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Abstract

This study investigated the correlates of two measures that capture students’ perception of the campus climate. It focuses on the role of religious identity and attending a religiously affiliated institution to assess how these factors influence students’ perception of the respect for their beliefs and comfort in expressing their views on campus. The results indicate few differences by religious identity in students’ perception of the respect for their beliefs, but significant differences by religion in their comfort in expressing their views. Additionally, attending a religiously-affiliated institution was positively associated with students’ comfort in expressing their beliefs.
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**Introduction**

Discriminatory incidents against religious minorities have become increasingly common at American college campuses. Students from various faith traditions have been victims of these incidents, but Jewish and Muslim students are particularly vulnerable to being a target of one these incidents (Bishop, 2015; Dreid, 2016; Siddiqi, 2016). While much scholarly attention is devoted to understanding the campus climate for racial and ethnic minorities and women (Hurtado & Harper, 2007; Mayhew et al., 2016), research on how religion influences campus climate perceptions is relatively rare. Understanding how religion influences the campus climate is important due to the voluminous research indicating that a negative campus climate can inhibit students’ learning and development (Mayhew et al., 2016). While the scarcity of research in this realm may be due to a lack of data on students’ religion in many of the most prominent higher education data sources, the gap of research in this area is notable as religion is an important factor in the identity of young, college-aged adults (Furrow, King, & White, 2004; King, 2003). In this study, we utilized a multi-institutional sample to investigate the correlates of students’ perception of the religious and spiritual aspects of the campus climate. In a previous study (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017), we found that roughly one in four students experience religious intolerance at least once in the past year and that the religious and spirituality dimensions of the campus climate accounted for a substantial and unique portion of students’ perceptions of the overall campus climate.

Numerous scholars have detailed how student background characteristics (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age) influence both the student experience and their perceptions of college (Hurtado & Harper, 2007; Mayhew et al. 2016). This work has become increasingly important due to the diversification of the college student population from one that
was predominately young, white, and male to the current environment that features substantially higher enrollment and participation from historically underrepresented populations.

Of particular interest to this study is the religious and spiritual experiences of students. Colleges today serve students from a variety of faith traditions, including an increasingly greater share of students who are atheist or agnostic (Pew Research Center, 2015). However, many students continue to be interested and involved in religious and spiritual activities and exhibit high levels of religious commitment (Higher Education Research Institute [HERI], 2004, 2005). Existing research indicates that religion is important to college students and influences their well-being (Bowman & Small, 2012). Additionally, perceptions of the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate have been demonstrated to be an important factor in how students perceive the overall campus climate (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017). Yet, until recently, religion and spirituality have largely been overlooked in the campus climate literature.

**Literature Review**

Greater attention has been placed on how religion and spirituality influence undergraduates. A frequent topic of attention by scholars is students’ spiritual growth (Bowman & Small 2010, 2012, 2013; Cole & Ahmadi, 2010; Paredes-Collins, 2014; Small & Bowman, 2011). Others have examined how religion influences engagement in spirituality activities and how spirituality integration influences persistence at religiously-affiliated institutions (Gonyea & Kuh, 2006; Morris, Smith, & Cejda, 2003; Patten & Rice, 2009; Speers, 2008). In recent years, scholars have started to pay attention to the role of religion and spirituality play in students’ perceptions of the campus climate (Bowman & Toms Smedley, 2013; Mayhew, Bowman, & Rockenbach, 2014; Rockenbach & Mayhew, 2014; Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Bowman, 2015).
The emerging campus climate research is derived from data from the Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey (CRSCS) which “assess[es] dimensions of campus climate pertaining to religious and worldview pluralism” (Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Bowman, 2015, p. 182). Rockenbach and Mayhew (2014) found that religious minority students were more satisfied with the spirituality campus climate than religious majority students. Additionally, their results demonstrated that structural worldview diversity, the psychological climate, and engagement in various activities were predictive of satisfaction with the spirituality campus climate; however, these relationships did not vary by religion. Additionally, they found differences in satisfaction with the spirituality campus climate by race as Asian and African Americans were less satisfied than Whites, holding constant other factors.

In a subsequent study, atheists were found to perceive a negative campus climate for non-religious students (Rockenbach, Mayhew, & Bowman, 2015). However, students’ commitment to their worldview was positively correlated to perceptions of a positive campus climate for non-religious students. The authors explain these disparate findings by pointing to previous research suggesting that many Christians feel unwelcome on campus (Magolda & Gross, 2009; Moran, 2007). Therefore, Christians may conversely feel that non-religious students are more accepted by their campuses than members of their own faith.

A study by Fosnacht and Broderick (2017) examined the role of the religious and spirituality dimensions of the campus climate contributions to students’ perception of the overall campus climate. They found that roughly one in four undergraduates experienced religious intolerance at some time in the past year. Their multivariate results indicated that two measures of the campus climate related to religion and spirituality accounted for approximately 15% of the variance in students’ perception of their quality of interactions and their institution’s support for
their education after holding constant other variables. Additionally, after accounting for students’ perception of the respect for and comfort in expressing their religious beliefs, few differences on the study’s overall campus climate measures were observed by religion. This relationship suggests that the relationship between the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate and the overall campus climate are mediated or moderated by students’ religion.

It is important that any study of the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate should be informed by the history of U.S. higher education. Christianity, particularly its protestant branches, had a substantial influence on the development of the American higher education system (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1962). The original colonial colleges were created to “uphold orthodox Puritanism” and religion was a critical factor in their creation (Geiger, 2015, p. 1). The missions of the first colleges focused on educating ministers and the political elite (Geiger, 2015). This legacy can commonly be seen through the inclusion of chapels on many campuses and architecture inspired by religious buildings. Additionally, Christian churches devoted to serving students occupy prominent locations immediately on- or off-campus at many institutions. Students who identify as Christians also comprise over half of the “traditional” aged college student body (Pew Research Center, 2015).

Due to these factors, Christian privilege is an important concept in the study of the religious aspects of the campus climate. Christian privilege is “the conscious and subconscious advantages often afforded to the Christian faith in America’s colleges and universities” (Seifert, 2007, p. 11). This form of privilege is embedded into a range of higher education structures from the academic calendar to food offerings in a cafeteria to the physical buildings on a campus (Bowman & Toms Smedley, 2013; Seifert, 2007). These embedded structures may alienate students with views outside of the dominant institutional culture. While other forms of privilege
like racial, gender, and heterosexual have been extensively studied among college students, less focus has been placed on the role Christian privilege influences higher education outcomes. Consequently, in this study, we investigate the correlates of two factors components of the religious and spiritual campus climate and pay particular attention to the role of religion and institution type.

**Theoretical Framework**

Our study adapted Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, and Allen’s (1999) campus climate framework to incorporate religious diversity as a guiding theoretical framework. The original framework focuses on racial and ethnic diversity and can be used as a guide to improve the campus climate for racial minority students. It focuses on identifying and delimiting the various factors that shape students’ perceptions of the campus climate. The four factors are: the historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and behavioral dimensions. While this conceptual framework was formed from research on racial/ethnic diversity, the applicability for religious minority students is evident.

The psychological climate and behavioral dimension of Hurtado and colleagues’ (1999) framework were the primary focus of our study. They identified the psychological dimension as related to the individual’s thoughts about various groups, along with perceptions of group and individual discrimination. The psychological dimension is influential, as it guides how individuals perceive the campus, its actors, and their role within campus structures. The behavioral dimension focuses on interactions between and among individuals from different backgrounds and the relationships between affinity groups. The importance of the behavioral dimension stems from the critical role engagement in educationally beneficial activities in-
outside of the classroom play in students’ learning and development (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991; McCormick, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2013) and persistence decisions (Tinto, 1987). Hurtado and colleagues (1999) theoretical framework provides an important framework to better understand the religious and spiritual climate of today’s college campus.

**Research Questions**

Guided by Hurtado and colleague’s (1999) campus climate framework, we investigated the following research questions:

1. How does students’ religion relate to their perception of the spirituality campus climate?
2. How does attending a religiously-affiliated institution relate to students’ perception of the spirituality campus climate?
3. Does the relationship between perceptions of the spirituality campus climate and religion vary by attending a religiously-affiliated institution?

**Methods**

**Data**

To answer these research questions, we utilized data from the 2016 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE is administered annually to first-year and senior students attending bachelor’s-granting institutions in the U.S. and Canada. It focuses on various aspects of the college experience ranging from time use to participation in effective educational practices to perceptions of the campus climate. In 2016, students attending a subset of institutions received questions on the religious and spirituality campus climate, in addition to the main NSSE questions. Institutions were randomly assigned to receive the supplemental questions from a pool of institutions that elected not to append two additional item sets (modules
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or consortia) to NSSE. We focused our data analyses on 6,670 senior students attending 38 U.S. institutions who received these additional questions. The response rate for the sample was 21%.

The institutions selected to receive the additionally questions on the religious and spirituality campus climate were relatively diverse. Roughly 40% of the sample attended an institution with a Basic 2015 Carnegie Classification (aggregated) of doctoral, 40% master’s, and 20% bachelor’s. Six in ten of the students attended a public institution and 25% attended a Christian-affiliated institution (no non-Christian, religiously-affiliated institutions were included in our sample). About half of the respondents attended an institution with an undergraduate enrollment of less than 5,000 students, while about 40% attended an institution with an undergraduate enrollment greater than 10,000.

Sixty-one percent of the sample was Christian, 6% were members of a non-Christian, world faith, 22% were unaffiliated with a formal religion, and 11% preferred not to disclose their religious preference (see below for more details on how religions were classified). About two-thirds of the sample was female, and half of the respondents were first-generation college students. One in ten students were members of a fraternity or sorority. Half of the students transferred from another institution, and about 80% of the respondents were enrolled full-time.

Our data were primarily collected via the core NSSE instrument and the supplemental items focusing on aspects of the religious and spirituality campus climate. Our dependent variables, Respect for Beliefs and Expression of Beliefs, were factors identified from the supplemental item set. The psychological dimension in Hurtado and colleagues’ framework was reflected in the “Respect for Beliefs” factor as the study explored the respondents’ perceptions of religious and spiritual diversity and included items like “the students at my institution are respectful of people of different religious or spiritual beliefs” and “instructors at my institution
are respectful of people of different religious or spiritual beliefs.” The behavioral dimension of
the framework was engaged in the “Expression of Beliefs” factor. This factor engages the
experiences of individuals on campus and the interactions between differing groups of people
and included items like “I feel comfortable expressing my religious or spiritual identity on
campus” and “I feel comfortable discussing my religious or spiritual beliefs during class.” The
Cronbach’s alpha for these variables were .87 and .81, respectively. Details on the psychometric
properties and creation of these variables are available in Fosnacht and Broderick (2017). The
same study demonstrated that these two measures account for a substantial and unique
proportion in the variance of students’ perceptions of the overall campus climate. Both variables
were standardized to have a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1. We also utilized data on
students’ religious preferences from the supplemental items. Students were able to choose from
28 religious/spirituality choices that we collapsed into four groups: Christian, non-Christian
world faith, unaffiliated, and prefer not to respond. Both the options on the original survey and
the collapsed variable utilized the classification created by the Pew Research Center (2015) for
its Religious Landscape Study.

In addition to the data from the supplemental item set, we used data on students’ sex, on-
campus residency, Greek-life affiliation, age, race/ethnicity, first-generation status, educational
aspirations, transfer status, grades, major field, and enrollment intensity. These variables were
primarily obtained from the demographics portion of NSSE, although some data elements were
provided by institutions. We also utilized data on the characteristics of the students’ institutions.
Data on the religious affiliation of the institution were obtained from the Integrated
Postsecondary Education Data System (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Data on
institutional control (public vs. private), Basic 2015 Carnegie Classification, and undergraduate
enrollment were obtained from the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (n.d.). Data on institutional selectivity utilized Barron’s Educational Series (2012) ratings.

**Analyses**

To answer our first two research questions, we estimated ordinary least squares regression models that predicted our dependent variables, respect for beliefs and expression of beliefs. These models included the student and institutional characteristics described above. To answer our third research question about if the relationship between perception of the religious/spirituality campus climate and attending a religiously-affiliated institution varies by religion, we added interaction terms between religiously-affiliated institution and students’ religion to our models. To aid in the interpretation of the interaction effects, we calculated the predicted estimates for the four religion categories by religious affiliation holding other characteristics constant using the margins command in Stata. As the dependent variables were standardized, the estimates showed the difference from the average student and allowed us to statistically compare the groups to the sample average. We also compared the expected means within a religion by institution type using Wald tests. For all of our regression models, we utilized robust standard errors that accounted for the nesting of students within institutions.

**Limitations**

Our study is subject to a handful of limitations. First, our analyses only focused on senior students at bachelor’s-granting colleges. The results may differ for students at community colleges or students with a lower academic standing. Second, our data is comprised of students who were randomly sampled within institutions choosing to participate in NSSE. Consequently, our sample may be subject to some degree of self-selection bias, although at the institution level. Third, our data was mostly self-reported by students and could be prone to self-reporting error.
Fourth, our results are correlational, not causal, as we were not able to randomly assign students to a particular institution. Finally, to achieve adequate statistical power, we aggregated students into four religious groups. While the assignment was based off of prior work by the Pew Research Center (2015), there is considerable diversity within these four groups and the results may not be consistent for all of the faiths within these groups.

Results

To answer our research questions, we estimated two separate regression models for dependent variables: respect for beliefs and expression of beliefs. The results from these models are displayed in Table 1 and will be discussed by dependent variable. Unless otherwise noted, the results described refer to Model 1, which did not contain interaction terms between religion and religiously-affiliated institution.

Respect for Beliefs

After holding constant other factors, students who preferred not to respond to the religion question perceived less respect for their beliefs than Christian students. International students perceived a greater respect for their religious/spirituality beliefs than White students. Students who earned grades lower than As reported less respect for their beliefs than their peers with A grades. Students majoring in the health professions perceived more respect for their beliefs than social science majors. Coefficients for the other variables in Model 1 were not significant at $p < .05$.

Table 2 contains the predicted levels of students’ respect for beliefs by religion and religiously-affiliated institution derived from the Model 2 estimates, when all other variables were held at their mean. As the dependent variable was standardized, the estimates in the first two columns contain the estimated mean for students of a particular faith by institution type. The
third column compares the estimate within a faith group by institution type. Among students at non-sectarian institutions, students who preferred not to provide their religious identity reported less respect for their religious beliefs on campus than the average student. No significant differences were observed between the means for the average student and each of the four religious/worldview groups, as our dependent variable was standardized with a mean of 0. Among students attending a religiously-affiliated institution, Christians perceived a greater respect for their faith views than the average student. The magnitude of the difference was .18 SDs. In contrast, students who preferred not to provide their religion perceived less respect for their faith views than the typical student. The effect size of this difference was nearly a quarter SD. The predicted values for members of a non-Christian, world faith and the unaffiliated were not significantly different from 0. When comparing the estimates within a faith by institution type, Christians who attended religiously-affiliated institutions perceived a greater respect for their beliefs than their peers at non-sectarian institutions. The estimates for the other faith groups were not significantly different by institution type.

**Expression of Beliefs**

Students who were members of a non-Christian, world faith, unaffiliated with a religion, or preferred not to provide their religious identity indicated that they were less comfortable expressing their religious and/or spirituality views than Christian students, after controlling for other factors. The magnitude of these differences were roughly a quarter SD for members of a non-Christian world faith or the unaffiliated and a third of a SD for those who preferred not to respond. African American and international students were more likely to be comfortable expressing their religious views than White students. Grades were negatively correlated with expression of beliefs. Students majoring in the biological sciences and engineering were less
comfortable expressing their beliefs than social science majors. However, the catch-all “all other” major category was more likely to feel comfortable expressing their beliefs than social science majors. Students enrolled full-time felt more comfortable expressing their beliefs than part-time students. Undergraduate enrollment size was negatively correlated with expression of beliefs. Students attending a religiously-affiliated institution were more likely to score higher on our expression of beliefs measure than students enrolled at non-sectarian institutions.

Coefficients for the other variables in Model 1 were not significant at $p < .05$.

The results from Model 2 indicate that the potential influence of attending a religiously-affiliated institution on expression of beliefs varies by religion. Table 3 contains the predicted level of expression of beliefs by religion and religiously-affiliated institution attendance using the coefficient estimates from Model 2 and holding all other covariates at their mean. Table 3 is formatted in the same manner as Table 2. As the expression of beliefs variable was standardized with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1, the predicted levels indicate the standardized degree of difference from the average student. Among students at non-sectarian institutions, Christians were not significantly different from the average student on our expression of beliefs measure. In contrast, the estimates for non-Christian, world faith, the unaffiliated, and prefer not to respond groups were significantly lower than the typical student. For students attending religiously-affiliated institutions, Christians were substantially more likely to feel comfortable expressing their religious views than the average students. Members of a non-Christian world faith at a religiously-affiliated institution approximated the average student on the expression of beliefs measure. Members of the unaffiliated and prefer not to respond groups had lower than average means on the expression of belief measure; however, the difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$. When comparing students within a religion by institution type, Christians
were more likely to feel comfortable expressing their religious or spiritual views at religiously-affiliated institutions. The magnitude of the difference was substantial at nearly .60 SDs. The differences between the other religion groups by institution type were not significant. However, it should be noted that, on average, students of these minority faith groups felt more comfortable expressing their views at religiously-affiliated institutions, although the difference was not statistically significant.

**Discussion**

Over the past few years, discriminatory incidents against religious minority students have become too common (e.g., Bishop, 2015; Dreid, 2016; Siddiqi, 2016). These incidents can lead to a perception of a hostile campus climate for religious minority students, which in turn can negatively influence students’ learning and development, arguably the chief function of a college education. Most research focusing on the campus climate has examined the experiences of racial/ethnic minorities or women, largely overlooking how religion and spiritual views influence perceptions of the campus climate. While this lack of attention on religion and spirituality may be due to a lack of data on religious identity in many of the higher profile education datasets, the oversight is nonetheless concerning due to the importance of religion in students’ identity development (Furrow, King, & White, 2004; King, 2003).

In response to this lack of research, we developed and appended a set of survey questions that inquire about the religious and spirituality aspects of the campus climate to a large, multi-institutional study. A prior study utilizing this data demonstrated that the religious and spiritual dimensions of students’ perceptions of the campus climate account for a substantial amount of the variation of students’ view of the overall campus climate (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017). The present study examined the correlates of two measures focusing on the religious and spiritual
dimensions of the campus climate: respect for beliefs and expression of beliefs. Additionally, it paid particular attention to the role of religion and attending a religiously-affiliated institution.

The study’s results found little difference by religion on the respect for beliefs measure, after holding constant other characteristics. The exception was for students who prefer not to respond, which scored roughly a quarter SD lower on this measure than Christians. Additionally, we found no significant relationship for attending a religiously-affiliated institution on our respect for beliefs measure. The results differed for expression of beliefs. Non-Christians reported less comfort in expressing their beliefs, holding constant other factors. The magnitude of the difference ranged from .23 SDs to .45 SDs for those who identified as non-Christian, world faith and those who selected the prefer not to respond the religion identification item, respectively. Additionally, students enrolled at religiously-affiliated institutions felt comfortable expressing their religious and/or spirituality beliefs on campus.

We further investigated these relationships by examining if the relationship between our dependent variables and religion differed between students who attended religiously-affiliated and non-sectarian institutions. Our results indicated that Christians felt a greater level of respect for their religious and spirituality views and felt more comfortable expressing their views at religiously affiliated institutions than Christians at non-sectarian institutions, holding constant other factors. Our results did not indicate significant differences in their expression of beliefs between students of minority faith views who did and did not attend non-sectarian institutions. However, the results for this construct did not differ from the overall average student for students attending a religiously-affiliated institution. In contrast, the relationship for students attending non-sectarian institutions were lower and significantly different from the average student.
Unfortunately, we are unable to identify the causal reason for these differences. However, we suspect that that religiously-affiliated institutions require students of all faiths to complete course(s) on religion that incorporate dialogue on different faith traditions. We speculate that these courses function like intergroup dialogue courses or experiences, which have been shown to promote relationships between individuals from different backgrounds and knowledge of students’ biases (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2007).

In addition to these main findings, our models indicate that other characteristics are associated with our religious and spirituality campus climate measures. International student status was positively correlated with both respect for and expression of beliefs. A possible rationale for this correlation is that international students emigrated from nations without protections for religious minorities. African Americans felt more comfortable expressing their views compared to Whites, holding other factors constant. This difference may be caused by the central role religion plays in the African American experience (Taylor, Chatters, & Levin, 2003). Students majoring in the health professions perceived more respect for their beliefs than social science majors. However, students in the biological sciences and engineering felt less comfortable expressing their beliefs than social science majors. While it is difficult to interpret these relationships, we suspect that biological science majors from faith traditions that reject evolution may feel uncomfortable expressing their religious views due to the conflict between their faith views and disciplinary teaching. Engineering has long been associated with conservatism (Astin, 1993) and students in this discipline may feel uncomfortable discussing their views with more liberal students. Part-time students felt less comfortable expressing their beliefs, which we suspect is related to the lower levels of integration into the campus community.
compared to full-time students. Finally, students at larger institutions felt less comfort with expressing their faith views than students at institutions with lower enrollments.

**Implications and Future Research**

This study follows-up on a previous study that investigated how the religious and spirituality dimensions of the campus climate influence students’ perceptions of the overall campus climate (Fosnacht & Broderick, 2017). The previous study found that the spirituality dimensions accounted for a unique and substantial proportion of the variance of two measures of the campus climate. This study dug deeper into the data and examined the correlates of two campus climate measures focusing on religion and spirituality. It also focused both on the main effects and interactions between students’ religion and attending a religious institution. We found that Christians, non-Christian members of a world faith, and students unaffiliated with a religion perceived similar levels of respect for their beliefs. However, members of a minority faith group felt less comfortable expressing their spirituality beliefs. We also found that attending a religiously-affiliated institution was positively correlated with our expression of beliefs measure. We also discovered that the relationship between religion and expression of beliefs varied by institution type (religious affiliation). Attending a religiously-affiliated institution strongly influenced Christians’ comfort with expressing their beliefs; however, the strength of this relationship diminished for members of minority faith groups.

We suspect that the relationship between comfort in expressing your beliefs and attendance at a religious institution is caused by curriculum requirements mandating student take courses on religion at religiously-affiliated institutions. It is possible that these courses perform a similar function to intergroup dialogue courses and programs, which have been demonstrated to promote cross-cultural competence and empathy towards different students (Zúñiga et al., 2007).
However, our results also suggest that if religion courses are the causal mechanism behind the impact of attending a religiously-affiliated institution, these courses may benefit students with majority faith views more than members of minority religions. Consequently, it may be more beneficial if they include more content on religious diversity.

While legal restraints prevent the mandatory courses on religion at public institutions, we speculate that intergroup dialogue courses or programs could help promote religious tolerance among the student body, which may prevent the frequency that students experience discriminatory actions related to their religion or faith views. Consequently, the implementation or expansion of intergroup dialogue courses or programs, which have already demonstrate their efficacy in improving race relations, maybe a primary strategy to prevent incidences of religion-based discriminatory incidents on college campuses.

Compared to the campus climate literature on race and gender, the existing literature on the religious aspects of the campus climate is relatively sparse leaving ample opportunities for future research. Researchers should evaluate the efficacy of intergroup dialogue courses or programs on promoting religious tolerance. Additionally, future research focusing on the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate should utilize large samples that will allow for the further disaggregation of students by religion. While previous campus climate literature focusing on race and gender indicates that a negative perception of the campus climate results in less learning and development (Mayhew et al., 2016), this finding has not yet been empirically tested in respect to the religious and spiritual dimensions of the campus climate.

**Conclusion**

Incidents of religious intolerance and discrimination have become too common on our nation’s campuses. In this study, we examined the correlates of students’ perceptions of the
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religious and spirituality campus culture using a diverse, multi-institutional sample. We found relatively little difference in whether students believed that students, faculty, and staff at their institution respected their beliefs by religion. However, members of minority faith groups felt less comfortable expressing their beliefs than Christians. Additionally, the results show that minority faith groups felt more comfortable expressing their beliefs at religiously-affiliated institution, despite that all of the institutions were affiliated with a Christian denomination.

Further research should focus on how institutions of all types can promote religious tolerance and inclusion.
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### Table 1. Predictors of Respect for Beliefs and Expression of Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respect for Beliefs</th>
<th>Expression of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (Ref: Christian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World faith</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus resident</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek-life member</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (10 years)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity (Ref: White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isl.</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/o</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational aspirations (Ref: Bachelor's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/professional</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer student</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades (Ref: Mostly As)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Bs</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Cs or lower</td>
<td>-0.24***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major field (Ref: Social Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Prof.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respect for Beliefs</th>
<th>Expression of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institution</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 2015 Carnegie Classification (aggregated; Ref: Doctoral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron's rating</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Enrollment (1,000s)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiously affiliated</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. inst.*Religion (Ref: Christian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World faith</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ | .03   | .03   | .11   | .12   

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Table 2: Predicted Values of Respect for Beliefs by Religion and Religiously-Affiliated Institution Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-sectarian</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18 *</td>
<td>-0.18 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World faith</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>-0.17 **</td>
<td>-0.24 *</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Note: The first two columns compare the predicted means to the average student. The third column compares the predicted means by institution type within a faith group. All other covariates held at their mean.
Table 3.  
*Predicted Values of Expression of Beliefs by Religion and Religiously-Affiliated Institution Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-sectarian</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.57 ***</td>
<td>-0.59 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World faith</td>
<td>-0.15 *</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>-0.21 ***</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>-0.38 ***</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Note: The first two columns compare the predicted means to the average student. The third column compares the predicted means by institution type within a faith group. All other covariates held at their mean.