HURLEY, PARKER T., Ph.D. I Am Because We Are: Exploring the Relationships between Mentorship, Involvement in LGBTQ Student Organizations, Resiliency, and Leadership Efficacy of Queer Students of Color. (2016)
Directed by Drs. Deborah J. Taub and Colleen Fairbanks. 174 pp.

Although undergraduates are enrolling in our colleges and universities during a historical moment in which the lives of LGBTQ communities have never been as visible, LGBTQ harassment, violence and oppression is still pervasive within institutions of higher education in the United States. Still, LGBTQ student leaders persist towards graduation. Moving away from research that is grounded within a deficit model, this study examines the relationship between community-based practices (social support) found on college campuses that foster resiliency and the cultivation of leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates; namely in the form of LGBTQ student organizations and mentor relationships. Using data from the 2012 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Dugan & Associates, 2012) this quantitative study works to address the gap in research exploring the leadership experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates, that has largely failed to incorporate the complexities of negotiating leadership at the intersections of race, sexuality and gender identity by centering the unique experiences of queer and transgender students of color. The results of the study indicate that overall, LGBTQ students demonstrated high levels of resiliency and moderately high levels of leadership efficacy but LGBTQ Students of Color had disparate experiences from their White peers in regards to mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations. Additional within group differences were found, with transgender students reporting lower levels of resiliency than their non-transgender peers. The findings of this study further

problematize literature that inaccurately conflates the experiences of LGBTQ students, and by doing so, defaults to dominant identities, practices and epistemologies (i.e. heteronormativity, homonormativity, cisgenderism, Whiteness). Operating within a queer, intersectional, social justice lens, this study offers student affairs professionals insights about how to engage with queer and transgender students of color in more culturally responsive and affirming ways.

I AM BECAUSE WE ARE: EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN

MENTORSHIP, INVOLVEMENT IN LGBTQ STUDENT

ORGANIZATIONS, RESILIENCY, AND

LEADERSHIP EFFICACY OF QUEER

STUDENTS OF COLOR

by

Parker T. Hurley

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fullfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2016

Approved by

Colleen Fairbanks
Committee Co-Chair

Deborah J. Taub
Committee Co-Chair

To my ancestors, my beloved community and all the revolutionaries fighting for liberation in our lifetime . . . This is a love letter to you.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation, written by Parker T. Hurley, has been approved by the

following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North

Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair   Deborah J. Taub

Committee Members   Colleen Fairbanks

Jewell Cooper

Jason Robertson

June 29, 2016
Date of Acceptance by Committee

June 29, 2016
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All of my gratitude goes to everyone who has journeyed with me up to and throughout this process. It is your brilliance, your magic, and resilience that I hope is reflected within these pages. The universe has afforded me too many incredible spirits who have seen me through it all, to honor you each by name. You are by far my greatest accomplishment, my ultimate healers, and together, I know we will continue to create the world we want to live in . . . until then . . . won't you celebrate with me . . .?

won't you celebrate with me
(Lucille Clifton, 1936–2010)

won't you celebrate with me
what i have shaped into
a kind of life? i had no model.
born in babylon
both nonwhite and woman
what did i see to be except myself?
i made it up
here on this bridge between
starshine and clay,
my one hand holding tight
my other hand; come celebrate
with me that everyday
something has tried to kill me
and has failed.

PREFACE

They tried to bury us. They didn't know we were seeds.

When I first began my doctoral journey I was 26 years old, a first-generation college graduate, leaving my home of six years in Brooklyn, NY to live in the U.S. South, without any family or community. I made these major life transitions only five months after I began medically transitioning and living as an openly queer, trans-masculine person. I did not yet know the community of queer and trans Southerners that would transform my life or what to expect from any of it. I did not know how I would be treated as an out trans-masculine person, especially a Black-transgender person at a predominantly White institution. At the time, I only knew of one other Black trans man who had successfully completed a doctoral program [currently, I only know three others]. What I knew was that transgender people of color were chronically unemployed, under employed, criminalized, incarcerated, impoverished, detained, and murdered (Grant et al., 2011), and that nothing about the Academic Industrial Complex (Smith, 2007) reinforced or affirmed my presence in it.

From the beginning, I did not see anyone like myself reflected in the readings, at my school, in my professors, or in leadership. This was also true of my experiences within mainstream K-12 educational settings, where the curriculum did not elevate the experiences, histories, leadership, resilience, and brilliance of people of color. And it was truer still within the mainstream LGBTQ non-profits that I worked in as a community

organizer. Although these organizations benefited from the narratives of queer and trans people of color, we were not reflected in decision making-leadership positions. However, my life experiences as a queer, trans person of color, my work as a community organizer, and connections to queer elders allowed me to contextualize the invisibility of queer and trans people within a sociopolitical context and identify this erasure as oppression. These formal educational spaces were not only symptomatic of systemic oppression but also regulatory and reproductive of what hooks (2004) refers to as imperialist white-supremacist-capitalist-patriarchy. In these spaces entire knowledges, histories, skill sets, and epistemologies are subjugated, and only certain people are depicted as teachers, leaders, and constructors of knowledge.

However, at the time, I did not possess the language of internalized oppression, intergenerational trauma, implicit bias, anti-racism, micro-aggressions, social justice, and intersectionality to describe my experiences as a burgeoning, Black, trans-masculine queer, of poor-working class origins, who is a feminist, vegan, anti-capitalist, activist with USAmerican, able-bodied, lighter skin, and educational privilege. These were words and identities that I was learning to powerfully and intentionally place together for the first time. And although I did not have the language to describe my persistence through these often oppressive organizations and institutions, I knew that it was partly attributed to connections with queer and trans ancestors of color who resisted oppression in all its forms—ancestors who upheld a radical vision for the world, free from fear. Early on in my development as a queer youth, my mentors and peers connected me to the legacies of

Sylvia Rivera, Marsha P. Johnson, Miss Major, Leslie Feinberg, Audre Lorde, James Baldwin, and Bayard Rustin. Learning about their lives and histories of resistance allowed me to situate my own experiences within the broader struggle for social and economic justice. Moreover, I was propelled forward by the connections I had cultivated with mentors and chosen family who were deeply invested in my survival, personal and professional success, and overall well-being. My involvement within affirming queer communities primed me to critically engage in the learning process and more readily identify spaces outside of borders, outside of the gender binary, and aspire to embody the authentic desire, joy, and the kind of liberation made possible by queer imagination.

My shift toward intersectional, social justice work happened gradually and then all at once. During my first semester, I learned of an acquaintance's suicide, a disabled transman, as well as the murder of Victoria Carmen White, a Black transwoman from my hometown. She was in my senior class but, like so many transgender and gender nonconforming youth of color, she never graduated and less than a decade later, on September 12, 2010, she was killed by a cisgender man who would later be acquitted. Her devastating death, like the unremitting pandemic of anti-trans violence against transwomen since, was eclipsed by the deaths of five LGBTQ-identified college students, including Rutger's senior Tyler Clementi, whose suicides happened all within weeks of each other. Their deaths and the subsequent media coverage were personally coupled by a bombardment of literature that inextricably positioned queer identities with suicidality and state-sanctioned violence. This literature not only fails to explore the resiliency

located at the intersections of identities and oppressions, but it also is overwhelmingly based on the lives and experiences of White, cisgender students. Furthermore, the programming that stems from this research and out of the leadership of LGBTQ spaces are also predominately White and cisgender led.

Without further contributing to the erasure of queer peoples' histories in their totality, I wanted to work to create programs and research that would shift the paradigm from one of queer victimization to one of resiliency, survivorship, and possibilities of leadership. I became invested in conducting research that works to identify the ways that LGBTQ communities have sustained ourselves, when larger systems (medical, governmental, educational) do not, by explicating what I refer to as "queer practices of care" and "characteristics of resiliency." Moreover, I wanted to cultivate research and programs that were culturally responsive, that uplifted, and centered the needs, experiences, and leadership of queer and trans people of color. I wanted to co-create something I saw myself and my community reflected in, whose organizational structure did not replicate larger systems of oppression.

A preliminary review of the literature and focus groups resulted in identifying queer practices of care and characteristics of resiliency that included but are not limited to cultivating our own liberatory spaces, extending a legacy of queer activism, positing intergenerational mentoring as "a way of life," steeped in an intrinsic need to "give back to a gay community," and even building our own families of choice (Weston, 1991). My awareness of collectively based organizational structures emerged while simultaneously

learning from my experiences living and learning collectively in Greensboro, NC and from the deep history of the Black collective work and economies of North Carolina, as some of the longest standing in the country (Gordon Nembhard, 2014). I also continued to benefit from the support and guidance of a network of Black, cisgender women who were also pursuing doctoral degrees in my department.

These praxes and ideas would come together in a powerful crescendo that resulted in the creation of The Mentoring Ourselves Raising Each other (MORE) Collective. MORE was designed to build intergenerational relationships with queer and allied students, faculty, and staff, promoting conversations across the intersections of race, ethnicity, class, ability, sexual orientation, and gender identity, while incorporating alternative models of mentorship, including an emphasis on non-hierarchical organizational structures and collective-based decision making processes. These participatory approaches were employed as a way of potentially defusing internalized oppression and addressing horizontal oppression, while offering transformative educational and community-building opportunities. The participants were selected intentionally to construct a group that was predominantly comprised of queer, trans, and gender non-conforming people of color/women/femme of center students, faculty, and staff. Together, we worked to de-center authority and combat horizontal oppressions by focusing on collaboration and collectivity, personal narratives, queer ancestry, and histories of resistance.

Although the program ended after two years of developing relationships, many of us have remained connected and some have become my chosen family, committed to engaging in lifelong mentorship and care. For us, liberation is a collective process (Crass, 2013) and our liberation is inherently connected to one another's (Combahee River Collective Statement). These anti-capitalist and anti-oppression practices and ideologies continued to evolve as I worked as the LGBTQQA Coordinator at a local liberal arts college. There, I was provided the opportunity to collaborate with powerful, brilliant young, queer, trans, and gender nonconforming students who gravitated towards intersectional approaches to education and movement building. These students were not coincidently mostly queer and Transgender Students of Color, who maintain concurrently experienced multiple salient identities, as well as burgeoning White, anti-racist queer and trans students, and straight Students of Color beginning to make connections between systems of oppression (i.e., racism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, cissexism, imperialism, etc.).

I shared a parallel process with these students, as well as the MORE participants, in that they too articulated neither feeling welcomed or affirmed in predominantly White, cisgender LGBTQ student organizations, nor comfortable in people of color-led spaces that were staunchly tethered to heterosexism and cissexism. Most disconcertingly, the majority of us do not identify as leaders, despite showing incredible leadership on and off campus. I also have troubled the boundaries of "advisor" with these students, and our exchanges have evolved to resemble the queer kinship that I reveled in outside of the

academia and with the MORE participants. My endeavors to engage in queer, intersectional pedagogies and community building is reflective in this research study.

This research is derivative of my own experiences as a beneficiary of lifelong mentorship and the parallel processes with other queer and transgender people within higher education. It is my hope that through this quantitative study, I can expound on the possibilities of leadership that center queer and transgender people of color. To depict an accurate portrayal of the ways in which queer and trans people are operating on characteristics of resiliency, it is imperative to pay close attention to the culturally defined community-based practices of care and how queer communities are working towards the sustainability of themselves and their communities and how those practices shift at the intersections of identities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Several decades of research have highlighted the struggles experienced by

lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning (LGBTQ) youth (e.g., Carragher &

Rivers, 2002; Hershberger, Pilkington, & D'Augelli, 1997; Remafedi, Farrow, &

Deisher, 1991; Rotheram-Borus, Hunter, & Rosario, 1994; Russell, Driscoll, & Truong;

2002; Savin-Williams, 2001; Schneider, Farberow, & Kruks, 1989). The discrimination

that sexual and gender minority youth disproportionately endure leaves them among

those most at risk for suicide, depression, substance abuse, academic failure, emotional

distress, compromised relationships, and homelessness. Research acknowledging that

sexual minority youth are at risk for a range of negative health and behavioral outcomes

provides important but incomplete renderings of their experiences, as it does little to

explain how these individuals transcend adversity (DiFulvio, 2011; Massey, Cameron,

Ouellette, & Find, 1998). These narratives, grounded in a deficit model and saturated

with elements of isolation and suicide, have become synonymous with the process of

LGBTQ identity development.

Moreover, the undergraduate experience itself is saturated with anxiety to

manage, peer-pressure to evade, expectations to fulfill, and transitions to endure (cf.,

Kadison & DiGeronimo, 2004). These issues and concerns, when compounded by a

sexual orientation and/or gender identity that is not congruent with societal norms, can

make attaining higher education even more challenging, if not seemingly impossible. Still, many LGBTQ (or queer) college students persist to graduation (Black, Gates, Sanders, & Taylor, 2000; Carpenter, 2009). There is a paucity of scholarly research dedicated to explaining "why or how the *majority* of sexual (and gender) minority young people grow up to be healthy and contributing members of society despite widespread heterosexism and homophobia" (Russell, 2005, p. 8). This study seeks to add to the burgeoning literature that suggests that it is through their experiences of overt discrimination and/or peripherally-felt stigma that LGBTQ communities have developed various protective factors and coping strategies that aid in the persistence towards graduation and overall success (Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2004; Fassinger, Shullman, & Stevenson, 2010; Russell, 2005).

This study specifically sought to examine the relationship between community-based practices (social support) found on college campuses that foster resiliency and the cultivation of leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates—namely in the form of LGBTQ student organizations and mentor relationships. Moreover, this quantitative study works to address the gap in research exploring the leadership experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b) that has largely failed to incorporate the complexities of negotiating leadership at the intersections of race, sexuality, and gender identity by centering the unique experiences of queer students of color.

Recently, literature has demonstrated how women, transgender communities, people of color, and individuals with disabilities (not mutual exclusive identities) often

feel unwelcome and may not want to access LGBTQ-specific student groups and campus organizations (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn, Blakewood, & DeVita, 2008; Westbrook, 2009). This has been attributed to perceived and experienced hostility and horizontal oppression (i.e., sexism, cissexism, ableism, and racism) within queer communities (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008; Ward, 2008; Westbrook, 2009). Operating within a social justice lens, this study worked to ascertain whether the mentoring opportunities and involvement in LGBTQ identity based student organizations of students of color differs from their White peers, and how those differences inform resiliency and leadership efficacy. Ultimately, this study could offer student affairs professionals insight about how to engage with queer students of color in more culturally responsive ways.

Problem Statement

Institutions of higher education have maintained a longstanding history of excluding individuals based on gender, religion, race, ethnicity, and social class (Margioles, 2001). It was not until the 20th century that mass education was made accessible to individuals of all ages, preparation levels, and incomes. Mass education in the United States can be attributed to several initiatives and policy changes including the introduction of the community college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Dougherty, 1994; Shannon & Smith, 2006); the establishment of normal schools (or teacher's colleges; accessed initially by White, cisgender women), and urban universities with multiple locations (Geiger, 2014). Moreover, post-World War II, the GI Bill made college more accessible than ever, but still disproportionately benefited poor and working class, white

male veterans, particularly in the U.S. South (Bound & Turner, 2002). Lastly, the affirmative action policies of the Civil Rights era, incited in part because of student activism, helped to desegregate institutions of higher education, increasing access for racial minoritized communities (Astin, 1998; Astin, Astin, Bayer & Bisconti, 1975).

In spite of these efforts, however, racial and sexual minority students, as well as those living at the intersections of identity (Bieschke, Eberz, & Wilson, 2000; Ferguson & Howard-Hamilton, 1999; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; hooks, 1989; Rankin, 2003, 2010) remain markedly marginalized within institutions of higher education. LGBTQ students in particular are disproportionately denied the support and resources needed to negotiate often unwelcoming and even overtly hostile campus environments. Moreover, although the traditional-age college student of the millennial generation has matured during a time in history in which LGBTQ communities are more visible than ever (Broido, 2004), stigma and anti-LGBTQ violence is still an everyday reality for queer youth and college students across the country (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011; Rankin, Weber, Blumenfield, & Frazer, 2010). Despite having to negotiate and endure socially and legally sanctioned oppression, many queer students persist to graduation (Black, Gates, Sanders, & Taylor, 2000; Carpenter, 2009).

As mentioned previously, decades of research have highlighted the struggles experienced by LGBTQ youth (e.g., Carragher & Rivers, 2002; Hershberger et al., 1997; Russell et al., 2002; Savin-Williams, 2001). The impact of various levels of oppression are reflected in higher rates of substance abuse and depression, disproportionately high rates of unemployment, and that 20–40% of all homeless youth identify as LGBTQ (Ray,

2007). The research over the past several decades about the lives and experiences of

LGBTQ youth (youth is loosely defined as adolescents to young adults ages 13–24)

overwhelming links suicide and suicidality with a non-heterosexual identity (e.g.,

D'Augelli et al., 2005; Russell, 2003; Russell & Joyner, 2001).

Moreover, the literature from the past two decades reveals that college campuses

have not necessarily proven to have been an empowering place for queer collegians and

that anti-LGBTQ intolerance and harassment has been prevalent (Mallory, 1998; Owens,

1998; Rankin, 2003; Rey, 1997; Sherrill & Hardesty, 1994). According to Rankin et al.'s

(2010) national assessment of the campus climate for LGBTQ undergraduates, campuses

remain sites of significant heterosexism, harassment, and violence:

> 23% of LGBQ respondents were significantly more likely to experience
> harassment when compared with their heterosexual counterparts (12%) and were
> seven times more likely to indicate that the harassment was based on their sexual
> identity (83%, 12%, respectively). Additional analyses indicated that those who
> identified as Queer (33%) were significantly more likely to experience harassment
> than other sexual minority identities . . . Thirty-nine percent of transmasculine
> respondents, 38 percent of transfeminine respondents, and 31 percent of gender
> non-conforming (GNC) respondents reported experiencing harassment compared
> with 20 percent of men and 19 percent women. (p. 10)

These experiences of harassment and hostility are further exacerbated for students of

color (and/or transmasculine, transfeminine, and gender non-conforming):

> Respondents of Color (20%) were 10 times more likely to indicate racial profiling
> as a form of harassment when compared with White Respondents (2%); LGBQ
> Respondents of Color were more likely than their LGBQ White counterparts to
> indicate race as the basis for harassment. Sexual identity, however, was the primary
> risk factor for harassment for both groups. Transmasculine, Transfeminine, and
> GNC Respondents of Color were more likely than Men and Women of Color to
> experience harassment. (Rankin et al., 2010, p. 11)

In short, we know quite a bit about the violence experienced by and the substance abuse of LGBTQ college students. Yet, we know little about their academic achievements or their achievements outside of the classroom. Previous research has chronicled the trials and tribulations associated with a sexual minority status; it has done so, however, without incorporating concepts of resiliency, internalized oppression, and efficacy.

Several researchers have observed this single-minded trend in educational and psychological research that inescapably couples the risk of stress with that of a sexual and gender minority identity and have begun to expound upon the existing research by investigating how resiliency factors, components of holistic wellness, and positive survival skills relate to psychosocial functioning of sexual minority college students (Moe, Dupuy, & Laux, 2008; Russell, 2005; Sanlo, 2004). Most recently, research has also begun to reflect the resiliency that can be found at the intersections of identity amongst queer people of color, demonstrating how negotiating multiple layers of oppression (racism and heterosexism) can lead to increased coping and resiliency (Meyer, 2010; Moradi, DaBlaere, & Huang, 2010). Although resilience is a nuanced phenomenon, it has been described within the literature as "a process of or capacity for, or the outcome of successful adaptation despite challenges and threatening circumstances" (Masten, Best, and Garmezy, 1990, p. 426) or "the ability people have to 'bounce back' from adverse situations and stressors" (Singh & Chun, 2010, p. 38).

What we know about resiliency as it relates to the lives and outcomes for young people in general is that it cannot be conceptualized as a certain skill set or intrinsic characteristic. Resilience is better described as an assemblage of protective factors that

promote healthy development and offset risk (Russell, 2005; Wenar & Kerig, 2000). These protective factors

> may come from supportive school policies (Goodenow & Szalacha, 2003; O'Shaughnessy, Russell, Heck, Calhoun, & Laub, 2004), unconditional family affirmation (Herdt & Koff, 2000), close friendships (Anderson, 1998), or individual strengths such as positive self-esteem (Savin-Williams, 1989a). (Russell, 2005, p. 7)

Together these protective factors comprise a culture of care and each can be potentially cultivated to combat internalized heterosexism and help ensure the success of queer students. This study sought to address an important question posed in Sanlo (2004) that asks, "does community involvement and/or leadership on or off campus help develop coping skills and resilience?" (p. 103).

As mentioned previously, this study focused on LGBTQ identity-based peer groups (student organizations and support groups), and the role of mentor relationships in fostering LGBTQ leadership efficacy and resiliency. Although the missions, culture, membership composition, and organizational structure of LGBTQ student organizations vary depending on the institution, they are generally perceived to be

> . . . a common resource on campuses that reduces social isolation and feelings of stigmatization. These groups are run by and for LGBTQ students and their allies and may or may not be connected to an LGBTQ campus center. These groups, like all LGBTQ organizations, serve one or more of three purposes: support, socializing, and activist work. (Westbrook, 2009, p. 371)

There is a growing amount of literature supporting the claim that participation in LGBTQ campus organizations promotes resilience (Rhoads, 1994; Sanlo, 2004; Stevens, 2004),

leadership development (Pacarella & Terenzi, 1991, 2005; Renn & Ozaki, 2010), and more specifically queer leadership development (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007) and potentially informs leadership efficacy (Dugan, Kusel, & Simounet, 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011). Also, Renn and Ozaki (2010) cite "a growing body of literature has supported the claim that involvement in campus activities related to a specific element of psychosocial identity—such as race, sexual orientation, or gender—contributes to the development of that identity" (p. 14).

As mentioned previously, although research suggests that LGBTQ campus groups can be beneficial to those who can access these organizations, there is a growing body of literature that demonstrates how women, transgender communities, people of color, and individuals with disabilities often feel unwelcome, tokenized, and may not want to access LGBTQ-specific student groups and campus organizations (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008; Westbrook, 2009). It is also important to highlight that leadership is not enacted, supported, or cultivated uniformly across differences within queer spaces and communities (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005), which may be partly attributed to racism within the LGBTQ community (Boykin, 1996). LGBTQ student organizations act as a microcosm of a larger discriminatory society complete with racism, sexism, ableism, transphobia, biphobia, classism, and various other forms of intersecting oppression. This kind of pervasive oppression manifests itself in a myriad of ways, most notably in the inaccurate depiction of "the LGBTQ community" as being one homogenous group rather than a composition

of numerous communities and subcultures with varying needs, disadvantages, and strengths.

In particular, students who maintain several marginalized identities might not feel welcomed in the one-size-fits-all model of the general LGBTQ student organization (Ward, 2008; Westbrook, 2009). Although the literature available does not speak to the intersectionality of identities as comprehensively as it could, there are connections to be made between how queer students of color have sustained themselves at heterosexist, predominantly White institutions of higher education and the research describing how students of color, in general, rely on the power of community and social connectedness as they negotiate unwelcoming and even hostile educational settings (Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Meyer, 2010; Moradi et al., 2010).

Moreover, as a way to combat the often hostile, heterosexist campus climate and to offer our sexual and gender minority students the high quality interactions with others in the campus community that are vital for student persistence as outlined within the retention model of Tinto (1975), this study explored the benefits of community building specifically as it relates to mentoring. The retention model of Tinto (1975) suggests that "given individual characteristics, prior experiences and commitments . . . it is the individual's integration into academic and social systems of the college that mostly directly relate to his continuance in college" (p. 96). Briefly put, students who do not feel a part of the campus are likely to drop out. The isolation often felt by queer and questioning students does not have to be an inevitable part of their college experience. Borrowing from the work done with racial and ethnic minority students, we know that

student affairs professionals play an integral role in the success of students, and by providing minority students with affirming mentoring relationships, while working to honor their existing "village networks" (Miller-Dyce, 2009), the retention and ultimate graduation of these students is significantly strengthened. This study sought to add to the growing body of literature that highlights that not only is mentorship desired by LGBTQ students (Lark & Croteau, 1998; McAllister, Harold, Ahmedani, & Cramer, 2009; Van Puymbroeck, 2001), but that it can positively inform self-development and help combat isolation and invisibility.

Although the aim of this study was not to elucidate ways of creating inclusive spaces or remedying the maltreatment of queer student communities specifically, implications for future research on how students, teachers, and student affairs practitioners can collaborate and work to preserve institutions of higher learning as caring places that promote the leadership of all students will be addressed. By failing to attend to concepts of resiliency and leadership efficacy in LGBTQ students' lives and collegiate experiences, researchers are continuing the cyclical nature of victimization of sexual and gender minorities. The perpetual reiteration of research that overpathologizes queer identities, which is pervasive throughout LGBTQ identity development research, is in the service of the maintenance of a heteronormative status quo obscured within academia.

This reality makes it imperative for researchers, theorists, and student affairs practitioners to refrain from locating queer identities solely in juxtaposition to the violence and hardships that they face, which are grave and largely overlooked in mainstream society. This is also true of LGBTQ students' unremitting demonstrations of

extraordinary courage, resilience, leadership, and perseverance in the face of ubiquitous

heterosexism, transphobia (DiFulvio, 2011), and cisgenderism (Ansara, 2012).

Definition of Terms

In this dissertation I use the following definitions of these terms:

LGBTQ or Queer—The letters "LGBTQ" depict a history of struggle and

resistance by non-heterosexual individuals and communities moving away from the

pathologizing label of "homosexual" (which was then defined as a mental illness and was

not removed from the Diagnostic Statistic Manual (DSM) until 1973), towards labels of

identification that work to incorporate and affirm the broad range of human sexuality.

What we know about sexuality and sexual identity is that it is both fluid and contested—

fluid in the sense that one's sexual identification is subject to change at any time, several

times throughout one's life, and contested in that even the language those who fall within

the acronym is debated and not used unanimously across communities and subcultures.

For the purpose of this study I focused on the lives and identities of non-

heterosexual (or sexual and gender minority) students and will be using the terms

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) as outlined within the

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Dugan and Associates, 2012). However, I will

also be employing the word "queer" in my discussion to not only connote an all-

encompassing umbrella term that houses the identities represented by the LGBTQ

acronym, but also to include the ideological underpinnings of "queer" as a collective

sociopolitical identity. "Queer" as a sociopolitical identity has evolved and eventually

divested from a gay and lesbian identity politics that seeks less to normalize gay (or non-

heterosexual) identities, but employed rather "as a means of confronting and disrupting static notions of gender and sexuality" (Rankin, 2006, p. 115). The common denominator between queer practices of care, queer social movements, queer citizenship, queer theory, queer pedagogies, and identity politics is almost always the confrontation of boundaries, binary thinking, and limitations, as well as the implementation of a critical lens that troubles normativity. Although "queer" identities were not used as a part of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL; Dugan & Associates, 2012) data collection used for this study, it continues to be important language when considering non-heterosexual student experiences and what is possible for institutions of higher education and future research.

Cisgender—For the purposes of this study, respondents who did not identify as transgender will be referred to throughout the study as cisgender or non-transgender. "'Cisgender' refers to people who generally experience congruence between their assigned sex at birth and the gender they are expected to identify with by extension" (Jourian, 2014, para. 3). Cisgenderism or cissexism (an extension of "transphobia") used "to describe discriminatory approaches towards people's self-designated genders and body diversity (e.g., Ansara & Hegarty, 2011; see also Serano, 2007)" that also address "systemic problems" (Ansara, 2012, p. 93).

Students of Color—The term students of color (or people of color) will be used as an umbrella term to describe an immense variety of students who identified themselves as African American/Black, Asian/Asian American, Middle Eastern, Latino/a, Chicano/a,

Hispanic American, American Indian/Native Alaskan, and Multiracial. These categories are derived from the data set utilized for this study (Dugan & Associates, 2012).

Resilience—Resilience is an extremely nuanced phenomenon and has been described within the literature as "a process of or capacity for, or the outcome of successful adaptation despite challenges and threatening circumstances" (Masten, Best, & Garmezy, 1990, p. 426) or "the ability people have to 'bounce back' from adverse situations and stressors" (Singh & Chun, 2010, p. 38). In human development research, resilience refers to "a class of phenomena characterized by good outcomes in spite of serious threats to adaptation or development" (Masten, 2001, p. 228). Operating within this definition of resiliency, it can be understood that assessing the presence of resiliency is only tenable in juxtaposition to and understanding of one's ability to overcome some level of adversity or risk.

Leadership Self-Efficacy—Self-efficacy is grounded in social cognitive theory coined by social cognitive psychologist Albert Bandura (1997) and "refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce give attainments" (p. 3). Although efficacy is often discussed broadly across disciplines and activities, "Bandura (1997) spoke to the significance of studying efficacy in a way that is domain specific (e.g., leadership, public speaking, and athletics)" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 185). Thus, leadership self-efficacy (LSE) or leadership efficacy refers to "individuals' internal beliefs about their knowledge, skills, and abilities to successfully engage in leadership" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 185), and within an ever-expanding global economy, scholars have elevated the meaningfulness of efficacy in meeting the

leadership needs and challenges of modern day society (Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008).

Mentorship—This study recognizes the varying definitions of mentoring relationships, which can differ in "their structure, intent, and communication style" (Mullen, 2005, p. 21) with research describing how these relationships "may be informal or formal, long-term or short-lived, planned or spontaneous" (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey 2005, p. 529). Within the realm of education specifically, mentorship "is generally understood as a personal or professional relationship between two people—a knowing, experienced professional and a protégé or mentee who commits to an advisory and non-evaluative relationship that often involves a long-term goal" (Mullen, 2005, pp. 1–2). This study, however, maintains the definition employed by the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Dugan & Associates, 2012), which defined a mentor as a person who intentionally assists your growth or connects you to opportunities for career or personal development (N. Turman, personal communication, September 22, 2015).

Research Questions

For the purpose of this study, I will focus on LGBTQ identity-based peer groups (student organizations and support groups) and the role mentors may have in fostering resiliency and leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates. Additionally, the aim of this study was to ascertain whether there are differences of experiences across intersections of identity. The research questions that guide this study were:

1. Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

2. Does the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color differ based on involvement in LGBTQ organizations?

3. Does the presence of a mentor increase the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

4. Does the presence of a mentor significantly relate to the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

5. Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

6. Are there differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

7. Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

8. Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

9. Does resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity, sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together. —Lilla Watson

This study sought to expand the literature that explores the relationship between race, sexual and gender identity and leadership development and enactment within college environments (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b) by focusing on the unique experiences of students of color. Although Renn (2007) described a "relative explosion of research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender adolescents and college students (e.g., Abes et al., 2004; Bilodeau, 2005; Dilley, 2005; Evans & Broido, 1999; Fassinger, 1998; Rhoads, 1998; Stevens, 2004; Tomlinson & Fassinger, 2003)" (p. 311), there is limited research available that integrated the ways that various social identities interact with sexual orientation, including race (Meyer, 2010; Moradi et al., 2010), gender identity (Beemyn, 2005; Carter, 2000), and ability (Harley, Nowak, Gassaway, & Savage, 2002). This existing literature demonstrates that although LGBTQ undergraduates are more visible than ever (Rankin et al., 2010), college campuses have not necessarily proven to be empowering places for LGBTQ people and that anti-LGBTQ intolerance and harassment has been prevalent (Abes & Kasch, 2007; Rankin et al., 2010; Rhoads, 1994; Wall & Evans, 1999). Also, most pertinent to this study, these experiences of harassment and hostility

are further exacerbated for students of color and/or transmasculine, transfeminine, and gender non-conforming students (Rankin et al., 2010).

This review highlights the work being done on college campuses to combat these hostile, heterosexist environments and to offer our sexual and gender minority students the "high quality interactions with persons in the social system of the campus [that] are critical for student persistence" (Tinto, 1975, p. 96). Borrowing from the work being done to support racial and ethnic marginalized students, we know that student affairs professionals play an integral role in the success of students and, by providing minority students with affirming mentoring relationships, while working to honor their existing "village networks" (Miller-Dyce, 2009), the retention and ultimate graduation of these students is significantly strengthened. This review incorporates the support services available to queer students that positively inform queer students' persistence towards graduation, specifically mentor relationships and LGBTQ student organizations. Operating within a social justice lens, this study worked to ascertain whether mentor relationships, and participation in LGTQ student organizations and subsequent leadership efficacy and resiliency of Students of Color differ from their White peers.

In this chapter the empirical and conceptual literature supporting this study is reviewed. First will be an exploration of the dependent variables of this study: resiliency and leadership efficacy, and how each are informed by sexual and racial identities. Second, to set the context in which this study was situated, the literature on campus climate for LGBTQ people in general and for LGBTQ persons of color specifically is reviewed. Then an overview of mentoring is provided, along with a discussion of the

relationship between queer-specific mentoring and the development of leadership efficacy. Finally, literature on LGBTQ student leadership is discussed. This discussion includes the literature exploring the relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations, leadership efficacy, and resiliency.

Overview of Leadership Efficacy

Self-efficacy is grounded in social cognitive theory popularized by social cognitive psychologist Albert Bandura (1997) and "refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce give attainments" (p. 3). Much of people's lives are guided by self-efficacy, including the choices in the activities in which to participate; efforts, persistence, and resilience; levels of accomplishments; self-talk; and the stress and depression experienced while traversing adversity (Bandura, 1997; Schunk & Pajares, 2005, 2009). Scholars have noted that "motivation and human behavior are directly connected to individuals' beliefs about their capabilities" (Montas-Hunter, 2012, p. 321). The more someone believes they can accomplish something the more motivated they are to do it; the more one is motivated and the more effort someone puts in, the more likely one will persist and succeed (Schunk & Pajares, 2005, 2009; Schunk, Meece, & Pintrich, 2014). Conversely, "people holding low self-efficacy for accomplishing a task may avoid it; those who believe they are capable are likely to participate. This may be especially when they encounter difficulties, efficacious students work harder and persist longer than those with doubts" (Schunk et al., 2014, p. 145).

Although efficacy is often discussed broadly across disciplines and activities, efficacy is domain specific (Bandura, 1997; Komives & Dugan, 2010). Thus, leadership

self-efficacy (LSE) or leadership efficacy refers to "individuals' internal beliefs about their knowledge, skills, and abilities to successfully engage in leadership" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 185); within an ever expanding global economy, scholars have elevated the meaningfulness of efficacy in meeting the leadership needs and challenges of modern day society (Hannah et al., 2008). Despite the limited research highlighting the meaningfulness of leadership efficacy within leadership development efforts and research endeavors (Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin, & Jackson, 2008; Komives & Dugan, 2010), scholars are suggesting that self-efficacy serves as a starting point for leadership development efforts and research endeavors (Anderson et al., 2008; Kodama & Dugan, 2013). This study sought to expand on a growing body of research on college student leadership development, which identifies "connections between leadership efficacy and leadership enactment as well as capacity" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 185). The available research that highlights the importance of leadership efficacy in leadership development efforts among college students cites correlations between the motivation and frequency with which students attempted a leadership role (McCormick, Tanguma, & López-Forment, 2002), socially responsible leadership capacity (Dugan & Komives, 2011), and the development of a leadership identity (Komives et al., 2005).

Dugan and Komives (2011) explored the "influences of college experiences on students' capacity to engage in socially responsible leadership" (p. 538). Their findings suggest that "socio-cultural conversations among peers, faculty mentoring, and participation in community service emerged as key influences" (Dugan & Komives, 2011, p. 542). Moreover, existing research suggests that there is a loose theoretical link

between LSE and leadership capacity and ability and the developmental process in general (Bandura, 1997; Dugan & Komives, 2011). Still, there remains scant attention that has been paid on examining what factors might predict or influence leadership efficacy (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Dugan & Yurman, 2011). The limited literature suggests that

> Both leadership capacity and leader efficacy are influenced by a variety of learning experiences associated with the collegiate environment. These include involvement in community service, interactions across difference,' mentoring relationships, internships, involvement in student clubs and organizations, positional leadership roles, and formal leadership training (Dugan, 2011b). (Dugan, Fath, Howes, Lavelle, & Polanin, 2013, p. 9)

Kezar and Moriarty (2000) cautioned that although "involvement opportunities are clearly important for the development of leadership among all groups . . . different types of involvement opportunities are helpful in developing leadership for each subgroup" (p. 67). This study was built from the limited literature that examines the relationship between leadership efficacy and social identity (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodama & Dugan 2013), with the aspirations of making recommendations to those developing programming specifically for students who are queer, transgender, and of color.

Although Bandura (1997) mentions ethnic affiliation as a potential influence on self-efficacy, including leadership efficacy, leadership studies and practice have failed to frame college student leadership within a racial context, and has been negligible in incorporating issues of social identity in general (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). In a recent review of the literature on the intersections of race and leadership, Ospina and Foldy (2009) critiqued the shortage of research on this topic and encouraged researchers to

investigate how racial identity influences leadership and its enactment. This trend is particularly evident in quantitative studies that often fail to disaggregate their data by race entirely (Dugan, Kodama, & Gebhardt, 2012). The lack of available research outlining how race informs, empowers, and conflates leadership efficacy is particularly disconcerting given the increased diversity on campus and a bourgeoning awareness that undergraduates do not experience educational spaces uniformly (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodama & Dugan, 2013; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005).

Disappointingly, the scant research that explores leadership efficacy among LGBTQ undergraduates does not disaggregate the findings by race and/or ethnicity, further perpetuating the erasure of the unique experiences of queer Students of Color (Kodama & Dugan, 2013; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Similarly, the relationship between sexual orientation, gender identity, and leadership efficacy has been gravely overlooked within the literature. From the limited research, several overarching themes emerge throughout the existing leadership development research. Most pertinent is a pattern of marginalized student populations in general (Arminio et al., 2000; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000), and LGBTQ students specifically are often being reluctant to take on the identity of "leader" due to subsequent homophobia, heterosexism, and harassment once identified as an LGBTQ leader (Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a). Although this hesitance is not uniquely relegated "to student leadership experiences in identity-based groups, they take on special importance to students from groups historically marginalized in higher education: women, people of color, gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgender students"

(Renn & Bilodeau, 2003, "College student leadership in identity-based contexts," para. 1).

And although owning a non-heterosexual identity remains taboo in most realms of modern society, our society is not at a loss for powerful LGBTQ leadership. Scholars have suggested that because of how heterosexism and internalized oppression can shape the way queer students enact leadership both positively and negatively, or how they are perceived as leaders in general, sexual identity in and of itself "may prove to be an extremely important and viable area of leadership study" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 206). This study aimed to build from the research that examines the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ college students, while exploring the nuances of experiences located at the intersections of race, gender, and sexuality.

Overview of LGBTQ Leadership Efficacy

As mentioned previously, LGBTQ students are not identifying as leaders. This remains true despite existing research suggesting that the perpetual engagement in some kind of coming out process, while having to negotiating multiple systems of interlocking oppressions, sexual minorities (and I would suggest LGBTQ people of color) may be better positioned to

> listen and respond better to criticism articulate their own points of view even in the face of oppositional create strong support systems; advocate for themselves and similar others within systems of power and privilege; examine their own needs, desires, and life goals; and take care of themselves psychologically, physically, and materially. (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 206)

Still, having to remain hypervigilant about perceived and enacted stigma,

> LGBTQ individuals may experience low self-efficacy in regard to assuming
> certain leadership roles; they may be prevented from emerging as leaders within
> certain occupational opportunity structures; they may find their effectiveness and
> success as leaders compromised when they become leaders; and they may be
> perceived as ineffective even if successful. (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 206)

Although a thorough exploration of the role that various internalized and horizontal

oppression plays in queer leadership identity development was not within the scope of

this study specifically, this study sought to bridge the gap in research and in theory

between leadership identity development and leadership efficacy amongst LGBTQ

students.

Porter (1998) provides an unparalleled examination of the relationship between

development of leadership self-efficacy and gay and lesbian identity development, and is

frequently cited as being particularly significant to the conversation. Porter (1998) found

that the progression of a gay and lesbian identity did not affect leadership efficacy for

leading any type of organization (gay or lesbian, or heterosexual); however, the study

revealed gender differences in students' self-efficacy, citing that "gay men reported lower

self-esteem and were less confident than lesbian women that they could engage in

leadership behaviors in mixed groups including heterosexual students as compared to

groups that were gay and lesbian in composition" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 207). These

findings were supported by Renn's (2007) qualitative study researching "the development

of leadership self-efficacy among gay and lesbian leaders of LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ

student organizations" (p. 314). The study sampled from across 13 different campuses

and suggested that "progression in lesbian or gay identity did not affect leadership efficacy for leading a same type (gay or lesbian) or different-type (heterosexual organization; however, identity did significantly influence self-esteem, which, in turn, affected self-efficacy" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 207).

These findings were later echoed in quantitative studies that also found that leadership-efficacy of undergraduate students was not largely affected by maintaining an LGB identity (Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Martinez, Ostick, Komives & Dugan, 2006). In general, the research remains divided as to the ways in which an LGBTQ identity informs the leadership efficacy of undergraduates. Quantitative research, however, remains particularly minimal (Longerbeam, Inkelas, Johnson, & Lee, 2007) with students typically not being asked about their sexual orientation, "reflecting deeper issues related to heteronormativity in research, but sampling strategies rarely capture the sample size necessary for quantitative analytic techniques" (Dugan & Yurman, 2001, p. 201). For this reason, the study being conducted parallels the few examples of empirical research concerning LGBTQ undergraduate based on the data made available by The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) (Dugan & Associates, 2012), which could potentially "provide additional perspective about qualities that sexual minority leaders bring to their roles" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 207).

Overview of Resiliency

Research has continually coupled a sexual minority status with unavoidable hardships, while failing to investigate how resiliency factors, components of holistic wellness, and positive survival skills relate to psychosocial functioning of sexual minority

college students (Moe, Dupuy, & Laux, 2008; Russell, 2005; Sanlo, 2004). Several

researchers including Russell (2005) have observed the single-minded trend in

educational and psychological research that inescapably couples the risk of stress with

that of a sexual and gender minority identity (Moe et al., 2008; Russell, 2005; Sanlo,

2004). Within the LGBTQ literature the concept of "minority stress" describes the

omnipresent awareness maintained by queer people of the stigma they face, as well as a

preoccupation with protecting their selves mentally, emotionally, and physically from the

ramifications of compulsory heterosexuality, including the threat or reality of violence

(Fassinger et al., 2010; Meyer, 1995, 2003, 2010). As mentioned previously, the

connection to high levels of minority stress to poorer health and educational outcomes, as

well as "risky" behavior, including suicide and substance abuse, has been widely

documented (e.g., Carragher & Rivers, 2002; Hershberger et al., 1997; Remafedi,

Farrow, & Deisher, 1991; Russell, Driscoll, & Truong; 2002; Savin-Williams, 2001).

Although highlighting the struggles and risks faced by queer communities is meaningful,

Russell (2005) posed the question, "How can we move 'beyond risk' to understanding

resiliency?" (p. 6).

　　　Russell (2005) contends that it would be remiss to abandon all research on

LGBTQ issues in education that is grounded in a history of risk, as LGBTQ individuals

indisputably face discrimination disproportionately to non-LGBTQ peers, but encourages

researchers to work against a "risk-as-outcomes" approach that systematically labels all

LGBTQ students as predictably "at-risk" and to reflect on the context that resiliency and

protective factors may be provided. "Resilience may come from supportive school

policies (Goodenow & Szalacha, 2003; O'Shaughnessy, Russell, Heck, Calhoun, & Laub, 2004), unconditional family affirmation (Herdt & Koff, 2000), close friendships (Anderson, 1998), or individual strengths such as positive self-esteem (Savin-Williams, 1989a)" (Russell, 2005, p. 7).

Sanlo (2004) identified the resiliency of LGB college undergraduates as being critically under-researched. She posed questions for future research about what factors might affect resiliency and persistence for sexual minority college students and whether involvement and/or leadership helps sexual minority students develop resilience. Renn and Bilodeau (2005a, 2005b) explored the question of the relationship between leadership in LGBTQ student organizations and leadership development and LGBTQ identity development. Recently, literature has emerged that builds on the hypothesis of sexual minorities being susceptible to unique stressors but have begun to attribute a positive cause and effect relationship between these seemingly negative experiences and having to traverse adversity. Emerging research suggests that it is because of the stress of ongoing adversity that queer people demonstrate higher level of resiliency (among other positive characteristics; Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006; Martinez, Ostick, Komives, & Dugan, 2006). Some of the scholarship focuses on the intersection of racial/ethnic and lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) identities and the question of stress and resilience (Meyer, 2010; Moe et al., 2008; Moradi et al., 2010). This study sought to add to the burgeoning literature that suggests that it is through their lived experiences of overt discrimination and/or peripherally felt stigma that LGBTQ communities develop aforementioned protective factors—positive coping skills such as community building, enhanced

meaning-making capacities, communication, and critical thinking skills (Abes et al., 2004; Fassinger et al., 2010) and demonstrate higher levels of resiliency in general (Meyer, 2010) than their non-LGBTQ peers. Wexler, DiFluvio, and Burke (2009) echoed the argument to move away from a deficit model and asserted that research on resilience must explore how social connections and group membership may help young people contextualize their individual hurt and oppression within the larger collective struggle of a marginalized group and how those connections foster positive health outcomes.

Next, a review of campus climate literature helps contextualize this study's exploration on the meaningfulness of centering sexual and gender identity in leadership development.

Campus Climate

Campus climate has been described as "the current attitudes, behaviors, standards, and practices of employees and students of an intuitions (Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264). Rankin et al. (2010) provided the most comprehensive national research study of its kind to date, surveying 5,149 LGBTQ students, faculty members, staff members, and administrators at college and universities "representing all 50 states and all Carnegie Basic Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education" (p. 8). This study revealed many things about the challenges that LGBTQ students face as they seek to achieve their educational goals. According to the study, 23% of respondents reported being harassed on campus, 31% of LGBTQ students felt their campus was homophobic, and 13% of LGBQ students and 43% of Transgender students feared for their physical safety on their college campuses. These findings mirrored Rankin's previous study (2004) that cited that

30% of the participants reported that they had "personally experienced harassment due to their sexual orientation or gender identity" (p. 18) within the last 12 months and that "20% of the respondents feared for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, and 51 percent concealed their sexual orientation or gender identity to avoid intimidation" (p. 19).

Research suggests that these negative experiences are consistent across different kinds of institutions of higher education, including community colleges (Beemyn, 2012; Garvey, Taylor, & Rankin, 2015; Ivory, 2012; Leider, 2012; Ottenritter, 2012; Sanlo & Espinoza, 2012), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs; Carter, 2013; Harper & Gasman, 2008; Rhoads, 1994), and Christian schools (Wolff & Himes, 2010). Although a heterosexist climate has been found to exacerbate or increase mental health problems for LGBTQ students leading to increased rates of substance and alcohol abuse (Reed, Prado, & Matsumoto, & Amaro, 2010), depression (Westefeld, Maples, Buford, & Taylor, 2001), and even suicidality (D'Augelli, 2002), the impact of a heterosexist and transphobic campus climate and how it affects the academic outcomes and retention of LGBTQ students in college have been less explored (Carpenter, 2009; Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Rankin et al., 2010; Sanlo, 2004; Woodford & Kulick, 2015).

The literature available describes how violence and harassment experiences by sexual minority students on campus "interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus" (Rankin, 2003, p. 24), and although sexual minority students perform academically better and maintain higher GPAs (Carpenter, 2009; Sherill & Hardesty, 1994), experiences of harassment combined with persistent negative perceptions of their

campuses led to LGBTQ students having decreased rates of persistence. Rankin et al. (2010) cited how "33% of LGBQ respondents [and 38% of Trans students] seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate" (p. 10). These findings are likely an underestimate, considering that students who already left the institution because of the negative climate were not taken into account.

Most recently, Woodford and Kulick (2015) examined the psychological and experiential campus climate for sexual minority students "based on the responses extracted from a campus climate survey conducted at a large university in the Midwest" (p. 14). Woodford and Kulick (2015) described how "heterosexism on campus is associated with decreased academic and social integration among sexual minority college students" (p. 20). This is contrary to the findings of Longerbeam et al. (2007), who investigated a wide range of educational outcomes and collegiate experiences based on a national sample of students but found no differences of educational outcomes based on sexual orientation. However, the implications of Longerbeam et al.'s (2007) findings are limited, considering that the study itself was based largely on the responses of first-year residents. Moreover, as predicted, Woodford and Kulick's (2015) findings aligned with Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure that postulates that integration into the academic and social aspects of the campus and overall sense of belonging is imperative for students' persistence. The researchers found that "student engagement with the informal academic and social systems can both promote academic and social integration. That is, higher rates of informal social engagement were associated with great academic and social integration" (Woodford & Kulick, 2015, p. 20).

Woodford and Kulick (2015) provide an important nuance to the existing body of research and create an important bridge for future research that attempts to understand the impact of campus climate on the academic outcomes for sexual minorities. Woodford and Kulick (2015) elucidated the connection between minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003), that suggests that perceptions of a negative social climate can cause sexual minorities to be hypervigilant of discrimination and the impulse to conceal their sexual identity, with the retention and academic outcomes of these students based on Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure. Similarly, Carpenter (2009) compared various aspects of the college experience for sexual minority students, including participation in leadership activities and social support (mentorship and friendships), as well as academic success of sexual minority students compared to their heterosexual peers. The goal of Carpenter (2009) was to ascertain the relationship between sexual identity and outcomes, and specifically to answer the question of "why sexual minorities have higher rates of college attendance and completion" (p. 694).

Carpenter (2009) used confidential data on over 40,000 students from the 1997, 1999, and 2001 waves of the Harvard College Alcohol Study, over 1,800 of whom report having same-sex sexual partners in their lifetime and found significant within group differences amongst the experiences and outcomes of LGB students. The study suggests that these differences can be attributed to various factors including time use, academic performance, and social capital, which according to the study can be informed by social identity. For example, "gay male students, who were generally estimated to have experiences that were no worse than heterosexual students and often more positive;

which may help explain why gay men have such high college attainment rates"

(Carpenter, 2009, p. 703). Although Carpenter (2009) did not include race and was

relegated to cisgender students (transgender students were omitted)—which eliminates

the possibility to make correlations between performance and social identity—the

findings echo scholarship that demonstrates that LGBTQ collegians neither maintain

identical access to resources and support services because of racial and gender

inequalities and horizontal oppression (Ward, 2008; Westbrook, 2009), nor do they

experience discrimination and harassment uniformly.

For example, students who identify on the "transgender spectrum (androgynous,

gender nonconforming, genderqueer, transfeminine, transmaculine, transgender, etc.)"

generally report feeling marginalized on their campuses and report a disproportionately

high amount of violence and discrimination in comparison to their non-transgender peers

(Beemyn, 2012, p. 504; see also McKinney, 2005; Pusch, 2005). Rankin et al. (2010)

found that "thirty-nine percent of transmasculine respondents, 38 percent of

transfeminine respondents, and 31 percent of gender non-conforming (GNC) respondents

reported experiencing harassment compared with 20 percent of [cisgender] men and 19

percent [cisgender] women" (p. 10). Similarly,

> in their 2007 study, Rankin and Beemyn found that over 250 survey respondents
> (27 percent of their sample size) had been harassed within the past year because
> of their gender identity and/or gender expression, and the majority of these
> individuals were 18-22 years old. (Rankin et al., 2010, p. 61)

Although "anecdotal evidence suggests that students are coming out as

transgender on campuses across the country" (Beemyn, Curtis, Davis, & Tubbs, 2005, p.

49) and that the number of college students identifying as transgender is increasing (Beemyn, 2005; Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; McKinney, 2005), their unique experiences remain largely ignored within the higher education literature (Beemyn, 2003a; Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012). Alternatively, the experiences of transgender students are inaccurately conflated with those of non-transgender LGB students (Beemyn, 2003a; Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Renn, 2007). From the scarce literature available it is apparent that, although some colleges and universities have made strides to address the unique needs and concerns of transgender and gender non-conforming students, institutions of higher education have failed to create anything more than "less chilly" climates, while creating and often maintaining discriminatory institutionalized policies and practices against them (Rankin et al., 2010).

Several studies provide insight into a number of challenges within campus environments for students who identify across the transgender spectrum. These challenges include a lack of mentorship and support services, access to affirming health care, difficulties with sex-segregated facilities, and a general lack of knowledge demonstrated across college institutions (Beemyn, 2003a, 2005; Beemyn et al., 2005; Nakamura, 1998). McKinney's (2005) mixed method study of 75 graduate and undergraduate transgender students from across the country revealed that, overall, undergraduate students felt that faculty and staff were not educated about transgender issues, there was a lack of programming on transgender issues, and a lack of resources across campus—including inadequate counseling. Moreover, "none of the students indicated that their college or university included gender identity or expression in its non-

discrimination policy, and only 25 participants (33%) reported having a campus GLBT office or center" (McKinney, 2005, p. 67). Similarly, support services and research pertaining to the unique collegiate experiences of bisexual students is lagging behind (Sheets & Mohr, 2009). Rhoads (1997) asserted, "the assumption that lesbian, gay, and bisexual students share quite similar experiences has led to overgeneralizations about their lives and has compromised the quality of scholarship on such populations" (p. 460). These overgeneralizations have not evolved over the years to include a more nuanced analysis of the within group differences of LGBTQ college students' experiences and distinctive developmental patterns (Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Renn, 2007).

Campus climate includes not only overt acts of violence and intolerance but also targets population members' perceptions of the climate or "psychological campus climate" (Woodford & Kulick, 2015, p. 14). How students perceive the campus climate plays a significant role in their learning and developmental outcomes, as well as their academic experiences, academic and intellectual development, institutional commitment, and persistence (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999; Reason & Rankin, 2006). Overall, literature suggests that LGBTQ undergraduates generally perceive their campuses as less welcoming than their heterosexual peers (Rankin, 2006; Rankin et. al., 2010). This research is congruent with studies that described how students from historically marginalized groups tend to be more aware of negative campus climate for their own group than those representing more privileged groups (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Woodford & Kulick, 2015; Yost & Gilmore, 2011).

Although the research that explores the relationship between perceptions and academic outcomes among sexual minority students is nominal (Sanlo, 2004), several studies suggest that the degree of the impact of negative perceptions may depend on the degree of internalization of negative messages (Meyer, 2010; Woodford & Kulick, 2015). This research echoes studies investigating the perceptions of campus climates for racial minority undergraduates that demonstrate how students' perceptions of their campus as racist negatively impacted their learning and developmental outcomes, as well as their persistence (Cabrera et al., 1999). Conversely, when Black students feel affirmed in their experiences at HBCUs, for example, research shows that it reflects in greater educational attainment, academic self-image, and cognitive development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Research demonstrates that LGB, transgender, and gender non-conforming students are at increased psychological, physical, emotional, and academic risk because of the pervasiveness of unopposed heteronormativity and gender conformity on campus (Rankin, 2003; Rankin et al., 2010; Yost & Gilmore, 2011). As mentioned previously, these negative "effects are magnified among 'multiple-identity minority students' (Poynter & Washington, 2005; Rankin et al., 2010; Rankin 2003)" such as queer Students of Color (Yost & Gilmore, 2011, p. 1350). Rankin et al. (2010) explores the experiences and perceptions of LGBTQ Students of Color who maintain multiple, salient, marginalized identities by paying attention to the intersections of racial, sexual, and gender identity. Their study found that "LGBQ Respondents of Color (44%) were significantly more likely than LGBQ White Respondents (52%) to observe harassment"

(Rankin et al., 2010, p. 13). These experiences of harassment also trickled into the students' academic lives with LGBQ respondents of color experiencing less comfort within their department/work unit climate than their LGBQ White counterparts (78% and 66%, respectively), as well as feeling less comfortable in their classes than White LGB respondents (60% and 65%, respectively; Rankin et al., 2010). Moreover, the forms of harassment reported from respondents of color were racial profiling (ten times more likely to be identified as a form of harassment than Whites), which included poor performance evaluations or assumptions being made about why they were hired or fired, and derogatory written comments (Rankin et al., 2010).

Moreover, the study revealed differences in the experiences within-racial groups with transfeminine respondents, transmasculine respondents, and non-transgender women being "more likely to attribute the harassment to gender identity to than to race, which was not the case for non-transgender men of color who participated in the study" (Rankin et al., 2010, p. 68). Research that examines the within-group differences of experiences of queer Students of Color and addresses the heterogeneity of communities of color is nascent within the literature and often glosses over how misogyny, sexism, and various forms of gender injustices inform the experiences and perceptions of Students of Color, particularly women of color (transgender and cisgender), genderqueer, and gender non-conforming students. Although there is limited empirical research that explicates the experiences and perceptions of LGBTQ people of color (Strayhorn et al., 2008), scholarship has grown to include the nuanced experiences of gay and bisexual, African-American men at predominantly White institutions (Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011;

Strayhorn et al., 2008), as well as HBCUs; Carter, 2013; Harper & Gasman, 2008;

Rhoads, 1994).

Although this research may not "accurately reflect the experiences of African-

American MSM [men who have sex with men] who identify as heterosexual . . ." or

"LGBTQ African Americans whose racial identity is less salient to them" (Goode-Cross

& Tager, 2011, p. 1249), it does successfully highlight key nuances to the experiences of

African American (Black was used interchangeably within the research) male

undergraduates. From the existing scholarship, we are able to recognize that Black gay

men do not experience the blanketed comfort within Black enclaves as their heterosexual

peers, or garner the same amount of support from Black peer campus communities

because of experienced or perceived homophobia (Strayhorn et al., 2008), and because of

experiences of racism within LGBTQ communities (Boykin, 1996), Black gay male

students did not access LGBTQ student support services (Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011;

Strayhorn et al., 2008). This was true, even though their desire to "come out" and live

freely in a college that provided that space was a determining factor in their college

choice (Strayhorn et al., 2008). Instead, Goode-Cross and Tager (2011) found that

students managed and persisted on these campuses by selectively disclosing their sexual

orientation, and being able to garner support and integrate into a perceived anti-gay Black

peer community in order to traverse sexual prejudice pervasive at predominantly White

institutions (PWIs).

Perceptions of a chilly campus climate can compel LGBTQ students to be

hypervigilant to prejudice, refrain from coming out and living openly as a queer person,

and internalize oppressive messages about queer communities and their own sexuality

(Meyer, 2010; Woodford & Kulick, 2015. As previously suggested, this turns out

particularly true amongst Students of Color, who in Rankin (2005) were

> more likely than white LGBT people to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity to avoid harassment. Many respondents said they did not feel comfortable being out in predominantly straight, people of color venues, but felt out of place at predominantly white LGBT settings. (pp. 19–20)

This can result in a dialectic relationship for queer Students of Color between their

identity salience and academic persistence. Research has suggested that LGBTQ college

experiences can differ based on level of outness and identity salience, which in turn

affects how they perceive the campus and as research suggests informs their experiences,

persistence, and academic success.

Section Summary

Considering how deeply academic and social integration into the campus

environment and culture impacts students' overall sense of belonging, academic

persistence, and success (Tinto, 1993), it is imperative that future research builds on the

few existing studies that explore LGBTQ students' collegiate experiences and academic

outcomes and persistence (Rankin et al., 2010; Sanlo, 2004). This work should be done in

the aspirations of providing the support necessary for the persistence of queer and

otherwise marginalized students. Moreover, the existing research demonstrates that a

student's perception of a campus as being a place that is welcoming and affirming has a

positive impact upon the student's academic achievement and persistence (Sanlo, 2004;

Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Conversely, if students perceive a campus to be an

unwelcoming place, it has a negative impact. Therefore, LGBTQ students' perceptions of a college campus's climate for LGBTQ students, faculty, and staff may have an impact upon students' learning and development as well as their persistence. Rankin's (2004) study regarding the campus climate for LGBTQ students, staff, and faculty shows that on many college campuses across the country LGBTQ people have to worry about being intimidated and harassed, and many conceal their identity in order to avoid negative consequences.

It is difficult to know how many LGBTQ students leave college without having obtained their undergraduate degree because of issues they face related to their sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. Current research does not provide this information for us directly; however, the available research does provide a clear outline of the issues that LGBTQ people are facing on college campuses. Simply stated, many college campuses are hostile and oppressive places for LGBTQ students. The next section focuses on mentor relationships of LGBTQ undergraduates and seeks to build from the existing research that suggests that positive instructor relations and peer relations may serve as a protective factor against a negative campus climate and strengthen leadership efficacy (Wernick, Woodford, & Kulick, 2014; Woodford & Kulich, 2015) and resiliency (Rhoads, 1994; Sanlo, 2004; Stevens, 2004).

Overview of Mentorship

Until the 1980s, few of the empirical studies on the benefits of mentorship had been conducted in academic settings; rather, they were predominantly conducted in the corporate and private business sector (Kram, 1985; Kram & Isabella, 1985). Although

there is a lack of empirical literature that explains why mentoring proves to be successful

or evaluates specific programming, there is a consensus that mentoring works and that

more is needed (Girves, Zapeda, & Gwathmey, 2005). The literature cites a lack of a

clear definition of mentorship that has made it challenging to draw comparisons between

and build from previous studies (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Girves et al., 2005). In addition to

the varying definitions, mentoring relationships also can differ in "their structure, intent,

and communication style" (Mullen, 2005, p. 21) with research describing how these

relationships may be formal or informal, or may vary by whether they are planned or

emerge organically, or whether they or short term or long term (Luna & Cullen, 1995).

Within the realm of education specifically, mentorship "is generally understood as a

personal or professional relationship between two people—a knowing, experienced

professional and a protégé or mentee who commit to an advisory and non-evaluative

relationship that often involves a long-term goal" (Mullen, 2005, pp. 1–2).

This study, however, maintains the definition employed by Dugan and Associates

(2012) (MSL), which defines a mentor as a person who intentionally assists your growth

or connects you to opportunities for career or personal development (N. Turman, personal

communication, September 22, 2015). The next section will focus on mentoring as it

relates to LGBTQ specific mentor programming. I identify research that makes the

connections between identity, mentorship, and leadership development, specifically

leadership efficacy. From this conversation, readers will gain insight into the potential

benefits of mentorship on leadership development as a way of defusing internalized

oppression and combat discrimination on campus, while offering transformative

educational relationships by connecting otherwise marginalized students, staff, and faculty members and those who support them.

LGBTQ Mentorship Programs and Practices

Although there is a lack of empirical research based on formal or even informal LGBTQ mentorship relationships (McAllister et al., 2009), the literature reviewed provides an overview of the strengths of LGBTQ-specific programs and some of the downfalls of targeted mentorship, that is, mentoring aimed at a particular population. Although the benefits of formal mentoring relationships for LGBTQ youth have been noted (McCormick et al., 2002; Renn, 2007), the importance of informal LGBTQ relationships (i.e., informal mentors, friends, peers, and romantic partnerships) have on their development is largely overlooked. Recent research outlines the significance of peer mentor relationships for LGB undergraduates and demonstrates that those relationships are maintained at almost as the same rate of mentoring relationships with faculty (Dugan & Yurman, 2011).

Although queer students desire formal or informal mentor relationships (Swerdlik & Barton, 1988), they often find themselves left wanting for positive role models, safe spaces, and guidance around negotiating being "out" in the academy (Evans, Wall, & Bourassa, 1994). A now dated, but still pertinent qualitative study found that

> When they [LGB students] felt safe and affirmed in their LGB identities, they then had the energy and freedom required to work on becoming counseling psychologists . . . Without a sense of safety and affirmation for their LGB identity, their time and energy were consumed with survival . . . Based on the results of this study, we are convinced that simple and intentional acts on the part of affirmative faculty mentors can 'make all the difference' for LGB students. (Lark & Croteau, 1998, p. 754)

Lark and Croteau (1998) found that mentoring needs of students varied by levels of "outness" and that mentors served two major functions: professional and interpersonal. Although the participants ranged in their level of outness, they overwhelmingly described a state of hypervigilance to anti-LGB sentiments and made decisions of their disclosures based in part because of their perceived safety and acceptance of the mentor (Lark & Croteau, 1998). In addition to these needed cues from the mentor, participants also observed how other oppressions (e.g., racism or sexism) were addressed to help surmise how LGB issues would be handled.

The need for LGBTQ affirming mentorship could help contextualize the research available that cites that LGBTQ students are more likely than their heterosexual peers to report the importance of career models being "of their orientation" (Nauta, Saucier, & Woodard, 2001, p. 358). It has also been suggested that LGBTQ-identified mentors were found to be helpful in ways that non-LGBTQ mentors were not (Lark & Croteau, 1998). These findings are echoed throughout the literature highlighting the importance of having LGBTQ-target mentoring (Lark & Croteau, 1998) with scholars citing that "overall, studies on mentoring for LGBTQ employees and graduate students across disciplines found that these individuals are seeking support and mentoring from and feel more satisfied by support and mentoring from LGBTQ or LGBTQ-affirming supervisors and mentors" (McAllister et al., 2009, p. 92).

As mentioned previously, target mentoring or matched mentoring "refers to mentoring aimed at a particular population" (McAllister et al., 2009, p. 89) and describes the process pairing a mentor and a mentee by a shared identity (e.g., race, sexual

orientation, gender). There have been numerous studies that explored the benefits and

desirability of target mentoring for Students of Color in general (e.g., Davidson & Foster-

Johnson, 2001; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005), African American

students in particular (Patitu & Terrel, 1997; Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009), and women

(Patton & Harper, 2003; Williams-Nickelson, 2009). There is also a growing amount of

literature that asserts that target mentoring across identifications is necessary to address

the marginalization of minority students. For example, Mullen (2005) argues that racially

mixed mentoring dyads and those shared across gender within faculty in higher education

have had significant breakthroughs. Still, there remains a scarcity of literature available

that explicitly investigates the utility of programs that work to match mentors and

mentees based on their shared sexual orientation or gender expression. There are several

college programs that have successfully maintained mentor programs designed for

LGBTQ and questioning undergraduates. However, very few have published on the

benefits and struggles of operating LGBTQ-specific mentor programs for college

students (Alford-Keating, 1998; McAlister et al., 2009). The identities and experiences of

these mentors, however, were not discussed.

Fewer still are studies exploring the within group differences of LGBTQ students,

especially research on mentoring that highlights the unique needs of bisexual (Sheets &

Mohr, 2009) and transgender students (Beemyn, 2003a, 2005; McKinney, 2005).

Beemyn (2005) explains how "many schools also do not have out transgender faculty and

staff or student affairs professionals who are well-versed on trans issues. Thus,

transgender students lack mentors and role models and may feel that there are no

supportive people on campus" (p. 85). This work is supported by Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012), which as mentioned previously, provides a rare study exploring the within group difference among transgender identified students. This study found that "Male to Female and intersexed students reported less mentoring by members than their FtM peers" (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012, p. 721). Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) provide an important contribution to the literature highlighting the heterogeneity of transgender and gender non-conforming undergraduates.

Moreover, LGBTQ students who maintain "multiple minority identities" further complicate target-mentoring initiatives, with research highlighting the difficulties queer Students of Color have in establishing mentoring relationships with a mentor who affirms not only their racial identity but also their LGBTQ identity (Komives et al., 2005; Renn, 2007; Reynolds & Pope, 1991). A lack of a conceptual framework based on issues of intersectionality leads to a deepening perpetuation of LGBTQ students as one monolithic group. One-size-fits-all programming for LGBTQ students, including mentor programs, does not adequately address the intersections of identities for those who identify as queer and transgender/disabled/Black/undocumented—those on the margins of the margins.

As an alternative to popular target mentoring models, Van Puymbroeck (2001) provided an example of co-mentorship models, or a mentor network that uniquely provides a network of resources to support career development and life planning to LGBTQ undergraduates. It was reported that

> the program was successful in all of its aims. It provided a safe environment for students to address their concerns regarding the relationship of their life and career goals with their burgeoning sexual identities. As a result of the focus

groups, students felt less isolated and began to see themselves as a part of a supportive community. (pp. 16–17)

Moreover, as students of the millennial generation make their way into college, it is important to acknowledge their inclination towards technology, social networking, and overall reputation for being peer-oriented when program planning (Balda & Mora, 2011).

Lastly, more research is needed about the impact of LGBTQ-specific programming as well as the experiences and benefits those relationships have on those deemed "mentors." Moreover, one major criticism of the existing literature on LGBTQ mentorship does not adequately address how mentor relationships function holistically at the intersections of identity (sexual orientation, gender identity, race, ethnicity, class, etc.). The following section provides an examination of the mentorship outcomes, specifically the literature that explores the role that mentorship plays in fostering leadership resiliency, identity, and efficacy within LGBTQ student communities. This line of inquiry will continue to add layers of meaning to our understanding of the experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates and their persistence towards graduation and potentially beyond college life.

Mentoring Outcomes: Leadership Efficacy for LGBTQ Undergraduates & Students of Color

When traversing often-hostile campus climates, mentors have the opportunity to instill hope in otherwise underserved LGBTQ students, offering students with a glimpse of what Gilbert and Rossman (1992) describe as a future "possible self" (p. 235). Mentorship for LGBTQ students has proven to be a catalyst for leadership outcomes and efficacy (Dugan & Komives, 2007), particularly in the way that Moe, Dupuy, and Laux

(2008) described hope "as a sense of efficacy and motivation related to past, present, and future goals as well as believing that plans to meet goals (including coping with and enduring the present)" (p. 202). As mentioned previously, there is minimal literature available about the predictors of leadership efficacy and even fewer that disaggregated their data by social identity (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). The research available has cited the potential significance of adult mentors (faculty, staff, LGBTQ Center Directors, LGBTQ student group advisers, older peers, and peers in general) have in getting students involved in queer-specific groups and activities and encouraging them to take on positional leadership (Komives et al., 2005; Renn, 2007). This kind of support and mentorship is particularly significant for students "who might not think of themselves as leaders" (Renn, 2007, p. 326).

Although Renn (2007) did not employ the language of "leadership self-efficacy," which has been described throughout the literature as an "individual's internal beliefs about their knowledge, skills, and abilities to successfully engage in leadership (Hannah et al., 2008)" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 185), the study provided an important theoretical bridge in the gap in existing research on LGBTQ leadership. Renn's (2007) qualitative study of 15 undergraduate students (including Transgender students and Students of Color) uplifted how staff advisors were key in instances that new organizations had to be created, particularly as a result of Students of Color experiencing racism within existing LGBTQ groups. This study sought to draw connections between these underserved student communities and the role that mentors may play in bridging

some of these disparities in services, address maladapted self-conceptions of leadership and ultimately cultivate leadership efficacy and resiliency.

Although the size of Renn's (2007) study did function as a limitation, previous research also noted how the sponsorship of adults and older peers for Students of Color at predominantly White institutions was especially important (Komives, Casper, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2003, 2004). As mentioned previously, the more recent work of John Dugan and colleagues meaningfully employed the language of "leadership efficacy" in a series of quantitative studies that also utilized the MSL, some of which center the experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011). As mentioned previously, this work has made important, unparalleled contributions to the project of LGBTQ leadership development by explicating the within-group differences of LGBTQ students, with one such study citing that Male to Female transgender students reported less mentoring as FtM peers and subsequently less leadership efficacy, as well as fewer positional leadership roles (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012). The authors suggested that these findings are problematical, considering research on the importance of faculty mentoring, specifically for LGBTQ undergraduates (Renn, 2007). Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) went on to suggest that a lower rate of mentoring could be attributed to feelings of discomfort amongst faculty and staff in interfacing with students identifying outside of the gender binary, especially transfeminine students whose transition is perceived to disavow masculinity within a patriarchal society (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012).

Dugan and Yurman (2011) conducted a quantitative study (also utilizing the MSL) that explored the similarities and differences of 980 LGB-identified students across 13 dimensions of the collegiate experience. Overall, the study found that these LGB students were more alike than different. Specifically, the study found that mostly students reported a general level of confidence in regard to leadership efficacy, but found no significant differences across the outcomes of leadership efficacy. These findings mirrored a national study conducted several years earlier (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Qualitative research on the LGBTQ leadership identity suggests that the difference between LGBTQ students might have less to do with sexual identities but more so about the degree of identity salience of that identity and how they conceptualize their sexual orientation (Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Renn, 2007). To this end, researchers have encouraged student affairs practitioners to develop programming that connects "leadership to other social identities so students can explore their leadership practices and personal leadership identity . . . For example, create a mentoring program for women or community service programs that engage men and Asian American students" (Dugan & Komives, 2007, p. 19). These types of mentor programs have the potential of not only informing students' leadership involvement and development process, but may also influence the academic lives and career goals.

There is also emerging literature that makes the connections between mentorship as a predictor of leadership efficacy across racial differences (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). Kodama and Dugan (2013) also relied on data collected as a part of the MSL, a quantitative, cross-sectional design to examine influences on the leadership development

of undergraduates securing a sample size of 8,510 students, with 73% White, and the remaining respondents being Students of Color (including 1,702 Latino students). The study found that predictors of LSE varied across race. For example, "community service was a positive predictor for LSE positively for African Americans, Asian Americans and multiracial students, it was not for white and Latina students" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 194). The study also cited that Asian Pacific American college students reported lower levels of LSE is "not new" (p. 196) within the literature, but research that expounds upon this reality is negligible. Similarly, Kodama and Dugan (2013) described the research on Latino students as being "virtually non-existent" (p. 196). Although the study highlighted two different significant predictors of LSE including sociocultural conversations with peers and positional leadership roles, faculty mentoring did not emerge as a significant influence on LSE across any racial group in this research (Kodama & Dugan, 2013).

However, this is contrary to other research that highlights faculty mentoring as having a positive relationship with leadership development (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Komives et al., 2005). A qualitative study of five out of eight bisexual, gay, or homosexual (although this study did not inquire about the participants' sexual identity but rather their same-sex sexual behaviors) African American/Black men at a public, Midwestern, predominantly White institution also attributed faculty mentoring as being vital to their persistence (Good-Cross & Tager, 2011). This study found that supportive relationships with faculty and staff, peers, and family members were vital to their persistence at predominantly White institutions (Good-Cross & Tager, 2011).

These findings are echoed in Strayhorn et al.'s (2008) qualitative study on the retention of gay, Black, non-transgender, male undergraduates, who also identified "supportive relationships with peers and family, self-determination and independence" (p. 99) as being vital to their persistence and success in college. Although neither study examined leadership efficacy specifically, Strayhorn et al.'s (2008) participants "perceived themselves as self-determined, motivated, and independent, which, in their view, affected their ability to succeed in college" (p. 99). Montas-Hunter (2012) provides an important phenomenological study that continues this line of inquiry that addresses the intersections of race and gender and extends Bandura's theory of self-efficacy to examine the self-efficacy of Latina women in leadership positions at institutions of higher education in the US. This study examined the experiences of eight leaders and found that they all maintained high self-efficacy, which was thought to be imperative to their success as leaders. In addition to significant professional experience accumulated by the women, 50% of the participants indicated having role models and indicated that these mentor relationships, especially from other Latinas in leadership positions, to be particularly beneficial in their own leadership journeys.

According to Montas-Hunter (2012), "social models are important to leadership development because they provide individuals with the opportunity of seeing similar people in positions that they strive for and will recognize in themselves similar capabilities needed for successful progression into leadership" (p. 325). These findings mirror Bandura's (1997) assertion that role modeling is imperative to efficacy, as well as Kodama and Dugan (2013) who also found a significant impact of racial group

membership on LSE and suggested that "despite mixed findings on the importance of matching mentoring relationships by race (Sedlacek, Benjamin, Schlosser, & Shen, 2007), attention should be paid to the racial context of mentoring relationship in higher education" (p. 196).

Montas-Hunter (2012) also noted that all of the participants recognized that encouragement from their families and a strong support network contributed to their success. These findings provide evidence supporting Bandura's (1994) theory that states, "affirmation and recognition are other ways to increase self-efficacy" (Montas-Hunter, 2012, p. 326). Furthermore, the study makes a tentative link between concepts of self-efficacy and resiliency, specifically as they relate to race by citing how

> self-efficacy is developed if individuals can overcome obstacles through perseverance . . . The Hispanic women who participated in this study cited both racial and sexist attitudes as a challenging experience, but these same women haves used these experiences as motivation to move forward and persevere. (Montas-Hunter, 2012, p. 331)

Although this study did not investigate the relationship between resiliency and leadership-efficacy, more research building on these connections could prove to be meaningful contributions to culturally responsive leadership development.

A combination of peer support, social models, and mentoring relationships proves as motivation to persist in these instances provided within the literature. Similar claims to peer connection and peer mentoring are also cited as points of resilience and persistence for LGBTQ undergraduates (D'Augelli, 1994; Evans & Broido, 1999; Rhoads, 1994; Stevens, 2004). The role that student organizations play in fostering these peer

connections and these organizations' potential to promote resilience will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Section Summary

The research available upholds that mentorship is both largely beneficial and desired by Students of Color (e.g., Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005; Simon et al., 2004), African American students in particular (Patitu & Terrel, 1997; Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009), as well as women (Patton & Harper, 2003; Williams-Nickelson, 2009), sexual minority students (Lark & Croteau, 1998; McAllister et al., 2009; Van Puymbroeck, 2001), and students living at the intersection of gender and race (Reynolds & Pope, 1991). However, more empirical research about the nuanced forms of mentor relationships—peer, formal, and targeted—is needed to ascertain the best interventions for queer students, especially when tackling the challenges that arise for queer Students of Color who live at the intersection of identities and oppression.

Mentor programs on college campuses are setting the precedent for formal interactions between younger generations of queers and older, professional queer faculty and staff members. Queer role models are something to which many generations prior did not have access. Programs that highlight the benefits of intergenerational community-building potentially maintain numerous positive outcomes and successes; however, the impact of these programs remains unclear because of lack of evaluation. In order to adequately meet the needs of queer collegians, formal evaluations of queer mentor programs would have to be conducted so that better practices can be established. Such

literature would work to move away from literature that inevitably renders LGBTQ

students as inevitably "at risk," and expounds on how students are sustained by

constructing positive healthy relationships to themselves, mentors, peers, and others in

their communities.

Similarly, there are a multitude of current studies available that confronts the

notion of queer youth as presumably at risk that are also mostly exploratory in nature, and

often leave more questions than answers. Sanlo (2004) identified three themes related to

LGB college students as being critically under-researched, including discrimination and

coping, health effects/outcomes, and resiliency. The next section will explore the

questions that Sanlo (2004) posed, including

> what factors affect resiliency (measured as psychological well-being and coping
> skills) and persistence to graduation among sexual minority students, particularly
> in the face of discrimination and harassment on campus? Does community
> involvement and/or leadership on or off campus help develop coping skills and
> resilience? (p. 103)

Involvement in LGBTQ Identity-based Student Organizations and the Impacts on Leadership Efficacy & Resiliency on LGBTQ Student Communities: Overview of LGBTQ Student Organizations

Theorists across disciplines have acknowledged the importance of LGBTQ (or

queer) student organizations (Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b; Sanlo, 1998).

LGBTQ student organizations in particular fulfill a variety of roles on college campuses

including, but not limited to providing networking opportunities, resources, and social

and educational programming, as well as support for students who are dealing with issues

related to their sexual orientation and gender identities (Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau,

2005a, 2005b; Sanlo, 1998). Although the missions, culture, membership composition, and organizational structures of LGBTQ student organizations vary depending on the institution, they are generally perceived to be

> a common resource on campuses that reduces social isolation and feelings of stigmatization. These groups are run by and for LGBTQ students and their allies and may or may not be connected to an LGBTQ campus center. These groups, like all LGBTQ organizations, serve one or more of three purposes: support, socializing, and activist work. (Westbrook, 2009, p. 371)

Research has been conducted that explores the nuances of students' experiences within the organizations, with many citing that not all students access these resources uniformly for a myriad of reasons, including but not limited to discrimination. For example, Westbrook (2009) extensively cites the long-noted gender gap in participation in LGBTQ organizations in groups intended for the "general" LGBTQ population within the literature with the membership of the groups being mostly male and the leadership positions held mostly by "White, middle class gay men" (p. 372). She attributed the lack of women in leadership positions to a cycle of hierarchal leadership dominated by gay White men recruiting other men, ultimately leading to disproportionate group membership. This cycle creates an environment in which sexist microagressions are naturalized and hard to withstand for all people who don't identify as cisgender men. Similarly, Students of Color have a long history of being marginalized within LGBTQ student organizations. When LGBTQ student organizations began to form in colleges across the U.S., their membership was largely gay, White, and affluent enough to attend

college; therefore, the research on these organizations largely outlines solely the experiences of mostly White, gay men (Dilley, 2002; Rhoads, 1994).

Today, diversity exists among LGBTQ student organizations. Although most colleges and universities have only one LGBTQ group, it is not uncommon for multiple organizations to exist on a given campus (Sanlo, 1998). Twenty years after the founding of the Student Homophile League, for instance, "Columbia University boasted 15 separate LGBTQ student organizations" (Sanlo, 1998, p. 322). When more than one group emerges on campus, the difference between groups may be based on ethnicity, gender, political, ideology, religious affiliation, or function (Scott, 1991). Scott (1991) acknowledged that the creation of more than one LGBTQ student organizations has been historically perceived to add to the fractionalization of gay and lesbian activism on campus. However, the author suggests that having multiple student organizations are largely beneficial because they provide more leadership opportunities (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) and can maintain more specific mission statements and purposes.

There is a growing amount of literature supporting the claim that participation in LGBTQ campus organizations promotes resilience and LGBTQ identity development (D'Augelli, 1994; Evans & Broido, 1999; Rhoads, 1994; Stevens, 2004). Much of the literature available describing the development of queer student organizations is engrossed in psychosocial identity development theory, highlighting the need for and benefits of identity-based organizations (Renn & Ozaki, 2010) and queer leadership development theory (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b; Renn & Ozaki, 2010) that make distinctions between activists who are queer and queer

activists. And although the past two decades have produced a modest body of scholarship

that explores the how leading LGBTQ student organizations informs LGBTQ students'

identity and leadership development (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn &

Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b), literature that examines horizontal oppression within these

organizations, however, is scarce **(**Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Westbrook, 2009).

The next section will work to build from the literature that makes the connections

between the role of student leadership and social connectivity and the community-based

practices (social support) found on college campuses that foster resiliency and the

cultivation of leadership skills (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2006; Renn, 2003; Renn

& Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b; Renn & Ozaki, 2010). Specifically, the next sections work to

highlight the meaningfulness of LGBTQ student organizations as sites that aim to foster

community and resilience (Renn, 2003; Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b; Sanlo,

1998), while exploring the varying experiences among students across difference.

Involvement in LGBTQ Identity-based Student Organizations and the Impacts on the Leadership Efficacy of LGBTQ Students

The past two decades have rendered a modest body of scholarship that

demonstrate that "colleges and universities have also played a role in incubating

LGBTQ/queer activism and activists" (Renn, 2010, p. 132). LGBTQ student

organizations specifically have been cited as spaces on campus that foster connection,

while promoting resiliency and LGBTQ identity development (D'Augelli, 1994; Evans &

Broido, 1999; Renn, 2003; Renn & Bilodeau 2005b; Rhoads, 1994; Stevens, 2004). Renn

and Bilodeau (2005b) suggested that a growing body of literature supports the claim that

"involvement in activities related to a specific element of identity—such as race or

gender-supports exploration of identity construction . . . However, it is not known how involvement in campus LGBT-related activities influences the identity development of student participants" (p. 51). This body of literature has expanded from psychosocial identity development to explore the intersection of college student LGBTQ identity and leadership, particularly the impact on LGBTQ college students of leading LGBTQ organizations and how students make meaning of their leadership and identity development experiences (Renn, 2007; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b). Some theorists assert that "LGBTQ leadership represents a distinctive leadership experience worth of empirical attention" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 207; see also Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Renn & Ozaki, 2010).

Renn and colleagues have written extensively on the subject of LGBTQ leadership development and suggest, "educational programs (e.g., residence halls, career services) and interventions (participation in LGBTQ student leadership) can be seen as developmental assets, one of the key contributors to resiliency. LGBTQ-supportive peer interactions and advisor-student relationships create a context for positive development" (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b, p. 68). Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) conducted an exploratory study using qualitative case study methods of seven LGBTQ-identified undergraduate student organizers of the 2002 Midwest Bisexual, Lesbian, Gay, Transgender, and Allies College Conference (MBLGTACC) and posed two questions: What is the relationship between involvement in leadership of LGBTQ student organization and student outcomes related to (a) leadership development and (b) LGBTQ identity? Students in their exploratory study demonstrated the potential for campus involvement to promote

resiliency. Renn and Bilodeau (2005b) proposed that, although LGBTQ student leaders are sometimes included in leadership development programs on campus, and although the benefits to identity development of group members are often acknowledged, the findings of this exploratory study suggest a different approach: making the LGBTQ identity development of student leaders a central purpose.

Fassinger et al. (2010) mirrored the potential positive effects of negotiating the stigma attached with a sexual minority status by stating, "despite the myriad of ways that marginalization may compromise LGBTQ leadership, it is also the case that marginalization, as Brown (1989) pointed out, may increase the effectiveness of LGBTQ people in a variety of contexts, including leadership roles" (p. 206). Learning to cope with the stresses related to marginalization actually may catalyze certain kinds of skill development that aid LGBTQ individuals in leadership roles. Fassinger et al. (2010) also argued "that LGBTQ leadership represents a distinctive leadership experience worthy of empirical attention" (p. 207).

Renn and Ozaki (2010) conducted a qualitative study of 18 traditional-age sophomores, juniors, seniors, and two "super seniors" (fifth year and beyond), who were diverse in terms of gender and race and who all served in the role of organization president/chair, co-president/chair, or vice president on a campus of over 30,000 undergraduate students, of whom 16.5% were Students of Color. They found that leaders of identity-based student groups experienced increased salience of the social identities related to that group. Further,

> except in the case of the LGBTQ student leaders, there did not seem to be much interaction between leadership identity and psychosocial identity (i.e., a student might experience herself as a feminist and as a leader, but not as a "feminist leader," or a student might experience himself as African American and a leader, but not as an "African American leader;" but a gay man described himself as a "queer activist." (Renn & Ozaki, 2010, p. 18)

Most noteworthy, the study also highlights the cycle of involvement and identity salience, a cycle Renn (2007) observed as a key component of LGBTQ student leaders' experience. The idea is that the more "out" students are the more involved they become and inversely, the more involved they are the more "out" they become. The authors go on to cite four factors influencing the experience of and interactions between students' psychosocial and leadership identities:

> (1) a cycle of increased involvement and identity salience, (2) social interaction and friendship groups, (3) the academic-cocurricular interface, and (4) the context of the university. . . . The social interaction with peers both influenced leaders to become more involved in groups and provided a foundation of members when beginning new groups. Much of the literature (HERI, 1996; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2006) on student leadership emphasizes relationships, but the role of friendships among students in campus organizations is less well explored. Evidence of this phenomenon was clear in our data and bears further exploration. (Renn & Ozaki, 2010, pp. 20–21)

Moreover, research has highlighted the positive effects of negotiating the stigma attached with a sexual minority status including the effectiveness within leadership positions (Fassinger et al., 2010). Additional research (Komives, Dugan, & Segar, 2006; Martinez et al., 2006) has found that in comparison to heterosexual identified students, lesbian, gay, and bisexual student leaders demonstrated a higher level of "managing controversy with civility, recognizing interconnectedness of members of a community,

and believing that change is possible and can be achieved when people work together" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 207), but no difference in leadership efficacy (Martinez et al., 2006).

Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) is one such study that builds from the MSL and as a part of that national study accessed the responses of 91 transgender identified students, specifically their "perceptions, engagements, and educational outcomes across 17 dimensions of the collegiate experience" (p. 719). As mentioned previously, Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) has not been replicated and represents "one of the first quantitative studies to explore within-group differences in the transgender populations," and found that "MtF students in particular reported lower leadership capacity, leadership efficacy, and attainment of positional leadership roles, all of which are interconnected" (p. 730). The authors assert that "decreased involvement in positional leadership along with lower perceptions of leadership capacity and efficacy may reflect MtF students' subconscious recognition of the significant impediments to women's attainment of positional leadership roles that continue to exist in society (Carli & Eagly, 2007; Rhode & Kellerman, 2007) and a desire to conform to them as normative" (p. 731).

This assertion has not been empirically supported, whereas prior research has found similar findings in studies of cisgender (or non-trans) college lesbian and bisexual women reporting "lower levels of involvement in student clubs and organizations and positional leadership roles" (Dugan & Yurman, 2011, p. 213), as well as "a pattern of significantly lower scores in leadership efficacy [for cisgender women] . . . despite evidence that they often demonstrate significantly higher leadership skills and capacities

than their male peers" (Dugan & Yurman, 2011, p. 211). This is, however, contrary to

earlier research that reported gay men having lower self-efficacy scores than gay women

(Porter, 1998). As a way to account for the within-group difference among LGBTQ

students, researchers suggest that student affairs professionals explore and interrupt ways

that the misogyny and hegemonic gender norms are upheld, maintained, and reproduced

within LGBTQ communities and LGBTQ student organizations (Dugan & Yurman,

2011; Westbrook, 2009).

 To this end, the available literature overwhelmingly suggests that involvement in

leadership activities connected to a particular aspect of identity (e.g., race, sexual

orientation, gender, etc.) supports student development, including student learning, the

development of leadership skills, and the exploration and construction around that

identity (e.g., Arminio et al., 2000; D'Augelli, 1994; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Liang,

Lee, & Ting, 2002; Porter, 1998; Renn, 2007; Rhoads, 1994). Although not indicated

specifically within the research, students feeling more connected to the campus because

they are able to integrate their sexual identities into their college experiences might have

implications for retention and positive social, developmental, and academic outcomes

(DiFulvio, 2011; Moe, Dupuy, & Laux, 2008; Russell, 2005). For these reasons, support

has emerged for a paradigm shift to centralizing sexuality identity in leadership

development (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b).

LGBTQ Student Involvement & Resiliency: Queer Students of Color Resiliency, Queer Politics, and Intersectionality

 One of the main benefits of participating in LGBTQ student organizations is the

opportunities for socializing and connectedness (Westbrook, 2009). If researchers are to

take seriously the task of explicating the ways in which LGBTQ students persist, then an investigation of how these relationships inform undergraduates' experiences and persistence is essential. DiFulvio (2011), one such study that pays particular attention to the concept of social connectedness, uses a life story methodology to understand how sexual minority youth define and perform resilience. The author describes how social connectedness and how thoroughly young people feel cared for (e.g., the number of friends, higher frequency of social contact, and lower levels of social isolation) act as a protective factor against poor mental health outcomes and self-destructive behavior such as substance abuse and suicidal thoughts and behaviors. In addition to connection, acceptance from others has also been identified within the research as a core protective factor in the lives of LGB youth (Anhalt, Morris, Scotti, & Cohen, 2003; Sheets & Mohr, 2009). Moreover, connection allows for LGBTQ youth to situate their lived experiences within a larger sociohistorical context and aligns their individual struggle with a larger collective struggle.

> Researchers have found that many ethnic cultural groups have developed pride and strength in collective resistance against oppression, with positive effects for individual and collective well-being (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Duran & Duran, 1995). These data suggest that social connectedness for sexual minority youth may also facilitate collective resistance and personal agency, which in turn may contribute to overall wellbeing. Future research examining resilience must continue to expand our understanding of connectedness and the particular ways that connectedness contributes to resilience for sexual minority youth. (DiFulvio, 2011, pp. 1616–1617)

An example of research highlighting the necessity of peer support can be found in Pusch's (2005) study of transgender college students (MtFs and FtMs). Pusch adds an

important contribution to the conversation about the complexities of peer support and friendship of transgender youth. The study found that although the youth initially found their friends' willingness to ask questions as affirming, eventually "as the students moved into living part time in their self-identified gender, they found the constant questions draining and a contributing factor to their sense of themselves as not normal" (Pusch, 2005, p. 60). This creates a challenge in that there is no blanketed way of affirming transgender youth, with each maintaining their own evolving capacity to articulate their equally evolving needs and identities. Sheets and Mohr (2009) continued in this line of investigation exploring the relationship of perceived social support to depression, life satisfaction, and internalized bi-negativity among 210 bisexual young adult college students. The researchers found that the participants' general well-being depended on the degree to which they received social support from friends and family, whereas when individuals received support specifically from heterosexual friends and family around their sexuality it was most predictive in combating internalized bi-negativity and the creation of a positive sexual identity. Contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, friend support remained at the same level of importance regardless if the participant received support from their family or not, further highlighting the need for peer support.

> Both family support and friend support contributed to the prediction of each of the outcome variables. Although it was expected that the link between friend support and positive adjustment would be strongest at low levels of family support, none of the interactions between friend and family support was statistically significant. (Sheets & Mohr, 2009, p. 152)

Peer support may play a particularly important role for LGBTQ identified young adults, as well as those questioning their sexual and/or gender identity. It has been noted that close-knit friendships and peer groups are the channels through which students initially access the formal LGBTQ campus structures (Renn & Bilodeau, 2005; Sheets & Mohr, 2009), although "the role of friendships among students in campus organizations is less well explored" (Renn & Ozaki, 2010, p. 21). Within this line of exploration, previous research has found that peer and adult mentors have been shown to be effective conduits for facilitating student involvement and leadership but also as safe alternatives to LGBTQ campus organizations, whereas interactions with peers with relatively complex meaning-making capacity could assist in the progression for students who have only begun to delve into issues of identities by providing alternative ways of thinking (Abes et al., 2004; Renn, 2007).

As mentioned previously, although LGBTQ student organizations can be beneficial, research suggests that not everyone can access these groups equally (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Westbrook, 2009). Recently, literature demonstrates how women, transgender communities, people of color, disabled individuals, etc. oftentimes have a challenging time accessing queer campus resources (Beemyn, 2005; Pusch, 2005; Westbrook, 2009), and additional research demonstrates that some Students of Color might not want to access LGBTQ student groups because of horizontal oppression. To this end, it is important to reassert that because members of LGBTQ communities do not experience adversity uniformly, the level of resiliency and strategies of coping may also shift at the intersections of identities. Meyer (2010), for example,

followed up on Moradi et al.'s (2010) examination of stress and resilience in racial/ethnic

minority LGB persons, finding that both the participants who identified as White and the

LGBTQ participants of color "perceived notable levels of heterosexist stigma" but

suggested that "LGB people of color might have resources and strengths that buffer

against the link of perceived stigma with internalized homophobia" (p. 419).

Both studies examined the double jeopardy concept of individuals having to

endure unique stressors and experience less social support because of their racial and

sexual gender minority status. Both studies agreed with the concept of minority stress,

but found that LGB people of color did not demonstrate more negative mental health

outcomes than White LGB people, and may in fact be more adept to manage stigma

effectively—what Kimmel (1978) referred to as "crisis competence" (p. 117). Through a

coming out process and having to negotiate multiple systems of interlocking oppressions,

sexual minorities (and I would suggest LGBTQ people of color), may be better

positioned to

> listen and respond better to criticism articulate their own points of view even in the face of oppositional create strong support systems; advocate for themselves and similar others within systems of power and privilege; examine their own needs, desires, and life goals; and take care of themselves psychologically, physically, and materially. (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 206)

This line of research contests the myth of the "warring selves," or the notion that LGB

people of color have difficulty simultaneously negotiating their multiple identities and

also has implications for LGBTQ leadership development—which has not yet been

explored. Overall, the amount of literature available that examines the resiliency found at

the intersections of multiple minority statuses, which builds upon the work of Meyer (2010) and Moradi et al. (2010), remains underwhelming.

In response to the greater visibility and power of privileged LGBTQ students within LGBTQ student organizations, as well as an overrepresentation within the research, advocates criticizing single-issue movement building and education have argued for a queered, intersectional approach in support of coalition-building across difference and anti-oppression education (Abes & Kasch, 2007; Harr & Kane, 2008; Kumashiro, 2002). For example, Harr and Kane (2008) seek to address the scant attention being paid in empirical testing of this kind of intersectional approach within the literature on LGBTQ movements. Drawing on data from a survey of queer students at 25 small liberal arts colleges (175 respondents; including transgender and genderqueer students) in the U.S., the researchers "assess students support for two dimensions of intersectional approach to queer organizing: inclusivity and coalition-building" (p. 284). Their analysis suggested that "among queer students, those with less-privileged personal identifications in terms of race, class, gender and sexuality are more likely to support the utilization of queer politics within queer student organizations" (p. 284).

Although the study focuses on queer students attending prestigious liberal arts colleges (who are disproportionately fulltime, White, affluent, cisgender students from the Northeast U.S.), which limits the generalizability of the sample, the authors maintain the assertion "that given the lack of other students studies documenting queer student support for queer politics, even this limited sample provides an important first look at such support" (Harr & Kane, 2008, p. 289). Moreover, the authors cite that the

meaningful introduction of queer theory politics will have a positive shift in campus

climate not just for the queer students, or the privileged students, but for the campus as a

whole. Queer politics and intersectionality infused within the mission and curriculum of

an institution could offer a heightened awareness of social issues and potentially incite

action on the part of the more privileged students. This kind of work brings

accountability to the student body, in particular the more privileged students. To this end,

"queer politics is important to all student organizations, as well as to campus political

climates more generally, for queer politics aids in the dismantling of privilege" (Harr &

Kane, 2008, p. 297).

Research that incorporates intersectional theory is essential to our holistic

understanding of students experiencing the matrix of domination (Hill-Collins, 1990). In

order to not perpetuate these interlocking systems of oppression, LGBTQ student leaders

and advisors must still problematize the way that we work within our intersections.

Kumashiro (2001) states this best,

> In our commitment to change oppression and embrace differences, we often fail
> to account for the intersections of racism and heterosexism, and of racial and
> sexual identities. Ironically, our efforts to challenge one form of oppression often
> unintentionally contribute to other forms of oppression, and our efforts to embrace
> one form of difference often exclude and silence others. In fact, even our attempts
> to address intersections are often problematic. (Kumashiro, 2001, p. 1)

Moreover, future literature will have to take into consideration that "queer

movements that are only about sexuality risk complying with other oppressions and

excluding their own margins" (Kumashiro, 2001, p. 5). Research around queer

movements and student organizations must resist the urge to entertain oversimplified

"identity politics" and single issue movements and incorporate research on intersectionality to help fill in the gaps left in queer theory.

Section Summary

The literature provided suggests organizing one's efforts, energies, and activism around a sexual identity is complicated but can help students not only in the coming out process but also in their leadership development in general. The available research offered insights around what centralizing sexual identity politics within our leadership development efforts could mean on college campuses. By centering sexual and gender identity as a part of the leadership development process, students have the potential to be more connected to themselves, their histories as queer people, as well as their peers and community members. These connections may provide points of strength and unity, and fortify the ability to enact resiliency. Although resilience remains an elusive phenomenon, it is suggested that it can also be cultivated through what researchers call protective factors (e.g., supportive school policies, affirmation from family, close friendships, positive self-esteem, etc.; Russell, 2005), and that some of us are predisposed to being able to negotiate adversity more positively than others. The relationship between resilience and leadership is made evident by how we conceptualize what makes for the most ideal or effective leaders, which is oftentimes the leader who has traversed adversity and whose leadership is informed by their resiliency. Researchers have encouraged a shift in employing a queer and intersectional lens when working with undergraduates and centering the leadership of historically marginalized students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the methodology that was employed in this study to explore the role of LGBTQ identity-based peer groups on college campuses (student organizations and support groups) and the role mentors may have in fostering resiliency and leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates. The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether experiences differ across intersections of identity, while centering the experiences of queer undergraduates of color. The chapter will begin by introducing the key research questions and describing the details of the research methodology, including the research design. Next, the participant population and sampling procedures will be described. Finally, the data analysis procedures that were conducted to answer the research questions will be identified.

This study sought to expand the literature that explores the role intersections of race and sexual and gender identity has on leadership development and enactment, specifically as it relates to LGBTQ leadership within college environments (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007, Renn & Bilodeau 2005a, 2005b). The study explored the unique experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates of color, focusing specifically on the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates of color. The aim of this research was to gain a better understanding of the relationships between mentorship, involvement in LGBTQ identity-based student organizations, resiliency, and leadership self-efficacy. Operating within a

social justice lens, this study explored whether the leadership efficacy of Students of Color differs from their White peers.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1: Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

Hypothesis: Involvement in identity-based organizations affects the experiences of students accessing these spaces of activism and support. As such, LGBTQ student organizations positively influence the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color.

RQ2: Does the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color differ based on involvement in LGBTQ organizations?

Hypothesis: Involvement in LGBTQ student organizations affects the resiliency of undergraduate students. However, not all Students of Color feel welcomed within largely White LGBTQ-run student organizations. As such, involvement in LGBTQ student organizations has a negative or neutral effect on the resiliency of LGBTQ undergraduates of color.

RQ3: Does the presence of a mentor increase the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

Hypothesis: Mentors affect the leadership efficacy of undergraduate students. As such, LGBTQ undergraduates of color who have or have had relationships with mentors will exhibit significantly higher leadership efficacy than those who have not been mentored.

RQ4: Does the presence of a mentor significantly related to the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

Hypothesis: LGBTQ undergraduates of color who have or have had relationships with mentors will have significantly higher resiliency.

RQ5: Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

Hypothesis: The experiences of white LGBTQ undergraduates and those of color often differ. White LGBTQ students will have significantly higher leadership efficacy.

RQ6: Are there differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

Hypothesis: There are significant difference between the level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers. LGBTQ Students of Color have to traverse overlapping systems of oppression within institutions of higher education. Because of these experiences LGBTQ Students of Color cultivate higher levels of resiliency than their White peers.

RQ7: Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

Hypothesis: The experiences of white LGBTQ undergraduates and those of color often differ. White LGBTQ students will be significantly more likely to be involved in LGBTQ organizations.

RQ8: Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

Hypothesis: The experiences of White LGBTQ undergraduates and those of color often differ. White LGBTQ students will be significantly more likely to have been mentored.

RQ9: Does resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity, sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?

Hypothesis: There is heterogeneity amongst the experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates. There will be within-group difference of LGBTQ students across gender identity, race, and sexual orientation. There will also be interaction effects of race and sexual orientation that demonstrate that students maintaining multiple marginalized identities (i.e., LGBTQ Students of Color) will have less leadership efficacy but higher resiliency than White LGBTQ students.

Research Design

The study employed secondary quantitative analysis of a data set extracted from The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL; Dugan & Associates, 2012). The MSL was first administered in 2006 and is one of the largest studies of college student leadership to date. This study used the data from the 2012 administration of the MSL. The MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012) is comprised of responses from 77,148 students at 82 institutions of higher education in the U.S., and maintains a response rate of 33% (Dugan & Associates, 2012). Of the 77,148 participants, this current study drew from the 4,237 students who identified as LGBQ and 124 who identified as Transgender students.

Participants

Scholars have argued that quantitative research within queer communities is scarce because of lack of significant sample size. Compulsory heterosexuality and cissexism latent within higher education research can be exemplified by the lack of research studies that ask students questions about their sexual and gender identities. The MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012) does ask such questions. Extracting data from such a large dataset provides an exciting opportunity because the larger sample size and multi-institutional nature of the data provides a large enough sample to look at what are small sub-populations in the college student population and helps ensure the generalizability of the findings and comparisons. Of the MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012) participants, 4,294 students identified LGBQ with a breakdown of: 1,829 students identifying as Bisexual (29.3%), 1,667 as Gay/Lesbian (26.7%), and 798 as Questioning (12.8%). See Table 1.

Table 1

Breakdown of the Sexual Orientation of LGBQ Respondents (*N*=4294)

Sexual Orientation	*n*	Percentage of Total LGBQ Respondents
Bisexual	1829	29.3%
Gay/Lesbian	1667	26.7%
Questioning	798	12.8%
Rather Not Say	1945	31.2%
Total LGBQ Respondents	4294	100.0%

For the purpose of this study, the 1,945 respondents who declined to identify their sexual orientation (listed as "rather not say") were omitted. Although their experiences could provide meaningful insights about the experiences of non-heterosexual identified students, this study is concerned with sexual identity and not necessarily behavior and also since "Questioning" was one of the options, "rather not say" does not meet the qualifications of the study, outlined in the research questions.

Sexual orientation and gender identity were kept as two markedly different categories within the original data collection process, which allowed for further study of the sexual orientation of the 124 Transgender students, with 91 of those students identifying as LGBQ. When frequencies were run to identify potential transgender students who identified as heterosexual or "rather not say," no students were found within those categories. Perhaps of the options available the remaining transgender students identified outside of LGBTQ, or heterosexual. Although this study does not explore the within-group differences of transgender students based on sexual orientation, gender expression, and identity, these nuances could be further explored in future research. Of the students who identified as LGBQ 1,844 (42.9%) identified as Male and 2,357 (54.9%) identified as Female.

Racial group membership was also self-reported with cisgender participants who identified as LGBQ also identifying as 207 African American/Black (4.8%); 13 American Indian/Alaska Native (.3%); 270 Asian American (6.3%); 249 Latino/Hispanic (5.8%); 23 Middle Eastern (.5%); 79 Multiracial (1.8%); and 2,908 White/Caucasian (67.7%). The 59 respondents who selected their race as "Not Included" were collapsed

with Other Students of Color. Although their race is unknown, they did not select

"White" and for the purposes of this study racial categories were dichotomized (1=White,

2=Students of Color) to answer some of the research questions. This was done since the

main area of research was to determine differences between White and non-White

groups. Students who identified as transgender by racial group membership breakdown

included seven African American/Black (5.6%); three American Indian/Alaska Native

(2.4%); three Asian American (2.4%); two Latino/Hispanic (1.6%); five Middle Eastern

(4%); two Multiracial (1.6%); and 63 White/Caucasian (50.8%).

For the purpose of this study the data were grouped into two categories of racial

group membership: LGBTQ Identified Students of Color (LGBQ Students of Color,

N=900; Transgender Students of Color, N=34) and LGBTQ White Students (LGBQ

White Students, N=2908, Transgender White Students, N=63) for descriptive

comparisons. This information played a significant role in ascertaining the differences of

experiences within LGBTQ communities, specifically LGBTQ Students of Color and

answering the research questions. To answer the last research question, the data were

grouped into five categories of racial group membership (White, African-

American/Black, Asian-American, Middle Eastern, Latino, and Racial Groups with small

sample sizes were grouped to make one multiracial group). See Table 2.

Table 2

Demographical Information of LGBTQ Respondents by Race

LGBQ Students of Color	*N*	Percentage (of LGBQ and Transgender participants)
LGBQ Students of Color	900	
LGBQ White	2,908	
LGBQ Total	4,294	
Trans Students of Color	34	
White Trans	63	
Trans Total	124	
African American/Black LGBQ	207	4.8%
African American/Black Trans	7	5.6%
White Transgender	63	50.8%
Latino/a LGBQ	249	5.8%
Latino/a Trans	2	1.6%
Asian American LGBQ	270	6.3%
Asian American Trans	3	2.4%
Middle Eastern LGBQ	23	0.5%
Middle Eastern Trans	5	4.0%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	13	0.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	3	2.4%
Multiracial LGBQ	79	1.8%
Multiracial Trans	2	1.6%

Instrumentation

The dataset offered through the MSL begins with the participants' demographic information. In addition to the demographic questions, the MSL survey includes more

than 400 variables, scales, and composite measures that capture a variety of experiences that occur during college that often inform educational and leadership-related outcomes (Kodama & Dugan, 2013). "The MSL instrument underwent significant psychometric testing to establish the reliability and validity of constructs (Dugan, Komives, & Associates, 2012)" (Kodama & Dugan, 2013, p. 188). For the purpose of this study, the researcher selected several scales addressing the variables of interest as outlined within the research questions including the Leadership Efficacy Scale and the Resiliency Scale, as well as information concerning the mentor relationships of LGBTQ students (if any) and their involvement in on-campus, LGBTQ identity-based student organizations (if any).

Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) Scale

Leadership self-efficacy was measured using the Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) Scale. The LSE is derived from the work of Bandura (1997) that defined leadership self-efficacy as an individual's internal belief in his or her ability to successfully engage in leadership. The scale comprises four questions that asked participants to identify the extent to which they would be confident doing the following: leading others, organizing a group's tasks to accomplish a goal, taking initiative to improve something, and working with a team on a group project, with possible responses ranging from "*not at all confident*" (1) to "*very confident*" (4). Cronbach's alpha was tested to assess reliability with this sample. A high alpha of .88 was reported (Cronbach, 1951).

Resiliency Scale

Resiliency was measured using a 10-item Resiliency Scale that asked participants to identify the extent to how much they agreed with a series of statements as they apply to their experiences over the last month (if a particular situation did not occur within the last month, participants were asked to answer in ordinance to how they think they would have felt). Examples of the Resiliency Scale items are: I can deal with whatever comes my way; I think of myself as a strong person when dealing with life's challenges and difficulties; and I am able to handle unpleasant or painful feelings like sadness, fear, and anger. Responses were obtained using a Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1= *Not at All True*, 2=*Rarely True*, 3=*Sometimes True*, 4=*Often True*, 5=*True Nearly All of the Time*). The Resiliency Scale reported high reliability. A high alpha of .91 was reported (Cronbach, 1951).

Involvement in LGBTQ Organizations

Student Involvement in on-campus LGBTQ student organizations was measured using a single question from the MSL within the background information section: To what extent have you been actively involved in LGBTQ groups (e.g., Pride Alliance, Queer Student Union) on campus during college? This question was only asked to students who responded as transgender and LGBQ in the background information section. Although participants responded to this MSL item in terms of frequency of involvement (0=*Never*, 1=*Sometimes*, 2=*Often*, 3=*Very Often*), the present study was interested in whether study participants were involved or not. Therefore, responses were

recoded to "No Involvement" (those who originally responded Never) and "Any

Involvement" (those who originally responded Sometimes, Often, and Very Often).

Mentoring

The MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012) defined a mentor as a person who

intentionally assists your growth or connects you to opportunities for career or personal

development (N. Turman, personal communication, September 22, 2015). The presence

of a mentor was operationalized using the five items used to assess mentorship in the

MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012). The question read as, "Since you started at your

current college/university, have you been mentored by the following types of people" and

lists six difference categories of types of people. Because the current study was interested

in whether or not participants had a mentor (not in the characteristics of the mentor or the

frequency of mentorship), mentorship or "presence of a mentor" was created by recoding

responses to "Yes Mentor Present" if respondents indicated that they had been mentored

by any of the types of people listed and "No Mentor Present" if they indicated that they

had not been mentored by any of the types of people listed.

Demographic Items

In addition to the previous scales, the researcher explored several demographic

responses. Several of the variables (racial identity, gender identity, sex and sexual

orientation) were used for grouping responses for descriptive comparisons. As mentioned

previously, for the purpose of this study racial group membership was grouped into two

categories for descriptive comparisons: Students of Color and White. This information

played a significant role in ascertaining the differences of experiences within LGBTQ

communities, specifically LGBTQ Identified Students of Color and LGBTQ White Students and answering the research questions. It is important to note that because sexual orientation and gender identity were listed as different demographical responses, each test had to be run separately in regards to (Lesbian/Gay, Bisexual, and Questioning) and then again for transgender participants.

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics were obtained for all of the measures. Multiple statistical analyses were utilized to answer the research questions.

Research Question 1& 2: Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color? Does the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color differ based on involvement in LGBTQ organizations?

To control for the possibility of a Type I error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008), a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations (independent variable) and leadership efficacy (research question #1) and resiliency (research question #2) (dependent variables) for LGBTQ Students of Color.

Research Question #3 & 4: Does the presence of a mentor increase the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color? Does the presence of a mentor significantly relate to the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

To control for the possibility of a Type I error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008), a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to evaluate the

significance of the relationship between the presence of a mentor (independent variable) and leadership efficacy and resiliency (as dependent variables) for LGBQ Students of Color.

Research Questions 5 &6: Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers? Are there differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

To control for the possibility of Type I error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008), a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between race (1=White, 2=Students of Color as the independent variable) and leadership efficacy and resiliency of LGBTQ students (as the dependent variables).

Research Question 7: Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their white peers?

RQ7 was analyzed using a chi-squared test of independence to examine the relationship between the race of LGBQ students and their involvement in LGBTQ student organizations.

Research Question 8: Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their white peers?

RQ8 was analyzed using a chi-squared test of independence to examine the relationship between the presence of a mentor (1=Yes, 2=No) and race (1=White, 2=Students of Color). These tests were duplicated for research questions pertaining to evaluate the experiences of transgender students.

Research Question 9: Do resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity, sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?

A MANCOVA was used to determine the main effects and interactions between sexual orientation, gender identity and race as it pertains to leadership efficacy and resiliency. The MANCOVA was also used to identify the within-group differences or interaction effects of race, gender identity, and sexual orientation with LGBTQ respondents (see Appendix for a table summarizing the analyses by research question).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore how experiences of mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations for LGBTQ Students of Color informs resiliency and leadership efficacy and if the students' experiences differ from their White LGBTQ peers. This chapter is organized in relation to the seven research questions posed in Chapter III. The findings of the study are reported in this chapter. First, preliminary analyses are reported. Following that, analyses for each of the research questions are reported.

Preliminary Analyses

Both the Resiliency Scale and the Leadership Self Efficacy scale were used as dependent measures in this study. Overall, respondents reported having high resiliency (M=3.899, SD=.699) and moderately high efficacy (M=3.059, SD=.714).

The relationship of the two dependent variables, leadership self-efficacy and resiliency, was explored using a Pearson's correlation. The test revealed a moderate positive relationship between leadership efficacy and resiliency, r= .57, $p < .001$. See Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Resiliency and Leadership Efficacy of LGBTQ

Participants

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistic	Standard Error	Statistic	Standard Error
Leadership Efficacy Scale	4292	1.00	4.00	3.0588	.71409	-.512	.037	-.187	.075
Resiliency Scale Construct	4292	1.00	5.00	3.8990	.69853	-.624	.037	.847	.075
Valid N (listwise)	4291								

Research Questions 1 & 2

- Is there a significant relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student

  organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

- Is there a significant relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student

  organizations and the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

1a & 2a: LGBQ Students of Color

To control for the possibility of Type I error created by running multiple tests, a

one-way MANOVA was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between

involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and leadership efficacy (research question

#1) and resiliency (research question #2) for LGBQ Students of Color. It is appropriate to

run a MANOVA when the dependent variables under consideration are correlated; the

MANOVA takes the correlation into account (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008). The

MANOVA revealed a significant relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and leadership efficacy and resiliency, $F(2,897) =6.895$, Wilks's Lambda=.985, $p=.001$, partial eta^2=.015, Observed Power=.923. When a MANOVA is significant, it indicates that there is a significant relationship somewhere among the variables. Follow-up univariate tests are performed to ascertain where the significance lies.

A univariate test revealed that there is a significant difference in leadership efficacy based on the involvement in LGBTQ student organization, $F(1, 898) =12.402$, $p<.001$, partial eta$^2 =.014$, Observed Power=.940. Those who were involved had higher leadership efficacy ($M= 3.119$, $SD= .039$) than those who were not involved ($M=2.944$, $SD= .031$). Although the test had high power because of the ample sample size, and revealed a statistical significant difference, the effect that involvement in LGBTQ student organizations has on leadership efficacy is small (partial eta$^2 =.014$). Post-hoc tests were not necessary as there were only two groups in each analysis.

The univariate tests did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between LGBTQ student organization involvement and resiliency, $F(1,898) =1.148$, p=.284, partial eta^2=.001, despite a large sample size. LGBQ Students of Color who were not involved ($M=3.687$, $SD=.742$ reported less leadership efficacy than LGBQ Students of Color who were involved at any level ($M=3.923$, $SD=.749$).

1b & 2b: Transgender Students of Color

As above, a one-way MANOVA was run to control for the possibility of Type I Error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008) and evaluated the

significance of the relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and leadership efficacy (research question #1b) and resiliency (research question #2b), this time for Transgender Students of Color. The multivariate test was not significant when evaluating the significance of the relationship between the involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy or the resiliency of Transgender Students of Color, $F(2, 31) = 1.917$, $p=.164$, Wilks's Lambda = .890, Observed Power=.367. To check whether the non-significant results for both tests were due to a lack of statistical power, a post hoc power analyses using G*Power (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992) with power (1- β) set at 0.80 and alpha= .05, two tailed. A sample size of $N=158$ would be needed to meet an 80% chance of detecting any existing statistically significance (Cohen, 1988). Thus, it is possible that these negative findings could be attributed to a limited sample size.

Research Questions 3 & 4

- Is there a significant relationship between the presence of a mentor and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?
- Is there a significant relationship between the presence of a mentor and the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

3a & 4a: LGBQ Students of Color

To control for the possibility of Type I Error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008), a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between the presence of a mentor and leadership efficacy (research question #3) and resiliency (research question #4) for LGBQ Students

of Color. The MANOVA revealed that there is a significant difference in leadership efficacy and resiliency based on the presence of a mentor, $F(2, 896) = 8.559$, Wilks=.981, $p=.000$, partial eta2=.019.

A univariate test that evaluated the significance of the relationship between the presence of a mentor and leadership efficacy of LGBQ Students of Color revealed that there is a significant difference in leadership efficacy based on the presence of a mentor, $F(1, 897) = 16.361$, $p=<.001$, partial eta^2=.018. An examination of the means shows that those who had a mentor had higher leadership self-efficacy (M=3.05, SD= .701) than those who did not (M= 2.73, SD= .88). Although the test had high power because of the ample sample size, and revealed a statistical significant difference, the effect that the presence of a mentor has on the leadership efficacy of LGBQ students is small (partial eta^2=.018).

A univariate test that evaluated whether there was a significant relationship between the presence of a mentor and the resiliency of LGBQ Students of Color revealed that there is a significant difference in resiliency based on the presence of a mentor, $F(1, 897) = 9.227$, $p=.002$, partial eta2=.010. Those who had a mentor had higher resiliency (M= 3.919, SD= .713) than those who did not have a mentor (M=3.680, SD= .902). Although the test had high power because of the ample sample size, and revealed a statistical significant difference, the effect that the presence of a mentor has on the resiliency of LGBQ students is negligible (partial eta^2=.010). No post-hoc test was necessary as there were only two groups in each analysis.

3b & 4b: Transgender Students of Color

As above, a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to control for the possibility of Type I Error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008) and evaluate the significance of the relationship between the presence of a mentor and leadership efficacy and the resiliency, this time for Transgender Students of Color. The multivariate test revealed no statistical difference when evaluating the significance of the relationship between the presence of a mentor and leadership efficacy and the resiliency, $F(2, 30) =.106$, $p=.90$, Wilks's Lambda = .993, Observed power=.065. To check whether the non-significant results were due to a lack of statistical power, a post hoc power analyses using GPower (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992) with power ($1- \beta$) set at 0.80 and alpha= .05, two tailed (Cohen, 1988). This showed that sample sizes would have to increase up to $N=158$, in order for group differences to reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, it is likely that these negative findings could be attributed to a limited sample size.

Research Questions 5 & 6

- Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

- Does resiliency vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

5a & 6a: LGBQ Students

To control for the possibility Type I Error created by running multiple tests (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2008), a one-way MANOVA analysis was run to whether there was a significant relationship between the presence of a mentor and leadership efficacy

(research question #5) and resiliency (research question #6) for LGBQ Students of Color.

The MANOVA revealed a statistical significance of the relationship between the

leadership efficacy and the resiliency of LGBQ Students of Color and the leadership

efficacy and resiliency of White students, $F(2, 3,802) = 3.056$, Wilks's=.998, p=.047,

partial eta^2=.002, Observed Power=.592.

A univariate test evaluated the significance of the relationship between leadership

efficacy and race. The test revealed a statistical difference in resiliency based on race,

$F(1, 3803)$ =5.338, p=.021, partial eta^2=.001. White LGBQ students had higher efficacy

(M=3.074, SD=.706) than Students of Color (M=3.011, SD=.729). Although the test had

high power because of the ample sample size, and revealed a statistical significant

difference, the effect that race has on the leadership efficacy of LGBQ students is small

(partial eta^2 =.001).

A univariate test evaluated the significance of the relationship between race and

resiliency of LGBQ students. The test revealed that there is no significant difference in

resiliency based on race, $F(1, 3803)$ =.345, p=.557, Observed Power=.090. No post-hoc

test was necessary as there were only two groups in each analysis.

5b & 6b: Transgender Students

A MANOVA was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between the

leadership efficacy and the resiliency of Transgender Students of Color and White

Transgender students. The test revealed a statistically significant difference in the

leadership efficacy and resiliency based on race, $F(2, 94) = 6.340$, Wilks=.881, p=.003,

partial eta^2=.119. A univariate test was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship

between the leadership efficacy for Transgender Students of Color and White Transgender students. The test revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in the leadership efficacy based on race, $F(1, 95) =.191$, $p=.663$, partial eta^2= .002, Observed Power=.072. White Transgender people reported more leadership efficacy (M=3.905, SD=.675), that Transgender Students of Color (M=3.889, SD=.745). A small effect size partial eta^2=.002) was found (Cohen, 1992).

A univariate test was run to evaluate the significance of the relationship between the resiliency for Transgender Students of Color and White Transgender students. The test revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in the resiliency based on race, $F(1, 95) = 4.014$, $p=.048$, partial eta2=.041, Observed Power=.509. White Transgender students reported more resiliency (M=3.69, SD=.89) than Transgender Students of Color (M=3.25, SD=1.24). A moderate effect size (partial eta^2=.041) was found (Cohen, 1992).

Research Question 7

Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their white peers?

7a: LGBQ Students

A chi-square analysis was performed to examine whether LGBQ Students of Color and White LGBQ students were equally likely to have had a mentor. White LGBQ students were more likely to have a mentor than their student of color counterparts X^2 (1) = 7.164, p =.007).

7b: Transgender Students

A chi-square analysis was performed to examine whether Transgender Students of Color and White Transgender students were equally likely to have had a mentor. No statistical difference was found, meaning neither White Transgender nor Transgender Students of Color were more or less likely to report the presence of a mentor X^2 (1) = 1.191, p =.275). To check whether the non-significant results were due to a lack of statistical power, a post hoc power analyses using GPower (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992) with power (1- β) set at 0.80 and alpha= .05, two tailed (Cohen, 1988). This showed that sample sizes would have to increase up to N=143, in order for group differences to reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, it is likely that these negative findings could be attributed to a limited sample size.

<div align="center">

Research Question 8

</div>

Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their white peers?

8a: LGBQ Students

A chi-square analysis was performed to examine whether LGBQ Students of Color and White LGBQ students were equally likely to be involved in LGBTQ campus organizations. White LGBQ students were more likely to be involved in LGBTQ student organizations than their student of color counterparts X^2 (1) =13.387, $p < .001$).

8b: Transgender Students

A chi-square analysis was performed to examine whether Transgender Students of Color and White Transgender students were equally likely to be involved in LGBTQ campus organizations. No statistically significant difference was found, as White Transgender students and their transgender student of color contemporaries reported similar involvement in LGBTQ organizations X^2 (1) = 2.735, p =.098). To check whether the non-significant results were due to a lack of statistical power, a post hoc power analyses using G*Power (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992) with power (1- β) set at 0.80 and alpha= .05, two tailed (Cohen, 1988). This showed that sample sizes would have to increase up to N=143, in order for group differences to reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, it is likely that these negative findings could be attributed to a limited sample size.

Research Question 9

Do resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity (cisgender v. transgender), sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity (cisgender v. transgender), sexual orientation, and race?

A MANCOVA analysis was run to assess the effects and interactions between the sexual orientation, gender identity and race of LGBTQ undergraduates as independent variables and leadership efficacy and resiliency as dependent variables. The MANCOVA also was used to identify the within-group differences or interaction effects of race, gender identity, and sexual orientation with LGBTQ respondents. The test indicated that there is a main effect of race F(8, 7,572) =4.131, Wilks's=.991, p<.001, partial eta^2=.004,

Observed Power=33.046), and a main effect of gender identity of $F(4, 7,572) = 11.736$,

Wilks's=.988, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.006, Observed Power=1.0, when controlling for

sexual orientation $F(2, 3,786) = 12.376$, Wilks's=.994, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.006,

Observed Power=.996. The test revealed that there is a significant interaction between

race and gender identity, when you control for sexual orientation $F(16, 7572) = 3.502$,

Wilks=.985, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.007.

From this study, univariate tests revealed that there was a significant difference of

the resiliency of LGBTQ $F(8, 3787) = 5.022$, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.010, Observed

Power=.999; but not leadership efficacy, $F(8, 3787) = .431$, $p=.903$, partial eta^2=.001,

Observed Power=.206. The pair-wise comparisons revealed that there were no statistical

differences in the resiliency between White, Black, Latino/a LGBTQ students or LGBTQ

students whose racial groups included small sample sizes. However, there were statistical

differences between Asian American LGBTQ respondents and mostly all other LGBTQ

groups (White MD=.659, p=.001; Latino MD=.971, $p<.001$); as well as differences

between the groups with small sample sizes and Latino/a LGBTQ students (MD=.521,

p=.036) in regards to resiliency.

The pairwise comparisons revealed that White LGBQ cisgender Men had the

highest resiliency (M=3.993, SD= .020), higher than both their White LGBQ cisgender

women (M= 3.841, SD=.017, and their White LGBQ transgender peers (M=3.727,

SD=.097). The pairwise comparisons also showed that Asian-American transgender

students had the lowest reported levels of resiliency (M=2.147, SD=. 482). Asian

American in general were the lowest scoring racial group with Asian American cisgender

men (M=3.730, SD=.061) and cisgender women (M=3.303, SD=.057). The test revealed that other racial groups with smaller sample sizes—Asian American (N=2) also reported lower resiliency LGBTQ Latino men (M=4.009, SD=.061), LGBTQ Latina women (M=3.959, SD=.062), transgender students (M=4.528, SD=.483), and a multiracial group of cisgender men (M=3.986, SD= .077), cisgender women (M=4.045, SD=.075), and transgender (M=2.992, SD=.091). These insignificant results might be because of the lower sample size of these racial groups (partial eta^2=.010)

A MANCOVA analysis was run to assess the effects and interactions between the sexual orientation, gender identity and race of LGBTQ undergraduates as independent variables and leadership efficacy and resiliency as dependent variables. The MANCOVA was also used to identify the within-group differences or interaction effects of race, gender identity, and sexual orientation with LGBTQ respondents. The test indicated that there is a main effect of gender identity F(4, 7586) =13.437, Wilks's=.986, p<.001, partial eta^2=.007, Observed Power=1.00), and a main effect of sexual orientation F(4, 7584) =3.501, Wilks's= .996, p=.007, partial eta^2=.002, when controlling for race F(2, 3,792) =2.608, Wilks's=.999, p=.074, partial eta^2=.001, Observed Power=.521. The test revealed that there are no significant interactions between sexual orientation and gender identity, when you control for race, F(8, 7584) =.836, Wilks=.998, p=.570, partial eta^2=.001, Observed Power=.398. Overall, respondents reported to have moderately high leadership efficacy, as well as high resiliency.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Leadership Efficacy and Resiliency by Race and Gender Identity

	Race	Gender	M	SD	n
Resiliency Scale Construct	White	Male	3.9839	0.63767	1233
		Female	3.8505	0.69084	1621
		Transgender	3.7347	0.86904	49
		Total	3.9052	0.67553	2903
	Black	Male	3.9895	0.61607	86
		Female	4.0810	0.75376	116
		Transgender	3.0400	0.29665	5
		Total	4.0179	0.70801	207
	Asian	Male	3.7173	0.75667	127
		Female	3.7014	0.65900	141
		Transgender	2.1000	1.55563	2
		Total	3.6970	0.72275	270
	Latinx	Male	4.0040	0.64912	125
		Female	3.9680	0.63964	122
		Transgender	4.4500	0.77782	2
		Total	3.9900	0.64403	249
	Groups with small groups	Male	3.8795	0.72781	78
		Female	4.0518	0.82556	83
		Transgender	2.9385	1.45976	13
		Total	3.8914	0.88728	174
	Total	Male	3.9602	0.65517	1649
		Female	3.8682	0.69939	2083
		Transgender	3.5141	1.06077	71
		Total	3.9015	0.69249	3803

Table 4

Cont.

	Race	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Leadership Efficacy Scale	White	Male	3.1800	0.67745	1233
		Female	3.0011	0.71311	1621
		Transgender	2.8265	0.82633	49
		Total	3.0741	0.70625	2903
	Black	Male	3.3169	0.58840	86
		Female	3.1164	0.68321	116
		Transgender	2.9000	0.74162	6
		Total	3.1944	0.65261	207
	Asian	Male	2.8583	0.74242	127
		Female	2.6667	0.74021	141
		Transgender	2.3750	1.94454	2
		Total	2.7546	0.75339	270
	Latinx	Male	3.1340	0.70963	125
		Female	3.0697	0.68353	122
		Transgender	3.3750	0.88388	2
		Total	3.1044	0.69607	249
	Groups with small groups	Male	3.1571	0.61384	78
		Female	3.0131	0.74621	83
		Transgender	2.7308	1.05801	13
		Total	3.0565	0.72299	174
	Total	Male	3.1578	0.68354	1649
		Female	2.9894	0.71823	2083
		Transgender	2.8169	0.87928	71
		Total	3.0592	0.71220	3803

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes for Leadership Efficacy and Resiliency

by Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

	Gender	Sexual Orientation	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Resiliency Scale Construct	Male	Bisexual	3.9580	.66955	403
		Gay/Lesbian	4.0123	.63504	989
		Questioning	3.7634	.67348	257
		Total	3.9602	.65517	1649
	Female	Bisexual	3.8809	.68293	1192
		Gay/Lesbian	3.9836	.68637	482
		Questioning	3.6950	.73002	409
		Total	3.8682	.69939	2083
	Transgender	Bisexual	3.5538	1.09772	26
		Gay/Lesbian	3.5783	.82954	23
		Questioning	3.4000	1.25508	22
		Total	3.5141	1.06077	71
	Total	Bisexual	3.8948	.68973	1621
		Gay/Lesbian	3.9964	.65704	1494
		Questioning	3.7111	.73345	688
		Total	3.9015	.69249	3803

Table 5

Cont.

	Gender	Sexual Orientation	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Leadership Efficacy Scale	Male	Bisexual	3.1644	.67479	403
		Gay/Lesbian	3.1999	.67443	989
		Questioning	2.9854	.70747	257
		Total	3.1578	.68354	1649
	Female	Bisexual	3.0109	.70300	1192
		Gay/Lesbian	3.1120	.69255	482
		Questioning	2.7820	.74967	409
		Total	2.9894	.71823	2083
	Transgender	Bisexual	2.7404	.89017	26
		Gay/Lesbian	2.9239	.79927	23
		Questioning	2.7955	.97173	22
		Total	2.8169	.87928	71
	Total	Bisexual	3.0447	.70317	1621
		Gay/Lesbian	3.1673	.68377	1494
		Questioning	2.8584	.74751	688
		Total	3.0592	.71220	3803

A MANCOVA analysis was run to assess the effects and interactions between the sexual orientation, gender identity and race of LGBTQ undergraduates as independent variables and leadership efficacy and resiliency as dependent variables. The MANCOVA was also used to identify the within-group differences or interaction effects of race, gender identity, and sexual orientation with LGBTQ respondents. The test indicated that

there is a main effect of race $F(8, 7,572) = 6.625$, Wilks's=.986, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.007,

Observed Power= 1, and a main effect of sexual orientation $F(4, 7,572)= 8.963$,

Wilks's=.991, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.005, Observed Power=.999, when controlling for

gender identity $F(2, 3,786)=19.987$, Wilks's= .990, $p<.001$, partial eta^2=.010, Observed

Power=1). The univariate test revealed that there are no significant multivariate

interactions between race and sexual orientation, when you control for gender identity,

$F(15, 7572) =1.582$, Wilks's=.993, $p=.065$, partial eta^2=.003, Observed Power=.916.

Overall, respondents reported to have moderately high resiliency, as well as high

leadership efficacy. See Tables 6 and 7 to reference means and standard deviations.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Resiliency by Race and Sexual

Orientation

	Sexual Orientation	Race	*M*	*SD*	*n*
		White	3.8898	.67981	1264
		Black	4.0711	.67797	83
Resiliency Scale Construct	Bisexual	Asian	3.6811	.71446	101
		Latinx	3.9105	.69198	105
		Groups with small groups	4.0559	.77003	68
		Total	3.8948	.68973	1621

Table 6

Cont.

	Sexual Orientation	Race	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Resiliency Scale Construct	Gay/Lesbian	White	3.9955	.63952	1157
		Black	4.1805	.62171	82
		Asian	3.7452	.80373	93
		Latinx	4.1067	.59522	105
		Groups with small groups	3.9561	.78080	57
		Total	3.9964	.65704	1494
	Questioning	White	3.7289	.71092	482
		Black	3.5952	.77079	42
		Asian	3.6500	.62876	76
		Latinx	3.8897	.60122	39
		Groups with small groups	3.5878	1.07754	49
		Total	3.7111	.73345	688
	Total	White	3.9052	.67553	2903
		Black	4.0179	.70801	207
		Asian	3.6970	.72275	270
		Latinx	3.9900	.64403	249
		Groups with small groups	3.8914	.88728	174
		Total	3.9015	.69249	3803

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Leadership Efficacy by Race and

Sexual Orientation

	Sexual Orientation	Race	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Leadership Efficacy Scale	Bisexual	White	3.0492	.70332	1264
		Black	3.2229	.55903	83
		Asian	2.7649	.71922	101
		Latinx	3.0571	.74780	105
		Groups with small groups	3.1397	.66409	68
		Total	3.0447	.70317	1621
	Gay/Lesbian	White	3.1871	.67606	1157
		Black	3.3659	.59212	82
		Asian	2.7500	.76436	93
		Latinx	3.1833	.63480	105
		Groups with small groups	3.1316	.67663	57
		Total	3.1673	.68377	1494
	Questioning	White	2.8683	.73293	482
		Black	2.8036	.77801	42
		Asian	2.7467	.79319	76
		Latinx	3.0192	.70567	39
		Groups with small groups	2.8537	.82206	49
		Total	2.8584	.74751	688
	Total	White	3.0741	.70625	2903
		Black	3.1944	.65261	207
		Asian	2.7546	.75339	270
		Latinx	3.1044	.69607	249
		Groups with small groups	3.0565	.72299	174
		Total	3.0592	.71220	3803

Table 8

Main Effects and Interactions between Race, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation

Source	Dependent Variable	df	SS	MS	F	p	Partial eta^2
Covariate (IV): Sexual Orientation	Resiliency	1	7.767	7.767	16.707	.000	.004
	Leadership Efficacy	1	10.53	10.530	21.502	.000	.006
Interaction: Race*Gender Identity	Resiliency	8	18.679	2.335	5.022	.000	.004
	Leadership Efficacy	8	1.687	.211	.431	.903	.001
Covariate (Race)	Resiliency	1	.000	.000	.000	.986	.000
	Leadership Efficacy	1	1.786	1.786	3.640	.056	3.64
Interaction: Sexual Orientation * Gender Identity	Resiliency	4	.485	.121	.259	.904	.000
	Leadership Efficacy	4	2.687	.672	1.369	.242	.001
Covariate Gender Identity	Resiliency	1	7.195	7.195	15.518	.000	.004
	Leadership Efficacy	1	19.171	19.171	39.664	.000	.010
Interaction: Race*Sexual Orientation	Resiliency	8	8.076	1.009	2.177	.026	.005
	Leadership Efficacy	8	7.333	.917	1.896	.056	.004

CHAPTER V

WE ARE THE ONES WE HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR: EXPLORING THE EXPERIENCES OF LGBTQ UNDERGRADUATES OF COLOR

The purpose of this study was to explore the leadership efficacy and resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color. The aim of this research was to gain a better understanding of the relationships between mentorship, involvement in LGBTQ identity-based student organizations, resiliency, and leadership self-efficacy. Although today's campuses maintain more diversity than ever before, LGBTQ students still remain largely marginalized within colleges and universities (Rankin et al., 2010). The literature has overwhelmingly demonstrated that colleges and universities remain unwelcoming and hostile places for LGBTQ students (Beemyn & Rankin, 2011; Rankin et al., 2010). Within the literature, LGBTQ students have been inextricably linked to substance abuse, poor mental health outcomes, and suicide (D'Augelli, 2002; Reed et al., 2010; Westefeld et al., 2001).

Although chronicling the trials and tribulations associated with an LGBTQ identity is important, it presents an incomplete depiction of the LGBTQ student experience, grounded within a deficit framework. This study breaks from that trend by examining the relationship between community-based practices (social support) found on college campuses that foster resiliency and the cultivation of leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates, namely in the form of LGBTQ student organizations and mentor relationships. This research was guided by nine research questions. This chapter

further explains the research findings and discusses limitations of the study, significance of the findings, implications for both practice and research, and conclusions.

Discussion

Overview

Using data from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL; Dugan & Associates, 2012), this study explored the relationship of mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations with both leadership efficacy and resiliency. However, mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ organizations were not significantly related to the resiliency of LGBQ Students of Color. This study demonstrated that overall, LGBQ students and LGBQ Students of Color demonstrated high levels of resiliency and moderately high levels of leadership efficacy, but had disparate experiences from their White peers in regards to mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations. As an overview, when examining the within-group differences of LGBTQ students based on race, significant differences were found between the experiences of LGBQ students and those of their White peers. For example, White students had received mentorship more often, were more involved in LGBTQ student organizations, and reported higher leadership efficacy. Conversely, LGBQ students across the board maintained high resiliency. However, inferences about the experiences of Transgender Students of Color were limited because of the small sample size of the study (N=124). Below, each research question is discussed in light of the empirical results. In addition, implications for future research and practice will be provided.

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analysis found that leadership efficacy and resiliency are moderately connected constructs. There is some relationship between students' feeling of confidence in their ability to be leaders and their resiliency in the face of hardship and failure. Following are Research Questions 1–9:

1. Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

2. Does the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color differ based on involvement in LGBTQ organizations?

3. Does the presence of a mentor increase the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

4. Does the presence of a mentor significantly relate to the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

5. Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

6. Are there differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

7. Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

8. Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

9. Does resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity, sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

1a. LGBQ students. As predicted, findings from this study suggest that LGBQ Students of Color who engaged in LGBTQ student organizations had higher leadership self-efficacy than the LGBQ Students of Color who did not engage in LGBTQ student organizations. These findings are consistent with the existing research that outlines the positive connections between participation in LGBTQ student organizations and leadership efficacy and leadership identity development (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn, 2007; Renn & Billodeau, 2005a, 2005b), and social identity development (Renn & Ozaki, 2010). The existing literature suggests that although the missions, culture, membership composition, and organizational structure of LGBTQ student organizations vary depending on the institution, they are generally perceived to be an important resource that provides support, opportunities for socialization, and activist work that can help to combat isolation and feelings of stigmatization (Westbrook, 2009). Renn and colleagues have written extensively on the subject of LGBTQ leadership development and suggest that "LGBTQ-supportive peer interactions and advisor-student relationships create a context for positive development" (Renn & Bilodeau 2005b, p. 68; also see Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a).

The increase in leadership efficacy by those involved in student organizations can be further contextualizing using Bandura's (1994) four sources of self-efficacy: performance accomplishments (mastery), vicarious experience (observing those similar to you doing it), verbal persuasion, and physiological states (mood, emotion, stress, physical reaction). Considering the multi-faceted nature of LGBTQ student organizations, several of these sources of self-efficacy are present. LGBTQ student organizations can provide an opportunity for LGBTQ students to learn and to practice leadership. LGBTQ student organizations could potentially provide a space for participants to cultivate important leadership skills while planning LGBTQ events on campus. Whether these events are educational or social in nature, a successful event entails employing time management skills, collaborating effectively with other students and collaborators across campus, budgeting, and public speaking. Performing these tasks as a part of an event planning team could provide an opportunity for "mastery" of these skills, as outlined by Bandura (1994), and could positively impact the leadership efficacy of participants. One successful event could help LGBTQ student leaders develop the confidence needed to plan subsequent events.

Second, the lack of diversity in our institutions can result in LGBTQ Students of Color to go without mentoring relationships more often (also affirmed by this study's findings). The lack of representation of people of color in leadership positions at our colleges and universities leaves LGBQ Students of Color wanting and unable to tap into the power of vicarious experience outlined by Bandura (1994) as being sources for the development of self-efficacy development. Third, interactions with affirming and

supportive advisors of LGBTQ student organizations, as well as peers, could also provide the "verbal persuasion" discussed in Bandura (1994). Advisors and student affairs practitioners can play an integral role in facilitating conversations around the needs, expectations, and guidelines for the group, while also normalizing and affirming their experiences, as well as communicating encouragement to LGBTQ student leaders (Komives et al., 2005; Renn, 2007). Although the role of peer support is less researched in the leadership development (Renn & Osaki, 2010), it is important to note the important role peers may play in verbally affirming their friends in the group. This kind of mutual aid, perhaps from LGBTQ upperclassmen to LGBTQ lower classmen, may hold significant weight as someone who has recently been "in their shoes." Exchanges with peers also have the benefit of mirroring what positive coping strategies might look like when traversing heterosexism and cissexism on campus, but other participants can also act as a much needed shoulder to lean on. This process of mutual aid and support has implications for the psychological state of those involved in LGBTQ student organizations. If encouragement, affirmation, and support are present in these student organizations, student leaders might feel as though they have the emotional safety net to take risks often necessary of leadership (Komives, Lucas, et al., 2006; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b; Renn & Ozaki, 2010).

How students feel about their participation matters and how students feel about leadership matters. Leadership efficacy plays an important yet under-researched role in the experiences of college students with scholars citing correlations between the efficacy and motivation and frequency with which students attempted a leadership role

(McCormick et al., 2002), socially responsible leadership capacity (Dugan & Komives, 2011), and the development of a leadership identity (Komives et al., 2005). Essentially, so much of what we do is motivated by how we feel about our abilities (Schunk & Pajares, 2005, 2009; Schunk et al., 2014). As mentioned previously, participation in these LGBTQ student organizations provides important opportunities for engaging in sociopolitical, cross-cultural interactions, and conversations said to bolster leadership efficacy and identity development (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Abes et al., 2004; hooks, 1984; Kodama & Dugan, 2013). Dugan and Komives (2010) theorized that these opportunities to negotiate and experiment with having difficult conversations may incite an aspiration to work towards social change. It is also important to mention that these positive gains from being involved in student organizations and engaging in these conversations are beneficial throughout the entire campus, not just the few students engaged in social justice work, or the privileged students who might not have otherwise engaged in difficult conversations across differences (Abes et al., 2004; Kodama & Dugan, 2013). Overall, these findings that demonstrate a connection between involvement in LGBTQ organizations and increased leadership efficacy and may suggest the meaningfulness of using and creating opportunities at every level, formal and informal, to engage in these sociocultural conversations in the aspirations of cultivating culturally responsive leaders.

However, the findings of this study are disconcerting considering the importance of leadership efficacy in LGBQ undergraduates, because we know that not all students have equal access to these spaces (Ward, 2008; Westbrook, 2009). LGBQ Students of

Color may be averse to participating in these organizations potentially because of the horizontal oppression present within LGBTQ spaces (Meyer, 2010; Moradi et al., 2010; Ward, 2008; Westbrook, 2009). The findings suggest that it is imperative that all students have access to the benefits of LGBTQ student organizations, which might mean that those responsible for the group work to mitigate ways in which people are feeling unwelcomed or ostracized. Although these findings suggest a connection between involvement in LGBTQ organizations and leadership efficacy of LGBQ Students of Color, it remains unclear if LGBQ Students of Color who accessed these spaces maintained higher efficacy already, which propelled them to engage, or if involvement in LGBTQ identity-based student organizations helped cultivate higher levels of leadership efficacy. Moreover, this research cannot clearly outline the specific benefits of the student organization. As mentioned previously, although these organizations have similar benefits, they can maintain different organizational structures, missions, and practices. Although the evaluation and implications of the level, quality, mission, and positional leadership of these groups remain outside the scope of this study, future research will be addressed in subsequent sections.

1b. Transgender students. Due to a small sample size of Transgender Students of Color and low power, most of the findings were not statistically significant. As noted in the result section, the sample size was too small to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 2

Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations increase the resiliency of

LGBTQ Students of Color?

2a. LGBQ students. As predicted, findings from this study suggest that LGBQ

Students of Color who engaged in LGBTQ student organizations did not necessarily

maintain higher resiliency, and instead involvement in these organizations would have a

negative or neutral effect on the resiliency of LGBTQ undergraduates of color. This study

found that there was no statistically significant relationship between involvement in

LGBTQ student organizations and the resiliency of LGBQ students. These findings

contradict the growing amount of literature that suggests that participation in LGBT

campus organizations promotes resiliency for LGBTQ undergraduates (D'Augelli, 1994;

Evans & Broido, 1999; Renn; 2003; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005b; Rhoads, 1994; Stevens,

2004).

It is important to note, however, that although there were significant differences

between the LGBQ Students of Color and their White peers, overall LGBQ Students of

Color reported moderately high levels of resiliency for those involved in LGBTQ student

organizations (*M*=3.923, *SD*=.749) and for the uninvolved group (*M*=3.119, *SD*=.039).

The variance in reported resilience may be also be attributed to the level of "out-ness"

and identity salience of the respondents. LGBTQ Students of Color might have to

negotiate being "out" from their White peers, and might not want to be a part of LGBTQ-

specific organizations. Instead, these LGBQ Students of Color may seek refuge within

race and ethnicity identity-based organizations, although these spaces may not be as open

to LGBTQ identities. Research suggests that LGBTQ students may refrain from disclosing their sexual identity in order to socialize within the larger student of color communities (Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011). These concessions may negatively impact their experiences in general although this research is not as developed. The findings of this study encourage future researchers to extend the existing scholarship that demonstrates that involvement and leadership efficacy vary across social identity (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodama & Dugan 2013).

Further, the high resiliency scores of both groups may have greater implications for LGBQ students. It contests the myth of the "warring selves," or the notion that LGBTQ People of Color having difficulty simultaneously negotiating their multiple identities and also has implications for LGBT leadership development—which has not yet been explored. Overall, the literature available that examines the resiliency found at the intersections of multiple minority statuses, which builds from the work of Meyer (2010) and Moradi et al. (2010), remains underwhelming. Implications for future research will be addressed in subsequent sections.

2b. Transgender students. This analysis yielded non-significant results. As noted earlier, the sample size was insufficient to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 3

Is the presence of a mentor significantly related to the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?

3a. LGBQ students. As predicted, findings from this study indicated that LGBQ Students of Color who had a mentor had higher leadership self-efficacy than the LGBQ Students of Color who did not have a mentor. These findings support the existing research that outlines the positive connections between leadership efficacy and mentorship (Dugan & Komives, 2007). In general we know that mentorship is both desired by and beneficial for Students of Color (e.g., Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005) and African American students in particular (Patitu & Terrel, 1997; Saddler, 2010; Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009), as well as women (Patton & Harper, 2003; Williams-Nickelson, 2009), sexual minority students (Lark & Croteau, 1998; McAllister, Harold, Ahmedani, & Cramer, 2009; Van Puymbroeck, 2001), and students living at the intersections of gender and race (Reynolds & Pope, 1991). As mentioned previously, when traversing often-hostile campus climates, mentors have the opportunity to instill hope in otherwise underserved LGBTQ students, offering students with a glimpse of what Gilbert and Rossman (1992) describe as a future "possible self" (p. 235). Mentor relationships have the potential to help combat stigma and isolation and presenting models of possibilities. This line of thought is aligned with Bandura's (1994) concept of vicarious experiences as a source of self-efficacy. Mentors potentially provide possibility models for LGBTQ student-by offering conceptions of what it might mean to be out as an LGBQ person, as a professional and someone who is a

part of a larger community. This could help negate the perpetuation of LGBTQ individuals as isolated and deprived of support.

To this end, mentor relationships can help LGBTQ undergraduates reframe negative self-conceptualizations of who and what leaders are. This may be particularly true for LGBQ Students of Color, negotiating institutions of higher education in which representation of LGBQ people of color, (and people of color in general) remain incredibly scarce and while institutionalized heterosexism and racism remain prevalent (Montas-Hunter, 2012). With the affirmation, safety, and guidance afforded by mentorship, LGBQ undergraduates' energies can be channeled into development and persistence, instead of being consumed with survival (Lark & Croteau, 1998). Bandura (1994) would agree that this kind of connection, encouragement, and verbal persuasion from a mentor could prove to be a source of self-efficacy for LGBTQ Students of Color.

To this end, a simple "you can be a leader of this organization" from an adult mentor (faculty, staff, LGBTQ Center Directors, LGBTQ student group advisers, older peers, and peers in general) can play a significant role in getting students involved in queer specific groups and activities and encouraging them to take on positional leadership (Komives et al., 2005; Renn, 2007). This kind of support and mentorship is particularly significant for students "who might not think of themselves as leaders" (Renn, 2007, p. 326). This is an important line of inquiry, considering what this study revealed about the connection between participation in LGBQ student organizations and leadership efficacy for LGBQ Students of Color. As mentioned previously, much of people's lives are guided by self-efficacy, including the choices in the activities to participate in, efforts,

persistence and resilience, levels of accomplishments, self-talk, and the stress and depression experienced while traversing adversity (Bandura, 1997; Schunk & Pajares, 2005, 2009). Montas-Hunter (2012) has noted that "motivation and human behavior are directly connected to individuals' beliefs about their capabilities" (p. 321). The more people believe they can accomplish something, the more motivated they are to do it; the more motivated they are, the more effort they put in, and the more likely they will persist and succeed (Schunk, Meece, & Pintrich, 2014; Schunk & Pajares, 2005, 2009). Conversely, "people holding low self-efficacy for accomplishing a task may avoid it; those who believe they are capable are likely to participate. This may be especially when they encounter difficulties, efficacious students work harder and persist longer than those with doubts" (Schunk et al., 2014, p. 145). This points to the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and resiliency.

The findings of this study further problematize the ways that LGBQ Students of Color may struggle with establishing mentoring relationships with a mentor that affirms not only their racial identity but also their LGBTQ identity (Komives et al., 2005; Renn, 2007; Reynolds & Pope, 1991). Although research is mixed around the importance of mentors also sharing an LGBTQ identity (Lark & Croteau, 1998; McAllister et al., 2009; Nauta et al., 2001), the very low representation of prospective LGBTQ mentors of color within the academy make that possibility incredibly challenging. However, similar to our investigation of LGBTQ student involvement, the inferences about the identities of the mentors invoked in this study, as well as the level, role (faculty, staff, peer, community member, etc.), and kinds of mentoring (target, matched mentoring, informal, etc.) that

may positively influence resiliency of LGBQ Students of Color is beyond the scope of this study.

3b. Transgender students. This analysis yielded non-significant results. As noted in the result section, the sample size was insufficient to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 4

Is the presence of a mentor significantly related to the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?

4a. LGBQ students. As predicted, this study found a significant relationship between the presence of a mentor and the resiliency of LGBQ Students of Color. The findings from this study suggest that LGBQ Students of Color who have a mentor had higher resiliency (*M*=3.919, *SD*=.713) than the LGBQ Students of Color who did not have a mentor (*M*=3.680, *SD*=.902). These findings are aligned with existing research that outlines the positive connections between resiliency and mentorship (D'Augelli, 1994; Evans & Broido, 1999; Rhoads, 1994; Stevens, 2004). These findings support the research on underserved Students of Color suggesting that students thrive when given models of success within predominately White institutions of higher education (Montas-Hunter, 2012). One reason for the significant difference in resiliency between those who received mentorship and those who did not could be linked to their willingness and ability to seek out support in the form of a mentor. If students do not see role models of

LGBQ faculty and staff at colleges and universities, they might internalize the lack of representation and might feel less likely to persist and navigate adversity successfully. It also may be that students with low resiliency may lack the persistence to find and benefit from a mentor.

To compensate for the lack of faculty and staff of color within our institutions of higher education (especially those that are out as LGBQ), LGBQ Students of Color might rely on their connections to peers for support and affirmation. From the research, we know that the harassment and violence endured by LGBTQ students are also disproportionately endured by LGBTQ Students of Color (Rankin et al., 2010). Under these stressful circumstances, it makes sense that LGBQ Students of Color would form strong connections to combat internalized oppression and isolation. These peer mentor relationships are also important considering the heterosexism latent within racial identity-based student organizations that might deter LGBQ students from accessing or feel comfortable within these organizations. Strong peer relationship would not, however, account for the variance in resiliency found in this study, since peer mentorship was also listed as a possible response category and incorporated into the results.

Another potential explanation for the variance in the resiliency, as well as the leadership efficacy of LGBQ Students of Color who have a mentor, may be attributed to the willingness, ability, and capacities of the mentors themselves. Out of the potential 4,294 respondents, 88.6% (*N*=3,806) reported that they had some sort of mentor. It is unclear if the mentors selected these students because of their demonstrated resiliency or if the mentors were catalysts for the development of resiliency. While causation and

causal direction cannot be confirmed by this study, a connection between mentorship and resiliency is nonetheless well established.

4b. Transgender students. This analysis yielded non-significant results. As noted in the results section, the sample size was insufficient to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 5

Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

5a. LGBQ students. As predicted, findings from this study suggest that White LGBQ students have higher leadership efficacy than LGBQ Students of Color. These findings contradict research that did not find within-group differences amongst LGB students (Dugan & Yurman, 2011), although the study did not disaggregate the data by race. White LGBQ students may have reported higher leadership efficacy for many of the same reasons listed above, including increased mentoring and greater involvement in LGBTQ student organizations, both of which have been located as potential predictors of leadership efficacy within this study. Another reason for the higher levels of the leadership efficacy of White LGBQ students are the opportunities of positional leadership, that are disproportionally accessed by White students, which has also been suggested as a predictor of leadership efficacy (Dugan, Kodama, et al., 2012). As

mentioned previously, White, gay, cisgender students have historically held positional leadership since their establishment (Beemyn, 2003b).

White students, regardless of their sexuality, are more likely to find affirmation and support on campus within predominantly White institutions. Again, the concept of internalized dominance, although outside the scope of this study, could be an important theoretical link when considering the self-reporting of high leadership efficacy by White students. Internalized dominance, coupled with an inaccurate appraisal of one's leadership abilities, may accompany an inflated sense of confidence from White LGBQ undergraduates. If students are entering college having historically been cultivated, perceived, and treated as leaders, these conceptions are echoed by a larger society that upholds Whiteness as the cultural barometer against which all else is gauged. This is again reified once they get to college by the overrepresentation of White leadership on college campuses. White normativity within LGBTQ organizations and mentor paradigms might allow for White students to feel an inherent ownership of the identify of "leader," regardless of their capacity or effectiveness as leaders. This outcome is explained by Bandura's (1994) concept of vicarious experiences because observing those similar to you engaging in something provides a source of self-efficacy. If White students hold positional leadership, and White staff and faculty members are also serving as advisors, then a cycle may be created that disproportionately benefits the self-efficacy of LGBQ White students who have access to those vicarious experiences more often than LGBQ Students of Color.

Conversely, LGBQ Students of Color might be reluctant to take on the identity of leader for its connection to Whiteness. If leadership is conceptualized as a way to exert dominance or even take authority of a task, then students, who have engaged in more collective models and collaborative familial relationships might be averse to the term leader. It is important to note that although White students reported moderately high confidence to engage in leadership behaviors, the means were fairly close; White LGBQ students had higher efficacy (*M*=3.074, *SD*=.706) than Students of Color (*M*=3.011, *SD*=.729).

Still, if Bandura (1994) positions verbal persuasion, psychological mood, and vicarious experiences as sources of self-efficacy, it is important to note that overall experiences of harassment and violence are disproportionately endured by queer and Transgender Students of Color (Rankin et al., 2010). Instead of positive verbal affirmations and in lieu of vicarious experiences of other LGBTQ leaders of color (due to lack of representation), LGBQ Students of Color remain hypervigilant to racial micro-aggressions and systemic violence. This may lead Students of Color to psychologically feel as though their leadership is not valued, or even feel like what feminist psychotherapist Pauline Clance coined as an "impostor syndrome." Impostor syndrome, "has been defined as an 'internal experience of intellectual phoniness' and a phenomenon of 'feeling like a fraud'" (Clance & Imes, 1978, p. 241). These feelings of insecurity around leadership could also be exacerbated by being a first-generation student, a woman within a predominantly male field, non-native English speaker, or those living at the intersections of those experiences.

These findings specifically do not take into account the within-group differences amongst LGBQ Students of Color, but are assessed within this study. In doing so, this study builds from the research that highlights within-group differences of LGBQ student communities (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008) and have found race as an important yet under-measured variable in leadership development theory (Arminio et al., 2000; Balon, 2005; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodoma & Dugan, 2013). Implications for future research will be addressed.

5b. Transgender students. This analysis yielded non-significant findings. As noted in the results section, the sample size was insufficient to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 6

Are there significant differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?

6a. LGBQ students. Contrary to prediction, the study found no significant differences in the resiliency of White LGBQ students and LGBQ Students of Color. It was surmised that, because of having to negotiate interlocking systems of oppression, that LGBTQ Students of Color would maintain higher resiliency than their White LGBQ peers. These findings are not congruent with previous research that suggests that, because of having to negotiate multiple levels of "minority stress," minority students have

cultivated higher decision making capacities and communication skills (Meyer, 2010;

Moradi et al., 2010). It is important to note that overall LGBQ students reported high

levels of resiliency (*M*=3.899, *SD*=.699). The non-significant findings may have greater

implications related to the cultivation of resiliency in the lives of LGBQ students. That is,

LGBQ students, regardless of race, are forced to develop high levels of resiliency.

Regardless of race or gender identity, LGBTQ students are tasked with traversing

discrimination and harassment, as well as peripherally-experienced or "felt stigma

(Herek, 2007, 2008; Herek et al., 2009)" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 205). Research has

suggested that these lived experiences help prepare LGBTQ individuals to cope with

adversity and may enhance communication and leadership skills (Abes et al., 2004;

Fassinger et al., 2010; Meyer, 2010; Moradi et al., 2010; Russell, 2005).

6b. Transgender students. Contrary to the hypothesis, findings from this study

suggest that there is a statistical difference in the resiliency amongst transgender students,

with White Transgender students have higher resiliency than Transgender Students of

Color. This finding adds to the literature highlighting the within-group differences of

transgender student communities (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012). One reason for the

variance in resiliency between White Transgender students and Transgender Students of

Color might be that, despite maintaining a transgender identity, students who are White

still operate within White privilege. This privilege helps them potentially access mentor

relationships and access LGBTQ student communities that maintain a long history of

upholding White supremacy and normativity.

Research Questions 7 & 8

Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations, or presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their white peers?

7a & 8a. LGBQ students. As predicted, findings from this study suggest that White LGBQ students are more likely to receive mentorship and be involved in LGBTQ student organizations than LGBQ Students of Color. These findings support the literature that demonstrates that LGBTQ students do not experience college uniformly (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008; Westbrook, 2009) and affirms the burgeoning scholarship that works to explicate the within-group difference of LGBTQ collegians by disaggregating their data by social identity (i.e., race, sexual identity, gender identity, etc.; Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Strayhorn et al., 2008). The findings of this study highlight the inequitable access to resources and support for LGBQ Students of Color.

These findings are particularly problematic considering the connections cited previously in this study between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and mentorship and their potentially positive influences on the leadership efficacy of LGBQ Students of Color. One of the reasons White LGBQ students are more heavily involved in LGBTQ student organizations have already been named in previous discussions, which is the overrepresentation of White leadership within LGBTQ student organizations and on campuses as a whole.

Previous research has suggested that peers can play a significant role in encouraging the participation of their peers in LGBTQ student organizations (Renn &

Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b; Sheets & Mohr, 2009). This then would create a cycle of participation, with White students recruiting other White students to join and even take on positional leadership roles within the group. This is an important consideration given previous research that identifies positional leadership in student organizations as a predictor of higher reports of leadership efficacy (Dugan, Kodama, et al., 2012; Kodama & Dugan, 2013). This cycle is further exacerbated considering the overrepresentation of White faculty, staff, peers, and community members within institutions of higher education, who also serve as prospective advisors and mentors.

7b & 8b. Transgender students. These analyses both yielded non-significant results. For each question, the sample size was insufficient to reach 80% power (Cohen, 1988), which is one of the possible reasons for non-significant findings. It is also possible that there were no differences to compare. Implications for future search and practice will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Research Question 9

Do resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?

As predicted, findings from this study suggest that there are within-group differences of LGBTQ undergraduates in regards to resiliency. Findings from this study depart from the scholarship that positions race as an important predictor of leadership efficacy and leadership development and a meaningful factor to study (Arminio et al., 2000; Balon, 2005; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodoma & Dugan, 2013) in that there were

no statistically significant differences found in regards to race and leadership efficacy. Previous research, however, did not further disaggregate their data by gender identity and sexual orientation, looking specifically at LGBTQ student communities. Overall, these findings align with research that suggests that LGBTQ students are more alike than different (Dugan & Yurman, 2011), demonstrating no statistical differences across race, gender, and sexual orientation in regards to leadership efficacy.

However, the findings of this study suggest that intersections of race, sexual orientation and gender identity played a role in the level of reported resiliency with White LGBQ cisgender men reporting the highest resiliency (*M*=3.993, *SD*= .020), higher than both White LGBQ cisgender women (*M*= 3.841, *SD*=.017) and their White LGBQ transgender peers (*M*=3.727, *SD*=.097). These findings are symptomatic of previous discussions on the impact that race has on the experiences and identity development of LGBTQ students but provides a greater nuance uplifting gender differences between cisgender men, cisgender women, and transgender identified students. Looking through an intersectional lens (Crenshaw, 1991), students living at the intersections of dominant group membership (i.e., White, Cisgender LGBQ Men) are in some ways oppressed within a heterosexist campus community; however, they still benefit from and reproduce the sexism and cissexism latent within the academy.

In juxtaposition to the previous findings yielded by this study suggesting that White LGBQ students access LGBTQ student organizations and report having a mentor more often than LGBQ Students of Color, it is not a huge leap to surmise that White, cisgender, LGBQ men disproportionately reap the benefits of those support networks.

These findings demonstrate that there is horizontal oppression to consider even within s

subgroup (Westbrook, 2009).

Conversely, Asian Americans in general were the lowest scoring racial group, with Asian-American cisgender men (M=3.730, SD=.061) and cisgender women (M=3.303, SD=.057) and Asian-American transgender students reporting the lowest levels of resiliency (M=2.147, SD=. 482). The literature on the leadership development and resiliency of Asian American students is scarce (Balon, 2005). The meaningfulness of these findings, however, is questionable because of the smaller sample size of Asian Americans (N=2). This is also true of other racial groups with smaller sample sizes, who also reported lower resiliency including LGBTQ Latino men (M=4.009, SD=.061), LGBTQ Latina women (M=3.959, SD=.062), transgender students (M=4.528, SD=.483), and a multiracial group of cisgender men (M=3.986, SD= .077), cisgender women (M=4.045, SD=.075), and transgender (M=2.992, SD=.091). These insignificant results might be because of the lower sample size of these racial groups.

This was the first time throughout this study, however, in which transgender students were specifically compared to cisgender students. These findings join Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) as one of the rare quantitative studies to explore within-group differences in the transgender population. Even within their own racial groups, transgender students reported lower resiliency than cisgender students. Transgender students appear to have similar feelings of resiliency across race, which can be attributed to shared experiences of marginalization and harassment (Beemyn, 2003a, 2005; Dugan,

Kusel, et al., 2012). Again, the sample size of transgender student populations plays a role in these statistical findings. Future implications for research will be addressed below.

It is important to note that although many of the tests exploring the leadership efficacy and resiliency of LGBQ students yielded statistically significant results, the small effect sizes of both the involvement in LGBTQ organizations, as well as the presence of a mentor, makes their significance questionable. For example, although the test examining leadership efficacy between LGBQ Students of Color and their White LGBQ peers were statistically significant, the means were very close (White LGBQ students M=3.074, SD=.706; Students of Color M=3.011, SD=.729), with an effect size of partial eta^2=.001. This would indicate that although statistically significant because of the high power from the large sample sizes, the effect of mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations is small and in some cases negligible, renders the true meaningfulness or practicality significance of these findings to be limited.

Limitations of the Study

There are challenges when attempting to capture the nuances of intersecting identities. There are two major limitations in the results of this study including the limited demographical categories of sexual identity and the limited power yielded by such a small sample size of Transgender Students of Color. Because this study involved secondary analysis of an existing data set, the researcher was constrained by the way that the original study delineated demographic categories. Dugan and Associates (2012) collected the sexual orientation of their participants by asking, "What is your sexual orientation?," with potential response categories being "Gay/Lesbian," "Bisexual,"

"Questioning," or "Rather not say." The way this information is gathered is problematic in that the sexual (and gender) identities of LGBTQ students and identities can be fluid and the language that students use to describe their identities is also constantly evolving (Jourian, 2015). For instance, students may identify as queer, asexual, pansexual, and demi-sexual when describing their sexual identities, and masculine-of-center (MOC), genderqueer, agender, transmen, and transwomen when describing their gender identity (Jourian, 2015). These evolutions were not reflected in the possible response categories and the limited options made available for students to report proved to be a major limitations identified within this study. This study would be bettered by having to myriad of ways that LGBTQ undergraduates identify as possible response categories. Another option would be to conduct a mixed method study that includes a qualitative component or fill-in option for participants to self-report their sexual orientation more accurately.

These challenges in capturing the nuance of LGBTQ identities may contribute to the lack of quantitative research available about the within-group differences amongst these student communities. This work is even more challenging and has greater implications for transgender students that often yield small sample sizes, making empirical findings hard to come by (Bowleg, 2008). These students whose "experiences, sexes assigned at birth, and current gender presentations appear similar, choose to define their gender identities differently from each other" (Jourian, 2014, p. 3). Collapsing all transgender students into one single demographic category presents an oversimplified and inaccurate portrayal of their collegiate experiences. Rather, the findings of this study

located within group differences between Transgender Students of Color and their White peers.

Although Dugan and Associates (2012) did yield the warning of Dugan and Yurman (2011) that cited the inappropriateness of collapsing lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students into a single category in quantitative research designs, the study still remained limited in that it only gave the options of "male," "female," or "transgender" for the question, "What is your gender?" Dugan and Associates (2012) did, however, provide a rare exploration of within-group differences of transgender students by disaggregating the data by trans-feminine and trans-masculine identities. Although improved, it is not an exhaustive list of gender identities and excluded genderqueer, non-binary, and agender students. Moreover, since queer was not an option of sexual orientation, this may limit the number of transgender students who do not identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning, limiting an already oversimplified population sample.

This is of course true of cisgender students who do not identify as LGBQ, which might account for the students who did not answer, or the 1,945 participants (31.2%) who chose "rather not say." As a result, those selecting "rather not say" as their response could not be utilized in analyses.

In terms of gender identity, the small number of transgender students meant that the analyses lacked sufficient power to detect differences that may have existed. Of the 4,294 students represented in this study, only 124 identified themselves as transgender and only 34 identified both as transgender and as Students of Color. This highlights the

challenge of quantitative research on transgender college students (Bowleg, 2008;

Jourian, 2014).

Lastly, other limitations identified within this study included the fact that although

the data are available as part of the MSL, this study did not explore the level, role

(faculty, staff, peer, community member, etc.), kinds of mentoring (target, matched

mentoring, informal, etc.), or frequency of interaction that may influence resiliency and

leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates. Implications for future research are

addressed below.

Significance of Study

Even with its limitations, this study addresses critical gaps in the literature

regarding the lives and experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates. At the time of the study,

no other published study had explicitly endeavored to assess the role that LGBTQ student

organizations and mentoring has on the leadership development and resiliency of

LGBTQ undergraduates. This study expanded upon the small body of existing knowledge

on the college experiences of LGBTQ students that disaggregated data by race, gender

identity, and sexual orientation, and explored the within-group differences of LGBTQ

student communities (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011; Goode-Cross

& Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008). To this end, this was successful in

its aim to move away from previous research that portrays LGBTQ undergraduates as

one monolithic group by centering the experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color. By

doing so, this study problematizes literature that inaccurately conflates the experiences of

LGBTQ students, and by doing so, defaults to dominant identities and epistemologies

(i.e., heteronormativity, homonormativity, cisgenderism, Whiteness). Amplifying the unique experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color also unearths the potential for LGBTQ student leaders and student affairs professionals to work to address the horizontal oppression within queer student communities and organizations and create more liberatory educational spaces. By employing an intersectional lens, researchers have the ability to identify where colleges and universities successfully support and affirm the lives of marginalized student communities, while identifying room for development.

Lastly, this study moves away from previous research on the experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates that was largely restricted to deficit models, rendering LGBTQ youth as solely "at risk," and adds value to the literature by providing quantitative support that LGBTQ organizations and mentorships were significant predictors of leadership efficacy and resiliency. By focusing on the resiliency and leadership efficacy, this study provides a more holistic understanding of how LGBTQ students traverse the undergraduate experiences and potential influences on leadership and persistence.

Implications for Future Research and Theory

The paucity of literature exploring the within-group differences of LGBTQ student communities, and unchecked disparities endured by queer and Transgender Students of Color, begs to be addressed through scholarship that centers the leadership and experiences of marginalized student communities. The findings of this study encourage a deeper exploration of how we conduct research about LGBTQ student communities, in general. The findings of this study suggest that LGBQ Students of Color have disparate experiences than their LGBQ White peers. Future research should work to

supplement the existing literature that examines the resiliency found at the intersections of multiple minority statuses (Meyer, 2010; Moradi et al., 2010), as well as the existing scholarship that explores how social identity impacts leadership efficacy, development, and involvement (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Kodama & Dugan, 2013). The findings of this study highlight the disproportionate involvement by White LGBQ students in LGBTQ student organizations, affirming the necessity of continued research on the within-group differences of LGBTQ student communities (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011), as well as scholarship that seeks to address the horizontal oppression within LGBTQ campus communities (Beemyn, 2005; Goode-Cross & Tager, 2011; Pusch, 2005; Strayhorn et al., 2008; Westbrook, 2009). However, studies that explicitly name or expound upon the potential impact of White supremacy, White normativity, and how institutional racism informs LGBTQ student organizations remains nascent within student affairs literature. Future research could engage in a deeper interrogation of the social capital and privileges that come with being White, even while maintaining minoritized identities (poor, disabled, queer, transgender, etc.) in the aspirations of revisiting LGBTQ identity development and addressing horizontal oppression. Again, the potential role, effectiveness, or positionality of the mentors cannot be deduced through this study; however, an investigation of how implicit biases held by prospective mentors may inform which students to invest in and to what extent is warranted. Conversely, internalized oppression is also a factor that was not included in the parameters of this study that could improve future research endeavors.

As highlighted in the discussion of this study, a theoretical foundation using intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991), social justice and anti-oppression, critical race theories could provide a holistic understanding of the leadership and experiences of sexual and gender minorities of color. It is recommended that future research continues to move away from compartmentalizing racial and sexual identities. These findings concur with literature that avows the disaggregation of data on LGBTQ communities by race, sexual orientation, and gender identity, and specifically uplifts within-group differences (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011, Kodama & Dugan, 2013). Disappointingly, the scant research that explores leadership efficacy among LGBTQ undergraduates does not disaggregate the findings by race and/or ethnicity, further perpetuating the erasure of the unique experiences of queer Students of Color (Kodama & Dugan, 2013; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). This shift is crucial, since

> organizations do not operate in an institutional or cultural vacuum, an analysis of white normativity, sexism, classism, transphobia, etc. in LGBTQ organizations must account for the ways the external norms produce rewards for organizations that have white normative cultures and, conversely, produce constraints for those organizations that attempt to operate outside of a cultural framework that is similar to whites. (Ward, 2008, p. 565)

Previously, researchers have encouraged a shift towards framing research on students through a queer, anti-racist, anti-oppression, intersectional lens (Abes & Kasch, 2007; Harr & Kane, 2008; Kumashiro, 2002). This study's recommendation is to endeavor to deepen this work by centering the experiences and leadership of historically marginalized students. By centering queer and trans Students of Color and building these important theoretical bridges, scholars will be more adept at explicating the ways that historically

marginalized students persist and how our institutions can learn from these student communities to address and eliminate systemic oppression. Furthermore, future research that identifies ways to foster community engagement and build on these important connections is imperative to what we know about how LGBTQ youth perceive themselves and their leadership and enact resiliency.

For example, the findings of this study suggest that social connectedness, especially in the form of mentorship, proves to positively inform the leadership efficacy and resiliency of LGBQ undergraduates. These findings are aligned with previous research that suggests that social connectedness allows LGBTQ youth to contextualize their own personal oppression within a longer history of LGBTQ resistance, take action against their own oppression, and subsequently enhance their own well-being (DiFulvio, 2011). Although mentor relationships are cited as beneficial, there remains a paucity of empirical research based on formal or even informal LGBTQ mentorship relationships (McAllister et al., 2009). Future research is necessary, as mentor programs on college campuses are setting the precedent for formal interactions between younger generations of queers and older, professional queer faculty and staff members. Queer role models are something that prior generations did not have access to. Programs that highlight the benefits of intergenerational community-building potentially maintain numerous positive outcomes and successes; however, the impact of these programs remains unclear because of lack of evaluation (Alford-Keating, 1998; McAlister et al., 2009). In order to adequately meet the needs of queer collegians, formal evaluations of queer mentor programs would have to be conducted so that better practices can be established. Such

literature would work to move away from literature that inevitably renders LGBTQ students as inevitably "at risk" and expounds on how students are sustained by constructing positive healthy relationships to themselves, mentors, peers, and others in their communities.

Moreover, although the data were made available through the MSL (Dugan & Associates, 2012), this study did not explore the level, role (faculty, staff, peer, community member, etc.), kinds of mentoring (target, matched mentoring, informal, etc.), or frequency of interaction with the mentor that may influence resiliency and leadership efficacy of LGBTQ undergraduates. Furthermore, research that extends the literature on the identities of the mentor themselves and the meaningfulness of LGBTQ target mentorship (Lark & Croteau, 1998; McAllister et al., 2009; Nauta et al., 2001) is necessary. Future research could create evaluations and work to assess what kind of mentorship, as well as extent of mentoring, is most beneficial to LGBQ undergraduates, especially those of color, if we are to retain the most marginalized student communities and harness the diversity required of authentic learning. Similarly, future research could endeavor to provide a deeper evaluation of kinds of LGBTQ organizations (support and discussion oriented, activist oriented, queer people of color specific, women specific), as well as the level of involvement and their impacts on leadership development and resiliency of LGBTQ students. This exploration could build on existing literature that highlights positive connections between positional leadership and leadership efficacy (Dugan, Kodama, et al., 2012; Kodama & Dugan, 2013).

Lastly, future researchers could explore the leadership and experiences of Native or Indigenous, Latino/a, Middle Eastern, Black, and Asian American LGBTQ students more intimately. There are challenges, however, that occur when attempting to capture the nuances of LGBTQ youth, especially when incorporating their intersecting identities. These challenges also informed the data analysis of this study. As mentioned previously, future research would have to build from the limited research that explores the within-group differences of LGBTQ student communities (Dugan, Kusel, et al., 2012; Dugan & Yurman, 2011). For example, Dugan, Kusel, et al. (2012) provided an important contribution to the literature by highlighting the heterogeneity of transgender and gender non-conforming undergraduates. In order to advance this scholarship, future researchers would have to find ways to garner larger sample sizes, or create alternative demographical categories to self-report, as this study offered only "transgender." Future research would have to address the myriad ways that queer and transgender (as well as asexual, pansexual, genderqueer, etc.) describe themselves, especially when considering within-group differences of transgender identities. These difficulties would most likely contribute to the lack of quantitative research available about the within-group differences amongst LGBTQ student communities and transgender students (Bowleg, 2008; Jourian, 2014). A mixed method study that includes a qualitative component or fill-in option would allow participants to more accurately self-report their sexual orientation and gender identity.

Implications for Practice

This study's findings provide further understanding into the experiences of LGBTQ undergraduates related to leadership efficacy and resiliency, as well as the within-group differences of queer student communities. This study's findings suggest that affirming and supportive spaces for LGBTQ students can positively influence leadership efficacy and resiliency of LGBTQ undergraduates. It is incumbent upon campus communities to provide a welcoming environment for all of their members. The results of the study suggest that mentorship and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations are potentially beneficial to the leadership efficacy of LGBQ students in general. However, this study also found that LGBTQ Students of Color have disparate experiences when working to access these support services. Overall, the study found that LGBTQ students report high resiliency and maintain high levels of leadership efficacy. What is particular noteworthy are the findings that highlight how, despite having less mentorship and potentially less access to LGBTQ student organizations, the LGBTQ Students of Color still report high leadership efficacy and high resiliency.

To meet the needs of underserved Students of Color, it is recommended that professionals in higher education must engage in a deep interrogation of the factors that negatively impact the college experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color, as well as those that work to bolster resiliency, leadership development, positive academic outcomes, and persistence towards graduation. Previous research has cited the important role that student affairs practitioners and educators play in the lives of LGBTQ students (Sanlo, 2004). The findings of this study suggest that it is imperative for student affairs

professionals (faculty and mentors) to be educated about the way they perpetuate institutional oppression and the ways it is enacted within LGBTQ student organizations and mentoring relationships and campuses as a whole (Jourian, 2014).

One way that student affairs practitioners can aspire to collaborate more effectively with LGBTQ Students of Color is to cultivate more culturally responsive programming. To support and inform these endeavors it is recommended that educators and advisors infuse an intersectional, anti-oppression analysis in doing the work with marginalized student communities. This recommendation is informed by the findings of this study and suggest that White LGBQ student leaders are disproportionately benefitting from being in these LGBTQ student organizations, maintaining an important network of connections. This trend is evident in that research practices, programming, and queer leadership development theory also has been based largely on the college experiences of White, cisgender LGBQ students (Cass, 1979, 1984; Fassinger, 1991; Savin-Williams, 1988, 1990).

In response to the greater visibility and power of privileged queer students within queer student organizations, "advocates of queer theory and queer politics have argued for a more intersectional approach to organizing, encouraging inclusion of members and issues in queer social movements, criticizing single issue movement organization, and supporting coalition-building among social movements" (Harr & Kane, 2008, p. 284). Literature has documented that "among queer students, those with less-privileged personal identifications in terms of race, class, gender and sexuality are more likely to support the utilization of queer politics within queer student organizations" (Harr &

Kane, 2008, p. 284). LGBTQ Students of Color often go without seeing themselves reflected in leadership, programming, policies, and curricula. An intersectional, anti-oppression, queered pedagogical approach would help to address institutionalized oppression and create the necessary changes needed to meet the needs of all of our students.

Moreover, Harr and Kane (2008) cite that the meaningful introduction of queer theory politics will have a positive shift in campus climate not just for the queer students, or the privileged students, but the campus as a whole. Recruiting, retaining and serving considerable numbers of less privileged students within their student bodies would work to increase recognition and utilization of queer politics within queer student organizations. Queer politics and intersectionality infused within the mission and curriculum of an organization could offer a heightened awareness of social issues and potentially incite action on the part of the more privileged students. Moreover, the employment of a queer intersectional lens within LGBTQ student organizations and mentor relationships, may help to mitigate horizontal oppression and retain LGBTQ students of color. Operating within a theoretical foundation that centers the intersections of power and privilege could also bring about more accountability from the student body, particularly the more privileged students. To this end, "queer politics is important to all student organizations, as well as to campus political climates more generally, for queer politics aids in the dismantling of privilege" (Harr & Kane, 2008, p. 297). Student affairs practitioners must work to engage in the work holistically and uplift the various needs and strengths of LGBTQ Students of Color and invest in building intersectional analysis

to inform their practices, policies, and programming. By moving away from compartmentalizing racial and sexual identities and single-issue programming, LGBT student organizations can harness the power of difference and address the power dynamics within the organizations. Again, this would also mean working to build collaboratively across campus to infuse intersectional and social justice issues and analysis. This would work to engage in not just the sexual and gender identity development processes of LGBTQ Students of Color, but also their personal, academic, and career development.

Lastly, previous research offered insights around what centralizing sexual identity politics within our leadership development efforts could mean on college campuses (Fassinger et al., 2010; Renn & Bilodeau, 2005a, 2005b) especially in the attempts for students to employ all of their creativity and coping strategies and enact their fullest selves more of the time. Through these processes, students have the potential to be more connected to themselves, their histories as queer people, and their peers and community members, providing points of strength, unity, and the ability to enact resiliency. As mentioned previously, literature suggests that it is rampant discrimination that LGBT communities face that propels students to emerge from those lived-experiences and those peripherally experienced or "felt stigma (Herek, 2007, 2008; Herek et al., 2009)" (Fassinger et al., 2010, p. 205), with aforementioned protective factors already intact, and with them positive coping skills such as community building, enhanced meaning-making capacities, communication, and critical thinking skills.

Future practice with LGBTQ students needs to move away "from a view of queer students as survivors of victimization, [and] instead educators can help foster hopeful relationships in which they can helps students define themselves in positive terms of what they value" (Abes & Kasch, 2007, p. 634). Our jobs as educators and practitioners then becomes to empower and to draw out characteristics of resiliency and develop the leadership skills that our students already possess. Abes and Kasch (2007) emphasized the need for a shift in approach of the student affairs practitioners' role when working with queer students from being one of service provider to that of facilitator or mentor. However subtle this shift may seem, it can serve as a powerful and empowering framework that honors the ways that LGBTQ communities have sustained themselves when larger systems (medical, government, higher education, etc.) have not met their needs by developing their own practices of care and cultivating their own liberatory spaces.

It is imperative that practitioners extend this theoretical framework into program planning and invest in programming that employs strategies and practices of care already being employed by queer and trans communities. The findings of this study suggest that there is a positive relationship between mentorship, resiliency, and leadership efficacy. As mentioned previously, although mentor relationships could prove to be a powerful resource for LGBTQ students, not all students have access to or seek out these kinds of connections. Social connections, like those fostered by involvement in mentor programs and LGBTQ student organizations,

allows one to reach beyond the self, take action against his/her own oppression and situates the gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender youth within a larger sociohistorical context shifting their personal experiences of oppression into a larger collective struggle . . . facilitate collective resistance and personal agency, which in turn may contribute to overall wellbeing. (DiFulvio, 2011, pp. 1616–1617)

Considering the findings of this study suggest that White LGBTQ students are significantly more likely to receive mentoring than are their peers of color, coupled with the possibility of a lack of affirming, competent, and available mentors, new models of mentoring could be embraced as a solution to this problem. This study recommends that certain models of mentorship (networks, group-mentoring, mentor collectives, co-mentoring, etc.) may work to provide more culturally responsive alternatives to traditional, dyadic technical mentoring (Van Puymbroeck, 2001). These networks or collective-based mentorship programs could prove to be powerful strategies to reduce horizontal oppression and center the epistemologies and practices of care of communities of color. Considering the findings of this study suggest that White LGBTQ students are significantly more likely to receive mentoring than are their peers of color, traditional dyadic mentoring could perpetuate these disparate experiences and an insufficient remedy to systemic oppression within colleges and universities.

This recommendation is aligned with the literature describing how these broader, more flexible networks of support, which are non-hierarchical, position all participants as having vital information and "know-how" necessary for the group's success. Moreover, mentoring networks, collaborative mentoring, and co-mentor models have been favored in the literature because they provide underserved student populations with an

opportunity to increase social capital and the support necessary to persist in higher education (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Girves et al., 2005; Lark & Croteau, 1998; Van Puymbroeck, 2001). These community-based models could also help increase the mutual aid amongst students as well as faculty and staff and foster support needed to combat systemic oppression. The potential collaborations between participants and increased visibility could work to cultivate a more transformative learning community. These mentoring paradigms are engaged from a social justice perspective that demands for a certain level of agency to be demonstrated by all members in a learning community and also de-centers White, patriarchal ways of knowing while exalting other epistemologies and otherwise subjugated knowledges (Freire, 1997; hooks, 1994).

This kind of programming seeks to acknowledge the "risk" and violence that our students face, but builds from a structure that embodies antiracism, anti-oppression, and a queer lens that works to promote community-building, intergenerational dialogue, and self-care that is imperative to the continued success of all of our students, of all orientations, capacities, and genders. This premise also has larger implications, not just for culturally responsive program planning, but also a call for more participatory program evaluative methods, interdisciplinary research, and theoretical frameworks that are conducted from a critical, strengths-based perspective. Additionally, as the students of the millennial generation continue to make their way into college it is important that student affairs practitioners acknowledge their inclination towards technology, social networking, and an overall reputation for being peer-oriented when program planning (Balda & Mora, 2011).

It is necessary that mentor programs are developed keeping in mind the capacity of LGBTQ faculty and staff who are also having to traverse "cool" campus climates, while juggling mentoring responsibilities and intense workloads. Moreover, at a time when budgets are eroding and universities are challenged to meet the needs of more students with less resources and more students are forced to balance the struggles of working and having to go to school at the same time, college administrators and student personnel are all going to have to pay attention to programs that highlight networks and resource sharing as highlighted in newly emerging mentor programs and student success programs. As mentioned previously, these programs could prove to be more culturally responsive and effective than more traditional technical models of mentorship within higher education, especially in seeking to meet the needs of historically marginalized student populations.

Conclusion

Colleges and universities currently exist in a time of incredible social change. And as always, colleges and universities have worked to combat, but also reproduce social injustices. The recent mobilization and increased visibility of LGBTQ Students of Color leadership on college campuses mirrors current intersectional movements also led by queer and trans activists of color (e.g., #BlackLivesMatter, #NotOneMore, #FightFor15). These concurrent realities have major implications for campus life and beyond. The results of this study provide insights about the meaningfulness of cultivating and centering the leadership of LGBTQ Students of Color, in the aspirations of harnessing the power of difference, and addressing interlocking systems of oppression in

ourselves, our relationships, organizations, and communities. Future research expanding on these findings will assist in helping to create campuses equipped to do the hard work of creating spaces where students bring their fullest selves, and within them the power to learn how to transform themselves and the world.

REFERENCES

Abes, E. S. (2008). Applying queer theory in practice with college students: Transformation of a researcher's and participant's perspectives on identity, a case study. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(1), 57–77.

Abes, E., Jones, S., & McEwen, M. K. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6), 612–632. Retrieved from http://multipleidentitieslgbtq.wiki.westga.edu/file/view/Abes_multipleID.pdf

Abes, E. S., & Kasch, D. (2007). Using queer theory to explore lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6).

Alexander, C. J. (1999). Mentoring for gay and lesbian youth. *Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 10*(2), 89–92.

Alford-Keating, P. (1998, March). UCLA offers gay, lesbian, bi and transgender mentoring program. *Lesbian News*, p. 16.

Anderson, D. W., Krajewski, H. T., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (2008). A leadership self-efficacy taxonomy and its relation to effective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(5), 595-608.

Ansara, Y. G. (2012). Cisgenderism in medical settings: How collaborative partnerships can challenge structural violence. In I. Rivers & R. Ward (Eds.), *Out of the ordinary: LGBT lives* (pp. 102–122). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Anhalt, K., Morris, T. L., Scotti, J. R., & Cohen, S. H. (2003). Student perspectives on training in gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues: A survey of behavioral clinical psychology programs. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *10*(3), 255-263.

Arminio, J. L., Carter, S., Jones, S. E., Kruger, K., Lucas, N., Washington, J., . . . Scott, A. (2000). Leadership experiences of students of color. *NASPA Journal*, *37*(3), 496–510.

Astin, A. W. (1998). The changing American college student: Thirty-year trends, 1966-1996. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(2), 115–135.

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., Bayer, A. E., & Bisconti, A. S. (1975). *The power of protest.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Balda, J. B., & Mora, F. (2011). Adapting leadership theory and practice for the networked, millennial generation. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(3), 13–24. doi:10.1002/jls.20229

Balón, D. G. (2005, April 26). *Asian Pacific American college students on leadership: Culturally marginalized from the leader role?* Retrieved from the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators website at https://www.naspa.org/constituent-groups/kcs/asian-pacific-islanders/resources

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-Efficacy. In V. S. Remachadruan (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 74–81). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Beemyn, B. (2003a). Serving the needs of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *1*(1), 33.

Beemyn, B. (2003b). The silence is broken: A history of the first lesbian, gay, and bisexual college student groups. *Journal of the History of Sexuality, 12*(2), 205–223.

Beemyn, B. (2005). Making campuses more inclusive of transgender students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 77.

Beemyn, G. (2012). The experiences and needs of transgender community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *36*(7), 504-510.

Beemyn, G., & Rankin, S. (2011). Introduction to the Special Issue on "LGBTQ Campus Experiences." *Journal of homosexuality*, *58*(9), 1159–1164.

Beemyn, B., Curtis, B., Davis, M., & Tubbs, N. J. (2005). Transgender issues on college campuses. *New directions for student services*, *111*, 49–60.

Bieschke, K. J., Eberz, A. B., & Wilson, D. (2000). Empirical investigations of lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students. In V. A. Wall & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Toward acceptance: Sexual orientation issues on campus* (pp. 29–60). UPA.

Black, D., Gates, G., Sanders, S., & Taylor, L. (2000). Demographics of the gay and lesbian population in the United States: Evidence from available systematic data sources. *Demography, 37*(2), 139–154.

Blackburn, M. V. (2004). Understanding agency beyond school-sanctioned activities. *Theory into Practice, 43*(2), 102–110.

Boice, R. (1993). New faculty involvement for women and minorities. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(3), 291.

Bound, J., & Turner, S. (2002). Going to war and going to college: Did World War II and the GI Bill increase educational attainment for returning veterans? *Journal of Labor Economics, 20*(4), 784–815.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59*(5/6), 312–325.

Boykin, K. (1996). *One more river to cross: Black and gay in America*. Anchor.

Brittian, A., Sy, S., & Stokes, J. (2009). Mentoring: Implications for African American College Students. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 33*(2), 87–97.

Broido, E. M. (2004). Understanding diversity in millennial students. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2004*(106), 73–85.

Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E., & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 134–160.

Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (2007). Overcoming resistance: The importance of leadership style. In B. Kellerman & D. L. Rhode (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 127–148). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Carpenter, C. S. (2009). Sexual orientation and outcomes in college. *Economics of Education Review, 28*(6), 693–703.

Carragher, D. J., & Rivers, I. (2002). Trying to hide: A cross-national study of growing

    up for non-identified gay and bisexual male youth. *Clinical Child Psychology and*

    Psychiatry, 7(3), 457–474.

Carter, B. A. (2013). "Nothing better or worse than being black, gay, and in the band": A

    qualitative examination of gay undergraduates participating in historically black

    college or university marching bands. *Journal of Research in Music Education*,

    61(1), 26–43.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexuality identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of*

    Homosexuality, 4(3), 219–235.

Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity: A concept in need of definition. *Journal of*

    Homosexuality, 9(2-3), 105–126.

Crass, C. (2013). Towards collective liberation: Anti-racist organizing, feminist praxis,

    and movement building strategy. Pm Press.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.).

    Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). Background: Evolving priorities and expectations

    of the community college. *The American Community College*, 1–37.

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*,

    1(3), 98–101.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Clance, P. R., & Imes, S. A. (1978). The imposter phenomenon in high achieving

women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. *Psychotherapy: Theory,*

Research & Practice, 15(3), 241.

Combahee River Collective. (n.d.). *The Combahee River Collective statement.* Retrieved

from http://circuitous.org/scraps/combahee.html

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and

violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 1241–1299.

Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the

literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(6), 525–545.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.

Psychometrika, 16(3), 297–334.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development 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 context* (pp. 312–333).

San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

D'Augelli, A. R. (2002). Mental health problems among lesbian, gay, and bisexual

youths ages 14 to 21. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *7*(3), 433-456.

Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate

researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(4), 549–574.

De Janasz, S., & Sullivan S. (2002). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the

professional network. *Academy of Management Proceedings & Membership*

Directory, C1–C6.

DiFulvio, G. T. (2011). Sexual minority youth, social connection and resilience: From

    personal struggle to collective identity. *Social Science & Medicine, 72*(10), 1611–

    1617.

Dilley, P. (2002). *Queer man on campus: A history of non-heterosexual college men,*

    1945–2000. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Dilley, P. (2005). Which way out? A typology of non-heterosexual male collegiate

    identities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(1), 56–88.

Dilley, P. (2010). New century, new identities: Building on a typology of

    nonheterosexual college men. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 7*(3), 186–199.

Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of

    the mentoring experience of recently minted Ph.Ds. *Journal of Black Studies,*

    34(1), 12–27.

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and*

    futures of the community college. SUNY Press.

Dugan, J. P., & Associates. (2012). *Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership 2012:*

    Institutional reports. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership

    Programs.

Dugan, J. P., Fath, K. Q., Howes, S. D., Lavelle, K. D., & Polanin, J. (2013). Developing

    the leadership capacity and leader efficacy of college women in science,

    technology, engineering, and math fields. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 6–

    23. doi:10.1002/jls.21292

Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C. M., & Gebhardt, M. C. (2012). Race and leadership

    development among college students: The additive value of collective racial

    esteem. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 5*(3), 174.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college*

    students: Findings from a national study. A report from the Multi-Institutional

    Study of Leadership. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership

    Programs. Retrieved from https://nclp.umd.edu/include/pdfs/mslreport-final.pdf

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2011). Influences on college students' capacities for

    socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(2),

    525–549.

Dugan, J. P., Kusel, M. L., & Simounet, D. M. (2012). Transgender college students: An

    exploratory study of perceptions, engagement, and educational outcomes. *Journal*

    of College Student Development, 53(5), 719–736. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.2008

Dugan, J. P., & Yurman, L. (2011). Commonalities and differences among lesbian, gay,

    and bisexual college students: Considerations for research and practice. *Journal of*

    College Student Development, 52(2), 201–216.

Evans, N. J., Wall, V. A., & Bourassa, D. (1994). *How student affairs programs can*

    assist gay, lesbian & bisexual graduate students. Unpublished manuscript.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (1999). Coming out in college residence halls: Negotiation,

    meaning making, challenges, supports. *Journal of College Student Development*,

    40(6), 658–668.

Fassinger, R., Shullman, S., & Stevenson, M. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 201–215.

Fassinger, R. E. (1991). The hidden minority issues and challenges in working with lesbian women and gay men. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19*(2), 157–176.

Faul, F., & Erdfelder, E. (1992). *GPOWER: A priori, post-hoc, and compromise power analyses for MS-DOS* [Computer program]. Bonn, FRG: Bonn University, Department of Psychology.

Ferguson, A. D., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (1999). Addressing issues of multiple identities for women of color on college campuses. In V. A. Wall & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Toward Acceptance: Sexual Orientation Issues on Campus* (pp. 283–297). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Freire, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire* (Vol. 60). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed/Paulo Freire; translated by Myra Bergman Ramos; with an introduction by Donald Macedo.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Garmezy, N., & Masten, A. S. (1991). The protective role of competence indicators in children at risk: Perspectives on stress and coping. In E. M. Cummings, A. L. Greene, & K. H. Karraker (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 151–174). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Garvey, J. C., Taylor, J. L., & Rankin, S. (2015). An examination of campus climate for LGBTQ community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 39*(6), 527–541.

Geiger, R. L. (2014). *The history of American higher education: Learning and culture from the founding to World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gilbert, L. A., & Rossman, K. M. (1992). Gender and the mentoring process for women: Implications for professional development. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23*(3), 233–238.

Girves, J., Zepeda, Y., & Gwathmey, J. (2005). Mentoring in a post-affirmative action world. *The Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 449–479.

Goode-Cross, D. T., & Tager, D. (2011). Negotiating multiple identities: How African-American gay and bisexual men persist at a predominantly White institution. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*(9), 1235–1254.

Gordon Nembhard, J. (2014). *Collective courage: A history of African American cooperative economic thought and practice*. University Park, PA: Penn State Press.

Grant, J. M., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J. L., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey.* Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Haas, A. P., Eliason, M., Mays, V. M., Mathy, R. M., Cochran, S. D., D'Augelli, A. R., . . . Russell, S. T. (2010). Suicide and suicide risk in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and

transgender populations: review and recommendations. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*(1), 10–51.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 669–692.

Harper, S. R., & Gasman, M. (2008). Consequences of conservatism: Black male undergraduates and the politics of historically Black colleges and universities. *The Journal of Negro Education, 77*(4), 336–351.

Harr, B. E., & Kane, E. W. (2008). Intersectionality and queer student support for queer politics. *Race, Gender & Class, 15*(3/4), 283–299.

Harley, D. A., Nowak, T. M., Gassaway, L. J., & Savage, T. A. (2002). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students with disabilities: A look at multiple cultural minorities. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(5), 525–538.

Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*(4), 905–925.

Herek, G. M. (2009). Sexual stigma and sexual prejudice in the United States: A conceptual framework. In D. A. Hope (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities* (pp. 65–111). New York, NY: Springer.

Hershberger, S. L., Pilkington, N. W., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1997). Predictors of suicide attempts among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*(4), 477–497.

Hill-Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hill-Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hines, S. (2007). Transgendering care: Practices of care within transgender communities. *Critical Social Policy, 27*(4), 462–486.

hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Outlaw culture: Resisting representations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ivory, B. T. (2012). Little known, much needed: Addressing the cocurricular needs of LGBTQ students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(7), 482-493.

Johnson, W. (n.d.). *On being a mentor: a guide for higher education faculty.* Retrieved from University of North Carolina at Greensboro Library Catalog database.

Jones, S. R. (2009). Constructing identities at the intersections: An autoethnographic exploration of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(3), 287–304.

Jourian, T. J. (2014). Trans* forming authentic leadership: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis, 2*(2), 8.

Jourian, T. J. (2015). Evolving nature of sexual orientation and gender identity. *New Directions for Student Services, 152,* 11–23. doi:10.1002/ss.20142

Kadison, R., & DiGeronimo, T. F. (2004). *College of the overwhelmed: The campus mental health crisis and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55–69.

Kimmel, D. C. (1978). Adult development and aging: A gay perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 34,* 113–130.

Kodama, C. M., & Dugan, J. P. (2013). Leveraging leadership efficacy for college students: Disaggregating data to examine unique predictors by race. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 46*(2), 184–201.

Komives, S. R., & Dugan, J. P. (2010). Contemporary leadership theories. *Political and Civic Leadership: A Reference Handbook*, *1*, 111–120.

Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., & Segar, T. C. (2006). The multi-institutional study of leadership: Understanding the project. *Concepts & Connections, 15*(1), 5–7.

Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(6), 593–611.

Komives, S. R., Casper, J. O., Longerbeam, S., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2003). *Leadership identity development model: A grounded theory.* In American College Personnel Association Annual Conference, Minneapolis, MN.

Komives, S. R., Casper, J. O., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F., & Osteen, L. (2004). Leadership identity development. Concepts and Connections, 12(3), 1-6.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2006). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 608–625.

Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organization life.* Gleview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 110–132.

Kumashiro, K. (2001). *Troubling intersections of race and sexuality: Queer Students of Color and anti-oppressive education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and antioppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lark, J. S., & Croteau, J. M. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual doctoral students' mentoring relationships with faculty in counseling psychology: A qualitative study. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(5), 754–776.

Leider, S. J. (2012). LGBTQ people on community college campuses: A 20-year review. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(7), 471–474.

Liang, C. T., Lee, S., & Ting, M. P. (2002). Developing Asian American leaders. *New Directions for Student Services, 2002*(97), 81–90.

Lodziak, C., & Tatman, J. (1997). *André Gorz: A critical introduction.* Chicago, IL: Pluto
Press.

Longerbeam, S. D., Inkelas, K. K., Johnson, D. R., & Lee, Z. S. (2007). Lesbian, gay, and
bisexual college student experiences: An exploratory study. *Journal of College
Student Development, 48*(2), 215–230.

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. (1995). *Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and
renewed* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3). Washington, DC: The
George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human
Development. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED399889.pdf

Mallory, S. L. (1998). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student organizations: An
overview. *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students:
A handbook for faculty and administrators*, 321–328.

Margolis, E. (Ed.). (2001). *The hidden curriculum in higher education*. New York, NY:
Routledge.

Martinez, K. Y., Ostick, D. T., Komives, S. R., & Dugan, J. P. (2006). Lesbian, gay, and
bisexual leadership and self-efficacy: Findings from the multi-institutional study
of leadership. *Concepts and Connections*, *15*, 10-12.

Massey, S., Cameron, A., Ouellette, S., & Fine, M. (1998). Qualitative approaches to the
study of thriving: What can be learned? *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(2), 337–355.

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American
Psychologist, 56,* 227–238.

Masten, A. S. (2011). Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity: Frameworks for research, practice, and translational synergy. *Development and Psychopathology, 23,* 141–154.

Masten, A. S., Best, K. M., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development and Psychopathology, 2,* 425–444.

McAllister, C., Harold, R., Ahmedani, B., & Cramer, E. (2009). Targeted mentoring: Evaluation of a Program. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(1), 89.

McCormick, M. J., Tanguma, J., & López-Forment, A. S. (2002). Extending self-efficacy theory to leadership: A review and empirical test. *Journal of Leadership Education, 1*(2), 34–49.

McKinney, J. S. (2005). On the margins: A study of the experiences of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 63–76.

Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 36*(1), 38–56.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. Psychological bulletin, 129(5), 674.

Meyer, I. H. (2010). Identity, stress, and resilience in lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals of color. *Counseling Psychologist, 38*(3), 442.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association American Colleges and Universities.

Miller-Dyce, C. M. (2009). *Social capital as village network: rethinking the nature of parental involvement in the precollege preparation of African American students*. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Moe, J., Dupuy, P., & Laux, J. (2008). The relationship between LGBQ identity development and hope, optimism, and life engagement. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 2*(3), 199–215.

Montas-Hunter, S. S. (2012). Self-efficacy and Latina leaders in higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 11*(4), 315–335.

Moradi, B., Wiseman, M., DeBlaere, C., Goodman, M., Sarkees, A., Brewster, M., & Huang, Y.-P. (2010). LGB of color and white individuals' perceptions of heterosexist stigma, internalized homophobia, and outness: Comparisons of levels and links. *Counseling Psychologist, 38*(3), 397–424. doi:10.1177/0011000009335263

Mullen, C. (2005) *Mentorship.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Nakamura, K. (1998). Transitioning on campus: A case studies approach. *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators*, 179–186.

Nauta, M. M., Saucier, A. M., & Woodard, L. E. (2001). Interpersonal influences on students' academic and career decisions: The impact of sexual orientation. *The Career Development Quarterly, 49*(4), 352–362.

Ortiz-Walters, R., & Gilson, L. L. (2005). Mentoring in academia: An examination of the experiences of protégés of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67,* 459–475.

Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 876–896.

Ottenritter, N. (2012). Crafting a caring and inclusive environment for LGBTQ community college students, faculty, and staff. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(7), 531–538.

Owens, R. E. (1998). *Queer kids: The challenges and promise for lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patitu, C. L., & Terrell, M. C. (1997). Participant perceptions of the NASPA Minority Undergraduate Fellows Program. *NASPA Journal, 17*(1), 69–80.

Patton, L. D., & Harper, S. R. (2003). Mentoring relationships among African American women in graduate and professional schools. *New Directions for Student Services, 2003*(104), 67–78. doi:10.1002/ss.108

Porter, J. D. (1998). *The contribution of gay and lesbian identity development to transformational leadership self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Information & Learning).

Poynter, K. J., & Washington, J. (2005). Multiple identities: Creating community on campus for LGBT students. *New Directions for Student Services, 2005*(111), 41–47.

Pusch, R. (2005). Objects of curiosity: Transgender college students' perceptions of the reactions of others. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 45–61.

Rankin, S., Weber, G. N., Blumenfeld, W. J., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender people*. Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride.

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

Rankin, S. R. (2004). Campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. *The Diversity Factor, 12*(1), 18–23.

Rankin, S. R. (2005). Campus climates for sexual minorities. *New Directions for Student Services, 2005*(111), 17-23. Retrieved from https://www.gvsu.edu/cms4/asset/ 5D80BD51-996D-6AE0-B9D7668ADFEA7A31/ally_handouts_article_campus_ climate_sexual_minorities_rankin_2005.pdf

Rankin, S. R. (2006). LGBTQA students on campus: Is higher education making the grade? *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(2/3), 111–117.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How Students of Color and White students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(1), 43–61.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2008). Transformational Tapestry Model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(4), 262.

Ray, N. (2006). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth: An epidemic of homelessness.* New York, NY: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute and the National Coalition for the Homeless. Retrieved from http://www.thetaskforce.org/static_html/downloads/HomelessYouth.pdf

Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2008). *An introduction to applied multivariate analysis*. Routledge.

Reason, R. D., & Rankin, S. R. (2006). College students' experiences and perceptions of harassment on campus: An exploration of gender differences. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(1), 7.

Reed, E., Prado, G., Matsumoto, A., & Amaro, H. (2010). Alcohol and drug use and related consequences among gay, lesbian and bisexual college students: Role of experiencing violence, feeling safe on campus, and perceived stress. *Addictive behaviors, 35*(2), 168–171.

Remafedi, G., Farrow, J. A., & Deisher, R. W. (1991). Risk factors for attempted suicide in gay and bisexual youth. *Pediatrics*, *87*(6), 869-875.

Renn, K. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(3), 311–330.

Renn, K. (2010). LGBT and Queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher, 39*(2), 132–141.

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. (2003, November). *Coming out as a leader: The development of leadership identity among lesbian, gay, bisexual, & transgender students.* Paper presented at the ASHE Annual Meeting, Portland, OR. Retrieved from https://msu.edu/~renn/Coming%20Out%20as%20Leader.htm

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. L. (2005a). Leadership identity development among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders. *NASPA Journal, 42*(5), 342–367.

Renn, K. A., & Bilodeau, B. L. (2005b). Queer student leaders: An exploratory case study of identity development and LGBT student involvement at a Midwestern research university. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 2*(4), 49.

Renn, K., & Ozaki, C. (2010). Psychosocial and leadership identities among leaders of identity-based campus organizations. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(1), 14–26. doi:10.1037/a0018564

Rey, A. M. (1997). Beyond high school: Heterosexuals' self-reported anti-gay/lesbian behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 7*(4), 65–84.

Reynolds, A. L., & Pope, R. L. (1991). The complexities of diversity: Exploring multiple oppressions. *Journal of Counseling and development, 70*(1), 174–180.

Rhoads, R. (1994). Coming out in college: The struggle for a queer identity. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). A subcultural study of gay and bisexual college males: Resisting developmental inclinations. *Journal of Higher Education, 68,* 460–482.

Rhode, D. L., & Kellerman, B. (2007). Women and leadership: The state of play. In B. Kellerman & D. L. Rhode (Eds.), *Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change* (pp. 1–62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Hunter, J., & Rosario, M. (1994). Suicidal behavior and gay-related stress among gay and bisexual male adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 9*(4), 498–508.

Russell, S. T. (2003). Sexual minority youth and suicide risk. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(9), 1241–1257.

Russell, S. T. (2005). Beyond risk: Resilience in the lives of sexual minority youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 2*(3), 5–18.

Russell, S. T., Driscoll, A. K., & Truong, N. (2002). Adolescent same-sex romantic attractions and relationships: Implications for substance use and abuse. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(2), 198–202.

Russell, S. T., & Joyner, K. (2001). Adolescent sexual orientation and suicide risk: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(8), 1276–1281.

Saddler, T. (2010). Mentoring and African American undergraduate' perceptions of academic success. In T. Strayhorn & M. Terrell (Eds.), *The evolving challenges of*

black college students: New insights for policy, practice, and research (1st ed., pp. 179-198). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Sanlo, R. L. (Ed.). (1998). *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Sanlo, R. L. (2004). Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual College Students: Risk, resiliency, and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 6*(1), 97–110.

Sanlo, R. L., & Espinoza, L. (2012). Risk and retention: Are LGBTQ students staying in your community college? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(7), 475–481.

Sanders, G., & Kroll, I. (2000). Generating Stories of Resilience: Helping Gay and Lesbian Youth and Their Families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 26*(4), 433–442.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1988). Theoretical perspectives accounting for adolescent homosexuality. *Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 9*(2), 95–104.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (1990). *Gay and lesbian youth: Expressions of identity*. New York, NY: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (2001). Suicide attempts among sexual-minority youths: population and measurement issues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69*(6), 983.

Schneider, S. G., Farberow, N. L., & Kruks, G. N. (1989). Suicidal behavior in adolescent and young adult gay men. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 19*(4), 381–394.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2005). Competence perceptions and academic functioning. *Handbook of competence and motivation, 85,* 104.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation at School* (pp. 35–53). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. R., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Scott, D. (1991). Working with gay and lesbian student organizations. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 117–130). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Shannon, H. D., & Smith, R. C. (2006). A case for the community college's open access mission. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2006*(136), 15–21.

Sheets, R., & Mohr, J. (2009). Perceived social support from friends and family and psychosocial functioning in bisexual young adult college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 152–163.

Sherrill, J. M., & Hardesty, C. (1994). *The gay, lesbian, and bisexual students' guide to colleges, universities, and graduate schools*. NYU Press.

Singh, A., & Chun, K. Y. S. (2010). "From the margins to the center": Moving towards a resilience-based model of supervision for queer people of color supervisors. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4*(1), 36.

Smith, A. (2007). Social-justice activism in the academic industrial complex. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, 23*(2), 140–145.

Stevens, Jr., R. A. (2004). Understanding gay identity development within the college environment. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 185–206.

Strayhorn, T. L., Blakewood, A. M., & DeVita, J. M. (2008). Factors affecting the college choice of African American gay male undergraduates: Implications for retention. *National Association of Student Affairs Professionals Journal, 11*(1), 88–108.

Strayhorn, T. L., & Saddler, T. N. (2009). Gender differences in the influence of faculty-student mentoring relationships on satisfaction with college among African Americans. *Journal of African American Studies, 13*(4), 476–493.

Sutton, E. M., & Terrell, M. C. (1997, Winter). Identifying and developing leadership opportunities for African American men. *New Directions for Student Services, 1997*(80), 55–64.

Swerdlik, M., & Barton, J. (1988). A survey of mentoring experience in school psychology. *Journal Social Psychology, 26*(3), 213–224

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving vollege: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of educational research, 45*(1), 89–125.

Van Puymbroeck, C. M. (2001) *The Mentoring Web: A model to increase retention of lesbian, gay, bisexual undergraduates.* College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Wall, V. A., & Evans, N. J. (Eds.). (1999). *Toward Acceptance: Sexual Orientation Issues on Campus*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Ward, J. (2008). White normativity: The cultural dimensions of whiteness in a racially diverse LGBT organization. *Sociological Perspectives, 51*(3), 563–586. doi:10.1525/sop.2008.51.3.563

Wenar, C., & Kerig, P. K. (2000). *Developmental psychopathology: From infancy through adolescence* (4th ed.) New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wernick, L. J., Woodford, M. R., & Kulick, A. (2014). LGBTQQ youth using participatory action research and theater to effect change: Moving adult decision-makers to create youth-centered change. *Journal of Community Practice, 22*(1-2), 47–66.

Westbrook, L. (2009). Where the women aren't: Gender differences in the use of LGBT resources on college campuses. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 6*(4), 369–394. doi:10.1080/19361650903295769

Westefeld, J. S., Maples, M. R., Buford, B., & Taylor, S. (2001). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual college students: The relationship between sexual orientation and

depression, loneliness, and suicide. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 15*(3), 71–82.

Weston, K. (1991). *Families we choose: Gay and lesbian kinship.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Wexler, L. M., DiFluvio, G., & Burke, T. K. (2009). Resilience and marginalized youth: Making a case for personal and collective meaning-making as part of resilience research in public health. *Social Science & Medicine, 69*(4), 565–570.

Williams-Nickelson, C. (2009). Mentoring women graduate students: A model for professional psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 284–291. doi:10.1037/a0012450

Wolff, J. R., & Himes, H. L. (2010). Purposeful exclusion of sexual minority youth in Christian higher education: The implications of discrimination. *Christian Higher Education, 9*(5), 439–460.

Woodford, M. R., & Kulick, A. (2015). Academic and social integration on campus among sexual minority students: The impacts of psychological and experiential campus climate. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 55*(1-2), 13–24.

Yost, M. R., & Gilmore, S. (2011). Assessing LGBTQ campus climate and creating change. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*(9), 1330–1354.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF ANALYSES BY RESEARCH QUESTION

Research Question	Data Source/ Scale	Analysis	Reason for Test
1: Is there a relationship between involvement in LGBTQ student organizations and the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?	Leadership Efficacy Scale Dependent Variable (DV)=Leadership Efficacy Involvement (IV)= Involvement in LGBTQ Student Organizations	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error
2: Does the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color differ based on involvement in LGBTQ organizations?	Resiliency Scale DV=Resiliency IV=Involvement in LGBTQ student organizations	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error
3. Does the presence of a mentor increase the leadership efficacy of LGBTQ Students of Color?	Leadership Efficacy Scale DV=Leadership Efficacy IV=Presence of a Mentor (No/Yes)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error

Research Question	Data Source/ Scale	Analysis	Reason for Test
4. Does the presence of a mentor increase the resiliency of LGBTQ Students of Color?	Resiliency Scale DV=Resiliency IV= Presence of a Mentor (Yes/No)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error
5. Does leadership efficacy vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?	Leadership Efficacy Scale DV=Leadership Efficacy IV=Race (1=White, 2=Students of Color)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error
6. Are there differences in level of resiliency between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?	Resiliency Scale DV=Resiliency IV=Race (1=White, 2= Students of Color).	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)	To reduce the risk of Type 1 Error
7. Does involvement in LGBTQ student organizations vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?	The relationship between the race of LGBQ students and involvement in LGBTQ student organizations.	chi-squared test of independence	To determine if there is a significant relationship between two nominal (categorical) variables.

Research Question	Data Source/ Scale	Analysis	Reason for Test
8. Does the presence of a mentor vary significantly between LGBTQ Students of Color and their White peers?	Resiliency Scale DV=Resiliency The relationship between the race of LGBQ students and the presence of a mentor	chi-squared test of independence	To determine if there is a significant relationship between two nominal (categorical) variables.
9: Does resiliency and leadership efficacy vary based on gender identity, sexual orientation, and race? Is there an interaction effect with gender identity, sexual orientation, and race?	Resiliency Scale, Leadership Efficacy Scale DV=Resiliency& Leadership Efficacy IV=Race, Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation	Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA)	To examine pairwise comparisons/intersectional within-group differences