



Minnesota State University, Mankato
Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly
and Creative Works for Minnesota
State University, Mankato

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

2014

The Influence Of Religiosity On The Attitudes Towards Homosexuality Among College Students

Anastasiia Kuptsevych
Minnesota State University - Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>

 Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuptsevych, A. (2014). The Influence Of Religiosity On The Attitudes Towards Homosexuality Among College Students [Master's thesis, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/303/>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOSITY ON THE
ATTITUDES TOWARDS HOMOSEXUALITY AMONG
COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Anastasiia Kuptsevych

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

Sociology

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

May 2014

Date: _____

The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards Homosexuality among College Students

Anastasiia Kuptsevych

This thesis has been examined and approved by the following members of the student's committee.

Advisor: Dr. Diane H. Graham

Committee Member: Dr. Vicki L. Hunter

Committee Member: Dr. Jasper Hunt

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Being an international student from Ukraine I received a great experience when I became a part of a different culture which is very valuable especially for sociological imagination. I am very thankful for being able to write this thesis, where I could research and analyze social processes that are taking place in American society. I want to thank all the professors and colleagues from sociology department of Minnesota State University, Mankato for giving me an opportunity to gain knowledge in this amazing country and who contributed to my educational growth as a sociologist. This thesis is dedicated to my mom, who always encouraged me to move far with my education.

ABSTRACT

The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards Homosexuality among College Students

Anastasiia Kuptsevych M.A., Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota, 2014

This is a descriptive study of the influence of religiosity on the attitudes towards homosexuality. The hypothesis for this study was that the degree to which one is religious influences the attitudes one has towards homosexuality. Data was analyzed by using regression analysis. Results show that students who attend church often and interpret Bible as true and correct tend to have negative attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners as well as same sex unions. On the other hand, the degree to which students view God as active and angry in their life is not a significant predictor of their attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners or same sex unions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER:

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERAURE AND THEORY	4
Factors Influencing Attitudes towards Homosexuality	4
Religion and Attitudes towards Homosexuality: Types of Denomination ..	5
Religiosity and Attitudes towards Homosexuality: Rate of Attendance, Images of God and Interpreting the Bible.....	7
The Influence of Religion and Religiosity in Conjunction with Other Factors on Attitudes towards Homosexuality.....	9
Measuring Attitudes towards Homosexuality	11
Theoretical Framework	13
III. PROCEDURES AND METHOD	16
Sample	16
Data Collection.....	16
Variables.....	17
Analysis	20
Limitations	21
Ethical Issues	21
IV. RESULTS.....	23
The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards a Homosexual person.....	23
The Influence of Religiosity towards a Homosexual Behavior between Same Sex Partners.....	25
The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards Same Sex Unions	27
V. DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	35
APPENDICES	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to the results of the study “U.S. Acceptance of Gay and Lesbian Relations Is the New Normal” conducted by Saad, Americans have become more liberal regarding the acceptance of homosexuality over time. Saad (2013) analyzed a Gallup poll that was based on telephone interviews conducted May 3-6, 2012 with a random sample of 1,024 adults, aged 18 and older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia. While during the year of 2001, 40 percent of the surveyed American population believed that homosexuality was acceptable, this number increased to 54 percent by 2012 (Saad 2013). As Saad deduced from the statistics of the Gallup poll there was an increase in positive attitudes towards homosexuality, however, the attitude of approximately half of the population was still negative. Thus, the results of this 2012 poll indicate that the issue still remains and there is a need for further research and analysis.

According to this review of literature many factors have been found to influence attitudes towards homosexuality; however religion and religiosity were one of the most influential (Unneve, Cullen, and Applegate 2005). Several studies focused on how religion influences the attitudes towards homosexuality by examining the correlation between denomination one belongs to and these attitudes (Steensland, Park, Regnerus, and Bradford 2000; Finlay and Walther 2003). Few studies focus on religiosity which can be defined as to what extent one accepts and performs the beliefs of a particular established denomination and church (Alston 1975; Finlay and Walther 2003). Several researchers that studied influence of religiosity on the attitudes towards homosexuality

used frequency of church attendance for religious purposes as a measure of one's religiosity on the attitudes towards homosexuality (Schulte and Battle 2004; Finlay and Walther 2003; Adolfsen, Iedema and Keuzenkamp 2010; Olson, Cadge and Harrison 2006). The influence of the way one views God (Whitehead 2010; Froese and Bader 2005) and the way one interprets the Bible (Kenneth 2004; Whitehead 2010) on attitudes towards homosexuality have also been used to explain attitudes towards homosexuality. However, based on this review of related literature studies to date do not incorporate such variables as frequency of church attendance for religious purposes, the way a person views God and interprets the Bible in order to analyze attitudes towards homosexuality. Thus, by including all three variables as parts of the definition of religiosity a more complex picture of how religiosity affects people's attitudes towards homosexuality can be described.

Attitudes towards homosexuality have primarily been measured as attitudes towards a homosexual orientation in general (Lois and Porter 1990; Lottes 1992; Wagenaar and Bartos 1977; Whitley 2001; Adamczyk and Pitt 2009; Adolfsen et. al. 2010; Andersen and Fetner 2008; Loftus 2001; Finlay and Walther 2003; Lewis 2003; Furnham and Saito 2009; Hans, Kersey and Kimberly 2012) or to a homosexual person (Herek and Glunt 1988; Jenkins, Lambert and Baker 2009; Schulte and Battle 2004; Hicks and Lee 2006; Ford, Brignall, VanValey and Macaluso 2009). Lately a few studies have focused on legal same sex unions (Whitehead, 2010; Olsen et. al. 2006; McVeigh and Diaz 2009) and few also examined attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners (Treas 2002; Kite 1966). However, there is a gap in the literature

concerning complex measure of attitudes towards homosexuality. The gap was addressed in this study by taking into account three aspects: attitudes towards homosexual person, attitudes towards homosexual behavior, and attitudes towards legal same sex unions. Thus, the focus of this thesis was the influence of religiosity on attitudes towards homosexuality. With the use of more complex measures of religiosity and homosexuality new knowledge regarding attitudes towards homosexuality may be identified.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORY

Factors Influencing Attitudes towards Homosexuality

Olson, Cadge and Harrison (2006) argued that homosexuality is a major component of the 'moral values' discourse in America. According to this review of literature in order to better understand the issue of homosexuality researchers focused mostly on what people think of homosexuality and what affects the way they view homosexuality.

Multiple factors influence attitudes towards homosexuality according to past and current literature. Factors such as economic growth and the increase of inequality bring intolerance towards homosexuality (Anderson and Fetner 2008). A person with politically liberal orientation holds more positive attitudes towards homosexuality, whereas a person with politically conservative orientation more negative attitudes (Lottes and Kuriloff 1992). Gender and gender roles (Furnham and Saito 2009; Whitley 2001), race and ethnicity (Louis and Porter 1990; Schulte and Battle 2004) and interaction with a homosexual person (Adolfson, Iedema and Keuzenkamp 2010; Hans, Kasey and Kimberley 2012) are other substantial factors that have an impact on attitudes towards homosexuality. Age and education are also considered by researchers to be important factors influencing attitudes towards homosexuality (Herek 1988; Olson et. al. 2006). Researcher as well looked at micro and macro effects of religion and a survival vs. self-expressive cultural orientation on the attitudes towards homosexuality (Adamczyk and Pitt 2009).

However, religion and religiosity factors are one of the primary factors based on multiple past and current studies (Wagenaar and Bartos 1977; Unneve, Cullen, and Applegate 2005; Bader, Mencken, and Froese, 2007; Rosik, Ghriffith, and Cruz 2007; Jenkins 2009). Hans et al. (2012) found that nearly every respondent with negative attitude towards homosexuality stated religion as a source of his or her attitude and viewed homosexuality as morally wrong. Even the ones who were tolerant towards homosexuality referenced religious beliefs in explaining their attitudes toward homosexuality by stating that according to God all individuals regardless of their orientation have a right to exist (Hans et. al 2012).

Between 1980 and 2008 the influence of religion and religiosity on attitudes towards homosexuality became slightly stronger, however less religious people still have more positive attitudes (Loftus 2001). Thus, current thought in examining the impact of religion and religiosity still remains important in understanding why people think of homosexuality in one way or another and what aspects of religiosity in particular determine their attitude.

Religion and Attitudes towards Homosexuality: Types of Denomination

This review of literature documented that both the past and current literature focused on how the denomination one belongs to affects attitudes towards homosexual orientation (Lottes 1991; Steensland et al. 2000; Loftus, 2001; Finlay and Walther; 2003; Rosik et al. 2007). Catholic and moderate Protestants have the most tolerant attitudes towards homosexuality (Olson et al. 2006).

Loftus (2001) also stated that in the United States, people who are Jews and mainline Protestants are the most likely to be liberal in terms of homosexuality, followed by Catholics. Compared to other religious groups in America, conservative Protestants have the least accepting attitudes. Non-Protestants and the religiously unaffiliated are much more likely than evangelical Protestants to support homosexuality (Whitehead 2010; Olson et. al. 2006). Among college students, Christian students are found to be more conservative than mainline Protestants in their attitudes toward homosexuality, and that Evangelical Christians are by far more conservative than either group (Finlay and Walther 2003). Another important notion is that among those who adopt conservative religion in their life, attitudes towards lesbians is more positive than towards gays (Rosik and Griffith 2007).

With regard to the same sex unions in particular, non-Protestants are much more likely to support them than Protestants (Olson et. al. 2006). Moreover, members of Conservative Protestant denominations have the highest homophobia scores, followed by Moderate Protestants, Catholics, Liberal Protestants, Non-affiliated and Non-Christian groups. Thus, differences in religious affiliation, including differences within the category of Protestants greatly affect attitudes toward homosexuality (Finlay and Walther 2003).

In cross cultural analyses, countries with high percentages of Catholics display less opposition to homosexuality and same-sex marriage (McVeigh and Diaz 2009). Muslims are less likely to approve of homosexuality than Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists and people with no religion (Adamczyk and Pitt 2009). Thus,

according to the reviewed literature, religiously unaffiliated, Catholics and moderate Protestants are seen to have the most positive attitudes towards homosexuality as an orientation and same sex unions, whereas conservative Protestants and Muslims are the cohorts who have the most negative attitudes.

Religiosity and Attitudes towards Homosexuality: Rate of Attendance, Images of God and Interpreting the Bible

Rate of attendance

According to the reviewed literature there are studies that measure the influence of religiosity on attitudes towards homosexuality through the influence of frequency of attendance of a church for religious purposes. Those who participate actively in religious life are more likely to oppose homosexuality as an orientation and, moreover, legal same sex unions (Schulte and Battle 2004; Olson et al. 2006). Olson et al. (2006) found that active religious involvement increases anti-homosexual attitudes by 23 percent among citizens as compared to those who visit church on a regular basis. Finlay and Walther (2003) also found that people who attend worship services more frequently are 13 percent less likely to agree with legal same sex unions than the ones who do it less frequently. To sum up, the more time one spends on religious involvement, the more negative attitudes are created towards homosexuality.

Images of God

Religiosity can also be conceptualized as the way “God” is defined by a person. Froese and Bader (2005) argue that measure of conceptions of God are crucial in predicting church attendance rates, belief in biblical literalism, political party

identification, attitudes toward abortion, and attitudes about sexual morality. They argue that the extent to which God is viewed as angry and active predicts particular attitudes one will have towards these phenomena. An angry image of God focuses on judgment, retribution, and wrath. An active view of God refers to whether God is removed from or directly involved with human affairs. Taking into account the issue of homosexuality as a part of the issue of sexual morality those who view God as active, angry and always present are seen to be much less likely to have a positive attitude towards homosexuality and individuals that see God as passive and not interfering with every aspect of their life are inclined to have more positive attitudes (Bader and Froese 2005; Whitehead 2010). However, based on this review of how views of God influence attitudes towards a homosexual orientation in general and legal same sex unions, no studies to date take into account how it will influence attitudes towards a homosexual person and behavior between same sex partners.

Interpreting the Bible

The way people interpret and the extent to which they are familiar with the Bible has an impact on how they perceive particular issues (Rogers. 1999; Kenneth 2004). In the Bible homosexuality is discussed as something sinful, something that requires punishment. Locke (2004) gave an example that God destroyed Sodom because men wanted to have sex with men. Another example he gives is that there is a clear prohibition against same-sex sexual encounters and homosexuality is described as abomination with the penalty of death in Leviticus. Coupling in the Bible is achieved exclusively through the union of male and female; sex is only moral within marriage and

marriage between people of the same sex is not allowed (Locke 2004). Taking into account that the Bible dictates what is sinful and what is moral it is important to examine the way people interpret the Bible to better understand how people view homosexual people, homosexual behavior between two same sex partners and legal same sex unions.

Several studies identified the interpretation of the Bible as a significant factor in influencing attitudes towards homosexuality (Schulte and Battle 2004; Whitehead 2010). Schulte and Battle (2004) argue that being familiar with religious writings and involved in learning conservative religious scripts play a prominent role in influencing attitudes towards homosexuality. However, these researchers do not examine how interpretations might impact attitudes toward homosexual behavior and legal same sex unions. Olsen et. al. (2006) also examined the frequency of reading religious literature and found that regular exposure to religious literature increases negative attitudes towards homosexuality. Whitehead (2010) included in his study questions about whether people adopt literal or a more critical interpretation of the Bible to see how each view influences their perception of legal same sex union. However, the author did not include in his study the analysis of how interpretation of the Bible influences attitudes towards homosexual person and homosexual behavior between two same sex partners. Therefore as deduced from this literature review there is a limitation in current research concerning how the interpretation the Bible influences attitudes towards homosexuality, including attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior and same sex unions.

The Influence of Religion and Religiosity in Conjunction with Other Factors on Attitudes towards Homosexuality

According to this literature review there are studies that focused on how religion and religiosity in relation with other factors affects attitudes towards homosexuality. Few studies focused on the relationship between ethnicity and religion in influencing homosexuality (Schulte and Battle 2004; Jenkins, Lambert and Eric 2009). Interestingly Jenkins et. al. (2009) found that the denomination one belongs to is not a significant predictor of attitudes towards homosexuality for Blacks, only for Whites. Moreover, Schulte and Battle (2004) concluded that differences in attitudes toward homosexuals in general and gay men specifically, are not affected by ethnicity at all but by religious attendance only.

The relationship between religion and familiarity with a homosexual person was also explored by Herek and Glunt (1993) and Adolfsen et. Al. (2010). Within religious organizations, researchers have also tried to understand the role of friendship networks and being familiar with a homosexual person in a religious congregation in shaping attitudes towards homosexuality (Hans et. al. 2012; Adolfsen et. al. 2010). These studies reveal that people whose social networks are deeply tied to a religious congregation tend to be less accepting of homosexuality and have more negative attitudes towards it. The more close friends people have in their congregations, the more their outlook on life appears to be affected and structured by the these friendship networks, which do not foster positive attitudes towards homosexuality. (Herek and Glunt 1993; Adolfsen et. al. 2010; Hans et. al. 2012). Catholics are seen to have more homosexual friends in their congregation as compared to Protestants, 26.7 percent as compared to 23.9 respectively (Hans et. al. 2012). Participants who did not know any homosexuals wanted to interact

with them, but showed at the same time more negative views about homosexuality than those who have had previous contact with them (Hans et. al. 2012).

The effect of religion and religiosity in connection with gender on attitudes towards homosexuality has also been studied. Religious women are considered to be more liberal in attitudes towards homosexuality than religious men (Jenkins 2009; Finlay and Walther 2003; Herek 1988). More specifically, religious men are more likely to hold negative attitudes toward lesbians than do women. Religious women are seen to have equally positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians, whereas religious men are seen to respond more negatively to gay men than to lesbians (Finlay and Walther 2003).

The influence of religion and religiosity in conjunction with internal motivation was also studied. Ford et. al (2009) found that for people who have strongly internalized orthodox Christian beliefs (beliefs that Jesus is both truly a God and truly a man) religion becomes associated with stronger internal motivation to respond without prejudice toward homosexuals and less negative attitudes toward homosexuals.

Measuring Attitudes towards Homosexuality

While measuring attitudes towards homosexuality researchers primarily referred to attitudes towards a homosexuality orientation in general (Adamczyk and Pitt 2009; Lottes 1992; Adolfsen et. al. 2010; Finlay and Walther 2003 Lois and Porter 1990; Lottes 1992; Wagenaar and Bartos 1977; Whitley 2001; Andersen and Fetner 2008; Loftus 2001; Finlay and Walther 2003; Lewis 2003; Furnham and Saito 2009; Hans, Kersey and Kimberly 2012). Rather than looking at homosexual orientation in general other studies have examined attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners (Treas

2002; Kite 1966; Ford et. al 2009). For example, Treas (2002), using General Social Surveys (GSS), examined Americans' attitudes toward premarital, extramarital, teen, and homosexual sex specifically. Some studies also focused on attitudes towards homosexual persons (Kite 1966; Herek et. al. 1993; Ford et. al. 2009). Schulte and Battle (2004) for instance examined the difference between the attitudes towards gays and heterosexual men and between lesbians and heterosexual women. Recent studies also started to examine attitudes of people towards legal same sex unions (Whitehead, 2010; Olsen et. al. 2006).

Thus, overall researchers have examined attitudes towards homosexual orientation in general, homosexual behavior between same sex partners, homosexual persons and legal same sex unions. However, this review of literature established that there is a gap in studies concerning the incorporation of all three parts of attitudes towards homosexuality. For instance, Kite (1966) in her analysis distinguished between attitude toward homosexual persons, and homosexual behavior, but didn't include legal same sex unions in his measures. Ford et. al. (2009) studied the attitudes of people towards homosexual behavior, but also did not include attitudes towards legal same sex unions. On the other hand, while examining attitudes towards legal same sex unions neither Whitehead (2009) nor Olsen et. al. (2006) included measures of attitudes towards homosexual person and homosexual behavior between same sex partners.

Thus, this review identified that past studies have not included the analysis of the attitudes towards homosexuality using all three approaches: 1) homosexual persons; 2) homosexual behaviors between same sex partners and 3) legal same sex unions.

Theoretical Framework

The review of related literature identified few studies that incorporated sociological theory in examination of how attitudes towards homosexuality are influenced. The first identified theory was attribution theory. Whitehead (2010) addressed attribution theory as the way to explain idea that behavior can be viewed as either controllable or uncontrollable. The person is considered personally responsible for those behaviors that are labeled controllable and those persons who attribute personal responsibility to a particular group tend to view them more negatively if their behavior is stigmatized in some way. Whitehead (2010) found that one of the strongest predictors of attitudes toward homosexuality is the attribution of choice to sexual orientation. Framed by attribution theory, Herek and Glunt (1993) and Whitehead (2010) found that people who believe that homosexuality is the result of natural or biological forces have more positive attitudes to gay rights and same-sex unions, whereas those attributing homosexuality as the result of a choice have more negative attitudes towards same-sex unions.

The second identified theory was the basis for contact hypothesis (Herek & Glunt 1993; Hans et. al. 2012). Contact hypothesis was tested in order to examine the attitude that the intergroup contact promotes towards homosexuality and the way the frequency of the contact with homosexual person influences these attitudes. Hans et. al (2012) found that interpersonal contact with homosexual person promotes more positive attitudes towards homosexuality. The more one interacts with a homosexual person, the more positive attitudes will be created towards homosexuality (Herek & Glunt 1993; Hans et.

al. 2012). Herek and Glunt (1993) used contact hypothesis to test how interpersonal contact with homosexual person influences attitudes towards gay men as compared to lesbians and found that interpersonal contact with homosexual person influences attitudes to be more positive towards lesbians than to gay men.

Lastly, this review of related literature did not identify Symbolic Interactionism as a theory to describe how religiosity influences attitudes towards homosexuality. One of the classic sociologists in symbolic interactionism Blumer (1969) stated that people create attitudes towards “things” in terms of meanings they attach to them. “Things” are everything that exists in the physical world: activities, other human beings, categories of social life, social groups etc. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes the multiplicity of meanings that exist in the world. These meanings are socially constructed and determine what views one will have towards a “thing” or social group. Meaning is not simply inherent in things themselves, but chosen by a person in a collective – meaning process with others (Blumer 1969). In other words, attitudes one has towards a “thing” will be created based on the framework of meaning one will use in order to create the “thing”. Meaning systems created by people influence their attitude towards “things”. In a case of this thesis a person who uses framework of religious meaning will have a different attitude towards homosexuality than one that does not apply that framework. So, religiosity as a system of meaning is a factor that affects attitudes towards homosexuality.

Blumer’s perspective on the relationship between constructs of Symbolic Interactionism can be represented as follows:



The application of the relationship between corresponding constructs (main variables) for this study can be viewed as following:



That is, positive or negative attitudes towards homosexuality will be shaped by the degree people use religious ideology as a meaning system in their life. In other words, the degree to which a person uses system of religiosity influences attitudes towards homosexuality (positive or negative).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHOD

Sample

In this study a non – random selection process, convenience sampling was used. A convenience sample of college students was recruited from Minnesota State University, Mankato. For this thesis the religiosity construct was represented by three predictor (independent) variables: frequency of attendance, views of God and interpretation of the Bible. One approach to determine sample size is to choose 20 subjects per predictor variable (McNeil, Kelly and McNeil 1975). Therefore, the suitable sample size for the study of these three variables had to be minimum 60 students. In total 217 students were interviewed.

Data Collection

The permission of access to the convenience sample was asked from the instructors of Minnesota State University, Mankato. Specifically, the instructors of Introduction to Sociology and Introduction to Social Statistics were asked permission to administer a survey in their classes. Both classes were chosen because they are general education course options and thus, include a certain diversity of majors. The purpose of the study was explained to the students. Students were also informed that their responses will be analyzed without identification. The researcher noted that the survey was anonymous. Students were also informed that the participation in a survey was voluntary and that they could skip questions if they felt uncomfortable answering them. The informed consent with the information stated above was included with the self –

administered questionnaire. Students were asked to sign the informed consent if they were eighteen and over years old and if they agreed to participate. The researcher was present in the classrooms during the survey in order to answer the questions regarding the questionnaire.

Variables

Independent variables

The concept of “**religiosity**” in this study was defined as the degree to which one performs religious beliefs by attending church and degree to which one accepts religious beliefs through portraying God and interpreting the Bible. The concept of religiosity was represented by four independent variables:

The first variable was the frequency of attendance. “Frequency of attendance” refers to how often one visits church for religious purposes. The variable was measured by using ordinal level measurement. Low scores represented low religiosity. Students were asked how often they visit church for religious purposes (see appendix A survey question 1).

The second variable was views of God. “Views of God” refers to the degree one believes God is involved in life and is angered by sins of a person. The variable was measured by using ordinal level measurement. High scores represented low religiosity. Respondents were asked two questions and this variable was measured by summing responses of these two questions. First, respondents were asked to choose where their position lies on the scale from 1 to 5 concerning the degree God is involved in their life

and second, they were asked where their position lies concerning the degree God is angered by their sins (see appendix A survey questions 2 and 3).

The third variable was interpretation of the Bible. “Interpretation of the Bible” refers to the degree one interprets the Bible as true and correct. The variable was measured by using ordinal level of measurement. High scores represented low religiosity. Students were asked three questions and this variable was measured by summing responses to these three questions. First, respondents were asked to choose on the scale from 1 to 5 where their position lies concerning the degree to which they think the content of the Bible is true. Second, they were asked to choose where their position lies concerning the degree to which they think the content of Bible should be analyzed before believing in what it says. And third, respondents were asked to choose the degree to which they think the Bible includes human error (see appendix A survey questions 4, 5 and 6).

Dependent variables

The concept “**attitudes towards homosexuality**” in this study was defined as the degree of what one thinks about homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners and legal same sex unions positively or negatively. The lower the score the more positive was an attitude towards homosexuality. Thus, the concept “attitudes towards homosexuality” was represented by three variables.

The first variable was “attitudes towards homosexual person”, which can be defined as the degree to which one thinks of a person with homosexual orientation positively or negatively. The variable was measured by using ordinal level measurement.

Students were asked to choose a statement which best describes their attitude towards a homosexual person (see appendix A survey question 7).

The second variable was “attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners” which can be defined as the degree to which one thinks of sexual behavior between two homosexual people positively or negatively. The variable was measured by using ordinal level measurement. Students were asked to choose a statement which best describes their attitude towards homosexual behavior (see appendix A question 8).

The third variable was attitudes towards legal same sex unions which can be defined as the degree to which one thinks of the idea of legal civil same sex unions positively or negatively. The variable was measured by using ordinal level measurement. Students were asked to choose a statement which best describes their attitude towards legal same sex unions (see appendix A survey question 9).

Control variables

There were four **control variables** used in this analysis. The first control variable is “sex”. This variable was measured by nominal level of measurement. Students were asked to state their sex (see appendix A survey question 10).

The second control variable was “race”. This variable was measured by nominal level of measurement. Students were asked to identify their race (see appendix A survey question 11).

The third control variable was “type of denomination” one belongs to which can be defined as a type or subgroup within a religion that has a common name and tradition. This variable was measured by nominal level of measurement. Students were asked to state their religion (see appendix A survey question 12).

The fourth control variable was “traditionality of religion” which can be defined as the degree to which a person is traditional in his or her religion. This variable was measured by ordinal level of measurement. Students were asked to identify where their position lies concerning the degree of how traditional they are in their religion. (see appendix A survey question 13).

Analysis

The data gathered during this research was statistically analyzed by using multiple regression, specifically enter method. The enter method of analysis focuses on the analysis of each independent variable’s contribution to the dependent variable.

Hypothesis regarding dependent variable 1: “Frequency of church attendance” (X_1), “the degree to which one views God as angry and present in life” (X_2) and “the degree to which one interprets Bible as true (X_3)”, influences attitudes towards homosexual person (Y_1), controlling for sex (X_4), race (X_5), religion (X_6)” and traditionality of religion (X_7) was analyzed with the following model.

$$\text{Model 1: } Y_1 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7$$

Hypothesis regarding independent variable 2: “Frequency of church attendance” (X_1), “the degree to which one views God as angry and present in life” (X_2) and “the degree to which one interprets Bible as true (X_3)”, influences attitudes towards

homosexual behavior between same sex partners (Y_2), controlling for sex (X_4), race (X_5), religion (X_6)” and traditionality of religion (X_7) was analyzed with the following model.

$$\text{Model 2: } Y_2 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7$$

Hypothesis regarding variable 3: “Frequency of church attendance” (X_1), “the degree to which one views God as angry and present in life” (X_2) and “the degree to which one interprets Bible as true (X_3)”, influences attitudes towards same sex unions (Y_3), controlling for sex (X_4), race (X_5), religion (X_6)” and traditionality of religion (X_7) was analyzed with the following model.

$$\text{Model 3: } Y_3 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7$$

Limitations

The limitation of this study was the use of convenience sample of college students from one university. Therefore, findings cannot be generalized to the general population. Another limitation was that it is not possible to account for every factor that contributes to Y value (dependent variable). The questions about the degree to which one thinks God is angry by his or her sins also includes limitations. There was no option for the respondents who do not believe in God. And also some respondents claimed they believed that God is equally angered as well as forgiving for sins at the same time. However, respondents had to only choose one option.

Ethical Issues

The topic of homosexuality included questions concerning attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners, which is represented as sensitive questions in the IRB list of “Information relating to sexual attitudes”. In order to

minimize harm potential participants were informed about the confidentiality of the information they provide and that they have the right not to answer questions if they choose to do so.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In order to analyze the influence of religiosity on the attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior and same-sex unions the enter method of regression analysis was used. Regression analysis was conducted to study the correlations between independent and control variables with dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual person, followed by the correlation between independent and control variables with second dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners and finally, the correlation between independent and control variables with the third dependent variables – attitudes towards same sex unions.

The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards a Homosexual person

The overall F value for the model 1 was 6.788 significant at .000. Thus, the combinations of the coefficients associated with an independent and control variables was not equal to 0 (see appendix B table 1-2). That is, overall R^2 is statistically significant, the assumption that the null hypothesis is true can be rejected and the research hypothesis is supported. Therefore, it can be stated that the correlation between variables exists, thus at least one variable does not equal to 0. The overall R^2 for model 1 equals to .222, which means 22.2 % of variance of the attitudes towards homosexual person can be explained by the independent variables (see appendix B table 1-3).

The result of correlation analysis shows the correlation between each independent and control variable with the dependent variable – attitudes towards a homosexual person. Church attendance, the degree to which one interprets Bible as true, sex and

traditionality of religion are the variables that turned out to have a significant effect on the attitudes towards homosexual person according to the results of the t-test (see appendix B table 1-3). Church attendance has the highest positive association with attitudes towards homosexual person (.243). The person who attends church for religious purposes less often will be more likely to have a positive attitude towards a homosexual person than the person who goes to the church more often. Traditionality of religion has the strongest negative correlation with the attitudes towards homosexual person. (-.340). The more traditional the person is in his or her religion the more negative the attitude will be towards homosexual person. The degree to which the person analyzes the Bible as true also negatively correlates with the attitudes towards a homosexual person (-.333). If the person tends to analyze the content of the Bible as true, this person tends to have more negative attitudes towards a homosexual person. Sex of the respondents was significantly related to the attitudes towards a homosexual person as well. That is, on average females scored .219 higher on the current attitudes towards a homosexual person scale than male (see appendix B table 1-1), women had significantly more positive attitudes towards a homosexual person than men.

Tolerance measures the degree to which one independent variable is independent from the others. A tolerance score of lower than .4 and VIF higher than 2.50 is the case where it can be concluded that independent variables are too highly correlated (Allison 1999: 141). Another concern is when the correlations between variable is above .8 (Allison 1999: 142). The correlation between all the independent variables does not exceed 0.8 level. The VIF indicates that all variables are below 2.5 level and tolerance of

all the variables does not go below 0.4 level. Thus, none of the independent variables are highly correlated enough with each other to cause collinearity (see appendix B table 1-5).

According to the partial correlations table the association between the degree to which a person analyzes the Bible as true and attitudes towards a homosexual person, correlation between traditionality of religion and attitudes towards a homosexual person and the correlation between church attendance and the attitudes towards a homosexual person decreases when controlling for other independent and control variables. On the other hand, the correlation between sex and the attitudes towards homosexual person increases. The control variable sex has the strongest partial correlation with the attitudes towards a homosexual person as compared to the independent variables while controlling for other variables (.271) followed by the degree to which one analyzes the Bible as true (-.166), followed by church attendance (.156), followed by traditionality of religion (.036) (see appendix B table 1-4).

The Influence of Religiosity towards a Homosexual Behavior between Same Sex Partners

The overall F value for the model 2 was 10.947 significant at .000. Thus, the combinations of the coefficients associated with an independent and control variables was not equal to 0 (see appendix B table 2-2). That is, overall R^2 is statistically significant, the assumption that the null hypothesis is true can be rejected and the research hypothesis is supported. Therefore, it can be stated that the correlation between variables exists, thus at least one variable does not equal to 0. The overall R^2 for model 2

equals to .315, which means 31.5 % of variance of the attitudes towards homosexual behavior can be explained by the independent variables (see appendix B table 2-3).

Church attendance, the degree to which one analyzed the Bible as true and sex are the variables that have significant association with the dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners according to the results of the t-test (see appendix B table 2-3). The degree to which one interprets the Bible as true has the strongest negative association with the attitudes towards homosexual behavior (-.440). The student who does not tend to analyze the content of the Bible as true and correct, tends to have more positive attitudes towards a homosexual behavior as compared to the student who tends to interpret the Bible as true and correct. Church attendance had the strongest positive association with the attitudes towards homosexual behavior (.344). The more person attends church for religious purposes the more negative attitudes are towards a homosexual behavior. Sex was also found to be significantly related to the attitudes towards homosexual behavior (.195). That is, on average females scored .195 higher on the current attitudes towards a homosexual behavior scale than male (see appendix B table 2-1), women had significantly more positive attitudes towards a homosexual behavior than men.

The correlation between all the independent variables does not exceed 0.8 level. The VIF indicates that all variables are below 2.5 level and tolerance of all the variables does not go below 0.4 level. Thus, none of the independent variables are highly correlated enough with each other to cause collinearity (see appendix B table 2-5).

According to the partial correlation table the association between church attendance and attitudes towards homosexual behavior and the correlation between the degree to which one analyzes the Bible as true and the attitudes towards homosexual behavior decreases when controlling for other independent and control variable. On the opposite, the correlation between sex and the attitudes towards homosexual behavior increases. After controlling for other variables the control variable sex turned out to have the strongest partial correlation with the attitudes towards homosexual behavior as compared to the independent variables (.287) followed by the degree to which one analyzes the Bible as true (-.261) followed by church attendance (.235) (see appendix B table 2-4).

The Influence of Religiosity on the Attitudes towards Same Sex Unions

The overall F value for the model 3 was 14.903 significant at .000. Thus, the combinations of the coefficients associated with independent and control variables was not equal to 0 (see appendix B table 3-2). That is, overall R^2 is statistically significant, the assumption that the null hypothesis is true can be rejected and the research hypothesis is supported. Therefore, we can state that the correlation between variables exists, thus at least one variable does not equal to 0. The overall R^2 for model 2 equals to .384, which means 38.4 % of variance of the attitudes towards same sex unions can be explained by the independent variables (see appendix B table 3-3).

Church attendance, the degree to which one interprets Bible as true, sex and traditionality of religion are the variables that turned out to have a significant effect on the attitudes towards same sex unions according to the results of the t-test (see appendix

B table 3-3). As deduced from the correlation matrix the degree to which one analyzes the Bible as true has the strongest negative association with the attitudes towards same sex unions (-.436) followed by traditionality of religion (-.432). The less traditional the student is in his or her religion and the less the student interprets the Bible as true the more positive the attitudes towards same-sex unions the student tends to have. Church attendance has the strongest positive association with the attitudes towards same sex unions (.409). Thus, the more often the student tends to attend church the more negative attitudes the student tends to have towards same sex unions. Women were found to have significantly more positive attitudes toward same sex unions as sex was also found to be significantly related had to the attitudes towards same sex unions (.234). That is, on average females scored .234 higher on the current attitudes towards same sex unions scale than male (see appendix B table 3-1),

The correlation between all the independent variables does not exceed 0.8 level. The VIF indicates that all variables are below 2.5 level and tolerance of all the variables does not go below 0.4 level. Thus, none of the independent variables are highly correlated enough with each other to cause collinearity (see appendix B table 3-5).

As deduced from the partial coefficient table the association between church attendance and the attitudes towards same-sex unions decreases while controlling for other variables. The association between the control variable sex and the attitudes towards same-sex unions increases while controlling for independent variables. The association between the degree to which one interprets the Bible as true with the attitudes towards same sex union and between traditionality of religion and the attitudes towards

same sex unions decreases if controlling for other variables. After controlling for other variables the control variable sex becomes the most associated with the attitudes towards same-sex unions (.343) followed by church attendance (.331) followed by the degree to which one analyzes the content of the Bible (-.215) as true followed by the traditionality of religion (-.214) (see appendix B table 3-4).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Framed by symbolic interaction theory in this study the hypothesis was that the degree to which one is religious influences his or her attitudes towards homosexuality. This hypothesis was partly supported. The degree to which one attended church was found to have a significant influence on the attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners and also same sex unions. That is, the more students attend church for religious purposes the less positive the attitudes of the students towards homosexuality are. Church attendance had the strongest association with the attitudes towards same sex unions and the least influence on the attitudes towards a homosexual person.

The degree to which one analyzes the Bible as true also had an influence on the attitudes towards a homosexual person as well as homosexual behavior between same sex partners and same-sex unions. The more students believed that the Bible should be analyzed before believing in what it says, the less they thought that the Bible is true and the more they were inclined to believe that the Bible includes human error the more positive attitude they had on their attitudes towards homosexuality. The strongest association was between the degree to which one interprets the Bible as true and attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners. I speculate that the strong correlation between these two particular variables is due to the numerous punishments that were described in the Bible especially towards people of the same sex who had sexual intercourse between each other (Locke 2004).

The third independent variable “views of God” did not have any significant influence on the attitudes towards homosexuality (see appendix B table 1-3, 2-3 and 3-3). The results of the studies referenced in the literature review support the result that the extent to which God is viewed as angry and active predicts particular attitudes towards homosexuality (Bader and Froese 2005, Whitehead 2010). However, the results of this study contradict the results of these previous studies, this study supports that the degree to which one views God as angry and active does not influence the attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners or same sex unions. In order to see whether the degree to which one thinks God is active in life and the degree to which one thinks God is angry by sins have significant influence apart from each a separate regression analysis was conducted. The results showed that even after entering these two variables separately there was no significance influence on the attitudes towards homosexuality (see appendix B table 6-1, 6-2 and 6-3).

The control variable sex was found to have significant influence on all three dependent variables: the attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners and legal same sex unions (see appendix B table 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3). Females were more likely to be positive towards homosexuality than men. After conducting crosstabs it was found specifically that 52.8 % women were positive towards homosexual person as compared to 23.9% men (see appendix B table 4-1). Attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners of both males and females become less positive as compared to the attitude towards a homosexual person. However, females still remain more positive towards it. In the sample for this study 35.8% women

were positive as compare to 15.2% males (see appendix B table 4-2). Both females and males had the most positive attitude towards same sex unions as compared to the attitudes towards a homosexual person and homosexual behavior between same sex partners, 56.9% and 26.1% respectively (see appendix B table 4-3).

Interestingly while religiosity was significantly correlated with the attitudes towards homosexuality, the influence of religion was not found to have a significant influence on homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners or same sex unions (see appendix B tables 1-3, 2-3 and 3-3). These results contradict the results of the studies that were referenced in the literature review. Specifically, according to the studies described in the literature review respondents stated religion as a source of their mostly negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Wagenaar and Bartos 1977; Unneve, Cullen, and Applegate 2005; Bader, Mencken, and Froese, 2007; Rosik, Ghriffith, and Cruz 2007; Jenkins 2009). In this study religious affiliation did not have significant impact on positive or negative attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners and same sex unions.

Similarly according to this study, the control variable race also did not have any significant influence on the attitudes towards homosexuality (see appendix B tables 1-3, 2-3 and 3-3). If comparing the results of this study to the results of other studies referenced in the literature review, it is important to mention that all the results are contradictory. While some researchers argued that race has a significant influence on the attitudes towards homosexuality only for Whites (Jenkins, Lambert and Eric 2009, Louis and Porter 1990), other examples were that race did not have any significant influence on

the attitudes towards homosexuality at all (Schulte and Battle 2004). In particular the results of our study indicated that race does not have any significant influence neither on attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners nor on same sex unions.

Finally, traditionality of religion as a control variable was used in this study. Only the responses of the respondents who knew what it means to be traditional in their religion were taken into account. Overall 96.3 % of respondents were familiar with the meaning of that concept (see appendix B table 5). Specifically traditionality of religion was found to have a significant influence on the attitudes towards a homosexual person and same sex unions (see appendix B tables 1-3 and 3-3). Interestingly, traditionality of religion did not influence attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners (see appendix B table 2-3). These results can serve as basis for a new more detailed studies about the influence of the traditionality of religion on the attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners and same sex unions.

Overall, the hypothesis for this study was supported, because the degree to which students are religious does have an influence on the attitudes towards homosexuality. Students who attend church often and interpret Bible as true and correct tend to have negative attitudes towards a homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners as well as same sex unions. However, the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables is minimal since the variance in common for the pairwise comparisons of the variables is minimal. For example, the degree to which one analyzes

the Bible as true has a significant association with the attitudes towards homosexual person and correlates with it on the -.333 level (see appendix B table 1-1), but it means that only 11.56 % of the variance of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable. On the other hand, the degree to which students view God as active and angry in their life was not a significant predictor of their attitudes towards homosexual person, homosexual behavior between same sex partners or same sex unions at all.

REFERENCES

- Adamczyk, Amy and Cassady Pitt. 2009. "Shaping Attitudes about Homosexuality: The Role of Religion and Cultural Context." *Social Science Research* 38(2): 338-351.
- Adolfson, Anna, Jurjen Iedema, and Saskia Keuzenkamp. 2010. "Multiple Dimensions of Attitudes about Homosexuality: Development of a Multifaceted Scale Measuring Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality* 57(10) 1237-1257.
- Allison, Paul D. 1999. *Multiple Regression: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Alston Jon 1975. "Review of the polls." *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* 14: 165-168
- Andersen, Robert and Tina Fetner. 2008. "Economic Inequality and Intolerance: Attitudes toward Homosexuality in 35 Democracies" *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4) : 942-958.
- Bader, Christopher D. and Paul Froese. 2005. "Images of God: The Effects of Personal Theologies on Moral Attitudes, Political Affiliation, and Religious Behavior." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Religious Research* 11 (1): 1-24.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University Of California Press.
- Finlay, Barbara and Carol S. Walther. 2003. "The Relation of Religious Affiliation, Service Attendance, and Other Factors to Homophobic Attitudes Among University Students." *Review of Religious Research* 44: 370–393.
- Ford, Thomas E., Thomas Brignall, Thomas L. VanValey, and Micheal J. Macaluso. 2009. "The Unmaking of Prejudice: How Christian Beliefs Relate to Attitudes toward Homosexuals." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48: 146–160.

- Furnham Adrian and Kaoru Saito. 2009. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Attitudes toward and Beliefs About, Male Homosexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality* 56(3): 299-318.
- Hans, Jason D., Megan Kersey and Claire Kimberly .2012. "Self-Perceived Origins of Attitudes toward Homosexuality" *Journal of Homosexuality* 59(1): 4-17.
- Herek, Gregory M. 1988. "‘Heterosexuals’ Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men: Correlates and Gender Differences." *Journal of Sex Research* 25(3): 451–477.
- Herek, Gregory M. and Eric K. Glunt. 1993. "Interpersonal Contact and Heterosexuals' Attitudes towards Gay Men: Results from a National Survey." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30(3): 239-244.
- Hicks, Gary R. and Tien-tsung Lee. 2006. "Public Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians: Trends and Predictors." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51(2): 57-77.
- Jenkins, Morris, Lambert, Eric, and David N. Baker. 2009. "The Attitudes of Black and White College Students toward Gays and Lesbians" *Journal of Black Studies* 39(4): 589-613.
- Kite, Mary E. 1996. "Sex Differences in Attitudes toward Homosexual Persons, Behaviors, and Civil Rights. A Meta-analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4): 336–353.
- Lewis, Gregory B. 2003. "Black-white Differences in Attitudes toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67: 59–78.
- Locke, Kenneth A. 2005. "The Bible on Homosexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality* 48(2): 125-156.
- Loftus, Jeni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes toward Homosexuality, 1973 to 1998." *American Sociological Review* 66: 762-782.

- Louis, Bonilla and Judith Porter. 1990. "A Comparison of Latino, Black, and Non-Hispanic White Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Journal of Behavioral Science* 12 (4): 437-452.
- Lottes, Ilsa L and Peter Kuriloff . 1992. "The Effects of Gender, Race, Religion, and Political Orientation on the Sex Role Attitudes of College Freshmen" *Adolescence* 27: 675-688.
- McVeigh, Rory and Maria - Elena Diaz. 2009. "Voting to Ban Same-sex Marriage: Interests, Values, and Communities." *American Sociological Review* 74: 891-915.
- McNeil, Keith A., Kelly. J Francis and Judy T. McNeil. 1975. *Testing Research Hypothesis Using Multiple Regression* Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Maher. Michael J., Linda M. Sever, and Shaun Pichler. 2008. "How Catholic College Students Think About Homosexuality: The Connection between Authority and Sexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality* 55(3): 325-349.
- Olson, Laura R., Wendy Cadge, and James T. Harrison. 2006. "Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:340-360.
- Rosik, Christopher H., Griffith, Lois, and Zenaida Cruz. 2007. "Homophobia and Conservative Religion: Toward a More Nuanced Understanding." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 77(1): 10-19.
- Rogers, Jack. 1999. "Biblical Interpretation regarding Homosexuality in the Recent History of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A" *Review of Religious Research* 41: 223-238.

- Saad, Lydia. 2012. "U.S. Acceptance of Gay and Lesbian Relations Is the New Normal." *Gallup politics*. Retrieved April 11, 2013 (<http://www.gallup.com/poll/154634/acceptance-gay-lesbian-relations-new-normal.aspx>).
- Schulte, Lisa and Juan Battle. 2004. "The Relative Importance of Ethnicity and Religion in Predicting Attitudes towards Gays and Lesbians." *Journal of Homosexuality* 47(2): 127-142.
- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79: 291–318.
- Treas, J. 2002. "How Cohorts, Education, and Ideology Shapes a New Sexual Revolution on American Attitudes toward Nonmarital sex." 1972-1998." *Sociological Perspectives* 45(3): 267-283.
- Unneve, James, Francis T. Cullen, and Brandon K. Applegate. 2005. "Turning the Other Cheek: Reassessing the Impact of Religion on Punitive Ideology." *Justice Quarterly* 22: 304–338.
- Whitehead, Andrew. 2010. "Sacred Rites and Civil Rights: Religion's Effect on Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Unions and the Perceived Cause of Homosexuality." *Social Science* 491 (1): 63-79.
- Wagenaar, Theodore C. and Patricia E. Bartos. 1977. "Orthodoxy and Attitudes of Clergymen towards Homosexuality and Abortion" *Review of Religious Research* 18 (2): 114-125.
- Whitley, Bernard E, Jr. 2001. "Gender Role Variables and Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Sex roles* 45: 691-721.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Questions Included in the Survey

Survey

Informed Consent

Thank you for considering the participation in this survey.

This notice is related to the participation in a research study for the graduate student Anastasiia Kuptsevych. The study focus is on the influence of religiosity on attitudes towards homosexuality. The purpose of the research study is to describe new knowledge about this topic.

You will be asked to complete a survey, which will last approximately 5 minutes. The participation in the survey is voluntary. If you don't feel comfortable answering some of the questions you can skip them or stop participating at any time. The risks you will encounter as a participant in this research are not more than experienced in your everyday life. Whether you decide to participate or not will not affect your relationship with Minnesota State University, Mankato and you will not be penalized or lose any benefits if you refuse to participate.

All your answers will be confidential. Your answers will be included as a group information to analyze data for research purposes. If you are at least 18 years old and agree to participate in the survey, please print your name and sign the informed consent. The informed consents and data recorded will be locked in storage of Minnesota State University, Mankato for three years and then destroyed.

If you agree to participate, please complete this survey and then return to a researcher. If you want to keep the copy of the informed consent, it can be obtained from the researcher. If you do not want to participate, please, return the survey blank.

IRB Case number: 520206-4

If you have any questions regarding the survey and the study, please contact:

Principal Investigator: Dr. Diane Graham (507) – 389 - 6169

Student Investigator: Anastasiia Kuptsevych (507) – 491 – 2732

For the information about the rights of the research subjects you may contact:

MNSU IRB Administrator (Graduate Dean): Barry Ries (507) – 389 – 2321

Printed name _____

Signature _____ Date: _____

This study is about the influence of religiosity on the attitudes towards homosexuality.

1. Please, identify how often you visit a church for religious purposes by circling the answer.

- 1. Never
- 2. Less than once a year
- 3. Several times a year
- 4. Once a month
- 5. 2 to 3 times a month
- 6. Once a week
- 7. More than 1 time a week

2. On a scale from 1 to 5, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree to which God is involved in your life, where 1. – God is involved and present in everything I do, 5 – I never feel his presence.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

3. On a scale from 1 to 5, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree to which you think God is angered by your sins, where 1.– God is angered every time I sin, 5 – God forgives me every time I sin.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

4. On a scale from 1 to 5, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree to which you think the content of the Bible is true, where 1.- The content of Bible is true, 5.- The content of the Bible is not true.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

5. On a scale from 1 to 5, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree to which you think the content of the Bible should be analyzed before believing in what it says, where 1. - I should not analyze the content of the Bible before believing in what it says, 5. - I should analyze the content of the Bible before believing in what it says.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

6. On a scale from 1 to 5, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree to which you think the Bible includes human error, where 1. – The Bible does not include human error, 5. –The Bible includes human error.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

7. Please, circle a statement which best describes your attitude towards a homosexual person.

1. Positive
2. More positive than negative
3. Neutral
4. More negative than positive
5. Negative

8. Please, circle a statement which best describes your attitude towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners.

1. Positive
2. More positive than negative
3. Neutral
4. More negative than positive
5. Negative

9. Please, circle a statement which best describes your attitude towards legal same sex unions (gay marriage).

1. Positive
2. More positive than negative
3. Neutral
4. More negative than positive
6. Negative

10. Please, identify your sex by circling the answer.

1. Female
2. Male

11. Please, identify your race by circling the answer.

1. European - American
2. African-American
3. Hispanic/Latino
4. Asian-American
5. American Indian
6. Other

12. Please, identify your religion by circling the answer.

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. Muslim
5. Other religion
6. I do not have a religion (The survey is finished, thank you for your answers!)

13. On the scale from one to five, please, circle where your position lies concerning the degree of how traditional you are in your religion, where 1. – I am very traditional in my religion, 5.- I am not traditional in my religion. If you do not know what it means to be traditional and not traditional in a religion, please circle the answer 6.

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

6. I do not know what it means to be traditional and not traditional in a religion.

Thank you very much for your participation!

Anastasiia Kuptsevych

Appendix B. Tables

Table 1-1. Correlations between the independent and control variables with the dependent variable - attitudes towards a homosexual person

Independent Variables	Dependent variable
Church attendance	.243*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.333*
Views of God	-.146
Control variables	
Sex	.219*
Race	.044
Religion	-.111
Traditionality of religion	-.340*

*p<.05

Table 1-2. ANOVA: dependent variable: attitudes towards a homosexual person

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	47.221	7	6.746	6.788	.000
Residual	165.956	167	.994		
Total	213.177	174			

Table 1-3. Coefficients: dependent variable: attitudes towards a homosexual person

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Church attendance	.126* (.588)	.154
Interpretation of the Bible	-.072* (.033)	-.193
Views of God	.026 (.056)	.035
Control variables		
Sex	.576* (.158)	.257
Race	.017 (.058)	.021
Religion	-.016 (.050)	-.023
Traditionality of religion	-.185* (.084)	-.193
Constant	1.958	
R ²	.222	

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors

Table 1-4. Partial correlations between the independent and control variables with the dependent variable - attitudes towards a homosexual person

Independent Variables	Zero Order	Partial
Church attendance	.243*	.156*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.333*	-.166*
Views of God	-.146	.036
Control variables		
Sex	.219	.271*
Race	.044	.023
Religion	-.111	-.025
Traditionality of religion	-.340*	-.169*

*p<.05

Table 1-5. Collinearity Statistics: dependent variable – attitudes towards a homosexual person

Independent Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Church attendance	.823	1.214
Interpretation of the Bible	.596	1.677
Views of God	.801	1.248
Control variables		
Sex	.936	1.069
Race	.954	1.048
Religion	.912	1.097
Traditionality of religion	.609	1.643

Table 2-1. Correlations between the independent and control variables with the dependent variable - attitudes towards a homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Independent Variables	Dependent variable
Church attendance	.344*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.440*
Views of God	-.205
Control variables	
Sex	.195*
Race	.037
Religion	-.084
Traditionality of religion	-.388

*p<.05

Table 2-2. ANOVA: dependent variable: attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	78.552	7	11.222	10.947	.000
Residual	171.185	167	1.025		
Total	249.737	174			

Table 2-3. Coefficients: dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Church attendance	.195* (.063)	.220
Interpretation of the Bible	-.117* (.034)	-.290
Views of God	.009 (.057)	-.290
Control variables		
Sex	.622* (.161)	.256
Race	.006 (.059)	.007
Religion	.018 (.051)	.024
Traditionality of religion	-.161 (.085)	-.156
Constant	2.535	
R ²	.315	

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors

Table 2-4. Partial Correlations between independents and control variables with the dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Independent Variables	Zero Order	Partial
Church attendance	.344*	.235*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.440*	-.261*
Views of God	-.205	-.012
Control variables		
Sex	.195*	.287*
Race	.037	.008
Religion	-.084	.028
Traditionality of religion	-.388	-.145

*p<.05

Table 2-5. Collinearity Statistics:dependent variable – attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Independent Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Church attendance	.823	1.214
Interpretation of the Bible	.596	1.677
Views of God	.801	1.248
Control variables		
Sex	.936	1.214
Race	.954	1.048
Religion	.912	1.097
Traditionality of religion	.609	1.643

Table 3-1. Correlations between the independent and control variables with the dependent variable - attitudes towards same sex unions

Independent Variables	Dependent variable
Church attendance	.409*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.436*
Views of God	-.202
Control variables	
Sex	.234*
Race	.057
Religion	-.110
Traditionality of religion	-.432*

*p<.05

Table 3-2. ANOVA: dependent variable: attitudes towards same sex unions

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	113.575	7	15.225	14.903	.000
Residual	181.819	167	1.089		
Total	295.394	174			

Table 3-3. Coefficients: dependent variable – attitudes towards same sex unions

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Church attendance	.293* (.065)	.304
Interpretation of the Bible	-.099* (.035)	-.224
Views of God	.018 (.059)	.021
Control variables		
Sex	.782* (.166)	.296
Race	.028 (.060)	.029
Religion	-.005 (.052)	-.006
Traditionality of religion	-.249* (.088)	-.221
Constant	1.463	
R ²	.384	

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors**Table 3-4. Partial Correlations between independents and control variables with the dependent variable – attitudes towards same sex unions**

Independent Variables	Zero Order	Partial
Church attendance	.409*	.331*
Interpretation of the Bible	-.436*	-.215*
Views of God	-.202	.024
Control variables		
Sex	.234*	.343*
Race	.057	.036
Religion	-.110	-.007
Traditionality of religion	-.432*	-.214*

Table 3-5. Collinearity Statistics: dependent variable – attitudes towards same sex unions

Independent Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Church attendance	.823	1.214
Interpretation of the Bible	.596	1.677
Views of God	.801	1.248
Control variables		
Sex	.936	1.069
Race	.954	1.048
Religion	.912	1.097
Traditionality of religion	.609	1.643

Table 4-1. Crosstabulation of the control variable sex and the dependent variable attitudes towards a homosexual person

Attitudes towards a homosexual person	Sex		Total
	Female	Male	
Positive	52.8%	23.9%	40.5%
More positive than negative	14.6%	15.2%	14.9%
Neutral	22.8%	48.9%	34.0%
More negative than positive	7.3%	12.0%	9.3%
Negative	2.4%	0.0%	1.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 4.2. Crosstabulation of the control variable sex and the dependent variable attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Attitudes towards homosexual behavior	Sex		Total
	Female	Male	
Positive	35.8%	15.2%	27.0%
More positive than negative	18.7%	12.0%	15.8%
Neutral	27.6%	43.5%	34.4%
More negative than positive	9.8%	23.9%	15.8%
Negative	8.1%	5.4%	7.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 4-3. Crosstabulation of the control variable sex and the dependent variable attitudes towards same sex unions

Attitudes towards same sex unions	Sex		Total
	Female	Male	
Positive	56.9%	26.1%	43.7%
More positive than negative	12.2%	17.4%	14.4%
Neutral	17.1%	38.0%	26.0%
More negative than positive	5.7%	7.6%	6.5%
Negative	8.1%	10.9%	9.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 5. Traditionality of religion

Traditionality of religion	Percent
I know what it means to be traditional in religion	96.3
I do not know what it means to be traditional in religion	3.7
Total	100

Table 6-1. Coefficients: dependent variable: attitudes towards a homosexual person

Independent variable: Views of God: the degree to which one thinks God is active in life and the degree to which one thinks God is angry by sins

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Involvement of God in life	-.017 (.080)	-.017
Angriness of the God by sins	.063 (.075)	.061

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors

Table 6-2. Coefficients: dependent variable: attitudes towards homosexual behavior between same sex partners

Independent variable: Views of God: the degree to which one thinks God is active in life and the degree to which one thinks God is angry by sins

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Involvement of God in life	-.069 (.081)	-.064
Angriness of the God by sins	.043 (.076)	.039

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors

Table 6-3. Coefficients: dependent variable: attitudes towards same sex unions

Independent variable: Views of God: the degree to which one thinks God is active in life and the degree to which one thinks God is angry by sins

Independent Variables	b	Beta
Involvement of God in life	-.063 (.083)	-.054
Angriness of the God by sins	.090 (.078)	.074

*p<.05

Notes: Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors