representative Literature and

Biography, 1950s-1960s

To illustrate the dangers of the gay-and-lesbian collegiate experience during the early

1960s, Rita Mae Brown (1973), the author of *Rubyfruit Jungle*, arguably America's best lesbian

novel of the twentieth century, shares the fictionalized story of Molly Bolt, a student at the

University of Florida, who experiences the harmful effects of homophobia from an officious

administrator:

> 'I have arranged for you to see one of our psychiatrists here three times a week and of
> course, you'll see me once a week. I want you to know I'm in there rooting for you to get
> through this phase you're in. I want you to know I'm your friend.' (p. 128)

Following a brief stint in a psychiatric ward, Molly quickly learns that her sexual orientation

exacts steep costs: She loses both her membership in the Delta Delta Delta Sorority *and* her

scholarship (for "moral reasons"), despite having a "superb" academic record (Brown, 1973, p.

131). Molly's fictional story holds many similarities to real life events during the time period—

for instance, at Bryn Mawr College (Marine, 2011) and Columbia University (Duberman,

1993)—and to other literary works that negatively portray gay men and lesbians within academe

during the 1950s and 1960s (e.g., Anderson, 1955; Bannon, 1957; Crowley, 1968; Hitt, 1958;

Isherwood, 1962; Packer, 1952; Sarton, 1961; Taylor, 1957; Williams, 1955). To further

illustrate the plausibility of *Rubyfruit Jungle*, Dilley (2002) presents a personal narrative from a

male student who attended the University of Illinois (UI) during the 1960s: "[The Chicago

police] asked what I was doing [in a gay bar], and I had to admit that I was a student at [UI. . . .

Then the university] just sent me a letter. They had a regents' meeting at the school; I was dismissed for conduct unbecoming a student" (p. 59).

These accounts reflected representative attitudes toward homosexuality within college campuses during the mid-twentieth century, yet further matters hovered on the horizon. If gay-and-lesbian students wanted to read a novel that would speak to them on a personal level, they were simply out of luck: The publishing world was vehemently homophobic, yet many of the second-rate presses found a particular loophole when planning their editorial returns: that they could capitalize upon the erotic value of the lesbian literary widget—that a lusty sorority girl, they reasoned, would certainly deliver the goods (Forrest, 2005; Keller, 1999). As with all new products, packing and marketing influence the design process, so warning labels and editorial red-tape carefully governed the manufacture and distribution of all fictionalized lesbians. In one telling instance, the cover of the novel *Girls' Dormitory*, by Orrie Hitt (1958), told readers that they would brave the following horrors: "[that these young women who] came to college [were] sweet, pretty[,] and unsuspecting [and that their] housemother was strangely corrupt." Assuming that a single admonition might not direct naïve readers toward an obvious plot—never mind the cover's sensational art work—the publisher further counseled about "[a] scathing attack on the evils of off-campus housing—and [of] coeds obliged to live in dangerous proximity" (Hitt, 1958, cover of novel). With warnings like these, lesbian novels performed a primary purpose—to rouse the voyeuristic imaginations of the general public—but they also functioned pedagogically, letting readers vicariously experience a heroine's (mis)adventures in, no less, a girls' dormitory (Forrest, 2005; Keller, 1999).

Girls' Dormitory provided a classic example of gay-and-lesbian pulp fiction, a titillating literary movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, this genre was rife with hoary stereotypes:

Naughty sorority girls, bored housewives, lonely shipmen, female soldiers, liberated

sophisticates, and curious hipsters populated scores of pulps. These stories of secretive love and

same-sex desires usually delivered a formidable morality lesson throughout the concluding

chapters: that homosexuality generated dreadful social and psychological consequences—

wherein the lesbian character, for instance, becomes a pariah, denies her sexual orientation, gets

married, and/or even commits suicide (Forrest, 2005; Keller, 1999; Smith, 1999). Still, not all

narratives within the genre ended so terribly, and some even legitimized their readers' same-sex

feelings, providing stories that were "as necessary . . . as air" (Forrest, 2005, p. ix); that supplied

"maps, hints, and clues that told [them] how they might lead their lives" (Bronski, 2003, p. 8);

and that gave them "more of a language with which to name their oppression" (Keller, 1999, p.

18).

Novels like *Girls' Dormitory*, however, were purely formulaic. Vin Packer (2004), the

author of another collegiate lesbian novel, *Spring Fire* (1952), recalls the restrictions given to

her by her editor at Gold Medal Books: "'You have to do two things [when writing this story.

The main characters, Susan Mitchell and Leda Taylor,] would have to be in college [*and* in a

sorority . . . and] you cannot make homosexuality attractive. No happy ending'" (p. vi).

Because of this proviso, Packer (1952) includes a distinct editorial constraint within *Spring Fire*,

one that imposes heterosexual conscription upon every character—especially upon her two

lesbian leads, who are members of the fictionalized Epsilon Epsilon Epsilon Sorority. In one

scene, for instance, Susan harshly psychoanalyzes herself while writing a letter to Leda:

> *Lesbian* is an ugly word and I hate it. But that's what I am, Leda, and my feelings toward
> you are homosexual. I had no business to ask you to stop seeing [your boyfriend], to try
> to turn you into what I am, but please believe me, I didn't know myself what I was doing.
> I guess I'm young and stupid and naïve about life, and I know that you warned me about
> the direction my life was taking when you told me to get to know men. I tried, Led. But
> it was awful. Even Charlie knows what I am now. I think that if I go to an independent

30

house, away from you, the only person I love, I'll be able to forget some of the temptation. If I stay in the sorority, I'll only make you unhappy and hurt you. I love you too much to do that. (Packer, 1952, p. 106)

Throughout *Spring Fire*, similar passages appear over and over, and Susan's thoughts and experiences—like those within *Rubyfruit Jungle*—parallel countless, actual situations within various sororities and fraternities at colleges and universities from the 1940s through the 1960s (Dilley, 2002; Syrett, 2009; Windmeyer & Freeman, 1998, 2000).

The situation in *Spring Fire* also bears an uncanny resemblance to an event that happened at Barnard College in 1964, one that affected a freshman, Karla Jay, living on campus:

During [her] first week [at school], she heard about two women who had been expelled the previous year. A male student at Columbia (directly across the street from Barnard) had peered into the women's dormitory room with a pair of binoculars and [had] seen them making love. The Peeping Tom was allowed to stay and, by some, was praised; the women were kicked out. Hearing the story, Karla 'realized for the first time that there was something wrong with being a lesbian' and decided she 'had better cover up.' (Duberman, 1993, p. 117).

For Karla and the fictional Susan, their sexual orientation exacted a terrible toll—social blacklisting and academic bankruptcy—and to conceal their true identities, they both chose to date men, at least for the time being, thus embracing the ultimate heteronormative criterion of the day: "to decide [that they were] really not queer" (Packer, 2004, p. vi). Keller (1999) provides further clarification: "The pulps' homophobia induced many lesbians to feel their sexual orientation was morally wrong, diseased, or criminal, and it caused some to refuse the label of lesbianism altogether" (p. 20).

Unlike Packer's (1952) *Spring Fire*, Rita Mae Brown's (1973) *Rubyfruit Jungle* is based upon numerous real-life experiences so that the novel functions much like a *roman à clef*. Being expelled in 1964 from the same university *and* for the same reasons, Brown (n. d.) holds a clairvoyant connection to her heroine Molly Bolt:

I earned a scholarship to the University of Florida but got kicked out over [my sexual orientaiton]. Naturally, that's not what the administration said. It sure wasn't my grades. Those were bitter, duplicitous days, and whenever people wax nostalgic I remember (because I can flip through the turnstiles of nostalgia, too) institutionalism, racism, sexism, and other encoded behaviors that served to hurt people. (para. 7)

Brown's explanation of the University of Florida, however, contradicts Packer's (2004) recollection of the University of Missouri during the late 1940s: "I had a wonderful time. I pledged a sorority. I fell in love with a Hungarian . . . [and] began to write story after story. That was when I learned there wasn't a cure [for my sexual orientation]" (p. v). The experiences of Rita Mae Brown and Vin Packer, alongside their fictional counterparts and everyday confederates, ironically illustrate one important triumph: "[Y]oung gay men and women in college [during the mid-twentieth century] were nonetheless taking considerable personal risks to express their desires and find meaningful connections with one another, setting the stage for the emergence of a revolutionary . . . movement in the next decades" (Marine, 2011, p. 13).

Competing with sensationalized pulps and scores of damaging studies about homosexuality, meaningful information for gay-and-lesbian students was largely unavailable in the printed form. Hoping to receive a healthier understanding of their sexual orientation, some students might have uncovered certain periodicals written by two early, influential gay-rights groups: *The Ladder*, published by the Daughters of Bilitis, an organization for lesbians; and *One*, published by the Mattachine Society, an organization for gay men (Bronski, 2011; Loftin, 2012; Marine, 2011; Streitmatter, 1995). In 1962, for instance, one college student wrote to *One*, begging for the editors' advice and compassion:

Perhaps I should start by identifying myself. I am a young man, 24 to be exact, now finishing my last year at college. I would have finished earlier but I left college for four years during which time I stayed three years in a religious community from which I had to eventually depart, partially because of the homosexual problem. . . . I am still very unsure and know little more than I did except that I want no longer to be ashamed of what

I am, and feel I have the right to get together with other folks, male or female, who want to get together with me. (Loftin, 2012, p. 16-17)

Providing a timely response to these students, however, was a difficult undertaking for publications like *One* and *The Ladder*. Unlike the more literary "pulps"—which were readily available in drugstores and newspaper stands—any "gay" material sent through the U.S. Postal Service was subject to a series of strict censorship laws that banned the transport of pornography, which included even implicitly homosexual material (Bram, 2012; Bronski, 2011).

These postal restrictions were especially problematic for gay-and-lesbian students who lived in suburban and rural America. The very reports and stories that they read, if they could, clarified their geographic dilemma: "Novels set within the general confines of heterosexual society [e.g., a dormitory, a sorority or fraternity house] show a pattern of being those with the most tragic outcomes" (Forrest, 2005, p. xvii). The censorship laws, however, were eventually overturned through a series of court cases during the 1950s and 1960s (Bram, 2012). One such case involved the postal transportation of Alan Ginsberg's (1956) "Howl," a poem that, at times, includes graphically gay subject matter, as indicated by the poem's angry speaker: "I saw the best minds of my generation . . . who blew and were blown by those human seraphim, the sailors, caresses of Atlantic and Caribbean love" (lines 1 and 37).

Campus Unrest and the 1960s

Despite a proliferation of pulps and increased visibility—largely from Hollywood's gradual introduction of homosexual characters (Bronski, 2011; Davies, 2008; Rich, 1999; Russo, 1985)—gay men and lesbians regrettably found themselves mired in controversy, and their sexual orientation, hidden or overt, contributed to the polemical social dialogue of the times:

[H]omosexuality was very much in the public consciousness. If anything, it was more integrated into popular culture than it [was] in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. This is not to say that the public discourse about homosexuality in the 1950s was more enlightened or tolerant . . . but it was understood and discussed in very different ways. (Bronski, 2003, p. 6)

Mainstream news outlets even joined the debate, although *Time Magazine*, *The New York Times*, and *CBS News* were notoriously homophobic, generating commentaries about everything from Tennessee Williams to Miami's burgeoning gay scene (Bram, 2012; Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993). Notwithstanding these and other charges, LGBT students slowly emerged from the proverbial closet, taking with them a new, radical revelation: that the volatile decade of the 1960s included civil rights for everyone, in addition to those for African-Americans, women, and military personnel (Bronski, 2011; Duberman, 1993).

LGBT students at Columbia University cautiously entered the fray in 1967, establishing the first chapter of the Student Homophile League (SHL), which "organiz[ed] lectures, integrat[ed] school-sponsored dances, and offer[ed] counseling to students struggling with their [sexual orientation]" (Marine, 2011, p. 21). Other SHL chapters soon followed, at Cornell University and New York University (where Rita Mae Brown eventually enrolled and became a member). One university, however, still holds a notable distinction: The University of Minnesota houses "[t]he oldest gay and lesbian student center on record [it was created in May 1969] . . . and [o]ne of its founders, Jack Baker, was the first openly gay man to become student body president at a major university" (Marine, 2011, p. 22). With these efforts, the homophile movement gained considerable traction, and LGBT students were socially astir, especially in New York City, where a seminal event in 1969 would soon change their lives forever: an uprising at the Stonewall Inn (Armstrong, 2002; Armstrong & Crage, 2006; Bronski, 2011; Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993; Gorton, 2009; Marine, 2011; Marotta, 2006).

The Stonewall Legacy and the Modern LGBT Movement

The Stonewall Inn was a rough-and-tumble gay bar located in Greenwich Village, and its customers were largely street punks, the working class, hustlers, drag queens, and a smattering of fag hags, lesbians, and hippies (although other members of the LGBT community would occasionally mingle with the crowd). Stonewall was also run by the mafia—as were most of New York City's gay bars throughout the 1950s and 1960s—and its business practices were selective, secretive, illegal, and unethical. High-jacked liquor, stolen cigarettes, employee theft, mob-sponsored grift, watered-down drinks, under-age patrons: All were part and parcel of a dangerous, seedy bar—one that was raided almost weekly by the local precinct but that also sent financial kickbacks, on behalf of its shady owners, to various policemen so they would sidestep Stonewall during patrols (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993).

The barroom scene was not entirely underhanded and underground: Regulars danced, drank, traded stories, and found romance. In many ways, Stonewall was simply a neighborhood hangout, yet ambitious politicians saw the bar as a scourge and coerced the police to harass, intimidate, and even arrest the crowd for any lewd, illegal conduct (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993). The bar's customers certainly knew the rules—simply dancing with a member of the same sex could invite incarceration—so they were quick to disband when raids occurred. Eskridge (1999) makes note of additional draconian policies governing LGBTs in New York:

> The homosexual in 1961 was smothered by law. She or he risked arrest and possible police brutalization for . . . crossdressing, propositioning another adult homosexual, possessing a homophile publication, writing about homosexuality without disapproval, displaying pictures of two people of the same sex in intimate positions, operating a lesbian or gay bar, or actually having . . . sex with another adult homosexual. (as cited in Carter, 2009, p. 11)

Indeed, the stakes were high: An arrest could bring private, public, and professional ridicule—and the patrons of Stonewall were all too familiar with "Betty Badge" and "Lily Law" (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011).

During the early hours of June 28, 1969, Stonewall was in full swing—the drinks flowed, the men danced, and the hustlers hustled—but another raid was mere moments away. This time, as the police stormed the bar, the patrons had had enough: They surprisingly fought back, and a mob mentality quickly took hold. Hundreds of gay men, drag queens, and passersby took to the streets and battled the police, hurling Molotov cocktails, angry slurs, and anything they could find, such as bricks, bottles, trash cans, and even coins from a nearby parking meter. The riots lasted for five days, and from them came an entirely new consciousness for the LGBT community: an identity bred not from fear but from pride (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993).

Forty-four years later, many LGBT scholars argue whether or not Stonewall indicates the actual tipping point of the modern-day gay-rights movement (Armstrong, 2002; Armstrong & Crage, 2006). Nevertheless, the event's effect upon the LGBT community is immeasurable, according to Gorton (2009): The rebellion (a) "electrified the gay and lesbian activists who would lead a historic wave of community organizing"; (b) "brought mass LGBT visibility . . . [since] coming out came to be seen as an ethical and political imperative"; and (c) energized a "broad political spectrum," through which gay men and lesbians began to fight oppression and marginalization (p. 6). In effect, Stonewall was a logical culmination of the tumultuous 1960s, wherein many students waged war against the status quo, and LGBT students were no different (Duberman, 1993; Gorton, 2009).

Following Stonewall, Craig Rodwell, the owner of the Oscar Wilde Memorial Bookshop

in Greenwich Village, the nation's first gay-and-lesbian bookstore, recruited young people to

lead a new social charge against LGBT discrimination:

> Some of them were students at NYU. . . . They had been energized by [the riots and]
> were impatient for further direct confrontation with oppressive traditions and habits—and
> vigorously applauded Craig's initiative. . . . [T]hey argued with their recalcitrant elders
> for a new impetus, a new departure that would embody the defiant spirit of Stonewall.
> As the contention continued, it became clear to Craig that this would be the final
> reminder—that a new day had dawned, which required different tactics, a different
> format. (Duberman, 1993, p. 210)

Within New York and elsewhere, LGBT students took notice of the shifting tides and their

sociopolitical crusades "proliferated at campuses around the country in the 1970s following

Stonewall" (Marine, 2011, p. 23). Even *The New York Times* took notice:

> In defiance of taboos, thousands of college students are proclaiming their homosexuality
> and openly organizing 'gay' groups on large and small campuses across the county. No
> one knows exactly how many are involved, but in growing numbers they are forming
> cohesive organizations . . . and [making] substantial strides in changing attitudes.
> (Reinhold, 1971, p. 1)

From these kinds of isolated efforts, higher education slowly altered its charge against

homosexuality over the coming years, and a new holistic way of administering to students

developed: "The college guidance movement [following Stonewall] . . . acknowledg[ed] that

[the] personal and intimate lives [of gay men and lesbians] matter in who they are becoming and

[new extracurricular programs played] a large role in the shaping of their self-concepts as adults"

(Marine, 2011, p. 35).

Higher Education and the LGBT Movement Forge a New Relationship, 1970s-2000s

Previous to the 1970s, gay men and lesbians certainly attended college, yet not until the early 1970s did they find a foothold within student affairs. Indeed, many students remained "in the closet," but more and more students found campus administrators and faculty members who were sympathetic to their unique situations, especially at institutions like the University of Michigan, Oberlin College, and Yale University (Marine, 2011; Sanlo et al., 2002). The shifting attitudes within academe were no doubt the result of countless external influences: from Stonewall in 1969 to the development of Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gay in 1972 (Baez et al., 2007) to the APA's reversal of homosexuality as a mental disorder in 1973 (Pope, 2007). Sanlo et al. (2002) concur: "By the early 1970s . . . concepts of how to be non-heterosexual on college campuses were no longer conscripted to definitions delimited by comparisons to heterosexuality" (p. 121) and to "normal" ways of thinking and acting.

In many ways, the LGBT movement on college campuses during the 1970s and 1980s was akin to *organizational development*, a process (a) that "focus[es] on the 'human side' of organizations [that includes] people, relationships, policies, procedures, processes, norms, culture, and organization design" (French, Bell, & Zawacki, 2005, p. 1); and (b) that often occurs incrementally, rather than haphazardly or rapidly. This school-of-thought, then, partially explains that although institutions were quick to realize that gay-and-lesbian students held particular educational and psychosocial needs, they (the institutions) were not so quick to provide crucial services through specialized offices and outreach programs. Beemyn (2002) explains the scarcity of LGBT outreach during this time : "Prior to 1990, there were only five such centers/offices with *paid staff* [italics added for emphasis]" (p. 25)—offices that included

those at the University of Michigan, the University of Massachusetts (Amherst), the University

of Pennsylvania, Grinnell College, and Princeton University.

Following this pivotal milestone—1990, to be exact—LGBT centers proliferated, and by

the late 2000s, approximately 200 such centers existed within every geographic region of the

United States (www.lgbtcampus.org), focusing their work upon four generalized areas:

"[institutional] transformation, policy inclusion, curricular integration, and educational efforts"

(Sanlo et al., 2002, p. 24). Beemyn (2002) insists that LGBT centers and outreach programs will

continue to gain ground:

> [T]here is little evidence to suggest that the growth of LGBT student services is at or
> approaching a standstill. With more students coming out in college or already open about
> their sexual identities when they enter education, schools will be increasingly hard-
> pressed to ignore their needs and to pretend, as many did for years, that LGBT students
> do not exist at their institutions or do not have any concerns different from those of their
> heterosexual peers. (p. 31)

LGBT centers also fulfill a vital role within the day-to-day operations of various institutions,

regularly delivering educational programs like Transgender Awareness Week and Safe Zone—

certain "safe" places on-campus free from homophobia and/or heterosexism (Evans, 2002)—and

those that encourage mentorships and socialization opportunities (Baez et al., 2007; Marine,

2011; Sanlo et al., 2002). These offices, however, are distinctly different from academic

departments that offer majors/minors in sexual-orientation and gender studies, even though both

groups often work conjointly by offering colloquia and/or lectures that highlight historical and

contemporary LGBT concerns (e.g., Cawthon, 2004).

Moreover, the LGBT movement addressed other important matters within academe. One

of the most significant undertakings occurred within those institutions that enacted

nondiscrimination policies to protect gay-and-lesbian faculty and staff from homophobic and/or

heterosexist policies. Today, more than 500 institutions have developed non-discrimination

policies, and these and other institutions are currently drafting/devising new guidelines to ensure also that *transgender* students, faculty, and staff are not lost within the shuffle of the LGBT acronym (Baez et al., 2007; Marine, 2011). In an interesting aside, non-discrimination policies also appeared within areas outside of academe, and "liberal university cities," explains Bronski (2011), "passed the first such laws in the country, starting with East Lansing, Michigan, [Michigan State University] in March 1972 and Ann Arbor, Michigan, [the University of Michigan] in August" (p. 219). Additionally, many institutions began to offer domestic-partner benefits for their LGBT employees, who could document legally a committed relationship, thereby providing health-care coverage, educational credits/waivers, and paid leave for care of partners.

Current Trends Involving LGBT Students

The LGBT movement has made considerable strides during the last 100 years. Its incremental victories, however, depended largely upon grassroots lobbying: "History tells us that students have . . . driven the movement for LGBT empowerment on campus. . . . Although student affairs administrators and faculty joined in the struggle . . . the momentum was largely driven by students' ingenuity and resolve" (Marine, 2011, pp. 103-104). Students have repeatedly looked toward the outside world to guide their reconfiguration of the campus community. The Stonewall uprising in 1969, for instance, led to sweeping changes within academe during the 1970s (Marine, 2011; Sanlo et al., 2002), and the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1980s reinvigorated activists and iconoclasts (Shilts, 1987). By 2013, however, the sociopolitical landscape had become considerably more tolerant—so much so that LGBT students expected academe and the real world to share similar values (e.g., Young, 2011).

Contemporary LGBT students no longer battle rampant homophobia and heterosexism; in fact, they recognize their own unique place within this changing landscape: "As students begin to know themselves as bisexual, gay, lesbian, and transgender, their natural impulse is to join others in a community and to seek refuge and strength from the example of those who have gone before" (Marine, 2011, p. 111). With more and more students identifying as LGBT during their adolescence (Russell, Clarke, & Clary, 2009), many post-secondary institutions now market themselves to the LGBT community. Many publications and websites, like *The Gay and Lesbian Guide to College Life* and Campus Pride, help prospective students learn more about the following opportunities: engaging in extracurricular activities; participating in political/campus activism; uncovering scholarly opportunities; securing appropriate psychological support; and navigating residence life, which can be difficult for many LGBT students, especially for those who identify as transgender (Baez et al., 2007; Marine, 2011).

Marketing initiatives, such as Campus Pride, fall within two categories: Passive programs consist of those organizations that solicit LGBT students through websites, newspapers, and glossy publications, whereas active programs rely upon face-to-face communication, such as the one at Western Michigan University that recruits LGBT students at area high schools (Ceglar, 2012; Einhaus et al., 2004). Today, Campus Pride is the nation's largest supplier of higher educational information for prospective LGBT students, and each fall it holds a series of fairs throughout the country, representing many universities and colleges, including Appalachian State University, Bennington College, Brown University, Claremont McKenna College, Cornell University, Georgetown University, Indiana University, New Mexico State University, Ohio State University, Princeton University, Rutgers University, University of North Dakota, University of Iowa, Vanderbilt University, and Wright State University

(www.campuspride.org). Current trends in recruitment indicate that higher education is taking notice of LGBT students—and these concerted efforts are independent of geographic, political, and social boundaries within the United States.

Programs like those offered by the previous named institutions are an "important component of a university's civic mission because . . . [they] increase college access for underserved students" (Kiyama, Lee, & Rhoades, 2012, p. 276). Not all institutions, however, provide comprehensive services to LGBT students, and administrators could argue that a lack of these programs leads to marked increases in internal homophobia (found within LGBT students, who might experience feelings of shame) and external homophobia (found within heterosexuals, who might enact discriminatory policies and spread fear and misinformation). Rosser, Bockting, Ross, Miner, and Coleman (2008) find that "internalized homophobia, not homosexuality, appears to be a critical predictor of depression in homosexual men" (p. 163), and Szymanski, Chung, and Balsam (2001) reveal that "[homophobia within lesbians] correlated significantly with depression . . . , passing as heterosexual . . . , overall social support . . . , satisfaction with social support . . . , and overall gay social support" (p. 35). Moreover, Sanlo (2004) examines the lives and experiences of LGBT students and discovers that numerous stressors (such as homophobia, heterosexism, and a lack of community) affect retention: The more stress, the more likely that LGBT students will leave school.

Legal Considerations for Working with LGBT Students

Life for LGBT Americans is rapidly changing, especially in light of a recent landmark decision at the Supreme Court, one that examined the constitutionality of treating same-sex marriage differently than heterosexual marriage. In *United States v. Windsor* (2013), Edith Windsor sued the federal government for not acknowledging her marriage to Thea Spyer, a

marriage previously recognized by New York. The federal government, however, was bound by the Defense of Marriage Act (1996), or DOMA, a law that banned federal recognition of same-sex marriages conducted in any state. In particular, however, *United States v. Windsor* (2013) challenged the restrictive wording of Section 3 found within DOMA (1996): "[T]he word 'marriage' means *only* [italics added for emphasis] a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word 'spouse' refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or wife." After hearing Windsor's argument, the Supreme Court, through a 5-4 decision, determined that Section 3 was unconstitutional and discriminatory: "By . . . treating those persons as living in marriages less respected than others," wrote Justice Anthony Kennedy, "the federal statute is in violation of the Fifth Amendment [of the *Constitution*]" because Section 3 is "a deprivation of the equal liberty of persons" (*United States v. Windsor*, 2013). Although *United States v. Windsor* does not, of course, address higher education, the ruling is nonetheless an important victory for LGBT equality, clearly indicating evolving attitudes surrounding sexual orientation, as witnessed, for instance, at Elmhurst College.

   United States v. Windsor was also linked through precedent to *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), another landmark decision that established that LGBT Americans deserve the same basic constitutional protections afforded to heterosexual Americans. Since dozens of states like Texas had crafted anti-sodomy laws during the last century (and even before), gay men and lesbians were, in effect, breaking the law once their relationships became sexual, or even intimate, and they could be arrested for carnal activity (Leslie, 2000). In *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), the Supreme Court recognized that Texas had infringed upon John Lawrence's right to privacy when he was arrested for having consensual sex with another man and that a constitutional issue was at stake. In its 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that anti-sodomy laws treated homosexuals

43

and heterosexuals differently, therefore violating the equal-protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (see also *Romer v. Evans*, 1996). Moreover, *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) overturned *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), a case that established that sodomy was not constitutionally protected via the Fourteenth Amendment. *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) is also particularly important to institutions like Elmhurst College: Since anti-sodomy ordinances directed solely at gay men and lesbians are unequivocally unconstitutional, potential students who declare either a same-sex or bisexual orientation within a college application are not breaking any laws.

Despite these recent advancements, LGBT students have historically met opposition from on-campus administrators and fellow students when forming alliances, organizations, and even casual get-togethers. An LGBT student group at Boston College, for example, struggled for almost 30 years—weathering death threats, hate mail, and campus-wide indifference—before gaining formal recognition by the decidedly Catholic administration in the early 2000s (Colbert, 2003). Upon examining these kinds of previous struggles, Stimpson (1993) theorizes that some administrators and students had reacted negatively to LGBT groups because of their own "psychological . . . fear of gays and lesbians," believing that these individuals would contaminate and pollute" gendered, sexual, theological, and political norms (para. 6). Rhoads (1998) adds that these homophobic fears have "contributed to campus policies and practices [for LGBT students] that are inadequately articulated[,] . . . implemented ineffectively[,]" or left out altogether (para. 1). Indeed, public institutions, like the University of Iowa that encourages applicants to declare their sexual orientation and gender identity, and private ones, like Boston College and Elmhurst College, are governed by different legal restrictions. As a religious university, Boston College can choose not to recognize an LGBT student organization or a student's sexual orientation—due to the Catholic Church's prohibitive stance against

44

homosexuality and to the First Amendment, which guarantees the right to exercise religion—yet

Boston College must allow any LGBT student or organization the opportunity to assemble

publically (*Coalition of Georgetown University Law Center v. Georgetown University*, 1987;

Dutile,1988; *Healy v. James*, 1972).

In fact, every institution—private or public, secular or denominational—must abide by

certain legal guidelines that unequivocally apply to the general public, a diverse collective of

individuals that, of course, includes the LGBT citizenry. The first of these guidelines centers

upon the very nature of education: Institutions, as part of their inherent educative design, must

support a primary mission: to offer a marketplace of ideas so that students and staff may

peaceably assemble to speak about certain issues, even those that are illegal or allegedly immoral

(*Healy v. James*, 1972). The University of Missouri and the University of South Alabama

previously challenged this constitutional protection, at one time denying formal recognition to

LGBT groups since, their administrators argued, homosexuality was illegal, as specified by their

states' laws (these cases occurred before *Lawrence v. Texas* in 2003). The federal courts of

appeal eventually considered the universities' arguments but ruled in favor of both LGBT

groups, determining that the First Amendment expressly gave these groups two important rights:

assembly and speech.

In *Gay Lib v. University of Missouri* (1971), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth

Circuit criticized the university for denying Gay Lib's members certain constitutional

protections:

> Of particular significance . . . is the prior restraint of First Amendment rights on such
> skimpy and speculative evidence as [the university] advanced. There is absolutely no
> evidence that [Gay Lib intends] to violate any state law . . . or even that [it] will advocate
> such violations. Until such time as imminent overt lawless activity can be shown, the
> organization may not be excluded from recognition if it is otherwise in compliance with
> university regulations.

In *Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance of the University of South Alabama v. Alabama* (1990), the

Eleventh Circuit issued almost the same ruling, stressing that the "First Amendment protects

advocacy to violate [an anti-LGBT] law" and that if the content of speech does not produce

"imminent lawless action" then it maintains constitutional protection. Cases like these from the

Federal Courts of Appeal, along with those decided by the Supreme Court—most notably, *Healy*

v. James (1972) and *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003)—ensure that all LGBT students, despite their

geographic locale, are protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments: (a) they can freely

enter into a marketplace of ideas to discuss sexual orientation, and (b) they can safely proclaim

their sexual orientation without fear of legal retaliation.

Two other important federal cases also impact guidelines for managing LGBT students,

especially at institutions that craft policies to address their LGBT students. *The Christian Legal*

Society UCLA v. Martinez (2010), the first case, clarifies the constitutionality of an "accept-all-

comers" policy—an institutional directive that requires any student group seeking official

recognition, like the Christian Legal Society, to accept anyone who wishes to join, like an LGBT

student (Schmidt, 2010). Although the Supreme Court was bitterly divided over the

constitutionality of UCLA's "accept-all-comers" policy, the majority opinion, written by Justice

Ruth Bader Ginsburg, revealed that UCLA could deny recognition to the Christian Legal Society

for not accepting LGBT students: "[It is] hard to imagine a more viewpoint-neutral policy than

one requiring all student groups to accept all comers" (*The Christian Legal Society UCLA v.*

Martinez, 2010). Moreover, this ruling holds tremendous implications: By applying a broad

interpretation to Ginsburg's opinion, institutions like Elmhurst College can justify an admissions

policy that quantifies sexual orientation (and also gender identity), arguing that every student,

regardless of sexual orientation or religious affiliation, is welcome on campus.

Grutter v. Bollinger (2003), the other case, also speaks implicitly to institutions that quantify sexual orientation and gender identity as it established that race could be a deciding factor during the admissions process so that a student body includes underrepresented minority groups (e.g., Garces, 2012). The case centered upon the perceived notion of a quota system for race—a practice that is unconstitutional (e.g., *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 2003; *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978)—yet the Supreme Court found that the University of Michigan, while evaluating and selecting certain applicants for its law school, did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause. The university instead attained a "critical mass" of minority students—rather than a predetermined number—by holistically evaluating how an applicant might contribute to a diverse educational environment (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003). Although *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) does not address sexual orientation and the college-admissions process, the case illustrates that institutions continually look at different factors—in addition to mere test scores and transcripts—when determining the demographic constitutions of their student bodies (see also *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 2013).

Ethical Matters: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (1974) is considered "one of the most misunderstood regulations in education" (Orlando, 2011, para. 1). Also called FERPA or the Buckley Amendment, named after Senator James Buckley, the bill's sponsor, the act presents numerous legal restrictions for educators who hold access to students' private information, such as standardized test scores, disability status, end-of-the-semester grades, and/or sexual orientation. Over the last four decades, FERPA has affected almost every section within higher education—from academic departments, whose faculty members handle scholastic assessment;

to various student-affairs offices, whose directors often provide counseling and diagnostic services. FERPA equally affects any admissions office and its unrelenting collection of confidential data, a process that involves analyzing letters of recommendation (Ault, 1993), standardized test scores, academic transcripts, and demographical delineations, including race, sex, age, and even sexual orientation and gender identity. Understanding FERPA's underpinnings allows educators to recognize certain ethical dilemmas that could tempt a breach of confidentiality in light of any well-intended effort like asking students to reveal their sexual orientation in a college application.

During FERPA's introduction to Congress in the early 1970s, Sen. Buckley argued that the enactment of the bill was an important educational concern. Weeks (2001) explains:

> He pointed to numerous practices that violated the privacy of students and parents, including the placement of information in a student's record that was not relevant or that reflected personal opinions of individuals not qualified to make statements concerning the psychological characteristics of the student. Furthermore, he pointed to a number of abuses in which confidential information from student personnel files was revealed to parties or persons with no legitimate interest in that material. (p. 40)

Sen. Buckley also realized that parental involvement was an essential consideration—even if college students were of legal age (18-years-old or older)—and that FERPA should therefore allow institutions to devise family-friendly strategies and policies so that concerned parents could access their adult children's educational records if necessary (Weeks, 2001). At most institutions today, students can sign waivers that allow their parents (or others, for that matter) to retrieve, for instance, transcripts, end-of-the-term grades, and/or medical records.

However, any well-intended effort—albeit one that recognizes the need for parental involvement—may lead toward *un*intended consequences, especially for those LGBT students who may be "in the closet" or "out" only to their closest friends. For these students, FERPA could create difficulties in the event of the following situation: First, they categorize themselves

as a member of the LGBT community upon completing an application; next, they sign a waiver that gives their parents access to their educational records; and finally, a parent decides to investigate this private information. Recognizing the possibility of this scenario, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, in its directive for LGBT Programs and Services, stresses that "privacy and confidentially [must be] maintained" and that "staff members must ensure that the confidentiality of individuals' sexual orientation and gender identity are protected" ("CAS self assessment guide for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender programs and services," 2009, p. 22). To illustrate the importance of the previous mandate, Ceglar (2012) provides a telling scenario:

> While technically [the council's] ethics are not for recruitment and admission offices, they should still be carefully [considered because although] a student may identify himself or herself as [gay, lesbian, or bisexual] in an admission essay or interview, s/he may have yet to share this private information with a parent. If a college or university were to disclose accidently or unintentionally an applicant's [sexual orientation] to still-ignorant parents [by sending a brochure from an LGBT office], issues of the prospective student's safety and possible homelessness might arise. This [realization] is especially important as the most recent Campus Pride National College Climate Survey found that only 46 percent of undergraduate students were open with their family members about their sexual identity . . . . [From this data,] it is safe to assume that an even smaller percentage of high school students researching their college options have informed their parents of their [sexual identity]. (p. 22)

Indeed, FERPA does not recognize distinctions between heterosexual and LGBT students—despite their declarations of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender on an application—yet family-friendly strategies and policies can drastically alter LGBT students' familial relationships, perhaps forcing them to "come out" prematurely and/or to remain under a cloud of secrecy.

Acknowledging FERPA's inconsistencies, McDonald (2008) issues a stark caveat, one that unequivocally opposes the good intentions surrounding so-called family-friendly strategies and policies:

49

The consequences of violating FERPA are devastating [i.e., a loss of federal support and/or civil litigation (Toglia, 2007)—though no educational institution has lost its funding due to a violation (Graham, Hall, & Gilmer, 2008)], so the safest course is to disclose nothing. It is true that withholding student information [e.g., sexual orientation or gender identiy] is, almost always, 'safe,' at least as far as FERPA is concerned. At the college level, the only person who ever has a legally enforceable right under FERPA to know what is in a student's records is the student. All of the exceptions that permit broader disclosure are entirely discretionary, so there is no legal consequence under FERPA in choosing not to disclose. (p. A53)

McDonald's (2008) common-sense advice, however, appears in stark contrast to Sen. Buckley's

original intentions:

[The senator] emphasized that the 'rule of reason' applies to [FERPA's] implementation. Accordingly, student affairs practitioners should participate in a reassessment of student privacy and educational records and respond to two fundamental questions. . . . First, what is an appropriate policy for the college in regard to disclosure of student records to parents, and what rationale supports that policy? And second, what are the costs and benefits of a disclosure to parents if, in the professional judgment of the administrator, the disclosure relates to the health and welfare of the student? (Weeks, 2001, p. 49)

By comparing McDonald's (2008) and Weeks's (2001) explanations, educators clearly recognize

two conflicting interpretations of the law—yet FERPA is essentially an iron-clad contract

between each student and his/her institution, ensuring that educational data, including application

information, remain private.

FERPA includes scores of additional guidelines and revisions that have appeared since

1974 (DeSantis, 2012; Essex, 2000; Klein, 2008; Lipka, 2008, December 19; McDonald, 2008).

In fact, Congress has amended the law numerous times, most recently following the Patriot Act

in 2001 ("Legislative history of major FERPA provisions," 2004), and has occasionally

requested federal inquiries, often in response to catastrophic occurrences, like the mass shooting

at Virginia Tech in 2007 (Redden, 2007). Two other legislative concerns within FERPA,

however, especially affect LGBT students: the right-to-consent clause and health-and-safety

issues. These concerns also affect any institution that chooses to include a demographic for sexual orientation and gender identity within its application.

The right-to-consent clause allows institutions to make public specific information about a student—for instance: names/addresses found within a student directory, fields of study, and/or scholastic awards (Weeks, 2001). However, anonymous demographics—those descriptive facts about the student body found within charts, graphs, and tables released through an institution's office of institutional research—are *not* considered educational records since they do not include personally identifiable information ("NACADA: Records not considered as educational records," n. d., para. 1). Despite these various delineations, FERPA neglects to address sexual orientation and gender identity through its right-to consent clause as it does for other pieces of non-directory information: social security numbers, student identification numbers, race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, and transcripts ("NACADA: Non-directory information," n. d., para. 1).

Given these jurisdictive shortcomings, educators might be quick to wonder: Would an institution treat sexual orientation differently—than, say, race and gender—and therefore release such private information by mistake, perhaps upon posting the names of LGBT students who receive an LGBT scholarship and/or who graduate with a major (or minor) in sexuality and gender studies? After all, the right-to-consent clause allows for the release of "degrees and awards received" (Weeks, 2001, p. 43)—a process through which either of the prior scenarios could occur (even though any student receiving such an award or degree would most likely be "out" to friends and family members already). In any event, the preceding question holds no clear answer if the right-to-consent clause does not address sexual orientation and gender

51

identity, and these concerns clearly affect any institution that might add ask potential students to identify as LGBT during the application process.

Another concern for LGBT students falls under FERPA's exemption for "health and safety"—an indemnity clause through which Sen. Buckley legislated that "certain health and safety information [obtained from *non*medical files] can be released to an appropriate person [i.e., a parent, relative, or spouse] . . . [if] the seriousness of the health or safety threat" (Weeks, 2001, p. 46) warrants immediate attention. To clarify how the previous provision works, Baker (2005) conjectures that a "residence hall director's [nonmedical] report describing a student's suicide attempt can be disclosed under FERPA to parents and other individuals in a position to protect the student from further harm" (p. 3). This hypothetical explanation, however, is especially important to administrators (a) who recognize the statistical likelihood of suicidal thoughts, and even suicide itself, within various subpopulations of the LGBT community (D'Augelli et al., 2005; King et al., 2008; O'Donnell, Meyer, & Schwartz, 2011); but (b) who seek to prevent such tragedies by overstepping their bounds.

To address this concern, McDaniel, Purcell, and D'Augelli (2001) issue a caveat to any LGBT administrator who might experience a serious "health and safety" concern:

> It should be noted that in discussing suicide and suicidal behaviors among GLB people [gay, lesbian, and bisexual] , civil rights issues are at stake. People often use the existing data on suicidal behavior in opposing ways, with advocates of GLB people using the data to gain support for GLB people and programs, and adversaries using the data to support allegations that GLB people are unfit for military service, teaching, parenthood, or other important life roles. Given the tentative nature of the existing data, readers should use the information carefully and cautiously to avoid bringing further discrimination upon GLB people. (p. 102)

McDaniel et al. (2001) also urge LGBT administrators to use extreme caution since any over-zealous reaction might cause more harm than good for LGBT individuals   It should be noted, however, that FERPA generally provides the same protections guaranteed by the Health

Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (1996), also called HIPAA, a legislative mandate

that governs the release of personal health information in the event of a medical emergency.

HIPAA, however, does *not* apply to higher education, only to "covered entities," which includes

health care providers and insurance providers ("Understanding health information privacy," n.

d.). Thus, the release of confidential information to the wrong family member could endanger

suicidal LGBTs even further—especially if these family members are unaware or unaccepting of

their relative's sexual orientation or gender identity.

Conclusion

In 2011 Illinois's Elmhurst College became the first institution to invite potential students

to declare their sexual orientation within an application for admission. The following year the

University of Iowa (UI) implemented the same practice. Since then, hundreds of institutions,

both public and private, as well as the Common Application, have debated whether or not to

follow UI and Elmhurst's lead—yet none have successfully joined these solitary schools.

Academe's collective conversation about the quantification of sexual orientation, in fact, has

rarely delivered a satisfying solution to a deceptively simple administrative problem: Would

asking students to identify themselves as members of the LGBT community be beneficial or

detrimental to each student as well as to each institution? The answer to this question depends

not only upon a careful survey of the contemporary landscape but upon a clear understanding of

the LGBT historical continuum within higher education.

This continuum reveals that LGBT students and educators have frequently confronted

various cultural, medical, legal, political, religious, and academic obstacles against equality.

These individuals have nonetheless made significant advancements, especially in light of seminal

events, like Stonewall and gay-pride celebrations; proliferative on-campus LGBT services; and landmark legal directives, such as *Healy v. James* (1972), FERPA (1974), *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), and *United States v. Windsor* (2013). Today, LGBT individuals continue to react and adapt to various social, geopolitical, and educational forces, even as they consider the benefits and limitations of self-reporting sexual orientation within a college application.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology that described how a national LGBT organization considered the quantification of sexual orientation within a college application. As this trend is a recent phenomenon—Elmhurst College only initiated the debate in 2011—the body of research surrounding the issue has yet to identify a clear, investigative focus. *The Chronicle of Education* clarifies the matter: "[S]chools should spend some time deciding exactly what they wish to determine and how the information will be used" (Johnson, 2013, para. 3). This advice speaks directly to this study's methodology, which utilized a descriptive design (Anastas, 1999) in order to address key concerns: How many institutions considered a demographic for sexual orientation? Why would other educators (not) support a policy that quantifies sexual orientation? Could LGBT students be harmed when declaring their sexual orientation—or would institutions use this information to identify, track, monitor, and assist their LGBT students? What were some of the institutional and sociopolitical challenges that govern this contentious debate within academe? Concerns like these influenced this study's methodology, which is divided into ten subsections within this chapter: purpose of the study and research questions, overview of the research design, population, questionnaire, pilot study, questionnaire delivery, response rate, incentives for participation, monitoring the study, and analysis of data.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to facilitate a constructive conversation about the (dis)advantages of quantifying sexual orientation during the admissions process—a conversation conducted via a questionnaire with members of a national LGBT organization of educators (referred to as the Organization throughout Chapter Three). Nine questions guided this study's examination of the Organization and its members:

1.   Are members of the Organization aware that other institutions have recently asked, or are considering asking, potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for college admission?

2.   How many institutions represented by the Organization have considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?

3.   Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *at their own institutions*?

4.   What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *at their own institutions*?

5.   Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *within academe in general*?

6.   What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *within academe in general*?

7.   Do members believe that their institutions would support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?

8.   What reasons do members give to explain their institutions' willingness, or lack of willingness, to support such a policy?

9.   Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of

a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation an application for

admission within academe in general? These demographics include: institutional

enrollment, Carnegie classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of

position, duration of position, function of position, duration of LGBT experience, and

duration of membership within the Organization.

Overview of Research Design

Following IRB approval (see Appendix A), this study used a descriptive design (Anastas,

1999) in order to identify, categorize, exemplify, and describe the complex issues surrounding a

sexual-orientation demographic as reported by self-selected members of the Organization

through a questionnaire. The questionnaire included fourteen quantitative items (multiple choice

and Likert scales) and three qualitative items (a brief verbal/written explanation of a particular

issue), and it was accessed through the on-line host Qualtrics, a private research company, from

August 25, 2013 through September 30, 2013.

The design was further subdivided into two sections: (a) initial phone interviews with

members of the Executive Board of the Organization, and (b) an on-line questionnaire for the

remaining members who chose to participate in the study. This two-fold delivery attempted to

accomplish two tasks: to account for response representativeness by asking more-involved

members to share their expertise and to improve the response rate. By including all members of

the Executive Board, this study attempted to include a "social norm-based appeal"—a

methodological assumption that explains how rank-and-file members are encouraged to complete

the questionnaire by enthusiastic leaders of the organization (Misra, Stokols, & Marino, 2012, p.

90). This researcher also hoped to secure the support of the Organization's Chairs—two

influential members who would urge fellow members to participate within the study and who

might co-author a brief cover letter for the on-line questionnaire. In order to contact members of

the Executive Board, this researcher accessed the Organization's directory, which included email

addresses and phone numbers. Other members were contacted via the Organization's listserv,

through which they received day-to-day communications by way of their institutional email

accounts.

Following the collection of data, the study's design presented a summative explanation of

the Organization's responses. The following procedures were used to ascertain the various

positive and negative implications that surround a demographic for sexual orientation in a

college application: (a) descriptive statistics to measure frequencies, percentages, and averages;

(b) decisional statistics to determine, for instance, if smaller institutions were more likely to

support a policy like the one at Elmhurst College; (c) grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)

to code, categorize, exemplify, and describe qualitative responses; and (d) various tables to

summarize quantitative and qualitative data in relation to each of the nine research questions.

Descriptive design guided this study's methodology because it is particularly useful for

researchers trying to understand an innovative trend—like the one started by Elmhurst College—

and it provides important recommendations for colleagues:

> Descriptive research . . . is directed toward clarifying a phenomenon's appearance or
> nature. Descriptive research is analogous to taking and developing still photographs.
> The scene depicted may be shown in great detail, but what is depicted is entirely
> dependent on where the photographer was standing, what the photographer decided to
> focus on, and how much of the context the photographer decided to leave in or out when
> the picture was taken and the print prepared. The greatest strength of this form of
> research is that its results can be perhaps among the most unambiguous. (Anastas, 1999,
> p. 125)

This study acted much like a photographer in the field, supplying an informative, detailed snapshot of a national LGBT organization of educators who shared their opinions and expertise concerning the quantification of sexual orientation. In fact, descriptive design has been a common practice within LGBT scholarship; recently it has been utilized when studying the following concerns: LGBT issues and college faculty (deLeon & Brunner, 2013; Woodford, Luke, Grogan-Kaylor, Fredriksen-Goldsen, & Gutierrez, 2012); LGBT families and healthcare access (Chapman et al., 2012); LGBT seniors and aging services (Knochel, Croghan, Moone, & Quam, 2012); gay-and-lesbian patients and oncological outreach (Katz, 2009); LGBT college students and smoking (Ridner, Frost, & LaJoie, 2006); LGBT youths and homelessness (Rew, Whittaker, Taylor-Seehafer, & Smith, 2005); LGBT teens and the ill-effects of reparative therapy (Dickinson, Cook, Playle, & Hallett, 2012); and HIV testing and the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center (Smith et al., 2006).

Population

Data for this study were drawn from a single population that consisted of approximately 700 members of a national LGBT organization in higher education. This population was beneficial to this study for two reason: First, the Organization's members influenced institutional policy regarding LGBT matters—for instance, they served as directors of LGBT centers or as deans within student affairs—and they regularly contributed to the ongoing dialogue about the LGBT experience within academe. Secondly, the Organization's demographics were comprehensive. They included geographic diversity (almost every state was represented); a range of institutional size (from small liberal arts colleges to comprehensive, research-intensive universities); contrasting administrative structures (private and public); types

of position (e.g., director and coordinator); functions of positions (within an LGBT office or elsewhere on campus); and varying degrees of LGBT experience within both academe and the Organization.

Other reasons also dictated the selection of this population. First, cluster sampling of the previous population would have generated trivial conclusions: If merely a handful of schools participated in the study, then the results would not have been illustrative, given probable geographic, structural, and educational differences. Secondly, systematic sampling could have issued too few respondents from the available pool. Lastly, a representative sample taken from the "true" LGBT population—that is, all LGBT administrators who worked in colleges and universities in the United States—would have been almost impossible to identify. Since schools do not include demographical delineations for employees' sexual orientation and gender identification within offices of institutional research, an accessible population/sample was not readily available to any researcher who wished to investigate LGBT issues within the campus workplace (e.g., Hill, 2006; Meyer & Wilson, 2009). Thus, the Organization provided a perfect microcosm of today's LGBT academic landscape, and the organization served the purpose of this study well: to determine what LGBT administrators thought about quantifying sexual orientation within a college application.

One concern, however, challenged the previous arguments in favor of the Organization: that the Organization was a population of convenience. Many researchers who have sought to understand LGBT issues have frequently designed a methodology with a population (a) that self-reported sexual orientation—as did many members of the Organization, although implicitly—and/or (b) that included only a few participants, such as the Organization's approximately 700 members. Despite these limitations, current LGBT research indicates that populations consisting

of individuals who self-report their sexual orientation are commonplace (Katz, 2009; Robinson, 2010; Weber, 2008). These kinds of studies, however, often yield either highly focused results (e.g., McAllister, Harold, Ahmedani, & Cramer, 2009) or extensive qualitative data (e.g., Longerbeam, Inkelas, Johnson, & Lee, 2007)—even though valid discoveries and crucial recommendations are readily apparent for LGBT scholarship in general. Thus, finding a truly representative sample of any LGBT population was difficult—if not impossible—and this study recognized this situation by identifying a ready-made, expert-based population for research.

Moreover, the Organization served as an ideal population because the participants, either as members or allies of the LGBT community, did not harm themselves, or their institutions, when contributing to the study. First, the name of the Organization and its members remained confidential. Secondly, members already worked within an established, visible LGBT position, which means that they were expected to discuss issues surrounding sexual orientation, gender identity, and sexuality. Lastly, members did not experience psychological harm: the sheer nature of their position implied that they were LGBT advocates who handled homophobia, either internally or externally, quite well. By using an alternate population, a researcher might have risked "outing" an "in-the-closet" subject—a serious problem that could have precipitated grievous consequences (e.g., termination of employment, professional marginalization, emotional instability, or familial ridicule). The American Psychological Association (APA) also recognizes that "[t]here are unique difficulties and risks faced by lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals in the workplace" ("Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients," 2012, p. 25)—difficulties such as discriminatory policies, hostile workplace climates, job stereotyping, and a lack of benefits, such as family medical leave and same-sex partner benefits. (These difficulties would have been more pronounced at certain church-

61

affiliated institutions that perhaps condemn LGBT students and staff.) To clarify the previous

guideline, the APA warns:

> The most salient issue for lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers . . . is identity management
> . . . [which causes these individuals to] adopt strategies to protect against actual or
> anticipated workplace discrimination . . . . Identity concealment strategies, however,
> exact a psychological price, including constant vigilance about sharing information,
> separation of personal and work lives, coping with feelings of dishonesty and invisibility,
> isolation from social and professional collegial networks and support [such as the
> Consortium], and burnout from the stress of hiding identity. ("Guidelines for
> psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients," 2012, p. 25)

Indeed, numerous extraneous factors would have precluded any researcher from obtaining a truly

random sample of LGBT professionals within higher education at any given moment—

especially in today's uncertain climate, even within academe, which generally has supported pro-

LGBT policies for students, faculty members, and administrators (see also Higher Education and

the LGBT Movement Forge a New Relationship, 1970s-2000s, Chapter 2).

Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix B) included 17 questions that generated both

quantitative and qualitative data. All questions except numbers 4, 6, and 8 provided multiple-

choice responses that included Likert scales, yes/no options, and specialized selections, such as

the eleventh question, which asked respondents to identify the structure of their institution: (a)

public; (b) private, religious affiliation; (c) private, secular; or (d) other. Questions 4, 6, and 8

were open-ended questions that encouraged respondents to expand upon a particular opinion and

to explain, for example, why they supported asking potential students to reveal their sexual

orientation during the application process. These three qualitative questions anticipated that

respondents would provide explanations that escaped quantitative restrictions imposed by Likert

scales and yes/no options. Moreover, the qualitative questions appeared at the beginning of the

questionnaire so that respondents were more likely to provide thorough answers (Galesic &

Bosnjak, 2009).

In order to address this study's nine research questions, the questionnaire included

specific items. Table 1 illustrates, for example, that the first item on the questionnaire—"Are

you aware that other institutions have recently asked (or are considering asking) potential

students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application for college admission?"—related

specifically to the first research question: "Are members of the Organization aware that other

institutions have recently asked, or are considering asking, potential students to reveal their

sexual orientation in an application for college admission?" The last nine items on the

questionnaire measured the respondents' demographics, which included four general areas: (a)

the size, location, and organizational structure of the respondent's institution; (b) the

respondent's LGBT experience in higher education; (c) the respondent's duration of membership

within the Organization; and (d) the respondent's current position, such as a director or

coordinator, and length of tenure. As Table 1 also indicates, these institutional demographics

were important to the ninth research question: "Do certain demographics within the

Organization indicate support, or lack of support, for a policy that urges potential students to

reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?" Thus,

demographics measured, for instance, if private institutions were more likely to endorse a sexual-

orientation policy, or if those individuals who worked within an LGBT office were more

enthusiastic about such a policy.

Table 1

Research Questions and Their Relationship to the Questionnaire

Research Questions to Examine Quantifying Sexual-Orientation	Correspondent Question(s) on Questionnaire
Are members of the Organization aware that other institutions have recently asked, or are considering asking, potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for college admission?	1
How many institutions represented by the Organization have considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?	2
Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *at their own institutions*?	3
What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *at their own institutions*?	4
Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *within academe in general*?	5
What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *within academe in general*?	6
Do members believe that their institutions would support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?	7
What reasons do members give to explain their institutions' willingness, or lack of willingness, to support such a policy?	8
Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general? These demographics include: institutional enrollment, Carnegie classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of position, duration of position, function of position, duration of LGBT experience, and duration of membership within the Organization.	9-17

Pilot Study

Before the questionnaire was submitted to the Organization's members, a pilot study was conducted with two different groups. The first group consisted of non-randomly selected faculty members who worked within a department of English at a regional university. Asked to consider legibility and readability, twelve individuals received the questionnaire through their university's email system, and eight responded and participated in the pilot study. Because of their expertise with English grammar and syntax, these eight individuals offered much constructive feedback. They suggested alternate words with stronger connotations (such as changing "urges," previously found in questions 3 and 5, to "encourages"), provided minor editorial revisions (such as punctuation and capitalization), and highlighted organizational problems, which included three important alterations to the original questionnaire: (a) reordering Questions 16 and 17; (b) inserting "very likely" into the options for Questions 3, 5, and 7; and (c) adding "don't know" to Question 7.

The pilot study's second group contained individuals who were members of an LGBT faculty organization at the same regional university. This group included approximately twenty members, representing a variety of academic disciplines. Whereas the first group examined the questionnaire's legibility and readability, the second group inspected the questionnaire's LGBT nomenclature and serviceability to the LGBT community. Their goal, as participants within the pilot study, was to address the following question: Could fellow LGBT administrators determine the questionnaire's ultimate purpose—to uncover attitudes surrounding a designation for sexual orientation within a college application? Six randomly-selected individuals received the questionnaire through their university's email system, and three responded and contributed to the pilot study. The respondents concurred that the questionnaire was serviceable, easy-to-

understand, and offered sufficient options; they also issued comments such as "[it provides] very useful information" and "it is obvious what you are asking." Furthermore, all three respondents agreed that the questionnaire took only a short time to complete—well under the advertised ten-minute timeframe, which was based upon research conducted by Galesic and Bosnjak (2009), who documented that on-line questionnaires advertised to take less than 10 minutes to complete received a higher return than those described to take 30 minutes. After participating in the pilot study, one respondent wondered: "Do you need *all* of the questions?" This lone comment, however, did not result in changes to the questionnaire as the respondent was not initially informed of the study's numerous, individual objectives.

Although this pilot study could not account for reliability, it did address internal validity. Both groups who examined the questionnaire determined that each question measured what it purported to measure and that each question provided appropriate and adequate options. Moreover, the individuals who participated in the pilot study addressed the particular purpose of the pilot study itself: to examine legibility, readability, serviceability, and time-to-complete. The final questionnaire used in this study appears in Appendix B.

Questionnaire Delivery

Following the pilot study, the questionnaire was to be delivered via phone interviews, during the first two weeks of August 2013, to the first group of respondents, the Organization's Executive Board. This group included 17 members who specialized in membership, education, outreach, or supervision. The data-collection plan was to contact the Executive Board before rank-and-file members so that two assumptions would be met: (a) to increase both representativeness and the response rate, and (b) to establish a "social norm-based appeal," a

66

process through which an organization's leaders encourage other members to participate in important endeavors (Misra et al., 2012, p. 90). Thus, members of the Executive Board were initially contacted through their email accounts (listed with the Organization's domain), and they received an overview of the study, along with informed consent (see Appendix C), and an invitation to verbalize their responses to the questionnaire during a phone interview.

Only one Co-Chair of the Organization answered the appeal, issuing the following remarks:

> I appreciate your invitation to participate, but I'm not entirely comfortable responding to your survey in my capacity as co-chair of the [Organization]. It could be seen as the [Organization] endorsing a particular stance on asking this question, and we cannot speak for the organization without consulting our members. I would recommend that you post your survey on our website, where it can be accessed by all of our members, which will give you a much broader group of people who have a perspective on the issue. (personal communication, August, 12, 2013)

The Co-Chair's response was inconsistent with other communications from the Organization: (a) the study had been authorized earlier by the previous Co-Chairs; (b) the study was already approved by a current sub-Chair so that rank-and-file members could access it later through the Organization's on-line forum for LGBT research; and (c) the Executive Board claimed neutrality, notwithstanding previous instances of advocacy, either publically or intra-organizationally. Despite these matters, a sole board member eventually contacted this researcher—during the second stage of data collection, when the entire Organization had gained on-line access to the questionnaire—and agreed to an interview: "I apologize for the delay in responding to this email. This sounds like a great project, and I'm happy to speak with you if you are still interested" (personal communication, August, 31, 2013). This researcher sent a quick response, but the board member never responded. Thus, none of the 17 members of the Executive Board verbally shared their opinions about a college application that quantifies sexual

orientation, yet it is possible that each member could have participated anonymously within the study at a later date.

The members of the Organization were the second group to receive the questionnaire, and they had access to it on-line during the final week of August and throughout September 2013. Having gained permission to utilize the Organization's on-line forum, this researcher used the Organization's listserv in order to access members' campus-based email accounts and to invite participation. An initial mass email was sent on August 25, 2013, which included a brief overview of the study along with a link to the on-line forum. After clicking the link, members were then able to read a detailed description of the study, along with informed consent (see Appendix B), and to access the on-line questionnaire, hosted by Qualtrics, which also generated all descriptive and non-parametric statistics and cross tabulations for this study.

The questionnaire was available during a five-week period—from August 25, 2013 through September 30, 2013—and members received a series of reminders, via email, that included the following requests:

On September 6, 2013:

To those who've already completed my questionnaire: Thank you so much! You've provided excellent feedback, and your comments and suggestions will lead to a comprehensive understanding of this very important issue. If you'd like, I'll be glad to share the final results once they're tallied.

To those who are still considering to participate: There's still time! I'd very much like to have your input because of your expertise and experience with LGBT students. In fact, you have until September 30 to complete the questionnaire. Here's a copy of last week's email, which will direct you to the [Organization's] forum for research postings:

On September 17, 2013:

I'm still hoping to collect a few more responses for my study about college applications that ask students to self-report their sexual orientation. I'd like to have at least 100 responses by the end of September—a goal that's not too far away! I'm really amazed by the breadth of your collective responses. In fact, we have a lot to consider as we decide the benefits and drawbacks of this kind of policy. So if you haven't taken the survey, please reconsider; your expert advice is extremely important to the success of this comprehensive study.

On September 25, 2013:

This is my *final appeal* for you to participate in my study about college applications that ask students to self-report their sexual orientation. The study ends on Monday, September 30, so you still have a few more days to offer your expert advice.

Aside from these reminders, this researcher also used social media—Facebook and Twitter—in order to solicit additional participants, should they prefer a concise Tweet over a formal email. Table 2 presents the various Tweets and Facebook postings shared with the Organization over the five-week period:

Table 2

Social Media Postings to Solicit Participation within the Study

Date	Tweet through Twitter	Posting on Facebook
August 28	What do you think about asking students their sexual orientation in a college application? (URL removed for anonymity.)	No posting on this date.
August 29	What do you think about asking students their sexual orientation in a college application? (URL removed for anonymity.)	No posting on this date.
September 1	THANK YOU to everyone who took my survey. There's still time to add your thoughts. (URL removed for anonymity.)	A BIG THANK YOU to everyone who participated in my survey that examines sexual orientation and college admissions. There's still time to share your thoughts. (URL removed for anonymity.)
September 3	THANK YOU to everyone who took my survey. There's still time to add your thoughts. (URL removed for anonymity.)	No posting on this date.
September 6	Still time to share your thoughts about quantifying sexual orientation in a college application. (URL removed for anonymity.)	Your collective response has been overwhelming, yet there's still time to participate in my survey that examines sexual orientation and the college-admissions process. Just visit the [Organization's] forum for research postings and following the simple directions. (URL removed for anonymity.)
September 15	Still time to share your thoughts about quantifying sexual orientation in a college application. (URL removed for anonymity.)	There's still time to participate in my survey that examines sexual orientation and the college-admissions process. Just visit the [Organization's] forum for research postings and following the simple directions. (URL removed for anonymity.)
September 20	Still time to share your thoughts about quantifying sexual orientation in a college application. (URL removed for anonymity.)	There's still time to participate in my survey that examines sexual orientation and the college-admissions process. Just visit the [Organization's] forum for research postings and following the simple directions. (URL removed for anonymity.)
September 26	Still time to share your thoughts about quantifying sexual orientation in a college application. (URL removed for anonymity.)	There's still time to participate in my survey that examines sexual orientation and the college-admissions process. Just visit the [Organization's] Forum for research postings and following the simple directions. (URL removed for anonymity.)

Response Rate

      Response rate (RR) was a primary concern of this methodology. The goal was to generate an RR of at least 33%, or approximately 230 participants. In order to increase the number of respondents from the available pool ($N \approx 700$), this researcher employed a number of methods to boost the members' interest. First, the questionnaire appeared on-line; digital-age scholars have been quite supportive of electronic data collection, explaining that web-based questionnaires receive more respondents than do conventional mail-based surveys (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). Secondly, each participant had the chance to win one of four $50 gift cards from Amazon since financial incentives have been shown to increase the RR (Baruch & Holtom, 2008; Rose, Sidle, & Griffith, 2007). Lastly, a strict timetable ensured that the Organization's members participated in this study. This timetable was based on Baruch and Holtom's (2008) recommendations for planning, devising, and administering a questionnaire—a step-by-step process that urges researchers to "pre-notify participants, publicize the survey, design the survey carefully, manage survey length, provide ample response opportunities, monitor survey response, establish survey importance, foster survey commitment, and provide survey feedback" (p. 1156). Table 3 explains how Baruch and Holtom's (2008) recommendations functioned within this study:

Table 3

Baruch and Holtom's (2008) Recommendations for Response Rate Analysis and Reporting

Baruch and Holtom's Recommendations	Efforts to Ensure Recommendations Are Met
To pre-notify participant, publicize the survey, and establish survey importance	The Organization gave instructions for any member who conducted a study: Researchers had to submit the following information: the title of the project, contact information, a description of the study, a link to the on-line survey, IRB approval, and a timeframe. After fulfilling these requirements, this researcher sent a series of emails to the Organization's members before the study. In these emails, this researcher explained the study and invited members to share their expertise.
To design the survey and manage length	The questionnaire underwent a pilot study with two different groups: It was first analyzed for legibility and readability, then for suitability and time-to-complete.
To provide ample response opportunities	The Organization accessed the question on-line through Qualtrics from August 25, 2013 through September 30, 2013.
To monitor survey response and foster survey commitment	Qualtrics was monitored daily to ensure that enough members were participating within the study. Furthermore, members received additional reminders via email and through social media (the Organization maintained active accounts on Facebook and Twitter).
To provide survey feedback	Once the study was completed, all members of the Organization received a synopsis of the results—and they were invited to request more information.

Incentives for Participation

Incentives, such as gift cards, are a common practice within web-based questionnaires to raise the RR (e.g., Baruch & Holtom, 2008; Tourangeau, Conrad, & Couper, 2013), and they were used within this study. While reviewing the letter of informed consent—and before taking the questionnaire—members of the Organization read the following explanation:

Whether or not you complete the questionnaire, I will enter your name in a random drawing for a chance to win one of four $50 gift cards from Amazon. To share your contact information with me, you can use one of the following methods [email, Facebook, Twitter, or text messaging]. After the study is over, four names will be drawn randomly, and each winner will be contacted. (Informed Consent, Appendix C)

By using this precaution, as per IRB guidelines, this researcher did not determine which individuals completed the on-line survey. Eight individuals eventually contacted this researcher—through email and by text messaging—asking to be entered into the drawing to win a gift card. In February 2014, four names were drawn at random, and each winner was notified. The gift cards were mailed to the winners on March 3, 2014.

Monitoring the Study

Three on-line components had to be monitored carefully during the duration of the study. The first component was Qualtrics, the webhost for the questionnaire. Before sending the study to the Organization's rank-and-file members, this researcher prevented search engines from indexing the questionnaire and respondents from using a single computer to "stuff the ballot box." This researcher, however, did not require a password for respondents to enter upon accessing the questionnaire; this decision was made because potential respondents already had to read various emails, synopses, informed consent, instructions, and the questionnaire itself. Once the study was released to the Organization, this researcher monitored Qualtrics daily to ensure that data were being tabulated consistently.

The second component to be monitored was the Organization's webpage, which included both the listserv and the forum for research postings. Maneuvering unfamiliar technology initially caused a few problems—a mass email that only reached a few members and an incomplete URL within an email—yet these matters were quickly resolved during the first day of

the study's release. Each email to the listserv also generated a steady supply of respondents throughout the five-week study, further illustrating that frequent monitoring was effective. As with Qualtrics, this researcher maintained a daily presence within the Organization's cyber-sphere.

The final component to be monitored was the researcher's email account, through which numerous respondents sent well-wishes, addressed a particular concern, and/or asked to enter the drawing for one of four $50 Amazon gift cards. A sampling of their emails was as follows:

> I wanted to see if you would mind sharing some of your findings (either raw or once written up into publishable format) with me and my colleagues at the [anonymous institution], as we are working with our admissions office on adding a sexual orientation identifier to our application, as well as expanding the binary gender options. I would appreciate any information you can share! Thanks so much, and best of luck with your research. (personal communication, September 17, 2013)

> I would be very interested in receiving your findings. Please keep us in the loop as this is very pertinent to how we move forward in our applications process, as I'm sure it is everywhere. Thank you for doing this important work. (personal communication, September 17, 2013)

Daily monitoring of these three on-line components—the researcher's email, the Organization's webpage, Qualtrics, and also Facebook and Twitter—minimized the influences of external variables, namely technological complications and researcher-respondent confusion. It should be mentioned, however, that this researcher never engaged in personalized, subjective discussions with any respondent via email; all brief exchanges were limited to advice (e.g., "click the link again"), to a request (e.g., "I will send the results at a later date"), to etiquette (e.g., "thank you"), to caution (e.g., "do not share with random colleagues"), or to the raffle (e.g., "I will enter your name into the drawing").

Analysis of Data

The analysis of data began with a discussion of response rate (RR) and response representativeness. The RR was calculated by looking at the Organization's total membership (as of August 2013) along with the number of members who subscribed to the Organization's listserv and who therefore received various invitations to participate within this study. Response representativeness was measured by assessing (a) the breadth of the respondents' positions, which included, for instance, director, assistant director, faculty member, program coordinator, or graduate assistant; and (b) other demographical delineations found within the questionnaire.

Next, the study's first eight research questions were addressed by analyzing quantitative and qualitative data from the questionnaire (see Table 1). The questionnaire's quantitative questions (1-3, 5, 7, and 9-17) were analyzed via frequency distribution, percent distribution, and disaggregation. The questionnaire's qualitative questions (4, 6, and 8) relied upon coded assessment, a process derived from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). To accomplish this task, this researcher, along with a colleague who worked in higher education, separately coded each response, determining, for example, that a respondent did not support a demographic for sexual orientation because of confidentiality or possible ill-intent toward the LGBT applicant during the admissions process. Next, a comparison was made between both coders to determine if similar patterns had emerged. Once an agreement had been reached, quantitative data was identified, categorized, and exemplified in tabular format; it was then described with descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, percent distribution, and disaggregation).

Additionally, non-parametric testing answered the ninth research question: "Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation on an application for admission within

75

academe in general? (These demographics include (institutional enrollment, Carnegie

classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of position, duration of

position, function of position, duration of LGBT experience, and duration of membership within

the Organization.)"   The results from these non-parametric tests were analyzed further through

cross tabulations, and the results appeared with tabular format.

Finally, all research-related materials—coded questionnaires, the coders' worksheets,

email communications, and various lists and statistical notations—remained confidential during

data analysis. These materials, along with all postings on social media and all data housed

within Qualtrics, were destroyed and deleted following the completion of this study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of a descriptive study that examined what a national

LGBT organization of educators thought about quantifying sexual orientation within a college

application. Following IRB approval (see Appendix A), the study relied upon a descriptive

design (Anastas, 1999), using a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures delivered

through a seventeen-item, on-line questionnaire, made available during August and September

2013. Quantitative responses were examined with descriptive statistics, and qualitative

responses relied upon coded assessment, a process derived from grounded theory (Glaser &

Strauss, 1967). Six sections guide this chapter: (a) response rate, (b) response

representativeness, (c) quantitative research questions and results, (d) qualitative research

questions and results, (e) demographics of the organization and quantifying sexual orientation,

and (f) a summary of results in relation to the nine research questions.

Response Rate

The organization consisted of approximately 700 members as of August 2013, according

to one of the current Co-Chairs. To use this number to gauge the response rate (RR), however,

was somewhat problematic. The first reason centered upon indeterminate figures: The listserv

did not provide access to every member since only between 604 and 610 members received

various emails throughout the duration of the study. (This situation could have been the result of

confidentiality: Some members probably chose not to share their contact information with the listserv.) Another problem involved the previous assumption that, for instance, $N = 610$. Indeed, a series of emails were delivered to 610 members, yet following each mass email, a few dozen emails were returned, flagged either as "undeliverable" or "out-of-office." As a result, this researcher felt comfortable issuing a final population estimated at 550 members, all of whom likely viewed at least one of the solicitations to participate in this study. With this final population, assuming that $N \leq 550$ and with 106 respondents, the RR was 19.3%, a figure that fell short of the original target, 33.0%.

The RR of 19.3% occurred after using Baruch and Holtom's (2008) best-practice methods for response-rate analysis: to pre-notify participant, publicize the survey, and establish survey importance; to design the survey and manage length; to provide ample response opportunities, and to monitor survey response and foster survey commitment (See Table 3). These best-practice methods are largely similar to those of Thomas (2004) and Tourangeau et al. (2013). The research surrounding RR and web-based questionnaires, however, indicates that they might be less effective than mail-based surveys:

> The proliferation of surveys makes it harder for potential respondents to distinguish good surveys from bad ones and legitimate survey requests from less worthwhile ones. Coupled with the general rise in email traffic, the rise in the number of web surveys may mean that we have saturated the market. Evidence for this can be seen in the increasing number of survey requests to op-in panel members and the corresponding decline in response rates. There may simply be too many surveys chasing too few respondents. The very qualities that led to the rapid adoption of web surveys—their low cost and high convenience—may now be their downfall. (Tourangeau et al., 2013, p. 55)

When researchers add these concerns to those that surround the identification of a serviceable LGBT population—a problem often due to the psychological and professional effects of social marginalization and stigmatization (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000)—a precise response-rate analysis becomes difficult to conduct. With an estimated RR of at least 19.3%, the questionnaire

nonetheless offered a wealth of qualitative and qualitative data for a descriptive study that was "directed toward clarifying a phenomenon's appearance or nature" (Anastas, 1999, p. 125).

Response Representativeness

Although this population, $N \leq 550$, was not representative of the entire national network of LGBT professionals in higher education, the results indicated that respondents ($N = 106$) were a diverse group. Tables 4 and 5 show that these individuals represented a variety of demographics found within higher education: institutional enrollment, Carnegie classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of position, duration of position, function of position, and duration of LGBT experience. For instance, Table 5 illustrates that the respondents held the following kinds of positions within their institutions: graduate assistant, LGBT office ($n = 7$, 7.0%); specialist, LGBT office ($n = 1$, 1.0%); coordinator, LGBT office ($n = 16$, 15%); assistant director, LGBT office ($n = 3$, 3.0%); associate director, LGBT office ($n = 2$, 2.0%); director, LGBT office ($n = 31$, 29.0%); faculty member ($n = 4$, 4.0%); and other administrator ($n = 42$, 40.0%). Upon further inspection, Tables 4 and 5 might suggest a group of respondents that was less diverse—especially those who worked at religious institutions ($n = 5$, 5.0%), who had less than two years of experience ($n = 42$, 40.0%), and who worked in certain geographic regions: Northwest ($n = 6$, 6.0%); Midwest ($n = 6$, 6.0%); South Central ($n = 2$, 2.0%); and Mid-Atlantic ($n = 9$, 8.0%). Aside from these slight reservations, respondents as a whole effectively represented a national collective of LGBT administrators, all of whom provided practical, knowledgeable advice about self-reporting sexual orientation during the application process.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Questions 9, 10, 11, and 12: Respondents' Institutional Demographics

Quantitative Questions on Survey	Options for Answers	$N = 106$	Percentage
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment? ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 2.11$, minimum value begins with first option)	up to 4,999 5,000 to 9,999 10,000 to 14,999 15,000 to 19,999 20,000 to 24,999 25,000 to 29,999 30,000 plus	13 13 19 12 13 10 26	12.0 12.0 18.0 11.0 12.0 9.0 25.0
Q10: To the best of your knowledge, what is the generalized Carnegie classification of your institution? ($M = 3.23$, $SD = .90$, minimum value begins with first option)	associate's baccalaureate master's doctoral	2 27 22 55	2.0 25.0 21.0 52.0
Q11: What is the overall structure of your institution? ($M = 1.50$, $SD = .84$, minimum value begins with first option)	public private, religious private, secular other	76 5 24 0[a]	72.0 5.0 23.0 0.0
Q12: Within which region is your institution located? ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 2.01$, minimum value begins with first option)	Northwest Midwest Great Lakes Northeast Southwest South Central South Mid-Atlantic	6 6 27 19 16 2 21 9	6.0 6.0 25.0 18.0 15.0 2.0 20.0 8.0

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

[a] Only 105 respondents answered Q11.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Questions 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17: Respondents' Demographics

Quantitative Questions on Survey	Options for Answers	$N = 106$	Percentage
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position? (*M* = 5.93, *SD* = 2.23, minimum value begins with first option)	Graduate Asst. (LGBT office)	7	7.0
	Specialist (LGBT office)	1	1.0
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	16	15.0
	Asst. Director (LGBT office)	3	3.0
	Assoc. Director (LGBT office)	2	2.0
	Director (LGBT office)	31	29.0
	Faculty Member	4	4.0
	Other Administrator	42	40.0
Q14: How long have you held this position? (*M* = 1.96, *SD* = .97, minimum value begins with first option)	less than 2 years	42	40.0
	2 to 5 years	35	33.0
	6 to 10 years	20	19.0
	11 or more years	9	8.0
Q15: Which of the following statements best describes the institutional function of your position within LGBT education and outreach? (*M* = 3.04, *SD* = 1.67, minimum value begins with first option)	within an LGBT office	34	32.0
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	2	2.0
	within inclusivity initiatives	24	23.0
	within student affairs	30	28.0
	within an academic department	4	4.0
	within another office on campus	12	11.0
Q16: How would you classify your participation within the Organization? (*M* = 2.02, *SD* = 1.31, minimum value begins with first option)	member only	60	58.0
	member with committee work	9	9.0
	member with leadership	8	8.0
	member with committee work and leadership experience	27[a]	26.0

Table 5 continues on next page.

Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations in higher education?	less than 2 years	8	8.0
	2 to 5 years	36	34.0
	6 to 10 years	37	35.0
	11 or more years	25	24.0
(*M* = 2.75, *SD* = .91, minimum value begins with first option)			

^a Only 104 respondents answered Q16.

Quantitative Research Questions and Results

This study was guided by nine research questions, five of which were quantitative in nature:

1. Are members of the Organization aware that other institutions have recently asked, or are considering asking, potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for college admission?

2. How many institutions represented by the Organization have considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?

3. Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *at their own institutions*?

5. Would members support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *within academe in general*?

7. Do members believe that their institutions would support a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?

These five research questions were addressed individually within this study's questionnaire: The first research question corresponded to Q1, the second to Q2, and so on (see Table 1).

Table 6 illustrates that the first research question (Q1 within the questionnaire) was answered by 106 respondents, 95 of whom, or 90%, were aware that other institutions have considered asking potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application, while 11 respondents, or 10.0%, were not aware. The second research question (Q2 within the questionnaire) was also answered by 106 respondents: (a) 41, or 39.0%, reported that their institutions had considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to their application; (b) 38, or 36.0%, said that their institutions had not considered such a demographic; and (c) 27, or 25.0%, did not know. The third research question (Q3 within the questionnaire) asked each respondent if s/he would support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application to his/her institution. Answers came from 106 respondents, who said: not at all ($n = 12$, 11.0%); somewhat likely ($n = 25$, 24.0%); more than likely ($n = 17$, 16.0%); very likely ($n = 22$, 21.0%); or entirely ($n = 30$, 28.0%). The fifth research question (Q5 within the questionnaire) posed the following hypothetical situation: Would respondents support the selfsame policy within academe in general? The respondents ($N = 106$) categorized their varying degrees of support: not at all ($n = 17$, 16.0%); somewhat likely ($n = 22$, 21.0%); more than likely ($n = 22$, 21.0%); very likely ($n = 24$, 23.0%); or entirely ($n = 21$, 20.0%). The seventh research question (Q7 within the questionnaire) slightly altered the wording of the previous two questions and measured whether each respondent thought that his/her own institution would support such a policy. On this occasion answers came from only 105 respondents, who indicated: not at all ($n = 30$, 29.0%); somewhat likely ($n = 30$, 29.0%); more than likely ($n = 14$, 13.0%); very likely ($n = 15$, 14.0%); entirely ($n = 5$, 5.0%); or don't know ($n = 11$, 10.0%).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Questions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7: Respondents' Consideration of
Self-Reporting Sexual Orientation During the Admissions Process

Quantitative Questions on Survey	Options for Answers	$N = 106$	Percentage
Q1: Are you aware that other institutions have recently asked (or are considering asking) potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application for college admission?	yes	95	90.0
	no	11	10.0
($M = 1.10$, $SD = .31$, minimum value begins with first option)			
Q2: Has your institution considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?	yes	41	39.0
	no	38	36.0
	don't know	27	25.0
($M = 1.87$, $SD = .79$, minimum value begins with first option)			
Q3: Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution?	not at all	12	11.0
	somewhat likely	25	24.0
	more than likely	17	16.0
	very likely	22	21.0
	entirely	30	28.0
($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.40$, minimum value begins with first option)			
Q5: Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?	not at all	17	16.0
	somewhat likely	22	21.0
	more than likely	22	21.0
	very likely	24	23.0
	entirely	21	20.0
($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.37$, minimum value begins with first option)			

Table 6 continues on next page.

Q7:	Do you think that your institution is likely to support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?	not at all	30	29.0
		somewhat likely	30	29.0
		more than likely	14	13.0
		very likely	15	14.0
		entirely	5	5.0
		don't know	11[a]	10.0
	(*M* = 2.70, *SD* = 1.62, minimum value begins with first option)			

[a] Only 105 respondents answered Q7.

Qualitative Research Questions and Results

This study included three qualitative research questions, which respondents addressed by offering written response to open-ended questions on the questionnaire. The three qualitative research questions were:

4. What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for a policy that quantifies sexual orientation *at their own institutions*?

6. What reasons do members provide to explain their support, or lack of support, for such a policy *within academe in general*?

8. What reasons do members give to explain their institutions' willingness, or lack of willingness, to support such a policy?

To investigate these three questions, this researcher relied upon grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), a process through which social scientists observe, categorize, and then define abstract phenomena in order to explain a particular group's justification for doing something or believing in a certain way. This process originates from an initial procedure known as coding, wherein the researcher collects qualitative data from the group and looks for repetitive explanations (when relying, say, upon a questionnaire), detecting key words, phrases, and descriptions. Additionally, the process requires the researcher to develop categories from the

various codes in order to craft definitions of the abstractions found within the qualitative data. Finally, the categories themselves indicate possible theories—or rather, explanations—of the group's beliefs and/or behaviors, signifying how subsequent observations can be interpreted consistently. Thus, the process of grounded theory allows a researcher to theorize, for instance, why LGBT students should (not) self-report sexual orientation within a college application.

Grounded theory greatly influenced the qualitative aspect of this study, and it involved the following steps: after respondents gave written responses to Questions 4, 6, and 8, this researcher along with a colleague who specializes in English composition and textual investigation, a scholarly subclass of qualitative analysis, coded the explanations independently. During this time, each researcher looked for noticeable evidence of specific words, phrases, and explanations that indicated particular reasons that supported, or did not support, an LGBT admissions policy. Together the researchers then compared their individualized codes, discussing at length each similarity and difference, eventually agreeing upon a fixed number of categories that effectively summarized respondents' answers to the qualitative questions. Coding and categorizing occurred over a one-month period (October 2013), and the researchers met weekly to discuss their progress, reservations, recommendations, and conclusions. Finally, the categories for Questions 4, 6, and 8 were reconciled, identified, defined, and demonstrated through various tables (see Tables 7, 9, and 11) and descriptive statistics (see Tables 8, 10, and 12).

Table 7 presents the categories that answered the fourth research question (Q4 within the questionnaire): What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution? Four positive reasons emerged: (a) tracking of LGBT students, (b) educational

86

outreach for LGBT students, (c) funding justification for LGBT resources, and (d) advocacy for LGBT students. Additionally, four negative reasons appeared: (a) confidentiality of LGBT students' records, (b) possible ill-intent toward LGBT students, (c) relevance of an LGBT admissions policy, and (d) lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy. Table 8 illustrates the descriptive statistics for these eight reasons, where $N = 131$ (see footnote for Table 8): tracking ($n = 29$, 22.1%), educational outreach ($n = 24$, 18.3%), confidentiality ($n = 18$, 13.7%), funding justification ($n = 13$, 9.9%), possible ill-intent ($n = 13$, 9.9%), miscellaneous ($n = 13$, 9.9%), advocacy ($n = 12$, 9.1%), relevance ($n = 7$, 5.3%), and lawfulness ($n = 2$, 1.5%).

Table 7

Categorization of Responses to Question 4: What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution?

Reason	Explanation of Reason (Implied Yes/No)	Example of Reason from Respondent within Question 4
Tracking of LGBT students	Yes, because data would allow the institution (a) to measure matriculation, retention, and graduation rates for LGBT students (as well as other such figures); and/or (b) to assess these students in comparison to their peers.	We need data to determine if our GLBT students are recruited, persist, and graduate at the same rates as our non-GLBT students. We can't address any potential problems for this population if we have no data on them. [For an additional explanation of the LGBT acronym and how it can be altered—e.g., *GLBT*—see (a) List of Abbreviations and (b) Terminology, Chapter One.]
Educational outreach for LGBT students	Yes, because data would allow the institution to connect LGBT students to campus resources that address their various needs, such as an LGBT center, extracurricular activities, and counseling.	Being able to connect admitted students to various resources based off of demographic information that is disclosed during their application process would be a great step to ensure that they are aware of valuable information/people/resources pertinent to them as an individual, especially during the first 6 weeks of their campus experience.
Funding justification for LGBT resources	Yes, because data would allow LGBT administrators to justify expenditures associated with LGBT resources, such as an LGBT center, extra-curricular activities, and counseling.	In the increasing age of assessment and proving worth, having finite numbers around underrepresented populations helps keep vital resources for LGBT students on campus.
Advocacy for LGBT students	Yes, because data would encourage the institution (a) to identify, create, and promote pro-LGBT initiatives and resources; and/or (b) to recognize and validate LGBT students.	It often feels as though the administration believes there is a lack of an LGBT presence on campus. The data our institution would get from such a question would be enlightening to our faculty, staff, and administrators, and would lead to better serving the LGBT students who are often forgotten about.

Confidentiality of LGBT students' records	No, because data would jeopardize the LGBT applicant's privacy should a parent, family member, or other person gain access to application materials. (See also Ethical Matters: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Chapter 2.)	I think that students should not feel obligated to disclose their sexual orientation to the university. We don't know whether the institution will use this in consideration of the student's admission or not. It can also put students on the spot if they have their parents helping them fill out the application and they are not out yet. So even if these questions to identify their sexual orientation were included, we might not be able to receive accurate results because some students might have to lie or just not feel comfortable disclosing that information.
Possible ill-intent toward LGBT students	No, because data might lead the institution to make discriminatory decisions that would negatively impact the application process and harm the LGBT applicant.	I would be concerned about how institutions might use this information. Would it be merely for demographics info? To justify inclusive policies? To discriminate?
Relevance of an LGBT admissions policy	No, because data would be irrelevant during the application process.	I don't think that it is needed. I am a member of the LGBTQ+ community and I would not answer that question.
Lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy	No, because data would create legal problems in light of FERPA, HIPAA, and "applicant representativeness"—*i.e.*, using sexual orientation, like race and sex, as a factor in the admissions process.	I would not support asking questions of sexual orientation at time of application; I would however support asking such questions at time of matriculation when the information would become protected under FERPA. Until matriculation, parents have access to information submitted by their students, putting the student in danger of outing themselves inadvertently to family members, a potentially dangerous circumstance.
Miscellaneous responses	An answer that does not entirely answer the question.	I work with students who would feel comfortable disclosing their identity. Additionally, my institution has a long history of student activism and LGBTQ history on campus and community.
Blank responses	An answer left blank.	No example is available.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Question 4: What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution?

Reason to (Not) Support Policy (Implied Yes/No)	$N = 131$	Percentage
Tracking of LGBT students (yes)	29	22.1
Educational outreach for LGBT students (yes)	24	18.3
Confidentiality of LGBT students' records (no)	18	13.7
Funding justification for LGBT resources (yes)	13	9.9
Possible ill-intent toward LGBT students (no)	13	9.9
Miscellaneous responses	13	9.9
Advocacy for LGBT students (yes)	12	9.1
Relevance of an LGBT admissions policy (no)	7	5.3
Lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy (no)	2	1.5[a]

Note. Although 106 respondents completed the questionnaire, only 104 respondents answered Question 4, which asked them to explain a *primary reason* for supporting a policy that encourages students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to their institution. Inevitably, however, many respondents readily provided *multiple reasons*. Thus, Question 4 generated 131 reasons as many respondents explained two, three, and even four reasons. Moreover, the descriptive statistics for this figure ($N = 131$) do not include the two blank responses.

[a] The percentages add to only 99.7 percent due to rounding.

Tables 9 and 10 address the sixth research question (Q6 within the questionnaire): What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general? The answers to this question were more comprehensive, simply because respondents were considering the topic of discussion more broadly: higher education in its entirety. For this question, seven positive reasons materialized, and they appear within Table 10: (a) tracking of

LGBT students, (b) educational outreach for LGBT students, (c) funding justification for LGBT resources, (d) advocacy for LGBT students, (e) self-actualization for LGBT students, (f) diversity initiatives that increase LGBT students, and (g) self-prevention of harm by LGBT students. Inversely, five negative reasons were found, and they also appear within Table 9: (a) confidentiality of LGBT students' records, (b) possible ill-intent toward LGBT students, (c) relevance of an LGBT admissions policy, (d) sociopolitical forces that affect LGBT students, and (e) lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy. Table 10 displays the descriptive statistics for these twelve reasons, where $N = 134$ (see footnote for Table 10): tracking ($n = 24$, 17.9%), possible ill-intent ($n = 20$, 14.9%), confidentiality ($n = 20$, 14.9%), advocacy ($n = 20$, 14.9%), miscellaneous ($n = 14$; 10.4%), funding justification ($n = 10$, 7.5%), educational outreach ($n = 7$, 5.2%), relevance ($n = 7$, 5.2%), sociopolitical forces ($n = 5$, 3.7%), self-actualization ($n = 3$, 2.2%), diversity initiatives ($n = 2$, 1.5%), lawfulness ($n = 1$, 0.7%), and self-prevention of harm ($n = 1$, 0.7%).

Table 9

Categorization of Responses to Question 6: What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?

Reason to Support Policy	Explanation of Reason (Implied Yes/No)	Example of Reason from Respondent within Question 6
Tracking of LGBT students	Yes, because data would allow the institution (a) to measure matriculation, retention, and graduation rates for LGBT students (as well as other such figures); and/or (b) to assess these students in comparison to their peers.	I think that it is important for us to be able to quantify the numbers of LGB students we have on campus so that we can track their perceptions of climate, as well as enrollment and retention rates.
Educational outreach for LGBT students	Yes, because data would allow the institution to connect LGBT students to campus resources that address their various needs, such as an LGBT center, extracurricular activities, and counseling.	My school is supportive of LGBTQ students and their full inclusion and we are among the schools fortunate enough to have an office dedicated to advocating for the needs of LGBTQ students. Within the framework of this advocacy, we are sensitive to the kinds of complications around asking students, some of whom are minors, and most of whom are still dependent on their parents financially to consider revealing their LGBTQ identity on an application could be anxiety producing and off putting.
Funding justification for LGBT resources	Yes, because data would allow LGBT administrators to justify expenditures associated with LGBT resources, such as an LGBT center, extra-curricular activities, and counseling.	Higher Education uses data to justify the existence of things like LGBT centers, gender neutral housing and other programs geared towards certain populations. Without knowing if there are LGBT students/faculty/staff on campus (of course we know there are but often upper administration likes to pretend there isn't) we can't get the funding needed to truly support the LGBT community.

Table 9 continues on next page.

Advocacy for LGBT students	Yes, because data would encourage the institution (a) to identify, create, and promote pro-LGBT initiatives and resources; and/or (b) to recognize and validate LGBT students.	I believe that it is important for LGB+ students to feel included and safe. I would support the decision to ask students about their sexual orientation because that helps institutions provide unique services catered to LGB+ community. It also removes the stigma and oppression around "not asking" others about their sexual orientation and adding to the "shame" they experience. This will also help track discrimination and oppression faced by the students and will provide them with special scholarships and support.
Self-actualization for LGBT students	Yes, because the institutional atmosphere could encourage LGBT students to reach their full potential, in terms of educational, social, and psychological development.	I think it is another sign of the times. Students are coming to college expecting this not to be a big deal, and then it still is. In many cases they have been out since middle school. Our colleges are forcing them to go back into the closet. Plus, having it on the application form normalizes it for all other students.
Diversity initiatives that increase LGBT students	Yes, because diversity is essential for a critical mass of life experiences and ideas to occur within an institution.	Sexual orientation falls into the realm of diversity, although it seems that most institutions focus on racial diversity. Diversity of thoughts and ideas is essential to academe. One way to ensure diversity of thought is to ensure diversity of the institution's population. Also, from personal experience applying to graduate school, I would have liked to explicitly indicate my LGBT identity to my program. I had felt very isolated as an LGBT person in my program, and found that the few other LGBT students in my program felt the same way. Perhaps revealing our sexual orientation in an application for admission would have helped with this.

Self-prevention of harm by LGBT students	Yes, because data that reflects a negative LGBT climate would prevent other LGBT students from applying to any unsafe institution.	Even in the case of a school using the question to discriminate against a student, the student might be better off if they are rejected based on that information given the fact that the climate would likely be very hostile. I know there was an effort to get a question on the common application and that hasn't yet succeeded. I don't know which schools use the common app but I am in favor of adding it to the common app since it is widely used and it would eliminate individual schools having to argue why it should be added.
Confidentiality of LGBT students' records	No, because data would jeopardize the LGBT applicant's privacy should a parent, family member, or other person gain access to application materials. (See also Ethical Matters: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Chapter 2.)	Sexual orientation is private (although, should not have to be hidden); and, there is no need to encourage potential students to out themselves. I'd rather show them that they are encouraged to be who they are (or find who they are) without the pressure of verbally communicating it to others.
Possible ill-intent toward LGBT students	No, because data might lead the institution to make discriminatory decisions that would negatively impact the application process and harm the LGBT applicant.	I would be fearful that this information would bias admissions officers against applicants.
Relevance of an LGBT admissions policy	No, because data would be irrelevant during the application process.	Why does it matter?

Table 9 continues on next page.

Sociopolitical forces that affect LGBT students	No, because some institutions are located in more conservative geographic areas that are shaped by social and political forces, such as state governments, boards of trustees, religious groups, and/or citizens at large.	The social and political context changes from institution to institution.
Lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy	No, because data would create legal problems in light of FERPA, HIPAA, and "applicant representativeness"—*i.e.*, using sexual orientation, like race and sex, as a factor in the admissions process.	I've heard people say, in resistance to adopting the practice of asking about sexuality, that they are afraid that if a student checks a non-hetero box and is not admitted that they would try to sue the institution for discrimination. If people seriously have that fear, they are missing the point entirely. Students should feel empowered to sue institutions for discrimination—as it is already happening all of the time. It is the institution's responsibility to assess the ways in which they already enact discriminatory policies and practices so that they are inclusive, follow federal policy, live up to their missions, and not face lawsuits.
Miscellaneous responses	An answer that does not entirely answer the question.	I would rather consider requesting this information on intent to register and/or during the regular annual updating of student records. This would curb the thought potential students may have about discrimination and would also provide an avenue for fluidity and changes to how a student identifies.
Blank responses	An answer left blank.	No example is available.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Question 6: What is the primary reason that you would (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?

Reason to (Not) Support Policy (Implied Yes/No)	$N = 134$	Percentage
Tracking of LGBT students (yes)	24	17.9
Possible ill-intent toward LGBT students (no)	20	14.9
Confidentiality of LGBT students' records (no)	20	14.9
Advocacy for LGBT students (yes)	20	14.9
Miscellaneous responses	14	10.4
Funding justification for LGBT resources (yes)	10	7.5
Educational outreach for LGBT students (yes)	7	5.2
Relevance of an LGBT admissions policy (no)	7	5.2
Sociopolitical forces that affect LGBT students (no)	5	3.7
Self-actualization for LGBT students (yes)	3	2.2
Diversity initiatives that increase LGBT students (yes)	2	1.5
Lawfulness of an LGBT policy (no)	1	0.7
Self-prevention of harm by LGBT students (yes)	1	0.7[a]

Note. Although 106 respondents completed the questionnaire, only 97 respondents answered Question 6, which asked them to explain a *primary reason* for supporting a policy that encourages students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general. Inevitably, however, many respondents readily provided *multiple reasons*. Thus, Question 6 generated 134 reasons as many respondents explained two, three, and even four reasons. Moreover, the descriptive statistics for this figure ($N = 134$) do not include the nine blank responses.

[a] The percentages add to only 99.7 percent due to rounding.

Tables 11 and 12 address the eighth research question (Q8 within the questionnaire): Why would your institution (not) support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission? Whereas Questions 4 and 6 generated similar reasons, Question 8 provided a distinctly different set of categories as respondents had to consider their own institutional climates regarding LGBT outreach and even homophobia. Despite the speculative nature of Question 8, however, each respondent indicated a noticeable understanding of his/her institution and how it addressed LGBT issues—or how it approached them apathetically or without notice. Table 11 reveals that respondents believed that their institutions would (not) support the quantification of sexual orientation due to the following six reasons: (a) administrative interest, (b) administrative challenges, (c) positive campus climate, (d) negative campus climate, (e) geographic location, and (f) issues surrounding the Common Application or a standardized state-wide application. Table 12 presents the descriptive statistics for these six reasons, where $N = 96$ (see footnote for Table 12): administrative challenges ($n = 32$, 33.3%), administrative interest ($n = 26$, 27.1%), positive campus climate ($n = 14$, 14.6%), geographic location ($n = 8$, 8.3%), issues surrounding the Common Application or standardized state-wide application ($n = 7$; 7.3%), negative campus climate ($n = 5$, 5.2%), and miscellaneous ($n = 4$, 4.2%).

Table 11

Categorization of Responses to Question 8: Why would your institution (not) support
a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation
in an application for admission?

Reason to (Not) Support Policy	Explanation of Reason	Example of Reason from Respondent within Question 8
Administrative interest	The administration is considering reasons (a) that would benefit LGBT students, such as tracking, diversity, self-actualization, and educational best practices; and/or (b) that would require institutional attention, such as the application process itself and technological upgrades for the admissions office.	They are considering adding this question on the admission application because LGBT-inclusion is important at each level of administration, other institutions are doing it, and enrollment management dialogue would have added value with LGBT retention data.
Administrative challenges	The administration (a) appears apathetic, homo-phobic, or unaware; (b) only considers possible negative consequences for LGBT students, such as confidentiality, lawful-ness, relevance, and ill-intent; and/or (c) resists institutional change.	Presently, I don't believe that there is enough of an institutional motivation to go through the process of collecting that information. I don't know that the people who are in charge of making that kind of decision are even aware that it's something that may be of value to collect, or that they would want to go through the trouble of making waves to do so.
Positive campus climate	The institution, *apart from the administration*, is visibly committed to pro-LGBT policies and practices.	My institution has a very strong LGBT Center Director who has advocated for many LGBT-inclusive policies and practices on campus. We were marked one of the Top LGBT friendly higher education institutions. My institution also does well to ensure a very diverse student population.

Negative campus climate	The institution, *apart from the administration*, is *not* visibly committed to pro-LGBT policies and practices.	I work in a Jesuit institution and believe the institution already has difficulty addressing questions of sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression. There is a culture in my institution that highly discourages open discussion about sexuality and gender expression.
Geographic	The institution is located in a conservative geographic area shaped by social and political forces, such as state governments, boards of trustees, religious groups, and/or citizens at large.	As a state chartered flagship university, my institution has strong ties to a highly conservative legislative constituency that has, in the past, worked to directly oppose issues of interest to the queer community. I cannot imagine that that would change anytime soon in ways that would sway support for this particular group of students.
Common Application or standardized state-wide application	The Common Application or any standardized application (for states with multi-campus institutions) does not provide a demographic that measures sexual orientation; this situation effectively strongholds the individual institution from altering the status quo regarding LGBT applicants and students.	I work at a very liberal institution, but we use the common application so unless that is changed then it is less likely that it will be added at my institution. Our supplement to common app doesn't ask any demographic information or information about extra-curricular activities so I don't see how this question would fit well on the supplement either. The school might be willing, but the question would make more sense on the common app where other demographic information is asked.
Miscellaneous responses	The answer does not entirely answer the question.	I do not know of any plans to begin this process; however I don't know that it is not happening either.
Blank responses	The answer is left blank.	No example is available.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Question 8: Why would your institution (not) support
a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation
in an application for admission?

Institutional Reason to (Not) Support Policy (Implied Yes/No)	$N = 96$	Percentage
Administrative challenge (no)	32	33.3
Administrative interest (yes)	26	27.1
Positive campus climate (yes)	14	14.6
Geographic (no)	8	8.3
Common Application or standardized state-wide application (no)	7	7.3
Negative campus climate (no)	5	5.2
Miscellaneous	4	4.2

Note. Although 106 respondents completed the questionnaire, only 96 respondents answered Question 8. Moreover, the descriptive statistics for this figure ($N = 96$) do not include the ten blank responses.

Demographics of the Organization and Quantifying Sexual Orientation

The ninth research question asked: Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general? These demographics included: institutional enrollment, Carnegie classification, administrative structure, geographic location, type of position, duration of position, function of position, duration of LGBT experience, and duration of membership within the Organization. To identify if, in fact, certain demographics revealed significant conclusions, this researcher compared Questions 1-3, 5, and 7 (those that measured a respondent's awareness and support of the policy) to Questions 9-17

(those that quantified the Organization's demographics). These comparisons were made with

cross tabulations prepared through Qualtrics, the on-line webhost for the study.

Tables 13 and 14 examine which groups of respondents were aware that other institutions

have quantified sexual orientation during the admissions process. Groups that appeared less

aware were those who worked within the Organization's southern region, those who did not

work within an LGBT office, and those who held varying degrees of experience within the

Organization. Chi Square values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities for each question were:

Q9 ($\chi^2 = 7.43$, $df = 6$, $p = .28$), Q10 ($\chi^2 = 3.53$, $df = 3$, $p = .32$), Q11 ($\chi^2 = .85$, $df = 3$, $p = .84$),

Q12 ($\chi^2 = 8.37$, $df = 7$, $p = .30$), Q13 ($\chi^2 = 10.67$, $df = 7$, $p = .15$), Q14 ($\chi^2 = 6.57$, $df = 3$, $p = .09$),

Q15 ($\chi^2 = 17.38$, $df = 5$, $p = .003$), Q16 ($\chi^2 = 14.32$, $df = 3$, $p = .003$), and Q17 ($\chi^2 = 2.87$, $df = 3$, p

$= .41$). Out of all the previous comparisons, only two were statistically significant ($p \leq .05$):

Q15 ("Where is your position located on campus?") and Q16 ("How would you classify your

experience with the Organization?"), both of which happened within less than a .05 chance of

random occurrence.

Table 13

Cross Tabulations for Question 1 and Questions 9 through 12

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Are you aware that other institutions have recently asked potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application?		
		Yes	No	Total
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment?	up to 4,999	12	1	**13**
	5,000 to 9,999	13	0	**13**
	10,000 to 14,999	17	2	**19**
	15,000 to 19,999	11	1	**12**
	20,000 to 24,999	12	1	**13**
	25,000 to 29,999	10	0	**10**
	30,000 plus	20	6	**26**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**
Q10: What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?	associate's	1	1	**2**
	baccalaureate	24	3	**27**
	master's	20	2	**22**
	doctoral	50	5	**55**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**
Q 11: What is the overall structure of your institution?	public	67	9	**76**
	private, religious	5	0	**5**
	private, secular	22	2	**24**
	other	0	0	**0**
	Total	**94**	**11**	**105**
Q12: Within which region is your institution located?	Northwest	5	1	**6**
	Midwest	5	1	**6**
	Great Lakes	24	3	**27**
	Northeast	19	0	**19**
	Southwest	15	1	**16**
	South Central	2	0	**2**
	South	16	5	**21**
	Mid-Atlantic	9	0	**9**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

Table 14

Cross Tabulations for Question 1 and Questions 13 through 17

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Are you aware that other institutions have recently asked potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application?		
		Yes	No	Total
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position?	Graduate Assistant (LGBT office)	6	1	**7**
	Specialist (LGBT office)	1	0	**1**
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	15	1	**16**
	Assistant Director (LGBT office)	3	0	**3**
	Associate Director (LGBT office)	2	0	**2**
	Director (LGTBT office)	31	0	**31**
	Faculty Member	4	0	**4**
	Other Administrator	33	9	**42**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**
Q14: How long have you held this position?	less than two years	34	8	**42**
	2 to 5 years	34	1	**35**
	6 to 10 years	18	2	**20**
	11 or more years	9	0	**9**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**
Q15: Where is your position located on campus?	within an LGBT office	34	0	**34**
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	1	1	**2**
	within inclusivity initiatives	26	1	**24**
	within student affairs	22	8	**30**
	within an academic department	4	0	**4**
	within another office on campus	11	1	**12**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**
Q16: How would you classify your participation with the organization?	member only	56	4	**60**
	member with committee work	5	4	**9**
	member with leadership	7	1	**8**
	member with committee work and leadership experience	26	1	**27**
	Total	**94**	**10**	**104**
Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations in higher education?	less than two years	7	1	**8**
	2 to 5 years	30	6	**36**
	6 to 10 years	34	3	**37**
	11 or more years	24	1	**25**
	Total	**95**	**11**	**106**

Tables 15 and 16 investigate which institutions have considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation; in particular Table 16 demonstrates the effect of professional socialization: Groups who worked within an LGBT office had considered this matter, and those who worked elsewhere (e.g., in student affairs or as a faculty member) had not. Chi Square values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities for each question were: Q9 ($\chi^2 = 5.93$, $df = 12$, $p = .92$), Q10 ($\chi^2 = 5.67$, $df = 6$, $p = .46$), Q11 ($\chi^2 = 1.13$, $df = 6$, $p = .98$), Q12 ($\chi^2 = 16.30$, $df = 14$, $p = .30$), Q13 ($\chi^2 = 35.02$, $df = 14$, $p = .001$), Q14 ($\chi^2 = 5.99$, $df = 6$, $p = .42$), Q15 ($\chi^2 = 32.18$, $df = 10$, $p = .001$), Q16 ($\chi^2 = 8.39$, $df = 6$, $p = .21$), and Q17 ($\chi^2 = 5.17$, $df = 6$, $p = .52$). Out of all the previous comparisons, only two were statistically significant ($p \leq .05$): Q13 ("Which of the following titles best describes your position?") and Q15 ("Where is your position located?"), both of which happened within less than a .05 chance of random occurrence.

Table 15

Cross Tabulations for Question 2 and Questions 9 through 12

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Has your institution considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?			
		Yes	No	DK	Total
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment?	up to 4,999	5	4	4	**13**
	5,000 to 9,999	6	3	4	**13**
	10,000 to 14,999	7	7	5	**19**
	15,000 to 19,999	4	5	3	**12**
	20,000 to 24,999	4	6	3	**13**
	25,000 to 29,999	5	5	0	**10**
	30,000 plus	10	8	8	**26**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]
Q10: What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?	associate's	0	2	0	**2**
	baccalaureate	10	10	7	**27**
	master's	7	7	8	**22**
	doctoral	24	19	12	**55**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]
Q 11: What is the overall structure of your institution?	public	29	29	18	**76**
	private, religious	2	1	2	**5**
	private, secular	9	8	7	**24**
	other	0	0	0	**0**
	Total	**40**	**38**	**27**	**105**[*]
Q12: Within which region is your institution located?	Northwest	4	1	1	**6**
	Midwest	2	3	1	**6**
	Great Lakes	7	10	10	**27**
	Northeast	11	4	4	**19**
	Southwest	9	4	3	**16**
	South Central	0	2	0	**2**
	South	5	10	6	**21**
	Mid-Atlantic[**]	3	4	2	**9**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

Table 16

Cross Tabulations for Question 2 and Questions 13 through 17

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Has your institution considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?			
		Yes	No	DK	Total
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position?	Graduate Assistant (LGBT office)	2	2	3	**7**
	Specialist (LGBT office)	1	0	0	**1**
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	7	5	4	**16**
	Assistant Director (LGBT office)	2	1	0	**3**
	Associate Director (LGBT office)	2	0	0	**2**
	Director (LGTBT office)	20	10	1	**31**
	Faculty Member	1	3	0	**4**
	Other Administrator	6	17	19	**42**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]
Q14: How long have you held this position?	less than two years	12	15	15	**42**
	2 to 5 years	14	14	7	**35**
	6 to 10 years	11	6	3	**20**
	11 or more years	4	3	2	**9**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]
Q15: Where is your position located on campus?	within an LGBT office	21	11	2	**34**
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	0	1	1	**2**
	within inclusivity initiatives	13	9	2	**24**
	within student affairs	4	11	15	**30**
	within an academic department	0	2	2	**4**
	within another office on campus	3	4	5	**12**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]
Q16: How would you classify your participation with the organization?	member only	23	21	16	**60**
	member with committee work	2	2	5	**9**
	member with leadership	2	3	3	**8**
	member with committee work and leadership experience	14	10	3	**27**
	Total	**41**	**36**	**27**	**104**[*]
Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations in higher education?	less than two years	4	2	2	**8**
	2 to 5 years	12	11	13	**36**
	6 to 10 years	14	14	9	**37**
	11 or more years	11	11	3	**25**
	Total	**41**	**38**	**27**	**106**[*]

Tables 17 and 18 compare the respondents' level of support for the policy at their own institutions (e.g., not at all, somewhat likely, etc.) to institutional demographics: Respondents who worked at larger, public, doctoral-granting institutions and those who had more LGBT experience (e.g., as a Director of an LGBT office or as a member of the Organization with leadership practice) were more likely to support an LGBT admissions policy at their own institutions. Chi Square values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities for each question were: Q9 ($\chi^2 = 26.67$, $df = 24$, $p = .32$), Q10 ($\chi^2 = 9.58$, $df = 12$, $p = .65$), Q11 ($\chi^2 = 9.28$, $df = 12$, $p = .68$), Q12 ($\chi^2 = 20.57$, $df = 28$, $p = .84$), Q13 ($\chi^2 = 35.67$, $df = 28$, $p = .15$), Q14 ($\chi^2 = 8.78$, $df = 12$, $p = .72$), Q15 ($\chi^2 = 24.27$, $df = 20$, $p = .23$), Q16 ($\chi^2 = 8.23$, $df = 12$, $p = .77$), and Q17 ($\chi^2 = 8.86$, $df = 12$, $p = .71$). No tests were found to be statistically significant ($p \leq .05$).

Table 17

Cross Tabulations For Question 3 and Questions 9 through 12

		Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution?					
Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Total
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment?	up to 4,999	2	5	4	1	1	**13**
	5,000 to 9,999	2	2	2	2	5	**13**
	10,000 to 14,999	1	8	2	4	4	**19**
	15,000 to 19,999	1	3	1	2	5	**12**
	20,000 to 24,999	1	0	3	7	2	**13**
	25,000 to 29,999	1	2	2	1	4	**10**
	30,000 plus	4	5	3	5	9	**26**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**
Q10: What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?	associate's	1	1	0	0	0	**2**
	baccalaureate	4	9	5	4	5	**27**
	master's	2	5	4	5	6	**22**
	doctoral	5	10	8	13	19	**55**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**
Q11: What is the overall structure of your institution?	public	8	14	12	19	23	**76**
	private, religious	0	3	1	1	0	**5**
	private, secular	4	7	4	2	7	**24**
	other	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
	Total	**12**	**24**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**105**
Q12: Within which region is your institution located?	Northwest	0	1	2	1	2	**6**
	Midwest	1	2	0	2	1	**6**
	Great Lakes	2	6	6	6	7	**27**
	Northeast	2	6	1	3	7	**19**
	Southwest	1	3	3	2	7	**16**
	South Central	1	0	0	0	1	**2**
	South	3	5	4	7	2	**21**
	Mid-Atlantic[**]	2	2	1	1	3	**9**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

Table 18

Cross Tabulations For Question 3 and Questions 13 through 17

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to your institution?					
		Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Total
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position?	Graduate Asst. (LGBT office)	2	1	2	2	0	**7**
	Specialist (LGBT office)	0	0	0	0	1	**1**
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	0	3	3	5	5	**16**
	Asst. Director (LGBT office)	0	0	1	1	1	**3**
	Assoc. Director (LGBT office)	0	1	0	1	0	**2**
	Director (LGBT office)	0	7	4	5	15	**31**
	Faculty Member	0	0	1	1	2	**4**
	Other Administrator	10	13	6	7	6	**42**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**
Q14: How long have you held this position?	less than 2 years	7	12	7	7	9	**42**
	2 to 5 years	2	7	5	10	11	**35**
	6 to 10 years	1	5	4	4	6	**20**
	11 or more years	2	1	1	1	4	**9**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**
Q15: Where is your position located on campus?	within an LGBT office	0	5	6	9	14	**34**
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	0	1	0	0	1	**2**
	within inclusivity initiatives	2	5	4	5	8	**24**
	within student affairs	5	10	5	6	4	**30**
	within an academic department	1	2	1	0	0	**4**
	within another office on campus	4	2	1	2	3	**12**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**
Q16: How would you classify your participation within the Organization?	member only	6	14	9	14	17	**60**
	member with committee work	2	2	2	2	1	**9**
	member with leadership	1	4	1	1	1	**8**
	member with committee work and leadership experience	3	4	4	5	11	**27**
	Total	**12**	**24**	**16**	**22**	**30**	**104**
Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations?	less than 2 years	1	3	1	1	2	**8**
	2 to 5 years	2	8	6	11	9	**36**
	6 to 10 years	7	8	4	7	11	**37**
	11 or more years	2	6	6	3	8	**25**
	Total	**12**	**25**	**17**	**22**	**30**	**106**

109

Tables 19 and 20 report the extent of the respondents' level of support for the policy within academe in general (e.g., not at all, somewhat likely, etc.) to institutional demographics. These tables, however, present inconclusive results: When respondents were asked if they would want potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within any application at any institution, they (the respondents) seemed evenly divided, although most were "more than likely" to support such a policy. Chi Square values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities for each question were: Q9 ($\chi^2 = 18.84$, $df = 24$, $p = .76$), Q10 ($\chi^2 = 7.80$, $df = 12$, $p = .80$), Q11 ($\chi^2 = 5.29$, $df = 12$, $p = .94$), Q12 ($\chi^2 = 22.57$, $df = 28$, $p = .75$), Q13 ($\chi^2 = 37.47$, $df = 28$, $p = .11$), Q14 ($\chi^2 = 16.70$, $df = 12$, $p = .16$), Q15 ($\chi^2 = 28.10$, $df = 20$, $p = .11$), Q16 ($\chi^2 = 15.47$, $df = 12$, $p = .22$), and Q17 ($\chi^2 = 6.23$, $df = 12$, $p = .90$). No tests were found to be statistically significant ($p \leq .05$).

Table 19

Cross Tabulations For Question 5 and Questions 9 through 12

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?					
		Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Total
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment?	up to 4,999	3	4	2	1	3	**13**
	5,000 to 9,999	3	2	1	3	4	**13**
	10,000 to 14,999	2	6	3	6	2	**19**
	15,000 to 19,999	2	3	1	4	2	**12**
	20,000 to 24,999	1	0	5	4	3	**13**
	25,000 to 29,999	1	2	2	3	2	**10**
	30,000 plus	5	5	8	3	5	**26**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**
Q10: What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?	associate's	1	1	0	0	0	**2**
	baccalaureate	6	7	5	5	4	**27**
	master's	3	4	3	6	6	**22**
	doctoral	7	10	14	13	11	**55**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**
Q11: What is the overall structure of your institution?	public	12	12	18	19	15	**76**
	private, religious	0	2	1	1	1	**5**
	private, secular	5	7	3	4	5	**24**
	other	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
	Total	**17**	**21**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**105**
Q12: Within which region is your institution located?	Northwest	1	1	0	1	3	**6**
	Midwest	1	1	0	3	1	**6**
	Great Lakes	4	6	8	4	5	**27**
	Northeast	2	4	3	4	6	**19**
	Southwest	2	3	5	3	3	**16**
	South Central	1	0	0	0	1	**2**
	South	3	6	4	7	1	**21**
	Mid-Atlantic[**]	3	1	2	2	1	**9**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

Table 20

Cross Tabulations For Question 5 and Questions 13 through 17

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?					
		Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Total
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position?	Graduate Asst. (LGBT office)	3	1	2	1	0	**7**
	Specialist (LGBT office)	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	0	3	5	6	2	**16**
	Asst. Director (LGBT office)	0	0	1	0	2	**3**
	Assoc. Director (LGBT office)	0	1	0	0	1	**2**
	Director (LGBT office)	2	6	7	6	10	**31**
	Faculty Member	0	0	2	1	1	**4**
	Other Administrator	12	11	5	9	5	**42**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**
Q14: How long have you held this position?	less than 2 years	11	7	8	9	7	**42**
	2 to 5 years	3	8	10	8	6	**35**
	6 to 10 years	2	5	3	7	3	**20**
	11 or more years	1	2	1	0	5	**9**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**
Q15: Where is your position located on campus?	within an LGBT office	1	6	12	8	7	**34**
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	0	1	0	0	1	**2**
	within inclusivity initiatives	3	4	3	9	5	**24**
	within student affairs	6	9	4	6	5	**30**
	within an academic department	2	1	1	0	0	**4**
	within another office on campus	5	1	2	1	3	**12**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**
Q16: How would you classify your participation within the Organization?	member only	10	9	16	15	10	**60**
	member with committee work	2	4	1	2	0	**9**
	member with leadership	1	3	2	0	2	**8**
	member with committee work and leadership experience	4	5	2	7	9	**27**
	Total	**17**	**21**	**21**	**24**	**21**	**104**
Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations?	less than 2 years	2	2	2	1	1	**8**
	2 to 5 years	5	6	8	9	8	**36**
	6 to 10 years	8	6	8	9	6	**37**
	11 or more years	2	8	4	5	6	**25**
	Total	**17**	**22**	**22**	**24**	**21**	**106**

Lastly, Tables 21 and 22 compare the respondents' assessment of their own institutions (i.e., how likely would it be to support an LGBT policy) to institutional demographics. Clearly, most institutions, regardless of size, would be less likely to support a policy that measures sexual orientation, and most respondents agree, despite their level of experience. Chi Square values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities for each question were: Q9 ($\chi^2 = 26.01$, $df = 30$, $p = .67$), Q10 ($\chi^2 = 13.41$, $df = 15$, $p = .57$), Q11 ($\chi^2 = 9.16$, $df = 15$, $p = .87$), Q12 ($\chi^2 = 50.55$, $df = 35$, $p = .04$), Q13 ($\chi^2 = 38.53$, $df = 35$, $p = .31$), Q14 ($\chi^2 = 14.55$, $df = 15$, $p = .48$), Q15 ($\chi^2 = 28.41$, $df = 25$, $p = .29$), Q16 ($\chi^2 = 17.70$, $df = 15$, $p = .28$), and Q17 ($\chi^2 = 17.86$, $df = 15$, $p = .27$). Out of all the previous comparisons, only one was statistically significant ($p \leq .05$): Q12 ("Within which region is your institution located?"), which happened within less than a .05 chance of random occurrence.

Table 21

Cross Tabulations For Question 7 and Questions 9 through 12

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Do you think that your institution is likely to support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?						
		Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Don't Know	Total
Q9: What is your institution's approximate enrollment?	up to 4,999	3	4	3	0	1	2	**13**
	5,000 to 9,999	3	6	1	3	0	0	**13**
	10,000 to 14,999	7	4	2	1	1	3	**18**
	15,000 to 19,999	2	3	2	3	1	1	**12**
	20,000 to 24,999	6	2	3	0	1	1	**13**
	25,000 to 29,999	3	4	1	1	1	0	**10**
	30,000 plus	6	7	2	7	0	4	**26**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**
Q10: What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?	associate's	1	1	0	0	0	0	**2**
	baccalaureate	6	8	3	2	2	6	**27**
	master's	8	4	3	6	0	1	**22**
	doctoral	15	17	8	7	3	4	**55**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**
Q11: What is the overall structure of your institution?	public	21	19	11	12	3	10	**76**
	private, religious	3	1	0	0	0	1	**5**
	private, secular	6	9	3	3	2	0	**23**
	other	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
	Total	**30**	**29**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**104**
Q12: Within which region is your institution located?	Northwest	1	2	0	1	2	0	**6**
	Midwest	3	0	0	1	0	1	**6**
	Great Lakes	8	5	4	3	3	4	**27**
	Northeast	2	12	4	1	0	0	**19**
	Southwest	3	3	4	5	0	1	**16**
	South Central	1	1	0	0	0	0	**2**
	South	9	4	1	3	0	4	**21**
	Mid-Atlantic[**]	3	3	1	1	0	1	**9**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**

Note. Each region includes specific states and territories, as defined by the Organization: Northwest (Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming); Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota); Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin); Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont); Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah); South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia); and Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania).

Table 22

Cross Tabulations For Question 7 and Questions 13 through 17

Quantitative Questions	Options for Answers	Do you think that your institution is likely to support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?						
		Not at All	Some-what Likely	More Than Likely	Very Likely	Entirely	Don't Know	Total
Q13: Which of the following titles best describes your position?	Graduate Asst. (LGBT office)	3	0	1	2	0	1	**7**
	Specialist (LGBT office)	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**
	Coordinator (LGBT office)	4	5	2	3	1	1	**16**
	Asst. Director (LGBT office)	0	1	2	0	0	0	**3**
	Assoc. Director (LGBT office)	0	2	0	0	0	0	**2**
	Director (LGBT office)	8	12	5	4	2	0	**31**
	Faculty Member	1	2	0	1	0	0	**4**
	Other Administrator	14	8	4	4	2	9	**41**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**
Q14: How long have you held this position?	less than 2 years	12	11	4	6	3	6	**42**
	2 to 5 years	13	7	8	4	0	3	**35**
	6 to 10 years	3	9	2	4	1	1	**20**
	11 or more years	2	3	0	1	1	1	**8**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**
Q15: Where is your position located on campus?	within an LGBT office	6	14	4	9	0	1	**34**
	within women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies	1	1	0	0	0	0	**2**
	within inclusivity initiatives	7	6	4	3	2	2	**24**
	within student affairs	12	4	3	1	3	6	**29**
	within an academic department	1	1	0	1	0	1	**4**
	within another office on campus	3	4	3	1	0	1	**12**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**
Q16: How would you classify your work with the Organiza-tion?	member only	19	14	8	11	2	6	**60**
	member with committee work	3	2	0	1	0	3	**9**
	member with leadership	2	4	2	0	0	0	**8**
	member with committee work and leadership experience	4	10	4	3	3	2	**26**
	Total	**28**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**103**
Q17: How long have you worked with LGBT populations?	less than 2 years	3	1	0	1	1	2	**8**
	2 to 5 years	11	6	6	7	2	4	**36**
	6 to 10 years	10	15	7	4	0	1	**37**
	11 or more years	6	8	1	3	2	4	**24**
	Total	**30**	**30**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**11**	**105**

Summary of Results in Relation to the Nine Research Questions

Following a 19.3% RR, wherein $N \leq 550$ and $n = 106$, this descriptive study provided

answers to nine research questions (see Table 1). The primary findings from this study were:

1. Ninety percent ($N = 106$, $n = 95$) of respondents were aware that other institutions had

    recently asked, or had considered asking, potential students to reveal their sexual

    orientation within an application.

2. Thirty-nine percent ($N = 106$, $n = 41$) of respondents said that their institutions had

    considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation, 36% ($n = 38$) said no, and 25%

    ($n = 27$) did not know.

3. When asked if they would support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal

    their sexual orientation within an application to their own institution, respondents lacked

    a clear consensus: Twenty-eight percent ($N = 106$, $n = 30$) would be "entirely"

    supportive, whereas the other respondents were largely divided among the remaining four

    options within the Likert scale.

4. When asked for the primary reason behind the answer to the previous question,

    respondents shared a variety of reasons through written responses: Tracking of LGBT

    students (22.1%, $N = 131$, $n = 29$) was the most positive reason, and confidentiality of

    LGBT students' records (13.7%, $N = 131$, $n = 18$) was the most negative.

5. When asked if they would support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal

    their sexual orientation within an application to any institution, respondents again lacked

    a clear consensus: This time, only 20% ($N = 106$, $n = 21$) would be "entirely" supportive.

6. When asked for the primary reason behind the answer to the previous question,

    respondents again shared a variety of reasons through written responses: Tracking of

LGBT students (17.9%, $N = 134$, $n = 24$) was the most positive reason, yet confidentiality of LGBT students' records (14.9%, $N = 134$, $n = 20$) as well as possible ill-intent toward LGBT students (14.9%, $N = 134$, $n = 20$) were equally the most negative.

7. When asked if they thought that their institutions would likely support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation during the application process, respondents provided an unenthusiastic assessment of their own academic environments: Only 5% ($N = 106$, $n = 5$) thought their institutions would be "entirely" supportive, and 29% ($n = 30$) speculated that their institutions would be "not at all" supportive.

8. When asked for the primary reason behind the answer to the previous question, respondents had to assess their institution's climate regarding LGBT matters. In written responses, they identified six reasons why their institutions would or would not add an LGBT demographic to any existing application. The most popular reason, wrote respondents, was administrative interest (27.1%, $N = 96$, $n = 26$), an area that acknowledged certain benefits for LGBT students, such as tracking, diversity, self-actualization, and educational best practices. The most negative reason, added respondents, was administrative challenges (33.3%, $N = 96$, $n = 32$), an area that included the following concerns: a perception of an apathetic, homophobic administration; a resistance toward institutional change; and any hypothetical confidentiality issue that might comprise an LGBT student's academic records.

9. The final research question was: Do certain demographics within the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?

Tables 13-22 revealed various inferences about the demographics of the Organization. A sampling of these inferences were: (a) groups that appeared less aware of the trend started by Elmhurst College were those who worked within the Organization's southern region, those who did not work within an LGBT office, and those who held varying degrees of experience within the Organization; (b) groups that had considered implementing this trend at their own institutions were more likely to be found within an LGBT office; and (c) groups that were located in certain geographic reasons were less likely to believe that their institutions would support the trend.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a summary and discussion of a descriptive study that examined what a national LGBT organization of educators thought about quantifying sexual orientation within a college application. Three sections guide this final chapter: a summary of the results, a discussion of the results, and a conclusion. The second section is further divided into five subsections: an overview; an interpretation of the findings; the relationship of the current study to previous literature; recommendations for LGBT researchers and administrators; and suggestions for additional research involving LGBT students, the college-application process, and the quantification of sexual orientation.

Summary of the Results

After examining a non-representative national LGBT organization of educators (referred to as the Organization throughout Chapter Five), this study generated a response rate of 19.3%, wherein $N \le 550$ and $n = 106$. Although the results from this study were not generalizable to the higher educational LGBT establishment, important findings and recommendations were no less evident as the Organization was an influential cooperative of educators who participated regularly in the following activities: consistent interaction with both LGBT students and campus administrators; professional socialization at national, regional, and local LGBT conferences; scholarly investigation through ongoing LGBT research; and public communication, as

spokespersons for LGBT issues within their academic, religious, political, social, and on-campus communities. Participants were thus able to reveal the following six considerations regarding the quantification of sexual orientation during the admissions process:

1.   Respondents found tracking to be the most beneficial reason to support this policy (see Tables 8 and 10), realizing that institutions could measure matriculation, retention, and graduation rates for LGBT students and could also assess these students in comparison to their peers. One respondent clarified: "I think that it is important for us to be able to quantify the numbers of [LGBT students] we have on campus so that we can track their perceptions of climate, as well as enrollment and retention rates."

2.   Respondents understood that other issues are tied directly to demographical quantification (see Tables 8 and 10). For instance, LGBT administrators could justify campus funding for LGBT centers or outreach programs through numerical data gleaned from the application process. One respondent simplified the matter: "In order to continue getting financial resources for LGBT initiatives, data must be collected to count students."

3.   Respondents realized that the primary detrimental reason to oppose this policy centered upon LGBT students themselves—that these individuals' privacy and/or admissions status could become jeopardized should a homophobic parent, family member, or administrator gain access to application materials that disclose sexual orientation. To illustrate this concern, one respondent imagined a precarious situation: "[The student] may not be out to parents/family and indicating this on [the] application where parents/family could see could be risky . . . . Also, [a] perception could exist that by identifying as LGBTQ could . . . negatively influence admission . . . ."

4. Respondents noted that other issues can also affect the implementation of an LGBT admissions policy. These issues included, for instance, sociopolitical climates, homophobic campus communities, and standardized application processes, such as the Common Application and those for multi-campus institutions. One respondent explained a particular administrative concern for many schools represented within the Organization: "Our institution uses a common [statewide] application so although [administrators] may agree [that an LGBT demographic] needs to be added it would take a higher governing body to affect change."

5. Respondents were often inconsistent when writing about LGBT matters. For instance, some respondents would largely support such a policy (a) at their own institutions but not elsewhere and (b) even when they consider a noticeable lack of LGBT-friendly policies, programs, and people at their own institutions. This conclusion was especially apparent in Table 6. The answers to Q3 (would you support an LGBT demographic at your own institution?) and Q7 (would your institution support an LGBT demographic?) suggested an inverse relationship, via Likert scales: Respondents considered themselves more socially progressive than the institutions in which they worked. Descriptive statistics for these two questions, however, revealed only slight differences: Q3 ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.40$) and Q7 ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.62$).

6. Respondents also shared another set of considerations: The LGBT establishment must educate not only academe at large but its own constituents, some of whom are unaware of any dialogue surrounding such a policy, even at their own institutions, or do not consider any benefits to such a policy, even at a homophobic campus. Although this study was unable to detect specifically these kinds of constituents, cross tabulations revealed, for

instance, that individuals who had less than two years of LGBT experience and who worked outside of an LGBT office were less likely to support an LGBT admissions policy. Similar conclusions also appeared when analyzing, coding, categorizing, and explaining the qualitative questions (Q4, Q6, and Q8, all of which appear within Tables 6-11) and were apparent when reading certain comments, for example, that argued against any relevance of an LGBT admissions policy: e.g., "A student's sexual orientation should not be part of their [sic] acceptance decision."

Discussion of the Results

This section contains five subsections: an overview; an interpretation of the findings; the relationship of the current study to previous literature; recommendations for LGBT researchers and administrators; and suggestions for additional research involving LGBT students, the college-application process, and the quantification of sexual orientation.

Overview

Printed words evoke different emotions, even when read within sanitized instructional manuals and promotional publications (Mehta, 2010), such as those distributed by a university's admissions office. Words that denote sexual orientation and gender identity are even more semantically charged, especially when potential students investigate educational publications for written evidence of an institution's pro-LGBT policies (Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012; Young, 2011). Unfortunately, LGBT applicants find very little notice of themselves when viewing highly-edited stock photos of happy-go-lucky students within a brochure, webpage, or catalogue. Although applicants might discover that diversity—race, sex, ethnicity—is readily apparent,

sexual orientation, they learn, is clearly absent—which, to be fair, could mean that an institution only wishes to avoid pernicious stereotypes by dodging any particularly thorny queer visibility.

A handful of institutions, however, have made a concerted effort to address LGBT inclusivity—either by using their applications to identify specifically LGBT students, as do Elmhurst College and the University of Iowa (UI), or by using alternate methods, as do, for instance, Dartmouth College, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Southern California (Ceglar, 2012). Figure 1 demonstrates the visual, emotional impact of these kinds of recruitment efforts at Elmhurst and UI, illustrating that words even *associated* with sexual orientation hold marked connotative value:

Elmhurst College: Application for Admission

Do you **consider** yourself to be a member of the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) community?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer Not to Answer

The University of Iowa: Application for Admission

Do you **identify** with the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) community?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer Not to Answer

Figure 1. Identifying LGBT Applicants: Elmhurst College and the University of Iowa. Adapted from (a) "Elmhurst College: Application for Admission," 2012, retrieved from http://media.elmhurst.edu/documents/Elmhurst_Application_2012.pdf ; and (b) "University of Iowa Will Ask Applicants if They Identify with Gay Community," by E. Hoover, 2012, *Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(17), p. 11.

In Figure 1, the verbs *consider* and *identify* speak directly to potential students: "Iowa does not pose the question so directly: To say you 'identify' with the LGBT community doesn't necessarily mean you belong to it" (Hoover, 2012, p. 11). It is precisely these kinds of efforts—a deliberative choice of words within an application, a determined commitment to LGBT diversity, even an apathetic reaction to the LGBT community—that give importance to this study: to explain what the quantification of sexual orientation means for those who work with LGBT students in higher education.

Interpretation of the Findings

The most important finding in this study centered upon the concept of tracking: Without an LGBT demographic, an institution cannot measure matriculation, retention, and graduation rates for LGBT students, nor can it assess these students in comparison to their peers. Respondents consistently wrote about tracking when answering the qualitative questions (Q4, Q6, and Q8), and they shared similar concerns:

> I would love to have this information so we can identify these students early in their college careers, give them targeted information about services that can aid in their success in college and truly assess our retention efforts.

> Otherwise we have no way to track these students' retention and graduation rates, provide targeted services, [and] inform students about services.

> It will help us know the fuller picture of LGBTQAAIP students' experiences on college campus, i.e., retention, GPA, involvement—raw data rather than relying on anecdotal evidence. [The standard LGBT acronym appears differently in some of the responses about tracking. For an additional explanation of the LGBT acronym and how it can be altered—e.g., *LGBTQAAIP*—see (a) List of Abbreviations and (b) Terminology, Chapter One.

> We need data to determine if GLBT students are recruited, persist, and graduate at the same rates as non-GLBT students. Institutions can't address any potential problems for this population if they have no data on them.

[I am] curious as to who[m] our population is and how we can better serve them [and] would like to know if we are retaining our LGBTQ population.

It would be beneficial to track achievement, engagement, and all other issues in the same way we track other students.

[Tracking] has been part of a national conversation about what is useful information to gather. [Institutions are] thinking about how [they] may use this data.

If we know the sexual orientation and gender identity demographics of our entering students, we can track their academic progress in relation to the campus climate and make adjustments should there be graduation disparities. Moreover, we can track those intersecting identities, such as queer Latinas, and again get clearer on how these folks are experiencing our university. Also, we can track which majors and fields LGBT students trend towards and why. For those campuses that conduct ongoing assessment of the student experience we can track any rise or fall in the numbers of LGBT folks and perhaps even be able to track who graduates and who is leaving/stopping out, etc. Basically, if we don't collect data we are doing a disservice to LGBT students and more broadly to society—besides the census is starting to do a better job of collecting this data so why wouldn't a university? [For ease of reading this response has been slightly edited.]

In fact, tracking was the most popular answer to Q4 (why would you [not] support an LGBT demographic at your own institution?) as well as to Q6 (why would you [not] support an LGBT demographic within academe in general?); and it was the second most popular answer to Q8 (why would your institution [not] support an LGBT demographic?). Descriptive statistics for tracking were: Q4 ($N = 131$, $n = 29$, 22.1%); Q6 ($N = 134$, $n = 24$, 17.9%); and Q8 ($N = 96$, $n = 26$, 27.1%). These figures also suggested another conclusion: Institutions (see Q8) seemed to value tracking slightly more than LGBT administrators (see Q4 and Q6). This previous conclusion is nonetheless highly speculative, even though it supports the popularized notion of a data-driven administration (e.g.,Picciano, 2012; Voorhees, 2008).

Tracking also allows institutions to determine which demographic groups drop-out, stop-out, and/or transfer; what grades they make; and to what degree they meet regularly with an advisor, select particular majors/minors, apply for graduate programs, and enroll in

125

developmental, honors, or on-line courses. By not quantifying sexual orientation, institutions cannot determine—other than conducting anecdotal observations—if LGBT students are academically (un)successful, cognitively (un)prepared, psychosocially (mal)adjusted, or professionally (ill-)equipped. Institutions also cannot calculate LGBT students' graduation rates, draw statistical comparisons between these students and their peers, or codify any other systematic LGBT figure over time (e.g., Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012; Windmeyer, Humphrey, & Baker, 2013). On most campuses, LGBT students are demographically invisible—or "relatively unknown" (Ceglar, 2012, p. 22)—and these problems only compound when issues surrounding intersectionality arise (Abes, 2012; Cheshire, 2013; Patton et al., 2010; Poynter & Washington, 2005).

Despite these limitations, the Education Resources Information Center, or ERIC, reveals that researchers have recently made significant discoveries about tracking when studying the following demographic groups: African Americans (Baker & Robnett, 2012; Chandler, 2011; Grier-Reed, Ehlert, & Dade, 2011; Grier-Reed, Madyun, & Buckley, 2008; Palmer, Maramba, & Dancy, 2011); Latinos (Perez, 2010; Sandoval-Lucero, Maes, & Chopra, 2011); women (Bliss, Webb, & St. Andre, 2012; Ong, Wright, Espinosa, & Orfield, 2011); and adult learners (Lei, Gorelick, Short, Smallwood, & Wright-Porter, 2011). In all of these studies, researchers identified their populations by accessing institutional databases, in which the demography of the student body depended upon a sustained quantification of sex, age, race, ethnicity, and even religious affiliation during the application process. Conspicuously absent in this previous list, of course, is an LGBT demographic. Windmeyer et al. (2013) share this concern: "Currently there is not any other known standard LGBT identity-based practice being used for tracking retention and matriculation of LGBT students at other colleges [aside from Elmhurst and UI]" (p. 4).

126

Another important finding within this study focused on *fluctuating LGBT support*—a phrase that denotes how respondents, as LGBT administrators, issued conflicting statements about their commitment to LGBT diversity. This finding was quite remarkable considering that 56.6% of respondents ($N = 106$, $n = 60$) worked within an LGBT on-campus office and that 92.0% ($N = 106$, $n = 98$) had worked two or more years with LGBT students (see Table 6). Numerous examples of *fluctuating LGBT support* were found within the quantitative and qualitative data, yet a discussion of only two instances appears within this final chapter.

The first example came from various reasons that were collectively identified by the respondents in Q4 (why would you [not] support an LGBT demographic at your own institution?) and Q6 (why would you [not] support an LGBT demographic within academe in general?). In one instance, respondents determined that demographic data gleaned from quantification might lead institutions to make discriminatory decisions that would negatively impact the application process and harm the LGBT applicant (see Tables 7-10). One respondent effectively summarized the concern: "I would be fearful that this information would bias admissions officers against applicants." What was interesting about respondents' reservation toward quantification was that they, as a whole, regulated their support when providing written responses to Q4 and Q6: Only 9.9% ($N = 131$, $n = 13$) thought that discriminatory decisions might happen at their own institutions, whereas 14.9% ($N = 134$, $n = 20$) feared that discriminatory decisions might happen on other campuses. (See Tables 8 and 10 for a comparison of other categories, particularly *educational outreach for LGBT students* and *advocacy for LGBT students*.) Nevertheless, an alternate explanation could be coaxed from these results: that respondents would err on the side of caution—or strive to protect any LGBT student far removed from their secure domain.

The second example of *fluctuating LGBT support* appeared within Q3 and Q5—a situation in which respondents again regulated their support, rating more favorably their own institutions over others (see Table 6). When answering Q3 (would you support an LGBT demographic at your own institution?), respondents replied: not at all (11.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 12$); somewhat likely (24.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 25$); more than likely (16.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 17$); very likely (21.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 22$); or entirely (28.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 30$). When answering Q5 (would you support an LGBT demographic within academe in general?), respondents replied differently: not at all (16.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 17$); somewhat likely (21.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 22$); more than likely (21.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 22$); very likely (23.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 24$); or entirely (20.0%, $N = 106$, $n = 21$). Thus, the notion of *fluctuating LGBT support* was readily apparent here as well, most noticeably within two options: (a) the fifth—i.e., "I would be *entirely* supportive of an LGBT demographic"—which generated 28.0% for Q3 (own institution) but only 20.0% for Q5 (other institutions); and (b) the first—i.e., "I would be *not at all* supportive"—which prompted only 11.0% for Q3 (own institution) but 16% for Q5 (other institutions). The differences in the previous examples were slight, but they nonetheless indicated a *fluctuating-LGBT-support* matrix: In general, assessment of the LGBT climate was more favorable whenever respondents assessed their own workplaces and less so whenever they imagined unfamiliar locales.

Schmidt, Githens, Rocco, and Kormanik (2012) offer a possible rationalization for respondents' *fluctuating LGBT support*: "For LGBT employees, career development is challenging due to the dilemma of [how to manage] identity in a multitude of work-related interactions [either real or imagined]. Identity has to be managed for LGBT people at the same time individuals are developing their identities as [members of the] LGBT [community]" (p. 339). Identity synthesis—as noted by Cass (1984), Coleman (1981), and Troiden (1979)—is an

ongoing process that continues throughout adulthood for "out" gay men and lesbians as they maneuver familiar and unfamiliar territories—even within academe (Halpin & Allen, 2004). For allies of the LGBT community who work with LGBT students—and it cannot be assumed that every respondent was undoubtedly gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender—the lingering effects of homophobia and heterosexism may have influenced the degree of support (Ayres & Brown, 2005; DiStefano, Croteau, Anderson, Kampa-Kokesch, & Bullard, 2000; Evans & Broido, 2005; Watt, 2007). In any event, identity synthesis, internal homophobia, external homophobia, and heterosexism are inextricably bound, and they appeared to affect respondents' fluctuating attitudes about the quantification of sexual orientation.

Relationship of the Current Study to Previous Literature

Throughout much of the twentieth century, LGBT college students periodically experienced institutionalized homophobia and heterosexism—as well as regular acts of kindness and compassion. This claim (see also Chapter Three) is well supported through important works such as Faderman's (1991) groundbreaking exploration of early-twentieth century female-female relationships on college campuses; Wright's (2005) investigation of Harvard's relentless eradication of gay men during the 1920s; and Windmeyer and Freeman's (1998, 2000) anecdotal examinations of fraternities, sororities, homosexuality, and homophobia. Eventually, however, LGBT college students noticed a marked increase in social responsiveness, especially in light of a monumental demonstration in Manhattan at the Stonewall Inn in 1969: Gay men and lesbians retaliated against the homophobic establishment and successfully turned the march toward civic equality in their direction, providing a radical, new gay visibility during the forthcoming decades (Davis & Heilbroner, 2011; Duberman, 1993; Marotta, 2006). Throughout the 1970s, 1980s, and

1990s, LGBT centers, outreach programs, and fields of studies proliferated (Marine, 2011), and researchers began addressing the efficacy of these efforts (Miranda & Storms, 1989; Tierney, 1992) and discovering inventive ways to address this marginalized population (Beemyn, 2002). In many ways, then, what happened at Elmhurst College and the University of Iowa was merely an evolutionary occurrence within the LGBT continuum—shaped not only by academe but by other social, cultural, religious, political, and legal forces (e.g., Chenier, 2013; *The Christian Legal Society UCLA v. Martinez*, 2010; Duberman, 1993; T. Johnson, 2012; Marine, 2011; *United States v. Windsor*, 2013).

During the last few decades, institutions have continued to address their LGBT students through programs like Safe Zone (Alvarez & Schneider, 2008; Evans, 2002; Wantanabe, 1996) and Lavender Graduation (Hauswirth, 2006; Penn, 2008; Sanlo, 2000), and most recently through the quantification of sexual orientation, which, say some researchers, is a necessary, beneficial practice (e.g., Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012; Windmeyer et al., 2013). Perhaps this trend toward LGBT-demographic specialization is best summarized with a popular saying: "I know no way of judging the future but by the past" (Henry, 1775, as cited in Bartlett & Kaplan, 1982, p. 339). This maxim speaks not only to the rapid propagation of LGBT outreach but to higher education's inexorable fascination with retention and accountability as they relate to (LGBT) students, institutional effectiveness, taxpayers, stakeholders, and the economy (e.g., Conner & Rabovsky, 2011; Marchand & Stoner, 2012; McKeown-Moak, 2013). The American College Personnel Association recognizes this concern as well, providing an official statement about the quantification of sexual orientation:

> Institutions of higher education should be held responsible for the retention and academic success of every student. There is no reason today why colleges and universities should not be held accountable for the campus climate as well as want to ensure the academic

130

success and retention of LGBT students. We track retention for other student populations. Now is the time to do so for LGBT students. (Windmeyer et al., 2013, p. 4)

This directive likewise acknowledges this study's primary finding—that tracking of LGBT students can allow institutions to understand more clearly the determinants of academic success or failure for marginalized populations (e.g., Baker & Robnett, 2012; Ong et al., 2011; Perez, 2010).

Other findings revealed that respondents would not want to quantify sexual orientation because they were concerned about the confidentiality of LGBT students' records and the lawfulness of an LGBT admissions policy (see Tables 7-10). These findings were also consistent with previous literature: Many respondents attributed their reasons for not quantifying sexual orientation to FERPA (1974), and occasionally to HIPAA (1996), and they referenced these federal acts' guidelines, demonstrating a clear understanding of the legalities that govern the confidentiality of personal, academic, and medical information (e.g., Baker, 2005; Essex, 2000; Hodum & James, 2010; Klein, 2008; "Legislative history of major FERPA provisions," 2004; McDaniel et al., 2001; McDonald, 2008; Weeks, 2001). Respondents were also aware of additional legal considerations, implicitly mentioning landmark cases from the Supreme Court: *United States v. Windsor* (2013), which invalidated Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (1996); as well as *Regents v. the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) and *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003), all of which examined race, affirmative action, the college application process, and the calculated selection of a diverse student body (e.g., Garces, 2012) . By referencing these court cases, as well as FERPA, respondents illustrated their knowledge of certain legislative and constitutional protections for LGBT individuals and other minorities. (For a further discussion of these and other LGBT cases from the Supreme Court—and of FERPA

and HIPAA—refer to Chapter Two: (a) Legal Considerations for Working with LGBT Students and (b) Ethical Matters: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.)

Recommendations for LGBT Researchers and Administrators

The first recommendation references the LGBT lexicon, which includes certain words that can impede communication. The terms *sexual orientation*, *gender identity*, *homosexuality*, *heterosexuality*, *bisexuality*, *sexuality*, *transgender, cisgender*, and *LGBT* hold specific denotations (see also Terminology, Chapter One)—and LGBT professionals understand each term's precise psychosexual, semantic context. However, this study possibly included contradictory nomenclature within the questionnaire's primary question: "Are you aware that other institutions have recently asked (or are considering asking) potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application for college admission? (A possible question to students on an application might read: Would you consider yourself a member of the LGBT community?)." Most respondents easily answered the question, yet one respondent rightly noted that *sexual orientation* does not apply to the *T* (transgender) within the LGBT acronym:

> I . . . think that the question should be worded so that we are asking about sexual orientation, not the LGBT community. The 'T' should be separate from sexual orientation [because it distinctly references gender identity] and the question should include heterosexual orientation as well. This way everyone is being asked the [same] question, not just the LGB population.

This explanation, in effect, summarizes the first recommendation: Researchers should add *gender identity* to any LGBT study that examines demographic specialization. Thus, a potential question to respondents might read: "Are you aware that other institutions have asked students to reveal their sexual orientation *and gender identity* within an application for college admission?" The addition of *gender identity* also serves another purpose: to recognize an

132

institution's transgender students, who are often overlooked within LGB(T) scholarship and by society at large (Newhouse, 2013; Stryker, 2008).

This researcher, however, does not recommend adding *heterosexual* to a potential questionnaire or to an application: (a) heterosexual orientation is implied should a student mark "no"—as in: *I am* not *a member of the LGBT community*; (b) the term itself, like the word *homosexual*, is often pejorative; and (c) too many terms would simply obfuscate both students and researchers. At any rate, the discussion about the LGBT lexicon is not limited merely to this study; it pervades LGBT scholarship and outreach, especially when the traditional acronym expands, like LGBTQQIAAPPG (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, ally, polyamorous, pansexual, and genderqueer), and/or departs, like SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity). (For an additional explanation of the LGBT acronym and how it can be altered—e.g., *GLBT* v. *LGBT v. LGBTQQIAAPG*—see (a) List of Abbreviations and (b) Terminology, Chapter One.)

The second recommendation is directed toward LGBT administrators who work in LGBT centers: The quantification of sexual orientation (and gender identity) would provide these centers with quantifiable data—e.g., "we have 452 LGBT students at XYZ State University"— that would, in turn, strengthen intra-institutional assessment: e.g., "During the fall semester, we provided services to 78.0% of our LGBT population." This recommendation comes from findings within Tables 8 and 10—both of which revealed that funding was an important reason for quantifying sexual orientation: Q4 (9.9%, $N = 131$, $n = 13$) and Q6 (7.5%, $N = 134$, $n = 10$). One respondent noted: "In order to continue getting financial resources for LGBT initiatives, data must be collected to count students." In fact, justification for funding is an integral component of student affairs, and research reveals how data, along with other measures, affect

the availability and quality of diversity initiatives (Bresciani, 2010; Hernandez & Hernandez, 2011; Plageman, 2011; Rames, 2000).

The third recommendation also addresses LGBT administrators, as well as their colleagues in admissions offices: Although many institutions recognize the benefits of quantifying sexual orientation, along with gender identity, they should first determine if such a practice is feasible in light of available LGBT resources. At schools with LGBT centers, these resources are plentiful—even prototypical—offering LGBT students the following kinds of opportunities: social interaction, gender-neutral housing, internships, counseling, colloquia, academic enrichment through LGBT fields of study and scholarships, and specialized curricula, like Safe Zone, Lavender Graduation, and hate-crime prevention (e.g., Ryan, 2005; Sanlo, 2005). Fine (2012) presents a similar conclusion: "[C]ampuses that have greater person resources—that is, a larger student body with more diverse needs to serve—may be more inclined to create an LGBT resource center [e.g., to quantify sexual orientation] to serve sexual minorities" (pp. 294-295).

At other schools, however, LGBT resources are conceptual, scarce, absent, or even expressly forbidden—and the feasibility of quantifying sexual orientation is further complicated by various religious, institutional, and geopolitical forces (e.g., Cramer & Ford, 2011; Falcone, 2011; Garcia, 2013; Hermann, 2010; Robertson, 2010). Realizing these circumstances, a few respondents wrote about geopolitical feasibility when answering the questionnaire's open-ended prompts (see Table 13) and argued, for instance, that "[we could not quantify sexual orientation because we] are a flagship public university in the Southeast with a very conservative state legislature." One respondent, however, addressed feasibility further: "[I'm] not sure we are ready to deal with this information once we collect it." This statement also brings to light

134

another concern with feasibility: Despite abundant LGBT resources, an institution might not be able to examine LGBT data accurately and meaningfully—or connect LGBT students adequately to various programs. Thus, feasibility is a crucial component of the LGBT-quantification mix, and LGBT administrators should reconsider their institutional responsibilities: (a) to continue (or begin) implementing LGBT resources; (b) to educate their stakeholders, naysayers and confederates alike; and (c) to consult campus climate surveys that identify evolving attitudes surrounding sexual orientation (e.g., Brown & Gortmaker, 2009; Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger, & Hope, 2013; Vaccaro, 2012).

The final recommendation considers a paradox. The quantification of sexual orientation would improve future scholarship by giving researchers categorical access to LGBT populations gathered from a single campus, a specific region, or a collection of similar schools (e.g., urban, suburban, rural, private, religious, land-grant, liberal arts, junior colleges, athletic conference, Carnegie classification, or Ivy League). As it now stands, researchers must repeatedly identify these populations through nonprobability methodologies, such as convenience sampling, snowball sampling, and purposive sampling, and must generally abandon equal-probability methodologies, such as cluster sampling and systematic sampling (see also Population, Chapter Three). When writing a meta-analysis of contemporary LGBT scholarship, Renn (2010) identifies a similar concern: "[E]xisting studies of LGBT issues in higher education too frequently rely on convenience samples, limited data, and unsophisticated data analysis and/or interpretation [of trivial qualitative studies involving too few subjects]" (p. 137). The catch-22, of course, becomes manifestly obvious: Without an LGBT demographic, LGBT scholarship cannot adequately address the LGBT demographic. This final recommendation, therefore, is a call for sustained deliberation —for LGBT administrators to recognize that the quantification of

sexual orientation can generate valuable, quantitative scholarship along with educational best practices for LGBT students.

Suggestions for Additional Research

The first suggestion focuses on the ongoing deliberation over an LGBT demographic, a situation that often presents a single viewpoint: The debate is dominated by LGBT administrators and their sympathizers, playing out within mainstream academic publications like *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed* (e.g., Almeida-Neveu, 2010; DeSantis, 2012; Hoover, 2011, 2012; Jaschik, 2010, 2011; Johnson, 2013; Kahlenberg, 2011; Ray, 2011), as well as within this very study. Three other groups, however, have rarely shared their recommendations and reservations about an LGBT demographic—groups that include LGBT students, students in general, and admissions officers (e.g., Carillo, 2012; Mannion, 2011; Montes, 2011). Students have the most to gain, or lose, when declaring their sexual orientation—heterosexual or otherwise—and their opinions have provided institutions with additional considerations about possible pro-LGBT policies (e.g., Young, 2011) along with a better understanding of LGBT self-actualization, homonegativity, homophobia, and heterosexism within a college environment (Chonody, Siebert, & Rutledge, 2009; Crama, Miller, Amacker, & Burks, 2013; Furrow, 2012; Iconis, 2010; Pettijohn & Walzer, 2008; Ripley, Anderson, McCormack, & Rockett, 2012; Rogers, McRee, & Arntz, 2009; Schmidt, Miles, & Welsh, 2011; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008). These social paradigms, however, could also influence students' (un)willingness to declare their sexual orientation within an application—and current research needs to explore this matter further. Moreover, admissions officers have remained collectively silent within the existing literature, yet three officers have previously offered professional advice within the *Journal of College Admissions*, published by

the National Association for College Admission in Counseling, addressing the recruitment of LGBT students in general (Baum, 2012; Ceglar, 2012) and of transgender students (Newhouse, 2013). Therefore, researchers must address these groups if they are to understand fully the implications of quantifying sexual orientation (and gender identity).

The second suggestion focuses on this study's inconclusive results. Any descriptive study seeks only to describe a particular phenomenon—not to make predictions, confirm hypotheses, or uncover causality and correlations; consequently, the findings support only a preliminary framework, often indicating plausible conclusions and raising further questions. This descriptive study produced similar effects, and its findings lead this researcher to suggest that the quantification of sexual orientation needs further investigation. This advice speaks to two inconclusive results: (a) the reasons for *fluctuating LGBT support* (see Interpretation of the Findings, Chapter Five); and (b) the data for the ninth research question (Do certain demographics with the Organization indicate support, or lack of support, of a policy that urges potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission within academe in general?). First, researchers should determine why LGBT administrators regulated their advocacy for the quantification of sexual orientation by rating their own campuses more LGBT-friendly and academe less so. Secondly, researchers should identify specifically those LGBT administrators—as indicated through demographical demarcations (e.g., place of work, type of position, tenure of LGBT experience)—who are more likely (not) to support the quantification of sexual orientation. It should be noted here that demographical research, for instance, has previously revealed the prevalence of LGBT centers within certain geographic regions (Fine, 2012). By further examining these two areas—*fluctuating LGBT support* and demographical demarcations—the LGBT establishment can provide a cogent, educative response

137

to hesitant colleagues, who mistrust the advantages of quantification, and to other administrators and stakeholders.

Conclusion

Elmhurst College made a brave decision in 2011—to ask potential students if they considered themselves members of the LGBT community—and many institutions wondered: *What are we doing to identify our LGBT students*? *Should we follow Elmhurst's lead? Or just observe the aftermath cautiously—even dodge the matter altogether?* Easy answers, however, were not to be found, and a contentious debate ensued, within both the mass media and academe. The reason for this controversy undoubtedly centered upon the very foundation of the debate: Forty-five years after Stonewall, sexual orientation remains a divisive issue, even within progressive places like metropolitan Chicago, where Elmhurst is located, and on college campuses, where open-minded faculty and staff drive innovative policy and pedagogy.

Today, three years after Elmhurst's bold move, institutions are still wondering and waiting. Their reluctance to follow Elmhurst is tied largely to influential polemics—those who wish to protect LGBT students and those who want to avoid them—yet there are numerous supporters who recognize the benefits of asking students to reveal their sexual orientation within a college application. Not surprisingly, one of these supporters is the president of Elmhurst, S. Alan Ray, who recently reiterated the institution's commitment to diversity when addressing alumni within *FYI Magazine*:

> By constructively engaging very different perspectives—be they religious, political, gender, geographical or sexual orientation, to name a few—our students become informed, self-critical advocates for certain values over others because they've seen the alternatives and consciously selected the ones they will operate out of. That can only be done if you've had the opportunity in college to dialogue with other people, maybe argue with them, and maybe be converted to their points of view. If you've had that kind of

138

dress rehearsal in college, you're better prepared to engage a complex world. (Santella, 2013, para. 11)

Progressive viewpoints like these propel the evolution and proliferation of LGBT outreach within higher education, and LGBT-friendly institutions continue to adapt to a rapidly changing society, where inclusivity depends upon a sustained, deliberative recognition of demographical diversification.

Still, Elmhurst only initiated the national dialogue about quantification—and LGBT administrators must diligently carry the conversation forward, working collaboratively to ensure that LGBT students can declare confidently their sexual orientation and gender identity during the application process. This researcher suggests that LGBT administrators consider three goals as they continue to talk with stakeholders and among themselves. The first goal is educative in nature: to identify which institutions and colleagues need additional information and support. This study, for instance, revealed that faculty members and non-LGBT administrators are less likely to be aware of what happened at Elmhurst or if their own institutions have considered quantifying sexual orientation during the application process. These individuals, however, often significantly influence decision-making when working with cross-campus committees, faculty senates, and professional organizations; and their collective efforts would encourage additional constructive dialogue. The second goal is to provide the Common Application with current research and anecdotal observations, persuasively illustrating that the quantification of sexual orientation leads to positive results—for instance, tracking LGBT students indicates that they differ academically and socially from their non-LGBT peers and that they need additional support in order to stay in school and to graduate. (For a further discussion of the Common Application, refer to Statement of Problem, Chapter One.) The third goal is for all LGBT administrators to enter into an immediate conversation with their institutions about LGBT

139

students and the application process. This study, for instance, showed that almost two thirds of respondents reported either that their institutions had not considered such a policy or that they (respondents) did not know of any considerations (e.g., see Tables 15 and 16). This conclusion was quite telling: If approximately a mere third of respondents revealed an awareness of talks at their own institutions, then few discussions about quantification are actually taking place. By accomplishing these previous goals, LGBT administrators can develop an application process (generally speaking) that recognizes and validates LGBT applicants, whose rich personal experiences and academic contributions, upon matriculation, will continue to diversify each institution's demography.

This study identified many of the considerations that surrounded the quantification of sexual orientation: to determine the number of institutions that have considered implementing such a policy, to identify the advantages and disadvantages of such a policy (e.g., tracking LGBT students throughout their academic tenure and recognizing sociopolitical forces that might harm them), to provide recommendations for institutions to consider further, and to suggest new areas of research involving LGBT students and admissions officers. Although asking students to self-report their sexual orientation might issue ethical and administrative concerns, the benefits, stress this researcher, far exceed possible risks. Therefore, institutions should begin to identify potential LGBT students during the application process—or at least to deliberate the matter voluntarily, swiftly, thoroughly, and without homophobic prejudice. To reject the idea entirely would indicate that an institution does not value its LGBT constituents—students, faculty members, staff, and alumni—and that it does not studiously observe the ever-evolving socio-academic community.

REFERENCES

Abes, E. S. (2012). Constructivist and intersectional interpretations of a lesbian college student's multiple social identities. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(2), 186-216.

Adams, C. (2012). College remains elusive goal for many Latino students. *Education Week, 31*(34), 16-19.

Akombo, D. O. (2013). Scholarship and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 20*(1), 3-6.

Almeida-Neveu, K. (2010). Diversify diversity: Remembering gay students in recruiting. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(5), B38-B39.

Alphabet soup. (2012, August 22). *The Advocate.* Retrieved from http://www.advocate.com/arts-entertainment/advocate-45/2012/08/22/lgbtqqia

Alvarez, S. D., & Schneider, J. (2008). One college campus's need for a safe zone: a case study. *Journal of Gender Studies, 17*(1).

Anastas, J. W. (1999). *Research design for social work and the human services*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Anderson, G. M. (2005). In the name of diversity: Education and the commoditization and consumption of race in the United States. *Urban Review, 37*(5), 399-423. doi: 10.1007/s11256-005-0017-z

Anderson, R. (1955). *Tea and sympathy*. New York, NY: Samuel French.

Armstrong, E. A. (2002). *Forging gay identities: Organizing sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Armstrong, E. A., & Crage, S. M. (2006). Movements and memory: The making of the Stonewall myth. *American Sociological Review*(5), 724-751. doi: 10.2307/25472425

Ault, R. L. (1993). To waive or not to waive? Students' misconceptions about the confidentiality choice for letters of recommendation. *Teaching of Psychology, 20*, 44-45. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top2001_10

Ayres, I., & Brown, J. G. (2005). *Straightforward: How to mobilize heterosexual support for gay rights*. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.

141

Baez, J., Howd, J., & Pepper, R. (2007). *The gay and lesbian guide to college life*. New York, NY: The Princeton Review.

Baker, C. N., & Robnett, B. (2012). Race, social support, and college student retention: A case study. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(2), 325-335.

Baker, T. R. (2005). Notifying parents following a college student suicide attempt: A review of case law and FERPA and recommendations for practice. *NASPA Journal, 42*(4), 513-533.

Ballinger, P. (2007). Why and how socioeconomic factors should be used in selective college admissions. *New Directions for Student Services*(118), 3-15.

Bannon, A. (1957). Odd girl out. San Francisco, CA: Cleis Press.

Bartlett, J., & Kaplan, J. (Eds.). (1982). *Bartlett's familiar quotations* (16 ed.). Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations, 61*(8), 1139-1160.

Baum, B. S. (2012). LGBT applicants and challenges for admission: Five cases. *Journal of College Admission*(217), 25-29.

Bazarsky, D. (2007). Forward. In J. Baez, J. Howd & R. Pepper (Eds.), *The gay and lesbian guide to college life.* (pp. vii-ix). New York, NY: Random House.

Beauchamp, T. (2011, August 8). Elmhurst College asks for sexual orientation on admissions application. *Americablog.* Retrieved from http://americablog.com/2011/08/elmhurst-college-asks-for-sexual-orientation-on-admissions-application.html

Beemyn, B. (2002). The development and administration of campus LGBT centers and offices. In R. Sanlo, S. Rankin & R. Schoenberg (Eds.), *Our place on campus: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender services and programs in higher education* (pp. 25-32). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Bergerson, A. A. (2009). College choice and access to college: Moving policy, research, and   practice to the 21st century. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 35*(4), 1-141.

Blackburn, M. V., & Smith, J. M. (2010). Moving beyond the inclusion of LGBT-themed literature in English language arts classrooms: Interrogating heteronormativity and exploring intersectionality. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53*(8), 625-634.

Bliss, C., Webb, J., & St. Andre, M. (2012). The impact of the University of Utah's LEAP program on student performance. *Journal of General Education, 61*(1), 39-58.

Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186 (1986).

Bram, C. (2012). *Eminent outlaws: The gay writers who changed America*. New York, NY: Twelve.

Bresciani, M. J. (2010). Data-driven planning: Using assessment in strategic planning. *New Directions for Student Services*(132), 39-50.

Bronski, M. (2003). *Pulp friction: Uncovering the golden age of gay male pulps*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Bronski, M. (2011). *A queer history of the United States*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Brown, R. D., & Gortmaker, V. J. (2009). Assessing campus climates for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students: methodological and political issues. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 6*(4), 416-435. doi: 10.1080/19361650903296429

Brown, R. M. (1973). *Rubyfruit jungle*. New, York, NY: Bantam.

Brown, R. M. (n. d.). About Rita Mae. *Rita Mae Brown*. Retrieved from http://www.ritamaebrown.com/content/about.asp

Carillo, N. (2012, April 1). Asking for sexual orientation on colleges apps invades privacy. *The Daily 49er.* Retrieved from http://www.daily49er.com/opinion/2012/04/01/asking-for-sexual-orientation-on-college-apps-invades-privacy/

Carter, D. (2009). What made Stonewall different. *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide, 16*(5), 11-13.

CAS self assessment guide for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender programs and services. (2009) *Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC.

Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 9*(2/3), 105.

Cawthon, T. W. (2004). Using entertainment media to inform student affairs teaching and practice related to sexual orientation. *New Directions for Student Services*(108), 37-47.

Ceglar, T. (2012). Targeted recruitment of GLBT students by colleges and universities. *Journal of College Admissions, 1*(215), 18-23.

Chandler, D. R. (2011). Proactively addressing the shortage of Blacks in psychology: highlighting the school psychology subfield. *Journal of Black Psychology, 37*(1), 99-127. doi: 10.1177/0095798409359774

Chapman, R., Wardrop, J., Freeman, P., Zappia, T., Watkins, R., & Shields, L. (2012). A descriptive study of the experiences of lesbian, gay and transgender parents accessing health services for their children. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 21*(7/8), 1128-1135. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03939.x

Chauncey, G. (1994). *Gay New York: Gender, urban culture, and the making of the gay male world 1890-1940*. New, York, NY: Basic Books.

Chenier, E. (2013). Gay marriage, 1970s style. *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide, 2*(20), 19-21.

Cheshire, L. C. (2013). Reconsidering sexual Identities: Intersectionality theory and the implications for educating counsellors. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy, 47*(1), 4-13.

Chonody, J. M., Siebert, D. C., & Rutledge, S. E. (2009). College students' attitudes toward gays and lesbians. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(3), 499-512.

The Christian Coalition of Georgetown v. Georgetown University, 484 U.S. 1039 (1987).

The Christian Legal Society UCLA v. Martinez, 130 S. Ct. 2971 (2010).

Clark, C. (2011). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Just how important is diversity in higher education? . *Multicultural Education, 19*(3), 57-59.

Colbert, C. (2003). Boston College to consider gay/straight student alliance. *National Catholic Reporter, 16,* 10.

Coleman, E. (1981). Developmental stages of the coming out process. *Journal of Homosexuality, 7*(2/3), 31-43.

Conner, T. W., & Rabovsky, T. M. (2011). Accountability, affordability, access: A review of the recent trends in higher education policy research. *Policy Studies Journal, 39*, 93-112. doi: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291541-0072/issues

Cox, S. S. (2012). In this issue. *Journal of College Admission*(215), 2.

Crama, R. J., Miller, A. K., Amacker, A. M., & Burks, A. C. (2013). Openness, right-wing authoritarianism, and antigay prejudice in college students: A mediational model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(1), 64-71. doi: 10.1037/a0031090

Cramer, E. P., & Ford, C. H. (2011). Gay rights on campus, circa 2011. *Academe, 97*(5), 38-41.

Crowley, M. (1968). *The boys in the band*. New York, NY: Alyson Books.

D'Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., Salter, N. P., Vasey, J. J., Starks, M. T., & Sinclair, K. O. (2005). Predicting the suicide attempts of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. . *Suicide and life threatening behavior, 35*(6), 646-660.

Davies, S. P. (2008). *Out at the movies: A history of gay cinema*. Harependen, UK: Kamera Books.

Davis, K., & Heilbroner, D. (Writers). (2011). Stonewall uprising. USA: PBS/American Experience.

Defense of Marriage Act, Public Law 104-191 C.F.R. (1996).

deLeon, M. J., & Brunner, C. C. (2013). Cycles of fear: A model of lesbian and gay educational leaders' lived experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(1), 161-203.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dermer, S. B., Smith, S. D., & Barto, K. K. (2010). Identifying and correctly labeling sexual prejudice, discrimination, and oppression. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 88*(3), 325-331.

DeSantis, N. (2012). Colleges are pressured to open up student data. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 58*(33), A1.

Dickinson, T., Cook, M., Playle, J., & Hallett, C. (2012). Queer treatments: Giving a voice to former patients who received treatments for their 'sexual deviations'. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 21*(9/10), 1345-1354. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03965.x

Dilley, P. (2002). *Queer man on campus: A history of non-heterosexual college men, 1945-2000*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

DiStefano, T. M., Croteau, J. M., Anderson, M. Z., Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Bullard, M. A. (2000). Experiences of being heterosexual allies to lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of College Counseling, 3*(2), 131.

Duberman, M. (1993). *Stonewall*. New York, NY: Dutton.

Duggan, L. (1994). Queering the state. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 564-572). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dutile, F. N. (1988). God and gays in Georgetown: Observations on *Gay Rights Coalition of Georgetown University Law Center v. Georgetown University*. *Journal of College and University Law, 15*(1), 1-20.

Einhaus, C. F., Viento, W. L. E., & Croteau, J. M. (2004). Admissions comes out: Recruiting lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender youth. *College and University, 80*(2), 11-17.

Elmhurst College asks applicants for sexual orientation. (2011). *The Columbia Chronicle.* Retrieved from http://www.columbiachronicle.com/

Elmhurst College: A celebration of diversity. (n. d.). *Diversity.* Retrieved from http://public.elmhurst.edu/about/diversity

Elmhurst College: Application for admission. (2012). Retrieved from http://media.elmhurst.edu/documents/Elmhurst_Application_2012.pdf

Elmhurst College: Mission, vision, and core values. (2013). *About Elmhurst College.* Retrieved from http://public.elmhurst.edu/about/101584548.html

Essex, N. L. (2000). Confidentiality and student records: Ten ways to invite legal challenges. *The Clearing House, 73,* 259-261.

Evans, N. J. (2002). The impact of an LGBT Safe Zone project on campus climate. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(4), 522-539.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (2005). Encouraging the development of social justice attitudes and actions in heterosexual students. *New Directions for Student Services*(110), 43-54.

Fact and information sheet about heterosexism. (n. d.). *Safe Zone: James Madison University.* Retrieved from http://www.jmu.edu/safezone/wm_library/Heterosexism%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf

Faderman, L. (1991). *Odd girls and twilight lovers: A history of lesbian life in twentieth century America*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Falcone, J. (2011, November 14). The Catholic Church and sexuality: If only the hierarchs would listen and learn. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-falcone/catholic-church-sexuality_b_1085243.html

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g C.F.R. (1974).

Fine, L. E. (2012). The context of creating space: Assessing the likelihood of college LGBT center presence. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(2), 285-299.

Fisher v. University of Texas, 631 F.3d 213 (2013).

Forrest, K. (2005). *Lesbian pulp fiction: The sexually intrepid world of lesbian paperback novels 1950-1965*. San Francisco, CA: Cleis Press.

French, W. L., Bell, C. H., & Zawacki, R. A. (2005). *Organization development and transformation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Furrow, H. (2012). LGBT students in the college composition classroom. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 145-159.

Galesic, M., & Bosnjak, M. (2009). Effects of questionnaire length on participation and indicators of response quality in a web survey. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 73*(2), 349-360. doi: 10.2307/25548084

Garces, L. M. (2012). Necessary but not sufficient: the impact of Grutter v. Bollinger on student of color enrollment in graduate and professional schools in Texas. *Journal of Higher Education, 89*(4), 497-534.

Garcia, M. (2013, October 25). Baylor Univ. alters antigay sexual conduct code. *The Advocate.* Retrieved from http://www.advocate.com/society/education/2013/10/25/baylor-univ-alters-antigay-sexual-conduct-code

Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance of the University of South Alabama v. Alabama, 110 F.3d 1543 (1990).

Gay Lib v. The University of Missouri, 558 F.2d 848 (1971).

Ginsberg, A. (1956). *Howl.* San Francisco, CA: City Light Books.

GLAAD media reference guide. (2010, May 2010). *Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation. League* Retrieved from http://www.glaad.org/files/MediaReferenceGuide2010.pdf

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Joyner, R. L. (2005). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goodman, J. A. (2012, December 7). Six ways straight people benefit from gay rights. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/josh-a-goodman/6-ways-straight-people-benefit-from-gay-rights_b_2249344.html

Gordon, L. (2012, March 30). California state colleges weigh asking students about sexual orientation. *Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/30/local/la-me-uc-gay-20120330

Gorton, D. (2009). Why Stonewall matters after forty years.(GUEST OPINION)(Stonewall Riot). *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*(4), 6.

Graham, R., Hall, R., & Gilmer, W. G. (2008). Connecting the dots: Information sharing by post-secondary educational institutions under the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). *Education and the Law, 20*(4), 301-316.

Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244 (2003).

Green, M., & Barblan, A. (2004). *Higher education in a pluralistic world: A transatlantic view.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Grier-Reed, T., Ehlert, J., & Dade, S. (2011). Profiling the African American Student Network. *Learning Assistance Review, 16*(1), 21-30.

Grier-Reed, T. L., Madyun, N. i. H., & Buckley, C. G. (2008). Low black student retention on a predominantly white campus: Two faculty respond with the African American student network. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(5), 476-485.

Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).

Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. (2012). *American Psychologist, 67*(1), 10-42.

Hachmeister, L. (Writer). (2011). Enemies within: Joe McCarthy. USA: HMR Produktion/BBC.

Halpin, S. A., & Allen, M. W. (2004). Changes in psychosocial well-being during stages of gay identity development. *Journal of Homosexuality, 47*(2), 109-126.

Harden, M. (2011, August 25). College asks about sexual orientation on application. *National Review.* Retrieved from http://www.nationalreview.com/phi-beta-cons/275556/college-asks-about-sexual-orientation-application-nathan-harden

Hauswirth, K. (2006). Caps, gowns, and rainbows. *Advocate, 966,* 28.

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, Public Law 104-191 C.F.R. (1996).

Healy v. James, 408 U.S. 169 (1972).

Hermann, M. (2010). More Safety, Inclusion Measures Needed for LGBTs. *University Business, 13*(10), 15.

Hernandez, S., & Hernandez, I. (2011). Key resources on marginalized students. *New Directions for Community Colleges*(155), 85-89.

Hill, R. J. (2006). Queer challenges in organizational settings: Complexity, paradox, and contradiction. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 122*, 97-102.

Hitt, O. (1958). *Girls' dormitory*. New York, NY: Beacon.

Hodum, R. L., & James, G. W. (2010). An observation of normative structure for college admission and recruitment officers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 81*(3), 317-338. doi: 10.2307/40606859

Hoover, E. (2011, April 17). Common Application's new changes reflect evolution of college admissions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from www.chronicle.com

Hoover, E. (2012). University of Iowa will ask applicants if they identify with gay community, *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. 11.

Humphreys, L. (1970). The breastplate of righteousness. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 22-37). New York, NY: Routledge.

Iconis, R. (2010). Reducing homophobia within the college community. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 3*(5), 67-70.

Isherwood, C. (1962). *A single man*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Jaschik, S. (2010, August 12). Asking more than male or female. *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/08/12/questions

Jaschik, S. (2011, January 26). The same boxes to check. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/01/26/common_application_rejects_new_questions_on_sexual_orientation_and_gender_identity

Johnson, A. B., Takesue, K., & Chen, B. (2007). Identity-based discussion groups: A means of providing outreach and support for Asian Pacific American students. *Journal of College Counseling, 10*(2), 184-192.

Johnson, D. K. (2004). *The lavender scare: The Cold War persecution of gays and lesbians in the federal government*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, T. (2012). Equality, morality, and the impact of media framing: explaining opposition to same-sex marriage and civil unions. *Politics & Policy, 40*(6), 1053-1080.

Johnson, T. R. (2013, April 15). How should colleges ask about students' sexual orientation? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/headcount/how-should-colleges-ask-students-about-their-sexual-orientation/34363

Kahlenberg, R. (2011, August 24). Admissions preferences for gays? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations/admissions-preferences-for-gays/30190

Katz, A. (2009). Gay and lesbian patients with cancer. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 36*(2), 203-207. doi: 10.1188/09.ONF.203-207

Keller, Y. (1999). Pulp politics: Strategies of vision in pro-lesbian pulp novels, 1955-1965. In P. J. Smith (Ed.), *The queer sixties* (pp. 1-25). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, M., Semlyen, J., Tai, S. S., Killaspy, H., Osborn, D., Popelyuk, D., & Nazareth, I. (2008). A systematic review of mental disorder, suicide, and deliberate self harm in lesbian, gay and bisexual people. *BMC Psychiatry, 8*, 1-17. doi: 10.1186/1471-244X-8-70

Kinsey, A. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kiyama, J. M., Lee, J. J., & Rhoades, G. (2012). A critical agency network model for building an integrated outreach program. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(2), 276-303.

Klein, A. (2008). Groups urge that FERPA rules give researchers access to data. . *Education Week, 27*(38), 20-21.

Knochel, K. A., Croghan, C. F., Moone, R. P., & Quam, J. K. (2012). Training, geography, and provision of aging services to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender older adults. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 55*(5), 426-443. doi: 10.1080/01634372.2012.665158

Lawrence v. Texas, 539 U.S. 558 (2003).

Legislative history of major FERPA provisions. (2004). *U. S. Department of Education.* Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/leg-history.html

Lei, S., Gorelick, D., Short, K., Smallwood, L., & Wright-Porter, K. (2011). Academic cohorts: Benefits and drawbacks of being a member of a community of learners. *Education, 131*(3), 497-504.

Leslie, C. R. (2000). Creating criminals: The injuries inflicted by unenforced sodomy laws. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 35*(1), 103-181.

Lewis, G. B. (2001). Barriers to security clearances for gay men and lesbians: Fear of blackmail or fear of homosexuals? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 11*(4), 539-557.

Leznoff, M., & Westley, W. A. (1956). The homosexual community. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 5-11). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lipka, S. (2008, December 19). Education department gives colleges new flexibility on student-privacy law. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*(17), A18.

Loftin, G. M. (2012). *Letters to ONE: Gay and lesbian voices from the 1950s and 1960s.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Longerbeam, S. D., Inkelas, K. K., Johnson, D. R., & Lee, Z. S. (2007). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual college student experiences: An exploratory study. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(2), 215-230. doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0017

Loss, C. P. (2012). From pluralism to diversity: Reassessing the political uses of the uses of the university. *Social Science History, 36*(4), 525-549.

Mannion, A. (2011, August 26). Diversity is the goal, officials say of optional question on application. *The Chicago Tribune.* Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2011-08-26/news/ct-met-elmhurst-college-20110826_1_lgbt-elmhurst-students-elmhurst-college

Marchand, S., & Stoner, J. (2012). A brief history of accountability in higher education. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 92*(1), 16-18.

Marine, S. B. (2011). *Stonewall's legacy: Bisexual, gay, lesbian, and transgender students in higher education.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Marotta, T. (2006). What made Stonewall different? *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide, 13*(2), 33-35.

Martinez, M. (2011, August 25). Illinois college becomes the first to ask undergraduates if they're gay. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2011/US/08/25/illinois.college.lgbt.question/

McAllister, C. A., Harold, R. D., Ahmedani, B. K., & Cramer, E. P. (2009). Targeted mentoring: Evaluation of a program. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(1), 89-104.

McDaniel, J. S., Purcell, D., & D'Augelli, A. R. (2001). The relationship between sexual orientation and risk for suicide: Research findings and future directions for research and prevention. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 31*(1), 84-105.

McDonald, S. J. (2008). The Family Rights and Privacy Act: 7 myths and the truth, *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A53.

McIntosh, M. (1968). The homosexual role. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 68-76). New York, NY: Routledge.

McKeown-Moak, M. P. (2013). The 'new' performance funding in higher education. *Educational Considerations, 40*(2), 3-12.

Meachem, J. (2008). What's the use of a mission statement? *Academe, 94,* 21-24.

Mehta, B. (2010). Word power: A 12-point style guide for the quality professional. *Quality Progress, 43*(10), 24-29.

Meyer, I. H., & Wilson, P. A. (2009). Sampling lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 23-31. doi: 10.1037/a0014587

Miranda, J., & Storms, M. (1989). Psychological adjustment of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*(1), 41-45. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1989.tb02490.x

Misra, S., Stokols, D., & Marino, A. H. (2012). Using norm-based appeals to increase response rates in evaluation research: A field experiment. *American Journal of Evaluation, 33*(1), 88-98.

Mixon, S. L., Lyon, L., & Beaty, M. (2004). Secularization and national universities: The effect of religious identity on academic reputation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(4), 400-419. doi: 10.2307/3838740

Mondimore, F. M. (1996). *A natural history of homosexuality.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Montes, M. (2011, September 6). EC first in nation to ask LGBT admission question. *The Leader.* Retrieved from http://ecleader.org/

Most colleges not ready to ask about LGBT status. (2011, October 13). *Fox News.* Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/us/2011/10/13/most-us-colleges-not-ready-to-ask-about-lgbt-status/

NACADA: Non-directory information. (n. d.). *National Association of Academic Advising.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/FERPA-overview.aspx

NACADA: Records not considered as educational records. (n. d.). *National Association of Academic Advising.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/FERPA-overview.aspx

Newhouse, M. R. (2013). Remembering the 'T' in LGBT: Recruiting and supporting transgender students. *Journal of College Admission*(220), 22-27.

Newton, E. (1972). The queens. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 38-50). New York, NY: Routledge.

O'Donnell, S., Meyer, I. H., & Schwartz, S. (2011). Increased risk of suicide attempts among Black and Latino lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *American Journal of Public Health, 101*(6), 1055-1059. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2010.300032

Ong, M., Wright, C., Espinosa, L. L., & Orfield, G. (2011). Inside the double bind: A synthesis of empirical research on undergraduate and graduate women of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*(2), 172-209.

Orlando, J. (2011, February 7). FERPA and social media. *Faculty Focus: Higher Ed Teaching Strategies from Magna Publicaitons.* Retrieved from http://www.facultyfocus.com/%20articles/teaching-with-technology-articles/ferpa-and-social-media/

Packer, V. (1952). *Spring fire*. San Francisco, CA: Cleis Press.

Packer, V. (2004). Introduction *Spring fire* (pp. v-ix). San Francisco, CA: Cleis Press.

Palmer, R. T., Maramba, D. C., & Dancy, T. E. (2011). A qualitative investigation of factors promoting the retention and persistence of students of color in STEM. *The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(4), 491-504. doi: 10.2307/41341155

Patton, L. D. l. g. c., Shahjahan, R. A., & Osei-Kofi, N. (2010). Introduction to the emergent approaches to diversity and social justice in higher education special issue. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(3), 265-278. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2010.496692

Penn, D. (2008). Lavender graduation. *Lesbian News, 33*(11), 44.

Perez, P. A. (2010). College choice process of Latino undocumented students: Implications for recruitment and retention. *Journal of College Admission*(206), 21-25.

Pettijohn, T. F., II, & Walzer, A. S. (2008). Reducing racism, sexism, and homophobia in college students by completing a psychology of prejudice course. *College Student Journal, 42*(2), 459-468.

Phoenix, T. (2007). Consortium tips on labels and identifying LGBT students. In J. Baez, J. Howd & R. Pepper (Eds.), *The gay and lesbian guide to college life* (pp. 21-22). New York, NY: The Princeton Review.

Picciano, A. G. (2012). The evolution of big data and learning analytics in American higher education. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(3), 9-20.

Plageman, P. (2011). Educator, planner and advocate: Higher education for adults in the new millennium. *Adult Learning, 22*(2), 32-36.

Pope, M. (2007). December 15, 1973: Homosexuality is delisted by the APA. In K. T. Burles (Ed.), *Great events from history: Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender events, 1848-2006* (pp. 265-267). Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.

Poynter, K. J., & Washington, J. (2005). Multiple identities: Creating community on campus for LGBT students. *New Directions for Student Services*(111), 41-47.

Rames, M. P. (2000). Effect of financial constraints on student affairs services. *NASPA Journal., 38*(1), 70-81.

Ray, S. A. (2011, October 9). Despite the Controversy, We're Glad We Asked. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://chronicle.com/article/Despite-the-Controversy-Were/129316/

Redden, E. (2007). Fuzzy understandings of FERPA. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/06/14/vt

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Reinhold, R. (1971, December 15). Campus homosexuals organize to win community acceptance, *New York Times,* p. 1.

Reiss, A. J. (1961). The social integration of peers and queers. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 12-28). New York, NY: Routledge.

Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher, 39*(2), 132-141. doi: 10.2307/27764565

Rew, L., Whittaker, T. A., Taylor-Seehafer, M. A., & Smith, L. R. (2005). Sexual health risks and protective resources in gay, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual homeless youth. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing, 10*(1), 11-19.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *Journal of Higher Education, 69*(6), 621-639.

Rich, J. A. (1999). (W)right in the faultlines: The problematic of identity in William Wyler's *The Children's Hour*. In P. J. Smith (Ed.), *The queer sixties* (pp. 187-200). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ridner, S. L., Frost, K., & LaJoie, A. S. (2006). Health information and risk behaviors among lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 18*(8), 374-378. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-7599.2006.00142.x

Ring, T. (2011, August 24). College to ask applicants: Are you LGBT? *Advocate.* Retrieved from http://www.advocate.com/society/education/2011/08/24/college-ask-applicants-are-you-lgbt

Ripley, M., Anderson, E., McCormack, M., & Rockett, B. (2012). Heteronormativity in the university classroom: Novelty attachment and content substitution among gay-friendly students. *Sociology of Education, 85*(2), 121-130.

Robertson, C. (2010, December 17). Lesbian coach's exit from Belmont University has Nashville talking. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/18/education/18belmont.html?_r=0

Robinson, K. (2010). A study of young lesbian and gay people's school experiences. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 26*(4), 331-351.

Rogers, A., McRee, N., & Arntz, D. L. (2009). Using a college human sexuality course to combat homophobia. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society, and Learning, 9*(3), 211-225.

Romer v. Evans, 517 U.S. 620 (1996).

Rose, D. S., Sidle, S. D., & Griffith, K. H. (2007). A penny for your thoughts: Monetary incentives improve response rates for company-sponsored employee surveys. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(2), 225-240.

Rosser, B. R. S., Bockting, W. O., Ross, M. W., Miner, M. H., & Coleman, E. (2008). The relationship between homosexuality, internalized homo-negativity, and mental health in men who have sex with men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 55*(1), 150-168.

Ruiz, R. R. (2011, September 13). Elmhurst College asks applicants about sexual orientation. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://thechoice.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/09/13/elmhurst-sexual-orientation/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0

Russell, S. T., Clarke, T. J., & Clary, J. (2009). Are teens post-gay? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(7), 884-890. doi: 10.1007/s10964-008-9388-2

Russo, V. (1985). *The celluloid closet: Homosexuality in the movies*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Ryan, R. (2005). The evolution of an LGBT center at a public institution. *New Directions for Student Services*(111), 71-74.

Sandoval-Lucero, E., Maes, J. B., & Chopra, R. V. (2011). Examining the retention of nontraditional Latino(a) students in a career-based learning community. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 10*(4), 299-316.

Sanlo, R. (1998). *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Sanlo, R. (2000). Lavender Graduation: Acknowledging the lives and achievement of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(6), 643-647.

Sanlo, R. (2004). Lesbian, gay, bisexual college students: Risk, resiliency, and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 6*(1), 97-110.

Sanlo, R. (2005). Gender identity and sexual orientation: Research, policy and personal perspective. *New Directions for Student Services*(111), 7-97.

Sanlo, R., Rankin, S., & Schoenberg, R. (2002). *Our place on campus: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender services and programs in higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Santella, A. (2013). To engage in a complex world. *FYI Magazine.* Retrieved from http://public.elmhurst.edu/alumni/publications/fyi/202553461.html

Sarton, M. (1961). *The small room*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.

Schmidt, C. K., Miles, J. R., & Welsh, A. C. (2011). Perceived discrimination and social support: The influences on career development and college adjustment of LGBT college students. *Journal of Career Development, 38*(4), 293-309.

Schmidt, P. (2009). Colleges seek key to success of black men in the classroom. *Education Digest*(7), 4.

Schmidt, P. (2010). Supreme Court upholds campus anti-bias policy, but questions linger. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 56*(40), A21.

Schmidt, S. W., Githens, R. P., Rocco, T. S., & Kormanik, M. B. (2012). Lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgendered people and human resource development: An examination of the literature in adult education and human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review, 11*(3), 326-348.

Schueler, L. A., Hoffman, J. A., & Peterson, E. (2013). Fostering safe, engaging campuses for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning students. In S. R. Harper & S. J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education* (pp. 61-80). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schweizer, K., Brunner, F., Schutzmann, K., Schonbucher, V., & Richter-Appelt, H. (2009). Gender identity and coping in female 46, XY adults with Androgen Biosynthesis Deficiency (Intersexuality/DSD). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 189-201.

Shilts, R. (1987). *And the band played on*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin.

Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*(3/4), 179-191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1967). Homosexuality: The formulation of a sociological perspective. In P. M. Nardi & B. E. Schneider (Eds.), *Social perspectives in lesbian and gay studies: A reader* (pp. 59-67). New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, L. V., Rudy, E. T., Javanbakht, M., Uniyal, A., Sy, L. S., Horton, T., & Kerndt, P. R. (2006). Client satisfaction with rapid HIV testing: Comparison between an urban sexually transmitted disease clinic and a community-based testing center. *AIDS Patient Care & STDs, 20*(10), 693-700.

Smith, P. J. (1999). *The queer sixties*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Steinberg, J. (2010, February 26). University of Pennsylvania tries outreach based on sexual orientation. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://thechoice.blogs.nytimes.com/

Stimpson, C. R. (1993). Coming of age: Gays and lesbians in the academy. *Change, 25*(4), 78-79.

Streitmatter, R. (1995). *Unspeakable: The rise of the gay and lesbian press in America*. Boston, MA: Faber and Faber.

Stryker, S. (2008). *Transgender history*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Sturgis, E. T., & Adams, H. E. (1978). The right to treatment: Issues in the treatment of homosexuality. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*(1), 165-169. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.46.1.165

Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Szymanski, D. M., Chung, Y. B., & Balsam, K. F. (2001). Psychosocial correlates of internalized homophobia in lesbians. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*(1), 27-38.

Taylor, V. (1957). *Whisper their love*. New York, NY: Gold Medal Press.

Tetreault, P. A., Fette, R., Meidlinger, P. C., & Hope, D. (2013). Perceptions of campus climate by sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*(7), 947-964. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2013.774874

Thomas, S. J. (2004). *Using web and paper questionnaires for data-based decision making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tierney, W. G. (1992). Building academic communities of difference: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus. *Change, 24*(2), 40-46. doi: 10.2307/40177697

Toglia, T. V. (2007). How does FERPA affect you? . *Tech Directions, 67*(2), 32-35.

Tourangeau, R., Conrad, F. G., & Couper, M. P. (2013). *The science of web surveys*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Troiden, R. R. (1979). Becoming homosexual: A model of gay identity acquistion. *Psychiatry, 42*, 362-373.

Understanding health information privacy. (n. d.). *U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.* Retrieved from http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/privacy/hipaa/understanding/index.html

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.

Voorhees, R. A. (2008). Institutional research's role in strategic planning. *New Directions for Higher Education*(141), 77-85.

Wantanabe, R. (1996). The Safe Zone and other projects: An update on the University of Hawaii system-wide task force on sexual orientation. *Island Lifestyle Magazine,* 16.

Watt, S. K. (2007). Difficult dialogues, privilege, and social justice: Uses of the privileged identity exploration (PIE) in student affairs practice. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(2), 114-126.

Weber, G. N. (2008). Using to numb the pain: Substance use and abuse among lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 30*(1), 31-48.

Weeks, K. M. (2001). Family-friendly FERPA policies: Affirming parental partnerships. *New Directions for Student Services*(97), 39-50. doi: 10.1002/ss.10

Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Williams, T. (1955). *Cat on a hot tin roof*. New York, NY: New Directions.

Windmeyer, S. L., & Freeman, P. W. (Eds.). (1998). *Out on fraternity row: Personal accounts of being gay in a college fraternity*. Los Angeles, CA: Alyson Books.

Windmeyer, S. L., & Freeman, P. W. (Eds.). (2000). *Secret sisters: Stories of being lesbian and bisexual in a college sorority*. Los Angeles, CA: Alyson Books.

Windmeyer, S. L., Humphrey, K., & Baker, D. (2013). An institutional responsibility: Tracking retention and academic success of out LGBT students. *American College Personnel Association.* Retrieved from http://www.myacpa.org/article/institutional-responsibility-tracking-retention-academic-success-out-lgbt-students

Women's Status in Higher Education. (2011) *ASHE Higher Education Report* (Vol. 37, pp. 1-161).

Woodford, M. R., Luke, K. P., Grogan-Kaylor, A., Fredriksen-Goldsen, K. I., & Gutierrez, L. (2012). Social work faculty support for same-sex marriage: A cross-national study of U.S. and Anglophone Canadian MSW teaching faculty. *Social Work Research, 36*(4), 301-312. doi: 10.1093/swr/svs033

Wright, W. (2005). *Harvard's secret court: The savage 1920 purge of campus homosexuals*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Young, A. (2011). Gay students: The latest outreach target at many colleges. *Journal of College Admission*(210), 39-40.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board
Dept. 4915
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403-2598
Phone: (423) 425-5867
Fax: (423) 425-4052
instrb@utc.edu
http://www.utc.edu/irb

MEMORANDUM

TO: F. Lee Casson   **IRB # 13-095**
                 Dr. Valerie Rutledge

FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity
                 Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: July 17, 2013

SUBJECT: IRB # 13-095: Sexuality Demographics and the College Admissions Process:
                 Implications of Asking Applicants to Reveal Their Sexual Orientation

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

> *The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project #13-095*

Please remember that you must complete a Certification for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion Form when the project is completed or provide an annual report if the project takes over one year to complete. The IRB Committee will make every effort to remind you prior to your anniversary date; however, it is your responsibility to ensure that this additional step is satisfied.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page http://www.utc.edu/irb or email instrb@utc.edu

Best wishes for a successful research project.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you aware that other institutions have recently asked (or are considering asking) potential students to reveal their sexual orientation within an application for college admission? (A possible question to students on an application might read: Would you consider yourself a member of the LGBT community?)

    a. yes
    b. no

2. Has your institution considered adding a demographic for sexual orientation to its application for admission?

    a. yes
    b. no
    c. don't know

3. Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission to *your institution*?

    a. not at all
    b. somewhat likely
    c. more than likely
    d. very likely
    e. entirely

4. What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question (#3)?

    _____

    _____

    _____

5. Would you support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission *within academe in general*?

a. not at all
b. somewhat likely
c. more than likely
d. very likely
e. entirely

6.　What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question (#5)?

_____

_____

_____

7.　Do you think that *your institution* is likely to support a policy that encourages potential students to reveal their sexual orientation in an application for admission?

a. not at all
b. somewhat likely
c. more than likely
d. very likely
e. entirely
f. don't know

8.　To the best of your experience, what is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question (#7)?

_____

_____

_____

9.　What is your institution's approximate enrollment?

a. up to 4,999
b. 5,000 to 9,999
c. 10,000 to 14,999
d. 15,000 to 19,999
e. 20,000 to 24,999
f. 25,000 to 29,999
g. 30,000 plus

10. To the best of your knowledge, what is the generalized Carnegie classification of your institution?

   a. associate's—where all degrees are at the associate's level, or where bachelor's degrees account for less than 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees
   b. baccalaureate—where fewer than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during previous year
   c. master's—where at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during the previous year
   d. doctoral—where at least 20 research doctoral degrees were awarded during the previous year

11. What is the overall structure of your institution?

   a. public
   b. private, religious affiliation
   c. private, secular
   d. other

12. Within which geographical region is your institution located?

   a. Northwest: Alaska, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming
   b. Midwest: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota
   c. Great Lakes: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin
   d. Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Ontario, Rhode Island, Vermont
   e. Southwest: Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah
   f. South Central: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas
   g. South: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia
   h. Mid-Atlantic: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania

13. Which of the following titles *best* describes your position?

   a. Graduate Assistant (LGBT office)
   b. Specialist (LGBT office)
   c. Coordinator (LGBT office)
   d. Assistant Director (LGBT office)
   e. Associate Director (LGBT office)
   f. Director (LGBT office)
   g. Faculty Member
   h. Other Administrator

14. How long have you held this position?

    a. less than two years
    b. 2 to 5 years
    c. 6 to 10 years
    d. 11 or more years

15. Which of the following statements *best* describes the institutional function of your position within LGBT education and outreach?

    a. It is located within a freestanding LGBT office (e.g., LGBT Affairs, LGBT Resource Center, Queer Resource Center).
    b. It is located within a women's, gender, and/or sexuality studies department.
    c. It is located within inclusivity initiatives (e.g., multicultural affairs, minority affairs, diversity affairs).
    d. It is located elsewhere within student affairs.
    e. It is located within an academic department.
    f. It does not fall within the previous classifications.

16. How would you classify your participation with the Organization?

    a. I am a member only.
    b. I am a member who has also served on a committee within the Organization.
    c. I am a member who has also served in a leadership position within the Organization.
    d. I am a member who has also served the Organization on a committee *and* in a leadership position.

17. How long have you worked with LGBT populations in higher education?

    a. less than two years
    b. 2 to 5 years
    c. 6 to 10 years
    d. 11 or more years

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Member of the Executive Board:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (and member of the organization), and I am completing my dissertation research. I am conducting a study to ascertain the various positive and negative implications that surround collecting a demographic for sexual orientation on a college application. Although only a few institutions currently quantify sexuality during the admissions process—Elmhurst College, the University of Iowa— more and more institutions are considering if such a practice is beneficial or problematic for LGBT students.

To gather a greater understanding of this issue, I am requesting your participation in this study. This will involve a short phone interview, which should take approximately ten minutes. Your participation is, of course, voluntary and your identity will remain anonymous; you may also withdraw from the study at any time. Furthermore, the results of this study may be published, but your name and the name of this organization will not be used.

If you agree to an interview, please let me know via email [removed for anonymity], and we can then determine a day and time to speak. Moreover, your response to this inquiry will be considered your consent to participate.

Whether or not you complete the interview, I will enter your name in a random drawing for a chance to win one of four $50 gift cards from Amazon. To share your contact information with me, you can use one of the following methods (see below). After the study is over, four names will be drawn randomly, and each winner will be contacted.

1. Email: Lee.Casson@xxx.edu [email removed for anonymity]
2. Facebook: xxx@facebook.com [name removed for anonymity]
3. Twitter: https://twitter.com/xxx [name removed for anonymity]
4. Text message: 615.268.XXXX [number removed for anonymity]

This research has been approved by the UTC Institutional Review Board (approval code: IRB # 13-095). If you have any questions concerning the UTC IRB policies or procedures or your rights as a human subject, please contact Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair, at 426.425.4289 or by email: instrb@utc.edu. You may also contact Dr. Valerie Rutledge, Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies (and Chair of my dissertation), at 423.425.5374 or by email: Valerie-Rutledge@utc.edu.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please call me at 615.268.XXXX or email me at either Lee.Casson@xxx.edu or qyx795@mocs.utc.edu. [Some contact information has been removed for anonymity.]

Cordially,
F. Lee Casson, M.A., Ed.S.

Dear Fellow Member:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC), and I am completing my dissertation research. I am conducting a study to ascertain the various positive and negative implications that surround collecting a demographic for sexual orientation on a college application. (The study is entitled "Sexuality Demographics and the College Admissions Process: Implications of Asking Applicants to Reveal Their Sexual Orientation.") Although only a few institutions currently quantify sexual orientation during the admissions process—Elmhurst College, the University of Iowa—more and more institutions are considering if such a practice is beneficial or problematic for LGBT students.

To gather a greater understanding of this issue, I am requesting your participation in this study. This will involve completing a 17-item questionnaire—a process that should take no more than ten minutes. Your participation is, of course, voluntary and your identity will remain anonymous. Furthermore, the results of this study may be published, but your name and the name of this organization will not be used.

Between August, 25 2013, and September 30, 2013, you may access the questionnaire by clicking on the following link: [URL removed for anonymity]. Your completion of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate.

Whether or not you complete the questionnaire, I will enter your name in a random drawing for a chance to win one of four $50 gift cards from Amazon. To share your contact information with me, you can use one of the following methods (see below). After the study is over, four names will be drawn randomly, and each winner will be contacted. By allowing everyone to enter the drawing, I cannot determine who completed the questionnaire and who did not.

1. Email: Lee.Casson@xxx.edu [email removed for anonymity]
2. Facebook: xxx@facebook.com [name removed for anonymity]
3. Twitter: https://twitter.com/xxx [name removed for anonymity]
4. Text message: 615.268.XXXX [number removed for anonymity]

This research has been approved by the UTC Institutional Review Board (approval code: IRB # 13-095). If you have any questions concerning the UTC IRB policies or procedures or your rights as a human subject, please contact Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair, at 426.425.4289 or by email: instrb@utc.edu. You may also contact Dr. Valerie Rutledge, Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies (and Chair of my dissertation), at 423.425.5374 or by email: Valerie-Rutledge@utc.edu.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please call me at 615.268.XXXX or email me at either Lee.Casson@xxx.edu or qyx795@mocs.utc.edu. [Some contact information has been removed for anonymity.]

I look forward to reading your collective responses!

Cordially,
F. Lee Casson, M.A., Ed.S.

VITAE

F. Lee Casson holds a Master of Arts in English, with a focus in 20th-century American literature, from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC); the degree of Education Specialist in Higher Education Administration from Middle Tennessee State University; and a Doctorate in Education from UTC. He has worked in higher education for 22 years, specializing in on-campus LGBT issues, gay and lesbian American literature, contingent faculty, and post-secondary curriculum development and pedagogy.