Purpose

To examine gender variant students’ involvement in high-impact practices (HIPs)

To examine relationships between participation in HIPs and student-faculty interaction for gender variant students

Language Clarification

• Gender variant students
  • Students who do not identify as either cisgender man or woman
• Write-in responses
• References to previous scholarship

Conceptual Framework

• This study is framed through NSSE’s 10 high-impact practices (Kuh, 2001)
• We operate with the premise that student engagement in high-impact practices leads to increased student success (Kuh, 2009)

Literature Review

• High-Impact Practices across gender identity
• Student-faculty interactions across gender identity
• More research needed for gender variant students

Methods

1. How does participation in HIPs vary for gender variant students?
2. How do student characteristics, institutional region, and student-faculty interaction relate to HIP participation for gender variant students?
Data & Sample

- 2014 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
  - Measures the time and energy that students invest in activities known to relate to student learning and development
  - 710 four-year colleges and universities in the US and Canada; over 470,000 respondents
- 376,076 first-years and seniors at 692 institutions who responded to the survey question about gender identity
  - 64% women, 35% men, 2% prefer not to respond, 1096 students selected “Another gender identity”

“Another gender identity”

- Genderqueer
- Nonbinary
- Gender fluid
- Fluid
- Polygender
- Agender
- Gender neutral
- Transgender
- Trans
- FTM
- MTF
- Androgynous
- Androgyne
- Bi-gender
- Nonconforming
- Two spirit
- Third gender
- Pangender

Senior Major

Measures

- Gender identity
- Student-faculty interaction (talk about career plans; work on activities other than coursework; discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts outside of class; discuss academic performance)
- Number of high-impact practices
- Student-level controls: age, grades, major field, racial/ethnic identification, living situation, first-generation status
- Institution-level control: region

Analyses

- Used a series of OLS regression equations
  - Parallel HLM analyses yielded parallel results
  - Significance at $p < .001$
- First-years and seniors analyzed separately
- Dependent measure: number of HIPs
- Controls: age, grades, major field, racial/ethnic identification, living situation, first-generation status, institutional region
- RQ1 independent measure: gender identity (man, woman, I prefer not to respond; gender variant as reference)
- RQ2 independent measure: SFI. Models were only run for gender variant students
Results: How does participation in HIPs vary for gender variant students?

First-Years
- Compared to gender variant students, there are no differences in HIP participation for
  - Men
  - Women
  - Prefer not to respond

Seniors
- Women participate in slightly more HIPS ($\beta=.059$, $p<.001$)

Results: How do student characteristics, institutional region, and SFI relate to HIP participation for gender variant students?

First-Years
- For gender variant students,
  - Only Student-Faculty Interaction ($\beta=.344$, $p<.001$) was a positive predictor of increased HIP participation

Seniors
- For gender variant students,
  - Student-Faculty Interaction ($\beta=.382$, $p<.001$) was a positive predictor of increased HIP participation
  - Living on campus was as well ($\beta=.173$, $p<.001$)

Discussion: SFI
- Significant relationship between student-faculty interaction and participation in high-impact practices for gender variant students
- Faculty relationships with students still reflect a pervasive normative environment that favors genderism

Discussion: Engagement
- Little difference in high-impact participation by gender identity
- Trans* and gender non-conforming students are still participating in as many high-impact educational experiences as their peers

Discussion: Living on Campus
- Gender variant students who live on campus participate in more high-impact practices
- Benefits of residential living for trans* and gender non-conforming students may outweigh the gendered and discriminatory climate for residence life

Implications: Practice
- Warmer climates
  - Co-curricular environments
  - Classroom climates
- Student-faculty interaction
  - Training and education opportunities
- Policy
  - Inclusive campus policies
Implications: Research

- Advocacy through research
  - Include different gender identities in data sets
  - Outcome-based research
- We encourage a continued emphasis on gender variant students across all facets of higher education to facilitate success for students with different gender identities

Final thoughts and questions?
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Sample Descriptives

First-Year
- 6% Asian, Nat. HI, PI
- 6% Black/African Am.
- 6% Hispanic/Latino
- 43% White
- 7% Other
- 16% Canadian White
- 13% Canadian non-White
- 58% living on campus
- 42% first-generation
- 89% <21 years old

Senior
- 5% Asian, Nat. HI, PI
- 6% Black/African Am.
- 6% Hispanic/Latino
- 51% White
- 7% Other
- 13% Canadian White
- 18% Canadian non-White
- 16% living on campus
- 45% first-generation
- 72% <25 years old

High-Impact Practices

First-Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall NSSE</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Variant</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall NSSE</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Variant</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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