

Seton Hall University

eRepository @ Seton Hall

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses
(ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

Fall 10-27-2021

The Experiences of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a Diocesan Catholic University

Mark Fabbi

Seton Hall University, fabbimar@shu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fabbi, Mark, "The Experiences of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a Diocesan Catholic University" (2021).

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). 2945.

<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2945>

The Experiences of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a Diocesan Catholic University

Mark Fabbi

Dissertation Committee

Katie Smith, Ph.D., Committee Chair
Alexandra Freidus, Ph.D., Committee Member
Joshua Wilkin, Ph.D., Committee Member

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Higher Education Leadership, Management, and Policy
Seton Hall University
December 2021

South Orange, New Jersey

© 2021 Mark Fabbi



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN
SERVICES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT &
POLICY**

APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

Mark Fabbi has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the **Ph.D.** during this **Fall** Semester.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
(Please sign and date)

<u>Dr. Katie Smith</u>	<u>10/27/21</u>
Mentor	Date
<u>Dr. Alexandra Freidus</u>	<u>10/27/21</u>
Committee Member	Date
<u>Dr. Joshua Wilkin</u>	<u>10/27/21</u>
Committee Member	Date

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation.

Abstract

As the world continues to become more accepting of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people, is this experience similar on a diocesan Catholic campus in the United States? A diocesan Catholic institution is often referred to as an arm of the Catholic Church, often holding a view against same sex marriage and the LGBTQ community. However, the tide may be changing, with a more accepting Catholic church on the horizon. Dillon's theory (2011) explains how sexual identity manifests itself and identifies it as a global process. In Dillon's theory, there are two factors to individual identity development: social and individual experiences, with a focus on group membership and being part of a community. Thus, working at a religiously affiliated institution may be a barrier to identity development. The findings of this study are broken down into three themes: LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution, Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion, and lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGBTQ faculty and staff. These findings illustrate the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff at a diocesan Catholic university in the United States.

Keywords: LGBTQ, faculty, staff, Catholic, higher education, diocesan, experience, identity, universities, Catholic mission.

Dedication

To my partner, my parents, and family for their love and support through this process. To all the LGBTQ Faculty and Staff who have worked at Catholic institutions past and present, this dissertation is dedicated to you.

Acknowledgments

My dissertation indicates how sensitive and complex the relationship between the Catholic church and LGBTQ community is and my hope is that one day they can come together as one. I know there are many people working to make this a reality and I hope that in my lifetime we can see significant changes and improvements to this relationship. To my dissertation chair, Dr. Katie Smith, thank you for your guidance and support through this process. Thank you for taking a chance on me and believing in me. I will never forget what you did for me and I am eternally grateful. To my committee members, Dr. Freidus and Dr. Wilkin, thank you for all your support.

I need to acknowledge the researchers who have studied this topic before me and the courage they had to take on such a monumental issue. I need to acknowledge all the LGBTQ voices that have experienced hardships and were never able to be heard. This dissertation is something that you can be proud of and is hopefully on the road to bridging the gap.

This would have never been possible without the support of my partner, Joey, for his constant support and for my family. To my mother, Diane and father Mark, I hope I made you proud. To my siblings Carol Ann, Jennifer, and Anthony, I love you all so much and thank you for always being there and listening to me. To my nephew Louis and neice Lana, believe in yourself and never give up. This dissertation was a labor of love and sacrifice. The summer before defending, my Aunt Eileen passed away after a courageous battle with breast cancer. I know she was with me in spirit this last semester and giving me strength and wisdom. I love you and know you are always with me. This dissertation will always be my greatest accomplishment and today I have a grateful heart. May love always win.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	9
Purpose of the Study	22
Research Questions	22
CHAPTER 2	23
LGBTQ Faculty and Staff on College Campuses	23
Catholic Church and Homosexuality	31
Theoretical Framework	37
LGBTQ Identity Theory	37
Conclusion	44
CHAPTER 3	45
Purpose of the Study	45
Research Questions	45
Research Design	46
Study Site	47
Recruitment and Participants	48
Data Collection Methods	49
Data Analysis	53
Positionality	54

Reliability..... 55

Summary..... 56

CHAPTER 4 56

Background..... 56

LGBTQ Faculty and Staff Experience at a Diocesan Catholic Higher Education Institution..... 57

Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion..... 66

Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff..... 71

CHAPTER 5 76

LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution..... 76

Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion..... 84

Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff..... 88

Future Research 89

Future Practice 92

Conclusion 93

Appendix..... 109

CHAPTER 1

As the world continues to become more accepting of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people, many ponder if this experience is similar on a diocesan Catholic campuses in the United States. (U.S.) A diocesan Catholic institution is often referred to as an arm of the Catholic Church, often holding a view against same sex marriage and the LGBTQ community. However, the tide may be changing, with a more accepting Catholic church on the horizon. In 2013, Pope Francis said, “A gay person who is seeking God, who is of good will—well, who am I to judge.” This statement by the leader of the Catholic church suggests an openness to greater acceptance of people of LGBTQ identities, especially in the context of historical tension with the LGBTQ community (Carroll, 2013).

Catholic colleges and universities have many community members at their institutions who identify as LGBTQ; however, these individuals are often quiet participants in the community (Zimmerman, 2020). There are some vocal advocates for greater inclusion in these contexts, including Father James Martin, a Jesuit Priest from Fordham University, who has encouraged Catholic colleges and universities to be more accepting of LGBTQ people (Zimmerman, 2020). Father Martin believes that campuses should be a welcoming place for LGBTQ people. However, some people at Catholic colleges and universities resist inclusion efforts and acceptance by referring to the catechism regarding the views or attitudes against LGBTQ people (Zimmerman, 2020). The catechism is the sacred scripture that guides the Catholic church and is often referred to as the pillars of the church. Instead, advocates such as

Father Martin want higher education stakeholders to focus on the catechism and the gospel that promotes love, mercy and compassion to the LGBTQ community (Zimmerman, 2020)

Father Martin is not alone in his views and research suggests that people are becoming more accepting. Today, college students are more likely to support same sex marriage and LGBTQ people than college students at any other time in history (Cavanaugh, 2017). Research by Pew in 2016 indicated that 71% of young people born after 1981 support same sex marriage. However, many students may not always feel comfortable with their sexual identity (Evans, 2001; Rankin 2003, 2006). There has been an increase in homophobia and heterosexism on college and university campuses since 2000, especially at religiously affiliated institutions (Hughes, 2015). Additionally, LGBTQ students are more likely to be victims of violence than their counterparts (Broido, 2002; Rankin 2003, 2006). A national survey on campus climate and sexual assault at 27 U.S. colleges and universities involving 150,000 students indicated that students who identify as LGBTQ are more likely to experience sexual violence compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Heywood, 2015). While the experiences of LGBTQ employees are less studied than the experiences of students, LGBTQ-identifying faculty and staff may have similar experiences to students, feeling greater stress and anxiety than their heterosexual colleagues (Mays & Cochrane, 2001). The State of Higher Education report in 2010 surveyed 5,000 LGBTQ students, faculty, and administrators and found that 33% of respondents identified as LGBTQ. These respondents indicated they were more likely to have a negative campus climate experience compared to their counterparts (Rankin et al., 2010).

Political and Social Climate for LGBTQ People in the United States

These negative experiences are consistent with broader political challenges and other research that suggests negative experiences for LGBTQ individuals in the workplace. There are

approximately 11 million people in the U.S. who identify as LGBTQ (Miller, 2019). Prior to June 2019, there were no federal protections against employment discrimination based on sexual orientation (Miller, 2019). On June 15, 2019, the Supreme Court ruled that employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity is prohibited under federal civil rights law (Dwyer & Svokos 2019). More than half (52%) of people living in the U.S. have been fired, overlooked for a promotion, and harassed for their sexual orientation (Miller, 2019). Twenty-eight states also lack such protections (Out and Equal, 2017), meaning that LGBTQ individuals can be discriminated against for their sexual orientation in the workplace. There were more than 9,000 LGBTQ-related claims filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) from 2012-2016 from states without protections (Miller, 2019). One national study indicated that 42% of LGBTQ-identifying people had experienced employment discrimination based on sexual orientation in their life, and 27% within the five years prior to the survey (Sears & Mallory, 2011). Furthermore, 38% of respondents who are open about their sexuality experienced at least one form of discrimination tied to their sexual orientation in the five years before the study was conducted. One third of respondents indicated they were not out to anyone at work and 7% of respondents had lost their job as a result of discrimination in the workplace (Sears & Mallory, 2011). These studies suggest there is currently a group of individuals feeling isolated, marginalized, and discriminated against in America.

Historical Events Related to LGBTQ Discrimination in the U.S.

The LGBTQ community has long faced political discrimination in the U.S. In 1953, President Dwight Eisenhower signed executive order 10450, banning homosexual people from working in the government. This political action sparked what is often referred to as the “Lavender Scare.” Thousands of U.S. government employees were fired from their jobs for

identifying as LGBTQ (Shuster, 2019). One of the individuals fired during this time was Frank Kameny in 1965. Kameny fought the decision of the government through protests and fights in court (Shuster 2019). Kameny founded the Mattachine Society and led protests outside of the White House in Washington DC to highlight homosexuality oppression (Shuster, 2019). The Mattachine Society was an organization for equal rights that improved the visibility of homosexuality during the time of the Lavender Scare (Peacock, 2016). Similar groups emerged across the nation, providing an opportunity for people to connect and create awareness of homosexuality (Peacock, 2016). It was not until 2009 that a high-level official from the Office of Personnel Management apologized to Frank Kameny and others who lost their jobs during the Lavender Scare (Shuster, 2019).

Even after the Lavender Scare, LGBTQ people in the U.S. continued to face discrimination. One of the most well-known historical events in the gay rights movement was the Stonewall Riots, with the night of the riot detailed by Duberman and Kopkind (1993) in *The Night They Raided the Stonewall*. On June 28, 1968, the New York City Police Department raided the Stonewall Inn located in the Greenwich Village section of New York City. While it was routine for the police to raid local gay bars, the Stonewall Inn typically had advance notice, and raids would happen earlier in the night (Duberman & Kopkind, 1993). During this raid, there were 13 people arrested (Mattson, 2019). After this happened, patrons of the bar and community members protested and clashed with the police for several days. The Stonewall Riot was a major event in the LGBTQ movement, the culmination of smaller activism that garnered national attention (Mattson, 2019). This event also led to the annual Pride marches each year celebrated around the world, and President Barack Obama named the Stonewall Inn a National Historic Site in 2016 (Horsley, 2016).

Following the Stonewall Riots, the LGBTQ community continued to gain visibility within the U.S. In January 1978, Harvey Milk, a business owner and leader in the Castro Neighborhood in San Francisco, was sworn into office as San Francisco City-County Supervisor, serving as the first openly gay elected official in the state of California (Eyerman, 2012). Despite this progress, the LGBTQ community still faced great hostility. In November 1978, he was murdered by his colleague Dan White, who had resigned from his city position and wanted to rescind his resignation (Eyerman, 2012). While Harvey Milk was the mayor Dan White, came to City Hall and killed him (Eyerman, 2012). On the evening of his murder, many people walked from the Castro Neighborhood to city hall with candlelight in solidarity as a symbol against hate. Milk was one of the first LGBTQ leaders elected in the U.S., serving as a key figure in increasing visibility of LGBTQ people (Eyerman, 2012).

The progress of the LGBTQ community to gain equal rights in the U.S. has been slow, impeded by homophobia, discrimination, hostility, and bias. Following Milk's death, the AIDS crisis hit the U.S. in the 1980s, with New York City and the gay community at the epicenter (Gerald, 1989). The Gay Men's Health Clinic (GMHC) was founded in the early 1980s to help the earliest victims of AIDS. When the disease first appeared, it was referred to as GRID, which stands for Gay-Related Immune Deficiency (Gerald, 1989). The negative connection to the gay community only furthered a narrative that would have implications for years to come (Gerald, 1989). To date, over 700,000 people that have died from AIDS-related illness (Centers for Disease Control, 2016). The AIDS Crisis proved to be a challenge for the Catholic Church because, on one hand, the church showed compassion, care for the sick, and support during the AIDS Crisis (Rzeznik, 2016). However, the Catholic church simultaneously became more vocal about their views of homosexuality (Rzeznik, 2016).

In the wake of the AIDS crisis, the discrimination and victimization of LGBTQ-identifying people continued, and political progress and protections have been slow to follow. On October 6, 1998, Matthew Shepard, a student at the University of Wyoming, was beaten, tortured, and left to die in a remote area near Laramie, Wyoming (Zeleny, 2009). He was attacked based on his sexual orientation. Over 10 years later in 2009, President Barack Obama passed hate crime legislation to include protections based on gender and sexual orientation (Zeleny, 2009).

The oppression by Catholic Church leaders against the LGBTQ community still occurs today. In 2015, Archbishop of Newark John Myers sent out a memo to the priests in his diocese outlining that LGBTQ members, supporters, and those in marriages outside of the eyes of the church are not allowed to receive communion or use church facilities (Gibson, 2015). In 2019, The Archbishop of Providence, Thomas Tobin tweeted that Catholics should not support or attend Pride events because they are contrary to Catholic belief and morals (Gehring, 2019). Many Catholic Church leaders, acknowledging the growing support in the U.S. for the LGBTQ community, are trying to reinforce church teaching and doctrine. Meanwhile, the church takes a strong stance on life and the importance of life from birth to death. As such, there is great despair within the LGBTQ community regarding the lack of support from the church and many of its leaders. According to the United States National Center for Transgender Equality and the National LGBTQ task force, which interviewed more than 6,000 people that identify as LGBTQ, 41% of respondents reported they have attempted suicide (Gehring, 2019). The LGBTQ community has a history in the U.S. of hardship and oppression coupled with hopes of a more accepting Catholic church. Support from the church has the potential to help its institutions be more inclusive, including colleges and universities.

Higher Education and the LGBTQ Community

While executive order 10450 focused on government employees, this political action transferred to the private and higher education sectors (Reichard, 1971). Colleges and universities began to have gay and lesbian student organizations arrive on their campus in the late and mid 1960s (Reichard, 1971). The student homophile league was started at Columbia University in 1967 and other organizations followed suit at Cornell, Penn State, and Stanford (Reichard, 1971). The homophile league was a society or organization for homosexual freedom (Reichard, 1971). These organizations paved the way to transform college campuses for LGBTQ students through creating visibility and awareness. These organizations also led advocacy efforts in their campus communities, leading to myriad changes in support of the LGBTQ community that still exist today (Reichard, 1971).

Despite the progress made by these groups, there are still people that have opposing beliefs and views. A lawsuit was filed by students at Sacramento State University in which students, faculty, and staff fought for recognition of an official gay and lesbian student organization in 1971. The court case, the Associated Students of Sacramento State College v. Butz, was heard in California State Court. Ultimately the courts decided that the student organization was allowed to operate under the First Amendment's protection of free speech (Reichard, 1971). This case was groundbreaking and served as the benchmark for many future legal fights, paving the way for future LGBTQ student organizations to have a presence on college campuses.

There are numerous organizations trying to bring attention and awareness to inclusivity issues on college campuses in the U.S. One of these organizations is Campus Pride, an organization that publishes an annual report focusing on colleges and universities that are not

safe or supportive for the LGBTQ community known as the *Shame List*, with 139 campuses on the list:

The 139 campuses have a learning environment that is not supportive and “not safe” for LGBTQ people, particularly transgender students, staff and faculty. Seventy of the colleges listed have received Title IX religious exemptions to allow discrimination against LGBTQ people and 32 campuses have pending Title IX exemption requests. This is up from 58 campuses last year holding discriminatory Title IX religious exemptions and 17 campuses having pending requests. (Campus Pride, 2017, p. 1)

This list also highlights religion-based bigotry in their report, identifying four Catholic colleges (Pelletier, 2016). These schools are a mixture of diocesan, religiously sponsored, and independent institutions that are not safe or supportive of LGBTQ communities (Campus Pride, 2017). While Catholic colleges and universities are safe spaces for religious freedom and expression, there is still discrimination that occurs based on sexual orientation.

One of the schools listed on the Campus Pride Shame List is Catholic University of America, considered the flagship Catholic institution in the U.S. Catholic University has a history of anti-LGBTQ discrimination, including not recognizing their student-led LGBTQ Allies group on campus (Chibbaro, 2020). Catholic University is similar to a diocesan college and university because it is founded and guided by the U.S. Catholic Bishops. Diocesan colleges and universities are led by individual diocese bishops, whereas this university is sponsored by all the bishops in the country. Catholic University had an official recognized gay and lesbian student group on their campus from 1988 to 2002 (Riley, 2012). In 2012, students knowledgeable of this background information requested that the club to be reinstated and the university administration denied the request (Riley, 2012). In 2017, via a change.org petition, students,

once again, requests the student organization be recognized on campus, but it was rejected again by university administration (Riley, 2017).

Catholic Higher Education

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data, there are 4,627 degree-granting post secondary schools in the U.S. Catholic colleges and universities contribute 5% of the higher education workforce (NCES, 2017). According to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2010), there are 246 degree-granting institutions of Catholic higher education in the United States (USCCB, 2010). According to the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU), over 891,000 students were enrolled in Catholic higher education in 2016-2017 (ACCU, 2016). The majority of Catholic colleges and universities are small- to mid-size (ACCU, 2016).

From 1920 to 1960, Catholic higher education enrollment skyrocketed, and a boom occurred with the number of Catholic Colleges and universities growing from 130 to 231 (Garrett, 2006). The majority of Catholic Colleges were founded by religious orders such as Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, or Benedictines (Garrett, 2006). A religious order is a community of people who live their life in accordance with certain guidelines (Garrett, 2006). For example, the Franciscans follow the teaching and life of St. Francis of Assisi. Many Catholic colleges still have roots associated with their founding religious order today (Garrett, 2006). Three of the leading research Catholic colleges, Notre Dame, Boston College, and Georgetown, are all founded by religious organizations (McMurtie, 2014).

In addition to the religious order-founded Catholic colleges and universities, there are also diocesan institutions of higher learning. According to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), there are nine diocesan colleges in the U.S.: Carroll College,

Donnelly College, Gannon University, Loras College, Mount St. Mary's University, St. Ambrose University, St. Thomas University, Seton Hall University, and University of St. Thomas (USCCB, 2010). Diocesan means that the control of the university comes from the bishop and diocese in which it is located (Hengemuhle, 2015). The connection or control relates to the Catholic identity and governance structures (Hengemuhle, 2015). A diocese is a district or geographic boundary in which the churches are overseen by a bishop (Hengemuhle, 2015). One recent occurrence is the formation of colleges that are independent or not sponsored by a religious order (Hengemuhle, 2015). Independent Catholic colleges are fairly new, and most have only opened in the past 10 years. One of the leading religious organizations sponsoring higher education are the Jesuits, often referred to as the Society of Jesus, with 28 colleges and universities (Henshaw, 2017).

At many diocesan Catholic colleges, Catholic bishops serve as leaders and decision makers. There are specific characteristics that link Catholic colleges and universities to the Catholic religion and the local church (Stierle & Casale, 2010). The diocesan colleges and the church are intertwined through church leadership, teaching, and rules. The diocesan college has a primary purpose of developing future church and diocesan leaders, and most Catholic diocesan schools have a seminary attached to the institution, serving as a pipeline for priest and church workers (Stierle & Casale, 2010). Most Catholic colleges operate financially independent of the diocese; however, there are some instances in which the finances are linked and considered assets of the diocese (Stierle & Casale, 2010). Linking finances can be mutually beneficially, with the bishop able to fundraise for both the diocese and the university (Stierle & Casale 2010). The bishops are the leaders in a geographic area in regard to Catholic teaching.

At one time, Catholic colleges and universities were operated by religious people or individuals who vowed their life to the church and their religious order (McMurtie,2014). Today, lay people dominate and outnumber religious leaders at the nation’s Roman Catholic colleges (McMurtie, 2014). The interests of students have also changed over time. McMurtie (2014) referred to current students at the “unchurched generation,” and asserted that Catholic institutions are redefining themselves to attract this new generation. Enrollment services company EAB performed a survey of 1,800 students and 800 parents on why they were considering Catholic colleges and universities (Redden, 2019). The majority of students responded they were considering reasons other than Catholic religion or identity in selecting their institution (Redden, 2019). Approximately 7% of students in the survey indicated that the Catholic affiliation was an important choice in their decision (Redden, 2019). Some student reasons were based on size, internships, experiential learning, and diversity of campus (Redden, 2019). The changing participation in Catholic higher education may also be attributed to Catholic secondary-school enrollment decreasing 42% since 1970 (McMurtie, 2014).

Catholic institutions, especially those mostly closely connected to the church, face great tension between Catholic tenets and inclusivity. For example, Catholic colleges and universities face criticism from watchdog groups such as the The Cardinal Newman Society and The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, who are outward critics of Catholic colleges and universities that do not follow Catholic teaching and doctrine (Barlett, 2006). The Cardinal Newman Society was developed by Patrick Reilly, a former student at Fordham University, to serve as a group to call out universities and faculty who were not following Catholic teaching (Barlett, 2006). One of Reilly’s biggest targets was faculty members who supported abortion (Barlett, 2006). These organizations publicize information on institutions they believe are straying from Catholic

teaching on controversial issues, including LGBTQ rights (Barlett, 2006). The Cardinal Newman Society has called out multiple institutions for giving out condoms, hosting “Vagina Monologues” programs, and inviting guest speakers on campus whose views do not align with the church’s views, according to the Society (Barlett, 2006). One of these institutions was Santa Clara University, which hosted “homosexual themed events” on the Catholic campus (Barlett, 2006).

While some organizations condemn Catholic institutions that are, in their opinion, straying from church teaching, an organization known as New Ways Ministry is dedicated to reconciling the Catholic Church and LGBTQ community. New Ways works to advocate for Catholics fired from their job based on sexual orientation (O’Laughlin, 2018). They also provide workshops and educational opportunities for schools, parishes, and communities to learn more about the LGBTQ community and pathways to inclusivity (O’Laughlin, 2018). This organization serves as a resource to learn more about LGBTQ-friendly colleges and universities (New Ways Ministry, 2020). These organizations serve as a contrast to the hostile relationship between Catholic higher education and groups that are on different sides of religious issues. These examples also provide context to better understand a complex societal topic.

LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at Catholic Institutions

Because of tensions with Catholic doctrine, there are a number of cases of discrimination and aggression that have been reported towards the LGBTQ community by Catholic institutions of higher learning. There are still states where an employee can be fired from an institution for sexual orientation. Over the years, there have been myriad examples of faculty and staff being fired from Catholic institutions of learning, both from K-12 and higher education. Some cases receive media attention and others do not. The Catholic Church has struggled with how to deal

with openly gay employees in recent years and, just over the last decade, there have been over 80 people fired by Catholic entities-churches, schools, and higher education institution-for being LGBTQ (O’Laughlin, 2018).

In 2010, the dean of a school of arts and sciences was hired at a prominent Midwest Catholic school and, after the university discovered the new dean’s research on topics surrounding “Queer Identities and Social Movements,” they rescinded their offer to hire (Catholic News Service, 2010). The local archbishop put pressure on the university to rescind the offer and the college complied, citing conflicts with Catholic teaching and mission (Catholic News Service, 2010).

In 2011, a priest was fired from a small private Catholic college in the Philadelphia area after the school learned that the priest was in a gay relationship for 15 years (McDonald, 2011). The priest taught at the school and was popular among the students (McDonald, 2011). The college president said, “It was with great disappointment when we learned through St. George’s public statements of his involvement in a gay relationship with another man for the past 15 years” (McDonald, 2011, p. 1). The priest now is a member of the old Catholic Church of the Americas, a sect that broke off from the Vatican in the 1800s. This sect allows priests to be openly gay and is more accepting (McDonald, 2011).

In another example, a large public institution fired the minister of their campus Newman Center, a Center sponsored by the local archdiocese to minister to Catholic students on campus. In 2017, the Center’s minister liked a friend’s Facebook post about their gay marriage and posted a photo from the wedding congratulating them. Shortly after, the campus minister was called in to the human resource office for the Archdiocese, was questioned about his social media use, and was fired from this role. He identified as gay and later shared his identity (ABC News, 2018).

These cases highlight the difficult relationship that contributes to the need to better understand the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff on Catholic campuses.

Purpose of the Study

Many LGBTQ faculty and staff feel discriminated against or unsafe on campuses in the U.S. The views of the Catholic church may impact a campus's ability to develop an inclusive culture for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer-identifying people (LGBTQ) at a diocesan Catholic college. Furthermore, there is a history of tension between the LGBTQ community and Catholic institutions. This researcher aims to better understand the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff members at a diocesan Catholic college. While there have been studies about the experience of LGBTQ individuals in higher education, there is scant research on the LGBTQ experience at a diocesan college. This researcher will build upon the work of Hughes (2015), who examined organizational structures at Jesuit institutions to improve the climate for the LGBTQ community.

Research Questions

- 1.) What are the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution?
 - a. How do LGBTQ faculty and staff perceive that institutional Catholic values impact their work?
 - b. How do LGBTQ staff develop their social identity in their professional roles?

CHAPTER 2

In this literature review, the researcher will explore the student, faculty, and staff experience at a Catholic institution of higher education. The major themes discussed in this chapter are campus culture and the LGBTQ community, LGBTQ faculty and staff on college campuses, the Catholic Church and homosexuality, and identity theory and models.

In 21st century and it may be difficult to imagine that discrimination, harassment, and other exclusions still happen in many forms in higher education. Within higher education, the LGBTQ community is a group made up of faculty, staff, and students that comprise the fabric of campus communities in the U.S. Yet, there are still many college campuses that are not inclusive. According to Bazarsky et al. (2015), “[LGBTQ] individuals may be, for example, out at home and closeted at school or out on campus and closeted at work. LGBTQ discrimination, harassment, and violence continue to be a major national issue in communities, schools, and colleges” (p.55). There have been many advancements for LGBTQ individuals in the United States, however discrimination, harassment and violence are still significant and relevant issues.

LGBTQ Faculty and Staff on College Campuses

While much of the existing literature and history on LGBTQ communities on college campuses focuses on the experiences of students, faculty and staff are important campus stakeholders as well. However, there are very few empirical studies on the experience of LGBTQ-identifying faculty and staff. In this section of the literature review, the researcher provides an overview of some of the limited work available on this topic.

Kortegast and Van der Toorn (2016) studied 19 student affairs professionals in higher education who identify as LGBTQ. The authors indicated LGBTQ professionals at small colleges and universities with populations less than 5,000 have a unique experience. The authors

revealed that many LGBTQ professionals were assigned additional responsibilities such as an advisor to a club or organization, demonstrating that professionals may be exploited in these roles and expected to assume additional responsibilities (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016). Moreover, faculty and staff on Catholic campuses played a special role in creating underground groups to support students who are not out or just being out to show visibility (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016).

Kortegast and Van der Toorn (2016) identified the themes Disclosure of Sexual Identity, Enactment of Outness, Assumed Roles and Responsibilities, and Recognition and Support of LGBTQIA Activities. All participants in the study carefully thought about the disclosure of their sexual identity and the risks associated at their specific institutions. One of the respondents in spoke of his disclosure of sexual identity working at a Catholic institution, acknowledging that his immediate coworkers knew of his sexual identity, but no one beyond his department was aware. They discussed their level of outness, and while many of them said they came out in the job interview process, others said it was carefully navigated (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016).

The next theme explored by Kortegast and Van der Toorn (2016) was the enactment of outness by the participants. Many of the participants discussed not being “too gay” or “too out.” One openly gay director shared that his colleagues are nice to him, but he ultimately knows he is not part of their “good old boys club.” The director also said he is conscious of the clothes he wears to director meetings because if he wore a colorful shirt one day, he worried it may hurt his chances for advancement at the institution (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016). Next, the theme of assumed roles and responsibilities related to the roles that eight participants in the study assumed at the institution. Many of the respondents discussed accepting informal responsibilities at their institutions as advisor to clubs, assisting LGBTQ students on campus, organizing

programs, and education opportunities (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016). LGBTQ identified employees sometimes give more time, energy and devotion to their employers. Through the theme of recognition and support of LGBTQ activities, the authors indicated that some institutions were more supportive than others. One of the respondents received a new title, a 10% salary increase, and was given responsibilities towards the work he was doing on campus pertaining to the LGBTQ community. Conversely, another respondent was at an institution that discouraged the work he was doing with the LGBTQ community (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016). Kortegast and Van der Toorn called for more research on the experience of LGBTQ student affairs professionals at other types of institutions, including additional research on intersectionality and student affairs professionals of color (Kortegast & Van der Toorn, 2016).

In two seminal studies, researchers explored the experiences of LGBTQ student affairs professionals, including the job search process (Croteau & Von Destinon, 1994) and experiences on the job (Croteau & Lark, 1995). Croteau and Von Destinon (1994) surveyed LGBTQ student affairs professionals from multiple institutions and 53% of the respondents indicated supportive work environments impacted their job decisions in the search process. Another 26% reported being discriminated against because of their sexual orientation in the job search process. Lastly, there were many jobseekers not willing to discuss or report incidents of discrimination.

In a self-reporting anonymous study of 174 college student affairs professionals, Croteau and Lark (1995) found that 60% of respondents indicated at least one incident of discrimination in the workplace. The respondents also indicated that human resource policies such as benefits packages were exclusionary of same sex relationships. One of the respondents highlighted that professionals who live in residence halls can only live with partners if they are legally married

(Croteau and Lark, 1995). Croteau and Lark asserted that if an individual was out in the workplace they were more likely to be discriminated against.

Some religiously affiliated institutions have policies against hiring members of the LGBTQ community because they believe marriage is between a man and a woman and they argue that having these views fall under their religious liberty (Redden, 2020). However, many leaders at religiously affiliated institutions believe that the new anti-discrimination laws makes them susceptible to lawsuits (Redden, 2020). The Croteau and Lark (1995) study was conducted during a time without many measures or laws that protected the LGBTQ community. Participants discussed being excluded from professional networks, meetings, committees, and university events (Croteau & Lark, 1995). Moreover, some supervisors attempted to control how open the respondents were regarding their sexual orientation. Respondents discussed their identity being ignored in the workplace and the frustration they experienced when their supervisors and colleagues across campus assumed they were heterosexual (Croteau & Lark, 1995). Croteau and Lark asserted that LGBTQ student affairs personnel may not report the discrimination happening to them on their campus. They also argued that student affairs professionals who are open about their sexual orientation have higher job satisfaction because they can be comfortable in their workplace (Croteau & Lark, 1995). The findings from this study support the campus climate studies done by Rankin in 2003 and 2010 and while LGBT student, faculty, and staff experiences vary, 20% indicated experiencing a hostile or discriminative experience on their campuses.

While the propensity of the available research focuses on student affairs professionals and students, there is some research about the faculty experience. A study by Sears (2002) concerned faculty members' experiences and perceptions of their campus climate. Sears used a

national sample to collect data about the experiences of education faculty and researchers. The main findings of the study indicated that there was a difference of views of faculty working in private institutions versus public institutions (Sears, 2002). Participants viewed private institutions they worked at as 44 % gay affirmative and 44% gay tolerant (Sears, 2002). Whereas the participants viewed public institutions they worked at as 12% gay affirmative or 41% percent gay (Sears, 2002). This finding may be impacted by a sample that was more female and may have perceived their campus more a certain way. Sears (2002) stated:

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. (p.30)

Sears asserted that although faculty and staff may have a generally positive experience, they are also impacted by homophobic comments on campus, discriminatory action, lack of institutional protections, and overall support. At this time, Sears believed it would take 15 years of grassroots efforts and organizational change to combat homophobia and heterosexism to improve institutional life for the LGBTQ faculty.

Lyon et al. (2002) studied faculty opinion at Notre Dame, Boston College, Brigham Young, and Baylor University. The researchers surveyed faculty members on a wide variety of issues from academic freedom to hiring practices (Lyon et. al., 2002). In this study, the researchers compared faculty attitudes at Catholic institutions in comparison to other faith-based institutions. The results indicated faculty members with the same religious affiliation as their sponsoring institutions have very different views than their colleagues who do not share the same religious affiliation. Although all faculty in the survey were overall supportive of the religious

identity at the institutions where they work. In the study, it showed that Baylor, Notre Dame, and Boston College faculty had similar attitudes in terms of hiring practices, academic freedom, and the mission of the institution impacting their experience. Respondents in the study from Brigham Young reported the highest commitment to their religious tradition as compared to those from the other three institutions (Lyon et al., 2002). As well, the findings suggested that faculty place a higher importance on academic freedom, hiring the best candidate for a role regardless of religious background, and commitment to the school's academic goals and rigor, rather than religious pursuits.

Prock et al. (2019), examined the experiences of 17 social work faculty. The themes that emerged were: safety and security, faculty concerns with being viewed as the token representative of a specific group, exclusion/lack of support, and threats to credibility (Prock et al., 2019). Some of the faculty experiences highlighted risks such as being a victim of a hate crime, "trying to pass" being a faculty member in the south, and constant fear their students would find out their identity (Prock et al, 2019). The term "trying to pass" or "passing" is defined as person trying to be accepted or regarded as member of the sex or gender they identify with. Prock et al. indicated faculty without tenure were unwilling to risk speaking up about issues until they received tenure. Prock (2019) also highlighted positive aspects of the faculty experience, such as surrounding the power in authenticity, connecting with others, and paying it forward to pave the way for future LGBTQ students and faculty.

Nadal (2019) focused on LGBTQ people of color in both K-12 and higher education and identified a gap in the research surrounding LGBTQ faculty members of color and their experience in the academy. The author found that faculty of color are rare to begin with, but LGBTQ faculty of color are even more uncommon. LGBTQ people of color in academia face

discrimination, a heterosexism dominated field, and systemic oppression (Nadal, 2019). Nadal recommended that LGBTQ faculty of color create their own professional network to uplift and support this community and break down barriers for a more diverse academy.

There is scant research on LGBTQ faculty and staff experiences in higher education. Thus, more research is needed to better understand the LGBTQ faculty experience in the academy (Rankin 2003, 2010).

Trends and Practices to Make Campuses More Inclusive

It is important to look at the development and history on campuses to learn and grow. Today, colleges and universities are making strides in increasing inclusivity and more than 150 colleges in the US that have changed policies on their campuses to do so, although challenges remain (Banchiri, 2016). Incorporating students' preferred pronouns or names is one strategy, although not all campus technology systems may enable non-binary options (Bazarsky et al., 2015). Thus, ensuring the university embraces diversity in its members faculty, staff students, but also in its technology, human resources, and other university functions is important (Bazarsky et al., 2015). Yale University's efforts to create "All Gender Restrooms" is an example of policies and practices that include the needs of LGBTQ populations on college campuses (Banchiri, 2016). In addition to such efforts, colleges and universities should provide professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, such as the Safe Zone program, for employees to be educated on LGBTQ issues (Poynter & Tubbs, 2008).

According to Patton et al (2016), "Functional units across student affairs and other student services should have a baseline understanding of concepts related to sex assigned at birth, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual and romantic orientation" (p.156). A basic understanding of these issues is needed to truly make a community inclusive and ensure faculty,

staff, and students have an environment to thrive. Some institutions have LGBTQ centers on their campuses that are listed through a website *LGBTQ Campus.org*. Many of the colleges and universities without LGBTQ centers were religiously affiliated colleges and universities. Of all the institutions with LGBTQ centers, only two were religiously affiliated colleges and universities. In order to be eligible for an LGBTQ center institutions must have a position that is 50% full time equivalent, and a minimum of 20 hours per week dedicated to providing services to the LGBTQ community. Provide a space for LGBTQ students through these offices, significantly help increase diversity on the campus.

The visibility and support of LGBTQ community can have major impacts on a campus. One example of advocacy at a religiously affiliated institution occurred at a small Catholic college in Southern California. The college took steps to address the issue of discrimination and prejudice through the creation of an educational program. In response to campus incidents of discrimination in the late 1990s, the college created a rainbow educators' program. The rainbow educators' program was intended to bring awareness and bridge the gaps of the community. Prior to the rainbow educators' program development on this campus, LGBTQ faculty and staff feared losing their jobs and students worried about increased harassment and discrimination (Getz & Kirkley, 2006). Getz and Kirkley (2006) examined the rainbow educators' program to learn about how the program reduced incidents of prejudice and disrespect. The participants of the program were a diverse pool, who answered a series of open-ended questions about their experiences. The findings indicated that the program contributed to an increased awareness of social identity by faculty, staff, and students and an improvement in confidence of participants to serve as allies to the LGBTQ community (Getz & Kirkley, 2006). This was just one study to

provide a glimpse into how a Catholic institution combatted discrimination with a program that had positive effects on the community.

Yet, Getz and Kirkley's study is one of few pertaining to religiously affiliated institutions and the LGBTQ community. The campus culture for the LGBTQ community at any institution can be challenging. A study by Rankin (2003) indicated the difficulty the LGBTQ community experiences on college campuses, with 41% of respondents reporting that their campus community did not address sexual orientation or identity issues. For those on religiously-affiliated campuses, this may be even more challenging.

Catholic Church and Homosexuality

The church's teachings against homosexuality are derived from early teachings in the Bible. This issue is frequently challenged, and scripture is used as the pulpit for their stance on this issue. The textbook *Homosexuality in the Church* by Jeffrey Siker (1994) outlines the contentious relationship between homosexuality and the Catholic Church. According to Siker, "The Bible hardly ever discusses homosexual behavior" (p. 5). Siker asserted the most explicit biblical reference against homosexuality is found in the book of Romans 1:18-32. "Men committed shameless acts with men and received in their own persons due penalty for their own error" (Romans 1:18-32) Siker referenced this letter by Paul to the Romans as not being against God nore unlawful in the eyes of God. In the book of Leviticus 18:22, it states, "Man should not lie down with man for it is an abomination" (Leviticus 18:22). There are many interpretations of the Bible, and these passages may have been interpreted differently in the time the Bible was written. Further, Siker argued the Bible has many different authors and was compiled from various points of view.

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger wrote a letter to all bishops of the Catholic Church in 1986 in reference to pastoral care of homosexual persons. This letter addressed that the church's teachings on homosexuality are based on sacred scripture and biblical literature. Ratzinger stated that, in the book of Genesis and the creation story, God created people in his fashion of male and female (Siker, 1994). He referenced biblical passages in Romans and Genesis on the topic of homosexuality and articulated that the church's teaching aligns with scripture and the tradition of the church. Ratzinger proffered that the central argument was derived from scripture and that it should be at the forefront of any discussion of homosexuality and the Catholic Church (Siker, 1994). The Cardinal wrote of a movement outside of the church to undermine its position on homosexuality, asserting that some of the groups will use homosexuality as principle against the church (Siker, 1994). Ratzinger concluded by stating that priests and pastoral ministry should include LGBTQ among the people to whom they cater and help them in their spiritual journey. He added that God wants priests to minister to every man, woman, and child with compassion. This contradicted earlier arguments, but ultimately demonstrated the contentious and difficult relationship between homosexuality and the Catholic Church, even among church leaders.

A national survey conducted by Kappler et al. (2012) of 156 Roman Catholic priests indicated that 105 of those priest identified as gay (67.3%), 42 identified as heterosexual (26.9%), and 9 identified at bisexual (5.8%). This research indicated that there are priests and pastoral ministers of the Catholic church that identify as LGBTQ. One of the tenant teachings for pastoral or priestly ministry is the devotion to celibacy or not engaging in sexual acts. Roman Catholic teaching focuses on natural law which states that homosexual relations are not essential (Siker, 1994). The percentage represented in the priesthood exceeds the percentage displayed in the text by Siker (1994), who cited a series of existing research suggesting that 4% or less of the

adult male population are exclusively homosexual. Overall, these numbers are difficult to determine as people come out at different times in their life, because people may be hesitant to report this information, and because there are different identity processes that individuals go through.

Since the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church has been in disagreement on the issue of homosexuality. The Second Vatican Council, commonly known as Vatican 2, was a churchwide meeting from 1962-1965 to discuss doctrinal issues impacting the church, such as homosexuality. The church is divided on the issue of homosexuality and, according to Maher and Sever (2007), there are three primary perspectives on this issue within the church: the traditional point of view on the immorality of homosexuality, the mediating point of view of not challenging church teaching, and the revisionist point of view of publicly challenging church teachings.

The divisions in the Catholic Church trickle down into the education system that it sponsors (Maher & Sever, 2007). Some Catholic colleges and universities have been addressing the issue for decades through the acceptance of LGBTQ student groups on campuses. There is an organizational change that must occur in order for Catholic higher education to become more accepting for the LGBTQ community. It takes a community at all levels of the college to collaborate on the issue of acceptance and to review the institutions' mission and values.

Love (1998) examined the manner in which United States Catholic colleges handled the issue of homosexuality. Love collected data through interviews and observations in 1993 and participants at St. James Catholic College were selected if they identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Students, faculty, and staff participated in the study and there were 26 people interviewed and a total of 41 interviews. The findings indicated norms of homophobia and

heterosexism, uneasiness with sexuality, shame associated with homosexuality, and unacceptance of sexual minorities, or people whose sexual identity orientation and practices differ than the majority of society (Love, 1998). The study by Love also suggested that the Catholic religion did not cause barriers but was used as a tool to hide identity.

There were contradictions revealed in the study that indicated students were willing to divert from Catholic teaching on issues of birth control, premarital sex, and divorce, but not on the issue of homosexuality (Love, 1998). Love (1998) highlighted the fear of many on the campus of St James Catholic College. This fear emanated from upper level administrators, clergy, board of trustees, and other protectors of the Catholic tradition. The faculty had an easier time addressing issues of sexual orientation on campus compared to administrators because they were protected through academic freedom and tenure policies. Administrators such as hall directors, student activities, and other student affairs professionals had to treat the issue differently because they lacked a sense of protection due to the power structures on campus. One of the conclusions from the study was that, even though there was work being done by faculty and staff in support of LGBTQ students, the religion and cultural tendencies impacted this work. The faculty and staff were not recognized for the work they were doing, and many left the institution shortly after the study was conducted. The change on this religiously affiliated institution could not happen within due to the many layers of the oppressive culture (Love, 1998).

There is a changing church that is emerging, according to the literature. Maher and Sever (2007) highlighted a series of studies conducted by various researchers on the topic of homosexuality in the K-12 system. Findings from a study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center suggested American Catholics are becoming more accepting of homosexuality

and civil liberties of the LGBTQ community. The National Catholic Education Association found that 52 % of teachers believed a fellow teacher or administrator should not be fired for being homosexual. In contrast, the majority of principals (64%) agreed that homosexuals should not be hired to teach in Catholic schools. While the study by Maher and Sever focused on the the K-12 system, many findings are mirrored in studies on the higher education system. Maher and Sever identified that community reaction and lack of support from administration were the strongest barriers to addressing LGBTQ issues in school (Maher & Sever, 2007). There is a fear that exists in the K-12 system from teachers and administrators similarly described in Love's (1998) study. There is a struggle within the church, and the people who work within structures organized by the church are also often conflicted on the topic (Love, 1998).

Maher and Sever (2007) argued the dynamic of homosexuality and the Catholic Church is not going away and is something that needs to be discussed and remedied. Specifically, their findings revealed there are some teachers and administrators in Catholic elementary and high schools trying to support and educate students on gay and lesbian issues. However, the vast majority are not because of the Catholic teaching against homosexuality (Maher & Sever, 2007). Some students in the K-12 system come out during this time and, at Catholic high schools specifically, there is often limited support for them in the process. Further, there is a lack of training for educators in Catholic high schools pertaining to the coming out process and providing support for LGBTQ issues. The educators interviewed in the study believe Catholic identity is a barrier to students' expressing their sexual identity. There is also a fear from the teachers of the community response and reaction. In addition, they are also worried about the reaction from school administrators and clergy (Maher & Sever, 2007).

In the book, *Building a Bridge: How Catholic Church and the LGBTQ community can enter into a relationship of respect, compassion, and sensitivity*, Father James Martin (2017) discussed ways to bridge the gap between LGBTQ communities and the Catholic church. One of the reasons that Father James Martin wrote this book was because of the Pulse Night Club shooting in the summer of 2016, which was, at that time, the largest mass shooting in US history. Following the shooting at the night club there were many leaders of the Catholic Church sending prayers and speaking out in support of the LGBTQ community and against homophobia. Father James Martin began thinking about building this bridge, especially being a Jesuit Catholic priest ministering to LGBTQ people and a leader in the Catholic Church. Father Martin described the relationship between the Catholic Church and LGBTQ community as both contentious and simultaneously welcoming. For example, Father Martin proffered that there are gay men that enter diocesan seminaries and become priests because they are “called” to this service; however, Fr. Martin also acknowledged that this is a route men may take so they do not have to admit their own sexuality (Martin, 2017). The Catholic catechism says to treat LGBTQ people with respect, compassion, and sensitivity, and Father Martin focused on optimism in connecting the LGBTQ community and the Catholic Church. He acknowledged the struggle in bringing both sides together given the many differences they have. Father Martin discussed the institutional power that exists in the church. The institutional church consists of the pope, cardinals, archbishops, and in these roles they are given authority and power (Martin, 2017). The hierarchy that exists has powers associated that can open or close parishes, and hire and fire individuals in the organizations.

Pope Francis developed a document for a world audience on family life called *Amoris Laetitia*, which translates to “joy of love,” acknowledging that some countries are more

accepting towards the LGBTQ community than others (Martin, 2017). In this document, the pope wrote about the dignity of every person and asserted that LGBTQ people should receive the support and dignity they need in their spiritual journey. After the publication of this document Pope Francis was quoted by the media saying, “Who am I to judge?” The closing message of Father James Martin’s book is an analogy of being together on a bridge with people who are all imperfect and struggling and trying to do their best ever day. Martin (2017) asserted that the Catholic Church and LGBTQ community need to come together on this bridge of compassion, respect, and sensitivity to create a new a chapter for the future.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that guides this study is Dillon’s sexual identity unifying model (2011). To contextualize the development of Dillon’s model, I outline several influencing identity theories in the following sections before describing Dillon’s model in greater depth.

LGBTQ Identity Theory

The first homosexual identity model was developed by Cass in 1979. There are six stages of homosexual identity formation according to Cass: prestige, identity confusion, identity comparison, identity tolerance, identity acceptance, identity pride, and identity synthesis. (Cass, 1979). People go through stages to gain self-identity and ultimately fulfill oneself (Cass, 1979). The Cass model focuses on sex role socialization and that men and women may have different experiences based on their gender. The Cass model uses identity formation as a process independent of sexual preference (Cass, 1979). The Cass model was originally developed in the 1970s and since that time there have been many changes or adaptations. The most recent Cass revision in 1996 renames the original term “homosexual identity formation” to “sexual orientation identity formation.” The Cass model was based on clinical work with gay- and

lesbian-identifying people in Australia. One of the limitations of the model was that not all gay and lesbian people go through all the processes in the model. Individuals may go through any number of stages (Cass, 1979).

The critiques of the Cass Model are based on the theory's lack of identification of the intersection of race and sexual identity. The Cass model lacks in the area of including transgender individuals, people of color, and individuals with multiple intersecting identities (Kennedy & Oswalt, 2014). The early models were developed without acknowledging intersectionality and diversity. The majority of early literature and research about the LGBTQ community focused on White gay men. The application of the Cass Model helped perceptions move from homosexuality being a medical condition to setting a standard for working with gay and lesbian students in college.

The next three models of gay, lesbian, and bisexual identity development were developed by Fassinger (1996), D'Augelli (1994), and Dillon (2011). The Fassinger's Sexual Identity Formation model was developed by McCarn and Fassinger for lesbian identity development and was later restructured to include men as well. The Fassinger model is also a stage model structured into four levels: awareness, exploration, deepening/commitment, and internalization/synthesis. The model by Fassinger is more inclusive than the others because it considered racial and ethnic identity development (Gervacio 2015). The Fassinger model encompasses the role of a community or group structure. This was the first model to address identity in a social context. This model is aligned with this research because it can be used to address potential conflicts between personal identities and communities, such as the dichotomy between being Catholic and gay. This model focuses on what it means to be gay or lesbian in the world and specifically in the individual's community. Fassinger and Tomlinson (2003) studied

192 lesbians and found that that they felt more comfortable and freer to explore in a community that was more accepting (Evans et al., 2010). Student affairs administrators widely use both the Cass and Fassinger models for student development. Gervacio (2015) highlighted that both the Cass and Fassinger models call for deeper understanding and drawing a connection between race and ethnic identity models.

D'Augelli's Lifespan Model of Identity Development

The D'Augelli (1994) framework addresses the challenges of the identities of LGBTQ people. D'Augelli's model acknowledges the intersection of multiple identities and the complexity of identity (D'Augelli, 1994). D'Augelli explained that while U.S. society has become more accepting of LGBTQ people, many of the structures are built on heterosexuality. Therefore, being LGBTQ requires a coming out or owning an identity that society didn't initially recognize or accept (D'Augelli, 1994). D'Augelli further discussed how the coming out process is very personal and also requires the individual to overcome shame and fear built by societal norms.

D'Augelli's (1994) model was developed based on individual changes from birth through adulthood to death; patterns of social intimacy across the lifespan; and linkages between the person, their significant other, and their proximal and distal environments. D'Augelli built on these factors with variables using personal subjectivities and actions, interactive intimacies, and sociohistorical connections (D'Augelli, 1994). Personal prejudices and actions impact how the person feels about their sexual identity and how it plays it out in their life (D'Augelli, 1994). Interactive intimacies focus on the person's upbringing and familial life and how it affects personal relationships and intimacies (D'Augelli, 1994). The last variable is sociohistorical connections, which concerns social norms of a geographic and cultural nature (D'Augelli, 1994).

The D'Augelli model illustrates ways LGBTQ people go through in the identity process from isolation, rejection, failure, and prejudice (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). The D'Augelli stages are exiting heterosexuality, developing a personal LGB identity, developing an LGBTQ social identity, becoming an LGB offspring, developing an LGBTQ intimacy status, and entering an LGBTQ community (Renn & Bioldeau, 2005). These stages can happen in any form and some individuals may experience one more than the other stages. A person may be at one point in the process or experience some of the stages more than the other (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005). For example, the person might have strong LGBTQ social identity and a sex partner, but not have come out to family (Renn & Bioldeau, 2005).

The D'Augelli (1994) model illustrates that people change over the course of their lives and the importance of surroundings and other factors to owning identity and sexuality. One of the examples D'Augelli shared was urban gay clubs as a place gay men felt comfortable congregating and coming together to find acceptance, despite potentially contributing to the AIDS crisis (D'Augelli, 1994). D'Augelli's model and theory highlighted that a feeling of safety for LGBTQ members occurs in LGBTQ affirming communities.

Dillon's (2011) Unifying Model

D'Augelli's LGBTQ model was developed in 1994 and new theories have been developed since. It is important to understand influential past theories because they provide a foundation and inform future research that can benefit the LGBTQ community. One of the most recent models and theories for LGBTQ identity development was developed by Frank Dillon in 2011 and is referred to as sexual identity unifying model.

Dillon's (2011) sexual identity unifying model encompasses many factors and processes that impact sexual identity development. It outlines a range of sexual identity and journeys that

impact identity development (Dillon, 2011). One of the central components of Dillon's theory is that sexual identity development is a process happening around the globe (Dillon, 2011). In the unifying model, Dillon defined sexual identity development as the individual and social processes by which people state their sexual needs, values, preferences, and ways to express themselves sexually (Dillon, 2011). The unifying model is nonlinear and flexible in design and helps researchers better understand the ways people pass through identity development in their lifespan (Dillon, 2011). Dillon breaks the model down into two factors in identity development: the individual experience and the social/community experience (Dillon, 2011).

Dillon's (2011) theory was developed using previous theories and ideas from researchers. One of the researchers introduced within Dillon's theory is Urie Bronfenbrenner (1977) who described the ecology of human development. Bronfenbrenner believed that a person's development was impacted by their surrounding environment. Bronfenbrenner argued that there are microsocial influences in identity development and that, in addition to biological factors, identity development can stem from the environment which includes family, peers, neighbors, professional life, church, and social organizations (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Bronfenbrenner described microsocial influences as a setting defined as a place such as a school or church, with physical features and the people who interact with the place in roles such as parent, teacher, employee, etc. (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory is mentioned as an element of Dillon's theory and is aligned with this study.

There are five key themes of Dillon's (2011) model: compulsory heterosexuality, active exploration, diffusion, deepening and commitment, and synthesis. Dillon's model also illustrates how a person can go through identity development consciously or subconsciously. The theme of compulsory heterosexuality refers to heterosexual norms in society cemented through family and

society for specific gender roles, which may cause avoidance of sexual exploration (Dillon, 2011). The next theme is Active Exploration in which Dillon argued that socioeconomic, family, and religion are all as part of the active exploration of sexuality process (Dillon, 2011).

According to Dillon (2011),

This occurs when a person is raised in a family, culture, or religion that instructs that acceptable sexual partners are only persons of the same race, different gender, similar age, same socioeconomic status, and same religion. Although these constraints vary from person to person depending on a number of dimensions of social context (e.g., gender, culture, age, religious orientation), active exploration occurs when the individual engages in cognitive or behavioral exploration of individual sexual identities beyond that which is socially mandated within one's social context. (p. 661)

This assertion is aligned with this research because religion and working at a religiously affiliated institution is a potential barrier to identity development and an individual being able to express themselves, and Dillon noted this as part of the identity development process.

The next theme discussed by Dillon (2011) was Diffusion and is described as individuals who do not want to actively explore and exhibit low levels of care. Individuals in the Diffusion phase are people who may identify as asexual or not wanting a relationship or connection with others (Dillon, 2011). Dillon described the deepening and commitment theme as asserting oneself to identify one's sexual needs, values, orientation, and preferences for sexual expression. Lastly, the synthesis phase is when the individual and social experience come together. In this phase, the individual understands themselves and their own identity, and it carries over into their social groups (Dillon, 2011). The Dillon model is composed of multiple factors and ways

identity development occurs in an individual and social lens. This model covers all sexual orientations and provides barriers and ways to identity development.

In Dillon's (2011) theory there is a focus on group membership identity and recognizing oneself as a member of a community. According to Dillon the social identity process involves group membership identity or being part of a group of individuals that share similar attitudes or beliefs regarding an identity. This can be in conflict when identifying as LGBTQ and working at a Catholic institution. Dillon's theory helps scholars understand how the religious affiliation of a diocesan Catholic institution may be a social environment that influences LGBTQ faculty and staff. Further, this phenomenon may impact their work experience in these roles and in understanding how they handle group membership identities in both the LGBTQ and Catholic community.

Understanding LGBTQ faculty and staff identities and experiences matters for professional success and for the success of an organization. In 1994, discrimination against LGBTQ had productivity consequences and costed companies roughly 1.4 billion dollars that year (Ozeren, 2014). Employees who are able to be out in the workplace and own their own identity are more productive, retained, and successful in their roles based on experiences (Ozeren, 2014). There are varying experiences of being out in the workplace depending on the individual's comfort, including hiding one's identities to receive the privileges of another group, or trying to understand the culture of the office before coming out, and looking for signals (Clair, 2005). Visible Catholic symbols, such as a "Jesus Fish" on cars to outwardly share one's Catholic identity (Clair, 2005), may cause an individual to hesitate about sharing their identity in the workplace or being comfortable to work in that space. At the research campus for this study, LGBTQ employees may be especially careful in disclosing their identities or may report

professional experiences that are influenced by their dual membership in the LGBTQ community as well as their membership as an employee at a Catholic institution.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed literature on LGBTQ people and identity theories. There are LGBTQ people in every part of society and there are LGBTQ community members on every college campus. The literature supports that a difficult journey exists for LGBTQ people, including a challenging climate that exists on many college campuses, especially at religiously affiliated institutions. Society and college campuses have made tremendous advancements in supporting LGBTQ people, but there is still work to be done. As D'Augelli indicated in his theory, identity development is a difficult, complex process. Dillon (2011) asserted that identity development is a universal process and that there are influences such as religion, social, familial, and socioeconomic factors that can impact a person's identity journey. These factors are present in the experiences of LGBTQ professionals at diocesan Catholic colleges as well and will be further explored in this qualitative study. In the next chapter, I will provide the approaches used for solving problem and describe the methods used in this study.

CHAPTER 3

Purpose of the Study

There is a problem in higher education, with evidence that LGBTQ faculty and staff feel discriminated against or unsafe on campuses in the U.S. The views of the Catholic church may impact a campus's ability to develop an inclusive culture for LGBTQ at diocesan Catholic colleges. Furthermore, there is a history of tension between the LGBTQ community and Catholic institutions. While there have been studies about the experiences of LGBTQ individuals in higher education, there is scant no research on the LGBTQ experience at diocesan colleges. This researcher will ground this study in the work of Hughes (2015), who examined organizational structures at Jesuit institutions to improve the climate for the LGBTQ community.

Research Questions

- 1.) What are the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution?
 - a. How do LGBTQ faculty and staff perceive that institutional Catholic values impact their work?
 - b. How do LGBTQ staff develop their social identity in their professional roles?

In Chapter 2, I present Dillon's theory (2011) as a framework to better understand the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff at a diocesan Catholic campus. In his theory, Dillon applies sexual identity development to demonstrate the extent to which being LGBTQ is impacted by social or religious factors. Dillon's theory is aligned with study in that they both concern understanding identity development as a universal process. Dillon's theory applies to this study because it takes into account factors that impact sexual identity, such as social groups. Applying this theory will help the researcher better understand the experiences of faculty and

staff at the research site because it connects sexual identity across contexts such as home, work, neighborhood, etc. The theory focuses on microsocial influences that can occur within an institution through immediate relationships and experiences that inform the experiences of faculty and staff at the institution. The theory allows for various intersections and provides a more comprehensive view to identity development. This researcher aims to better understand the LGBTQ experience of faculty and staff at one diocesan institution. This study may be an important step in raising awareness, education, and acceptance, and in bridging the gap that exists between the LGBTQ community and Catholic institutions.

Research Design

This is a qualitative case study focused on understanding the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff at a diocesan Catholic college. The method is case study research and the institution is the case. Faculty and staff participants are embedded units within the institutional case context. The reason for using case study is because it provides the opportunity to get a real life understanding of a specific situation or setting. Yin (2018) described case study as trying to illuminate a decision or set of decisions involving individuals and organizations, both of which are important to a study. According to Yin (2018), “A case study is an empirical method that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the “case”) in depth and within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (p. 45). The participants in this case study are employees of the diocesan institution chosen for the study. A case study helps researchers better understand unique situations with myriad possible variables using its own design, data collection, and approaches to data analysis (Yin, 2018). In applying a case study for this research, I expanded upon the theory and information already presented. According to Yin (2018), a case study should be based on a real world

phenomenon that is grounded in concrete situations. Case study has been used widely in research on a variety of topics. Case study research focuses on a phenomenon within boundaries and, in this study, the participants, phenomenon, and institution all bound the case (Yin, 2018). Yin argued that the boundary and its case may not be sharp because real world issues cannot fit into a category. This allows for interpretation of different individual experiences within a common campus setting and climate. Through the conducting of this case study, I discovered the interactions and factors about the phenomenon (Yin, 2018), which is the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff within a diocesan Catholic institution setting.

Study Site

Since this is a sensitive topic, the research site is blinded to protect participant confidentiality, allowing participants to more accurately share their personal experiences. The institution is a mid-sized private Catholic institution located in the United States. The institution identifies as diocesan, meaning that there is a close connection with the local Catholic diocese and the institution. The institution was founded by the diocese in which it resides. A diocese is a term used to define a geographic area under a specific bishop. In the case of the site institution, the bishop is the chair of the school's Board of Regents and president of the school's Board of Trustees. The institution also is home to the diocesan seminary to train future priests. The institution has multiple campuses and is located in an urban area. The institution was founded in the 1800s and has an enrollment of over 10,000 students including undergraduate and graduate students. The institution employs over 1,000 faculty and staff and has a priest community residing on campus. It is the one of the oldest Catholic universities in the United States. There are over 90 majors and programs and students represent 51 countries. The research site has a documented history of tension with the LGBTQ community, including involuntary termination

of clergy, staff, and faculty of LGBTQ identity and those who have given vocal support of these communities, with members of the institutional leadership further reinforcing Catholic teachings and doctrine that were anti-LGBTQ.

Recruitment and Participants

Because this topic was sensitive, ensuring confidentiality to participants was a priority throughout the study. In order to participate in the study, participants needed to be employees of the institution. Participating employees were faculty or staff, which included any person who receives compensation from the institution, including adjunct faculty, administrative, dining staff, etc. Participants served in either a full-time or part-time capacity and were currently employed by the institution. Because of the nature and topic of this study, I expected only a small number of employees to be eligible for the study.

I found participants for the study using word of mouth and snowball sampling to connect with individuals. A starting point for this study was the former advisor of the student LGBTQ group at the site institution. I kept my sample to current faculty and staff at the institution. The faculty member who was a former advisor to the LGBTQ student group was very helpful in helping me recruit participants. My recruitment strategy was to send emails to faculty and staff at the institution asking them to participate based on suggestions from the LGBTQ advisor. I also connected with the leadership in the student services division at the institution to request assistance getting participants. They added information regarding my study to their monthly newsletter to help attract more participants.

Additionally, I was able to use snowball sampling as a way to recruit participants for the study, by asking each respondent to suggest other people for the study. Some participants made recommendations. This was important because it allowed for a community of participants who

trusted one another and allowed for more discreet recruiting. Snowball sampling is a common technique in qualitative research. According to Neuman (2009), snowball sampling is a technique that begins with one or few people and spreads out based on links to the original case. To give you a better understanding of snowball sampling, imagine a snowball rolling and, as it does, it continues to get bigger. Another analogy is a small spider web continuing to spread out touching multiple points, and as it grows the sample gets larger (Neuman, 2009).

Following these procedures, I secured eight participants for the study. Participants chose pseudonyms to protect their identities, and I used these pseudonyms in all study documents. There were seven faculty members and two identified as tenured faculty and the remaining were untenured/adjunct. Three participants (Al, Art, and Rich) have each worked at the institution for fewer than five years. The remaining five participants (Carl, Dolphin, Dinah, Gerard, and Ray) have each worked at the institution for 10 years or more, with two participants who have been at the institution for over 25 years.

Below is a breakdown of participants:

Pseudonym	Faculty/Staff	Gender Identity	Identity within LGBTQ Community
Al	Staff	Man	Gay
Art	Faculty	Man	Gay
Carl	Faculty	Man	Gay
Dolphin	Faculty	Woman	Lesbian
Dinah	Faculty	Woman	Bisexual/Queer
Gerard	Faculty	Man	Gay/Queer
Ray	Faculty	Woman	Lesbian
Rich	Faculty	Man	Gay

Data Collection Methods

It is important in the data collection portion to gather multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2018). Yin (2018) described the importance of triangulation to ensure an accurate picture of the

participants' perspectives. For the case study, the case is the institution so that was central to this process. Yin (2018) stated, "On the contrary, a major strength of case study data collection is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence" (p.170). This was the case with this study and the importance of using multiple sources. The data were collected through interviews, a focus group, and a document review for this study. The primary data for this study were interviews conducted on Zoom from June 1, 2021 to June 30, 2021. In addition to the interviews, there was also a focus group and a document review of the selected institution's website and social media.

Interviews

Interviews allowed for interaction and dialogue to occur freely and openly. I provided the participants with an understanding of the study, and ensured them that their confidentiality was my highest priority. According to Yin (2018), "Interview can be more challenging because the interactions are not as structured. This will allow for participants to express their views and have some flexibility to deviate from the questions" (p.127). The interviews began by the researcher allowing participants to select a pseudonym to protect their identity and then flowed with open-ended questions allowing them to answer freely and openly on the subject of their experience at the institution as an LGBTQ person. I had an interview protocol and questions developed prior to the interview, but some questions deviated and participants felt comfortable sharing their responses and experiences. The interview questions (Appendix I) covered participants' process of learning about their role in the institution, experiences working at the institution, the extent to which their own personal identity impacts their experience, and participant suggestions of additional ways the institution can be more inclusive. With participant approval, I recorded the interview, used auto transcription, and corrected the transcripts to ensure accuracy.

It is important to ensure bias and personal influence are left out of the interviews, collection, and analysis processes (Yin, 2018). Following the interview process, I was organized with clear notes and protocols for the data analysis and collection process (Yin, 2018). I transcribed and coded the data following the last interview and that continued through July and August 2021.

Focus Group

In addition to interviews, I conducted a focus group with participants. According to Yin (2018), focus groups first emerged during World War 1 and later became more popular market research, to better understand consumer perspectives of radio programs. Focus groups allow for participants to collaborate and for the researcher to gather additional relevant information for this study. This allowed for a deeper understanding of the topic being studied and further learning about attitudes and beliefs. According to Morgan (1998), “the key to a successful focus group is thinking through the whole project” (p.4). Morgan described a focus group as a research practice collecting data in a group setting with a topic led by the researcher. Morgan provided an outline for developing a successful focus group that I applied as a guide for this study.

After interviews, a focus group was held in July 2021. The focus group participants were the same group recruited to participate in the interview portion. There was one participant who was not able to participate in the interviews, but indicated interest in the focus group, however, ultimately could not participate due to scheduling conflicts. I had difficulty scheduling the focus group despite multiple attempts. The focus group ultimately had two participants, Dolphin and Dinah.

The focus group was approximately 30 minutes in length. In the focus group, the researcher asked questions in Appendix I. Prior to participating, participants were asked to keep

their cameras off and change their display name to help keep their identities confidential. I moderated the focus group and relayed the ground rules and questions in Appendix I. Both focus group participants had participated in individual interviews and started the focus group by talking about their love for working at the institution, due to research opportunities, teaching, small classrooms, the community, and sharing their interests with students. The focus group was an additional data collection step that helped gather additional information for the study. The focus group contributed to the interview data in discussing the oppressive nature of the institution connected to the Catholic religion and reinforced by Catholic mission at the institution. The focus group supported statements made in the interviews. Some of the topics discussed in the focus group were employment benefits for same sex couples. At the institution they do not provide benefits for same sex couples and the participants in the focus group found this to be punitive. Participants also discussed the power of the priestly community and their belief in a “shadow state” at the university that has control and power. Participants in the focus group discussed the hostile environment on campus and the censorship of speakers and films around LGBTQ issues. Lastly, one participant in the focus group discussed how uncomfortable it was for them to ask potential candidates in the interview process about the Catholic mission, but that it is mandated to do this in the interview process.

Document Review

The document review portion was an important step of the data collection process as it revealed data that supported data sets found in other collection areas, thus ensuring triangulation. I reviewed institution’s website and available documents. I used the search engine for the university to review relevant materials relating to my topic. The document review was another step in the art of inquiry. According to Yin (2018), “For case study research, the most important

use of documentation is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p.158). The document review included the following sources:

- 1.) The institution;s website
 - a. Library Website
- 2.) Social media/marketing materials.

The data sources reviewed were the institution’s website, library website, and social media/marketing materials available online. These sources were analyzed referring back to the research questions.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process was core to this study. Following the first interview, I began to organize and transcribe the interview data. The interviews and data were kept securely throughout the study. After completing the transcription process, I uploaded the data to Atlas.ti for the coding process. The Coding Manual for Qualitative Resarchers by Saldana (2016), served as a resource for the coding process. The manual was helpful to learn how to use codes to create categories and subcategories. Acording to Yin (2018), “Instead of thinking about any theoretical propositions, pour through your data. Whether as a result of your earlier ‘playing with the data’ or whether noticing a pattern for the first time, you may now find that some part of your data suggests a useful concept or two” (p.217). The data were analyzed assigning various codes (Yin, 2018). Coding is a qualitative inquiry using words or phrases to summarize or capture data (Saldana, 2016). The coding process method employed for this study was descriptive coding (Saldana, 2016). As such, I labeled the data passages from interviews and field notes with specific words, and compiled these labels into a codebook in which each code was defined, and kept track of emergent codes and descriptions (Saldana, 2016). Descriptive coding leads to

categorized inventory preparing for second level coding (Saldana 2016). After descriptive coding, I used second level coding to combine the data collected into categories. Following the second level coding, I also reviewed the data to save significant quotations or information useful for the study. The goal of second level coding is to gather meaningful material from the first cycle to generate themes that reflect patterns among the descriptive codes (Saldana, 2016).

In addition to coding, my goal was to triangulate the data through document review. I focused on the selected university's website to better understand how the LGBTQ community is represented on the website. Document analysis is a form of qualitative research that adds a component to the study or topic (Bowen, 2009). The document review incorporated content into themes and added to the data from the focus group and interviews (Bowen, 2009). Adding the document analysis of the website helps enhance credibility into the study (Bowen, 2009). The documents were analyzed with the same process used in the interviews and focus group, using codes to develop categories and subcategories. I conducted a more complex analysis for each category that contributed to answering the research questions, but this process was limited to the lack of information. However, this will add credibility because in addition to the interviews and focus group conducted, the document review of the website added to the research data.

Documents are a way to triangulate interview and focus group data to help promote trustworthiness. The website was a source that is outwardly facing managed by the institution. It provided background knowledge and a clearer picture of the topic.

Positionality

One of the challenges in selecting this topic for research was how personal it is for me, being a former employee of a diocesan institution and also identifying as a gay male. The most important part of a study is being honest and forward (Yin, 2018). According to Yin, "The goal

of reliability is to minimize the errors and biases in a study” (p.82). I am being forward about my own personal identity. In addition, I am one of four children and, in my family, three of the four siblings identify as lesbian and gay. In our household, growing up Catholic was a personal barrier to each of my siblings and myself owning our identities. At the time I did not realize the role religion played in this, but shortly after receiving one of my first professional positions at a Catholic diocesan university, this was illuminated. I realized that there were myriad views and attitudes of colleagues on campus towards the LGBTQ community, which inspired me to further research to better understand this phenomenon. This was a significant motivation in conducting this study.

Reliability

There were four tests administered to help the reliability of the study that Yin (2018) described as: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability (Yin, 2018). Yin offered these as a way to provide checks and balance in the study process. The first test is construct validity (Yin, 2018). I used construct validity in this study to ensure the sources of evidence and chain of evidence was relevant through the entire process (Yin, 2018). In this study, reviewing existing research and using multiple sources of evidence helped contribute to the construct validity. The next test was internal validity and for this test it was important to understand the strength of the causal or “how” and “why” inferences made in the case study (Yin, 2018). This tested the truth of what was directly observed throughout this study. The next test was external validity which entailed addressing the how and why questions posed initially to help keep structure (Yin, 2018). The theoretical framework that guided this study also contributed to and addressed the external validity.

Lastly, I used reliability in this study and acted as though someone was looking over my shoulder (Yin, 2018). It is often difficult when you are passionate about a topic. Throughout this study I tried to keep my own biases and opinions bracketed. These steps helped improve reliability and assisted the researcher in remaining neutral and staying committed to the information being presented in the process.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher presented the research method and structure followed in the study and the design and analysis processes. Case study research was the best method for this study because it explores a phenomena in everyday life bounded within a specific context. In this study, the case was a Catholic diocesan college. Through collecting data in interviews and analyzing using coding methods, I better understood the experiences of participants in analyzing the data. In the next chapter, I plan to share the results and findings of this qualitative case study.

CHAPTER 4

The purpose of this research study was to better understand the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic university. The research questions that informed the researcher in conducting this study are: What are the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution? To what extent do LGBTQ faculty and staff perceive that institutional Catholic values impact their work? How do LGBTQ staff develop their social identity in their professional roles? During in-depth interviews, study participants described their perceptions and experiences at a diocesan Catholic university. The research findings are based on interviews, focus group, and document analysis of the university website.

Background

The participants of this study were seven faculty members and one staff member from a diocesan Catholic university in United States. The participants were six males and two females. The participants' positions and experiences varied at the university. They all indentified as a member of the LGBTQ community. In order to protect the identities of the participants, they selected pseudonyms.

Throughout the analysis, three themes emerged:

- 1.) LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution
 - a. Hiring Process
 - b. Academic Freedom
 - c. Experience working at the institution
 - d. Feeling of safety and security
- 2.) Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion
- 3.) Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff

The data collection consisted of both individual interviews with participants combined with one focus group and document analysis. The following themes and subthemes exemplified the commonalities and differences that emerged in the interviews. The first theme highlights the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff who are employed at the institution. The second theme is Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion. The third theme is lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGBTQ faculty and staff.

LGBTQ Faculty and Staff Experience at a Diocesan Catholic Higher Education Institution.

This theme emerged based on participants' experiences and forming insights into the LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at diocesan Catholic institution. There are four sub areas

within this theme; hiring process, experience working at the institution, academic freedom, and feelings of safety and security.

In addressing the specific concerns and reflections of their employment at the diocesan Catholic institution as it relates to their identity, all of the participants shared their concern of working in a religious institution which may not embrace them. For example, Rich shared how he had specific identity concerns associated with the religious affiliation. Rich identifies as Jewish and didn't know how that would impact working at a Catholic institution. Art said, "I think my initial thought was, will I even be allowed to work here, will I be allowed to teach here?" Ray shared, "Sure I mean my thoughts at the time were I was nervous because obviously as a Catholic institution. My Google results showed that someone had been terminated a few years earlier for being gay, so I was very nervous about it." Additionally, the majority of the participants reported how colleagues emphasized the institution would not support their identity or affiliation with the LGBTQ community, therefore, they suggested removing any identifying information. They were instructed to remove any LGBTQ research on their curriculum vitae or other outlying signs of their sexual orientation or identity.

When participants were asked about their hiring experience at a Catholic diocesan university, all participants indicated that they had concerns, second thoughts, or paused when offered employment at the institution because of their identity. In addition to their LGBTQ identity, one participant had concerns because they identified as Jewish.

There was a strong consensus from participants that they were concerned about the institutional values and stances against the LGBTQ community. Gerard expressed,

Friends from other Catholic universities, friends who I knew through various academic conferences all advised me to remove everything from my CV that had any indication of

gayness and then I realized if I did that there'd be nothing on my CV except where I got my degrees and what my name and email address. I am not going to retreat back into the closet, so I left everything on the CV and thought to myself, you know why. This is who I am, and this is who I am going to be if you hire me, you at least know what you are getting.

Rich said,

The religious affiliation, the Catholic association of the university, was something I was a little bit concerned about because I was raised Jewish and I'm not very religious personally, and also because of the fact that I knew that there was no sort of openly gay, or not much anyway of an openly gay community or gay student support, student organizations. So I was a little bit concerned about it.

Art said, "The hiring process and working at the institution is like being in the military with the policy 'Don't Ask Don't Tell.' Art felt that if he doesn't say anything or wear a rainbow flag then no one at the institution will know." On the institution's website there is a non-discrimination and Title IX statement indicating they do not discriminate based on creed, color, religion, national origin, nationality, ancestry, affectional or sexual orientation, gender identity or expression.

Hiring Process

Seven out of the eight participants expressed concerns about being hired and working at the institution, citing their identity conflicted with the mission of the university. Participants were aware of the mission and connection to the Catholic church at the time of hiring and had major concerns. Throughout the interview process, the researcher noted how some of the participants were reluctant to share their true reflection about their direct experience at the

institution based on their status. For example, faculty who were tenured were comfortable sharing their perceptions, whereas the adjunct faculty were less candid in their responses.

One of the adjunct faculty participants said, “I mean, my thoughts at the time [of being hired] were I was nervous because obviously as a Catholic institution, my Google results showed that someone had been terminated for being gay a few years earlier, so I was very nervous about it. But of course as an adjunct you're kind of you're not necessarily expecting to be getting tenure, it's, you know, hired from semester to semester.”

Faculty participating in the interviews specifically responded they were concerned about revealing too much information and disclosing who they really are. They were worried about their identity being revealed and repercussions from the university. They realized how sensitive and controversial this topic is and requested I do my best in respecting their privacy and confidentiality. Some participants used email addresses that could not be traced back, kept their camera off during the interviews, and came to the interviews using alias and other steps to conceal their identity. From the researcher's perspective, tenured faculty did not exhibit these same behaviors and were more candid with their responses.

Some of the participants' experiences varied when it came to being protected through academic freedom by the institution. Faculty who were tenured at the institution felt more comfortable and free to share, whereas some participants cited being adjunct or part-time inhibited their ability to share in the classroom. Also, there were significant differences between the responses of tenured faculty in comparison to their non-tenured counterparts. Tenured faculty interviews tended to be longer in length and were more candid and open in their responses in the interviews because of their comfortability and job security, than their adjunct counterparts who

were more guarded and nervous to share. The experience working at the institution was mixed based on role, experience, tenured and non-tenured.

Multiple participants cited that during the interview process, colleagues already working at the institution minimized or dismissed the Catholic mission, indicating it would not impact their daily work. Specifically Dinah shared, “Basically, I was told, if you don't talk. If you don't organize about or try to educate about abortion, outside of the classroom, you're good. And so, you know, I thought about it but it was minimized by the people who were hiring me at the time. And so I decided that it would be okay.”

A few participants acknowledged that obtaining employment in academia was a difficult task to begin with and that was a cause for them obtaining employment at a Catholic university. The geographic location and market in which this university is located is competitive and that also was a driving force for accepting roles in the hiring process according to respondents. Participants indicated that if they had other options available they would have chosen other institutions. However, this was the only offer they had so they took the position, with hesitation and concerns because of their identity. Al said he took the position working at the institution because of location and proximity. Al's experience is different because he is a staff member. There were significant differences between the experience of staff versus faculty within study data.

Al, who is a full time staff member at the institution, discussed how he is apprehensive in sharing his perception of the institution. Al emphasized his perception is different from colleagues' because he is actively engaged in the institution and serves in a different capacity from faculty. Al was the only staff member to participant in the study. Al continued to reflect about his view on oppression and discussed his reluctance to share his personal life at the

institution. To emphasize his position, Al spoke about a cloud of oppression in his daily life and the institution's strong ties to conservatism. These differences included his ability to share his LGBTQ identity with colleagues and in his department. Al shared that he hesitates to share his personal life with those around him. He believes that if he worked in a different environment, he would have the ability to share his identity. Rich also shared that it was a concern, but not a large enough concern not to take the job. No participant in the study indicated they believed they can be free, feel comfortable, or open about their sexual identity without concerns.

Academic Freedom

Many faculty members in the interviews referenced academic freedom in their experience and focused on the extent of what they could share in the classroom. According to Webster's Dictionary, the definition for Academic Freedom is, "*Freedom to teach or to learn without interference.*" The majority of the faculty members in the interviews discussed feeling comfortable sharing their identity within their silos or departments, however had concerns about sharing with the larger community and students. Participants shared their belief that academic freedom gave them the flexibility in the classroom that they need to be comfortable at the institution. Dinah stated, "A university is supposed to be a place where educators live and they interact with their students and if you want to have engaged students you need to have faculty that are engaged with the life of the institution, and often I find that very challenging given the constraints on my own positions and identity and presentation that I feel at the institution." Even though there is academic freedom within the classroom, faculty participants were hesitant to share their own personal views or identity with their students at this specific institution. In the document review, there was a statement about academic freedom found on the website. The document mentions academic freedom, but reinstates that certain responsibilities are specifically

attached to the university's Catholic identity. Additionally, the website lists activities outside of the classroom related to academic freedom. The website describes an adherence to the Catholic mission as it relates to the sponsoring diocese and that all members of the community should follow these expectations.

Conversely, Dolphin believed that they are free to engage and have open discussions and protected by academic freedom in the classroom. Carl cited that they had created a course and there were outside objections to the course because it interfered with the Catholic mission. Carl faced criticism from the institution and the community, therefore, they understand the risks associated with an institution's inability to accept change, specifically course content, that may not align with the traditions of a Catholic school.

Art spoke about staying away from teaching or discussing topics contrary to Catholic church teaching the first couple of years at the institution. He spoke about being gay and married which are both against Catholic church teachings, but stated he tries not to pay much attention to it.

Another common response from all participants in teaching roles implied at the time of hiring, is that they or had concerns about the extent to what that could share in the classroom. Art stated, "Will I be allowed to teach here? I remember thinking, wondering how much filtering I would have when it came to my own personal identity, but also in my teaching, and in the curriculum. So, yeah, all of those things crossed my mind as I was considering my faculty appointment." A common theme among faculty participants in this study was worry or doubt related to the material or sharing their own personal identity in their courses. At this specific institution, the Catholic teachings and positions on homosexuality impacted academic freedom for faculty. This was a reoccurring theme from the participants in the study.

Experience working at the institution

Al stated, “I have to say that being in a Catholic institution you do feel that the cloud of this hierarchy, is around you. So even though I've been out for many years and I'm married now and I'm a middle aged person, I still feel like the oppression from that still affects me at work” Many participants cited that within their departments and units they felt comfortable about sharing their identity. Rich shared that he doesn't have any indications that anyone in his office that would out or share his sexual orientation, but within his department, his chair is openly gay and colleagues are aware of it and that makes it more comfortable. Gerard stated, “Being on campus here is participating in the LGBTQ version of the Dred Scott decision. In other words, we are only three fifths of a human being at the institution.”

Two participants referenced the priest community on campus. Al stated, “I don't know the specific identities of specific priests or seminarians, but I know that there's a gay culture there. So, somehow, some gay people can be in the institution, and still be gay and still be part of it.” Carl supported this notion in his interview, stating he believed that half the priest community was queer and not out. Dolphin similarly cited a recent news article about a high-ranking priest caught on a gay dating site and said that the hypocrisy exists. “What if priests were allowed to come out? How many would be left?” he pondered. Gerard, stated that he believed the priest community on campus works to convert students and is a source of conversion therapy. Gerard further elaborated, “So you know all of the nuns and monks walking around and flowing robes acting overly friendly to the students? You know, whenever I see that I think, oh conversion strategies and tactics.” Ray shared the following, “During one of my classes my students were on Google. We were talking about conversion therapy. One of my students Googled it while we were having a discussion and said there's a link to conversion therapy resources through the

institution's web page." In the researcher's Google search and document review, this information was unfounded, but it adds value to understanding there is a connection between Conservative views, Catholic mission, and a toxic environment for LGBTQ faculty and staff at the institution. This may have been on the website and taken down prior to this topic being researched. Dolphin found that, at this institution, there is a strong presence and power of the priest community on campus. Dolphin suggested a further study on the influence and power of the priest community on this campus as a future potential study.

Rich stated that, in working at this institution, one of his least favorite things is the compensation, which is below peer institutions in this geographic area. Rich was told that the religious component is the reasoning for the low compensation. Rich stated, "I do frankly wonder from time to time whether the expense of the religious side of the university, including the defense of misconduct through having to hire lawyers and so forth, whether all of that expense could be reallocated toward faculty and students."

Feelings of Safety and Security

The topic of safety and security emerged throughout the interviews by participants. Al and Art both said they feel physically safe on the campus. Rich indicated they don't feel unsafe or unwelcomed anywhere on campus. Carl shared he likes to be a provider of safety for LGBTQ people on campus, indicating that he has encouraged students who are LGBTQ or transitioning to transfer schools or get out because of the repressive nature of the university. Carl spoke of his work being as a service to those around him and being LGBTQ allows him to help others on campus. Carl also said, "You know, I can pass, I have White privilege and I have male privilege. And if I just keep my mouth shut, I'm not physically threatened. But not, If, if you're out. There's

potential discomfort, everywhere.” Yet, despite this, Carl also discussed the constant level of anxiety prevalent on the university.

Dolphin shared that she felt safe on campus and accredited it to “street smarts” growing up in a tough urban environment. This created an awareness that she credits to her feeling of safety on campus. Gerard shared that, even though his sexual orientation is only a part of who he is, whenever he’s at the institution or in a Catholic setting, because of the toxicity of the church’s teachings on human sexuality, safety is always on his mind. Ray shared that, on the floor of their office location, they feel safe, but whenever they are on campus, safety is always on their mind and a concern. Ray was also concerned about participating in the study because feared the university would be unhappy about it. Six out of the eight participants that indicated that safety is a concern because of their identity and the institution’s mission and connection to church’s teachings on homosexuality.

Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion

Participants’ responses to the research question on how the participants perceived the value of the mission and connection to the diocese provided valuable insight. Some participants were keenly aware of the relationship with the diocese and Catholic church, while other participants were not aware at all. Al’s responses indicated that he understood the relationship between the two more than any of the other participants. He believed that there is a connection between the Catholic church and conservative politics. This participant highlighted that many of the main voices in the Catholic church are conservative. He believes there are liberal views, but they are not as dominant and one does not always hear them. Al specifically discussed the difficulty of working at the institution during the Trump presidency. He found those around him not sympathetic to realizing the president was taking away rights of the LGBTQ community. Al

cited events such as Kavanaugh hearing and George Floyd as significant events that he recalled, and shared that he did not want to come to work during these times. The Kavanaugh hearing was when Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh was being confirmed for the US Supreme Court in September 4-7, 2018. During this time, a sexual assault allegation arose, but Brett Kavanaugh was still confirmed to the US supreme court. On Monday, May 25, 2020, George Floyd was an African American man who was murdered by a police officer in Minneapolis on live video footage. There were protest and riots following his murder on the issue of lack of police accountability and excessive force use by police. In the document review, this institution has a history of conservative commencement speakers and guests coming to campus.

Al believed he was surrounded by conservatives and Trump supporters in the workplace. He stated that priests and other staff were very vocal and outward of their support of the President Trump and this made him uncomfortable. He felt disconnected to the Catholic church because of their stances against the LGBTQ community stating, "As far as I'm concerned, Jesus was a trans person. He's all of us, he's the other person that you look down on and discard. So I think that we're all Jesus, and the teachings of the Church are very simple. So, somehow it's gotten away from that. It's gotten all mixed up and I don't know what's happened. I get tired of dealing with it, honestly."

Al was a staff member and most likely on campus more than the faculty, and as such, was likely able to speak more to the climate and daily experience. This insight was valuable in the study and indicated differences in the faculty versus staff experience. Al provided a glimpse into the conservative politics at the institution, gay culture within the priesthood and ranks of the church, and how the campus needs to be more inclusive moving forward to attract students. The interviews with faculty focused more on policies, academic freedom, and feeling of safety which

were all important, but the staff experience provided overall more information and better glimpse into the daily experience at the institution.

Art indicated that, often, when we discuss Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, we only want to discuss race and ethnicity, but it is a much larger spectrum that includes gender, age, orientation, ability, etc. It's a large spectrum and he tries to educate this in his courses with his students. Recently, students requested to work on a project focusing on LGBTQ issues in his course and he approved their choice, even though this may not be accepted or welcomed by the institution.

In the interviews, the site institution's connection to the Catholic diocese was discussed by Carl and Dolphin. Carl recalled sitting in faculty meetings being asked to pray, and the crosses throughout the campus and in every classroom. Carl stated, "In meetings they will discuss the family, but they don't mean my family." Carl attended every commencement ceremony knowing that he will be offended, but said he is there to support his students. Dolphin also shared similar sentiments regarding commencement. Dinah felt that the diocese and church influences are everywhere at the institution and involved in everything. Dinah doesn't understand why the study site institution is more conservative than other high-ranking Catholic colleges. There are Jesuit institutions and other Catholic colleges that have a recognized LGBTQ student group, host events, and are supportive of the LGBTQ community. The selected site institution does not have these, and has a history of being anti-LGBTQ.

Both Dinah and Carl highlighted that the Catholic mission impacts which speakers can come to campus, what films can be shown, etc. Faculty highlighted that, outside the classroom, these things can be controlled, but not inside the classroom because of academic freedom. Ray

said, “The Catholic thing is always nervewracking and worrisome. What if I say or do something that will cost me my job? A job that I really like and enjoy.”

Participants who had tenure were more willing to discuss topic in comparison to other participants. The participants who did not have tenure or who worked in an at-will capacity confided in the interviews their hesitation to share certain opinions and were more careful about outing themselves in the interview.

Dinah mentioned some topics in which the Catholic mission interferes with a person’s health decisions, such as in vitro fertilization (IVF) treatment and birth control. Women participants highlighted a discrepancy working at the institution, and talked about being denied access to reproductive products such as IVF and birth control working at the institution. The institution is allowed to restrict these treatments based on the university mission and laws protecting them under religious freedom in the state. In the document review portion, reviewing the human resource website and employee handbook there is information, but participants state it is difficult to find and vaguely written. During the document review, the institution’s employee handbook was produced. The handbook focused on the institution’s connection to Catholic church and tradition, being a Catholic institution, and living the Catholic teaching at the institution in many ways.

Dinah shared the discrimination against Women who love Women and the mission of the university working against those working for them. Dinah also stated that reproductive choice is a real concern. Rich doesn’t have a partner or child, but wonders, if he did, if they would be covered for benefits and health insurance. He believes that is something to be further investigated.

There are also events that occur during the semester, such as pro-life day, during which the institution outwardly displays its conservative views. Gerard highlighted this as well saying that there are other competitor Catholic colleges and universities that are more progressive, but for this campus he feels pain and stigma with the university holding on to conservative views. Gerard believes this selected site institution is different because it is Archdiocesan owned and operated. He said, “They actually believe that somehow it's going to become the 1950s again and the Catholic Church is never going to be questioned.”

In the focus group, Dolphin shared, “Being raised as a Catholic [she] understands what that is from the inside and tries not to think about it.” Dolphin believes that colleagues not brought up in the Catholic tradition are more disturbed by the Catholic mission. For example, “It seems to be that the Catholic mission is used to be both broader and more narrow and it's talked about as as being about the Catholic intellectual tradition. It is vague in ways which allow for lots of interpretation, and a lot of different ways of defining Catholicism. And then it's also used in more narrow and prescriptive ways, such as using the Catholic mission as an excuse for limiting faculty and staff's reproductive choices and health care.” Dolphin and Dinah agreed that the Catholic tradition can be interpreted in more than one way. The participants began to discuss how punitive and penal it was that the institution restricted women's access to IVF and birth control.

Dinah felt uncomfortable asking potential candidates about the Catholic mission in interviews. She is not Catholic and believes one needs to be Catholic to be in leadership positions at the university. Dinah also indicated feeling like an outsider discussing the curriculum conversations around the core and mission. Following this, Dolphin indicated that she has had to

sponsor events such as the “Vagina Monologues” performances in order for them to occur. As a faculty member, she has more flexibility to host under academic freedom.

Dolphin indicated that, a few years prior, this institution had fired a staff member for being gay. Dolphin had encouraged the students to become advocates on this issue and write letters to the Archbishop and hand deliver it to him at commencement. The archbishop refused to accept the letters from the students on stage. Dolphin wanted students to register their protest and, after this, told students to mail him the letter. If he won't accept it on stage, mail it and then you had your voice heard. However, nothing changed as a result of this advocacy. Dolphin said, “Even though the Pope said many years ago, is, who am I to judge. Yeah, well, the message did not get to the other ranks.”

The participant responses indicated that there are conservative values and feelings that are prominent on this specific campus. Many participants cited competitor institutions are more progressive and have more flexibility when it comes to supporting LGBTQ people and issues, even other Catholic institutions. The terms used by participants when discussing the Catholic mission and values at this institution were “hierarchical,” “veil of oppression,” and “conservatism.” It is important to note that multiple participants tied the oppression and feelings on campus to conservative politics and the Catholic teachings against homosexuality as key reasons for the campus not being inclusive.

Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff

The majority of the participants reported that the first step towards inclusiveness is acknowledging the LGBTQ community. Many cited that the LGBTQ student organization on campus wasn't fully recognized until recently. Based on the interviews, the student organization was a separate organization that reported to a specific person and was treated differently than

other student organizations on campus. For many years, according to participants, the students involved in the LGBTQ organization had to report to a special advisor and didn't receive same recognition or funding as other student organizations. Many interviewees also discussed that academic freedom did not extend beyond the classroom, so this impacted which speakers came to campus or which films were shown on campus. Ray said, "Some show support, some show from the university that were recognized and included. In fact it seems like semester to semester there is or isn't a gay straight alliance or GLSEN club for students, or any kind of reaching out to staff and faculty."

It was mentioned by a participant that since the university hosts pro-life days and other events promoting conservative views, they should allow for more LGBTQ speakers and events on campus as well. Overall, participants felt that there is a different set of rules and lack of flexibility when it comes to the LGBTQ community. Dinah stated, "There's the way Catholicism manifests on the university life. It takes form in the kind of censorship at times so that we can't say LGBTQ in any kind of public announcement or any kind of scholarship or event."

Participants provided suggestions for the university to be more inclusive. For example, they suggested providing benefits to same sex couples. Updating the university policies on funding IVF and birth control and funding may also need to be revisited. Participants noted that the restriction on IVF and birth control is another sign the university is not supportive of the LGBTQ community. Faculty and staff say these policies impact their personal experience because the institution uses a religious exemption to bypass and not provide for employees. Dolphin stated that nearly half of students on campus represent racial minority groups, whereas the faculty and administration do not represent the diverse students on campus. Dolphin recommends Diversity education and training to educate the faculty and staff to make the

campus more inclusive. Also, participants said that the university putting up rainbow flags or a similar outward way of support would be a step towards inclusivity.

Gerard said, “LGBTQ students should be afforded the total and complete rights that everybody else has on campus, in other words, the right to have dances and social activities, the right to be who they are and to conduct their intimate relationships in the same way.” Gerard highlight the lack of equality on campus, stating that the Catholic Church does not allow or bless same sex marriages. This campus hosts wedding for heterosexual couples regularly, but LGBTQ couples do not have the same access or ability. In the document review and on the website there is a mention of weddings in the chapel. It does state that non-denominational weddings or those outside the Catholic tradition are not permitted in the chapel. Currently, the Catholic church does not recognize same-sex marriages.

In addition to interviews and focus group, there was a content analysis portion of this study regarding the institution’s website. In reviewing documents, there was scant information on the website regarding the LGBTQ community or resources. In searching the university website for “LGBTQ” or “Lesbian” or “Gay” or “Queer,” visitors are taken to a page that is connected with the university library and archives. On this page, there is a series of links to University Library resource pages, archives of sexuality and gender: LGBTQ history and culture, antiracism education resources from another institution, anti racist resources from the library and a link to the university counseling page. There is also a short summary regarding the LGBTQ student organization and contact information for this organization. It took a series of clicks and links to find this page.

The website contains a link to a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion committee that was newly created by the university. The new committee has a number of links on their page with

events celebrating diversity. They do monthly celebrations that highlight various diverse backgrounds. In June, they celebrate Juneteenth along with LGBTQ pride. This webpage mentions the Stonewall Riots and highlights an upcoming event hosted by faculty about LGBTQ+ students.

The lack of the presence of LGBTQ-focused resources on the university website is additional information to indicate a lack of inclusion and acceptance of the LGBTQ community, which validates participant responses. Throughout the interview portion, faculty and staff both stated the lack of resources provided by the university, and this was evidenced by an examination of the university website. However, there was also some information that contradicted what participants' shared in interviews and in the focus groups. Participants indicated that a student informed them there are links to conversion therapy on the university website. This was further investigated and unfounded, but may have been taken down prior to the search. Multiple participants said there was not a recognized student LGBTQ organization, but the institution's website did show that there is an undergraduate student group represented and shown on the website. The institution's website indicated that the institution's affiliated medical school campus has a recognized student organization as well.

The website also linked to news articles and social media pages of by the university. In both outlets, there is no mention of LGBTQ-related media releases, articles, lectures etc. The student-run newspaper for the institution has had articles and information about the LGBTQ student organization and other events at the university, but no official information from the university media releases or social media were related to LGTBQ-related issues.

The selected site institution has multiple campuses. One participant in the study teaches at this institution's main campus and a second campus site that houses specific graduate

programs. This participant believed there is a more positive presence at the branch graduate campus. This participant noticed signs for LGBTQ events and celebrates LGBTQ pride. He believes there is a more welcoming atmosphere there in comparison to the main campus.

The university recently developed a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) committee that was referenced in the interviews, and it was suggested they expand their work to include the LGBTQ community on campus faculty and staff. LGBTQ faculty and staff indicated interest in outreach from the institution or support group. A1 said the institution needs to change its ways and be more progressive for their own survival. The younger generation is more diverse and accepting and if the institution doesn't mirror this they could be left behind. Thus, it may benefit the institution to expand their DEI efforts and bridge the gap with the LGBTQ community.

In conclusion, the participants in the study were candid in sharing their experiences at this diocesan Catholic university. I am grateful to their participation to be able to illuminate the faculty and staff experience at this specific diocesan Catholic university. The themes that emerged were the LGBTQ Faculty and Staff experience, Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion, and Lack of visibility, resources and support for LGBTQ faculty and staff. The participant views and experiences collected help better understand this experience and may result in improvement in the climate for future LGBTQ faculty and staff. In my next chapter, I plan to discuss my findings and share implications for future practice.

CHAPTER 5

The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff at a diocesan Catholic university. The research for this study was conducted through interviews through Zoom, one focus group, and a review of documents on the university website. In this chapter, the researcher reviews, analyzes, and discusses the findings of the study. In this chapter, the researcher will also outline implications of the findings and offer suggestions for next steps and future research.

There were three questions that guided this study: What are the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution? How do LGBTQ faculty and staff perceive that institutional Catholic values impact their work? How do LGBTQ staff develop their social identity in their professional roles? Answers to these questions emerged through data analysis within three themes that were developed:

- 1.) LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution
- 2.) Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion
- 3.) Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff

The research questions were answered by the data that emerged from the interviews, focus group, and document review reported in Chapter 4.

LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution

There was scant research available on LGBTQ faculty and staff experience at a diocesan Catholic higher education institution. One of the most important research studies conducted was Hughes's (2015), "Who am I to Judge? How a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues on campus." The study by Hughes concerned a Jesuit institution, which, is similar to diocesan

Catholic higher education institution. Jesuit institutions have a history of being more progressive and accepting. Jesuit institutions are Catholic, but sponsored by the religious order Society of Jesus. In the United States, there are various types of Catholic institutions. The Jesuit institutions have always been connected to liberal viewpoints.

In findings from this study, a majority of participants reported stakeholders associated with the research site did not support their identity or affiliation with the LGBTQ community. The findings from Hughes (2015) showed similar results to this study. One of the findings in Hughes, indicated that faculty and staff had concerns about seeking employment at the institution because of their sexual identity. In the study, employees indicated concerns with being a good fit, being openly gay, and the Catholic affiliation (Hughes, 2015). In the current study, participants had concerns about accepting employment at the institution. One participant mentioned conducting a Google search during their hiring process at the site institution and finding articles about someone being terminated for being gay a few years earlier. As well, some participants indicated they had concerns, second thoughts, or paused when offered employment at the institution because of their identity.

In the current study, participants shared they were concerned about the lack of visibility and resources for the LGBTQ community available at the site institution. For example, the LGBTQ student organization was not fully recognized or treated like other campus student organizations. Participants also discussed barriers about hosting an event or program on campus that was focused on or connected to the LGBTQ community. This was also supported in the literature by Hughes (2015) that indicated a lack of LGBTQ resources and community provided by the institution and available on campus (Hughes, 2015).

In the current study, Al discussed a “cloud of oppression” in his daily experience at the site institution. It was difficult for Al to share his identity with those around him. This is consistent with Hughes (2015) as well, who stated that LGBTQ employees were at greater risk of being discriminated against or harassed. One employee discussed hiding their identity in the hiring process (Hughes, 2015). Another employee inquired about their domestic partner being covered by benefits and was told that would never happen at the institution, but a change in state laws the school now allows partners to be covered (Hughes, 2015). Thus, many of the findings in Hughes have commonality with this study, especially in understanding the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff within the context of a religiously-affiliated institution. In this study, no participants indicated they believed they can be free, feel comfortable or open about their identity without concerns.

In the study by Hughes (2015), the majority of participants indicated a generally positive campus climate. Although, there were still examples of oppression on campus and a need for further diversity and inclusion education (Hughes, 2015). Some of the significant similarities between the study by Hughes and this study were the staff and faculty experiences related to seeking employment, working at the institution, and the extent to which they were able to share their identity in the workplace. Hughes mentioned that Pope Francis’ tone about the LGBT community was one of acceptance, which impacted climate on campus. However, even though the Pope was more accepting, it doesn’t change biblical and canonical law regarding homosexuality, but the Pope’s comforting words are a sign to church members and pastoral leaders to be more accepting and kind to the LGBT community (Hughes, 2015). The current study also indicated this, but one participant noted that there are not enough visible leaders within the church advocating for this change.

In addition to the Pope's views on homosexuality, Hughes (2015) also discussed that the type of student attracted to the institution, often Catholic conservative students, impact the campus climate. This contributes to the power dynamic of the Catholic church teachings, which can translate into an attitude of oppression against the LGBTQ community (Hughes, 2015). This was also discussed in the current study. One participant discussed the Trump presidency and related current events and found working at the institution during this time to be difficult. This participant specifically felt that President Trump was taking away rights for the LGBTQ community. It was shared that members of the site institution's campus community were very outwardly conservative, with participants also noting that priests and others on campus were generally supportive of conservative policies. In my study, I also discuss this connection to conservative politics, based on the perspective of the participants.

At the institution chosen for the study, there are still issues that uniquely impact LGBT faculty and staff, including a lack of benefits for same sex couples, discrimination, fear of being fired for gay, and a general lack of resources for the LGBTQ community. This was the biggest difference between my study and Hughes's (2015). In Hughes's study, the faculty and staff discussed their worries about working at the institution, but then found campus to be very pleasant and inclusive. Still, participants discussed many microaggression and forms of harassment they encounter on the campus (Hughes, 2015). AT the research site for this study, however, participants experienced a less inclusive environment. One participant compared their experience to the Dred Scott decision, feeling they are only three-fifths of a human being at the site institution.

Hughes (2015) also discussed that each person's experiences and perception of campus climate is going to be different because each participant is at varying stages sexual orientation of

identity development. This segways into the theory used as a framework for this study, Dillon's (2011) sexual identity model. Dillon's sexual identity has a connection to the D'Augelli (1994) model, which was developed years prior. Findings from the current study confirmed concepts from the D'Augelli model, namely in that participants are influenced by sociohistorical factors, their work environment, and community settings. Multiple participants were nervous about sharing their identity in the workplace. Many of the participants in this study discussed past experiences and their real life experiences of working at a Catholic diocesan institution. The participants in the study described a challenging environment from being hired, working at the institution, receiving benefits, and overall campus culture as unfriendly to the LGBTQ community. Many of the participants identified they were more comfortable in their LGBTQ identity outside of the workplace, for example with family, members of their community and church groups. D'Augelli argued that prejudices and actions can impact how a person feels about their identity and how it is reflected in life. The findings in this study indicated that the campus does not have a welcoming atmosphere towards LGTQ community. Many individuals felt unsafe, nervous about job security, and experienced a lack of resources such as benefits.

Both Dillon's (2011) and D'Augelli's (1994) theories suggested that identity development is a process that occurs over time and there can be factors that impact this development. Participants' approaches to sharing their identity was a concern encountered and stated multiple times. In the hiring process, some participants hid their identity or research pertaining to LGBTQ issues. Participants also often didn't feel comfortable sharing their identity outside their offices or with others across campus. The anti-LGTBQ history at the site institution and attachment to the Catholic Church impacted their feeling of acceptance and being able to share their true selves with the larger campus community. This fear and concern can cause a staff

or faculty member in the identity process to be unable to express themselves. Working at an institution associated with a religion that has opposing views can make sharing one's identity and coming out even more difficult.

Dillon's (2011) theory indicated how sexual identity manifests itself and identifies it as a global process. In the Dillon theory, there are two factors to individual identity development: social and individual experiences (Dillon, 2011). The results of the current study confirmed that many participants were further along in their identity development, as they shared they have been out for a number of years or have had long-time partners. There are five key themes in Dillon's theory: compulsory heterosexuality, active exploration, diffusion, deepening and commitment, and synthesis (Dillon, 2011). The compulsory heterosexuality theme, even experienced individually in the identity process, was discussed in this study by participants as a theme visible across campus policies and structures. There was a focus on heterosexuality across the campus and anything perceived as against heterosexuality was perceived as a threat to the institution. One participant said that she felt that there were barriers for women at the institution, but even more so for lesbian women. The challenges she mentioned included in the inavailability of IVF and Birth Control. This participant's experiences illuminates the extent to which heterosexuality is prevalent in the policies and operations of the institution. Another participant discussed that the university uses the term "family," but he knows they do not mean same-sex families. There were many times that heterosexuality was discussed, such as at the university chapel only allowing opposite sex couples to be married. Thus, heterosexuality is reinforced on this campus in a number of ways, and further research is needed to better understand it.

The theme active exploration in Dillon's (2011) theory addresses the social experience. In active exploration, Dillon discusses socioeconomic status, family, and religion as part of the

sexual identity process. In my study, participants highlighted these areas in a number of ways that influenced their feelings of inclusion and belonging at the site institution. One participant articulating being worried about their religion and working at the institution. The participant specifically cited that he was of another religious identity and was concerned this may impact his experience at the institution. Another participant indicated they were told to hide any information relating to LGBTQ on curriculum vitae when applying for a position. Lastly, one participant believed the institution had a “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy in place. All of these examples demonstrate how sexual identity is impacted by workplace contexts. Thus, a workplace with ties to a religion with a set of beliefs and values against the LGBTQ community can be a barrier. It is demonstrative of the extent to which active exploration occurs when an individual’s sexual identity is not socially accepted.

The participants shared their concern for LGBTQ students at the institution, who may be early in their sexual identity process. Kortegast and Van Der Toorn (2016) found that faculty and staff on Catholic campuses played a special role in supporting LGBTQ students. My study supported this research and indicated that faculty and staff wanted to protect students from a negative response or experience. One staff member told students who identified as transgender that the site institution would not be supportive or safe environment for them. Much of this is related to the connection with the Catholic Church. The college experience is developmental, and students should feel comfortable and supported to come out. The faculty and staff believe they can endure the discrimination and problems at the institution, but don’t want their students to be subjected to it.

Dillon (2011) discussed deepening and commitment to sexual identity. One participant in this study was very committed and visibly emotional and passionate on this topic. This

participant was committed to raise awareness, gather participants, and attempt to make the campus more inclusive. This participant wanted to advocate for LGBTQ faculty and staff to feel welcomed, accepted, and comfortable at the institution. When the deepening and commitment phase occurs, it allows for expression of sexual orientation and identity at a group level. Some participants mentioned they felt comfortable sharing their identities in their small departments or silos, but not with the overall campus. This is an example of the deepening and commitment phase in which the individual and social identity process become one.

The next theme discussed by Dillon (2011) is diffusion, which he described as individuals not wanting to actively explore and exhibit low levels of care. Even though no participants identified as asexual or showed low levels of care regarding their sexual identity, this theme is important to discuss because it focuses on expression of oneself and identity. Participants discussed the priest community on campus and some participants posited that some of the priests may identify queer and are accepted based on vows of chastity. They are examples of the diffusion phase by Dillon.

The last phase discussed by Dillon (2011) was the synthesis phase, when the individual and social experience come together. Many participants discussed how their identity revealed itself outside of the campus, whether in their community or church groups. There was a sense that, while at work, most kept their sexual orientation hidden. Participants often guarded these identities for employment security purposes and safety concerns.

One of the theorists who influenced Dillon's (2011) was Bronfenbrenner (1977), who believed that a person's development was impacted by their surrounding environment. Specifically, Bronfenbrenner discussed professional life, church, and social organizations as settings that can impact a person's identity development (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). In this study,

participants identified as far along in their own personal identity process. There were no participants who were still at the questioning phase of sexual identity developments. Participants shared they were comfortable with their identity. Some shared they have been married for several years in happy partnerships and have families of their own. The only place they were not totally comfortable sharing their identity and being open was in the workplace due to the religious barriers and Catholic viewpoints. This is important because it indicates the extent to which Catholic viewpoints impact a person's identity and acceptance on the campus where they work.

Dillon (2011) argued identity development occurs in an individual capacity, but what differentiates his theory is there is the focus on group membership and community. This is aligned with my research because religion and working at a religiously affiliated institution were found to be barriers to identity development and to individuals being able to express themselves, and Dillon indicated this as part of the identity development process. The participants in this study demonstrated their participation in a community as a faculty or staff member, in one sense. For them, the problem arose when LGBTQ sexual identity was identified as part of their identity. While having an LGBTQ identity may be difficult on campus, holding other marginalized or privileged identities may even be harder. One participant shared that because they identified as male and White, they used those privileges to navigate the campus. The study did not have any participants of color, which might bring additional challenges at this specific institution.

Catholic mission and values impacting diversity and inclusion

The second theme identified in this study was that the Catholic mission and values impacted diversity and inclusion on campus. Existing literature and this study's findings were again aligned. The survey by Kappler et al. (2012), found that 67.3% of Catholic priests identified as

gay. In this study, participants cited that they believed there was a gay culture within the priesthood and didn't understand how they were accepted on campus. For example, some of the participants believe there is a gay culture for priests who identify as LGBTQ, but who are unable to come out. One participant who was out questioned why priests were accepted, whereas the acceptance of other LGBTQ community members was lacking. There were also claims that priests and nuns used conversion therapy tactics on campus. The participants indicated they believed when priests and nuns on campus approached students to get them more involved in campus life, they were engaging in these tactics.

There has been a significant disagreement within the Catholic church on the issue of homosexuality. Since the second Vatican council, the Roman Catholic Church has struggled with this issue. According to the research by Maher and Sever (2007), there are three perspectives in the church: the traditional viewpoint on the immorality of homosexuality, the mediating point of view of not challenging church teaching, and the revisionist point of view publicly challenging the teachings. It is through both challenge and awareness that may perhaps allow the church to reflect its stance on these policies and make changes.

There are many Bible verses, policies, and church teaching against homosexuality. This was noted from participants and the extent to which it impacted their experiences. In the focus group, the oppressive nature and connection to the Catholic religion and mission was discussed. Participants shared how speakers and films on LGTBQ issues were censored at the institution. As well, during the hiring process, university leaders must ask a questions regarding the university's Catholic mission, according to participants. These are just a few examples how the church teachings are prevalent in the operations of the institution.

There were varying examples of the difficult experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff. Siker (1994) discussed this topic and the tumultuous relationship between homosexuality and the church. The church often attempts to refer to sacred scripture such as in the book of Leviticus 18:22, in which it states, “Man should not lie down with man for it is an abomination.” Yet, this scripture can have numerous interpretations. Dolphin highlighted that faculty and staff who were not as familiar with the Catholic religion or mission of the institution were disturbed to learn about the teachings.

There are certain ways Catholics demonstrate their faith. In this study, participants mentioned the frequent presence of the Catholic mission on campus, including crosses in each of the classrooms and starting meetings using prayers. Such outward Catholic symbols may cause an individual to think further about sharing their identity in the workplace or being comfortable to work in that space (Clair, 2005). Participants were careful about disclosing their identities and indicated feeling uncomfortable at specific meetings and events because of the outward Catholic symbols. They associated this sense of discomfort as being connected to employment security and safety concerns.

One of the most visible Catholic signs at the institution is the priest community. Participants made various references to the power of the priest community at the site institution, mentioning that their presence may contribute to the attitudes and views against the LGBTQ community on campus. One participant also mentioned that a recent sex abuse scandal associated with the site campus may be a reason for low salaries and financial challenges. There are many priests residing on campus and extremely involved in the daily operations. In general, the visible nature of Catholic symbols on campus, especially via the priest community, impacted and

influenced participants' experiences because the priests are an extension of the church and often reinforce anti-LGBTQ views.

Love (1998) found that faculty had an easier time addressing issues of sexual orientation on the campus compared to administrators because they aligned with the findings in the current study as well. Faculty highlighted their privileges and challenges with academic freedom. Findings indicated tenured faculty were more likely to speak out about the topic because of comfortability and job security. There was a hesitation from participants who were adjunct faculty to participate in this study. The low participation from staff also suggested a hesitation to participate and suggests a culture of fear that may exist on the campus.

This study's participants believed that the oppressive culture had many layers, which is consistent with Love's (1998) research. Love (1998) believed that the idea of protecting the Catholic tradition comes from upper-level administrators, clergy, and board members. Similarly the findings in this study suggested the participants agreed that the oppression came from the hierarchy, however, in addition, one participant believed oppression also came from a larger connection to conservative politics. They also believed that the connection between the Catholic church and conservative politics is financially beneficial. Findings indicated there is an oppressive culture and fear that dominates the research site that is connected to the church and its leaders.

There are policies and procedures at the institution that are consistent with the Catholic mission and impact employees in personal ways. There is little research about the experience of LGBTQ women navigating the lack of benefits at a Catholic institution or the extent to which policies impact their lives. However, the legal fight on abortion and birth control has been ongoing in the United States for years, with institutions using religious liberty as reasoning for

not providing or limiting access. Participants discussed how the Catholic mission interferes with their own personal health decisions. Women participants highlighted the discrimination of lesbian women working at the institution, and shared being denied access to reproductive products such as IVF and birth control while working at the institution. The institution is allowed to restrict these medical services based on the university mission and laws protecting them under religious freedom in the state. These policies have real impacts and effects on women's health and individuals wanting to make personal decisions about the growth of their families.

On this road to inclusion, there is some hope and promise. One leading voice in this journey is Father James Martin, a Catholic Jesuit priest and an outward advocate of the Catholic church's acceptance to the LGTBQ community. Father Martin has written a book on this topic and is consistently posting on social media platforms in support of the LGBTQ community. One of the participants in the study shared they believe many of the strong Catholic voices are conservative leaning. However, that is not the case with Father Martin, who is trying to build a bridge between the church and the LGBTQ community. In addition to Father Martin, another leader in the church, Pope Francis, has a more accepting attitude towards the LGBTQ community. This study adds to the literature because it focuses on the experience of faculty and staff at a diocesan university which has strong ties and highly visible connections to the diocese and leadership of the church.

Lack of visibility, resources, and support for LGTBQ faculty and staff

The lack of visibility and support for the LGBTQ community indicated in this study's findings constitutes a problem and, as one participant stated, the university needs to "get with the program." The younger demographic is more accepting and diverse. Many young people espouse more accepting attitudes and viewpoints. Thus, if the institution doesn't change their ways or

views, it could have detrimental organizational effects. A report completed around 1994 indicated that discrimination against LGBTQ people had productivity consequences and cost companies roughly 1.4 billion dollars that year (Ozeren, 2014). The world is changing at a dramatic pace. This specific institution has benefited from its geographic location with participants highlighting they like where it located and where they live.

In the study, certain participants were more vocal and willing to share than others in this study. These participants tended to have more experience at the institution and positions of power being tenured. In the interviews, there was not a major difference based on participation between identities. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer participants all provided value insight into this study and there were no significant differences based on gender identity. Although this study did not have any that identified as transgender participate, there is value in a future study focusing on the experience of transgender faculty and staff.

The selected university has multiples campuses. The findings revealed that there was significant differences between the campuses. The main campus has less LGBTQ signage and events, compared to their satellite and regional campuses and only the main campus has a priest community presence. This may contribute to lack of support and visibility. During the document review of the university website, there was a lack of presence for the LGBTQ community on satellite campuses as well. There was scant information found was difficult for this researcher to find.

Future Research

There are myriad options for future research. One suggestion for future research is studying the impact of the priest community on campus. This idea was referenced multiple times by participants. A future study may focus on priestly roles and responsibilities at the institution and

how their position and role impacts diversity and inclusion initiatives. Future research could examine reasons for the attitudes, discrimination, and anti-LGBTQ experience of faculty and staff. The priest community plays a significant role on this campus and any future research pertaining to them may be beneficial to explore.

Another suggestion for a future study is to better understand the role of conservative politics and relationship between the Catholic church and suborganizations such as colleges and universities. There were multiple mentions of this connection or reinforcement of conservative politics at this specific institution. It may be beneficial to better understand this connection and the extent to which it manifests itself in the campus and its policies. I believe through studying the campus climate and further exploring the connection with conservative politics may illuminate the experiences of LGBTQ faculty and staff. This may also help identify barriers to diversity and inclusion within the Catholic church and its affiliated universities.

In this study, there were no participants who were people of color, which is a major limitation of this work. A future study exploring the barriers of LGBTQPOC faculty/staff at a Catholic diocesan university may be warranted. According to Nadal (2019), LGBTQPOC faculty/staff is a rarity in higher education. Further understanding why this is a rarity and how diversity, equity and inclusion goals can help to level the playing field to make the institution demographics more representative may add to the body of knowledge in the field. It may be beneficial to learn more about the experience of LGBTQPOC faculty/staff at a diocesan catholic university to learn if their experience is similar or different than those of the participants in this study.

One area that should be further studied is the difference between gender identity and experience at the institution. There were few differences in my study, however a larger sample may produce more results and information. Participants who were older in age and had more

experience were more likely to share and be more comfortable sharing in the interviews. There may be room for a future study based on generations and ages and how attitudes are different or similar.

Another future potential study is examining the relationship between LGBTQ student organizations and the university. In this study, it was referenced multiple times that the LGBTQ student organization was treated differently than other organizations. To better support students, the institution can organize ways for faculty and staff who identify as LGTBQ to provide to support to this organization and other ways for them to connect, raise awareness on the campus, and provide education. As well, a future study may uncover reasons for and sources of anti-LGBTQ culture.

Another suggestion is to consider other potential barriers to LGBTQ faculty and staff at diocesan colleges and universities. This study had the limitation of a small sample size, especially in terms of staff participation. It is recommended to conduct a study in the future with a larger staff sample. Creating other ways to recruit participants and making it more discreet for them to participate would be helpful. In this study there was fear and that limited the participation of staff members. There should be future research on the faculty experience and the staff experience individually. There should also be future research done to better understand the experience of staff members in various positions and levels at the university, particularly in further understanding the difference between the experience of tenured and adjunct faculty members. Lastly, it may be beneficial to explore the experience of LGBTQ faculty and staff in comparison to another diocesan institution or as compared to a Jesuit institution. As well, a longitudinal study may be pertinent so as to study the phenomenon over time to examine how it develops and the extent to which campuses become more inclusive in the future.

Future Practice

After this study, some recommendations to improve the experience for LGBTQ faculty and staff are to revisit the human resource policies currently in place. Institutions need to make them more inclusive to benefit all staff members regardless of gender, sexual identity, race, etc. The human resource and benefits packages should not exclude any person based on who they love. In addition, institutions should ensure that women's health is supported, included IVF and other resources to help an individual make decisions about family planning.

The next recommendation is for the campus community and public to support LGBTQ colleagues regardless of pressure from watchdog groups, priests, or community members. Additionally, having a student organization and events that are supportive to the LGBTQ community may signify support and acceptance. Allowing events and speakers on campus that are LGBTQ friendly is another suggestion, including embracing PRIDE month festivities and having rainbow flags at different places on campus. The faculty and staff who participated in this study suggested a group for LGBTQ faculty and staff to support each other and have programs that are supportive to students in the questioning phase of identity development. My hope is that this campus will become a more welcoming and open place for LGBTQ people in visible ways.

Lastly, beyond changing policies and allowing LGBTQ friendly events and speakers, perhaps the most important thing the university can do is join on this journey to changing attitudes and beliefs. This begins with members of the faculty and staff standing up to implement true change on the campus, such as creating a pathway for individuals to report harassment and discrimination incidents. Hopefully this action will lead to a more inclusive and diverse experience. Some of the information collected in this study was surprising given that the study was conducted in 2021, and much has been accomplished in terms of LGBTQ rights. However,

unfortunately, this will likely be a reoccurring problem and only rectified through meaningful advocacy, policy changes, and by challenging people to be more open.

Conclusion

In conclusion, because of the long and tumultuous relationship between the Catholic Church and the LGBTQ community, understanding the LGBTQ faculty and staff experience can be a sensitive topic. The hope of this researcher was to raise awareness to the LGBTQ faculty/staff experience at diocesan Catholic university. There is a long road ahead in bringing together these communities, but there is a hope for a more diverse, inclusive diocesan Catholic college in the future.

References

- Associated Press. (2018). *Miami Catholic school teacher says she was fired for being gay*. NBC News. Retrieved September 22, 2018, from <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/miami-Catholic-school-teacher-says-she-was-fired-being-gay-n847116>
- Banchiri, B. (2016, May 21). Yale OKs gender-neutral bathrooms, joining 150+ college trend. *Christian Science Monitor*. <https://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Education/2016/0521/Yale-OKs-gender-neutral-bathrooms-joining-150-college-trend>
- Barlett, T. (2006, June 30). *Bully Pulpit*. Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/bully-pulpit/>
- Bazarsky, M. (2015). Cocurricular and Campus Contexts. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2015(152), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20145>
- Bethune, B. (2005). Harvard's secret anti-gay court. Book retrieved from: <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/2005/11/14/harvards-secret-anti-gay-court>
- Bilodeau, B. L., & Renn, K. A. (2005). Analysis of LGBT identity development models and implications for practice. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2005(111), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.171>
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*. 9. 27-40. 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513-531. Retrieved from <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=ovfta&NEWS=N&AN=00000487-197707000-00001>.
- Campus Pride (2017). *Campus Pride releases 2017 shame list documenting “The absolute worst campuses for LGBTQ youth” in the nation.* (n.d.). Retrieved October 1, 2018, from <https://www.campuspride.org/2017ShameList/>
- Carroll, J. (2013). *Who Am I To Judge?* The New Yorker December 23 & 30, 2013 issue. Retrieved March 11, 2020, from <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/12/23/who-am-i-to-judge>
- Cass, V. C. Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model.” *The Journal of Sex Research*. vol. 20, no. 2, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 1984, pp. 143–67, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3812348>.
- Center for Disease Control (2020). *Basic Statistics. HIV Basics. HIV/AIDS.* <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/basics/statistics.html>
- Chibbaro, L. (2020, July 1). Petition asks Catholic university president to embrace supreme court LGBTQ ruling. *Washington Blade: Gay News, Politics, LGBT Rights.* <https://www.washingtonblade.com/2020/07/01/petition-asks-Catholic-univ-president-to-embrace-supreme-court-lgbtq-ruling/>
- Clair, J., Beatty, J., & Maclean, T. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 78-95. Retrieved January 31, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20159096>

Clawson, J. (2014). Coming out of the campus closet: The emerging visibility of queer students at the University of Florida, 1970–1982. *Educational Studies*, 50(3), 209–230.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2014.907162>

Cook, B. L., & Writer, I. S. (2011, February 27). *Catholic college fires gay teacher—Philly*.

Philly.com.

http://www.philly.com/philly/news/20110227_Catholic_college_fires_gay_teacher.html

Curran, C. E. (1994). The elusive idea of a Catholic university. *National Catholic Reporter*, 30(43), 12.

Croteau, J. M., & Von Destinon, M. (1994). A national survey of job search experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual student affairs professionals. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35(1), 40–45.

Croteau, J. M., & Lark, J. S. (1995). A qualitative investigation of biased and exemplary student affairs practice concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(5), 472–482.

D’Amico, A. (2015). Enrollment and employees in postsecondary institutions. *Financial Statistics and Academic Libraries, Fiscal Year 2015*. 26.

D’Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In Trickett, E. J. , Watts, R. J. & Birman D. (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context (pp. 312-333)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (n.d.).

ResearchGate. Retrieved September 3, 2020, from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258691916_D'Augelli_A_R_1994_Identity_developm

ent and sexual orientation Toward a model of lesbian gay and bisexual development In
E J Trickett R J Watts D Birman Eds Human diversity Perspectives on people in c

Dillon, F. R., Worthington, R. L., & Moradi, B. (2011). Sexual identity as a universal process. In Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K. , & Vignoles, V. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research* (pp. 649–670). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_27

Donadio, R., (2013) *On gay priests, Pope Francis asks, 'Who am I to judge?'*—*The New York Times*. (n.d.). Retrieved October 9, 2018, from

<https://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/30/world/europe/pope-francis-gay-priests.html>

Duberman, M., & Kopkind, A. (1993). The night they raided Stonewall. *Grand Street*, 44, 120–147.

JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25007620>

Dwyer, D. & Svokos, (2020) *Supreme Court bans LGBT employment discrimination*. ABC News.

Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/supreme-court-makes-historic-ruling-lgbt-employment-discrimination/story?id=71254749>

England, D. (2012) *Essential Guide to Handling Workplace Harassment & Discrimination*, *The*.

Retrieved September 29, 2018, from

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzEwMTM3NjVfX0FO0?sid=bcf0fee0-ca89-47f5-b47a-8f6b59bebce2@sessionmgr102&vid=0&format=EB&rid=2>

Evans, N., & Broido, E. (2002). The experiences of lesbian and bisexual women in college residence halls: Implications for addressing homophobia and heterosexism. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 6(3/4), 29-40.

- Eyerman R. (2012) Harvey Milk and the trauma of assassination. *Cultural Sociology*. 2012;6(4):399-421. doi:10.1177/1749975512445429
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission *Charge Statistics*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 29, 2018, from <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/charges.cfm>
- Feuer, A. (2017, December 21). Firing of Seton Hall priest highlights a Catholic debate on gay believers. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/30/nyregion/ouster-of-seton-hall-priest-points-to-Catholic-soul-searching-on-gay-believers.html>
- Fuchs, M. (2004, June 12). Religion journal: At one Catholic college, crucifixes make a comeback. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/12/nyregion/religion-journal-at-one-Catholic-college-crucifixes-make-a-comeback.html>
- Garrett, M. (2006). The identity of American Catholic higher education: A historical overview. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.15365/joce.1002082013>
- Gehring, J. (2019.). The case for why Catholics should march in LGBT Pride parades. *Washington Post*. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/religion/2019/06/06/case-why-Catholics-should-march-lgbt-pride-parades/>
- Gerald, G. (1989). What can we learn from the gay community's response to the AIDS crisis? *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 81(4), 449–452.
- Getz, C., & Kirkley, E. (2006). Shaking up the status quo: Challenging intolerance of the lesbian, Gay and bisexual community at a private Roman Catholic university. *College Student Journal*, 40(4), 857–869.

- Gibson, David. (2015) New Jersey archbishop: Priests should not give communion to Catholics who support gay marriage. *Washington Post*. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2015/10/13/nj-archbishop-priests-should-not-give-communion-to-Catholics-who-support-gay-marriage/>
- GMHC. (n.d.). *Current HIV Statistics*. Retrieved February 9, 2020, from <http://gmhc.org/hiv-info/hivaids-basics/current-hiv-statistics>
- Gruberg, S., Mahowald, L., & Halpin, J. (2020) *The State of the LGBTQ Community in 2020*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved October 2, 2021, from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbtq-rights/reports/2020/10/06/491052/state-lgbtq-community-2020/>
- Harper, G. W., & Schneider, M. (2003). Oppression and discrimination among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people and communities: A challenge for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(3–4), 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023906620085>
- Harvard School of Public Health. (2017). *NPR-RWJF-HSPH-Discrimination-LGBTQ-Final-Report.pdf*. Retrieved November 11, 2019, from <https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/94/2017/11/NPR-RWJF-HSPH-Discrimination-LGBTQ-Final-Report.pdf>
- Henshaw, A. (2017) *Colleges With Catholic Affiliations*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 10, 2019, from <https://www.campusexplorer.com/college-advice-tips/36449936/Colleges-With-Catholic-Affiliations/>
- Heywood, T. (2015). “Crisis”: LGBT college students nearly twice as likely to experience sexual violence. *Pride Source*. Retrieved March 22, 2020, from <https://pridesource.com/article/73348-2/>

- Hines, H. (2017). *The LGBT community responds: The lavender scare and the creation of midwestern gay and lesbian publications* [M.A. Thesis, Bowling Green State University].
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1946062552/abstract/9CCD003D6CB8486DPQ/1>
- Horsley, S. (2016). *Obama names LGBT landmark as national monument*. NPR.org. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://www.npr.org/2016/06/24/483385747/obama-names-lgbt-landmark-as-national-monument>
- Humberd, B. K., Clair, J. A., & Creary, S. J. (2015). In our own backyard: When a less inclusive community challenges organizational inclusion. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal; Birmingham*, 34(5), 395–421.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/10.1108/EDI-11-2013-0105>
- Hughes, B. (2015). “Who am I to judge?”: How a Jesuit university addresses LGBT issues on campus. *eScholarship*, University of California Dissertation
- International Student Guide *Catholic Colleges and Universities*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 15, 2018, from https://www.internationalstudentguidetotheusa.com/articles/Catholic_colleges.htm
- Jaeger-Fine, T., & Jaeger-Fine, T. (2016). Marriage equality in the United States: A look at Obergefell and beyond. *Revista de Investigações Constitucionais*, 3(1), 7–41.
<https://doi.org/10.5380/rinc.v3i1.45108>
- Johnson, C. (2020, July 8). Supreme Court makes anti-LGBTQ discrimination easier at religious schools. *Washington Blade*. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://www.washingtonblade.com/2020/07/08/supreme-court-makes-anti-lgbtq-discrimination-easier-at-religious-schools/>

- Kane, M. (2013). Finding "safe" campuses: Predicting the presence of LGBT student groups at North Carolina colleges and universities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60, 828-852.
10.1080/00918369.2013.774837.
- Kappler, H. (2012). Roman Catholic gay priests: Internalized homophobia, sexual identity, and psychological well-being. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62(6), 805–826. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-012-0505-5>
- Kortegast, C. A., & van der Toorn, M. (2018). Other duties not assigned: Experiences of lesbian and gay student affairs professionals at small colleges and universities. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11(3), 268–278. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000046>
- Kulpa, R. (2009). Mattachine Society. In J. O'Brien, *Encyclopedia of Gender and Society*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412964517.n267>
- Leonard, J., & Levine, D. (2006). The effect of diversity on turnover: A large case study. *ILR Review*, 59(4), 547–572.
- Lewis, G. B., & Gossett, C. W. (2008). Changing public opinion on same-sex marriage: The case of California. *Politics & Policy*, 36(1), 4–30.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2007.00092.x>
- Lipka, S. (2010, September 14). Gay students and college employees face significant harassment, report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Gay-StudentsCollege/124419>
- Lopez, G. (2015, April 22). *How most states allow discrimination against LGBTQ people*. Vox.com. <https://www.vox.com/2015/4/22/8465027/lgbt-nondiscrimination-laws>

- Love, P. (1998). Cultural barriers facing lesbian, gay, and bisexual students at a Catholic college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(3), 298-323. doi:10.2307/2649190
- Love, P., Bock, M., Jannarone, A., & Richardson, P. (2005). Identity interaction: Exploring the spiritual experiences of lesbian and gay college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(2), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0019>
- Lyon, L., Beaty, M., & Mixon, S. L. (2002). Making sense of a “religious” university: Faculty adaptations and opinions at Brigham Young, Baylor, Notre Dame, and Boston College. *Review of Religious Research*, 43(4), 326–348. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351200>
- Maher, S. (2007). What educators in Catholic schools might expect when addressing gay and lesbian issues: A study of needs and barriers. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 4(3), 79
- Martin, J. (2017). *Building a bridge: How the Catholic Church and the LGBT community can enter into a relationship of respect, compassion, and sensitivity*. HarperCollins.
- Mattson, G. (2019, June 12). *The Stonewall riots didn't start the gay rights movement*. JSTOR Daily. <https://daily.jstor.org/the-stonewall-riots-didnt-start-the-gay-rights-movement/>
- Mays V. M., Cochran, S. D. (2001). Mental health correlates of perceived discrimination among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*. Nov., 91(11):1869-76. doi: 10.2105/ajph.91.11.1869. PMID: 11684618; PMCID: PMC1446893.
- McDonald, N. (2011, February 28). *Openly gay priest fired from Philly college*. Phillymag.com. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://www.phillymag.com/news/2011/02/28/openly-gay-priest-fired-from-philly-college/>

- McMurtie, B. (2014, October 13). *Catholic colleges greet an unchurched generation*. Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Catholic-colleges-greet-an-unchurched-generation/>
- Miller, S.. (2019, October 8). LGBTQ employment discrimination: Half of states offer no protections. *USA Today*. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/10/08/lgbt-employment-discrimination-half-of-states-offer-no-protections/3837244002/>
- Morgan, D. (1998). Guiding principles of planning. In *Planning focus groups* (pp. 3-8). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www-doi-org.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/10.4135/9781483328171.n2>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019) *The NCES Fast Facts Tool provides quick answers to many education questions* (National Center for Education Statistics). Retrieved March 22, 2020, from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84>
- Nadal, K. L. (2019). Queer and browning the pipeline for LGTBQ faculty of color in the academy: The formation of LGBTQ scholars of color national network. *Journal of Critical Thought & Praxis*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp.8210>
- Nash, M. A. and Silverman, J. A. R. (2015). “An indelible mark”: Gay purges in higher education in the 1940s. *History of Education Quarterly*, 55: 441-459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12135>
- Neuman, W. L. (2009). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Newport, F (2015) Americans greatly overestimate percent gay, lesbian in U.S. Gallup.com. Retrieved September 15, 2018, from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/183383/americans-greatly-overestimate-percent-gay-lesbian.aspx>

- O’Laughlin, M. (2018, February 13). Firing of L.G.B.T. Catholic church workers raises hard (and new) questions. *America Magazine*. <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2018/02/13/firing-lgbt-Catholic-church-workers-raises-hard-and-new-questions>
- O’Laughlin (2016) *Cardinal Joseph Tobin says it’s all about listening*. (2016, October 18). *America Magazine*. <https://www.americamagazine.org/faith/2016/10/18/cardinal-joseph-tobin-says-its-all-about-listening>
- Out & Equal. (2017). *Workplace Equality Fact Sheet*. (2017, November 15). <http://outandequal.org/2017-workplace-equality-fact-sheet/>
- Ozeren, E. (2014). Sexual orientation discrimination in the workplace: A systematic review of literature. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1203–1215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.613>
- Parks, R., O’Connor, M., & Parrish, J. (2016). Gender pronouns: Recommendations from an institution with solutions. *College and University; Washington*, 91(4), 83-84,86.
- Patton, L. D., Renn, K. A., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Quaye, S. J. (2016). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. Josey-Bass.
- Peacock, K. W. (2016). Race, the homosexual, and the Mattachine Society of Washington, 1961–1970. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 25(2), 267–296.
- Pelletier (2016) *Four Catholic Colleges Make LGBT Shame List*. (2016). Retrieved March 22, 2020, from <http://www.churchmilitant.com/news/article/four-catholic-colleges-make-lgbt-shame-list>
- Poynter, K. J., & Tubbs, N. J. (2008). Safe Zones: Creating LGBT Safe Space Ally Programs. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13.

Prock, K., Berlin S., Harold, R., & Groden, S. (2019) Stories from LGBTQ social work faculty: What is the impact of being “out” in academia? *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 31:2, 182-201, DOI: [10.1080/10538720.2019.1584074](https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2019.1584074)

Rankin, S. (2003). Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people: A national perspective. New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Rankin, Susan (2005). Campus climates for sexual minorities—*Wiley Online Library*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2020, from <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/doi/abs/10.1002/ss.170>

Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W. J., Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender people*. Campus Pride, & Q Research Institute for Higher Education.

Radojcic, N. (2016). Building a dignified identity: An ethnographic case study of LGBT Catholics. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 63(10), 1297–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1151698>

Reichard, D. A. (2010). “We can’t hide and they are wrong”: The society for homosexual freedom and the struggle for recognition at Sacramento State College, 1969–1971. *Law and History Review*, 28(3), 629–674. JSTOR.

Redden, E. (2020) *Religious colleges see conflict between Supreme Court ruling on LGBTQ rights and their religious liberty*. (n.d.). Retrieved October 17, 2020, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/17/religious-colleges-see-conflict-between-supreme-court-ruling-lgbtq-rights-and-their>

Riley, J. (2017). *LGBTQ campus group again seeking recognition from Catholic University of America*. Metroweekly.com. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from

<https://www.metroweekly.com/2017/02/lgbtq-campus-group-seeking-recognition-Catholic-university/>

Rusch, T. (2010) Marquette University rescinds offer to hire dean, who is gay. (2010). *National Catholic Reporter*, 46(16), 3–3. <https://www.ncronline.org/news/justice/marquette-u-rescinds-offer-hire-dean-who-gay>

Rzeznik, T. F. (2016). The church and the AIDS crisis in New York City. *U.S. Catholic Historian*, 34(1), 143–165. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cht.2016.0003>

Saldana, J. (2016). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sears, B & Mallory C. (2011) *Sears-Mallory-Discrimination-July-20111.pdf*. Retrieved October 1, 2018, from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Sears-Mallory-Discrimination-July-20111.pdf>

Shuster, H. (2019) *Fired for being gay, Frank Kameny spent the rest of his life fighting back*.

Boundary Stones: WETA’s Washington DC History Blog. Retrieved November 13, 2020, from <https://boundarystones.weta.org/2019/06/24/fired-being-gay-frank-kameny-spent-rest-his-life-fighting-back>

Selingo, J (2015) How many colleges and universities do we really need? Washington Post. Retrieved November 7, 2018, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/07/20/how-many-colleges-and-universities-do-we-really-need/>

Siker, J. S. (1994). *Homosexuality in the Church: Both sides of the debate*. Westminster/J. Knox Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=h_dD_MP2Zn0C

Stierle, M & Casale F.,(2010) The transformational mission of a diocesan university. *Journal of Catholic Higher Education*. Retrieved January 31, 2019, from

<https://jche.journals.villanova.edu/article/view/623>

USCCB, *General Principles*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 15, 2018, from

<http://www.usccb.org/about/doctrine/publications/homosexual-inclination-guidelines-general-principles.cfm>

Vatican *Catechism of the Catholic Church—The sixth commandment*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 22, 2018, from http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p3s2c2a6.htm

Watson, K. H. (2015). *Exploring sexual orientation microaggressions on Christian college campuses* [Doctoral Dissertation, Regent University].

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1691347078/abstract/73928C5A7C34459DPQ/1>

Woodford, M. R., Howell, M. L., Kulick, A., & Silverschanz, P. (2013). “That’s so gay”:

Heterosexual male undergraduates and the perpetuation of sexual orientation microaggressions on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(2), 416–435.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512454719>

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications* (6th Edition). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zeleny, J. (2009, October 28). Obama signs hate crimes bill. *The Caucus*. *New York Times*.

<https://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/10/28/obama-signs-hate-crimes-bill/>

Zimmerman, C. (2020) Father Martin urges Catholic college leaders to support LGBT students.

National Catholic Reporter. Retrieved March 22, 2020, from

<https://www.ncronline.org/news/people/father-martin-urges-Catholic-college-leaders-support-lgbt-students>

Appendix I

Interview Protocol

Topic: The Experience of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a Diocesan Catholic University

Location: Video Interview

Goal: To learn about the experience of LGBTQ Faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic institution.

Interview Questions:

1. In this study, all participants will be represented with pseudonyms. What pseudonym would you like to use for this interview?
2. Can you tell me a little about how long you have worked at the institution and in what capacity?
3. How do you identify within the LGBTQ community?
4. At the time you were hired, did you think about the Catholic identity or mission at the institution?
 - a. What were your thoughts during this time and how did that affect your decision to accept employment at this institution?
5. How does your identity influence your experience at the institution and in your position?
6. How out are you in the workplace?
7. Where are spaces on campus you feel safe?
8. How important is your personal identity of being LGBTQ to you?
 - a. How does this compare to other settings in your life?
9. How aware are you of the institution's Catholic identity and connection to the diocese and how do you know about these connections?
 - a. How does the institution's relationship to the diocese affect your experience at the institution?
10. Do you notice instances on campus where you feel your identity conflicts with the mission of the institution? If so, what are some examples of this?
11. What are some of your favorite things about working at the institution?
12. What are some of your least favorite things about working at the institution?
13. What additional resources would you like to see provided to LGBTQ faculty and staff at the institution?
14. Is there anything else you would like to discuss or share related to this topic that you have not yet had the chance to talk about?

15. Is there anyone else you would recommend to participate in this study?

Focus Group Protocol

Topic: The Experience of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a Diocesan Catholic University

Location: Virtual Interview

Goal: To learn about the experience of LGBTQ Faculty and staff working at a diocesan Catholic institution.

Length: 60-90 minutes

Purpose of Focus Group: We want to hear from you and learn from your experience at a Diocesan Catholic University. The goal of this focus group is to learn your experience and make campuses more inclusive.

Confidentiality: We will not attach any of your comments with your actual name. We will use pseudonyms that you have the opportunity to select in order to protect your identity. We might use quotes or sayings, but agree to not attach it to your name. Your confidentiality is our priority.

Participants will agree to the following:

- Speak one at a time and be respectful of each other in this focus group
- Please do not share anything outside of this group and optional to answer any questions.
- There are no answers that are wrong. You do not need to answer each of the questions posed, but hope that everyone is actively participating where they can.
- Questions before we begin?

Focus Group Questions:

- 1.) How is everyone doing today? What pseudonym would you like to choose for this focus group?
- 2.) What do you enjoy about working at the institution?

- 3.) Do you ever think about the Catholic identity or mission at the institution?
- 4.) How important are the Catholic identity and values at the institution you work at from your perspective?
- 5.) Do you feel faculty and staff are able to be “out” in the workplace?
- 6.) What spaces or communities do you think are welcoming on campus?
- 7.) What recommendations do you have to make your institution more inclusive?
- 8.) Is there anything else you would like to share on this topic, your experience, or any additional thoughts?

Thank you for participating in this focus group and sharing your experience with us.



May 5, 2021

Mark Fabbi
Seton Hall University

Re: 2021-208

Dear Mr. Fabbi,


At its April meeting, the Research Ethics Committee of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your research proposal entitled, "*The Experience of LGBTQ Faculty and Staff at a diocesan Catholic university*" as submitted. This memo serves as official notice of the aforementioned study's approval. Enclosed for your records are the stamped original Consent Form. You can make copies of these forms for your use.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol, informed consent form or study team must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You will receive a communication from the Institutional Review Board at least 1 month prior to your expiration date requesting that you submit an Annual Progress Report to keep the study active, or a Final Review of Human Subjects Research form to close the study. In all future correspondence with the Institutional Review Board, please reference the ID# listed above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Mara C. Podvey, PhD, OTR
Associate Professor
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board



Phyllis Hansell, EdD, RN, DNAP, FAAN
Professor
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

Office of the Institutional Review Board

Presidents Hall · 400 South Orange Avenue · South Orange, New Jersey 07079 · Tel: 973.275.4654 · Fax 973.275.2978 ·

www.shu.edu

WHAT GREAT MINDS CAN DO