

The Institutional Climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Education Faculty: What Is the Pivotal Frame of Reference?

James T. Sears, PhD

University of South Carolina

ABSTRACT. This article presents data gathered from a national sample ($n = 104$) of lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty members and researchers. Here, the author examines three general dimensions through which these respondents judge their institutional climate—characterized as gay affirming, gay tolerant, gay neutral, gay intolerant, or gay hostile—and four unique factors that distinguish their assessment. Four questions are addressed: (1) How do sexual minority faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education characterize their institutional climate? (2) What institutional dimension is most salient in these faculty members' assessment of this climate? (3) What are the factors that differentiate sexual minority faculty members' perceptions in this study? (4) Which of these factors, if any, significantly contribute to their assessment of institutional climate? Using multivariate analyses, the author identifies one pivotal frame of reference that accounts for most of the variance in respondents' differing assessments of their institutional climate and explores differences between lesbian and gay male respondents as well as those working in public and private, independent institutions.

James T. Sears is Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policies, USC, Columbia, SC 29208 USA (e-mail: author@jtsears.com). Support for this project was provided, in part, by the South Carolina Educational Policy Center and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The author extends special thanks to: Lorin Anderson, Carolyn Arnold, Donna Gollnick, Ed Haertel, Sue Klein, Richard Kunkel, Shawn Quilter, Leonard Pellicer, and William Tierney.

Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 43(1) 2002
<http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J082>
© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

Implications for those seeking to reduce institutional heterosexism and homophobia are discussed. [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]

KEYWORDS. Educational homophobia, institutional homophobia, gay/lesbian educators, professional discrimination

INTRODUCTION

Openly lesbian, gay, or bisexual faculty on college campuses represent a small but growing presence. A variety of public and private colleges and universities throughout the United States have enacted variously worded sexual orientation statements to their university policy, homosexual faculty—tenured or untenured—remain a marginalized group. And, while more instructors are integrating homosexuality into their content and lesbian/gay studies, as well as queer theory courses are more frequently offered, the collegiate climate—particularly in schools, colleges and departments of education—remain problematic. The climate of higher education is reported to be rampant with homophobia and heterosexism while legal action has been taken to establish institutional protections and benefits (Dolan, 1998; Euben, 1999; Hunsicker & Freedley, 2000). Interestingly, little empirical work has been conducted examining the quality of campus life from the perspective of queer faculty with most work focused on glbt students' experiences (D'Augelli, 1989; Herek, 1994; Nelson & Baker, 1990; Rhoads, 1994; Smith, 1995).¹ Meanwhile, conservative legislators in some states have sought to discourage or prohibit support for homosexual faculty members or academic freedom and the Council of the American Association of University Professors continue to address concerns of queer faculty (Cannona, 1994; Record of Council, 2000; Shecter, 1996; Zapler, 1994).

Professional organizations such as the National Education Association and the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, larger or more liberal school districts such as those of Los Angeles and Chapel Hill, and a handful of states such as Massachusetts and Wisconsin have adopted a variety of policies relating to sexual minority students and teachers. Little leadership or movement, however, has come from

schools, colleges, and departments of education despite the proactive role organizations, such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

In NCATE's revised standards, for example, institutions seeking accreditation are expected to have a conceptual framework that "reflects multicultural perspectives," instructional practices that "reflect knowledge about and experience with cultural diversity . . . and culturally diverse" populations, and a unit procedure that "recruits, admits, and retains a . . . student body that is culturally diverse . . . [and a] culturally diverse faculty" (NCATE, 1994). These standards explicitly define "cultural diversity" and "multicultural perspectives" to include "sexual orientation."

As these standards were being proposed two nationwide surveys were disseminated to education deans and lesbian, gay, bisexual education faculty and researchers. The Institutional Climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Faculty (ICLGBF) survey is a substantive expansion of a questionnaire sent to departments of sociology in the early 1980s and re-administered a decade later (Gagnon et al., 1982; Taylor & Raebum, 1993). The schools, departments, and colleges of education Sexual Orientation Survey (SOS) is a condensed version of the ICLGBF.² This article analyzes the first nationally collected data on the perceived institutional climate for sexual minority education faculty.

PERSONAL INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Long ago I accepted the insight that the personal is political, agreeing with Lather (1986) that one criterion to judge the adequacy of research is its "catalytic validity." This study is situated within a personal and political context—which is, after all, where all inquiry is ultimately rooted—and, I believe, the meaning and context for interpreting these data should be placed along side the lived experiences of selected lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty and researchers, including myself.

When I completed my dissertation in the early 1980s, I had already been hired by a state university as a curriculum specialist. My dissertation, like all but one of my previously published works, focused on curriculum theory or teacher education. The one lone essay, published in an obscure alternative education journal, centered on the importance of integrating lesbian and gay issues into the public school curriculum

(Sears, 1982). While I was somewhat “out” as a graduate student, I did not view my sexual identity as linked to my professional identity; nor did I view it incumbent upon me to disclose my homosexuality to either the search committee or to departmental faculty who would soon be called upon to evaluate my work.

Within two years all had changed. Against the advise of several departmental faculty members, I elected to begin research into the lives of lesbian, bisexual, and gay adolescents. I soon met resistance and support from unlikely comers: some of the “closeted” lesbian and gay education faculty distanced themselves from me; some heterosexual senior faculty members became my most ardent and consistent supporters. I also made several discoveries: my obscure essay had not escaped the attention of some on the search committee; my decision to merge the professional with the personal liberated my thinking and invigorated my writing; I was transformed from a “homosexual professor” to the more protective status of a “researcher on homosexuality”; and, my relative safety and anonymity in the ivory tower was lost as I later became depicted by the gay media as an “openly gay activist” and crucified by leading Christian conservatives as “an avowed sodomite” (Sears, 1998).

A decade after I had begun research into queer issues in education, past promotion to associate and later full professor with tenure coming between the two, and following approbation as well as condemnation of my work, I prepared a rather innocuous two-page survey to disseminate to the education deans of accredited colleges and a six-page survey to lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty.³ Within a short time, I received a memo from my dean which stated, in part:

I have reviewed the sexual orientation survey form that you propose to send to SCDEs around the nation. In addition, I took the liberty of sharing it with the Provost. He stated that he believes this is valuable information to collect but that it would best be done under the sponsorship of a national or regional professional organization. I concur with this suggestion. . . . [The Provost] said that if you are unable or unwilling to go this route, the research should be done on your own in regard to the cost of the survey and the time devoted to it.

Armed with my faculty manual and the American Association of University Professors’ guidelines on academic freedom, I challenged his and the Provost’s authority and judgment:

Given that research is one of the major components of a professor's job description at this university, I am a bit puzzled by the nebulous statement. . . . Is it, for example, the position of this university that this particular research project is not part of my research-related work specified in the job expectation for a university professor and, as such, should be done on my own time? Is it your intention to withhold support generally provided for faculty in this College conducting research (e.g., use of university letterhead, reasonable telephone usage, reasonable secretarial/work study support)? . . . I view this research as partial fulfillment of my job requirement here at the university and as such expect the College to support this research in the same manner as it does all other small scale faculty research projects. I respectfully request that you operationally define your [memo]. . . .⁴

Of course, the dean and the Provost were well aware of my rights to pursue scholarly inquiry. Both—with a half of century of administrative expertise between them—were equally aware of the potential political fall-out of such research should self-appointed moral vigilantes learn of it or share their concerns with like-minded confederates on the Board of Trustees or in the statehouse.⁵ We each assumed our scripted roles and in the early spring of 1994, with the support and advise of senior faculty in my unit, the survey was mailed to an NCATE—provided list of 821 deans of schools, colleges and departments of education and a group of 173 members or former members of the AERA special interest group on lesbian and gay issues.⁶ Those in the latter group were requested to forward copies to other sexual minority education faculty and researchers, some of whom were less “open” than themselves. Given the difference between these two samples, I have chosen to focus on the frames of reference held by lesbian, gay, and bisexual educators. From the original 173 surveys, 59 envelopes were returned due to poor addresses. 104 surveys were ultimately useable from among the 114 returned surveys. However, due to the snow-ball sampling technique used whereby those who received surveys were asked to network with other lgbt education faculty regarding the completion of this survey, it is not possible to determine how representative these data are or the actual return rate vis-à-vis all faculty who were asked to participate.

Among the 104 education faculty and researchers, 52 percent are lesbian, one-third are gay men, and one in eight are bisexual (roughly split evenly between male and female); one in seven are racial minorities and 57 percent are members of the AERA special interest group. One-third

are tenured faculty and another one-quarter are in tenure track positions; graduate students in teaching positions represent 15 percent of the sample. Most (60%) work in an urban institutional setting, while one-sixth work in rural areas and one-quarter in suburbia. About 30 percent are in institutions with fewer than 300 faculty members with two-thirds working at PhD granting institutions and nearly one-third at master's level. One-half are employed at public colleges and universities and one-third private, independent institutions. While no significant differences in the sample were found between the percentage of women and men working at these two types of higher education institutions, when eliminating those relatively few ($n = 13$) faculty identifying themselves as bisexual, there was a significant difference in the representation of lesbians and gay men working in public and private institutions ($X^2 = 6.25$; $p < .01$, $df = 1$) with the former group being drawn more from state institutions. This difference is important, given others (e.g., Bensimon, 1992) who have reported differences between the lesbian and gay male experience in higher education.

Here I describe three general dimensions through which education faculty judge their institutional climate and four unique factors that distinguish these faculty members in their survey responses. One of these dimensions explains much of the unique variance and stands in sharp contrast to those institutional areas that have been the primary focus for campus activists. As I examine the two principal demographic differences that differentiate faculty perceptions of institutional climate (institutional type and gender), I employ bivariate correlational analyses and multiple regression to address two fundamental questions. First, how do sexual minority faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education characterize their institutional climate? Second, what institutional dimension is most salient in these faculty members' assessment of this climate?

I continue my analyses of these survey data exploring four unique factors (identified via a correlated factor analytic model) that distinguish respondents' overall assessment of institutional climate and the relative weight of each of these factors in the rendering of these judgments. Using bivariate and multivariate analyses, the second part of this essay addresses two additional questions. First, what are the factors that differentiate sexual minority faculty members' perceptions in this study? Second, which of these factors, if any, significantly contribute to their assessment of institutional climate?

This article concludes by suggesting that professional associations such as NCATE which have adopted resolutions, policies, or standards

relating to sexual orientation, universities such as Stanford and University of Texas which have adopted non-discrimination statements or offered courses in gay studies, and queer scholars like myself who have sought to integrate gay studies courses into the school curriculum have failed to focus on the pivotal frame of reference that is most salient for lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty in judging the quality of queer life on campus.

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE: A HIDDEN DIMENSION

In general, what is the perceived campus climate for lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty and researchers? In this study respondents characterized their institution as gay affirmative, gay tolerant, gay neutral, gay intolerant, or gay hostile (INSTCLI).⁷ Faculty who self-identified as working within a “gay affirmative” institution were defined as working within an environment where campus leaders worked in a proactive manner to reduce homophobia and heterosexism through actions such as modifying affirmative action and non-discrimination statements to include sexual orientation, and establishing gay/lesbian studies in its curriculum, providing domestic partner benefits, recognizing the accomplishments of its homosexual students, encouraging gay-related scholarship among its faculty, and hiring/admitting other lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty and students into the university community. A “gay tolerant” institution was conceptualized as supportive of initiatives undertaken by its student body and faculty, such as the offering of courses with homosexual content, the adoption of a nondiscrimination statement, and accepting memorabilia, such as photographs of one’s significant other in the office. A “gay neutral” institution took actions neither to encourage nor to curtail the presence of sexual minorities on its faculty, staff, or student body, the inclusion of homosexual content in its curriculum, faculty research into homosexuality, or the adoption of nondiscrimination statements. Those who self-identified as working within “gay intolerant” institutions were those at sites that did not support pro-gay initiatives in its policies, procedures, curriculum, personnel, or student body. Within such an institution, a researcher would find inquiries into gay-related subjects penalized or marginalized, teaching courses with lesbian/gay content discouraged, and the adoption of non-discrimination statements contested. A “gay hostile” institution was one that promoted an anti-gay agenda, including the

restriction of homosexuals from its student or faculty bodies and the inclusion of anti-gay content in its curriculum.

As noted in Table 1, two-thirds of the respondents view their institutional climate as gay affirmative or tolerant; less than one-quarter view it as gay intolerant or gay hostile. Faculty working in private, independent institutions assess their work environments as more gay affirming or tolerant than their public university counterparts ($X^2 = 16.27$, $df = 4$, $p < .01$). At the public institutions there tends to be a bimodal distribution. While a vast majority of faculty working in private, independent institutions view them as either gay affirmative (44%) or gay tolerant (44%), within public institutions only about one-half report environments as either gay affirmative (12%) or tolerant (41%) with 30 percent reporting intolerance (29%) or hostility (1%). Those working in public institutions were three and one-half times less likely than those in private, independent ones to view their institution as gay affirming and nearly ten times more likely to view their public institution as gay intolerant. Finally, while no significant difference was found between those faculty of master's granting and doctoral granting institutions and their caricature of their institutional climate,⁸ there was a trend, though not statistically significant, for lesbians to view their institution as less gay affirmative and more gay intolerant than homosexual men (as noted earlier female respondents were more representative in public institutions than gay men).

But, to what degree do these institutional characterizations fit the aforementioned definitions? What dimensions embedded within these definitions are most salient to these education faculty? In conceptualizing these definitions I, like most queer campus activists, have placed greater emphasis on the institutional dimension evidenced in the inclusion of sexual orientation in college statements, faculty benefits, and curriculum offerings. In order to test the validity of the a priori defined

TABLE 1. Faculty Characterization of Institutional Climate

	Total	Public	Private	Lesbian	Gay
Institutional Climate					
1. Gay Affirmative	22%	12%	44%	10%	32%
2. Gay Tolerant	43%	41%	44%	50%	42%
3. Gay Neutral	13%	16%	6%	14%	11%
4. Gay Intolerant	18%	29%	3%	20%	13%
5. Gay Hostile	4%	1%	3%	6%	4%

components of institutional climate described above, correlational analyses were conducted between respondents' overall assessment of their institutional climate (INSTCLI) and seven summative scales reflecting various institutional dimensions:⁹

Personal Support (SUPRPER). The degree of perceived personal support among members within the respondents' institution, ranging from the invitation of "partners or significant others" to unit functions and the acceptance of photographs/memorabilia of one's partner or girl/boy friend in one's office to the openness of colleagues in sharing and listening to one's personal experiences, the inclusion of items of personal relevance in institutional publications, and the existence of a lesbian/gay support group in their work settings. This six-item summative scale (Cronbach coefficient alpha = .77) required respondents to check or leave blank those components of support which they found within their immediate work environment; the higher the score the greater perceived support.

Institutional Provisions (PROINST). Respondents' reports of non-discrimination and/or affirmative action statements that include sexual orientation, the existence of either a gay, lesbian, and bisexual student or faculty organizations, the offering of university courses in g/l/b/t studies, or the availability of one of several domestic partner benefits. This six-item summative scale (Cronbach coefficient alpha = .61) required respondents to check or leave blank those provisions of their institution; the higher the score the more institutional provisions reported by the respondent.

Anticipatory Discrimination (ANTIDIS). Respondents' "realistic assessment" of their units taking favorable action on hiring, promoting or tenuring: an "open homosexual" or homosexual "activist"; admitting an "open homosexual student" for teacher training or graduate study; recommending an "open homosexual student" for teacher certification. This nine-item summative scale is based on a four-point Likert-type response scale (no problem, some problem, serious problem, couldn't be done) with a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .94; higher scores represent greater anticipatory discrimination.

Institutional Discrimination (INSTDIS). The actual occurrence in respondent's unit of one or more of the following: hiring, promoting, or tenuring an "open homosexual" or homosexual "activist"; admitting an "open homosexual student" for teacher training or graduate study; recommending an open homosexual student for teacher certification. This same nine-item scale has a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .82, requiring respondents to check the actual occurrence at their unit level of each

supportive personnel decision; the higher the score the more frequent such supportive decisions have been made and, hence, the lower the actual institutional discrimination.

Lesbian and Gay Curriculum in Education (EDUCURR). Reported offerings within the education school, college or department of: regular courses and/or occasional special topic courses on gay studies or gay, lesbian, bisexual issues in education; one or more courses that give major coverage of homosexuality or gay, lesbian, bisexual issues in education. Included in this six-item yes/no response set were respondents reporting current plans to provide major coverage to this subject in at least one education course or to offer a regular course or occasional seminar on gay studies or lesbian/gay issues in education. This six-item scale required respondents to check or leave blank those curriculum offerings or planned offering. With a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .53, the higher the score the greater the college curricular commitment.

Support for Gay/Lesbian Research (SUPRRCH). Degree of respondents' perceived institutional support from principal decision-makers (i.e., tenured unit faculty, university promotion and tenure committee, university administration, and the trustees) should one choose to conduct gay-related research. This is a five-item Likert scale ranging from 1 (approve) through 3 (neutral) to 5 (disapprove) and has a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .83; the higher the score the greater the perceived disapproval.

Support for Gay/Lesbian Faculty (SUPRHOM). Degree of perceived support among respondents from various campus constituent groups (i.e., undergraduate students and their parents, graduate students, untenured and tenured faculty, university promotion and tenure committee, university administration, trustees, and alumni) should one's sexual identity become known. This nine-item summative scale also used the five choice Likert-response set (Cronbach coefficient alpha = .89); the higher the score the greater the perceived disapproval for the respondent's disclosure of her/his sexual identity.

The inter-correlations among these seven scales and between these scales and respondents' overall characterization of their institutional climate along with means, standard deviations, and coefficient alpha reliability estimates appear in Table 2.

The bivariate correlations identified all seven predictor variables as significantly related to institutional climate (INSTCLI) which as a criterion variable ranged from 1 (Gay Affirmative) through 5 (Gay Hostile): Institutional Provisions (PROINST; $r = -.37$), Personal Support (SUPRPER; $r = -.72$), Anticipatory Discrimination (ANTIDIS; $r =$

TABLE 2. Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Coefficient Alpha Reliability Estimates Between Faculty Assessment of Institutional Climate and Seven Conceptually Generated Dimensions

Intercorrelations										
Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. INSTCLI	2.39	1.13	--							
2. PROINST	2.56	1.54	-.37***	(.61)						
3. SUPRPER	2.57	1.82	-.72***	.45***	(.77)					
4. ANTIDIS	15.73	6.89	.56***	NS	-.47***	(.94)				
5. INSTDIS	2.30	2.50	-.34***	.25**	.26**	-.29***	(.82)			
6. EDUCURR	.97	1.17	-.39***	.24*	.31**	NS	.21*	(.53)		
7. SUPRRCH	12.73	3.89	.44***	-.27***	-.30**	.36***	-.27***	-.31**	(.83)	
8. SUPRHOM	27.14	8.06	.33***	NS	NS	.42***	-.22***	NS	.70***	(.89)

Note: Reliability estimates appear on the diagonal.

NS nonsignificant

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

.56), Institutional Discrimination (INSTDIS; $r = -.34$), Lesbian and Gay Curriculum in Education (EDUCURR; $r = -.39$), Support for Gay/Lesbian Research (SUPRRCH; $r = .44$), and Support for Gay/Lesbian Faculty (SUPRHOM; $r = .33$). Each of these correlations were significant at $p < .001$ and all were in the predicted direction. Although the correlation between institutional climate and Lesbian and Gay Curriculum in Education was significant, this scale was discarded because of its low internal reliability.

The six remaining predictor variables were grouped into three broadly defined dimensions: Perceived Unit Support (SUPRPER, ANTIDIS); Perceived Campus Support (SUPRHOM, SUPRRCH); and Campus/Unit Decisions (PROINST, INSTDIS). The highest correlations for institutional climate were found on the two scaled variable groups defined as Perceived Unit Support. That is, those lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty members who judge their institutional climate more positively also are more likely to view their work environment

more personally supportive (e.g., partner's inclusion in unit functions) and believe their unit will be more supportive of personnel decisions, ranging from the hiring or tenuring of an openly gay faculty member to recommending a homosexual student for teacher certification than those education faculty who have more negative assessments.¹⁰

Significant, though less powerful, correlations also were found between the assessment of institutional climate and the scaled variables represented by the other two dimensions. Along the dimension of Perceived Campus Support, those faculty members who judge their institution more favorably also tend to believe that should their sexual orientation become known or should they elect to pursue gay-related research that their campus community, including those who are in key decision making roles, would be more approving than those faculty who characterize their institutional climate more negatively.¹¹

A third dimension that distinguishes faculty members' judgment of their institutional climate is Campus/Unit Decisions. For example, respondents who work at institutions with a nondiscrimination statement that includes sexual orientation, a curriculum that offers courses in gay/lesbian studies, or which provides partner benefits are more likely to render an overall judgment of their institutional climate as positive compared to those who do not report such progress on this dimension. This is also true for those education faculty who report their unit making positive personnel decisions, such as the hiring or promoting of openly glbt faculty.¹²

PERCEIVED DIMENSIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

From data analyzed in this study, there is a disjunction between what many have assumed contribute to a positive valuation of institutional climate and lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty members' assessment of their institutional climate. From the founding of the Gay Academic Union in 1973 through the steady growth of lesbian/gay caucuses within various academic associations in subsequent years, "fledgling groups of activist scholars worked to achieve recognition, to call attention to the problem of discrimination and win resolutions condemning it . . ." (D'Emilio, 1992, p. 166). For a generation following Stonewall, campus activists have fought often heated battles to include sexual orientation in their institution's nondiscrimination statement, to recognize and fund campus lesbian-gay student groups, and to extend benefits to same-sex partners in committed relationships (e.g., Tierney, 1993a).

Despite anti-gay initiatives to curb academic freedom (e.g., Carmona, 1994; Sears, 1998; Zapher, 1994) gay and lesbian studies as well as queer theory have established academic beachheads on many campuses. These are more likely to be found, however, in the colleges of arts and social sciences, with the professional schools, most notably education, languishing behind.

During the last quarter of this century campus activists principally focused on the third dimension: Unit/Campus Decisions, which include Trustee and presidential decisions to include sexual orientation in its nondiscrimination statement or include same-sex partner benefits; higher education administrators' decision to recognize campus gay organizations; unit faculty decisions to offer a lesbian-oriented course or to hire a homosexual professor who engages in gay-related research. Here, an underlying assumption was that such decisions bring into being or enhance an institutional climate wherein lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty could realistically anticipate their unit not discriminating in its personnel or admissions decisions (ANTIDIS), and, if they so chose, could freely conduct gay-related research (SUPRRCH), disclose their sexual orientation (SUPRHOM), or share aspects of their personal life with colleagues (SUPRPER). Therefore, in this study, it was hypothesized that the dimension of Unit/Campus Decisions (PROINST and INSTDIS) would be significantly related to these areas of institutional life.

As expected, a significant relationship exists in the predicted direction between institutional provisions and personal support at the unit level (SUPRPER, $r = .34$, $p < .001$), as well as the actual occurrence of positive personnel and admissions decisions in the respondent's unit (INSTDIS, $r = .25$, $p < .01$). However, in further review of Table 2, there are a few inter-correlations that evidence an unexpected or nonsignificant relationship.

This study, for example, found no significant relationship between institutional provisions (PROINST), such as the existence of nondiscrimination statements or gay studies courses and the perception of homosexual faculty that should their sexual orientation be known it would be met with approval among various campus constituent groups (SUPRHOM) or the respondent's "realistic assessment" of her/his unit acting favorably on personnel or admission decisions wherein sexual identity or gay political activism is known (ANTIDIS). Of particular note, too, is the inverse relationship between institutional provisions and the perceived institutional support among key decision-makers should the respondent pursue gay-related scholarship (SUPRRCH, $r =$

-.27, $p < .001$).¹³ Other scales, however, demonstrate the expected relationship with approval for conducting gay research. Those faculty members who anticipate such disapproval from key decision-makers also report working within an institution with less personal support (SUPRPER, $r = -.29$, $p < .01$) and with fewer positive personnel or admissions decisions made by their unit (INSTDIS, $r = -.27$, $p < .001$). These respondents are also more likely to anticipate discrimination within their units on personnel and admissions decisions (ANTIDIS, $r = .36$, $p < .001$) and disapproval from various university constituent groups, should their sexual identity become known (SUPRHOM, $r = .70$, $p < .001$).

Are one of these dimensions more salient than others for education faculty in their assessment of institutional climate? In order to determine the relative contribution of these dimensions in respondents' overall caricature of their institution, multiple regression analysis was performed on the six predictor variables. The results of that analysis appear in Table 3.

The institutional climate scores were regressed on the six predictor variables. Institutional Provisions (PROINST), Personal Support (SUPRPER), Anticipatory Discrimination (ANTIDIS), Institutional Discrimination (INSTDIS), Support for Gay/Lesbian Research (SUPRRCH), and Support for Gay/Lesbian Faculty (SUPRHOM) accounted for 65 percent of the variance in Institutional Climate, $F(6, 58) = 18.27$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .65$.

TABLE 3. Beta Weights and Uniqueness Indices Obtained in Multiple Regression Analysis of Six Dimensions Predicting Institutional Climate

Predictor	Beta Weights		Uniqueness Indices	
	Beta	t	Index	F
SUPRPER	-.57	-5.74***	.197	54.72***
ANTIDIS	.17	1.77	.019	4.32*
SUPRRCH	.15	1.36	.011	2.0
SUPRHOM	.09	.83	.004	.85
INTIDIS	-.03	-.32	.0006	.15
PROINST	-.01	-.12	.00001	.03

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

In order to assess the relative importance of each of these six variables in the prediction of respondents' perceptions of institutional climate, standardized multiple regression coefficients (beta weights) and the percentage of variance accounted for by a given predictor beyond that attributed to the other variables (uniqueness indices) were analyzed. As evident in Table 3, only Personal Support (SUPRPER) had a significant beta weight (beta = $-.57$, $p < .001$). The findings of uniqueness, however, did not match those for beta weights in that both Personal Support and Anticipated Discrimination (ANTIDIS) evidenced significant indices. The former dimension alone accounted nearly 20 percent of the unique variance beyond the variance attributed to the other predictor dimensions, $F(1, 58) = 54.72$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .197$; Anticipatory Discrimination accounted for about 2 percent of the unique variance, $F(1, 58) = 4.32$, $p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .019$. Thus, 22 percent of the unique variance is accounted for by the dimension of Perceived Unit Support.

In this study, sexual minority education faculty principally judge institutional climate on the basis of their interpersonal relations at the unit level. Institutional provisions, such as adopting a non-discrimination clause or adding domestic partner benefits—generally the target of campus activists and my hypothesized relationship—demonstrate a nonsignificant or inverse relationship with those decisions queer faculty are often encouraged to make (e.g., conducting homosexual-related research, disclosing one's sexual identity) or in our assumption that such decisions are associated with reduced fear of discrimination among these faculty. Hence, the hidden dimension of queer faculty members' judgment regarding the quality of institutional climate is to be found in everyday personal relations with others in their unit.

ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE: EXPLORING A FOUR FACTOR MODEL

In the preceding section the concepts discussed were generated from a theoretical model and then analyzed statistically, in this section the data are treated inductively with empirically generated variables using a correlated factor analytic model. Specifically, from the original 123 items (including all the variables cited in the theoretically-tested model), a correlational analysis was conducted within seven hypothesized factors, ranging from three to thirty-one variables, believed to differentiate among gay, lesbian, and bisexual education faculty.¹⁴

Those variables correlating greater than .25 ($p < .001$) were then subjected to factor analysis. Twenty-five variables met this criterion; six of these overlapped with the deductively developed concepts discussed in the previous section.¹⁵ Five factors (Eigenvalues > 1.0) were extracted from these 25 variables using a principal axis procedure followed by a promax rotation:

Factor 1: Respondent's Activism in Professional Discrimination (DISCRACT). Among those faculty who have experienced some form of discrimination, those who took action such as writing to the chair/supervisor, appealing the decision, contacting various type of legal counsel (i.e., lesbian/gay, other defense group, or general legal counsel), or undertaking legal action. This factor also includes those who report discrimination for funding on gay-related research or who disclosed their sexual orientation.

Factor 2: Campus Homophobia (HOMOPHOB). This factor is defined by the frequency respondents' report hearing homophobic comments in the classroom from students or faculty, at faculty meetings, or in casual student, faculty, or staff conversation.

Factor 3: Perceived Immediate Work Environment (FACPOSIT). The respondent reports unit support for displaying photographs/memorabilia of her/his partner or significant other, sharing of personal experiences with colleagues in a manner similar to heterosexuals, or the extending of invitations to one's partner or significant other. This factor also is defined by the educator's belief that disclosure would not adversely affect chances for future employment or advancement.

Factor 4: Public Disclosure (ACTIVISM). Within the past year, the respondent has participated in a lesbian/gay/bisexual political group, caucus, pride march, and/or in a women's political group. This factor also includes the degree to which these educators are "open" about their sexual identity with their students or clients.

Factor 5: Gay Affirming Student Institutional Climate (STDPOSIT). The presence of a g/l/b/t student organization or the offering of lesbian and gay studies courses at the respondent's institution.

Further analyses of the factors were conducted using a scree test, examining the proportion of variance accounted for, and judging for interpretability. Consequently, the number of factors was reduced to four with Factor 5 (STDPOSIT) dropped from analysis.¹⁶ This four-factor model accounted for 77.6 percent of the total variance and revealed a simple structure (i.e., the variables have high loading on one factor and low loadings on other factors). Table 4 displays the questionnaire items, corresponding factor loadings, and final commonality estimates. Final

TABLE 4. Rotated Factor Pattern and Final Community Estimates from Promax Factor Analysis of Variables Discriminating Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Education Faculty

Factor					Item #	Items
1	2	3	4	h2		
.87	.25	-.11	.30	.79	29A	Sent letter to chair/supervisor
.85	.12	.21	.17	.79	29B	Formally appealed decision
.91	.20	.02	.17	.83	29C	Contact gay/lesbian defense group
.70	.08	-.31	.07	.57	29D	Contacted other defense group
.78	.19	-.11	-.05	.65	29E	Contacted an attorney
.84	-.01	.01	.04	.74	29F	Took legal action
.49	.17	.11	.37	.34	35F	Denied research funding due to sexual identity
.14	.85	-.25	.07	.75	24A	How often heard homophobic comments by stds. in class
.17	.85	1.1	.22	.73	24B	How often heard homophobic comments by prof. in class
.31	.72	-.17	.12	.56	24C	How often heard homophobic comments in faculty meeting
.12	.80	-.14	.10	.67	24F	How often heard casual student homophobic comments
.06	.86	-.04	.08	.75	24G	How often heard casual professor homophobic comments
.09	.83	.03	.05	.73	24H	How often heard casual staff homophobic comments
.03	-.02	.77	.18	.61	18A	Partner invited to office/unit functions
.01	-.07	.74	.35	.61	18B	Photos/memorabilia of partner/"friend" acceptable
.02	-.01	.70	.07	.50	18E	Sharing personal experiences with co-workers acceptable
-.05	-.19	.54	-.08	.33	56D	L/G/B faculty organization on campus or in unit
-.18	-.33	.43	.08	.27	38	Likelihood of disclosure affecting future employment
-.08	-.06	.18	.57	.37	45A	Participation in Vglb political group during past year
.23	.12	.01	.77	.62	45C	Participation in l/g/b caucus during past year
.03	.15	.33	.64	.48	45F	Participation in l/g/b pride march during past year
.18	.31	-.15	.71	.60	47A	Participation in a women's political group during past year
.12	-.15	.25	.55	.39	23B	Proportion of students with whom "openly gay"

commonality estimates (h2) the percent of variance in a variable accounted for by all of the factors taken together.

On the basis of these results a set of four sub-scales (factor-based scores) were constructed with items loading $> .45$ on one of the four retained factors: Respondent's Activism in Professional Discrimination, seven items, ($\alpha = .68$); Campus Homophobia, six items ($\alpha = .48$); Perceived Immediate Work Environment, five items ($\alpha = .65$); and Public Disclosure, five items ($\alpha = .63$).

Differences between gender of the respondent (i.e., lesbian or gay male) as well as between type of institutions (i.e., public or private, independent) were then explored by comparing these four factor-based scores using independent samples t-tests. The results were mixed.

On one of the scales (HOMOPHOB) significant differences were found between both gender ($t[83] = 2.11$; $p < .05$) and institution type ($t[81] = 2.02$; $p < .05$). As the data appearing in Table 5 illustrate, lesbian education faculty reported hearing more homophobic remarks on campus (for lesbian group, $M = 15.47$, $SD = 7$; for gay male group, $M = 12.56$, $SD = 5.16$), as do those working in public institutions (for public, $M = 15.76$, $SD = 5.88$; for private, $M = 13.10$, $SD = 5.86$).

TABLE 5. Independent-Samples t, Means and Standard Deviations Between Gender, Institutional Type and Four Factor-Based Scaled Variables

Variable	Lesbian		Gay Male		t	df	Public		Private		t	df
	M	SD	M	SD			M	SC	M	SD		
HOMOPHOB	15.47	7	12.56	5.16	2.11*	83	15.76	5.88	13.10	5.86	2.02*	81
DISCRACT	.31	1.04	.30	.96	.09	88	.18	.56	.82	1.89	-1.89	82
FACPOSIT	4.19	1.86	4.37	2.19	-.41	88	3.82	1.92	4.61	2.15	-1.74	82
ACTIVISM	3.73	2.58	3.63	2.05	1.59	88	3.69	2.39	3.67	2.23	.04	82

NS not significant

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Examining the results from the other three t-tests, no significant differences were found between either gender or institutional type vis-à-vis public disclosure (ACTIVISM), respondent's activism in professional discrimination (DISCRACT), or perceived immediate work environment (FACPOSIT). Although, as noted in Table 5, there was trend ($t[82] = -1.74$; $p = .081$ for those working at public institutions to view their work environment as less gay-supportive than those at private, independent institutions (for public, $M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.92$; for private, $M = 4.61$, $SD = 2.15$).

What is the relationship between these four factors and respondents' overall caricature of their institutional climate? Bivariate correlational analysis among these four score-based factors¹⁷ and respondents' assessment of their institutional climate along with means, standard deviations, and coefficient alpha reliability estimates appear in Table 6.

As evident in Table 6, two of the scaled variables were significantly related to institutional climate (INSTCLI): Variable 2, Campus Homophobia (HOMOPHOB; $r = .18$, $p < .05$); and Variable 3, Perceived Immediate Work Environment (FACPOSIT; $r = -.64$, $p < .001$). The correlations between institutional climate area Variable 4, Public Disclosure (ACTIVISM; $r = -.16$), and Variable 1, Respondent's Activism in Professional Discrimination (DISCRACT; $r = .04$) were nonsignificant. Also, as expected, those lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty who view their institutional climate as more positive heard homophobic comments less frequently in the classroom, at faculty meetings, or in casual comments from students, staff, or faculty.¹⁸

TABLE 6. Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Coefficient Alpha Reliability Estimates Between Faculty Assessment of Institutional Climate and Four Factor-Based Scales

Intercorrelations							
Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. INSTCLI	2.39	1.13	--				
2. DISCRACT	2.22	.90	NS	(.68)			
3. HOMOPHOB	14.34	6.20	.18*	.26**	(.48)		
4. FACPOSIT	4.14	2.04	-.64***	NS	NS	(.65)	
5. ACTIVISM	3.53	2.31	NS	.23*	.29**	.22*	(.63)

NS not significant

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Positive institutional climate is also associated with those respondents who perceive a supportive unit work environment.¹⁹

Of particular interest here is that those faculty who distinguish themselves by greater campus activism do not judge their institutional climate as significantly more or less positive than other less active education faculty.²⁰ It is interesting to underscore, however, associations between various types of faculty activism and perceptions of institutional climate. Faculty who have taken action following incidents of discrimination in their professional lives (DISCRACT, $r = .20$, $p < .05$) or who have chosen to disclose their sexual identity through queer political activities or by coming out to their students (ACTIVISM, $r = .29$, $p < .01$) are more likely to report hearing homophobic comments (HOMOPHOB) on campus. Further, politically active faculty (ACTIVISM) are also more likely to report a unit that is personally supportive (FACPOSIT, $r = .22$, $p < .05$). Thus, activist faculty appear to be more sensitive or attentive to campus homophobia yet perceive their immediate work environment as more supportive than non-activist faculty.

How important are faculty perceptions of their unit work environment and how critical is the presence of homophobic campus comments in relationship to the assessment of institutional climate? In order to determine the relative contribution of these two factors in respondents' overall caricature of their institution, multiple regression analyses were performed. The institutional climate scores regressed on the two factor-based scales found to significantly correlate with these scores ac-

counted for 21 percent of the variance in institutional climate, $F(2, 93) = 32.45$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .41$.²¹ Beta weights and uniqueness indices appear in Table 7.

As presented in Table 7, Perceived Immediate Work Environment (FACPOSIT) contributed a larger beta weight at $-.62$ ($p < .001$), while the beta weight for Campus Homophobia (HOMOPHOB) is $.10$ and nonsignificant. The findings of uniqueness match these beta weights in that FACPOSIT evidences a statistically significant index; Perceived Immediate Work Environment accounts for 38 percent of the unique variance in assessment of institutional climate, $F(1, 103) = 22.08$, $p < .001$. Clearly, faculty perception of the degree of support they receive at their unit level—ranging from inclusiveness in unit events to the belief that sexual self-disclosure would not impact their future employment—is the principal factor that distinguishes faculty assessment of their institutional climate.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: A LOCALIZED FRAME OF REFERENCE

Despite the lethargy of many colleges and universities in the United States to adopt same-sex benefits, to provide an array of courses in glbt studies, or to provide support for queer student organizations, the quality of campus life experience for lesbian, gay, and bisexual faculty members in education is generally positive. Less than one in four respondents in this study viewed their institution as either gay intolerant or gay hostile although those working in public colleges and universities reported greater intolerance or hostility. In fact, those working

TABLE 7. Beta Weights and Uniqueness Indices Obtained in Multiple Regression Analysis of Two Factor-Based Scales Predicting Institutional Climate

Predictor	Beta Weights		Uniqueness Indices	
	Beta	t	Index	F
HOMOPHOB	.10	NS	.011	NS
FACPOSIT	-.62	-7.75***	.379	65.34***

NS Nonsignificant

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

within public institutions were ten times more likely to report a campus climate of gay intolerance with women tending to view the climate less positively than men.

In order to explore the source of these perceptions, seven dimensions of institutional climate were analyzed ranging from perceived personal support found within their immediate work environment and the degree of integration of glbt issues in the curriculum to respondents' realistic assessment of their unit taking favorable actions on hiring or tenuring queer faculty to their perception of support for faculty conducting queer-related research among different levels of decision-making authority. The largest correlations found for assessment of campus climate were personal support experienced by faculty in their department or program area and judgment of their colleagues' willingness to respond affirmatively in admitting, hiring, or retaining queer faculty and students. And, the most powerful predictor of faculty members' judgment of their institutional climate (accounting for one-fifth of the variance) was this dimension of personal support. Further, no significant relationship was found between the existence of institutional protections, such as a non-discrimination policy on sexual orientation and anticipated institutional response should a faculty member disclose one's homo/bisexual identity. Less than one percent of the variance in assessment of institutional climate ($R^2 = .65$) is accounted for by such provisions. And, in fact, there was an inverse correlation between the adoption of such protections and perceived support among queer faculty for pursuing gay-related research with lesbians more skeptical that such inquiries would be approved by university decision-makers. Such research, however, appears to be fostered where greater personal support existed and where there was evidence of positive hiring and retention decisions within the respondent's unit.

While great efforts have been expended to enhance the institutional climate for sexual minorities on campus by establishing legal protections, developing courses, and expanding benefits, education faculty in this study judged their institution largely on the basis of experiences within their departments or program areas. Whether the variables are generated conceptually or empirically, this personal localized frame of reference is the most significant and greatest contributor in predicting gay and lesbian faculty members' assessment of institutional climate. Anticipating institutional discrimination and noting homophobic comments on campus also contribute, albeit in a small way, to how lesbian and gay faculty members' assess their institutional climate.

Of particular interest is the disparity between these education faculty members' anticipation of discriminatory action in personnel or admissions decisions and their report of the existence of institutional provisions protecting against such discrimination. While institutional protections, benefits, and courses targeted at sexual minorities are clearly related to the degree of support faculty perceive at the unit level, the weight of these institutional provisions in predicting institutional climate pales in comparison to faculty perceptions of personal welfare and support.

What implications do these findings have for professional organizations and accrediting associations which have, at some political cost, encompassed sexual diversity within their domain? How should glbt university administrators and faculty leaders as well as their allies respond to these findings? How might campus activists and lesbian/gay faculty who seek a gay affirmative institutional climate proceed? My understanding of organizational change and fifteen years in working at a conservative public higher education institution coupled lead me to conclude that a personal, grass-roots approach is more likely to result in long-term and genuine transformation of the institutional climate. Rather than placing first priority on enveloping a college campus in sometimes divisive issues like legal protections, partner benefits, or curriculum reform efforts should first be placed at the interpersonal and unit levels—the frame of reference that defines the quality of institutional life for lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty. To the degree that debate on institutional-wide decisions facilitates this process, then these should be pursued; to the degree that they inhibit reflexive dialogue they should be avoided. The struggle to combat homophobia, heterosexism, and heteronormativity must be waged classroom by classroom, professor by professor, department by department.

NOTES

1. Over the years, there have been several national efforts to collect data on faculty within some academic fields, such as English (Crew, 1978), sociology (Gagnon et al., 1982; Taylor & Raebum, 1993), and psychology (Liddle, Kunkel & Kick, 1998). There are also a variety of normative studies into lesbian or gay college faculty experiences (e.g., Bensimon, 1992; Clarke, 1996; Garber, 1994; Khayatt, 1997; Tierney, 1993).

2. Prior to their dissemination, these surveys were reviewed by several deans and department chairs of education representing a variety of institutional types, as well as sexual minority education faculty members and researchers. Based upon their suggested revisions, surveys were sent out in February 1994. Individual and institutional anonymity were assured.

3. Copies of these surveys as well as frequency displays of survey items are available by writing to the author.

4. All personal correspondence housed in Sears Papers, Perkins Library, Special Collections, Duke University.

5. Within a year, this fall-out would be felt as members of the state legislature, evangelical conservative citizens, newspaper editorialists, and Pat Robertson of the 700 Club brought to bear immense pressure on the USC Board of Trustees regarding my teaching, sexual orientation, and research. (Sears, 1998)

6. Elsewhere (Sears, 1994), I have summarized and analyzed data gathered from surveys returned by 230 deans of education (28%). The population of college of education deans is quite different from education faculty sample. The dean's group is represented by significantly more church-related institutions; they are much more rural than urban and tend to be less represented than faculty in PhD granting institutions. Among these 230 institutions, two-thirds are public institutions, one-quarter church-related institutions, and one-eighth private, independent institutions; one-half are located in rural areas, one-third in urban institutional settings, and one-fifth suburban. While private institutions were more likely to be located in urban settings, most of the public institutions were located in rural areas. One-fourth of the administrators lead colleges, schools, or departments with 15 or fewer education faculty members. The majority are masters (one-third) or baccalaureate (one-fifth) granting institutions with 30 percent at PhD level and 12 percent at the specialist level.

7. Words in all capital letters and within parentheses are variable labels.

8. I purposely choose the term "caricature" in this article to underscore that these respondents' assessment of their institutional climate, their reports of gay-related institutional provisions, as well as the other data collected through this particular instrument (along with my own interpretation of those data) are all understood through these and other filters.

9. A summary of the specific items composing each of these scales, as well as the impact on scale reliability of eliminating each item is available by writing the author.

10. There is, of course, substantial variation regarding the specific events that are thought to be acceptable within the institutional unit. For example, two-thirds report memorabilia acceptable in their work environment, one-half bringing a "partner" or significant other to an office function, three in ten sharing personal experiences, and less than one in ten the celebration of events such as anniversaries. No significant differences ($p < .01$) exist between variables comprising this dimension and lesbians and gay men or institutional type. However, although one-half reported the presence of a lesbian/gay support group in their work setting, those working at private, independent institutions were significantly more likely to have such groups.

In the area of personnel and admissions decisions, about two-thirds of the respondents anticipate that "activists" seeking employment, promotion, or tenure would have serious problems in their unit. However, those education faculty members seeking employment, promotion or tenure who are simply "open" about their sexual orientation were perceived by about one-third of the respondents to pose "no problem" and another 40-50% only "some problem" in their unit. There was a tendency for lesbians and those working in public institutions to anticipate greater difficulties in most of these areas.

While two-thirds of the respondents report that admitting an openly gay graduate student would pose no problem in their unit, when it comes to admitting an openly gay student to its teacher education program or recommending the student for certification the respondent percentage shrunk to about one-third. Of particular interest is that these

two situations are those which generated the greatest proportion of respondents (37% and 35%, respectively) who said it either couldn't be done (about one in ten) or who foresee serious problems (about one in four). Again, there was a trend for those working in public institutions of higher education or lesbians to anticipate greater problems than those at private, independent institutions or gay male education faculty.

11. Relatively few respondents have pursued a research agenda in the area of lesbian/gay scholarship evidenced in applying for research grants (20%) or have engaged in a "study group" with others in their community on lesbian/gay scholarship (16%). Only a minority view those wielding decision-making authority as approving or, at best, being neutral should they engage in such work. There is, in fact, an inverse relationship between faculty perceptions of approval vis-à-vis the level of the decision-making group. That is, as one moves from the unit level (12% approve and 34% somewhat approve) through various levels of administration (between 3-4% approve and between 22-26% somewhat approve) and up to the trustee level (1% approve, 12% approve somewhat), anticipation of approval decreases. Education faculty in public institutions and lesbian education faculty are generally less likely to believe that these key groups of decision-makers (i.e., tenured college faculty, university promotion/tenure committee, university administration, trustees) will approve of gay-related research than those working at private, independent institutions or gay male faculty. Conducting gay-related research, however, is anticipated by respondents to be more favorably evaluated than the knowledge one's homosexuality. Faculty anticipated these key decision-making bodies to be less approving of their homosexuality should that become "known," than whether they elected to pursue inquiry into gay/lesbian studies. There also was an inverse relationship found in the anticipated approval of disclosure of one's homosexuality and the proximity of the particular constituent groups to the respondent. That is, the farther removed the particular group from the faculty member's immediate work environment (e.g., alumni, parents, trustees) the lower the expected approval.

12. While two-thirds of the respondents report their institution having a non-discrimination statement which included sexual orientation, only one-quarter cite such inclusion in the affirmative action statement. Further, less than one-in-seven respondents (13%) note the inclusion of any domestic partner benefits. The most likely benefit that partners of respondents can claim is access to sports facilities (14%) with less than six percent or less reporting (in order of descending frequency): partner access to the library, life insurance, health care, family leave, housing, and tuition/fee reduction.

About one-third of the respondents report that the promotion, hiring, or tenuring of an openly gay faculty member in education has already occurred in their unit; about one-quarter the admissions of an openly gay graduate student, and about one-fifth report their unit had already promoted, hired, or tenured an "activist" faculty member. A greater proportion of faculty working at private, independent institutions reported such events than their counterparts working at public colleges or universities.

13. Other scales demonstrate the relationship with approval for conducting gay research in the expected direction. Those faculty members who anticipate disapproval from key decision-makers for such inquiry also tend to report working within an institution with less personal support (SUPRPER, $r = -.29, p < .01$) and with fewer positive personnel or admissions decisions made by their unit (INSTDIS, $r = -.27, p < .001$). These respondents who expect disapproval are also more likely to anticipate discrimination within their units on personnel and admissions decisions (ANTIDIS, $r = .36, p <$

.001) and disapproval from various university constituent groups, should their sexual identity become known (SUPRHOM, $r = .70$, $p < .001$).

14. These hypothesized factors were: Respondents' Overall Political Activism (e.g., participation in women's, civil liberties, or environmental causes during the past year); Respondents' Gay Activism (e.g., participation in lesbian/gay activities, confronting perceived discrimination); Perceived Institutional Climate (e.g., nondiscrimination statement, hiring of openly gay faculty, non-heterosexist policies); Anticipatory Institutional Discrimination (e.g., anticipated likelihood of the college hiring a homosexual or gay activist, expected approval of university administrators/trustees for conducting gay scholarship); Perceived Professional Climate (e.g., discrimination in receiving research funding, publishing opportunities or leadership roles); Anticipatory Professional Discrimination (e.g., disclosure on vitae or in interview affecting employment); Homosexual Transparency (e.g., disclosure of sexual identity to colleagues or administrators, response to homophobic or heterosexist comments).

15. Q18A, Q18B, Q18E from the six-item SUPRPER scale, and Q56C, Q56D, Q56E from six-item PROINST scale. Q56C was presence of a g/l/b student organization and Q56E was g/l courses on campus. The other four items are cited in Table 4.

16. While Factor 5 met the arbitrary 1.0 cut-off Eigenvalue (1.2), and the scree plot suggested a break between Factors 3 and 4 or Factors 4 and 5, the proportion of variance accounted for in Factor 5 was less than 10 percent (6.9%) while Factor 4 (ACTIVISM) accounted for 10 percent and Factor 5 consisted of only two variables with significant loadings ($> .45$).

17. STDPOSIT deleted following initial examination of the original factor analysis, accounted for less than 1% of the total variance in institutional climate (INSTCLI).

18. Students (both within and outside of the classroom and through the campus newspaper) are those which respondents report hearing most of these comments. The majority does not report hearing (or hearing only occasionally) homophobic comments at faculty meetings, by a professor in the classroom, among office staff, or in casual remarks among fellow professors. Faculty working at private, independent institutions report hearing homophobic comments less frequently than those employed at public institutions.

19. The frequency distributions for most of these data have already been reported in the first section of this article. Related is workplace harassment or discrimination. While 60 percent report knowing someone who was discriminated on the basis of sexual orientation in the hiring, or in the promotion/tenure process, a comparatively small percentage of respondents report first hand experience of harassment or discrimination in their workplace. In descending frequency of discrimination: hiring (13%) promotion or job advancement (7%), awards (6%), salary or committee assignment (6%), tenure (5%). Among those who felt some sort of discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation, the most common response was to contact an attorney.

The most often cited form of discrimination reported by education faculty is discouragement from publishing in gay/lesbian areas (19 percent). However, fewer than 3 percent report discrimination in the publication of papers, the acceptance of conference papers, or book proposals on the basis of sexual orientation. The most often cited areas of discrimination by respondents were in research funding (8%) and leadership positions (7%).

In addition to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, respondents also indicated if they experienced other forms of discrimination. Four out of ten reported discrimination on the basis of gender—three-fourths of all women in the study and

one-third of all men ($X^2 = 17.7$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$)—and 13 percent on the basis of race or ethnicity.

With respect to harassment, one-fifth report experiencing verbal harassment at work, about one in ten report threats of physical violence or damage to personal property, and 8 percent report sexual harassment. Respondents from public institutions are more likely to report verbal harassment, physical property damage, and threats of violence on the basis of their sexual orientation.

20. Respondents, however, tend to keep their activism to less visible areas and outside their classrooms. While most (60-80%) participated in gay social groups, attended rallies, or gave money, less than one-third were politically involved (lobbying, speaking in public settings, or writing letters in the newspaper) and practically no one participated in acts of civil disobedience on gay-related issues. While two-thirds wear gay/lesbian buttons in public or in social settings, fewer than one in three bring these into the classroom setting.

21. Including the previously deleted Factor 5 (STDPOSIT; $\beta = -.15$, $t = -1.87$, $p > .05$) failed to contribute substantively to this regression equation, $F(3, 85) = 22.17$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .43$.

REFERENCES

- Bensimon, E. (1992). Lesbian existence and the challenge to normative constructions of the academy. Unpublished ms. Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.
- Cannona, J. (1994, March 30). Anti-gay initiatives cause anxiety on state campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 32.
- Clarke, G. (1996). Conforming and contesting with (a) difference: How lesbian students and teachers manage their identities. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 6(2), 191-209.
- Crew, L. (1978). Before emancipation: Gay persons as viewed by chairpersons in English. In L. Crew (Ed.), *The gay academic* (pp. 3-63). Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- D'Augelli, A. (1989). Lesbians' and gay men's experiences in discrimination and harassment in a university community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(3), 317-321.
- D'Emilio, J. (1992). *Making trouble: Essays on gay history, politics, and the university*. New York: Routledge.
- Dolan, J. (1998). Gay and lesbian professors out on campus. *Academe*, 84(5), 40-45.
- Euben, D. (1999). Domestic partnerships benefits for faculty. *Academe*, 85(2), 111.
- Gagnon, J., Keller, S., Lawson, R., Miller, P., Simon, W., & Huber, J. (1982). Report of the American Sociological Association's task group on homosexuality. *The American Sociologist* 17, 164-180.
- Garber, L. (Ed.). (1994). *Tilting the tower*. New York: Routledge.
- Grayson, D. (1992). Breaking the silence: Sexual and gender-based harassment in elementary, secondary and postsecondary education. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Sex equity and sexuality in education* (pp. 132-145). Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Herek, G. (1994). Documenting prejudice against lesbians and gay men on campus. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 25(4), 15-30.
- Hunsicker, J., & Freedley, J. (2000). Significant labor and employment law issues in higher education during the past decade and what to look for now. *Journal of Law and Education*, 29(3), 343-351.
- Khayatt, D. (1997). Sex and the teacher: Should we come out in class? *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(1), 126-43.
- Lather, P. (1986). Research as practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 257-277.
- Liddle, B., Kunkel, M., & Kick, S. (1998). The gay, lesbian, and bisexual psychology faculty experience. *Teaching of Psychology*, 25(1), 19-25.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1994, May 19). *NCATE Standards*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nelson, R., & Baker, H. (1990). The educational climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at the University of California at Santa Cruz. Unpublished ms. University of California Santa Cruz, Student Services.
- Record of the Council. (June 8 and 11, 2000). *Academe*, 86(5), 74-75.
- Rhoads, R. (1994). *Coming out in college*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Sears, J. (1982). Taking off the masks. *Changing Schools*, 11(Spring), 12-13.
- Sears, J. (1994). The quality of life for lesbian and gay faculty on campus. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Sears, J. (1998). Crossing the borders and becoming the other: Voices across borders. In J. Sears (Ed.), *Curriculum, religion and public education* (pp. 36-41). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shecter, J. (1996, April 26). Conservative legislators try to punish colleges that back gay rights. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 42, 28.
- Smith, J. (1995). Concerns of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender graduate students. *New Directions for Student Services*, 72(Winter), 111-119.
- Taylor, V., & Raeburn, N. (1993). *Discrimination against gay and lesbian sociologist*. Unpublished ms.
- Tierney, W. (1993). Academic freedom and the parameters of knowledge. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(2), 143-160.
- Zapler, M. (1994, October 26). Colleges wary of ballot measures on tax and social issues. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 41, 36-37.