Educators' Reasons for Not Practising 2SLGBTQ+-Inclusive Education

Christopher Campbell, PhD Candidate
University of Manitoba

Tracey Peter
University of Manitoba

Catherine Taylor
University of Winnipeg

Abstract

In this article, we analyze educators' self-reported reasons for not addressing 2SLGBTQ+ topics in their schools in order to develop a clearer picture of the barriers that prevent educators from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-supportive practices. Using hierarchical OLS (ordinary least squares) and logistic regression models to analyze the impacts of demographic, individual-based, and school-based barriers to practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education,

Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation 44:4 (2021)
**©2021 Canadian Society for the Study of Education/
Société canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation**
www.cje-rce.ca

we found that the most common reasons for inaction reported by educators were a lack of training/resources and general fear of opposition from various sources; however, educators who had confidence in the level of support for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education at the school level were less likely to give these as reasons for inaction.

Keywords: 2SLGBTQ+, teachers, educators, 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, K–12 schools

Résumé

Dans le présent article, nous analysons les raisons déclarées par des éducateurs pour expliquer pourquoi ils n'abordent pas des sujets 2SLGBTQ+ dans leur école, afin de clarifier les obstacles qui les empêchent d'employer des pratiques inclusives soutenant la communauté 2SLGBTQ+. L'impact d'obstacles démographiques, personnels et scolaires à la mise en œuvre de l'éducation inclusive des personnes 2SLGBTQ+ a été analysé à l'aide des modèles de régression linéaire hiérarchique (méthode des moindres carrés ordinaires [MCO]) et de régression logistique. Selon les résultats, le manque de formation et de ressources, et la crainte générale d'oppositions diverses sont les raisons d'inaction les plus couramment déclarées par les éducateurs. Cependant, les éducateurs qui avaient confiance dans le soutien de leur école concernant l'éducation inclusive des personnes 2SLGBTQ+ étaient moins susceptibles de donner ces raisons d'inaction.

Mots-clés : 2SLGBTQ+, enseignants, éducateurs, éducation inclusive des personnes 2SLGBTQ+, écoles M–12

Acknowledgements

This research is based on data from the Every Teacher Project on LGBTQ-inclusive Education in Canada's K–12 Schools, which was supported by a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2010 competition, #410-2011-0845) with additional funding from the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the University of Winnipeg, and Legal Research Institute at the University of Manitoba. Research ethics board approval for the project was received from the principal

investigator Catherine Taylor's institution, the University of Winnipeg, and subsequently from research team members' institutions, the University of Manitoba (Tracey Peter, Janice Ristock, and Donn Short) and Concordia University (Elizabeth Meyer).

Introduction

Much of the research on 2SLGBTQ+[1]-inclusive education and practices focuses on identifying the factors that motivate those who practice 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. In some ways, the question of how to promote 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education has been seen as the question of how to motivate individual teachers to do it. As a result, these motivating factors are treated as being fundamentally important in planning successful curricular and extracurricular interventions. However, research that primarily focuses on what motivates or enables teachers to engage in practices of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education does not provide us with a full picture of what is happening in schools. Barriers to action, or what we call "reasons for inaction" in this study, are equally important in understanding teachers' practices regarding 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. Asking *why* or even *how* educators engage in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education provokes much different responses than asking why they *aren't* doing it. Supports and barriers are two adjacent avenues that equally impact how 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive practices appear in schools.

In this study, we analyze teachers' self-reported reasons for not addressing 2SLGBTQ+ topics in their schools in order to develop a clearer picture of their reasons for inaction. By asking what holds teachers back from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, we seek to develop a clearer understanding of the impacts of individual and school-based factors in practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. We therefore analyzed the reasons for inaction that teachers identified using hierarchical OLS (ordinary least squares) and logistic regression models to understand the impacts of both individual and school-based barriers to practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, and how these barriers are lessened or mitigated by individual and school-based predictors. Two research questions guide this study: (1) How do demographic characteristics, individual experiences and practices, and school-based factors impact educators' likelihood of reporting reasons for inaction regarding 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education? (2) How strongly

1 In this article, we use the acronym 2SLGBTQ+ to refer to Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer and questioning, plus (+) additional minoritized sexual or gender identities (e.g., intersex, asexual, non-binary); Two-Spirit (2S) is placed first to acknowledge that Indigenous peoples are the first peoples in what is now known as Canada, where this research was conducted, and in recognition that Two-Spirit and Indigenous LGBTQ+ peoples were the first sexual and gender diverse people here. We deviate from this convention only when we refer directly to specific language used in other research or in the original study and reporting for the Every Teacher Project, for which we used the acronym LGBTQ.

are particular reasons for inaction affected by demographic, individual, and school-based predictors?

The vast majority of the related literature focuses primarily on the question of how to make schools safer for 2SLGBTQ+ students or how to "do" 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, and barriers are discussed primarily as contributing considerations in addressing the main question of motivation and practice. However, as we point out above, asking "Why are you engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education?" or "What would help you to practice 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education?" are much different questions from asking, "Why *aren't* you?" As Meyer (2008) points out, by identifying barriers for teachers to practising 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion in their classrooms and school communities, "we can design more effective intervention programmes to support educators in their efforts" (pp. 557–558).

The literature that does exist on barriers to engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive practices can generally be sorted into two broad categories: first, factors related to a lack of preparation, training, or resources (which can relate to a range of interventions, including the need for professional development and teacher education, strategies for intervention, general knowledge about 2SLGBTQ+ topics, and curriculum resources or guidelines); and second, factors related to a lack of support from colleagues or administrators (which may take the form of an absence of policy, or absence of 2SLGBTQ+ mentions in that policy, or absence of 2SLGBTQ+ content in professional development, staff meetings, curricular discussions, etc.) and an apprehensiveness about opposition from various sources (including parents, students, religious or cultural groups, colleagues, and/or administration).

In the first category, related to a lack of training, preparation, or resources, the literature usually includes a focus on developing knowledge in the area of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, which is then often linked to teachers' comfort or confidence level in practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, and the related increase in their sense of efficacy. At times, educators' lack of preparation was linked directly to their personal discomfort with these topics or a difference in values regarding 2SLGBTQ+ persons and topics (see Buston & Hart, 2001; Chambers et al., 2004; Flores, 2012; Larrabee & Morehead, 2008), though this was generally less frequently the case in Canadian research (see Schneider & Dimito, 2008; Taylor et al., 2015, 2016). More often in Canadian contexts, as well as in the broader literature, a lack of training or lack of preparation was connected

to a need to raise awareness and increase knowledge on the 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (see Adams et al., 2004; Crooks et al., 2017; Guasp et al., 2014; Page, 2017); this increase in knowledge was usually linked to an increase in educators' confidence in addressing 2SLGBTQ+ topics in schools, though not necessarily their competence in doing so (see Poteat & Scheer, 2016, for an interesting discussion of the difference between sense of self-efficacy and demonstrated competence) or their desire to do so (see Puchner & Aydt Klein, 2011, for a discussion addressing how recognition of the importance of addressing 2SLGBTQ+ topics does not translate into action and, sometimes, results in avoidance strategies). Swanson and Gettinger (2016) include a section on barriers to providing support for LGBT students, highlighting their finding that the most frequent barriers (including more than three-quarters of their study's respondents) were related to limited resources or training, not attitudinal beliefs (p. 339). Further, in their review of the literature, they identify three broad reasons why teachers may choose not to actively support LGBT students: lack of knowledge about how to be supportive, unsupportive or discriminatory attitudes toward LGBT students, and/or lack of awareness about the importance of intervening (p. 343).

Meyer (2008) notes that, depending on the external climate and internal influences for an educator, barriers can outweigh motivators (p. 567). Crooks and colleagues (2017) develop a three-factor explanation of how educators develop a sense of responsibility and empowerment in promoting positive school climates; they identify increasing knowledge, a positive sense of self-efficacy, and a reduction in moral disengagement (or increased sense of empathy or moral connection to one's personal responsibility to addressing 2SLGBTQ+ topics in schools). While lack of training or knowledge maps onto the first two factors fairly easily, lack of moral disengagement seems to stand on its own as a barrier that is worth noting, especially with regard to its potential to act as a mitigating force in terms of motivation. In a way, increased motivation and decreased moral disengagement are integral to one another, as both speak to a sense of responsibility or ability to be responsive to 2SLGBTQ+ students.

In thinking about the second category, the clearest connection between lack of support from colleagues and administrators and apprehension about opposition relates the level of support to the feared impact of a complaint: in the absence of support, complaints take on an added level of perceived threat (to job security, of professional reprimand, of questions of professional responsibility, etc.). A lack of support, or a lack of

confidence in support, is often identified in the research as being a main barrier to practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (Buston & Hart, 2001; Guasp et al., 2014; Meyer, 2008; Schneider & Dimito, 2008). In a study on principals and school leaders in primary schools, Farrelly and colleagues (2017) note that principals and school leaders can lead by example and empower teachers and school staff to respond to homophobic bullying (p. 156). The role of support, then, may be conceived in a broader sense, where leadership can exemplify, empower, and even provide institutional resources, such as in the case of provision of training, development of resources, or introducing clear inclusive policy and guidelines. Meyer (2008) points out that a lack of such policy or clear guidelines can act as a barrier, but even when formal aspects of school culture are supportive (e.g., 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive policy), there can be implicit opposition imposed through informal structures, such as a school's social values or community norms, that may enforce a culture of silence or discourage engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive practices. Clear messages of support can resolve ambiguities and correct misconceptions about professional expectations in such contexts. Relatedly, fear of opposition is often cited as a reason for inaction (Larrabee & Morehead, 2008), especially when opposition comes from parents (Flores, 2012; Page, 2017; Schneider & Dimito, 2008) or from community or cultural groups (Goldstein et al., 2007). In Schneider and Dimito's (2008) study on teachers' beliefs about raising LGBT issues in schools, they found that parents and students posed greater barriers to LGBT-inclusive education than colleagues did (p. 66). Overall, teachers expressed complex perceptions of their individual safety in engaging in LGBT-inclusive education, with school factors and community contexts emerging as important factors for teachers' perceptions of safety in engaging in LGBT-inclusive education (Schneider & Dimito, 2008).

Generally, the question of whether educators address 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive topics in schools seems not to be solely an attitudinal or "moral" question, especially in light of other findings from the Every Teacher Project that show 84.5% of our respondents indicated that they approved of LGBTQ-inclusive education, 98.3% agreed that school staff have a responsibility to ensure school safety for all students (including LGBTQ students), and 96.0% agreed that LGBTQ rights are human rights (Taylor et al., 2016). Rather, the question seems to be one concerning what barriers are in their way, their "reasons for inaction" on LGBTQ-inclusive education.

Methodology and Analysis

Sample and Data

The current study is based on data from the Every Teacher Project, which surveyed 3,400 primary and secondary educators from all Canadian provinces and territories about the presence and quality of LGBTQ-inclusive policies and practices in their schools. Participants were recruited through teacher organizations across Canada via a variety of methods including e-mail invitations, website notices, newsletters, and in-person invitations. Participants were given a link to access an online survey, which took 15–20 minutes to complete. (A subset of participants opted to complete a set of supplementary questions which took an additional 15–20 minutes; this article analyzes responses to questions from the short survey, n = 3,319.) Data were collected between October 2012 and July 2013, and surveys were provided in both French and English. For more information on the survey development and data collection, see Taylor et al. (2015, 2016).

After data cleaning, a final sample of 3,319 was obtained. Overall, 72.2% of the unweighted sample was female; 15.7% identified as a gender or sexual minority (or, as we used in the survey and throughout our reporting, LGBTQ); 85.8% were teachers; 5.7% were guidance counsellors, psychologists, or social workers; and 8.4% held administrator or other non-teacher positions. The average age was 41.45 years (SD = 10.1). Educators were well represented at all grade levels, with 50.6% working in pre-kindergarten to Grade 4, 73.4% in Grades 5 to 8, and 56.0% in Grades 9 to 12 (note: participants could select multiple grade levels to identify what grades they worked with). With respect to respondent gender and age, these numbers were representative of the Canadian teaching population, which has an average age of 45, with 75% being women (Canadian Teacher Magazine, 2014). Due to extensive regional variability, some geographical areas were overrepresented in the data. To avoid skewing the national results, data were weighted by province and territory to reflect their actual proportion of the Canadian teaching population.

Measures

The variables used to test the stated research questions empirically are described below. Univariate descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Univariate Descriptive Statistics (Weighted)

Continuous measures	Mean	*SD*	Min.	Max.
Reasons for inaction (logged count)	.35	.29	0	1.04
School climate	14.52	4.02	0	20
Religiosity	22.16	10.85	1	48
Binary/discrete variables	% Yes			
Reasons for inaction				
Training/resources	33.4			
Dismissal of issue	26.6			
Students too young	20.0			
Parental opposition	16.4			
Formally based opposition	17.7			
Religious-based opposition	7.6			
Participate in LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum				
None	25.6			
Homophobia only	5.2			
No homophobia, but at least 1 other way	23.3			
Homophobia, and at least 1 other way	45.8			
Received a complaint	11.7			
Participated in LGBTQ-inclusive efforts at school	37.2			
Approval of LGBTQ-inclusive education	84.5			
Students ever disclosed about being "gay"	34.7			
Catholic school educator	16.0			
Transgender and sexual identity	23.9			
Gender identity (female)	71.3			
Ethnic identity (white)	89.1			
Grades taught at school				
Pre-K to Grade 4	50.6			
Grades 5 to 8	73.4			
Grades 9 to 12	56.0			
Primary position				
Teacher	90.8			
Guidance counsellor	4.1			
Administration	5.1			

Reasons for inaction. Educators were asked what, if anything, would prevent them from addressing LGBTQ issues. Response items included 22 closed-ended multiple response categories plus an additional 10 reasons, which were coded based on the open-ended responses to an "other – please specify" option. An overall index was created based on the yes counts to these items (with the exception of the "none" category). Initial tests showed that the index was positively skewed and kurtose, which were corrected through a base-10 logarithm transformation. Reasons for inaction were further recoded into yes/no binary measures and divided into the following six sub-categories: (1) lack of training and/or resources (3 variables); (2) dismissal of the issues (6 variables; e.g., "It's not an issue at my school"); (3) students too young (1 variable); (4) parental opposition (1 variable); (5) formally based opposition (8 variables; e.g., "My school administration is opposed"); and (6) religious-based opposition (3 variables; e.g., "Homosexuality is against my religion" or "Religious groups would be opposed").

Demographics. The following sociodemographic variables were included in the analysis. Gender and sexual identity were recorded through a yes/no checklist of various responses, with those reporting to be 2SLGBTQ+ coded to one, and cisgender heterosexual respondents coded as zero. Respondent gender was coded into a binary variable where one corresponds to being female; for the purposes of this analysis, trans participants were included within the transgender and sexual identity variable (TSI) rather than the gender variable (GEN). Ethnic identity was coded into a binary variable of white and visible minority participants (1 = white).[2] Main type of educator was computed into the following discrete variables: teacher, guidance counsellor (including psychological or social worker), and administrator or other non-teacher position, with the teacher category excluded from the multivariate statistical analyses. Educators were also asked what grades they taught or worked with, and three non-mutually exclusive groups were created—pre-kindergarten to Grade 4, Grades 5 to 8, and Grades 9 to 12. Finally, a religiosity scale was computed based on educator responses to three questions: (1) whether their current religion generally approved of same-sex marriage (response options included

2 While we were able to report on the experiences of white, Indigenous (First Nations, Inuit, Métis [FNIM]), and visible minority participants, there were too few FNIM cases to include as a standalone variable in this analysis; FNIM participants have been included in visible minority variable.

oppose, mixed views, approve, and no formal religion or religious, but specific religion unknown); (2) whether their religious or spiritual beliefs influenced their decisions about 2SLGBTQ+ issues (response options included yes, strongly; yes, somewhat; yes, a little; and not at all or not applicable); and (3) whether or not respondents supported same-sex marriage (response options included strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, and strongly agree). A series of algorithms was calculated so that higher values correspond to greater religiosity (e.g., their religion is opposed to same-sex marriage, their religion strongly influences their decisions about 2SLGBTQ+ issues, and they strongly disagree that their religion supports same-sex marriage). In the final index, response categories ranged from 1 to 48.

Individual-level factors. To develop a measure of individual-level factors, we computed several variables for our analysis. First, we asked respondents to identify the various ways in which they included 2SLGBTQ+ content in their curriculum[3] and provided closed-ended multiple response categories, including challenged homophobia, challenged transphobia, included information about 2SLGBTQ+ historical figures, addressed topics in sexual health units, included 2SLGBTQ+ rights when talking about human rights, brought in guest speakers, used inclusive language and examples, critiqued heterosexual privilege, critiqued gender conformity, and included queer theory. For the purpose of this analysis, the following four mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories were computed as a measure for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive educational practices: educators who did not practise 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education in any way, educators who only challenged homophobia, educators who did not challenge homophobia but did practice 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education in one or more other ways, and educators who challenged homophobia plus practised 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education in one or more other ways.

Additionally, several individual-level binary variables were computed. As a follow-up to the inclusion of 2SLGBTQ+ issues in their practices, educators were asked if they had ever received a complaint for including 2SLGBTQ+ content (value of one represents those who received a complaint). Educators were also asked if they had ever

3 In this article, we use "curriculum" to refer not just to formal, planned course content but also to refer to additional forms of 2SLGBTQ+ content in the classroom, planned or unplanned.

participated in any 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts at their school. In addition, teachers' personal views on whether they approved of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education or not were included, for which one represents those who approve and zero those who do not approve or are neutral. Finally, survey participants were asked if a student had ever talked to them about or disclosed to them being 2SLGBTQ+.

School-based factors. We used five questions to create a measure based on educators' attitudinal assessment of the level of support within their school environment for 2SLGBTQ+ issues. These five questions asked participants to gauge level of support from various groups within the school system (i.e., a measure of school climate), including students, colleagues, administration, teacher organizations, and government-based legislation. Items were computed to form a school climate index ($\alpha = .81$) where higher values correspond to more positive environments. Educators were also asked if their school was affiliated with a religious denomination, and almost all who responded "yes," indicated that they worked at a Catholic school; as such, a binary variable was computed where one corresponds to working at a Catholic school and zero corresponds to those who do not work at a Catholic school.

Analytic Procedures

All analyses used SPSS Statistics (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, v.24). Multiple imputations with a total of five iterations were used to address any problems with missing values, particularly with educators' confidence in the level of support in addressing 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education at their school, where 14.3% of respondents did not answer one or more of the index questions. Multivariate OLS regression, a statistical model that analyses the degree to which multiple variables are related, was used to answer the first research question. OLS regression was employed using the hierarchical entry method in order to adjust for control variables as well as test for potential spurious effects. Specifically, the logged reasons for inaction measures were entered into the following hierarchical entries: demographic controls, individual-level predictors, and school-based factors. Logistic regression was next used to examine in more detail the specific six categories of reasons for inaction: (1) lack of training and/or resources, (2) dismissal of the issue (i.e., seeing the issue as unimportant), (3) seeing students as too

young, (4) formally based opposition, (5) parental opposition, and (6) religious-based opposition.

Results

Results from the OLS regression model with a logged count of reasons for inaction are presented in Table 2. In terms of demographic information, the significant inverse coefficients for both guidance counsellors (COUN) and administrators (ADMIN) indicates that teachers were more likely to cite multiple reasons for inaction, which is substantively validated through their moderate to strong standardized coefficients (see Table 2). Results also show that female educators (GEN) were less likely to give reasons for inaction than males. Educators who work with younger grades (i.e., pre-K to Grade 4 and Grades 5 to 8) were significantly more likely to have reasons for inaction, although the overall effect among the pre-K to Grade 4 educators reduces somewhat when other individual-level and school-based measures are entered as controls (see Table 2). Educators who scored highly on the religiosity index (REL) were also more likely to report reasons for inaction.

Table 2

OLS Regression by Overall Reasons for Inaction Count (Hierarchical Entry)

	Demographic controls			Individual-level predictors			School-based predictors		
		β CI 95			β CI 95			β CI 95	
	b (se)	LWR	UPR	b (se)	LWR	UPR	b (se)	LWR	UPR
Intercept	.25(.03)***			.33 (.04)***			.65 (.05)***		
GEN	-.05 (.01)**	-.08	-.02	-.05 (.01)**	-.08	-.02	-.06 (.01)***	-.09	-.03
TSI	-.01 (.01)	-.04	.01	.01 (.01)	-.02	.04	.003 (.02)	-.03	.03
ETH	-.04 (.02)*	-.07	-.01	-.03 (.02)	.07	-.06	-.03 (.02)	-.07	.00
REL	.01 (.01)***	.002	.004	.01 (.01)**	.001	.003	.01 (.01)	-.001	.002
K_4	1.0 (.02)***	.07	.13	.07 (.02)***	.04	.10	.06 (.02)***	.03	.08
5_8	.06 (.02)***	.03	.09	.06 (.02)***	.03	.09	.06 (.02)**	.02	.09
9_12	.03 (.02)	-.004	.064	.04 (.02)	-.001	.08	.03 (.02)	-.002	.07
COUN	-.18 (.03)***	-.23	-.12	-.15 (.03)***	-.21	-.09	-.14 (.03)***	-.20	-.08
ADMIN	-.16 (.02)***	-.21	-.11	-.12 (.06)***	-.25	-.13	-.15 (.03)***	-.22	-.08
CG-HO				-.02 (.02)	-.07	.03	.03 (.03)	-.02	.08
CG-NH				-.03 (.02)	-.08	.02	.003 (.02)	-.04	.05
CG-ALL				-.09 (.02)**	-.13	-.04	-.04 (.02)	-.08	.01

	Demographic controls			Individual-level predictors			School-based predictors		
		β CI 95			β CI 95			β CI 95	
	b (se)	LWR	UPR	b (se)	LWR	UPR	b (se)	LWR	UPR
PIE				-.08 (.02)***	-.11	-.05	-.05 (.02)**	-.08	-.02
FIE				.00 (.02)	-.04	.04	.002 (.02)	-.04	.04
COM				.07 (.02)**	.02	.11	.05 (.02)*	.01	.09
DIS				.02 (.02)	-.01	.06	.03 (.02)	-.001	.07
CSS							-.02 (.002)***	-.03	-.02
CATH							.09 (.02)***	.05	.12
r^2 (adjusted)		.085			.119			.204	
F change in r^2		33.12***			17.88***			164.35***	

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

GEN – gender identity (female); TSI – transgender and/or sexual identity; ETH – Ethnic identity; REL – Religiosity index; K_4 – Teach or work with pre-kindergarten to Grade 4; 5_8 – Grades 5 to 8; 9_12 – Grades 9 to 12; CG-HO – Challenged homophobia curriculum only; CG-NH – No homophobia, but at least one other curriculum type included; CG-ALL – Challenged homophobia, and included at least one other type of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum; PIE – Participated in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts at the school level; FIE – Feelings/attitudes toward 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education; COM – Received a complaint when included 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum; DIS – Dismissal of the issue; CSS – Confidence in the level of support on 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education at the school level; CATH – Teach/work in a Catholic school.

When individual-level predictors were added, results show that educators who had participated in some sort of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive event at their school (PIE) were less likely to express reasons for inaction. However, educators who had received a complaint when they included 2SLGBTQ+ topics in their curriculum (COM) were more likely to report reasons for inaction. Compared to educators who have not included 2SLGBTQ+ content in their curriculum, participants who reported including such content in multiple ways (i.e., challenged homophobia and engaged in one or more other ways of including 2SLGBTQ+ content in curriculum; CG-ALL) were less likely to cite reasons for inaction; however, the significance of this relationship disappears when school-based environment variables are included. Finally, results from the full model show that Catholic school educators (CATH) were more likely to have reasons for inaction, while there was an inverse relationship between level of support (CSS) for addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues and reasons for inaction, with those who were confident of support being less likely to have reasons for inaction.

Reasons for Inaction Measures

Logistic regression results showing specific categories of reasons for inaction are shown in Table 3. Each outcome measure will be discussed in turn. We provide a brief description of the data from Table 1 alongside the attitudinal assessment measure from Table 2 for each reason for inaction to help contextualize our findings. Approximately one-third of educators (33.4%) cited lack of training and/or resources as a reason for inaction; just over one-quarter (26.6%) dismissed the issue as not being relevant to their job or their students; 20.0% said their students were too young for 2SLGBTQ+ content; 17.7% cited fear of formal opposition (e.g., based on legislation or opposition from school, administration, or trustees); 16.4% expressed concern over parental opposition; and 7.6% were concerned about religious-based opposition.

Lack of training/resources. Lack of training/resources was the most commonly reported reason for inaction (33.4%). Based on an attitudinal assessment of the level of support within their school environment for addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues, we see that the greater the perceived support educators had within their schools, the less likely they were to cite lack of training and/or resources as a reason for inaction (OR = .905; CI_{95} = .887-.924). Teachers were more likely to report lack of training and/or resources (34.6%, vs. 17.5% for guidance counsellors and 22.2% for administrators; $X^2(2950,2) = 21.13$, $p < .001$). Catholic school educators (CATH) were also more likely to report a lack of training and/or resources as a reason for inaction (42.0% vs. 32.0% for non-Catholic school educators; $X^2(2908,1) = 17.16$, $p < .001$). Guidance counsellors (COUN, OR = .45; CI_{95} = .26-.76), 2SLGBTQ+ people (TSI, OR = .56; CI_{95} = .45-.70), those who had participated in 2SLGBTQ+ events at their school (PIE, OR = .70; CI_{95} = .53-.92), respondents with higher confidence in the level of support at their school (CSS, OR = .92; CI_{95} = .89-.96), and educators who had received a complaint for including 2SLGBTQ+ content in their curriculum (COM, OR = .72; CI_{95} = .54-.96) were less likely to name lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction. Conversely, participants who approve of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE, OR = 1.86; CI_{95} = 1.36-2.52) were significantly more likely to give lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction. Educators who had only challenged homophobia in their curriculum (CG-HO, OR = .51; CI_{95} = .33-.79) were less likely to give lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction; however, educators who were the most active in providing 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum (i.e., engaging

in more than one form of 2SLGBTQ+ curricular inclusion; CG-ALL, OR = 1.29; CI_{95} = 1.01-1.64) were significantly more likely to report lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction. Educators from all grades (pre-K to 4, 5 to 8, and 9 to 12) reported lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction, but respondents who teach or work with students from Grades 9 to 12 had the largest odds ratio.

Dismissal of the issue. The univariate frequency of responses dismissing the issue as unimportant in their school was 26.6%. There was an inverse relationship between the attitudinal assessment of the level of support within the school environment for 2SLGBTQ+ issues and dismissal of the issue as a reason for inaction, meaning educators who perceived their school environment as supportive were less likely to dismiss the importance of addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues (OR = .924, CI_{95} = .905-.945). Educators working in pre-K to Grade 4 schools were more likely to dismiss the issue (31.5%) than those working in other grade levels (21.6%; $X^2(2999,1) = 37.89$, $p < .001$). Respondents who reported participating in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts at their school (PIE) were also less likely to dismiss the importance of 2SLGBTQ+ issues than educators who had not participated in any events (15.0% vs. 32.6%; $X^2(2849,1) = 106.62$, $p < .001$). Those who actively engaged in multiple forms of 2SLGBTQ+ content in their curriculum (CG-ALL, OR = .42; CI_{95} = .31-.57), approve of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE, OR = .46; CI_{95} = .35-.60), are female (GEN, OR = .47; CI_{95} = .38-.58), are 2SLGBTQ+ (TSI, OR = .65; CI_{95} = .50-.86), and are either guidance counsellors (COUN, OR = .49; CI_{95} = .28-.86) or administrators (ADMIN, OR = .48; CI_{95} = .29-.79) were less likely to have cited dismissal of the issue as a reason for inaction, while religious educators (REL, OR = 1.02; CI_{95} = 1.01-1.03) and those who work with or teach students in Grades 5 to 8 (OR = 1.62; CI_{95} = 1.23-2.14) were more likely to cite this as a reason.

Students are too young. The univariate frequency of responses stating their students were too young as a reason for not engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education was 20.0%. Educators who perceived their school environment to be supportive of 2SLGBTQ+ content were less likely to indicate their students were too young (OR = .862, CI_{95} = .841-.884). Not surprisingly, educators from primary schools (pre-K to Grade 4, OR = 7.93; CI_{95} = 4.83-13.0) were significantly more likely to maintain that their students were too young than those working with other grade levels (37.7% vs. 1.5%;

$X^2(2949,1) = 604.4$, $p < .001$); educators working with students in Grades 9 to 12 were much less likely to give this as a reason (OR = .27; CI_{95} = .20-.37). In addition, educators who had participated in any 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive events at their school (PIE, OR = .53; CI_{95} = .37-.76) were less likely to say their students were too young for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive content (28.6% vs. 5.8%; $X^2(2801,1) = 210.1$, $p < .001$), as were women (GEN, OR = .65; CI_{95} = .49-.86), racialized educators (ETH, OR = .59; CI_{95} = .40-.85), those who actively included 2SLGBTQ+ content (CG-ALL, OR = .35; CI_{95} = .24-.50), and interestingly, those who have not included 2SLGBTQ+-content in their curriculum (CG-NH, OR = .74; CI_{95} = .55-.99).

Fear of formal opposition. The univariate frequency that gave fear of formal opposition, either in the forms of legislation or school/district level opposition from administration or trustees, as a reason for not engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education was 17.7%. An attitudinal assessment of educators' perceived level of support within their school environment for addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues revealed, unsurprisingly, that those who saw their school as being most supportive of 2SLGBTQ+ issues were less likely to cite formal opposition as a reason for inaction (OR = .820, CI_{95} = .799-.842). Sexual minority males were the most likely group to indicate fear of formal opposition as a reason for inaction (36.1%), followed by LGB females (18.8%), while cisgender heterosexual females (16.4%) and males (10.7%) as well as trans educators (14.7%) were all slightly less likely to cite this as a reason ($X^2(2835,4) = 92.62$, $p < .001$). Catholic school educators were also more likely to give fear of formal opposition as a reason for inaction (39.8%) than respondents from non-Catholic schools (13.7%; $X^2(2956,1) = 178.7$, $p < .001$). Administrators (ADMIN, OR = .23; CI_{95} = .11-.45) were significantly less likely to list fear of formal opposition as a reason for inaction, as were women (GEN, OR = .72; CI_{95} = .54-.97) and educators with higher confidence in the level of school-wide support for 2SLGBTQ+-issues (CSS, OR = .79; CI_{95} = .77-.82). Conversely, Catholic school educators (CATH, OR = 2.92; CI_{95} = 2.18-3.92), gender and sexual minorities (TSI, OR = 2.02; CI_{95} = 1.51-2.69), those who approved of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE, OR = 1.65; CI_{95} = 1.13-2.41), those who had received a complaint in the past (COM, OR = 1.71; CI_{95} = 1.09-2.67), and those who worked with students in Grades 5 to 8 (5 to 8, OR = 1.42; CI_{95} = 1.01-2.00) were more likely to report fear of formal opposition as a reason for inaction. Finally, overall educators who had included 2SLGBTQ+-issues in their

Table 3

Logistic Regression Results by Reasons for Inaction (Full Model)

	Training/resources		Dismissal of issue		Students too young		Parental opposition		Formally based opposition		Religious-based opposition	
	OR	CI 95	OR	CI 95	OR	CI 95	OR	CI 95	OR	CI 95	OR	CI 95
CG-HO	.51**	.33-.79	.81	.55-1.19	.66	.37-1.18	1.44	.87-2.39	3.14***	1.92-5.15	1.74	.97-3.10
CG-NH	1.04	.82-1.33	.85	.63-1.14	.74*	.55-.99	1.05	.68-1.61	1.72**	1.21-2.45	.89	.56-1.43
CG-ALL	1.29*	1.01-1.64	.42***	.31-.57	.35***	.24-.50	1.37	.99-1.89	1.45*	1.03-2.02	.91	.49-1.69
PIE	.70*	.53-.92	.69	.44-1.08	.53**	.37-.76	1.00	.72-1.38	.95	.66-1.35	.87	.34-2.19
FIE	1.86***	1.36-2.52	.46***	.35-.60	.77	.54-1.09	.85	.59-1.23	1.65**	1.13-2.41	.57**	.37-.87
COM	.72*	.54-.96	1.06	.73-1.54	1.18	.76-1.84	1.87**	1.19-2.95	1.71*	1.09-2.67	1.08	.56-2.07
DIS	.99	.77-1.27	1.15	.86-1.53	.76	.44-1.33	1.10	.84-1.44	1.19	.90-1.57	.99	.59-1.64
CSS	.92**	.89-.96	1.01	.97-1.05	.95	.89-1.01	.84***	.82-.87	.79***	.77-.82	.90***	.86-.94
CATH	1.15	.86-1.54	1.26	.96-1.66	1.14	.79-1.68	1.35	.90-2.02	2.92***	2.18-3.92	5.12***	3.55-7.38
GEN	1.01	.80-1.28	.47***	.38-.58	.65**	.49-.86	.84	.66-1.07	.72*	.54-.97	1.35	.89-2.06
TSI	.56***	.45-.70	.65**	.50-.86	1.14	.82-1.60	1.79***	1.37-2.33	2.02***	1.51-2.69	2.12**	1.37-3.28
ETH	1.19	.91-1.55	.84	.62-1.14	.59**	.40-.85	.76	.56-1.04	.91	.66-1.25	1.07	.60-1.91
REL	.99	.98-1.0	1.02***	1.01-1.03	.99	.98-1.01	.99	.98-1.00	.99	.97-1.00	1.03**	1.01-1.05
K_4	1.34*	1.04-1.72	1.24	.96-1.62	7.93***	4.83-13.0	.93	.68-1.27	1.06	.77-1.47	1.78*	1.09-2.91
5_8	1.56**	1.19-2.03	1.62**	1.23-2.14	1.63	.97-2.74	1.57**	1.14-2.15	1.42*	1.01-2.00	1.03	.67-1.58
9_12	2.11***	1.63-2.74	1.22	.94-1.58	.27***	.20-.37	.80	.59-1.07	1.24	.90-1.72	1.22	.84-1.77
COUN	.45**	.26-.76	.49*	.28-.86	.19	.03-1.32	.37	.10-1.32	.38	.11-1.26	.50	.09-2.80
ADMIN	.64	.39-1.04	.48*	.29-.79	.54	.27-1.09	.56	.29-1.08	.23***	.11-.45	.35*	.13-.92

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

GEN – gender identity (female); TSI – transgender and/or sexual identity; ETH – Ethnic identity; REL – Religiosity index; K_4 – Teach or work with pre-kindergarten to Grade 4; 5_8 – Grades 5 to 8; 9_12 – Grades 9 to 12; CG-HO – Challenged homophobia curriculum only; CG-NH – No homophobia, but at least one other curriculum type included; CG-ALL – Challenged homophobia, and included at least one other type of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum; PIE – Participated in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts at the school level; FIE – Feelings/attitudes toward 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education; DIS – Dismissal of the issue; COM – Received a complaint when included 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum; CSS – Confidence in the level of support on 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education at the school level; CATH – Teach/work in a Catholic school.

curriculum (CG-HO, CG-NH, and CG-ALL) were all more likely to give fear of formal opposition as a reason for inaction, but the odds ratio decreases as the amount of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive curriculum increases (i.e., CG-ALL had the lowest odds ratio; OR = 1.45; CI_{95} = 1.03-2.02).

Fear of parental opposition. The univariate frequency of responses that gave fear of parental opposition as a reason for not engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education was 16.4%. Again, based on an attitudinal assessment of the level of support within their school environment for addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues, educators who perceived their school to be more supportive of 2SLGBTQ+ issues were less likely to give parental opposition as a reason for inaction (OR = .867, CI_{95} = .846-.890). Trans educators were the most likely to give fear of parental opposition as a reason for inaction (52.9%), followed by sexual minority males (27.3%) and LGB females (21.9%), while cisgender heterosexual males (14.5%) and females (14.5%) were less likely to cite this as a reason for inaction ($X^2(2776,4) = 60.73$, $p < .001$). Catholic school educators were more likely to report fear of parental opposition as a reason for inaction than non-Catholic school respondents (23.9% vs. 14.8%; $X^2(2907,1) = 22.72$, $p < .001$). Looking to the logistic regression, we see that participants who have received a complaint in the past for including 2SLGBTQ+-content (COM, OR = 1.87; CI_{95} = 1.19-2.95), 2SLGBTQ+ educators (TSI, OR = 1.79; CI_{95} = 1.37-2.33), and respondents who teach or work with students from Grades 5 to 8 (5 to 8, OR = 1.57; CI_{95} = 1.14-2.15) were more likely to give fear of parental opposition as a reason for inaction. However, there was an inverse relationship between confidence in the level of school-wide support (CSS, OR = .84; CI_{95} = .82-.87) and fear of parental opposition.

Fear of religious-based opposition. The univariate frequency of responses stating religious-based opposition as a reason for not practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education was 7.6%. An attitudinal assessment of educators' perceived level of support within their school environment for addressing 2SLGBTQ+ issues revealed that those who saw their school as being more supportive of 2SLGBTQ+ issues were less likely to give fear of religious opposition as a reason for inaction (OR = .899, CI_{95} = .885-.913). However, Catholic school educators were 5.2 times more likely to list fear of religious opposition as a reason for inaction than respondents from non-religious schools (CI_{95} = 4.53–5.86).

The 2SLGBTQ+ educators were also more likely to give religious opposition as a reason (OR = 2.17; CI_{95} = 1.85-2.55). Religiosity was also significant, but with a very low odds ratio (OR = 1.03; CI_{95} = 1.02-1.04). Educators who had not included 2SLGBTQ+ content in their curriculum were significantly more likely to give religious opposition as a reason for inaction than those who had included 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive content in some way (OR = 1.65; CI_{95} = 1.29-2.1). As shown in Table 3, Catholic school educators (CATH, OR = 5.12; CI_{95} = 3.55-7.38), 2SLGBTQ+ educators (TSI, OR = 2.12; CI_{95} = 1.37-3.28), respondents who work with students from pre-K to Grade 4 (K to 4, OR = 1.78; CI_{95} = 1.09-2.91), and participants with higher scores on the religiosity index (REL, OR = 1.03; CI_{95} = 1.01-1.05) were more likely to cite religious-based opposition as a reason for not practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. Conversely, participants who approve of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE, OR = .57; CI_{95} = .37-.87), were confident in the level of school-wide support for 2SLGBTQ+ issues (CSS, OR = .90; CI_{95} = .86-.94), or hold administrative positions (ADMIN, OR = .35; CI_{95} = .13-.92) were less likely to give religious-based opposition as a reason for inaction.

Discussion

These comparisons provide insight into how educators conceive of barriers to their ability to practise 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. Looking at the demographic characteristics, we see that both guidance counsellors (COUN), including psychologists and social workers, and administrators (ADMIN) were significantly less likely than teachers to give reasons for inaction. In terms of specific reasons for inaction, counsellors were less likely to report lack of training/resources or to dismiss the issue, while administrators were also less likely to dismiss the issue but also less likely to cite formally based opposition or religious-based opposition as reasons for not engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. There were no categories in which either administrators or counsellors were more likely to give reasons for inaction.

Looking at other demographic factors, we see that women (GEN) were less likely than men to give reasons for inaction, and they were less likely to dismiss the issue, to say their students were too young, or to be concerned about formally based opposition. This may be a reflection of the strict gender regulation regarding masculinity and

normative gender expression among men, whereby homophobia acts as a form of gender socialization among men to regulate acceptable expressions of masculinity (e.g., Kimmel, 1994; Pascoe, 2011); as a result, there may be a tendency for men to dismiss the issue as unimportant or attempt to distance themselves from 2SLGBTQ+ identities by not addressing them in schools or, conversely, by affirming hegemonic notions of masculinity. The 2SLGBTQ+ educators (TSI), on the other hand, while much less likely than non-2SLGBTQ+ educators to list lack of training/resources or dismissal of the issue as reasons for inaction, were significantly more likely to give opposition-based reasons, including parental, formal, and religious-based opposition; in other words, 2SLGBTQ+ educators recognize the importance of 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion, but they were more concerned about encountering opposition. We see this, for instance, particularly among sexual minority male educators, with higher numbers of gay male teachers identifying formal opposition as a reason for inaction; this may reflect greater feelings of vulnerability to criticism or censure in schools due to historic but still prevalent homophobic discourses that cast gay educators as a threat to children (e.g., Griffin & Ouellett, 2003) and may also result in increased pressure for gay male teachers to conform to "masculine" norms in order to feel accepted in school (Mayo, 2007). In the OLS regression model (see Table 2), it is interesting to note, however, that there was no overall difference between 2SLGBTQ+ educators and cisgender heterosexual educators in perceiving reasons for inaction; any differences appeared at the level of the specific reasons they identified (as reported in Table 3).

The religiosity index (REL) also provides some insight into how barriers are conceived for educators. Generally, those who scored highly on the religiosity index were more likely to give reasons for inaction, including being significantly more likely to dismiss the issue or to cite religious-based opposition as reasons for inaction; however, when we take school-based predictors, such as confidence in school support (CSS) and Catholic school context (CATH) into consideration, we see that religiosity has a spurious relationship to reasons for inaction. In other words, religious educators were no more or less likely to report reasons for inaction when we controlled for school context.

We see this same trend evidenced when we look at variables related to school environments specifically. For instance, those who participated in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts at the school level (PIE) and those who had confidence in the level of support for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education at the school level (CSS) were both less likely to

give reasons for inaction. Those who participated in school-level 2SLGBTQ+ efforts (PIE) were less likely to name lack of training/resources or age of students as reasons for inaction. This suggests that when educators are provided with opportunities to participate in school-wide efforts for 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion (PIE), they better understand that 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive content can be applied at all levels of schooling and they feel better prepared having access to appropriate resources. Further, this suggests that some degree of exposure to 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive efforts and content—in this case, at the school-wide level or in another class, club, or extracurricular activity—decreases educators' likelihood of reporting reasons for inaction, which may be both because they have received permission to practise 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education and because they feel that they have some competence and comfort with 2SLGBTQ+ content.

Those who were confident in school-level support for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (CSS) were significantly less likely to give lack of training/resources as a reason not to practise it, or to cite any type of opposition; in fact, those who were confident in their school-level support were the only category of analysis to be less likely in all opposition categories (at significance levels of $p < .01$ or less for parental, formal, and religious-based opposition). This suggests that confidence in school-level support is a key factor in mitigating opposition-based barriers, including parental opposition, formally based opposition, and religious-based opposition to 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. In simple terms, if educators are confident in their level of school support, then they are less likely to give reasons for inaction and more likely to find ways to incorporate 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive practices, even in religious contexts or Catholic schools. When we look at educators working in Catholic schools (CATH), we see no significant differences in the specific reasons for inaction except for formally based opposition and religious-based opposition, where respondents were significantly more likely to provide these as reasons for inaction. Again, this speaks to the importance of school culture, especially in terms of administrative systems.

Grade level also affects educators' perception of the barriers they face. In general, educators working with elementary (pre-K to Grade 4) and middle school (Grades 5 to 8) grades were more likely to give reasons for inaction. This may reflect the common misconception that 2SLGBTQ+ content is only "suitable" for older children, either because they are more mature or because 2SLGBTQ+ content is only relevant to high school subject areas (such as sex education or health). This is reflected in the specific reasons for

inaction provided by educators working in pre-K to Grade 4 (K to 4), who were significantly more likely to say that their students were too young for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. Similarly, when we look at the same variable for educators working with Grades 9 to 12, we see they are significantly less likely to say their students were too young. Alongside this, educators in Grades 5 to 8 were more likely to dismiss the issue, which may convey further misunderstandings about what 2SLGBTQ+ content entails. Developing educators' understandings about what 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive content looks like for all grade levels may be one way to address the dismissal of the issue or the claim that students are too young. Educators at all grade levels were more likely to report lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction, which may support this point further.

Unsurprisingly, educators who received a complaint when they had included 2SLGBTQ+ content (COM) were more likely to have reasons for inaction; specifically, they were more likely to cite parental opposition and formally based opposition. This makes sense, as receiving a complaint would make one more apprehensive about the possibility of further complaints. Interestingly, however, those who received complaints were less likely to give lack of training/resources as a reason for inaction. This may be due to the fact these educators have clearly practised some form of 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion and, therefore, had already received training or sought out resources; their apprehensions about further engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive content are based in having confronted opposition, not a dismissal of the issue or lack of training/resources.

Finally, with this data we have an opportunity to consider the connection between educators' approval for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE) and their practices of inclusion (CG-HO, CG-NH, and CG-ALL). Given the overall high level of approval for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (84.5%), it is particularly interesting to look at what holds educators back from acting on these values. Educators who approved of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education (FIE) were more likely to cite lack of training/resources and formally based opposition as reasons for inaction, while being less likely to dismiss the issue or to give religious-based opposition as a reason for inaction. Again, school culture and the role of institutional approval for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education appear to be pivotal factors in educators' practices. When 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education is clearly supported, and this support is clearly reinforced through the provision of training and resources, these reasons for inaction may be mitigated. It is interesting to note that in the OLS regression model (see Table 2) there was no difference between educators who

approved of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education and those who did not in providing reasons for inaction, suggesting that approval alone does not address perceived barriers.

When we look at educators' reported practices of inclusion (CG-HO, CG-NH, and CG-ALL), we see that those who included 2SLGBTQ+ content in multiple ways (i.e., challenged homophobia and engaged in one or more other ways of including 2SLGBTQ+ content in the curriculum) were less likely to cite reasons for inaction. These educators were also significantly less likely to dismiss the importance of the issue or to claim their students were too young. For all three variables focused on practices, educators were more likely to cite formally based opposition as a reason for inaction, with those who had included curriculum that challenged homophobia (CH-HO) having the highest odds ratio. Both educators who included curriculum to challenge homophobia only (CH-HO) and those who included multiple forms of 2SLBGTQ+-inclusive content (CG-ALL) were significantly more likely to report a lack of training/resources as a potential reason for inaction. This suggests, as with the FIE variable, that educators are looking for support in engaging in this work.

In this article we have sought to identify some of the relationships between demographic predictors, individual-level predictors, and school-based predictors of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education and reasons for inaction. Understanding educators' reasons for inaction—their perceived barriers, as it were—provides an opportunity to better understand what is holding educators back from engaging in 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. The challenge facing educators in practising 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education is not a problem for individual teachers to solve alone, nor does it simply involve questions of motivation or adequate support; rather, this challenge is one that involves both individual and school-based factors. Through our statistical analysis, we see that approving of 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education, while a crucial attitudinal factor, does not necessarily lead to practising it. Rather, we see that confidence in school-level support and provision of training and resources are key factors in addressing barriers to 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education that can make educators more likely to practise 2SLGBTQ+ education and less likely to report reasons not to practise it. By implementing clear supports, such as 2SLGBTQ+-specific policy, school-wide 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion efforts, and the allocation of financial resources to providing training and resource development, school systems communicate clear support to educators for 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive practices. As our analysis shows, this interpretation of the data is supported even for educators who scored

highly on the religiosity index; while they were more likely to have reasons for inaction on their own and when individual-level factors were taken into account, this likelihood disappeared when school-based predictors were taken into account. Efforts to support educators through school-wide and school system-wide efforts at 2SLGBTQ+ inclusion are necessary to increase educators' confidence in the support of their schools/districts and to provide the training/resources necessary to empower educators to act.

The limitations of the present analysis prevent us from drawing conclusions about whether addressing reasons for inaction would actually result in increased numbers of educators who practise 2SLGBTQ+-inclusive education. Future research has an opportunity to address how reasons for inaction are linked with actual practices. Further, there are opportunities to investigate more deeply and validate our finding that 2SLGBTQ+-supportive school factors mitigate demographic and individual-level factors that make educators more likely to identify reasons for inaction. By understanding educators' reasons for inaction—the barriers they perceive as standing in the way of their practice—and the impact of school level supports on those reasons and ultimately on their teaching practices, such research contributes to the goal of enabling educators to create safe and equitable schools for 2SLGBTQ+ students.

References

Adams, N., Cox, T., & Dunstan, L. (2004). 'I am the hate that dare not speak its name': Dealing with homophobia in secondary schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *20*(3), 259–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/0266736042000251826

Buston, K., & Hart, G. (2001). Heterosexism and homophobia in Scottish school sex education: Exploring the nature of the problem. *Journal of Adolescence*, *24*, 95–109. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0366

Canadian Teacher Magazine. (2014). *Demographics*. Retrieved May 28, 2015 from http://www.canadianteachermagazine.com/ads/CTM-AdKit-2014.pdf (site now accessible by subscription only)

Chambers, D., van Loon, J., & Tincknell, E. (2004). Teachers' views of teenage morality. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *25*, 563–576.

Crooks, C. V., Jaffe, P. G., & Rodriguez, A. (2017). Increasing knowledge and self-efficacy through a pre-service course on promoting positive school climate: The crucial role of reducing moral disengagement. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, *10*(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/1754730X.2016.1249383

Farrelly, G., O'Higgins Norman, J., & O'Leary, M. (2017). Custodians of silences? School principal perspectives on the incidence and nature of homophobic bullying in primary schools in Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies*, *36*(2), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2016.1246258

Flores, G. (2012). Toward a more inclusive multicultural education: Methods for including LGBT themes in K-12 classrooms. *American Journal of Sexuality Education*, *7*(3), 187–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/15546128.2012.707072

Goldstein, T., Collins, A., & Halder, M. (2007). Anti-homophobia education in public schooling: A Canadian case study of policy implementation. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *19*(3-4), 47–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720802161540

Griffin, P., & Ouellett, M. (2003). From silence to safety and beyond: Historical trends in addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender issues in K-12

schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *36*(2), 106–114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665680303508

Guasp, A., Ellison, G., & Satara, T. (2014). *The teachers' report: Homophobic bullying in Britain's schools in 2014*. Stonewall UK. https://www.stonewall.org.uk/resources/teachers-report-2014-0

Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. In S. Whitehead & F. Barrett (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 266–287). Sage.

Lapointe, A. A. (2017). "It's not pans, it's people": Student and teacher perspectives on bisexuality and pansexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *17*(1), 88–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2016.1196157

Larrabee, T. G., & Morehead, P. (2008). Prospective teachers' reflection: Responding to a call for LGBT-inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *10*(1), 1–15.

Mayo, J. B. (2007). Negotiating sexual orientation and classroom practice(s) at school. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *35*(3), 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2007.10473344

Meyer, E. J. (2008). Gendered harassment in secondary schools: Understanding teachers' (non)interventions. *Gender and Education*, *20*(6), 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250802213115

Page, M. L. (2017). From awareness to action: Teacher attitude and implementation of LGBT-inclusive curriculum in the English Language Arts classroom. *SAGE Open*, *7*(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017739949

Pascoe, C. J. (2011). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Poteat, V. P., & Scheer, J. R. (2016). GSA advisors' self-efficacy related to LGBT youth or color and transgender youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *13*, 311–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2016.1185757

Puchner, L., & Aydt Klein, N. (2011). The right time and place? Middle school language arts teachers talk about not talking about sexual orientation. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *44*(2), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.563182

Schneider, M. S., & Dimito, A. (2008). Educators' beliefs about raising lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues in schools: The experience in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *5*(4), 49–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650802223003

Swanson, K., & Gettinger, M. (2016). Teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and supportive behaviors toward LGBT students: Relationship to Gay-Straight Alliances, antibullying policy, and teacher training. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *13*(4), 326–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2016.1185765

Taylor, C., Peter, T., Campbell, C., Meyer, E., Ristock, J., & Short, D. (2015). *The Every Teacher Project on LGBTQ-inclusive education in Canada's K-12 schools: Final report*. Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Taylor, C. G., Meyer, E. J., Peter, T., Ristock, J., Short, D., & Campbell, C. (2016). Gaps between beliefs, perceptions, and practices: The Every Teacher Project on LGBTQ-inclusive education in Canadian schools. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *13*(1–2), 112–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2015.1087929