

Copyright

by

Nicholas Daniel Phelps

2017

The Dissertation Committee for Nicholas Daniel Phelps
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Concealed Campus Carry and the Academic Freedom of LGBTQ+

Faculty:

A Case Study

Committee:

Patricia A. Somers, Supervisor

Edwin R. Sharpe, Jr., Co-Supervisor

Richard J. Reddick

Claudia E. Carroll

Concealed Campus Carry and the Academic Freedom of LGBTQ+

Faculty: A Case Study

By

Nicholas Daniel Phelps

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2017

Dedication

Dedicated to all who strive to create a safe, gun-free learning environment on campuses
of higher education.

Acknowledgments

My scholarly journey would not have been possible without the dedication and support of many others. I am thankful for the love and encouragement of my parents, who gave me the drive and intellectual ability to succeed. My committee, as well, has given me unwavering support, both for this study and throughout my four years at The University of Texas at Austin. I could not be more humbled by and in awe of the intelligence and strength of my participants, who courageously chose to offer their insights on what is a controversial, fraught topic. Finally, I am truly grateful for my partner and champion, my Steven, for the love, support, boyfriend nights, “wineses,” and happiness which has enabled me to complete this journey.

Concealed Campus Carry and the Academic Freedom of LGBTQ+ Faculty: A Case Study

by

Nicholas Daniel Phelps, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2017

SUPERVISOR: Patricia A. Somers

CO-SUPERVISOR: Edwin R. Sharpe

This study explores the perceptions of faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ of the impact of campus carry on their academic freedom and feelings of safety. This study employed a case study methodology, guided by self-determination theory's (Deci and Ryan, 2000) tenets of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This study explored three research questions: 1. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom? 2. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda? 3. To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented? Data were collected from ten total faculty interviews, an analysis of department statements regarding campus carry, and observations of two previously-recorded public forums on campus carry. Results indicated campus carry negatively impacts faculty perceptions of competence in teaching in potentially armed classrooms as well as faculty perceptions of safety and relatedness to their campus community. Results also indicated faculty are ardently striving to maintain

and pursue autonomy in their research agendas. Faculty also expressed considerable concern for the safety of their LGBTQ+ students, students of color, and students from other marginalized backgrounds. Finally, faculty expressed a general perception of campus carry as a symbolic affront to them as academics by a conservative Texas legislature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PURPOSE OF STUDY	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	5
METHOD.....	6
<i>Case Study</i>	6
<i>Population</i>	8
<i>Limitations and Significance</i>	8
KEY TERMS.....	9
STUDY ORGANIZATION	11
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
INTRODUCTION.....	12
THE SECOND AMENDMENT	13
FIRST AMENDMENT AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM	16
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE CHILLING EFFECT.....	23
NATIONAL GUN STATISTICS.....	26
MASS CAMPUS SHOOTINGS.....	28
PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS SAFETY	29
STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH	32
ATTITUDES TOWARDS GUNS ON CAMPUS	38
LGBTQ+ FACULTY AND CAMPUS CLIMATE	40
SUMMARY	43
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	44
CHAPTER THREE: METHOD	46
INTRODUCTION.....	46
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	46
RESEARCH DESIGN.....	47
SOURCES OF DATA.....	48
SUBJECTS AND POPULATION	50
DATA ANALYSIS	51
LIMITATIONS.....	51
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	54
DEPARTMENT STATEMENTS	55
<i>Physical Threat</i>	55

<i>Academic Freedom</i>	56
PUBLIC FORUM OBSERVATIONS	58
<i>Campus Safety</i>	59
<i>Academic Freedom</i>	60
INTERVIEWS	61
<i>Opposition to Campus Carry</i>	61
RISK OF PHYSICAL HARM.....	63
<i>Safety and Identity</i>	63
<i>Academic Freedom</i>	65
<i>Campus Carry as Symbolic Political Action</i>	68
DISCUSSION.....	69
<i>Relatedness</i>	70
<i>Competence</i>	71
<i>Autonomy</i>	72
CONTRIBUTION TO EXISTING LITERATURE.....	73
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	74
INTRODUCTION.....	74
LITERATURE REVIEW	75
METHODOLOGY	77
RESULTS.....	78
LIMITATIONS	82
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	83
APPENDICES.....	85
<i>Appendix A: Interview Protocol</i>	85
<i>Appendix B: Codebook</i>	87
<i>Appendix C: Participants</i>	92
REFERENCES.....	93

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In 2015, Texas state legislature passed Senate Bill 11 (SB11) legalizing the carry of concealed handguns by licensed permit holders in academic, administrative, and residential buildings on public higher education campuses. Previous to the passage of SB11, concealed permit holders were allowed to carry handguns on campus grounds but were not permitted to carry inside any campus buildings. The new law allows the administration of each institution to recommend restrictions on where and how permit holders can carry on campus, however it states none of these restrictions may be tantamount to “generally prohibiting license holders from carrying concealed handguns on the campus of the institution” (Senate Bill 11, 2015). Another provision of this law allows private institutions to “opt out” and continue to ban handgun carry on their campuses if they so choose. SB11 was implemented on public four-year campuses state-wide on August 1, 2016, and at public two-year campuses on August 1, 2017. In a twist of irony, the implementation of campus carry on the UT-Austin campus fell exactly 50 years after the UT-Austin Tower Shooting, in which Charles Whitman killed 16 people and wounded 31 others. The shooting was the first mass shooting on an American college campus.

As concealed carry was previously not allowed in campus buildings, many faculty, staff, and students have expressed concern for SB11’s impact on academic learning environments. Of these, faculty have been the most vocal, citing concern both for safety and for the potential negative effect the presence of handguns in the classroom

could have on teaching and learning. Faculty at The University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin), a public research institution in Texas, have been particularly vocal in expressing their concerns for the implementation of the law.

In November of 2015, the UT-Austin faculty council passed a resolution in opposition of campus carry. Citing concerns for safety, the council wrote, “by creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry, guns in education spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, and academic freedom” (The University of Texas at Austin General Faculty Council, 2015). The council also voiced concern for the impact of SB11 on the ability of the university to recruit and retain faculty, staff, and students.

Similarly, many departments and organizations on campus issued statements echoing the faculty council’s concerns. The Butler School of Music, for example, wrote, “Guns on campus are a direct threat to the freedom of speech which is a fundamental cornerstone of academic discourse” (GunFreeUT.org, 2016). Likewise, the College of Pharmacy stated, “our ability to deliver the curriculum and to recruit and retain outstanding and diverse faculty, staff, and students will be negatively impacted by the SB11 law allowing concealed weapons in campus buildings” (GunFreeUT.org, 2016).

These statements highlight the diversity of departments issuing concerns for safety and academic freedom. Similar statements have also been issued by professional organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Modern Language Association (MLA), and Texas Association of College Teachers (TACT), all expressing concern both for safety and the learning environment. In all, 43

UT-Austin departments and 11 professional societies at the university have issued statements against campus carry.

In opposition to SB11, faculty at UT-Austin have chosen to leave the university. In the spring of 2016, Frederick Steiner, dean of the School of Architecture, announced he was leaving partly due to concerns for safety and academic freedom as a result of SB11. Similarly, economics professor Daniel Hamermesh left UT-Austin at the start of the spring 2016 semester over considerable concern for his own safety: “my perception is that the risk that a disgruntled student might bring a gun into the classroom and start shooting at me has been substantially enhanced by the concealed-carry law”(Chasmar, 2015).

Both the faculty who have left UT-Austin and the faculty who remain worry over the impact SB11 will have on the learning and teaching environment of the university. As the faculty council noted, the presence of handguns in academic buildings potentially alters the campus climate to limit free inquiry and expression both for faculty and students. The role of an instructor is to address the assumptions and ideas of students in a supportive but challenging manner, however doing so in a classroom in which students may be armed alters power dynamics and itself becomes a challenge. Furthermore, faculty from underrepresented backgrounds, such as female, minority, or LGBTQ+ faculty, or those who teach in controversial or sensitive areas may feel additional concern for their ability to safely exercise their academic freedom in teaching and research. This study sought to explore the concerns for academic freedom, if any, of one such population: LGBTQ+ faculty.

Purpose of Study

Research Questions

This study explored the perceptions of LGBTQ+ faculty of the impact of campus carry on their academic freedom. The methodology was a case study and employed interviews, analysis of statements of various UT-Austin departments, and observations of two public UT-Austin town hall forums regarding campus carry. This study was an extension of a larger study being conducted by Dr. Pat Somers at UT-Austin on the intersection of campus carry and gender, however it was meant to serve as a stand-alone study on its own merits. The central purpose of this study was to address three fundamental research questions:

1. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom?
2. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda?
3. To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented?

Questions one and two directly address the concept of academic freedom, particularly regarding teaching and research. Question three addresses the broader concept of the intersection of personal identity and perceptions of safety and security.

Literature Review

Because of the newness of campus carry, scholarly research directly addressing the impact of campus carry on academic freedom and the campus climate in general is

scant. Mass shootings on education campuses, however, are unfortunately not a new phenomenon and considerable research relating to this topic is available. The literature review addressed research pertaining to both the First and Second Amendments as well as the legal concept of the chilling effect within First Amendment rights. Given that the LGBTQ+ experience was the focus of the study, this review explored literature related to the LGBTQ+ experience on higher education campuses as it relates to safety and satisfaction on campus. Finally, the literature review detailed the prevalence of guns on campus, issues of violence on campus, and any relationships between campus violence, drug and alcohol use, and mental health concerns among college-age students.

Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 2000). SDT holds human beings seek to satisfy three basic needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Competence is defined as an individual's need to feel effective in managing their presented environment (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). Autonomy refers to an internal sense of originating and being in control of one's own actions (Grolnick, 2009). Finally, relatedness refers to the ability to integrate competence and autonomy to effectively form stable, nurturing bonds within one's social community (Hutman et al., 2012).

The three research questions were guided by these different needs. Question one addressed the ability of faculty to free teach, challenge, and interact with students in and out of the classroom and was guided both by perceptions of competence in navigating new teaching environments under campus carry as well as autonomy in being able to freely teach. Question two addressed the ability of faculty to pursue their research agenda

and was guided by their perception of autonomy in doing so. Finally, question three explored general feelings of faculty safety and security on campus and was guided by whether or not faculty perceive themselves to be less integrated, nurtured, and “related” to the broader campus community as a result of campus carry.

Method

Case Study

This investigation of campus carry and its perceived influence on academic freedom was conducted through a case study. Case study methodology allows for the investigation of new phenomena: “the distinctive need for case study research arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena” (Yin, 2014). Case studies are exploratory by nature and focus on the investigation of a new or not widely studied phenomenon; furthermore, case studies allow for the use of multiple data sources, thus enabling data triangulation.

Campus carry is a new phenomenon for UT-Austin to address, and as the literature review showed very little scholarly work addressing its impact has been written. As such, given the newness of campus carry, this study was exploratory and used UT-Austin as its sole site, allowing for in-depth exploration of its effect on faculty academic freedom at an institution with an intimate history with campus violence. Furthermore, given the prevalence of opposition to campus carry at both the individual and organization level, multiple data points were available for analysis and triangulation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the effect of campus carry on faculty academic freedom.

In keeping with case study methodology, the primary methods of data collection were semi-structured interviews, analysis of various UT-Austin-affiliated department and organization resolutions, and a participant observation of publicly held town hall forums at UT-Austin found in the university's archives. While a detailed interview protocol was developed, the format of the interviews followed what Patton (1990) described as an interview guide, in that the questions and format were essentially the same for each participant, though with enough flexibility in questions and ordering to allow for exploration and probing. Furthermore, all participants were given advanced knowledge of the topics to be covered in the interview.

As mentioned, 43 academic departments and 11 professional programs or entities affiliated with the university have issued statements against campus carry. Many of these statements address both campus safety as well as academic freedom concerns. Analysis of these statements provided an understanding of the general faculty attitude toward campus carry, particularly with regard to the perceived effect of campus carry on the general academic freedom of the institution. Yin (2014), wrote of this as data triangulation, which enables the researcher to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

The third source of data triangulation was observational viewing of two town hall forums held at UT-Austin on September 30, 2015 and October 5, 2015, respectively. These observations allowed for further observation of comments of faculty and others both for and against campus carry pre-implementation. In sum, the observations and broader faculty resolutions provided contextual data for this study; the interviews with

faculty provided detailed investigation into campus carry's perceived effects on faculty teaching at the institution.

Population

The population for this study was LGBTQ+ faculty members at UT-Austin. While students do have academic freedom, this study focused on faculty because they are afforded more freedom in teaching and research. Furthermore, the experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals are unique among faculty. Much like other non-majority individuals, LGBTQ+ individuals often face increased scrutiny, hostility, or overt aggression because of their minority status, in this case for their gender and/or sexual identity. As a public institution, the chosen research site was required by law to implement campus carry and the population being studied is directly grappling with its implementation.

From this population, 10 LGBTQ+ faculty members were recruited for one interview in the spring semester following campus carry implementation. Due to the relatively small population size, participants were chosen through purposive snowball sampling (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014) and through recruitment with the institution's LGBT faculty association. The sample size itself was relatively small, however, a detailed interview with each participant in combination with the other sources of data allowed for greater richness in the data findings.

Limitations and Significance

This study focused on the experiences of one subset of the total faculty population at one institution. LGBTQ+ faculty were chosen for this study precisely because of their

unique experiences among faculty, however this is inherently a limitation as well. The LGBTQ+ experience with the phenomenon of campus carry is just one experience of the many faculty, staff, and students at the institution. Furthermore, all public four-year institutions across the state are now campus carry institutions, and the faculty experience at a different institution, such as a smaller, regional institution or a Hispanic-serving institution, may be quite different.

Given how little scholarly research exists on this topic, however, this study was significant because of its very high level of relevance to the higher education landscape and potential contribution to a new field. The literature review showed how little scholarly research has been undertaken on the effect of campus carry on academic freedom. Furthermore, this study's focus on LGBTQ+ individuals, though only a small subset of the total population affected, allowed greater insight into the experiences of a highly diverse but very important collective of faculty on higher education campuses.

Key Terms

“Campus Carry” refers to the concealed carry of a handgun in academic, administrative, and other buildings on public higher education campuses by an individual licensed to carry. “Concealed” indicates the handgun can be carried on the licensed individual's person, but cannot be visible to the naked eye at any time.

“LGBTQ+” refers to individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning. The “+” refers to individuals who do not identify as heterosexual or with their assigned birth gender, but may also not identify with the more

mainstream sexual or gender identities. “Cisgender” refers to someone who identifies with their assigned gender at birth.

“Academic Freedom” is primarily an academic concept particular to higher education campuses, but it does have legal roots in the First Amendment of the *United States Constitution*. For the purposes of this study, however, the primary definition of academic freedom comes from the American Association of University Professor’s *Statement on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure* (1940). The *Statement* issues these three principles:

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember

that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution (p. 2).

Finally, the legal notion of the “chilling effect” refers to the creation of an environment in which First Amendment rights are infringed, particularly the right to free speech. At a public university, environments that are hostile, threatening, or stifling to the expression of free speech have the effect of “chilling” First Amendment rights. As mentioned, academic freedom is an academic principle but has been protected at public institutions by the courts under the First Amendment, and as such can be chilled by hostile institution environments.

Study Organization

This study was organized to effectively guide the reader through the study. The following chapter focuses on the literature relevant to this topic and concludes with a detailed study of self-determination theory. Chapter three focuses on a case study as the appropriate method for this study as well as expounds upon the population to be studied, the recruitment method, and the interview protocol for the study. Chapter four presents the results of the study, focusing on the analysis and coding protocol. Finally, chapter five discusses relevant themes as they pertain to the research questions as well as presents implications for the higher education landscape and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In 2015, the Texas legislature enacted Senate Bill 11 (SB11), which legalized the carry of concealed handguns by concealed handgun license (CHL) holders in university buildings on public college and campuses. As outlined in Chapter One, this law has been met with significant controversy, with faculty and staff of public universities voicing considerable opposition to this law. Concerns for physical safety notwithstanding, faculty in particular have expressed grave concerns about the carry of concealed firearms in academic buildings and classrooms influencing academic freedom. Furthermore, LGBTQ+ faculty and other marginalized groups already face particular scrutiny on campus and have expressed heightened concern for the implementation of this law.

This chapter outlines scholarly literature and implications of SB11, particularly regarding concerns for the influence of the law on the academic freedom of LGBTQ+ faculty. This review will first detail relevant case law and theory surrounding the Second Amendment and the legality of implementing Campus Carry. Furthermore, this review analyzes salient case law and theory regarding the First Amendment, particularly free speech rights, academic freedom rights on college and university campuses, and the notion of the “chilling effect” in environments hostile to free speech. The chapter further details practical concerns and research regarding guns on campus, perceptions of campus safety, campus violence, and student mental health. Finally, this study discusses Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) as the theoretical framework for this study, particularly as it pertains to the psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and

relatedness and the potential impact of campus carry on the ability of LGBTQ+ faculty to satisfy these needs.

The Second Amendment

The Second Amendment to the *United States Constitution* states, “A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed” (“U.S. Constitution”, Amendment 2, 1789). Perhaps one of the most controversial of amendments, the Second Amendment addresses the right of citizens to own firearms for lawful purposes such as self-protection or, as the amendment states, for militia service. However, not until *Heller v. District of Columbia* (2006) , did the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) grant greater rights to citizens and clarify gun carry for purposes of protection (Wasserman, 2011).

Heller established the legal framework for state officials to pass campus carry legislation. *Heller* overturned a law in Washington, D.C. prohibiting gun ownership within its boundaries and conferring on individuals the right to keep and bear arms in their own homes (Wasserman, 2011). As Wasserman noted, however, the Court upheld provisions prohibiting those with documented mental illnesses or felony convictions from bearing arms as well as provisions prohibiting carry in certain venues such as schools, churches, and other locations deemed “sensitive” to gun carry.

Not until *McDonald v. City of Chicago* (2010) did the SCOTUS directly address the ability of state and local governments to regulate carrying a gun within the framework of the Second Amendment. Whereas *Heller* was narrowly tailored to apply only to the District of Columbia as a federal entity, *McDonald* addressed state infringement on

Second Amendment rights by overturning a ban on handguns in the city of Chicago (Smith, 2013). As a result, Smith notes *McDonald* and *Heller* together allowed for legal challengers protesting the limits of gun control at all levels of government.

Scholars have criticized the Supreme Court in both *Heller* and *McDonald* for not establishing a standard of review for when and where carrying a firearm is and is not permissible. Wasserman (2011) and Smith (2013) both critique these two decisions as vague precisely because they protect the right to carry but are limited in defining when, where, and how to do so. In contrast, Meltzer (2014) argues both cases, if read correctly and situated within historical context, establish the open carry of guns outside of the home as the standard for interpreting the Second Amendment. As Meltzer notes, “the Court’s methodology in *Heller* and its reliance on 19th century case law suggests that there must be some right to carry, and that open carry, not concealed carry is protected by the Second Amendment” (p. 1528). Yet within this argument is a fundamental flaw situated in the context of today’s society. While open carry does declare the presence of the firearm on a person for all to see, open carry also declares the threat of the firearm itself, a declaration not accepted in a modern society more sensitive to firearm threat.

While *Heller* upheld the “reasonable” restriction of carry in sensitive areas such as schools, churches, etc., both *Heller* and *McDonald* set the stage for eventual challenges to bans on firearms in these sensitive areas. In applying the concept of the “home” established in *Heller* and *McDonald*, Smith (2013) asserted bans on handgun possession in the home fail to meet standards of scrutiny even with no clear standard of review. Furthermore, in agreement with Meltzer and Wasserman, Smith argued

possession of firearms is a fundamental right protected by the Second Amendment, and bans therein should be subject to judicial scrutiny.

The central tenet of Smith's argument is the notion of college campuses, particularly on-campus student housing, as a "home" as defined by *Heller*. In addressing the argument against campus housing as private housing, the author wrote, "a student typically contracts with the college or university to stay in the dorm room, similar to signing a lease for a private apartment" (p. 1056). Smith's theory, in turn, establishes campus housing as the legal "home" for the student as defined by the Second Amendment in a manner no different from a private residence or leased apartment. Furthermore, Smith focused on the notion of self-defense within the context of student housing, arguing an absolute ban on concealed firearms in student housing unconstitutionally violates the right to self-defense guaranteed under the Second Amendment.

Accordingly, the legal right to carry guns on post-secondary campuses in some manner was as an almost inevitable legal challenge for legislators who supported the Second Amendment. With the state and federal restrictions of *Heller* and *McDonald* struck down, similar restrictions on specific locales, especially those such as state higher education institutions, would seem comparably illegal to Second Amendment proponents. What legislators fail to recognize, however, is the potential for campus carry of firearms on previously gun-free campuses to influence and possibly infringe upon the academic freedom of those who teach and study at these institutions. The Second Amendment firmly states owning and carrying firearms is an inalienable right. However, opponents of

campus carry argue the presence of guns on campus creates an environment hostile to academic teaching, research, and learning and thus “chills” academic freedom under the First Amendment.

First Amendment and Academic Freedom

The First Amendment to the *United States Constitution* addresses notions of freedom of religion, speech, and assembly. Specifically, the Amendment reads, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances” (“U.S. Constitution”, Amendment 1, 1789). For academics, the most important tenet of the First Amendment is the protection of free speech, which is the bedrock for the concept of academic freedom.

The modern concept of academic freedom originated in the German schools of thought of the 18th and 19th centuries. The two primary concepts of *Lehrnfreiheit*, translated as “freedom to learn” and *Lehrfreiheit*, translated as “freedom to teach,” undergirded the philosophy of allowing both students and scholars the freedom to pursue knowledge as they chose (Lucas, 2006). In particular, the German school of thought believed scholars should reach “whatever conclusions were warranted, and to disseminate the results through teaching or publication without hindrance or interference from external authorities” (Lucas, 2006, p. 178).

The first of the American institutions to embrace this philosophy was Johns Hopkins University. Adopting the German school’s approach to scholarly freedom, Johns

Hopkins made unfettered free pursuit of knowledge for the betterment of society paramount to its mission in the 1870's (Lucas, 2006). Soon thereafter, American universities began to widely adopt a "freedom of scholarly inquiry and curricular comprehensiveness" (Lucas, 2006, p. 180), which led to the modern adoption of academic freedom as it is known today.

Olivas (2006) described academic freedom as the bedrock concept of the academy. In particular, he asserted, "the search for truth through academic freedom requires that scholars be protected in posing new, controversial, and even unpopular ideas through their teaching and research, and publication of their research" (p. 133). Academic freedom, however, is not explicitly stated as a right for academics in state or federal constitutions, and as such has been the subject of many legal cases and theories.

One of the first cases in which the SCOTUS explicitly protected the freedom of academic research was *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957). In this case, Professor Sweezy was interrogated in court regarding the content of a lecture he delivered on communism and placed in contempt of court for refusing to testify. Sweezy protested his contempt through the court system to the Supreme Court. Citing his First Amendment rights, Chief Justice Warren held freedom in academia to be an "almost essential" right, and any attempt to regulate the content by the government would fundamentally restrict learning and free inquiry in education and damage the ability of academics to educate the nation's youth.

This case is important to the essentials of academic freedom in that it represents an attempt by the government to restrict the academic rights of an individual. Schauer

(2012) noted this distinction, asserting the State does not have the right to restrict free inquiry or learning. Academic freedom, Schauer wrote, is protected by law but exists outside of the law as an independent concept of public good; the state cannot infringe on the right of the public to learn and academics to teach and research within the framework set by respective institutions of higher education.

Academics in higher education, however, do not enjoy unfettered restrictions on their speech and research, especially within the confines of their employment. *Pickering v. Board of Education* (1968) in particular, established the standard of review for free speech by public employees. Pickering, a Township, Illinois school teacher, wrote a letter to a local newspaper criticizing a bond election of his school board and was subsequently terminated. Upon appeal, the SCOTUS overturned his dismissal and created the *Pickering* balancing test for evaluating the speech of public employees.

In particular, *Pickering* establishes protection for speech of public employees based on three characteristics: 1) Did the individual establish his or her speech addressed a matter of public interest or concern? 2) Did the individual establish the speech was a motivating factor in the employer's decision? 3) Did the court balance the interest of public concern with the interest of the employer in maintaining a work environment conducive to productivity and order? *Pickering*, however, pertains to general speech of public employees, and does not specifically address academic freedom or, indeed, employees of educational institutions beyond the coincidence of Pickering himself having been an employee of a public school system.

This lack of codification of academic freedom outside of the limited scope of the *Pickering* test has proven problematic for scholars and proponents of academic freedom. As Chang (2001) asserted, the SCOTUS ostensibly defended the need for academic freedom in higher education, however, the court has not provided a clear standard for this protection. While *Sweezy* affirms the value of academic freedom and *Pickering* provides a standard for evaluating the protection of general public speech by employees, neither expressly provides specifics for what is and is not protected in the unique sphere of academia.

Chang further attributed this lack of clarity to a fundamental difference between professional definitions of academic freedom for individuals compared to protections afforded to institutions as a whole. Citing the SCOTUS' reliance on the *Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure* (American Association of University Professors, 1940) as the professional standard for academic freedom, Chang wrote of academic freedom as sacrosanct in cases such as *Sweezy* in which the government infringes on the rights of individuals. In *Widmar v. Vincent*, however, Chang noted the court upholds the right of the institutions themselves as well, creating a lack of clarity between which takes precedence: the freedom of speech for instructors in teaching and researching, or the freedom of institutions to regulate who teaches and what can be taught.

Regardless, when discussing the inherent value of professorial speech, the notion of public interest under the *Pickering* test is particularly salient when evaluating what a professor chooses to teach in the classroom. Per Chang,

It would hardly be a stretch to argue that what professors choose to teach their students is inherently a topic of great concern to the public. And, if almost all teaching decisions can be linked to a topic of public concern in some way, the public concern requirement becomes an illusory hurdle for professors to clear before insisting upon such protection of such expression. (p. 941)

Academic content in teaching and research, Chang argued, is inherently a matter of public interest and should be afforded the highest protection under the courts.

This conflicts with the notion of intermural speech for public employees. In *Connick v. Myers* (1983), Myers, an Assistant District Attorney in New Orleans, circulated an internal memo and questionnaire to fellow employees regarding the office's transfer policy. Upon learning of this memo and the controversy it caused in the office, District Attorney Harry Connick, Sr. terminated her for insurrection. Upon filing suit, the SCOTUS eventually found her grievance "most accurately characterized as an employee grievance concerning internal office policy" (Olivas, 2006, p. 235) and, therefore, not a matter of public concern.

In contrast to *Pickering*, *Connick* allows for considerable confusion in what is or is not of public concern with regard to the speech of academics. Chang (2001) highlighted numerous cases in which faculty speech was found to be a protected public concern, including concerns for gender equity, grade fraud allegations, criticism of the faculty-to-student ratio, and general criticism of administrative decisions. All of these – assuming they were made in a manner not unduly disruptive to the administration of the institution – are instances of protected speech. Yet, Chang further noted very similar

situations not protected by the courts, including allegations of disparate treatment by supervisors, allegations of ethical violations of research protocol, and criticism of administration for general lack of guidance on various academic issues. In summary, *Pickering* and *Connick* do not provide a clear framework for what is truly protected speech in academia.

Any concerns voiced over the legality of campus carry may not be protected utterances under the First Amendment. As Chang (2001) succinctly put, ‘the overreliance on *Pickering* and *Connick* has produced inconsistent results and sheds little light upon how academic freedom, a ‘special concern of the First Amendment,’ enters into any balancing of interests between university and professor” (p. 947). As such, faculty at public institutions face, at best, uncertainty about their ability to openly criticize an initiative such as campus carry.

The SCOTUS further provided clarification on the limitations of public speech in *Garcetti v. Ceballos* (2006), and in doing so allowed for inadvertent limitations on academic freedom. Ceballos, a deputy district attorney in Los Angeles, penned a memo to his supervisor, District Attorney Gil Garcetti, noting significant inaccuracies in a legal affidavit produced by the police department and was subsequently disciplined. This case eventually reached the level of the SCOTUS and the majority found against Ceballos, stating his speech was made internally pursuant to his official duties as a public employee and not protected under the *Pickering* balancing test. Most notably, at the end of the majority opinion, Justice Kennedy issued a direct statement regarding *Garcetti* and academic freedom:

There is some argument that expression related to academic scholarship or classroom instruction implicates additional constitutional interests that are not fully accounted for by this Court's customary employee-speech jurisprudence. We need not, and for that reason do not, decide whether the analysis we conduct today would apply in the same manner to a case involving speech related to scholarship or teaching. (n.p.)

In doing so, the court potentially permitted further discrepancies in the definition of protected speech for academics in public institutions, despite pronouncements in earlier cases regarding the special protection afforded academic freedom under the First Amendment.

The most problematic issue with regard to the First Amendment in *Garcetti* is the distinction between speech made as a public citizen as opposed to a private citizen concerned with public good. *Rosborough IV* (2009), noted a troubling implication in the Court's failure to clarify the distinction for academic freedom in *Garcetti*:

Under the rule announced in *Garcetti*, a public university has the right to dismiss a professor solely because the administration disagreed with the content of his lectures, research, or publications because his speech would fall under the duties he was employed to perform. (p. 589)

More troubling for academic freedom, *Rosborough IV* (2009) cited a concern for the regulation of academic lectures as well as viewpoint speech. In particular, *Rosborough IV* asserted *Garcetti* gives public university employers latitude to mandate its academics espouse certain viewpoints, regardless of whether or not these academics

truly hold these viewpoints as their own. Without clarification from the courts on implications for academic freedom, *Garcetti* has permitted the State to further regulate the speech of its employees and potentially chill the freedom of academics to protest laws or policies.

Academic Freedom and The Chilling Effect

The legal term “chilling effect” in the First Amendment refers to the creation of an environment hostile to the expression of free speech for fear of some form of reprisal. The legal framework set by *Garcetti* has created an environment in which academics can be sanctioned for their extramural speech even when they believe the speech protected by the First Amendment. Under this framework, academics who previously espoused controversial ideas and opinions may find themselves facing an environment potentially hostile to any form of controversial or unpopular beliefs.

In an article on the importance of critical discourse and inquiry within the academy, Elrod (2008) wrote of academic freedom as valued and highly important in the academy. Citing the need for rich and robust dialogue among scholars, Elrod upheld controversial dialogue as protected and necessary for true scholarship in higher education. In short, Elrod’s definition of academic freedom extends not only to scholarship and teaching, but to the extramural speech made outside of the classroom as a public citizen, and both should be equally protected from administrative interference under the First Amendment.

Unclear policies from campus administrators regarding the permissibility of extramural speech, however, leads to an environment in which free expression is potentially chilled and stifled. Per Elrod,

The lack of protection for extramural utterances as expressed by dissident academics... is exacerbated by the uncertainty regarding what an institution's leaders deem to be acceptable expressive activity. This lack of protection creates a 'chilling effect' that can dampen or stifle the extramural activity of a professor.
(p. 1681)

This potential chilling effect, wrote Elrod, can and will harm discourse in the academy, leading to a uniformity of thought and lack of intellectual diversity at academic institutions.

The implementation of campus carry has added a new dimension to the chilling of academic freedom. Mash (2013) argued, "To the degree that allowing people to carry weapons on campus stifles open discussion, limits the marketplace of ideas, and hinders training students about engaging difficult ideas that challenge their core values, it also creates a 'chilling effect'" (p. 58). His argument centers around campuses as a marketplace of ideas, asserting guns on campus would stifle the creativity, open dialogue, and free inquiry protected for students and faculty alike under academic freedom.

Mash argued faculty may feel less safe pursuing or publishing controversial research. Specifically, he feared faculty who produce controversial, challenging research could be "chilled" from discussing their research in a classroom setting for fear of armed students who disagree. This concern for a chilling effect extends not just to faculty and

students, however, but to the general campus community as well, impacting peaceable assemblies, student organizations and meetings, guest speakers, and virtually all facets of the academy in which ideas are pursued and exchanged.

In support of this argument, Magarian (2012) stressed the importance of the First Amendment over the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment, Magarian argued, was established with the purpose of allowing citizens the means of violently mounting an insurrection should the government tyrannize and oppress its people. The First Amendment, he wrote, mitigated this need through establishing the civil means to engage in limiting the power of the government, including advocating for insurrection when necessary.

Lewis (2011) and Miller (2011) further argued institutions have a constitutional right to ban firearms from campus under the tenets of academic freedom. The authors outline academic freedom as inherently a constitutional right under the First Amendment. Furthermore, public institutions are proscribed by their charters to create environments propitious to advancing free inquiry and learning, and therefore the creation of a secure, non-threatening environment is preeminent. Lewis further outlined many arguments against campus carry, most notably asserting the State does not have a compelling interest in requiring institutions to allow firearm carry and guns on campus do not make the campus safer. Ultimately, the creation of a safe campus environment to promote the First Amendment supersedes any Second Amendment rights individuals may have.

In support of these arguments, Florida courts have allowed students to carry firearms in their personal vehicles but upheld bans on guns in campus residence halls and

academic buildings. In 2015, the First District Court of Appeals ruled the State of Florida and, by extension, the State-appointed boards of Florida's public colleges, have the right to regulate and ban the carry of firearms in college housing (*Florida Carry, Inc. v. University of Florida*, 2015). Ultimately, the court held institutions have the right of ensuring campus safety under their charters and should be allowed to freely do so in good faith.

If, as Magarian asserted, the First Amendment should be protected over the Second Amendment, does campus carry "chill" free speech through threat of reprisal? Consequently, does the idealized "marketplace of ideas" (Mash, 2013, p. 58) not fall under the sanctity of the First Amendment? Academic freedom, the bedrock of First Amendment rights in higher learning environments, deserves due consideration and concern when faced with the potential chilling effect on voices and ideas with the introduction of concealed firearms.

National Gun Statistics

Much of the concern for campus carry is based upon the perceived increase in frequency and severity of mass shootings at educational institutions. As of December 6, 2015, Gunviolencearchive.org reports 309 mass shootings in the United States in 2015 alone, 62 of which have been on education campuses. Since 2013, Everytownresearch.org (2015) reported a total of 162 fatal and non-fatal school shootings, averaging nearly one per week.

The Congressional Research Service (Bjelopera, Bagalman, Caldwell, Finklea, & McCallion, 2013) reported to Congress different, though no less troublesome, data.

Defining mass shootings as indiscriminate shootings in public places involving four or more deaths, the report indicated 78 mass shootings have occurred in the United States since 1983. In these shootings, 547 individuals were killed and 476 individuals were injured. Gun proponents argue the presence of more concealed weapons could prevent shootings such as these, yet data on gun crime and the risks associated with gun ownership do not support these assertions.

With regard to statistics on concealed handgun license (CHL) holders, the data are less cohesive. According to the National Institute of Health, CHL holders in Texas were overall much less likely to be convicted of a crime between 2001 and 2009 (Phillips, et al., 2013). Non-CHL holders were more likely to commit less violent crimes, such as burglary, robbery, or simple assault. In contrast, the report found CHL holders were more likely to be convicted of violent crimes such as sexual assault, gun offenses, and offenses involving a death.

A similar study also conducted for the NIH found a similar link between gun possession and the likelihood of being involved in a gun incident. The report found those in possession of a gun were 4.46 times more likely to be shot in an assault than those not in possession (Branas et al., 2009). Most importantly, the report found “guns did not protect those who possessed them from being shot in an assault” and “such users should reconsider possession of a gun” (p. 1). Hemenway and Solnick (2015) found similar results regarding gun possession and effectiveness of gun use, particularly noting self-defensive gun use was not statistically significant in reducing injury or property loss in

criminal situations. Such data indicate mere possession of a gun may not protect from gun crime, and may lead to an increase in gun victimization.

Despite these statistics, the national rate of legal gun ownership increases with each mass shooting. In a study of six mass shootings, including two school shootings, Wallace (2015) found the number of state criminal background checks associated with applying for a CHL permit significantly increased with each mass shooting. In particular, Wallace asserted this increase could not be solely attributed to concern over stricter gun laws or other factors, indicating the highly public nature of mass shootings in the media contributed to the increase in background checks used for obtaining a CHL permit.

Increases in gun ownership reflect deeper societal changes. As norms have shifted to reflect two-income households, white, middle-class men have experienced a decline in their role as protector-breadwinner. Guns, wrote Carlson (2015), represent an effort of these men to maintain their masculinity. Carlson noted, “guns provide a way for men to insist on their social relevance and usefulness” (p. 402). Gun ownership, though previously shown to put gun owners at more risk, ultimately represents masculine ideals and reinforces heteronormative structures for many who choose to become gun carriers.

Mass Campus Shootings

The first mass shooting on a college campus occurred at UT-Austin on August 1, 1966, exactly 50 years before the implementation of campus carry on the UT-Austin campus. In this instance, Charles Whitman climbed the UT-Austin tower and began shooting pedestrians below, killing 16 and wounding 31 others before being killed by police. The next significant school shooting did not happen until 1991, when graduate

student Gang Lu killed five University of Iowa employees as retaliation for not receiving a prestigious dissertation award (National Public Radio, 2007).

Other shootings related to academic performance and academic freedom followed. In 1996, Frederick Martin Davidson killed three of his professors during his master's thesis defense. In 2000, James Easton Kelly shot and killed an English professor overseeing his academic work after being dropped from his doctoral program (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012).

College campus shootings came to the forefront in 2007, when Seung-Hui Cho killed 32 people and wounded 17 others at Virginia Tech University. This shooting ignited the debate about guns on campus and brought questions about safety, preparedness, and student mental health to the forefront of political and social discourse (Rasmussen, Johnson, & Midwestern Higher Education Compact, 2008). From this and other concerns about safety, college campuses came under increased scrutiny for their seeming lack of preparedness to mass shootings and other threats; furthermore, conservative-leaning state legislatures renewed their push for arming college campuses.

As of 2008, only Utah allowed guns on college campuses. Since the Virginia Tech shooting, however, nine additional states have passed legislation allowing campus carry in some or all academic, administrative, and residential buildings, and an additional 10 states allow guns in locked cars (Armed Campuses, 2017). Each subsequent mass shooting, be it off or on an education campus, has continued to stoke the flames of the debate regarding safety and the arming of those on higher education campuses.

Perceptions of Campus Safety

Scholars have been critical of higher education for seemingly lagging behind corporations in managing significant crises such as violent shootings or other similar incidents. Dolan (2006) expressed concern for the preparedness of higher education institutions in addressing crises. Dolan wrote, “Higher education is run by academics who don’t have real experience and turn their noses down at managers. There are a few universities who get it, but most don’t” (p. 5). Citing a survey post-Hurricane Katrina and 9/11, Dolan stated higher education institutions need to be more assertive in forming crisis teams equipped at handling dangerous situations on campus.

This concern applies to perceptions of the general safety of the campus as a whole. As Connelly (2012) noted,

[C]olleges are responsible not only for the education but also the safety and welfare of their students. That responsibility includes keeping them free from physical and psychological harm from the moment they enter the campus. In recent years, it has become distressingly apparent that schools are not well prepared for this challenge. (pp. 376-377)

Concerns for campus safety, then, extend beyond managing active crises to promoting a safe environment generally conducive to learning.

Sulkowski and Lazarus (2011) found university campuses to be particularly vulnerable to gun violence. Higher education campuses, they state, “are prime locations for violent perpetrators to stage devastating multiple victim attacks due to their dense populations, relatively low police presence, and open and welcoming nature” (p. 339).

These institutions, they argue, are inherently vulnerable due their open physical design and welcoming culture allowing generally unfettered access to most of the campus.

In a study on the perceptions of students at Central Connecticut State University of the Virginia Tech massacre, the researchers found a number of prevalent perceptions among the students, faculty, and staff regarding school shootings (Fallahi, Austad, Fallon, & Leishman, 2009). The researchers used a 40-item instrument to assess student perceptions and beliefs and a shorter version of the instrument for faculty and staff. The instruments measured a number of factors, most notably opinions regarding the cause of the shooting and identification of persons responsible; reactions to the event; and issues of safety and personal experience with crime and violence on campus.

These researchers found students, faculty, and staff believed mental health and social isolation to be the cause of the shooting; students also believed lack of parental involvement and a strong family support structure to be a factor. With regard to perceptions of safety and fear on campus, women felt more at risk on campus than men, the exception being men living in the college residence halls. Of those surveyed, only 0.3% reported bringing a gun to campus, while 3.3% reported knowing someone who brings a gun to campus.

In particular, gun violence is a potential crisis most institutions of higher learning are ill prepared to handle. Citing the Virginia Tech shooting as an example, Catullo, Walker, and Floyd (2009) noted variations in the preparedness of institutions to effectively manage and mitigate catastrophic crises such as school shootings. In a study of 158 campuses, they found the institutions to be highly reactive, only implementing

comprehensive plans for managing catastrophic crises after experiencing a crisis or observing the fallout from a well-publicized crisis at a similar institution.

This study cited a concern for the proper handling of students exhibiting serious mental health issues. In particular, Catullo et al. wrote, “academic institutions need to be aware of proper procedures to handle students who are a threat to themselves or others and increase attention and funding to provide mental health programs for students” (p. 318). While proper care is needed to avoid stigmatizing those with mental health concerns, administrators must be aware of the increased risk these individuals pose to themselves and the inherent risks associated with the presence of concealed weapons on post-secondary campuses.

Student Mental Health

Student mental health is of increasing concern across higher education. In a study on the perceptions of mental health administrators regarding the increased demand for mental health services at college campuses, Watkins, Hunt, and Eisenberg (2012) found 96 percent of counseling center directors report treating more students with severe psychological disorders than in the past, leading to a 64 percent increase in staff burnout and staffing shortages. The researchers cited characteristics peculiar to the current generation of college students, commonly named the Millennial Generation, as a primary reason for the increase in psychological concerns among these students.

Administrators found Millennial students have higher levels of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and attention-deficit- and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, contributing to “record numbers of panic attacks and panic disorders” (p. 325). Further,

numerous administrators cited the “hovering, nervous” (p. 326) nature of Millennial parents as further contributing to these mental health concerns. These and other concerns have placed strain on mental health facilities struggling to meet the increased demand for mental health services while facing pressure to minimize the risk of campus-wide threat scenarios mirroring the Virginia Tech massacre and other shootings.

Storch, Bagner, Geffken, and Baumeister (2004) found overt aggression among college students to be higher among males than females and more likely to be tied to mental health disorders and alcohol and drug use. Using a 12-item adult peer aggression measure, the researchers studied the overt and relational aggression of 287 college males and females. Overt aggression included “physically damaging actions. . . Or threats of such actions” and relational aggression included “maltreatment through social exclusion and damage to personal relationships” through non-physical means (p. 689).

Overall, Storch et al. found men more likely to exhibit more overt and relational aggression, loneliness, alcohol use, and drug use than women. For men, overt aggression was most strongly predicted by alcohol use, and the researchers postulated aggression – and correlated alcohol use – may result from feelings of rejection based on behavior. Overall, the researchers found men more overtly and relationally aggressive than women and “that both forms of aggression were positively correlated to negative psychosocial adjustment” (p. 699).

Similar to these results, Genuchi (2015) identified anger and hostility as the primary externalized symptoms of depression in college-aged males. Genuchi’s study focused on 169 primarily white, single males of college age through an anonymous

online survey. Citing hegemonic norms of externalizing depressive thoughts and feelings through anger and aggression, Genuchi found “men may be more likely to externalize vulnerable emotions such as depression through anger, irritability, aggressive behaviors, risk-taking behaviors, and substance abuse” (p. 114).

Through this study, Genuchi found anger to be the primary indicator of depression in those he studied and noted this as a key feature primarily found in men experiencing depressive episodes. These results further indicated verbal and physical aggression as more common among those indicating symptoms of depression. These results were strongest with those who more acutely ascribed to hegemonic norms of masculinity, thus becoming less likely to externalize feelings of vulnerability in a non-aggressive or non-hostile manner.

Aside from these localized studies, however, the association between violence and the mental health of college students is not widely studied. In a national study analyzing nearly 80,000 undergraduate and graduate students, Schwartz, Beaver, and Barnes (2015) found 36.8% of the sample exhibited the characteristics of at least one diagnosable psychiatric disorder. In addition, 21.4% of the sample reported having engaged in some form of violent behavior, such as hitting, bullying, and intentionally injuring another individual.

More importantly, the researchers found violent tendencies and the presence of a mental disorder to be significantly related to one another. As the authors noted, “certain psychiatric disorders are relatively common among college students and . . . such disorders appear to contribute to a wide range of serious, violent behaviors” (p. 14).

Given this information, anecdotal concerns about college students and violent behaviors are not unfounded, though the authors carefully note college campuses are still relatively safe in comparison to other public places.

Perhaps of more concern for higher education institutions is the risk of suicide among its students. While the aforementioned research has shown higher tendencies towards violence or aggression among students with mental health concerns, overwhelmingly these students are at much greater risk to themselves than others (Hollingsworth, Dunkle, & Douce, 2009). Though statistics can vary, anywhere from one to seven percent of college students will attempt suicide at some point in their college career (Whisenhunt et al., 2015). Furthermore, these students are most likely to be Asian-American, Alaskan Native/Native American, or Multiracial/Multi-ethnic (Shadick & Akhter, 2014). In comparison to white students, however, all ethnic or racial minorities are found to be more likely to commit or attempt suicide (Shadick & Akhter, 2014).

The presence of handguns on campus increases both the risk of handguns being used in both suicide and violent crimes. Firearms, according to estimates from the American College Health Association, were used in the majority of both suicides and violent crimes on campus (Thompson, Price, Mrdjenovich, & Khubchandani, 2009). Overwhelmingly, police chiefs and college health officials argue against the legalization of guns on campus, citing fear for an increase in suicides and violent crimes due to the accessibility of firearms (Thompson et al., 2009).

Guns on Campus

While the debate over campus carry has become more pronounced in recent years, only recently have educational researchers begun to investigate the possible effects of allowing a greater handgun presence on campus. In a study of 61 campuses across the United States, Presley and Meilman (1997) found 11.1% of students had carried some sort of weapon on campus within the last 30 days of the survey. Of these, the students were more likely to be male, engage in binge drinking, and feel less safe on campus than those who did not carry some form of weapon.

As the authors found, 56.5% of men who brought guns to campus engaged in binge drinking as opposed to 43% of men who did not binge drink. Male gun carriers also consumed more illegal substances and experienced more negative consequences as a result of their substance abuse. These statistics particularly concerned these researchers, who asserted binge drinking and illegal substance use led to a much higher likelihood of an argument between weapon holders turning violent.

Statistics regarding the carrying of guns on campus by college students follow a similar trend. In a study of over 15,000 students at 140 college campuses across the country, Miller, Hemenway, and Wechsler (1999) found roughly 3.5% of student surveyed reported carrying a gun on campus. Of these, gun carriers were more likely to be male, white, or Native American. Furthermore, carrying a gun on campus positively correlated with needing to start the day with alcohol, drunk driving, binge drinking, and membership in a fraternity.

Citing the strong association between owning a gun and alcohol use, the authors stated, “gun owners are more likely than those who do not own guns to engage in

activities that put themselves and others at risk for severe or life-threatening injuries” (p. 5). These results indicated gun owners are more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors associated with lessened impulse control. What is not clear, and what merits further study, is whether or not the 3.5% bring their guns to campus or leave these guns in an off-campus location.

In support of this data, Meilman, Leichter, and Presley (1998) found regional variations in gun possession rates among college students. Universally, gun possession by college males was higher than females; furthermore, gun possession was highest on public campuses ranging from 2,500 to 9,999 students. In addition, 15.1% of males and 6.1% of females in the South reported gun possession, though the authors were careful to note this was only a study of gun possession and did not necessarily indicate these students carried their weapons on campus.

Bouffard, Nobles, Wells, and Cavanaugh (2012) investigated the possible effects of allowing campus carry. Citing arguments proffered by both sides, Bouffard, et al. highlighted, among these arguments, the possibility of concealed handgun carriers ending or deterring active shooter situations on campus and the risks of negative consequences such as suicide, accidental shootings, and substance abuse-related incidents becoming more prevalent.

In their study, Bouffard et al. sought to understand if lifting the ban on handguns would lead to an increase in the prevalence of handguns on a public university in the eastern part of Texas. Focusing on the classroom as the unit of study, their research started with the proposition that “allowing concealed handguns on campus might lead to

the increased probability that a student legally armed with a handgun is available to intervene” (p. 322). The researchers focused their research on whether more legally-carrying students would be present in academic settings during normal business hours.

Surveying a total of 1,396 students, the researchers found more than 75% of classrooms would have at least one student likely to obtain a concealed handgun license and carry on campus if legally allowed to do so. This amounted to an increase of concealed handguns per building between 4%-33%, depending on the specific majors primarily taught in the buildings. Citing numerous limitations, however, the researchers found the projected implications of concealed carry to be “complex and nuanced” (p. 337) and in great need of further study to establish any sort of generalizable validity.

Similarly, student intent to obtain a CHL and carry on campus was found to vary across majors. Students who are white and male were more likely to obtain a CHL and carry on campus if legally allowed to do so, and students in criminal justice majors were significantly more likely to obtain a CHL and carry on campus than those in other majors (Bouffard, Nobles, & Wells, 2012). Furthermore, these students were more likely to view themselves as “crime fighters” (p. 301), indicating a higher likelihood of willingness to use their concealed handgun on campus if necessary.

Attitudes Towards Guns on Campus

Research on attitudes towards guns on campus has shown faculty, staff, and students are largely opposed to allowing concealed handgun permit holders to carry on campus. Bennett, Kraft, and Grub (2012) surveyed university faculty regarding their attitudes towards guns on campus, particularly with regard to legislation expanding the

rights of concealed permit holders to carry on campus. The researchers found faculty overwhelmingly oppose allowing CHL holders to carry on campus and do not support legislation expanding the rights of these individuals to do so.

Likewise, Patten, Thomas, and Wada (2013) found similar results in their survey of faculty, staff and students at two institutions in California. Their survey found 73% of respondents opposed the carry of guns on campus, 70% did not feel more safe with guns on campus, and 72% felt armed faculty, staff, and students would hinder rather than promote more campus safety. Results were similar among both white and non-white participants. Furthermore, 85% of females on campus felt armed faculty, staff, and students would hinder campus safety, and a surprisingly large number of males (80%) felt the same. Of the respondents, 30% reported owning at least one gun, but the majority of those (77%) opposed the carry of concealed handguns on campus by faculty, staff, and students.

Another study of over 1,600 students across 15 universities returned similar results (Thompson et al., 2013). In this study, the authors found fully 79% of respondents opposed the carry of handguns on campus by CHL holders. Furthermore, 78% of respondents indicated they would not obtain a permit and carry on campus if legally permitted. Similar to Patten et al. (2013), 79% of respondents also overwhelmingly felt the carry of handguns on campus would not make campus safer, and 93% were not concerned about becoming the victim of a violent crime on their respective campuses.

While logic may indicate well-publicized violent crimes on campus would lead to an increase in the desire for concealed carry, Patten, Thomas, and Viotta (2013) found the

opposite. In a survey of women both before and after a notorious violent sexual assault took place on campus, these authors found opposition to concealed carry increased from 77% to 87%. Furthermore, 84% felt concealed carry did not increase campus safety, and the same percentage did not believe armed faculty, staff, and students would promote or protect campus safety.

In a recent exploratory study of all community college faculty in 18 states, Dahl, Bonham, and Reddington (2016) found community college faculty feel less safe on their campuses than those at four-year institutions and also have less faith in the ability of campus safety officers to prevent and mitigate campus violence. Furthermore, more than 70% of those surveyed either strongly oppose or oppose allowing students, faculty, and visitors to carry handguns on campus. These researchers also noted specific differences between community colleges and four-year institutions, particularly the open nature of community colleges and the greater variety in the ages of community college students, as the reasons for faculty concern for campus safety and allowing guns on campus.

LGBTQ+ Faculty and Campus Climate

The social and behavioral climate of a campus can have a profound impact on the satisfaction and persistence of students and faculty alike. Rankin (2005), described campus climate as “the cumulative attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential” (p. 17). A wealth of complex factors, such as race or ethnicity, gender, and sexuality can all influence the experiences of individuals on campus.

Faculty who are part of a non-majority group or classification often experience less satisfaction with their campus climate. Rosser (2004) found institutional morale and climate to greatly influence faculty satisfaction, with women and racial or ethnic minorities experiencing less satisfaction with their current institution than their white counterparts. Similarly, LGBTQ+ individuals often face similar dissatisfaction with their respective campuses, perceiving them to be less friendly, less supportive, and more hostile than their non-sexual minority colleagues (Rankin et al., 2003; Sears, 2002; Wright, 2010).

Though college and university campuses are generally perceived as liberal spaces, the experiences of many LGBTQ+ faculty contradict this assumption. In a multi-institutional study of LGBTQ+ faculty perceptions of campus climate, Sears (2002) found 47% of sexual minority faculty at public institutions perceived their institution to be LGBT neutral, intolerant or hostile, whereas only 12% of faculty at private institutions perceived the same. This study particularly found campuses with a higher prevalence of homophobic acts or comments were perceived as significantly less supportive or affirming than those with fewer instances of homophobia.

Hostility within a campus climate can impact whether or not a faculty member chooses to stay at an institution. Both Sears (2002) and Rankin et al. (2003) found large-scale discrimination such as homophobic comments, hiring practices, or prohibitions on research relating to sexual minorities to negatively impact campus climate for LGBTQ+ individuals and lead them to consider leaving the institution. These consequences can

occur across all types of institutions and disciplines, including education (Sears, 2002), science and engineering (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009), and other disciplines.

Even with the legalization of same-sex marriage (*Obergefell v. Hodges*, 571 U.S., 2015), campus climates for LGBTQ+ faculty vary widely and still heavily influence job satisfaction and persistence. Queer and queer-spectrum faculty are more likely than their straight counterparts to leave their institution because of hostile campus climates, and these effects are more pronounced at public, rural, and small-town institutions (Garvey & Rankin, 2016). Furthermore, trans-spectrum faculty experience this phenomenon even more acutely than their cisgender queer/LGB faculty counterparts, indicating transgender individuals face the most discrimination at their respective institutions (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Garvey & Rankin, 2016; Sears, 2002).

Societal hostility towards LGBT individuals extends beyond verbal or institutional threats and discrimination to include actual physical violence. Widely publicized cases of homophobic violence, such as the 1998 beating and death of Matthew Shepard in Wyoming or the 2016 shooting at Pulse nightclub in Florida, have underscored the real physical risk LGBTQ+ individuals face on a daily basis. The risk for LGBTQ+ individuals does not end when they set foot on a college campus.

In a comprehensive report on LGBT-motivated incidents, the Human Rights Campaign reported 1,265 biased crimes against LGB individuals in 2007 alone (Marzullo & Libman, 2009). Furthermore, the report found “sexual orientation- and gender identity-motivated hate crimes yielded higher levels of violence than other hate crimes” (p. 5). More recently, the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs reported 1,253 LGBT-

hate motivated crimes in 2015, indicating little change in reported violence against LGBTQ+ individuals over the past 9 years (Waters, Jindasurat, & Wolfe, 2016). According to national crime statistics released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, just over 20% of the total reported hate crime incidents for 2014 were motivated by sexual orientation, with 60.6 % of those motivated by anti-gay male bias (“Latest Hate Crime Statistics Report Released,” 2014).

Less is known regarding violence towards LGBTQ+ faculty on campus. What is clear, however, is these individuals often face heightened hostility and scrutiny on their respective campuses. Furthermore, LGBTQ+ individuals in general are already at heightened risk for hate crimes. Introducing handguns into a higher education community alters the social dynamics and power structures of the institution, potentially damaging the feelings of safety, security, and competence of LGBTQ+ faculty on these campuses.

Summary

Though the study of campus carry’s impact on academic freedom includes many hypotheticals from both legal and academic scholars, Academia has yet to empirically investigate the actual influence of campus carry on the academic freedom of faculty. The issue is multi-faceted; First and Second Amendment issues, gun use and prevalence on college campuses, campus safety, student mental health, and the current campus environment for faculty all influence the academic climate. Yet, the addition of concealed handguns among the university community has not been widely studied beyond general perceptions and concerns for safety. Furthermore, Academia has not investigated how campus carry directly affects academic freedom for minority faculty, particularly

LGBTQ+ faculty. This study contributed to the body of knowledge regarding campus carry by investigating precisely this issue.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was founded on self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Human beings, SDT suggests, seek to integrate their needs and actions into their larger social structures. In particular, SDT asserts, “it is part of the adaptive design of the human organism to engage in interesting activities, to exercise capacities, to pursue connectedness in social groups, and to integrate intrapsychic and interpersonal experiences” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 229). In other words, our sense of well-being is intimately tied to our ability to integrate our own dynamic identity into a larger sense of belonging with the fabric of our social structures.

The foundation of SDT is built on our drive to satisfy three basic psychological and social needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Competence is defined as an individual’s perception of their effectiveness in dealing with their presented environment (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). Consequently, competence is intricately tied to motivation, and experiencing a lack or hindrance of competence adversely affects our second basic need, autonomy. The second psychological need under SDT, autonomy, is defined as an internal sense of being in control of and the origin of one’s own actions (Grolnick, 2009). In disadvantageous or threatening situations in which an individual’s competence or autonomy is hindered, the individual’s intrinsic motivation can also be stifled.

The third psychological need influencing motivation is relatedness, defined as a desire to feel belonging with one’s environment and establish stable, nurturing, and

protecting relationships with others (Hutman et al., 2012). According to SDT, relatedness, autonomy, and competence form the three pillars necessary for psychological well-being. When these three are fully realized, an individual is able to grow and develop and experience their own fully-actualized intrinsic motivation in a healthy, positive way (Hutman et al., 2012).

As Deci and Ryan (2000) noted, however, social threats can adversely impact feelings of competence, autonomy, or relatedness. Campus carry is potentially hurtful to feelings of safety and security for marginalized individuals such as LGBTQ+ faculty, which in turn can be deleterious to their psychological needs under the framework of SDT. This study sought to explore if LGBTQ+ faculty feel less autonomy in their ability to freely teach and research to the best of their capability; this further addressed the impact of campus carry on their sense of relatedness to the broader campus community by creating an environment perceived as hostile to them as individuals. Finally, this study explored LGBTQ+ faculty's perceptions of competence in navigating an altered university environment in which firearms, previously absent, are now present in the academic setting.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

Introduction

This study explored the perceived influence of campus carry on the academic freedom of LGBTQ+ faculty. This chapter details the case study methodology used, drawing on the work of Stake (1995) and Yin (2014) to guide the exploratory research design. This study was qualitative and used interviews, analysis of faculty and professional council statements, and observation of two archived town-hall forums held at UT-Austin on September 30, 2015 and October 5, 2015, respectively.

The primary goal of this study was to explore three research questions:

1. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom? (RQ1)
2. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda? (RQ2)
3. To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented? (RQ3)

Theoretical Framework

As previously stated, this study was guided by the three basic psychological needs detailed in Self-Determination Theory (SDT): competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Competence refers to one's ability to successfully navigate their presented environment (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). Autonomy refers to feeling as if one is in control of and the originator of one's own thoughts and actions (Grolnick, 2009).

Relatedness describes one's sense of integration and belonging with their broader social structure (Hutman et al., 2012).

Research question one addressed a faculty member's competence in teaching in an environment in which guns are potentially present and their perceptions of being able to autonomously do so without fear. Research question two explored campus carry's influence on faculty perceptions of autonomy in being able to freely pursue their research agenda. Research question three explored how campus carry influences faculty perceptions of relatedness to their campus community, i.e. being safe, secure, and nurtured in the campus community.

Research Design

This study was conducted through a single case study methodology and used the influence of campus carry at The University of Texas at Austin as its single case. The primary reason for choosing a case study methodology was the exploratory nature of the topic. While much has been theorized or surmised regarding the possible implementation of campus carry on a higher education campus, a review of the literature has shown research on institutions post-implementation or on the effect on academic freedom is scant or non-existent. The use of a case study in this instance was in keeping with what Yin (2014) describes as a revelatory case.

The newness of campus carry at this institution provided the opportunity to reveal hitherto unexplored academic territory. Revelatory cases allow the researcher "an opportunity to observe and analyze a phenomenon previously inaccessible to social science inquiry" (Yin, 2014, p. 52). Furthermore, establishing this research at this

particular institution can potentially serve as an initial pilot study for later multiple-case studies.

In addition, this particular institution operated as what Stake (1995) would call a “bounded system” (p. 2). SB11 allows each institution to develop unique protocols for implementing and limiting campus carry. While certain standards for implementation have to be met, different institutions can limit campus carry in different ways. In this regard, UT-Austin was unique in how campus carry was implemented and how it affected and continues to affect faculty, particularly LGBTQ+ faculty. Thus, as a system of study, UT-Austin was integrated, bounded, and separate from other institutions.

A further reason for choosing UT-Austin over other institutions of higher education was its history with mass shootings. As previously mentioned in the review of the literature, UT-Austin was the site of the first mass shooting on a college campus, and this shooting is an active part of the institutions historical memory. Furthermore, in 2010 a young student took an AK-47 assault rifle into the institution’s library and committed suicide. Because of these two experiences, the issue of guns on campus was and continues to be particularly prescient for UT-Austin. These factors, combined with the institution’s proximity to the state capitol, made UT-Austin an ideal location for this study.

Sources of data

The data for this case was collected through three sources. Both Stake (1995) and Yin (2014) asserted document review, observations, and interviews to be the three cornerstones of case study analysis. Documents, Yin asserted, allow the opportunity to

“corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 107). Observations, Stake noted, allow the researcher to form “a relatively incontestable for further analysis and ultimate reporting” (p. 62) understanding of key events directly related to the issue(s) being studied in the case. Finally, both Yin and Stake held interviews allow the researcher to ascertain multiple views of the case from participants and understand perspectives not readily learned through observation. In keeping with this practice, this study employed analysis of UT-Austin school and faculty council statements, observations of archived town-hall forums on campus carry, and interviews of LGBTQ+ faculty as the primary sources of data.

The first data source was a random sampling of 16 of the various statements issued by faculty councils, colleges, and professional organizations at UT-Austin. In total, 42 faculty councils, colleges, and organizations at UT-Austin have issued statements against campus carry, citing concern for the educational environment and safety of the campus. Analysis of these documents provided context and understanding of the general faculty sentiment towards campus carry, including concerns for academic freedom (RQ1, RQ2) and concerns for the effect of campus carry on the general campus climate (RQ3).

The second data source was an analysis of two archived town hall forums held at UT-Austin on September 30, 2015 and October 5, 2015, respectively. Hosted by the working group tasked with forming the university’s campus carry policies, these forums were open to both UT-Austin and the general public and were an opportunity for individuals to express concern or support for campus carry as well ask questions about

implementation. Much like the document analysis, these observations provided greater insight into the concerns of faculty participants regarding academic freedom (RQ1, RQ2) and the general campus climate (RQ3).

The third data source was interviews of 10 LGBTQ+ faculty at UT-Austin. Yin (2014) asserted 10 participants to be the minimum number needed for saturation in a case study. Furthermore, these interviews were what Yin described as “shorter case study interviews” (p. 111) lasting roughly one hour and focusing on the topics of academic freedom (RQ1, RQ2) and faculty concerns for the safety of the campus community and their respective connectedness with the campus community (RQ3). The protocol for the interviews followed Patton’s (1990) interview guide approach (see Appendix A). With this approach, a general list of questions related to the research questions were developed, however with enough flexibility to allow new, salient topics to emerge as the interview progressed.

Subjects and Population

The population for this study was LGBTQ+ faculty at UT-Austin. As noted in the previous chapter, LGBTQ+ individuals in higher education often encounter higher rates of discrimination on higher education campuses (Rankin et al., 2003; Sears, 2002) and also are at a higher risk for bias-motivated crimes (Marzullo & Libman, 2009). This study focused on LGBTQ+ faculty precisely because these challenges make the LGBTQ+ faculty experience unique among the larger faculty population at UT-Austin. From this population, 10 LGBTQ+ full-time faculty were recruited to participate in a one-time, hour-long interview. As previously stated, Yin (2014) asserted 10 to be the minimum

number needed for saturation, though larger samples yield more strength and validity to the analysis and results.

Participants were recruited primarily through purposive and snowball sampling methods (Miles et al., 2014). Purposive samples are built by targeting a very specific sample of the larger population; since this study focused solely on full-time LGBTQ+ faculty, recruitment focused solely on these individuals and was not open to non-LGBTQ+ faculty. These individuals were initially recruited through the university's LGBT faculty/staff association, after which participants were asked to recommend other LGBTQ+, full-time faculty who may have been interested in participating.

Data Analysis

Data were coded primarily through what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) define as inductive coding. While the research questions guided the interview protocol, data were coded as themes emerge. This allowed unexpected new themes to be coded without being hindered by pre-existing expectations. Codes themselves were primarily holistic, attributive, and evaluative (Miles et al, 2014), with the option to allow for simultaneous coding for more nuanced participant statements (see Appendix C).

Limitations

The first limitation of this study was the sample itself. LGBTQ+ faculty are but one small subset of the general UT-Austin faculty population and, as such, may have a very different lived experience with campus carry as a phenomenon. This study was designed, however, to focus on this population precisely because of the unique experiences of LGBTQ+ faculty. The multiple sources of data analyzed provided

opportunities for triangulation and greater internal validity (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014). Furthermore, given the commonality of experiences of LGBTQ+ faculty found in the literature, this study provided the opportunity for external validity (Yin, 2014) to other similar institutions implementing campus carry and potentially can serve as an initial pilot for later studies of campus carry.

The second limitation of this study was the lack of opportunity for participant observation. This study focused on academic freedom and campus safety in relation to campus carry; observing the effects of campus carry in a classroom teaching setting or a research setting is not feasible. Observation of the town hall forums provided context, but any effects of campus carry on teaching or research will be subtle, occur over a much longer period of time, and be evidenced through broader shifts in the campus climate not observable in this study. To combat this, participants were asked about their perceived shifts in their research or teaching.

The third limitation of this study was in being revelatory and not longitudinal (Stake, 1995). Campus carry was in its first year of implementation at the time of this study, and this study was an exploration of its current effects. As time progresses, attitudes towards campus carry may shift, however only a longitudinal study will observe this process.

Study validity is always of issue in qualitative research. The use of three different types of data sources did, as mentioned, provide the opportunity for triangulation of themes and results. Furthermore, the use of multiple sources of triangulated evidence

increased construct validity (Yin, 2014) in that multiple data sources were tested against the research questions and theoretical framework of this study.

Finally, as a researcher I must address the issue of bias. I am both a member of the LGBTQ+ community and a student and employee of UT-Austin. I could not remove myself fully as an objective observer of campus carry because it directly affects me. To combat this, however, I created an open-ended interview protocol, multiple sources of data, and framework for data coding designed to increase validity and reliability and reduce my own opportunities for bias.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

In total, this study included interviews from 10 faculty participants as well as an analysis of 16 departmental statements and two observations of previously recorded public town hall meetings on Senate Bill 11 (SB11), which implemented the legal carry of concealed firearms in academic, administrative, and residential buildings on public college and university campuses in Texas. Of the participants, three identified as female, seven identified as male, and all identified as cisgender. One identified as bisexual, four identified as gay or queer, two identified as lesbian, one identified as lesbian or queer, one identified as a “Kinsey-5”, and one identified as exclusively queer (see Appendix C).

Following the exploratory case study design of Stake (1995) and Yin (2014), participants were interviewed for approximately one hour each to explore three research questions:

1. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom? (RQ1)
2. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda? (RQ2)
3. To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented? (RQ3)

The interview format followed Patton’s (1990) interview guide method, in which an interview protocol is used, however latitude is given to deviate from the protocol to explore the richness of data offered by the participant (see Appendix A).

Data were coded through what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) defined as inductive coding. The research questions guided the coding, however, the data were coded as themes emerged. Codes themselves were primarily holistic, attributive, and evaluative (Miles et al., 2014), allowing for simultaneous coding for more nuanced participant statements (see Appendix B).

Department Statements

Sixteen department statements on campus carry were selected from the Gun Free UT website. The 16 statements were selected to diversely represent the various disciplines taught at the university. Only statements too short to be analyzed were excluded; all others expressing a viewpoint either for or against campus carry were included. In total, all 16 departments expressed direct opposition to campus carry implementation, citing concern for guns as both a physical threat and a threat to academic freedom as the primary reason for their opposition.

Physical Threat

For many departments, guns on campus and in the classroom represented a threat to physical safety. As the Accounting department succinctly put, “We believe the presence of guns in the classroom will make the university less safe.” This opposition was further supported by the Kinesiology department: “Evidence overwhelmingly indicates that more guns lead to more gun deaths and do not lead to reduced crime rates” the department asserted, starting further, “we feel we must start at home by advocating for the health and well-being of our students and colleagues by opposing campus carry.”

Some departments also expressed more practical concerns for safety and the potential ramifications of gun discharge. The Chemical Engineering department stated guns, “may also pose threats in teaching and research laboratories where flammable and toxic chemicals are used.” Likewise, the Biomedical Engineering department wrote, “almost all [of our] laboratories contain flammable and toxic chemicals, biological agents and other hazards, and the presence of guns in these environments could pose additional threats.”

The threat of physical harm because of campus carry was particularly prescient for departments with a large population of minority students and faculty and a focus on diversity studies. The African American Studies department wrote, “Applied to our situation here at UT, in the presence of firearms the probability that bullets will find us is higher than for any other campus population.” Citing past experiences with violent threats, the department continued, “It is not uncommon for Warfield Center faculty to be the object of documented threats and harassment in our offices and lecture halls,” ultimately stating, “the expansion of citizens’ rights to bear firearms facilitates the violent deaths of Blacks.”

Academic Freedom

Departments consistently stated concern for the negative impact of campus carry on the general tenets of academic freedom. The Government Department bluntly wrote, “The Campus Carry law would have a detrimental effect on academic freedom and freedom of expression.” The Mathematics Department conveyed similar, more elaborated worries: “The presence of guns, or even their potential presence, would create an

atmosphere of fear and intimidation that would impede our ability to teach, mentor students, conduct research, and it would interfere with our students' ability to learn.”

Academic units at the university asserted specific uneasiness about campus carry's effect on teaching. The College of Pharmacy wrote their ability to effectively “deliver the curriculum” would be negatively impacted. These concerns were shared by the Computer Science Department, which wrote, “permitting guns on campus will.... impede our ability to teach and mentor our students.”

Departments consistently stated concern for the ability of their faculty and students to conduct and publish research, particularly controversial or provocative research. The Marketing department felt campus carry would “impede the free exchange of ideas” and hinder research. In a more extensive statement, the Middle Eastern Studies department wrote, “our faculty, staff, and students are fearful because on a daily basis, we teach, research, and discuss topics that are by their very nature emotionally and ideologically charged,” indicating apprehensiveness over the ability of their faculty and students to continue to research and publish specifically due to the nature of their academic work.

In addition to fear for the impact of campus carry on research, departments simultaneously stated disquiet over the effect of campus carry on student learning. In a statement addressing multiple facets of academic freedom, the Music department wrote, “the atmosphere of fear derived from the presence of guns directly conflicts with UT's mandate for ‘creating a community working together to solve challenges facing society, blending research and discovery with learning.’” Similarly, the Accounting department

stated, “permitting guns on campus will.... impede our ability to teach and mentor our students.”

One of the consistent themes found in the department statements is concern campus carry will adversely impact the expression of controversial dialogue on campus. As the Center for Women’s and Gender Studies expressed, “we are fully aware of the sensitive and often controversial nature of the topics with which we engage on a daily basis,” stating further, “The possibility that an armed student (licensed or not) might be present in the classroom or in our Center will necessarily limit the topics we discuss and our willingness to engage students in controversial discussions.” The Middle Eastern Studies department gave comparable concerns: “Increasing the number of guns in our classes, libraries, labs, lounges, dormitories, and offices, promises either to shut down such difficult dialogues altogether.... or to increase the chances of them turning deadly.”

Departments also indicated concern for their ability to recruit and retain faculty and students. As per the Computer Science department, many departments wrote of “fear that Senate Bill 11 may damage [their] ability to recruit and retain the most capable students, faculty, and staff.” The Latin American Studies department expressed equivalent unease: “We are particularly concerned about the effect of the law on the recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students from the United States and from the Latin America,” likely due both to the history of violence in many Latin American countries and the history of racism towards Latin American individuals in the United States.

Public Forum Observations

Two observations were made of previously-recorded public town hall forums on campus carry and its implementation conducted on September 30, 2015 and October 5, 2015, respectively. Both forums were held in The University of Texas Union Ballroom and were open to university faculty, staff, students, and members of the general community. In keeping with this study's focus on faculty, only faculty comments and observations were included.

Three consistent themes were offered by faculty who spoke at these forums. First, faculty seemed particularly concerned about not just their safety, but the safety of their students. Second, the faculty were concerned campus carry would infringe on their First Amendment and academic freedom rights. Finally, faculty posited SB11 is meant to be a political maneuver by the Texas Legislature and an issue of power, not safety.

Campus Safety

Faculty participants were almost unanimously against the presence of guns in academic, residential, and administrative buildings on campus. One male lecturer in Forum 2 (F2) cited FBI statistics in which 1674 homicides caused by arguments took place in 2014, second only to felony murder. He believed the legal presence of handguns on campus would increase the risk of individuals on campus harming one another because of an argument.

A female faculty member cited sexual assault statistics in other states with campus carry. She referenced a 25% increase in sexual assault in Colorado following the legalization of campus carry in 2012 and an increase in Utah from 6.6% to 14% since

implementation. She contrasted this to a national decrease of 3.3% over the past years, stating campus carry empowers would-be sexual predators.

A male faculty member in Forum 1 (F1) also cited gun statistics, particularly the safety of campuses as compared to safety off campus. He stated America saw 11,000 murders and 21,000 suicides from firearms in the past year, however the rate of these instances on college campuses was significantly lower. He further elaborated, saying college-aged individuals were 200 times more likely to be killed by gun violence off campus in comparison to on campus.

Academic Freedom

Faculty also believed campus carry implementation would significantly infringe on First Amendment and academic freedom rights both in and out of the classroom. A male professor in F2 shared concerns for his ability to recruit the best faculty, saying he could not “in good faith” encourage the best faculty to come to the University. A female faculty member at F2 gave concurrent recruitment concerns, stating she would not have chosen to allow her children to attend UT-Austin had campus carry been implemented when her children were students.

Faculty offered adamant alarm at the potential effect of campus carry on classroom discussion and dialogue. In F1, a male faculty member directly labeled SB11 as a potential chilling effect on classroom discussion. A female faculty member in F1 gave parallel concerns, asserting SB11 is contrary to the university’s value of creating a caring learning community, harming free dialogue and limiting the willingness of professors to engage in controversial discussion and teaching.

In support of this concern, a male faculty member directly stated his worry both for academic freedom and his safety. He shared he teaches controversial topics that often challenge the beliefs and assumptions of his students, who often respond in an emotionally charged, heated manner. He asserted he would be loath to engage in these topics and discussions in the future, and wondered if he should continue to stay at the university.

In F1, a second participant directly described campus carry as an attack on the UT-Austin community. She stated the Texas Legislature wants guns on the UT-Austin campus “against all reason” despite evidence guns do not make campus safer. In F2, a male professor similarly believed SB11 to be about political interest, expressing belief the legislature imposed SB11 as a means of deterring progressive-minded faculty from coming to the university to teach.

Interviews

In total, 10 participants were interviewed once for approximately one hour regarding their perceptions of the effect of campus carry on their academic freedom and feelings of safety on campus. As mentioned, 7 males and 3 females participated, with sexualities of bisexual, gay, queer, and lesbian (see Appendix C). Participants were asked questions pertaining to their perceptions of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in keeping with Deci and Ryan’s (2000) self-determination theory.

Opposition to Campus Carry

All but one of the participants expressed direct and, at times, vehement opposition to campus carry and its implementation. For some, the opposition was complicated and

tied largely to their own experience with guns. When asked about how he felt about campus carry, Participant 3 (P3), a gay male, said, “I don’t think they make things any safer....it doesn’t make me feel any safer that people have them,” however he also said he had learned to view the carry of guns in a “less emotional” way. As someone from a region of the world with very little gun ownership, P3 was open to understanding the values behind gun ownership: “these are people who are rooted in living their way of the 21st century, and you have to understand their narrative and where they come from,” indicating a willingness on his part to grapple with the cultural values underlying gun ownership.

Participant 10 (P10) a lesbian female, expressed more direct opposition to guns on campus. When asked about her experience with guns, she said, “I grew up with guns, and I am not afraid of them unless they are pointed at me.” In contrast to P3, however, she was adamantly opposed to guns on campus, stating, “I do not want them in my classroom. I don’t know what purpose they can serve in education, I just don’t. The only thing I can see is that it could be disruptive.” Participant 5 (P5), a gay male, spoke of losing a family member to suicide by gun and when asked how he felt about campus carry, succinctly stated, “not good.”

In contrast to the rest of the participants, however, Participant 7 (P7) did not express direct opposition to guns on campus. When asked about his personal experience with guns, P7 said, “I do not own one, I have not ever touched one, I personally do not like them,” however he went on to state, “The Second Amendment is part of the Constitution and.... does protect a right to bear arms.” When asked about his feelings

about campus carry, he expressed, “I am completely agnostic [about] whether allowing concealed carry permit holders will deter attacks by crazy people,” later clarifying his statement by saying, “I personally think there are far greater threats to academic freedom [and] this is frankly diverting our attention from it.” P7’s concerns were much less for the threat of guns on campus and much more for other issues relating to academic freedom in academia.

Risk of Physical Harm

For some participants, guns represented a very real risk of physical harm and a concern for personal safety. Participant 1 (P1), a bisexual male, correspondingly remarked, “I think we absolutely live in an armory. I feel like no one is safe anywhere,” but further declared, “the threat of violence is I think greater here in some ways than in many other areas.” This concern for physical harm was more pronounced in those who themselves had been the victim of violence in some way. P6 noted, “I have had weapons pointed [at my head].... I have been the victim of kidnapping, so I have that trauma.” When asked if he feels more or less safe here on campus, P6 stated, “Oh yeah.... if I discover a gun here, if for some reason a gun is accidentally visible, I will leave the room and not come back.” P5 indicated he had been gay bashed, the experience of which “lurks in the shadows constantly.” When asked about his perceptions of safety on campus now, he said, “I do not feel safe at all” and these feelings were augmented by his past violent victimization.

Safety and Identity

Many participants did express concern for the effect of campus carry on minority student, faculty, and staff safety. P8 contended, “I think any victims of violence we see as a result of this policy will be students of color, probably Black students.... these are the folks who will be impacted, and they won’t be the folks who are perpetrating.” P5 offered corresponding concerns, contending, “if you are a person of color in this climate, you are a target.”

In describing the interaction of a female faculty colleague, Participant 2 (P2), a queer/gay male, noted a general concern for female faculty with the implementation of campus carry. Because of this interaction, he stated, “I think that female faculty might be more vulnerable in many ways with this policy than male faculty,” a sentiment echoed by P10. P10, however, offered a female student-focused perspective: “I worry about sporting events and drinking and violence, because you know after a sporting event rapes go up,” signaling a concern campus carry would increase the prevalence of violent crimes against women.

This concern for at-risk populations of student extended to students who identify as LGBTQ+ as well. P8, who teaches many students who identify as queer, described her apprehensiveness for her students, saying, “I think the students I work with are the students who know the target is on their backs.” Equally, in discussing his interactions with his students after the November presidential election, P9 described the fear many of his female and LGBT students felt: “I had many students who refused to come to class and come to campus because of the fear of guns. One hundred percent of them were women or LGBT students.”

Some of the faculty themselves also felt less safe and connected to campus because of their own sexual identity. For P2, this manifested itself in his reluctance to share his sexuality with his students: “I am more reluctant to come out to the class because of gun policies and the general political climate of Texas.... the campus carry policy exacerbates my reluctance to out myself fully in front of the class.” P9 was more directly troubled for his own safety, saying, “Oh yeah, I see myself as one of the easy targets. I am a very visibly queer individual, and am committed to showing certain types of work in my classroom.”

P8 articulated her own fears and her fears for her students, particularly regarding her identity as a queer female and its intersection with other aspects of her identity:

I know, as a queer person, even as a white-passing, queer person of color, I know the target is on my back, or more specifically on a Black person’s or a Black queer person’s back most of all. I think if you think about hate crimes you think about being in a place like Texas. Queerness has to factor in to how you think about this issue. How can it not?

Her concern for her safety, as well as the concerns of P9 and P2 for their safety and their work in the classroom, calls attention to the effect campus carry can also have on perceptions of academic freedom of faculty.

Academic Freedom

For all 10 participants, academic freedom was seen as the bedrock of what they do as teachers and scholars. Participant 8 (P8), a lesbian/queer female faculty member,

succinctly defined academic freedom as “the foundation of everything,” stating she was “very adamant about the significance of academic freedom” in her work as a scholar and a teacher. Participant 4 (P4), a lesbian female, spoke of the importance of academic freedom in her classroom: “academic freedom is being able to express differences in a safe environment where people learn that just because it’s.... not what they believe, it is not unethical or immoral, and that they understand you can be ethical and still disagree.” Participant 6 (P6) focused more on the overall importance of academic freedom for the mission of the university, defining it as “essential for the university. If the university is a place for creating knowledge, for inventing ourselves as human beings, for open growth, open new ideas, we need that freedom so bad.” For participants who teach controversial subjects or engage in controversial research, academic freedom was of particular importance to them.

For some of the participants, campus carry has caused them to be more cautious with what they say and how they feel in the classroom. P1 blatantly stated, “Campus carry to me, yes, it makes a classroom even more unsafe” and went on to speak of being more cognizant of not inciting negative reactions from his students. Following the implementation of campus carry, P5 noticed a change in how he structures and guides classroom discussions: “I found myself pulling back more and more from what I would commit to talk about or do. And, my whole mindset was just don’t escalate.” For P5, this represents an active decision to modify his freedom to delve into controversial topics with his students.

In contrast, however, P8 has proclaimed a commitment to avoid modifying how she teaches: “I have made an active decision to never temper what I teach no matter the conditions.” She goes on, however, to note that any changes in her teaching may be subconscious, saying, “I think that is part of the plan of rolling [campus carry] out – to make subtle changes you wouldn’t have thought about otherwise.” P2 has also chosen not to modify his teaching in any way, stating, “I do not have the feeling that I have to fear a student who doesn’t think what I do will rise and do whatever type of violence against me.” For P2, choosing to modify his teaching is unnecessary because he does not feel any sort of threat from campus carry.

Surprisingly, none of the faculty are choosing to modify their research agendas, despite having produced research met with intensely charged reactions from the community. P7, for example, has a research agenda investigating “very contemporary questions that are very controversial that a lot of people don’t want to hear,” and yet is not modifying his research agenda in light of campus carry. Similarly, P9 has been subjected to responses such as, “fag, hell, go to hell” because of his scholarly work, but is still pursuing his controversial work as well. The potential effect of campus carry on one-to-one student interactions and grading, however, is less clear. Only one participant, P5, has actively changed how he meets individually with students, saying, “I don’t have office hours in my office any more. I don’t feel safe. I go into a public place where there are no firearms allowed.” For others, however, the issue of how to approach one-to-one interactions with students is based on past experiences and theoretical scenarios. P10 stated, “I have students in here who are having challenges.... and I have had angry

students who I knew who were familiar with guns who part of the reason they were in my office was because they were threatening people with guns. That was nerve-wracking,” though she admits she does not often consider campus carry now when meeting with students, despite having a no-guns policy for her office. She shared she often forgets to inform students not to bring a gun into her office.

Campus Carry as Symbolic Political Action

Despite much of the concern over campus carry and its potential impact on academic freedom, much of the concern from faculty focused on campus carry as a symbolic, political attack on academia. P9 scoffed at the argument of campus carry increasing safety, asserting, “I think it is really unfortunate that this law was passed....and it is being discussed as if it is an issue of safety, but we all know....it does not have to do with safety. It has to do with an industry.” He continues, “I think this is an example of legislation not matching the will of the people, so this is a larger issue that just shows a broken system where industry is king.” For P9, campus carry is a purely political law motivated by the power of the gun lobby.

P1 believed campus carry was much more symbolically motivated and rooted in power structures. He expounded,

My feeling on campus carry is that it speaks to so much more for than just what it ostensibly is. It speaks for the real sense of enmity between Texas politicians and intellectuals of any sort. The perception that we hold them in contempt – we do, not all of them, but many of them – and so, this is a way they demonstrate their

power over us and make it clear, at least they claim, that their intellectual power is of more significance.

For him, campus carry implementation was another means for a conservative legislature to exercise power and attack predominantly liberal academics.

P6, though adamantly opposed to campus carry and himself a previous victim of violence, did discuss the politics underscoring campus carry in a more hopeful manner. He set out, “it is desirable that we would not have this law, but that is a circumstance that politicizes the community. It is their reaction that makes some change, and that change is a positive thing.” For him, the highly-politicized conversations and generally adverse reactions to campus carry have served the purpose of bringing the issue of gun safety to the forefront which, he hoped, would bring long-term positive political engagement and change.

Discussion

For faculty, the interplay between safety concerns and academic freedom was complicated, especially as it relates self-determination theory’s (Deci & Ryan, 2000) tenets of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Certainly, faculty generally expressed less of a sense of relatedness to the campus community. Likewise, they struggled with competence in navigating how to address campus carry in their classroom or in their general interactions with students. While faculty asserted an ardent desire to maintain autonomy in their research and teaching agendas, the imposition of campus carry itself was viewed by the faculty as a highly symbolic attack on the autonomy of “liberal” academia by a conservative state legislature.

Relatedness

The expressed and often visceral concern of faculty participants, forum speakers, and academic units at the university for their safety on campus indicates a negative effect of campus carry on the relatedness of faculty, particularly to the campus community. For the academic units, this was evident in multiple statements directly voicing concerns for increased violence on campus due to campus carry. Furthermore, for minority, female, and LGBTQ+ faculty, this lack of relatedness was particularly felt and tied to a very real fear for their safety.

Forum speakers shared comparable concerns for safety and, consequently, relatedness. In citing statistics showing an increase in sexual assault or an increase in the risk of an accidental or intentional shooting on campus, for example, faculty indicated an increase in fear for the safety of their campus. This fear for safety directly translated into a decrease in the relatedness of these individuals to their campus community.

The faculty interview participants most thoroughly articulated their concern for both their students and their own safety. All but one participant stated they feel less safe on campus, and for many this was the result of the interplay between campus carry implementation and their own sexual identity. P6 even went so far as to say he intends to leave the university when given the opportunity, not trusting in the university to keep the campus safe or adequately respond to a threat. This concern extended not only to themselves, but to the minority students they daily teach and mentor. Very real fear for physical safety to the extent of wanting to leave the university community directly represented a diminishing of the relatedness of these faculty to their campus community.

Competence

Faculty departments, forum speakers, and academic units expressed a lack of competence in navigating the presence of guns in the classroom and on campus. For academic units, this was evident in the struggles to continue to create a “safe space” for students in the classroom and on campus while knowing students could be armed. This conflicting juxtaposition represented a new, more challenging environment for faculty and students alike, and one faculty do not feel competent navigating. Public forum faculty participants echoed these concerns for how to create a conducive learning environment, similarly stating guns in classes in which discussions can be quite heated present a new challenge to the faculty member trying to manage the discussion. Forum participants worried they lack the competence to effectively manage these discussions in the setting of an armed classroom.

Faculty participants shared a more nuanced understanding of their competence in addressing campus carry. For some, the challenge to their perception of competence was in how to include all students, CHL holders and anti-gun activists alike, in their classroom. Participants did not want to marginalize any of their students, and the hindrance to their perception of competence was in giving CHL holders a voice in the classroom while simultaneously creating a safe environment for students who are threatened by guns in the classroom.

Other faculty participants, however, felt their academic freedom competence as instructors was directly diminished in the classroom. For them, this lack of competence was reflected in their uncertainty about how to manage classroom discussion and how

much to push against students on controversial topics. P5, for example, described managing his classroom discussions as “complex” and shared he no longer feels competent in “going deeper” with his students. Similarly, participants did not feel competent in managing the anxieties and fears of their students. P9 described minority and LGBTQ+ students of his who did not want to come to campus after the November presidential election for fear of discrimination, violence, and guns, and he expressed uncertainty in how to support these students in this new campus environment.

Autonomy

Perhaps in no other area was SB11 more acutely felt than in its impact on faculty autonomy. Academic units vehemently expressed a desire to maintain integrity in their research and classroom discussions, yet the threat of violent reaction to their research or controversial teaching subjects left them feeling less autonomous in doing so. Academic units also strongly opposed being stripped of their ability to ban guns from their classrooms, stating this was an affront to the academic freedom autonomy of faculty to manage their classroom.

Faculty public forum speakers also viewed SB11 as a direct attack on their autonomy in research and in the classroom. One speaker related SB11 to the power the Texas legislature holds over Texas public education and the “utter contempt” the legislature holds for the UT-Austin community. For her, and for others in the forum, this power/powerlessness relationship between the legislature and the UT-Austin faculty represented a direct intent of the legislature to limit and attack the autonomy of the faculty through the imposition of SB11.

Faculty participants also viewed SB11 as a highly symbolic attack on their autonomy rooted in power and politics. As P1 obtusely stated, “Campus carry.... means the legislature really hates us, and it’s really only meant to stick it to us as intellectuals.” In this regard, for faculty participants SB11 represented much more than just a threat to being harmed for publishing a controversial, i.e. liberal, piece of research or teaching a socially conscious course rooted in activism. For faculty, SB11 was meant to be an attack on them as academics and a means of chilling their seemingly liberal influence on students and the community. More than anything, participants viewed SB11 as an assault on them as thinkers, leaders, and scholar-educators.

Contribution to Existing Literature

This study was meant to expand knowledge of campus carry’s impact, particularly with regard to academic freedom, faculty, and LGBTQ+ issues. Scholars such as Patten, Thomas, and Wada (2013) have surveyed general perceptions of faculty, staff, and students regarding campus carry. Similarly, Dahl, Bonham, and Reddington (2016) addressed perceptions towards campus carry, specifically with faculty at community colleges. Neither these studies nor others have focused on issues of academic freedom, especially in campuses post-implementation. Little is known about the potential influence of campus carry on perceptions of academic freedom. Likewise, the few studies investigating campus carry do not specifically address the impact on perceptions of safety of different minority groups in higher education. This study hoped to begin to fill the void in knowledge about campus carry’s impact on specific populations.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study sought to explore the effect of Senate Bill 11 (SB11) on the perceptions of academic freedom and campus safety of faculty who identify as LGBTQ+. Passed in 2015, SB11 legalized the carry of concealed handguns by licensed permit holders in academic, administrative, and residential buildings on public higher education campuses in the State of Texas. Prior to the passage of SB11, concealed permit holders could carry guns on campus grounds but were not permitted to carry in any of the aforementioned buildings. Faculty, staff, and students both for and against SB11 have been very vocal in voicing their opinions regarding SB11, with the vast majority of faculty expressing direct opposition to SB11.

Citing concern for both campus safety and academic freedom, faculty at The University of Texas at Austin have been particularly vocal in articulating opposition to SB11. The Faculty Council passed a resolution against campus carry, stating “guns in education spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, and academic freedom” (The University of Texas at Austin General Faculty Council, 2015). In total, 43 UT-Austin departments and 11 professional societies at the university issued statements against campus carry.

Faculty are meant to serve as teachers, scholars, and mentors who disrupt the status quo with their students and provide a nurturing, yet challenging, learning environment, however the introduction of concealed firearms into the classrooms potentially alters the dynamic of the classroom in a threatening and possibly dangerous

manner. Faculty who identify as LGBTQ+ or who teach highly controversial, emotionally charged topics, may feel additional apprehension on expressing their academic freedom in teaching and research. Utilizing an exploratory case study methodology (Stake, 1995), this study sought to explore three research questions:

1. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom?

(RQ1)

2. To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda? (RQ2)

3. To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented? (RQ3)

These research questions were formulated following the tenets of autonomy, competence, and relatedness of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Competence refers to one's ability to successfully navigate one's presented environment (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). Autonomy refers to feeling as if one is in control of and the originator of one's own thoughts and actions (Grolnick, 2009). Relatedness describes one's sense of integration and belonging with one's broader social structure (Hutman et al., 2012).

Literature Review

While much has been written regarding the Second Amendment rights to own and carry firearms as well as First Amendment rights to free speech and academic freedom, less has been studied regarding campus carry itself. Court cases such as *Heller v. District*

of Columbia (2006) and *McDonald v. City of Chicago* (2010) decided unequivocally the right of citizens to own and bear arms, however the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) did hold gun carry can be restricted in “sensitive” areas, such as schools. In contrast, First Amendment court cases such as *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957) and *Garcetti v. Ceballos* (2006) establish free speech and academic freedom on public campuses as fundamental rights, but also subject them to limitations.

Ultimately, the conflict between the First Amendment and the Second Amendment centers on the notion of whether guns on campus creates a hostile environment in which free speech and academic freedom are “chilled,” especially for those with controversial views. Mash (2013) argued, “To the degree that allowing people to carry weapons on campus stifles open discussion, limits the marketplace of ideas, and hinders training students about engaging difficult ideas that challenge their core values, it also creates a ‘chilling effect’” (p. 58). Magarian (2012) similarly stressed the importance of the First Amendment over the second, a position supported by Lewis (2011) and Miller (2011), who argued campuses have the right to ban campus carry under the First Amendment.

Safety on college campuses has been and continues to be a particular concern, with risk of student suicide being chief among concerns with campus carry implementation (Hollingsworth et al., 2009). Likewise, students who bring guns to campus are more likely to be male and engage in binge drinking (Presley & Meilman, 1997). Ultimately, however, students and faculty greatly oppose the presence of

concealed handguns on campus, citing concerns for safety as the primary reason (Bennet et al., 2012; Dahl et al., 2016; Patten et al., 2013; Thompson et al., 2013).

LGBTQ+ faculty on college campuses often experience heightened discrimination and are particularly vulnerable. Individuals who identify as LGBTQ+ face higher rates of violent crime victimization than any other crime (Marzullo & Libman, 2009). On college campuses, queer-identifying faculty are more likely to experience discrimination and leave their college campuses as a result (Garvey & Rankin, 2016) with transgender individuals facing the most discrimination at their respective institutions (Bilimoria & Stewart, 2009; Garvey & Rankin, 2016; Sears, 2002).

Methodology

The case study methodology employed in this study was a revelatory study (Yin, 2014). Revelatory case studies seek to understand hitherto new phenomena, which lent itself well to the newness of campus carry at UT-Austin. Furthermore, the UT-Austin campus represented a bounded system (Stake 1995) due to the uniqueness of campus carry implementation at individual public institutions in Texas, as well as UT-Austin's distinct and infamous history as the site of the first mass campus shooting in 1966.

Data were collected from three sources: statements of various academic units at UT-Austin regarding campus carry; observation of two previously-recorded public forums about campus carry held in a town-hall format; and 10 interviews with full-time UT-Austin faculty who identify as LGBTQ+. Sixteen academic unit statements were chosen at random and analyzed for content and themes. Similarly, public town hall

forums were observed via recording and notes were taken on faculty statements regarding campus carry.

For interviews, 10 total participants were recruited and interviewed for roughly 45 minutes regarding how they perceived academic freedom impacted their teaching and research as well as their perception of campus safety (see Appendix A). In total, seven identified as cisgender male and three identified as cisgender female; all identified as LGBTQ+ (see Appendix C). Interviews were transcribed and coded according to theme using what Miles et al. (2014) defined as inductive coding, meaning themes were created from the data as they emerged (see Appendix B).

Results

After interviewing 10 LGBTQ+ faculty, observing public town hall forums, and analyzing statements of academic departments and units, campus carry was shown to clearly have some effect on the perceptions of autonomy, competence, and relatedness of faculty. With regard to this study's research questions, the effect of campus carry on the academic freedom of faculty varied on the context. Faculty were generally more cautious and aware of what they say in and out of the classroom, but were determined not to let campus carry undermine their autonomy in their research. In general, faculty felt much less safe on campus and less related to their campus community. The one exception, however was one participant who was "agnostic" about guns on campus and believed more data are needed to fully understand whether guns make campus more or less safe. Ultimately, for the faculty interviewed, campus carry represented a general decrease in

the level of safety of their campus and a symbolic jab at academia and academic freedom by the Texas legislature.

Research question one (RQ1) asked, “To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely teach, challenge, and otherwise interact with students in and out of the classroom?” In answer to this question, faculty were fighting for their autonomy to regulate their classroom and feel they have lost. Furthermore, they did not feel competent in how to navigate some of the nuances of this law, which ultimately also affected their connectedness with their students.

Faculty departments generally expressed feeling less competent in navigating how to create a “safe space” for their students to think and be challenged in an armed classroom. This sentiment was echoed by public forum speakers, stating instructors who teach controversial courses in which discussion can be heated will now face the additional challenge of continuing to teach in this manner while maintaining safety. This conflict between academic freedom in the classroom and maintaining safety represented a new predicament faculty did not feel competent navigating.

Likewise, interview participants shared similar, albeit more nuanced, concerns. Both P2 and P3 chose not to modify their teaching in any way, but instead shared concern for maintaining connectedness with all of their students and providing a safe space both for both opponents and proponents of campus carry to feel safe and have a voice in their classroom. For others, however, campus carry did directly limit how they interact with students. P5, for example, stated he no longer holds private office hours; in the

classroom, he said he was actively avoiding “going too deep” in his classroom discussion to avoid it escalating into an unsafe situation.

Research question two (RQ2) asked, “To what extent do LGBTQ+ faculty perceive campus carry to influence their ability to freely pursue their research agenda?” Both academic units and public forum speakers shared significant distress over the potential impact of campus carry on the research of faculty, particularly those with provocative research agendas. Faculty interview participants, however, were determined to maintain their autonomy, despite having self-professed “controversial, provocative” agendas.

Academic departments were highly concerned for the ability of faculty and students to maintain highly controversial research agendas for fear of reprisal, stating campus carry posed a “direct threat” to the research of faculty and students particularly from minority backgrounds. Public forum speakers echoed these sentiments, stating carry would have a “chilling effect” on free speech and freedom in research agendas. For interview participants, however, continuing to publish controversial research was an absolute must towards maintaining a sense of autonomy. P8, for example, stated she unequivocally does not intend to modify her research agenda, even going so far as to actively maintain and pursue a progressive and controversial research agenda as a means of protesting against campus carry.

Research question three (RQ3) asked, “To what extent do faculty believe their identity as LGBTQ+ influences their sense of safety and security at a campus on which campus carry has been implemented?” For interview participants, the interplay of

sexuality and campus safety was largely impacted by how visibly LGBTQ+ they felt they were on campus. P1, for example stated he did not feel overtly threatened because he is not expressly known on campus for his identity as a bisexual male. In contrast, P8, a queer female, and P9, a queer male, both however expressed concern not only for themselves as LGBTQ+ individuals, but also for their LGBTQ+-identifying students. As P8 stated, “If you think about hate crimes you think about a place like Texas. How could queerness not be a factor?”

This broader concern for campus safety was echoed by departments in their statements and public forum speakers. Both the Center for Women’s and Gender Studies as well as the African and African American Studies department expressly shared concern for LGBTQ+ faculty and students, particularly those students of color. Likewise, public forum speakers shared significant worry for the safety of campus, highlighting the increased risk of suicides, violent crimes, and sexual assaults on campus due to an increased presence of guns.

Ultimately, the issue of campus safety represented a direct attack on the sense of relatedness of the faculty to the campus community. Both in and out of the classroom, faculty, particularly LGBTQ+ faculty, expressed significantly less connectedness to their campus. P6, a gay male, even expressed a desire to leave the university as soon as he finds a viable option for him to do so.

For these faculty, campus carry came to represent a symbolic attack on both the autonomy and relatedness of faculty by the legislature. One forum speaker described campus carry as an attack by “a legislature who hates us” for being liberal, progressive

academics. Similarly, P1 described campus carry as an exemplar of “the real sense of enmity between Texas politicians and intellectuals of any sort,” an enmity likely exacerbated by the earnestness with which the Academy has fought against campus carry.

Limitations

One of the main limitations of this study was the gender breakdown of the participants. While the study included a broad swath of sexualities, including queer, bisexual, lesbian, and gay, seven out of the 10 participants were male and all of them identified as cisgender, meaning they identify as the gender they were assigned at birth. Participants were recruited through a combination of snowball sampling and through recruitment from the university’s faculty and staff pride association. The overrepresentation of male participants could be due to a variety of reasons, though most likely this was due to the general overrepresentation of males in academia.

A second limitation of this study was the lack of participants who identify as transgender. As mentioned, all participants in this study identified as cisgender, with none identifying as transgender, gender-queer, gender-nonbinary, or some other non-binary gender identity. Due to both the time constraints in completing this study and the extremely limited pool of transgender faculty at the institution, recruiting a transgender faculty member was extremely difficult.

A third limitation of the study was the design of the study itself. Case studies provide an excellent understanding of the broader context and impact of a phenomenon, however the academic unit statements and public forums took place prior to the implementation of campus carry. Both provided excellent context for the overall

perception of faculty regarding SB11, however only the 10 interviews with faculty provided context post-implementation.

Implications for Future Research

First and foremost, the transgender voice of faculty needs to be heard. As Bilimoria & Stewart (2009) indicated, transgender individuals face particular discrimination at higher education institutions; further, they are victims of more violent hate crimes (Marzullo & Libman, 2009). How are transgender faculty, in particular, affected by campus carry? Are they feeling the potential for threat more acutely than their cisgender or hetero-identifying colleagues? A detailed phenomenological study about the transgender experience with campus carry needs to be conducted to investigate this issue.

Likewise, while this study was part of a larger study on gender and campus carry, a detailed study focusing on the experiences of female faculty who identify as non-heterosexual needs to be conducted. As some of the male participants noted, they know of female faculty who feel themselves to be under greater threat from campus carry due to their gender. This study was limited in assessing the experience of female faculty who identify as non-heterosexual, and yet this is an important voice to be heard both regarding academic freedom and campus safety.

To increase generalizability, all faculty need the opportunity to voice their opinions regarding campus carry and how they perceive it has affected their expression academic freedom and their perception of safety on campus. Further phenomenological studies including a large collective of faculty from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds would shed further light on campus carry's effect on the campus. Likewise,

a quantitative method of surveying faculty would help explore the faculty experience at not just UT-Austin, but other public institutions at Texas as well. Finally, this and other similar studies should be conducted after multiple years have passed since SB11 took effect. The emotional effects of campus carry may be very raw for faculty this soon after implementation, however faculty may feel differently about the law as more time elapses.

Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

1. What is your age?
2. What is your sexual identity?
3. What is your gender identity?
4. What is your political affiliation, if any?
5. How did you come to UT?
6. What are the primary areas in which you research?
7. How would you define academic freedom?
8. How do you use academic freedom in your position?
9. How important is academic freedom to you in your teaching?
10. What experience do you have with guns?
11. Are you a gun owner?
12. What role do you believe academic freedom has in your one-to-one interactions with students?
13. What do you know about concealed carry implementation?
14. How do you perceive the presence of concealed handguns on campus to affect your academic freedom regarding your teaching in the classroom?
15. How do you perceive the presence of concealed handguns on campus to affect your academic freedom regarding one-to-one interactions with students?

16. What effect do you perceive campus carry has had on the campus climate?
17. What effect do you perceive campus carry has had on your own feelings of personal safety and security on campus?

Appendix B: Codebook

Code	Subcode 1	Subcode 2	Description
Controversial Discussion			Controversial classroom discussion
	ThreatToFaculty		Threat to faculty as a result of controversial discussion
AcadFreedomThreat			General concern for academic freedom
	TeachingThreat		Threat to teaching freedom
	RecruitThreat		Threat to recruitment freedom
		MinorityRecruitThreat	Specifically denotes a threat to the recruitment of minority faculty and students
	FreeSpeechThreat		Threat to free speech
	ResearchThreat		Threat to freedom in research
	LearningThreat		Describes a hindrance to free learning
	LeaveUniversity		Indicates a faculty member is considering leaving the university because of campus carry
GunsAsThreat			Connotes guns as a source of harm

			Risk of psychological harm as a result of guns
	PsychHarmRisk		
			Risk of physical harm as a result of guns
	PhysHarmRisk		
			Risk of harm specifically to minorities
	HarmToMinorities		
			Risk of harm specifically to women
	HarmToWomen		
			Risk of harm specifically to LGBTQ+ individuals
	HarmToLGBT		
			Describes a change in 1:1 interactions with students
	1:1Change		
Opposition			Direct opposition to campus carry by a faculty member
AntiGunOwnership			Direct opposition to gun ownership by a faculty member
			Indicates a faculty member has had no experience with guns
	NoGunExperience		
AFDefinition			Definition of academic freedom by a faculty member

MHConcern			Concern for the mental health of a student by a faculty member
CCPolitics			Describes campus carry as a political or symbolic action by the legislature
ControversialResearch			Indicates faculty believe their research to be controversial or provocative
NoChange			Indicates faculty do not change their behaviors as a result of campus carry
	NoTeachChange		No change in teaching behavior
	NoResearchChange		No change in research behavior
	NoStudentChange		No change in observed student behavior
	NoCampusChange		No change in campus climate or safety
	No1:1Change		No change in one-to-one interactions with students
Sexual Identity			Indicates the self-identified sexuality of a faculty member
	Bisexual		Bisexual identity
	Gay		Gay identity
	Queer		Queer identity

	Kinsey-5		Identifies as "Kinsey-5" sexuality
	Lesbian		Lesbian identity
Gender Identity			Indicates the self-identified gender of a faculty member
	Male		Male gender
	Female		Female gender
PastStudentThreat			Indicates faculty member has felt physically threatened by a student in the past
PastVictimization			Indicates faculty member has past been the victim of violence
	PastGunVictimization		Indicates the faculty member has past been the victim of gun violence
	PastNonGunVictimization		Indicates the faculty member has past been the victim of non-gun violence
NoOpposition			Faculty member does not oppose campus carry
	Skepticism		Faculty member is skeptical of the effects of campus carry
	NoGunOpposition		Faculty member does not oppose

			guns or gun ownership on campus
--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Appendix C: Participants

Participant	Gender	Sexuality
P1	Male	Bisexual
P2	Male	Gay/Queer
P3	Male	Gay/Queer
P4	Female	Lesbian
P5	Male	Gay
P6	Male	Gay
P7	Male	Kinsey 5
P8	Female	Lesbian/Queer
P9	Male	Queer
P10	Female	Lesbian

References

- American Association of University Professors. (1940). *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf>
- Armed Campuses. (2017). *Guns on campus laws for public colleges and universities*. Retrieved from www.armedcampuses.org
- Bennett, K., Kraft, J., & Grubb, D. (2012). University faculty attitudes toward guns on campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 23*(3), 336–355.
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2009). “Don’t ask, don’t tell”: The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal, 21*(2), 85–103.
- Bjelopera, et al. (2013). *Public mass shootings in the United States: Selected implications for federal public health and safety*. Congressional Resource Service. Retrieved from http://journalistsresource.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MassShootings_CongResServ.pdf
- Bouffard, J. A., Nobles, M. R., & Wells, W. (2012). Differences across majors in the desire to obtain a license to carry a concealed handgun on campus: Implications for criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 23*(3), 283–306.
- Bouffard, J. A., Nobles, M. R., Wells, W., & Cavanaugh, M. R. (2012). How many more guns?: Estimating the effect of allowing licensed concealed handguns on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(2), 316–343.

- Branas, C. C., Richmond, T. S., Culhane, D. P., Ten Have, T. R., & Wiebe, D. J. (2009). *Investigating the link between gun possession and gun assault. American Journal of Public Health, 99*(11), 2034–2040.
- Carlson, J. (2015). Mourning Mayberry: Guns, masculinity, and socioeconomic decline. *Gender & Society, 29*(3), 386–409.
- Catullo, L. A. ., Walker, D. A., & Floyd, D. L. (2009). The status of crisis management at NASPA member institutions. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.), 46*(2), 301–324.
- Chang, A. W. (2001). Resuscitating the constitutional “theory” of academic freedom: A search for a standard beyond Pickering and Connick. *Stanford Law Review, 53*(4), 915.
- Chasmar, J. (2015, October). Texas professor against campus carry law to resign out of “self-protection.” *The Washington Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/oct/8/daniel-hamermesh-texas-professor-against-campus-ca/>
- Connolly, M. (2012). Is your college really ready for a crisis? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(5), 376–378.
- Dahl, P. P., Bonham, J. G., & Reddington, F. P. (2016). Community college faculty: Attitudes toward guns on campus. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 40*(8), 706–717.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268.

- Dolan, T. G. (2006). Few schools are ready to manage a crisis. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 72(2), 4–8.
- Elrod, J. (2008). Critical inquiry: A tool for protecting the dissident professor's academic freedom. *California Law Review*, 96(6), 1669–1691.
- Everytownresearcher.org. (2015). *161 school shootings in America since 2013*. Retrieved from <http://everytownresearch.org/school-shootings/>
- Fallahi, C. R., Austad, C. S., Fallon, M., & Leishman, L. (2009). A survey of perceptions of the Virginia Tech tragedy. *Journal of School Violence*, 8(2), 120–135.
- Florida Carry, Inc. v. University of Florida, 1D14-4614 (1st District Court of Appeals October 30, 2015).
- Garcetti v. Ceballos, 547 U.S. 410 (U.S.C. 2006).
- Garvey, J. C., & Rankin, S. (Sue). (2016). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000035>
- Genuchi, M. (2015). Anger and hostility as primary externalizing features of depression in college men. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 14(2), 113–128.
- Grolnick, W. S. (2009). The role of parents in facilitating autonomous self-regulation for education. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 164–173.
- GunFreeUT.org. (2016). *Statements*. Retrieved from <http://gunfreeut.org/statements/>
- Heller v. District of Columbia, 554 U.S. 570 (U.S.C. 2006).
- Hemenway, D., & Solnick, S. J. (2015). The epidemiology of self-defense gun use: Evidence from the National Crime Victimization Surveys 2007–2011. *Preventive*

- Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice and Theory*, 79, 22–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypped.2015.03.029>
- Hollingsworth, K. R., Dunkle, J. H., & Douce, L. (2009). The high-risk (disturbed and disturbing) college student. *New Directions for Student Services*, 128, 37–54.
- Hutman, et al. (2012). *Indicators of relatedness in adolescent male groups: Toward a qualitative description. Qualitative Report*, 17(15), 1-23.
- Latest Hate Crime Statistics Report Released. (2014). [Story]. Retrieved September 15, 2016, from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/latest-hate-crime-statistics-report-released>
- Lewis, S. K. (2011). Bullets and books by legislative fiat: Why academic freedom and public policy permit higher education institutions to say not to guns. *Idaho Law Review*, 48(1), N.P.
- Lucas, C. J. (2006). *American Higher Education: A History* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Magarian, G. P. (2012). *Speaking truth to firepower: How the First Amendment destabilizes the Second. Texas Law Review*, 91(1), 49–99.
- Marzullo, M. A., & Libman, A. J. (2009). *Research overview: Hate crimes and violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people*. Washington, D.C.: Human Rights Campaign. Retrieved from http://hrc-assets.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com/files/assets/resources/Hatecrimesandviolenceagainstlgbtpeople_2009.pdf
- Mash, K. M. (2013). Guns on campus: A chilling effect. *Thought & Action*, 29, 57–60.

- McDonald v. City of Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (U.S.C. 2010).
- Meilman, P., Leichter, J., & Presley, C. (1998). Analysis of weapon carrying among college students, by region and institution type. *Journal of American College Health, 46*(6), 291–292.
- Meltzer, J. (2014). Open carry for all: Heller and our nineteenth-century Second Amendment. *Yale Law Journal, 123*(5), 1486–1530.
- Miles, M., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J. H. (2011). *The Second Amendment goes to college. Seattle University Law Review, 35*(235), N.P.
- Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Wechsler, H. (1999). Guns at college. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(1), 7–12.
- National Public Radio. (2007). *Timeline: Shootings at U.S. College Campuses*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=9603275>
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education, 7*(2), 133–144.
- Obergefell v. Hodges, 571 U.S. (U.S.C. 2015).
- Olivas, M. (2006). *The Law and Higher Education: Cases and Materials on Colleges in Court* (3rd ed.). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

- Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Viotti, P. (2013). Sweating bullets: Female attitudes regarding concealed weapons and the perceptions of safety on college campuses. *Race, Gender, & Class, 20*(3), 269–290.
- Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Wada, J. C. (2013). Packing heat: Attitudes regarding concealed weapons on college campuses. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*, 551–569.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Evaluation and Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Phillips, et al. (2013). When concealed handgun Licenses break bad: Criminal convictions of concealed handgun licensees in Texas, 2001-2009. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(1), 86–91.
- Pickering v. Board of Education, 391 U.S. 563 (U.S.C. 1968).
- Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P. W. (1997). Weapon carrying and substance abuse among college students. (Cover story). *Journal of American College Health, 46*(1), 3.
- Randazzo, M. R., & Cameron, J. K. (2012). From presidential protection to campus security: A brief history of threat assessment in Nothrth American schools and colleges. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 26*(4), 277–290.
- Rankin, S. R. (2005). Campus climates for sexual minorities. *New Directions for Student Services, 111*, 17–23.
- Rankin, S. R., Cahill, S., Ellen, M., French, L., & Jones, K. (2003). *Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people: a national perspective*. The Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Retrieved from

- http://www.thetaskforce.org/static_html/downloads/reports/reports/CampusClimate.pdf
- Rasmussen, C., Johnson, G., & Midwestern Higher Education Compact. (2008). *The Ripple Effect of Virginia Tech: Assessing the Nationwide Impact on Campus Safety and Security Policy and Practice*. Midwestern Higher Education Compact. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED502232&site=ehost-live>
- Rosborough IV, R. S. (2009). A “great day” for academic freedom: The threat posed to academic freedom by the Supreme Court's decision in *Garcetti v. Ceballos*. *Albany Law Review*, 72(2), 565–595.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work-life satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285–309.
- Schauer, F. (2012). The permutations of academic freedom. *Arkansas Law Review (1968-Present)*, 65(2), 193–201.
- Schwartz, J. A., Beaver, K. M., & Barnes, J. C. (2015). The association between mental health and violence among a nationally representative sample of college students from the United States. *PLoS ONE*, 10(10), 1–19.
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty: What Is the pivotal frame of reference? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11.
- Senate Bill 11, 411 Texas Government Code § (2015).

- Shadick, R., & Akhter, S. (2014). Suicide prevention with diverse college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 28*(2), 117–131.
- Smith, M. L. (2013). Second amendment challenges to student housing firearms bans: The strength of the home analogy. *UCLA Law Review, 60*(4), 1047–1080.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Storch, E. A., Bagner, D. M., Geffken, G. R., & Baumeister, A. L. (2004). Association between overt and relational aggression and psychosocial adjustment in undergraduate college students. *Violence and Victims, 19*(6), 689–700.
- Sulkowski, M. L., & Lazarus, P. J. (2011). Contemporary responses to violent attacks on college campuses. *Journal of School Violence, 10*(4), 338–354.
- Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 354 U.S. 234 (U.S.C. 1957).
- The University of Texas at Austin General Faculty Council. (2015). Proposed Campus Carry Resolution. Retrieved from <https://wikis.utexas.edu/display/facultycouncil/Campus+Carry>
- Thompson, et al. (2013). Student Perceptions and Practices Regarding Carrying Concealed Handguns on University Campuses. *Journal of American College Health, 61*(5), 243–253.
- Thompson, A., Price, J. H., Mrdjenovich, A. J., & Khubchandani, J. (2009). Reducing firearm-related violence on college campuses—Police chiefs’ perceptions and practices. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(3), 247–254.
- U.S. Constitution, Amendment 1. (1789).

- U.S. Constitution, Amendment 2. (1789).
- Wallace, L. N. (2015). Responding to violence with guns: Mass shootings and gun acquisition. *The Social Science Journal, 52*(2), 156–167.
- Wasserman, L. M. (2011). Gun control on college and university campuses in the wake of District of Columbia v. Heller and McDonald v. City of Chicago. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law, 19*(1), 1–57.
- Waters, E., Jindasurat, C., & Wolfe, C. (2016). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and hiv-affected hate violence in 2015: 2016 release edition*. New York: National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs.
- Watkins, D. C., Hunt, J. B., & Eisenberg, D. (2012). Increased demand for mental health services on college campuses: Perspectives from administrators. *Qualitative Social Work, 11*(3), 319–337.
- Whisenhunt, et al. (2015). Self-injury and suicide: Practical information for college counselors. *Journal of College Counseling, 18*(3), 275–288.
- Wright, T. E. (2010). LGBT educators' perceptions of school climate. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(8), 49–53.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.