

*Interdisciplinary Journal of
Research on Religion*

Volume 14

2018

Article 8

Same-Sex Sexuality, Marriage, and the Seminary
Professor:
Catholic, Evangelical, and Mainline Protestant

Robert J. Priest*

Taylor University
Upland, Indiana

* Robert_priest@taylor.edu

Copyright © 2018 *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. The *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* is freely available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.religjournal.com>.

Same-Sex Sexuality, Marriage, and the Seminary

Professor: Catholic, Evangelical, and Mainline Protestant

Robert J. Priest

Taylor University
Upland, Indiana

Abstract

Prior research demonstrates that religion variables are among the strongest predictors of attitudes toward same-sex sexuality and marriage, with America's three largest religious traditions (Roman Catholic, evangelical, and mainline Protestant) differentially influencing adherents' views on same-sex sexuality and marriage, and with religious elites playing key roles in this influence. While a good amount of research has examined the influential role of pastors as religious elites, minimal research has focused on the seminaries and seminary professors that train America's future religious leaders. This article reviews basic findings of a 2015 Survey of U.S. Seminary Faculty on Sexuality and Marriage that surveyed seminary faculty from 100 U.S. seminaries. It compares and contrasts Catholic, evangelical, and mainline Protestant seminaries and their theological faculty and examines 1) faculty stances on same-sex marriage, 2) tradition-related factors associated with such stances, 3) faculty understandings of what such stances should imply for religious communities and civil society, and 4) the extent to which engagement with these issues represents a prioritized focus. It concludes with a discussion of key findings, considers possible futures, and suggests directions for further research.

In America, both religious and governmental authorities act to validate marriages. Such authorities do not always agree. Most churches, for example, disapprove of behaviors that laws allow and protect—ranging from no-fault divorce to non-marital sex to the production and consumption of pornography. Such laws often protect citizens' rights to act in religiously disapproved ways without requiring religious actors to endorse or support those actions. But the Supreme Court decision *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015) on same-sex marriage introduced, according to Chief Justice Roberts, “serious questions about religious liberty” (27). And since a majority of American Christians attend churches where only a marriage between a man and woman is thought to constitute a God-approved marriage,¹ religious America would seem to be moving into uncharted waters.

Historically, church leaders understood Scripture to teach that marriage was to be a male-female institution and that any sexual activity outside of such male-female marriage was sinful. Not surprisingly, Christians and churches committed to the authority and truth of Scripture and/or of the Magisterium find “accommodation to current attitudes and norms regarding sexuality” more of a challenge than do “theologically liberal” ones (Adler, 2012: 192; see also Burdette, Ellison, and Hill 2005; Ogland and Bartkowski 2014; Perry 2015; Sullins 2010; Todd and Ong 2012; Whitehead and Baker 2012; Whitehead and Perry 2014), where it is more acceptable simply to affirm that such authorities are wrong, at times, in what they affirm. And yet dramatic cultural changes in how sexuality is understood are creating challenges for older Christian viewpoints, with understandings of Christian communities in flux (Baunach 2012; Bean and Martinez 2014; Cadge et al. 2012; Schnabel 2016; Thomas and Olson 2012b; Thomas and Whitehead 2015). It is difficult to predict future religious and social outcomes.

Religion variables are among the strongest predictors of opinions about same-sex sexuality and marriage (Burdette, Ellison, and Hill 2005; Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006; Perry 2015; Perry and Whitehead 2016; Todd and Ong 2012; Whitehead and Baker 2012; Whitehead and Perry 2014; Woodford, Walls, and Levy, 2012: 5), with members of the three largest religious traditions in America (Roman Catholic, evangelical Protestant, and mainline Protestant) differing significantly in their beliefs on the topic (Gaines and Garand 2010; Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2005; Merino 2013; Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006; Perry 2013; Perry and Whitehead 2016; Pew Research Center 2015c; Schnabel 2016; Sherkat et al. 2011; Sullins 2010; Whitehead 2010, 2013; Whitehead and Baker 2012).

¹ A few denominations (MCC, TEC, UUS, ELCA, PCUSA, UCC) either fully support same-sex marriage or endorse and perform such marriages while permitting individual ministers and local congregations to decline to do so. But the majority of America's denominations, and the largest (RCC, UMC, SBC), currently do not approve same-sex marriages, although with varying degrees of internal dissent.

Since churches from the three traditions differentially influence adherents' beliefs and stances on sex and marriage, research also has focused on the formative role of such congregations and denominations (Adler 2012; Adler, Hoegeman, and West 2014; Brittain and McKinnon 2011; Cadge 2002; Cadge, Day and Wildeman 2007; Chaves and Anderson 2014; Djupe, Olson, and Gilbert 2006; Thomas and Olson 2012a; Whitehead 2013). And since religious elites also influence adherents' views and stances, research has also focused on pastors and denominational leaders (Brittain and McKinnon 2011; Cadge and Wildeman 2008; Cadge et al. 2012; Olson and Carroll 1992; Olson and Cadge 2002; Thomas and Olson 2012b; Uecker and Lucke 2011; Wellman 1999). And yet church leaders receive their training in theological seminaries that themselves deserve attention (Carroll et al. 1997; Finke and Dougherty 2002; Ott and Winters 2011; Stephens and Jung 2015; Turner and Stayton 2014), with seminary professors especially constituting an understudied elite that merits consideration due to their influential role as intellectuals and educators of future pastors and denominational leaders (Hunter 1987; Olson and Carroll 1992).

Reporting on results of a 2015 U.S. Seminary Faculty Survey on Sexuality and Marriage, this article compares and contrasts Roman Catholic, mainline Protestant, and evangelical seminaries and their theological faculty, and examines 1) faculty stances on same-sex marriage, 2) tradition-related factors associated with such stances, 3) faculty understandings of what such stances should imply for religious communities and civil society, and 4) the extent to which engagement with these issues represents a prioritized focus. It concludes with a discussion of the findings, considers possible futures, and suggests directions for future research.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

In the fall of 2015, more than 4,500 seminary professors in the United States taught over 64,000 seminarians in 210 theological schools fully accredited by The Association of Theological Schools (ATS).² Most of these schools may be categorized as Roman Catholic Seminaries (RCS), Evangelical Protestant Seminaries (EPS), or Mainline Protestant Seminaries (MPS).

The “standard way” sociologists have differentiated Evangelical from Mainline Protestant (Woodberry et al. 2012) is based on the classification system

² Although the ATS also lists Canadian seminaries, as well as U.S. seminaries that are not yet fully accredited, this research focused only on U.S. seminaries fully accredited by ATS. The ATS does not accredit undergraduate theological education, which is where pastoral training sometimes occurs in some evangelical traditions (accredited through ABHE). Some graduate theological schools have not sought accreditation through ATS, again primarily among evangelicals, but the vast majority of U.S. seminaries do seek accreditation through ATS. Most churches prefer, or require, that their pastors have graduate theological training.

(RELTRAD) devised by Steensland et al. (2000). This article’s coding of seminaries in the ATS data (42 RCS, 81 EPS, 68 MPS, and 19 “other” or “mixed”) is also based on RELTRAD. For a full explication of the application of RELTRAD coding that underpins data in Table 1 and in the survey sample selection, see Appendix A.

Table 1: U.S. Theological Schools by Religious Tradition

		Mean	SD	Sum	Perc
Student Head Count (Fall, 2015)	RCS	141	80	5,929	9.1%
	EPS	518	677	41,945	64.7%
	MPS	199	143	13,504	20.8%
	Other/Mixed	184	123	3,498	5.4%
	All	309	461	64,876	100%
FTE Faculty* (Fall, 2015)	RCS	19.2	10.2	808	17.9%
	EPS	25.4	28.1	2,059	45.7%
	MPS	18.9	11.6	1,288	28.6%
	Other/Mixed	18.3	12.7	348	7.7%
	All	21.4	19.2	4,503	100%
Endowment, in Millions, USD (Fall, 2015)	RCS	18.4	22.2	771	9.5%
	EPS	18.9	37.8	1,533	18.8%
	MPS	68.8	133	4,676	57.5%
	Other/Mixed	60.9	155	1,157	14.2%
	All	38.7	95.1	8,137	100%
Faculty Luce Awards (1994-2018)	RCS	.55	2.21	23	15%
	EPS	.10	.30	8	5.2%
	MPS	1.15	2.45	78	51%
	Other/Mixed	2.32	4.88	44	28.8%
	All	.73	2.31	153	100%

*ATS reports this variable as “Full-time estimate, number of faculty who would be teaching full time if all faculty were teaching full time (50% or more of their time).”

Sources: The data on students, faculty, and endowment money for each theological school was acquired from the ATS “2015-2016 Annual Data Tables – Table 1.2 Significant Institutional Characteristics of Each Member School,” found at <http://www.ats.edu/uploads/resources/institutional-data/annual-data-tables/2015-2016-annual-data-tables.pdf>. Information on the ATS-administered Faculty Luce Awards, with awards listed by school and tradition, may be found in Appendix B.

The mix of strengths, as measured by enrollment, faculty size, endowment, and faculty scholarship awards, varies in each tradition, as is seen in Table 1. RCS have 9.1 percent of the students, 17.9 percent of the faculty, and 9.5 percent of the endowment money. Their professors win 15 percent of the prestigious ATS-

administered Faculty Luce Awards.³ MPS have 20.8 percent of the students, 28.6 percent of the faculty, and 57.5 percent of the endowment money. Their faculty garner 51 percent of the Luce Awards. By contrast, EPS have 18.8 percent of the endowment money, 45.7 percent of the faculty, and 64.7 percent of the students.⁴ But EPS professors win only 5.2 percent of the Faculty Luce Awards. Divinity school faculty at Harvard, Yale, and the University of Chicago (coded as “other/mixed”) won most of the remaining Luce Awards.

Regarding the constituencies of these seminaries, mainline Protestants in America experienced the greatest decline, going in seven years (2007–2014) from 18.1 percent of the U.S. population to 14.7 percent, part of a long-term trend. These same years saw a decline for Roman Catholics from 23.9 percent to 20.8 percent. During this period, evangelical Protestants increased slightly in total numbers (from 60 to 62 million), but as a proportion of the U.S. population, they dropped nearly 1 percent, from 26.3 percent to 25.4 percent (Pew Research Center, 2015a: 3–4).

On one hand, as measured by financial resources and signals of elite intellectual success, MPS have the greatest strength. That EPS faculty have won only 5.2 percent of the Faculty Luce Awards would seem, on any interpretation, to signal their marginality or marginalization from elite theological scholarship. On the other hand, RCS and EPS serve larger constituencies, with EPS seeming to have an outsized influence—if measured by student numbers and by their constituencies’ continuing size and strength of religious affiliation.⁵

SURVEYING THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL FACULTY

This article reports on results of a survey of theological faculty⁶ taken during the weeks leading up to the 2015 *Obergefell* decision and focused on same-sex sexuality and marriage.

Survey Sample

Email contact information was secured online for faculty at twenty out of forty-two RCS (47.6 percent), thirty-two of eighty-one EPS (39.5 percent), thirty-five of

³ See Appendix B. Percentages relate to U.S. awards only, not Canadian ones.

⁴ Students at EPS are slightly more likely to be part-time than are students in RCS or MPS. If considering FTE rather than head count, students at evangelical theological schools comprise 58.8 percent of seminarians at ATS accredited institutions (based on 2015–2016 ATS data).

⁵ As reported by Schwadel (2013: 116) based on GSS data for 2008–2010, “more than 56 percent of evangelical Protestants and black Protestants had a strong religious affiliation while only 39 percent of mainline Protestants and 35 percent of Catholics reported having a strong affiliation.”

⁶ The data file and codebook for this *Survey of U.S. Seminary Faculty on Sexuality and Marriage* will soon be available from the Association of Religion Data Archives (<http://www.thearda.com>).

sixty-eight MPS (51.5 percent) and ten of the remaining nineteen schools (52.6 percent).⁷ Since EPS posted online faculty contact information at the lowest rates, with the largest interdenominational EPS underrepresented in the initial sample, administrators at six such schools were queried, with three of them providing faculty contact information, giving a total of thirty-five EPS to match the thirty-five MPS. An additional ten ATS schools were surveyed that were not RCS, EPS, or MPS, for a total of 100 ATS schools out of the 210 total.

In March of 2015, invitations were sent to 2,376 professors from these 100 theological schools to fill out a seventy-item online survey about same-sex sexuality, with 764 respondents completing the survey,⁸ a response rate of 32.2 percent.⁹ Given the sensitive subject and the survey's online nature (involving issues with spam filters, for example), this response rate is reasonable, adequate to compare and contrast RCS, EPS, and MPS faculty. A discussion of response rate and evidence for this sample being representative is provided in Appendix C. Table 2 provides socio-demographic information on respondents.

⁷ This residual category included Eastern Orthodox, historically black Protestant, and university divinity schools that straddled these divides or that were not specifically Christian. For further information, see Appendix A.

⁸ A total of 878 clicked on the link, with 833 filling out at least a portion of the questionnaire. This article only uses data for the 764 who completed all sections of the survey—although not necessarily every individual question.

⁹ If the fifty-five email invitations that bounced are excluded, the response rate would be 32.9 percent.

Table 2: Respondent Demographics

		N	Percent
Sex	Male	558	73.6
	Female	200	26.4
Age	20-29	1	0.1
	30-39	52	6.8
	40-49	148	19.4
	50-59	248	32.6
	60-69	264	34.7
	70+	48	6.3
Faculty Rank	Instructor/Lecturer	50	6.6
	Assistant Professor	133	17.5
	Associate Professor	218	28.8
	Full Professor	357	47.1
Ordination	Clergy	495	65.4
	Laity	262	34.6
Size of Theological Institution (By Enrollment)	<75	22	2.9
	75-150	136	17.9
	151-300	190	25.0
	301-500	173	22.7
	501-1,000	116	15.2
	1,000+	124	16.3
Tradition of Employer*	Roman Catholic Seminary	117	15.3
	Evangelical Protestant Seminary	273	35.7
	Mainline Protestant Seminary	267	34.9
	Other/Mixed	107	14.0

* Because of confidentiality assurances given, the survey did not ask for school identities. Thus, it was not possible simply to apply RELTRAD denominational listings to named schools. Rather the survey used the underlying logic of RELTRAD (with denominational membership in NAE vs. NCC as indicating whether they are evangelical or mainline). Respondents were asked to indicate whether their “seminary/graduate school of theology is most closely associated with a church or churches that are a.) Roman Catholic, b.) members of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), c.) members of the National Council of Churches (NCC), d.) members both of the NAE and NCC equally, or e.) other—please specify.” While some respondents replied that they were not sure, they often then named the denomination of their seminary, which allowed RELTRAD coding to be applied. Thus, if they clicked “other,” but indicated their school was United Methodist or PCUSA, then their school was recoded as mainline. For fuller discussion of sampling issues as handled, see Appendix C.

SURVEY FINDINGS

Stance on Same-Sex Marriage by Tradition

Historically, Christian churches understood marriage as a male-female union, a position widely affirmed by evangelical denominations and recently reaffirmed for Catholics by Pope Francis (2016: 190). But mainline Protestant denominations have long deliberated over homosexuality (Cadge, Olson and Wildeman 2008; Olson and Cadge 2002; White 2015), with a majority now officially affirming same-sex marriage. In May of 2015, support for legal same-sex marriage varied markedly by religious tradition and stood at 27 percent of white evangelical Protestants, 33 percent of black Protestants, 56 percent of Roman Catholics, 62 percent of mainline Protestants, and 85 percent of religiously unaffiliated Americans (Pew Research Center 2015c). Of course, as with church member views when compared with formal church positions, the degree of congruence between what denominational faculty affirm and official church positions is an open question.

Furthermore, approval of same-sex marriage as a legal option must be distinguished from approval endorsed by God and church. In 2013, Gallup reported that American support for same-sex marriage had solidified at “above 50%” (Jones 2013). In 2015, Pew reported that “a majority of Americans (55%) support same-sex marriage” (Pew Research Center 2015b). In both cases the actual survey question focused on legality, with Gallup asking whether same-sex marriage “should be recognized by the law as valid” and Pew asking whether respondents support “allowing gays and lesbians to marry legally.” These questions are, of course, rather different from asking whether respondents themselves morally approve, or believe God approves. Dillon (2014: 8–9) has argued that Americans often “decouple...the question of legalization” from the question of moral or religious approval and that surveys need to probe and report each separately. It is possible personally to affirm values based on religious beliefs that one does not feel inclined to impose coercively on others (Wellman 1999).

Thus, this survey asked for agreement or opposition to two statements, one focused on civil context: “I support the legality of same-sex (civil) marriage,” and the other focused on religious context: “I support pastors of my church/denomination performing same-sex weddings.” Figure 1 provides the results.¹⁰

¹⁰ The questionnaire allowed for six response categories ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 6 = “Strongly Agree.” Figure 1 collapses these responses into two, Agree and Disagree.

Figure 1: Support for Same-Sex Marriage

		□ AGREE	□ DISAGREE
RCS	Civil Context	63.8%	36.2%
	Religious Context	37.8%	62.2%
EPS	Civil Context	29.3%	70.7%
	Religious Context	8.5%	91.5%
MPS	Civil Context	88.7%	11.3%
	Religious Context	80.7%	19.3%

Several observations are in order. First, the three religious traditions differ significantly and with quite large effect sizes on both questions,¹¹ with RCS between the other two. That is, RCS faculty are less supportive of same-sex marriage than MPS faculty but more so than EPS faculty.

Second, EPS faculty support for legal same-sex marriage (29 percent) is similar to the level of support Pew found among American evangelicals more broadly (27 percent). RCS faculty support (64 percent) is slightly higher than among Catholics in general (56 percent). MPS faculty support (89 percent) is considerably higher than among mainline Protestant members generally (62 percent), higher even than among the religiously unaffiliated (85 percent).

Third, in each tradition there is a significantly higher level of support for the legality of same-sex marriage than for a full religious and moral endorsement of such marriages.¹² EPS faculty are more than three times as likely to support the legality of same-sex marriage as its religious endorsement, with 26 percent more RCS faculty endorsing civil same-sex marriage than religious, and with even MPS

¹¹ Analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates that the three religious traditions differ significantly from each other both on level of support for civil same-sex marriage [$F(2, 650) = 208.3, p < 0.001$] and on level of support for religious same-sex marriage [$F(2, 643) = 302.3, p < 0.001$]. A post hoc Tukey test showed that for both questions, each of the three traditions differed from the others at $p < 0.001$. Effect sizes on both approval for civil marriage [$\eta^2 = 0.391$] and religious marriage [$\eta^2 = 0.485$] were large. Even after controlling for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution, using the general linear model in SPSS, tradition still has a significant and quite large effect both on support for civil same-sex marriage [$F(2,624) = 115.2, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.270$] and on support for religiously approved marriage [$F(2,619) = 179.9, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.368$].

¹² RCS approval for civil marriage ($m = 4.02, SD = 2.04$) is higher than for religiously approved marriage ($m = 3.00, SD = 2.00$); $t(110) = 7.955, p < 0.001$. EPS approval for civil marriage ($m = 2.89, SD = 1.67$) is higher than for religiously approved marriage ($m = 1.58, SD = 1.15$); $t(269) = 10.266, p < 0.001$. MPS approval for civil marriage ($m = 5.27, SD = 1.41$) is higher than for religiously approved marriage ($m = 4.90, SD = 1.72$); $t(263) = 6.131, p < 0.001$.

faculty nearly twice as likely to oppose religious same-sex marriages as they are civil same-sex marriages. That is, a significant number of respondents religiously disapprove of same-sex marriage but do not wish to impose their views legally or coercively on others. In short, Pew and Gallup's public announcement that a majority of Americans now support same-sex marriage, without clarification that their survey questions pertained only to support for legally allowing same-sex marriage, was misleading. If seminary faculty are representative of the larger population in each tradition, then it appears likely that many religious Americans are comfortable decoupling their sense of what is sinful from what they wish to impose legally on others. Future surveys and reports on survey results should clearly differentiate the two, and theoretical discussions should take this distinction into account.

Finally, faculty from each tradition differ on the extent to which they support the official positions of their churches. RCS faculty express a higher level of disagreement with official Catholic teaching on same-sex marriage than EPS faculty express about official positions held by most evangelical churches. Of course, mainline Protestant denominations have been in transition, with the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Episcopal Church finalizing their official support of gay marriage in 2015, and with only the United Methodist Church continuing officially to affirm marriage only between male and female. Over a third of MPS respondents taught in United Methodist seminaries. Another third taught either in PCUSA or Episcopal seminaries whose denominations were in the process of modifying their positions at the time of this survey. Thus, it would appear that a high proportion of MPS faculty affirm positions that, at least until recently, would have contradicted official positions of their seminaries' denominations.¹³ In short, faculty at MPS have likely been leading advocates for change away from earlier official church positions.

Tradition-Specific Factors Associated with Such Stances

Different Christian traditions historically have appealed to different authorities and have ascribed differing weights and levels of authority to various sources of truth, from scripture, to church teaching, to natural law, to human experience. Human experience itself can cover relational experience with others, one's own personal experience, or the findings of science and social science about human experience.

¹³ Available data preclude greater precision. The survey did not ask about the denominational affiliation of seminaries. Survey Monkey made it possible to track from the original email list who actually filled out the survey, however, and denominational affiliations in the original contact list are known, on which the preceding sentences rest. Because of anonymity settings, however, this denomination information could not be matched with the actual content of answers.

Experiences Related to Same-Sex Attraction. As with academics anywhere, seminary faculty and students are themselves sexual beings. The communities of which they are a part, and the sex and gender scripts found within these communities, diverge from one religious community to another. And such divergence may contribute to social and personal experiences that influence views on sex and marriage.

While research into how EPS are engaging same-sex sexuality is lacking, not so with MPS. In a 2006–2007 study (Ott and Winters 2011) largely focused on mainline Protestant seminaries,¹⁴ nearly nine in ten seminaries ($N = 36$) had anti-discrimination policies for sexual orientation, and half had policies “for full inclusion of gay and lesbian persons...including ordination and blessing of same-sex unions” (64). A quarter had “centers or programs dedicated to sexuality-related issues,” centers that increased course offerings, workshops, faculty positions related to sexual topics, as well as advocacy on sexuality issues (65). A variety of foundations (The Carpenter Foundation, The Gill Foundation, The Arcus Foundation) provided funding to such centers. Many MPS have worked hard to create welcoming environments for those with same-sex attractions and identities (Tan 2012; Ott and Winters 2011). Research exploring the actual prevalence of those with same-sex attractions in EPS or MPS is lacking, however.

Unlike Protestants that historically idealized a married clergy, Catholics insist that clergy live a celibate life. It makes sense where marriage is exclusively heterosexual that Catholic males with opposite-sex attractions would have more to lose by entering and remaining in the priesthood than would those with same-sex attractions. But whatever the reasons, scholars report the Catholic priesthood contains a high number with same-sex attractions. Estimates have ranged from 20 percent (Greeley, 2004: 45) to between 30 and 50 percent (Cozzens, 2000: 98ff; Sipe, 2003: 136) or higher (Cozzens, 2014: 82), with Catholic seminaries part of the pattern (Cozzens 2000; Greeley 2004; Sipe 2003).

This research asked two questions intended to allow for a comparison of the three traditions regarding the extent to which there is an identifiable presence of same-sex-attracted persons within their seminary communities. First, faculty were asked to estimate the number of individuals (students and staff) at their school that they personally know who identify as LGBT (see Table 3). MPS faculty report knowing a mean of 17.3 LGBT persons at their school, compared to RCS faculty who know 12.9, and an EPS faculty mean of 2.6. The differences between the three traditions are significant and large, even after controlling for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution (using Factorial Anova).

¹⁴ The study also included one RCS, two Unitarian, and four Jewish seminaries.

Table 3: Number of LGBT Seminarians and Staff Known by Faculty

	One-Way ANOVA						Effects After Controls [†]				
	N	Median	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η ²	F(df)	P	η _p ²
RCS	104	5	12.9	a, b ¹	18.9	80	<.001	.206	50	<.001	.143
EPS	262	0	2.6	b, c	6.4	(2,616)			(2,593)		
MPS	253	12	17.3	a, c ¹	15.6						

a: Significantly different from EPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

b: Significantly different from MPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

c: Significantly different from RCS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

¹ = Significant at the lower threshold of $p < 0.05$

[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

Since the traditions differ over how acceptable it is to identify one’s self by such labels, this question, by itself, does not tell us how many seminary members have same-sex attractions. Furthermore, experience with one’s own sexuality is more basic than perceptions of the sexual experience of others. And so, based on a modified version of the Kinsey scale, respondents were asked to indicate the extent they themselves have experienced same-sex attractions. While Kinsey considered behavior and attraction, this survey asked only about attraction, something less likely than behavior to be considered sinful in these settings. That is, an attraction question was deemed less threatening than a behavior question. Yet the question is a sensitive one, so respondents were explicitly told they were free to “skip” this question if they preferred. RCS faculty reported, on average, higher rates of same-sex attraction than MPS faculty, and both RCS and MPS faculty reported higher rates of same-sex attraction than did EPS faculty, with 84.3 percent of EPS faculty reporting exclusive opposite-sex attraction, compared to 63 percent of MPS faculty and 57.3 percent of RCS faculty. Again, the differences are statistically significant (see Table 4).

Table 4: Extent to Which Faculty Have Experienced Same-Sex Attractions

One-Way ANOVA						Effects After Controls [†]					
	<i>N</i> ⁱ	<i>Response Rate</i>	Mean	Tukey	<i>SD</i>	F(df)	P	η^2	F(df)	P	η_p^2
RCS	82/117	70.1%	1.17	a, b ¹	1.86	22	<.001	.075	6.8	<.001	.025
EPS	249/273	91.2%	.23	b, c	.68	(2,547)			(2,524)		
MPS	219/267	82.0%	.84	a, c ¹	1.54						

ⁱThe first number under *N* refers to respondents who answered this question, with the second number being the total number of respondents who filled out the rest of the questionnaire. The response rate, then, is based on the number who answered this individual question as against the baseline of all who answered the other questions. The question was worded, “Over my life I would say that my sexual desires, interests, and/or arousal have been directed...” with response options in Likert scale from 0 = “Exclusively towards persons of the opposite sex,” 1 = “Almost exclusively towards persons of the opposite sex, but with minor exceptions,” 2 = “Primarily towards persons of the opposite sex, but with more than minor exceptions,” 3 = “Equally towards persons of the opposite sex and towards persons of my own sex,” 4 = “Primarily towards persons of my own sex, but with more than minor exceptions,” 5 = “Almost exclusively towards persons of my own sex, but with minor exceptions,” and 6 = “Exclusively towards persons of my own sex.”

a: Significantly different from EPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

b: Significantly different from MPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

c: Significantly different from RCS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

¹Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.05$)

[†]= Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

In each tradition, women reported higher same-sex attraction than men but not at a significant level. Differences between traditions were similar for men and women. If only faculty that are clergy are considered, then 84 percent of EPS, 66.4 percent of MPS, and 52 percent of RCS respondents reported exclusive opposite sex attractions, with differences statistically significant.¹⁵

One might hypothesize that these reported differences are attributable to differing levels of discomfort with the question due to differing levels of disapproval in their communities and resulting in differing propensities to answer deceptively. Response rates, however, make this supposition unlikely. While a fair number declined to answer this optional question, there were marked differences in who answered it, with 91.2 percent of respondents at EPS, 82 percent at MPS, and 70.1 percent at RCS answering it. While 84.8 percent of RCS faculty that were not clergy responded to this question, the response rate on this question for RCS clergy dropped to 50 percent, contrasted with an EPS clergy response rate of 94.3 percent and an MPS clergy rate of 80.6 percent.

In short, response rates suggest not that differences between groups are exaggerated but if anything understated. Consider, for example, RCS respondents.

¹⁵ An analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated differences between the three traditions [F(2, 350) = 18.43, $p = 0.000$], with a post hoc Tukey test showing that RCS clergy faculty differed from both EPS and MPS at $p < 0.001$, while EPS and MPS differed from each other at $p < 0.01$.

Given controversies over reports that significant numbers of priests and male seminarians are gay, made doubly sensitive by the U.S. Catholic clergy abuse scandals—where 81 percent of the abused were male, of which 86 percent were between the ages of eleven and seventeen (John Jay College Research Team, 2004: 53)—it makes sense that RCS male clergy respondents might find a question asking them to disclose same-sex attractions intrusive and threatening. By contrast, while only 50 percent of RCS female respondents report exclusive opposite sex attractions, 90.3 percent of RCS female survey respondents (twenty-eight of thirty-one) nonetheless answered the question, suggesting that the question is a less sensitive one for RCS women, about whom there is no scandal. For all three communities, it is less likely that nonrespondents are motivated to conceal opposite-sex attractions, over which there is no controversy, than to conceal same-sex attractions.

Thus the data support the idea that the three seminary communities differ in their sexual composition, with both MPS and RCS having significantly higher rates of those with same-sex attractions on campus than EPS. For the RCS, as already mentioned, this representation doubtless has some relationship to the Roman Catholic celibacy ideal for clergy (and other religious), as well as to the homosocial religious communities they inhabit. The elevated LGBT presence in MPS, by contrast, is likely associated with MPS as sites of open welcome and advocacy on behalf of new sexual paradigms that do not stigmatize same-sex sexuality (Tan 2012). The differences in LGBT presence between these communities is doubtless influenced by self-selection and/or exclusionary social processes. But these differences are compatible also with the possibility that sex and gender socialization may influence the extent of same-sex attraction, identity, and behavior (Bearman and Brückner 2002; Felson 2011), and specifically with Felson's finding that people "reared in conservative Protestant households are consistently the least likely of any group to report same-sex attraction" (2011: 21).

Within each tradition there is a weak positive relationship between personal experiences of same-sex desire and support for legal same-sex marriage.¹⁶ For RCS and MPS, but not EPS, there is also a weak positive relationship between such personally experienced desire and support for church-approved same-sex weddings.¹⁷ Within each tradition there is also a weak positive relationship between personal knowledge of LGBT persons in the community and support for legal same-sex marriage¹⁸ and a weak to moderate positive relationship between such personal knowledge of LGBT persons and support for church-approved same-sex weddings.¹⁹ Of course, the direction of causality here is unclear. For example, it is

¹⁶ RCS: $r = 0.239^*$; EPS: $r = 0.107^*$; MPS: $r = 0.121^*$

¹⁷ RCS: $r = 0.191^*$; MPS: $r = 0.172^*$

¹⁸ RCS: $r = 0.280^{**}$; EPS: $r = 0.253^{***}$; MPS: $r = 0.225^{***}$

¹⁹ RCS: $r = 0.391^{***}$; EPS: $r = 0.393^{***}$; MPS: $r = 0.262^{***}$

possible that faculty knowledge of LGBT persons influences faculty support for same-sex marriage but also that faculty expressions of support result in increased relationship with LGBT persons. Nonetheless, the results are compatible with the possibility that personal experiences with same-sex desire and personal knowledge of LGBT persons contribute to approval of same-sex marriage.

Intellectual Underpinnings of Faculty Views. Different Christian traditions historically appealed to different intellectual sources of truth. Thus, professors were asked to “Rate how influential” a variety of factors were to their “current views about same-sex marriage.”

Table 5: Influences on Faculty Views about Same-Sex Marriage

One-Way ANOVA								Effects After Controls [†]			
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η^2	F(df)	P	η_p^2
Personal Relationships	RCS	117	4.15	a	.90	59 (2,652)	<.001	.153	29 (2,627)	<.001	.085
	EPS	272	3.40	b, c	1.00						
	MPS	260	4.24	a	.92						
Church Teaching	RCS	117	3.45		1.33	11 (2,652)	<.001	.032	4.0 (2,627)	<.05	.012
	EPS	272	3.66	b	1.09						
	MPS	266	3.20	a	1.15						
Natural Law	RCS	117	3.29	b	1.40	31 (2,645)	<.001	.089	19 (2,620)	<.001	.058
	EPS	271	3.29	b	1.17						
	MPS	260	2.50	a, c	1.27						
Scripture	RCS	117	3.59	a	1.20	98 (2,653)	<.001	.231	46 (2,628)	<.001	.128
	EPS	273	4.75	b, c	.53						
	MPS	266	3.81	a	1.08						
Science, Social Science	RCS	117	3.95	a	.88	36 (2,653)	<.001	.104	20 (2,628)	<.001	.059
	EPS	273	3.23	b, c	.96						
	MPS	266	3.88	a	1.03						

Likert scale from 1 = “not at all” to 5 = “very extensively”

a: Significantly different from EPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

b: Significantly different from MPS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

c: Significantly different from RCS faculty ($p < 0.001$)

[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

RCS, EPS, and MPS faculty differed significantly in reported influences on their thinking, with the largest effect size for scripture and the smallest for church teaching. MPS and RCS faculty stress the influence of personal relationships more than EPS. EPS and RCS faculty stress natural law more than MPS but do not differ from each other in that respect. EPS faculty stress church teaching more than MPS, with RCS in between. That EPS faculty ascribe as much influence on their thinking to natural law and church authority as do RCS is puzzling but is perhaps a result of their sense that Romans 1 makes a natural law argument on this topic and of their sense that the historical uniformity of church teaching on this topic provides a

secondary witness to their understandings of scripture. In any case, EPS faculty emphasize the influence of scripture on their thinking more than either of the other two. MPS and RCS faculty stress the influence of science/social science on their thinking more than EPS.

Respondents who reported addressing same-sex sexuality in the classroom were also asked to rate the extent to which they addressed same-sex sexuality in relation to various topics, four of which relate to the discussion here. Two of these involve the twin authorities of scripture and church, and another two indirectly relate to science as an authority.

Table 6: Focus of Classroom Coverage

One-Way ANOVA						Effects After Controls [†]					
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η ²	F(df)	P	η _p ²
Biblical Passages	RCS	59	2.41	a	1.08	19.1 (2,446)	<.001	.079	6.4 (2,421)	<.01	.030
	EPS	187	3.02	b, c	.91						
	MPS	201	2.43	a	1.04						
Denominational Positions	RCS	58	2.38	a ²	1.06	8.9 (2,444)	<.001	.039	11 (2,419)	<.001	.050
	EPS	183	1.98	b, c ¹	.94						
	MPS	204	2.36	a	.92						
Etiology (origins, causes)	RCS	58	2.09	b ²	1.03	5.3 (2,439)	<.001	.024	3.0 (2,415)	<.05	.014
	EPS	183	1.96	b ¹	.87						
	MPS	199	1.72	a ¹ , c ²	.92						
Whether Change in Orientat. is Possible	RCS	56	1.55	a ¹	.87	20.1 (2,436)	<.001	.086	8.6 (2,413)	<.001	.040
	EPS	182	1.96	b, c ¹	.82						
	MPS	199	1.44	a	.78						

Likert scale from 1 = “not at all” to 4 = “extensively”

a = Significantly different from EPS ($p < 0.001$)

b = Significantly different from MPS ($p < 0.001$)

c = Significantly different from RCS ($p < 0.001$)

¹ = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.01$)

² = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.05$)

[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

Again, each tradition’s faculty diverge in classroom coverage at significant levels. EPS differed from MPS on all topics.²⁰ Specifically, EPS faculty focus more than either RCS or MPS on biblical passages, which coincides with their stronger claim that scripture informs their views. EPS focus less attention on denominational position, perhaps because many EPS schools are less denominationally aligned or possibly are less likely to experience the denominational positions of their constituent denominations as problematic and thus needing special attention.

²⁰ They differ in the focus on etiology at a lower level of significance ($p < 0.01$) and differ on all other topics at higher levels ($p < 0.001$).

Although MPS were highest in claiming science/social science as having influenced their views, they had less classroom coverage of the science-oriented question of etiology than either EPS or RCS faculty and devoted less class coverage than EPS on whether change in orientation is possible.

Beliefs about the Etiology of Same-Sex Sexuality. As the social sciences have articulated varying viewpoints on the etiology of same-sex sexuality, these perspectives have introduced varying levels of tension with religiously informed viewpoints. On one side, some sexuality scholars in anthropology, sociology, and psychology employing a variety of theoretical approaches, from psychoanalytic to symbolic interactionist, deny that the human body has any inborn wisdom in object choice and point rather to social experiences, social processes, and human meanings as foundational to the variable sexual patterns that emerge (Gagnon and Simon 2005; Simon and Gagnon 2003) across cultures and through time.

By contrast, another approach to the etiology of same-sex sexuality would seem more clearly to neutralize the traditional Christian assertion that same-sex sexual behavior is sinful (a matter presumably involving human agency and choice). Since the 1990s American media have steadily publicized “scientific findings” purporting to show that people have biologically-based naturally-occurring sexual orientations (Brewer 2008). The idea of sexual orientation as innate, genetically and/or hormonally determined, and immutable undercuts notions of choice and fault, takes sexual orientation out of the arena for moral debate, and implies that those who believe same-sex sexual behavior is sinful are simply ignorant of scientific biological truth. Furthermore, this view lends itself to legal arguments inviting comparison to other minority groups and incorporating homosexuality into protected “suspect class” status (Moon, 2005: 564; Suhay and Jayaratne 2013). Note, for example, the U.S. Supreme Court’s repeated insistence that sexual orientations are “immutable” (*Obergefell v Hodges*, 2015: 4, 8), an idea the Court apparently based on “new” (11, 20), “enhanced” (23), and “better informed” (19) “insights” (11, 20) and “societal understandings” (20, see also 19, 23)—immutability, of course, being one legal criterion for establishing a suspect classification justifying strict scrutiny.

Thus, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believe same-sex orientations are “determined at birth,” “emerge as a result of social processes,” or “result from choices an individual makes.”

Table 7: Beliefs about the Etiology of Same-Sex (SS) Sexual Orientations

One-Way ANOVA							Effects After Controls [†]				
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η ²	F(df)	P	η _p ²
Are Determined at Birth	RCS	106	3.11	a, b ¹	1.11	115 (2,627)	<.001	.269	51 (2,601)	<.001	.146
	EPS	267	2.10	b, c	.93						
	MPS	255	3.39	a, c ¹	1.02						
Emerge as a Result of Social Processes	RCS	106	2.82	a	.95	42.1 (2,627)	<.001	.119	21 (2,601)	<.001	.067
	EPS	268	3.33	b, c	.75						
	MPS	254	2.64	a	.96						
Result of Choices Made	RCS	117	2.01	a	1.04	84.1 (2,631)	<.001	.211	32 (2,605)	<.001	.096
	EPS	273	3.09	b, c	1.07						
	MPS	266	1.98	a	1.04						

Likert scale from 1 = “not at all” to 5 = “completely”

a = Significantly different from EPS ($p < 0.001$)

b = Significantly different from MPS ($p < 0.001$)

c = Significantly different from RCS ($p < 0.001$)

¹ = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.05$)

[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

The differences between traditions are significant and with medium to large effect sizes. Specifically, EPS faculty are less likely than RCS and MPS to affirm that orientations are determined at birth and more likely to affirm both that orientations are a result of social processes and that they result from choices made. MPS faculty differ from RCS only on whether orientation is determined at birth. Paralleling these findings, the Pew Research Center (2015c) found that only 25 percent of American white evangelicals believe people are “born gay or lesbian,” with 53 percent of Catholics, 60 percent of white mainline Protestants, and 64 percent of religiously unaffiliated affirming the “born gay” explanation.

Implications for Religious Communities and Civil Society

Since many respondents diverge in their vision of what the church should affirm and what society should allow and support, these must be considered separately.

Church-Approved Options. There appear to be three publicly-discussed views within American churches on what the legitimate options are for Christians with same-sex desires. Q Christian Fellowship (QCF)—formerly The Gay Christian Network—for example, formally creates space for two of these viewpoints. Side A (to use their label) affirms that “same-sex desires cannot be changed and thus that gay marriage should be an approved option within the church.” Side B (again using their label) affirms that “while same-sex desires cannot be changed, same-sex behavior is nonetheless sinful and therefore that faithful Christians with same-sex

orientations should commit to lifelong celibacy.” Excluded from the QCF conversation is what might be termed Side C, that “through spiritual formation, sanctification, counseling, and/or the partnership of a supportive marital partner, those with same-sex desires can experience a change that makes a sexually fulfilling heterosexual marriage possible.” Thus, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the above three “commonly expressed viewpoints about Christians who report exclusive and strong same-sex desires.”

Table 8: Options for Christians with Same-Sex (SS) Desires

One-Way ANOVA						Effects After Controls [†]					
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η^2	F(df)	P	η_p^2
Gay Marriage	RCS	112	3.58	a, b	1.94	269 (2,642)	<.001	.457	157 (2,615)	<.001	.338
	EPS	270	1.76	b, c	1.30						
	MPS	261	4.90	a, c	1.64						
Only Celibacy	RCS	112	2.72	a, b	1.80	213 (2,642)	<.001	.400	125 (2,616)	<.001	.289
	EPS	267	4.32	b, c	1.46						
	MPS	264	1.71	a, c	1.30						
Heterosexual Marriage	RCS	110	1.81	a, b ¹	1.22	220 (2,644)	<.001	.407	107 (2,617)	<.001	.258
	EPS	271	3.69	b, c	1.46						
	MPS	264	1.51	a, c ¹	1.02						

Likert scale from 1= “Strongly Disagree” to 6 = “Strongly Agree”

a = Significantly different from EPS ($p < 0.001$)

b = Significantly different from MPS ($p < 0.001$)

c = Significantly different from RCS ($p < 0.001$)

¹ = Significant at the level of ($p < 0.05$)

[†]= Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

On every question, the three traditions differ significantly and with quite large effect sizes. Specifically, MPS faculty support church-approved gay marriage at highest levels, with RCS faculty somewhat lower, and EPS faculty the least supportive. By contrast, EPS faculty expressed higher support than MPS and RCS faculty for both the celibacy option and the heterosexual marriage option, followed on both items by RCS faculty, and with MPS faculty least supportive. Each group was less supportive of the heterosexual marriage option than of the celibacy option.

While the three viewpoints considered here do seem to be the most central views featured within public church debates, a subsequent review of the theological writings that MPS respondents reported assigning in classes disclosed a blind spot in the original questionnaire. That is, MPS faculty assigned theological authors who defend “marriage equality” but who seldom, if ever, simultaneously defend the historic Christian demand for monogamy as the sole legitimate place for sexual relations. Rather than pressing for a slight adjustment to include a previously excluded minority within the marital monogamy paradigm, many theological authors press for a new ethical and theological paradigm of sexuality that would

not privilege monogamy (see Ellison 2012). Various of the theological authors cited, for example, affirm that open marriages or polyamory can be fully virtuous Christian options that exemplify “wanton” or “promiscuous” “hospitality” and “generosity” (see Cheng 2011; Clark 1990; Goss 2004; Haldeman 2007; Hunt 1991; Jennings 2013; McNeill 1988; Rudy 1997; Stuart 1999, 2003; Wilson 1995). Consider the book, *An Ethic of Queer Sex* (2013), by United Methodist theologian Theodore Jennings, Professor of Biblical and Philosophical Theology at Chicago Theological Seminary, a United Church of Christ seminary. He argues that core ethical considerations related to consent, harm, fairness, honesty, hospitality, and respect must be applied in the context of any act, sexual or otherwise. He applies such ethical considerations to open marriages, polyamory, sex work, migration for purposes of sex work, sex tourism, brief sexual encounters with strangers, and pederasty. In each case, after identifying unethical variants, he argues that each can be practiced in ethical ways that churches should fully affirm. In his chapter on pederasty, for example, Jennings invites readers to set aside issues of legality and focus purely on pederasty as an ethical matter. He writes that “for church purposes, we assume that people come of age somewhere between twelve and fourteen” (188) and are then allowed to make consequential decisions. He suggests that many gay young people (“at an age of even ten or so”) “have a strong desire to initiate relationships with older persons in order to safely explore their own sexuality” (192). He defends such cross-generational sex, if done without “coercion or underhanded pressure” (192), as a positive good (181–92).

In short, this survey, in its design, failed to consider the full range of theologically articulated positions present in seminaries. Future research needs more adequately to explore the full contours of new sexual ethics in theological settings, and not merely focus on the narrower ways the “marriage equality” theological discussion has been framed rhetorically in public.

Religious Liberty and Civil Society. *Obergefell’s* majority ruling stressed the harm done to gays by those with traditional, and religiously-based, views. By contrast, the Court’s four dissenting Justices warned that *Obergefell* would harm religious liberty. And since wedding businesses and religious educational institutions are core sites of conflict between religious liberty concerns and civil rights protection from harm, survey questions focused here. Respondents rated their level of agreement with five statements:

1. Wedding photographers with religious objections should have the protected right to refuse to photograph same-sex weddings.
2. Wedding photographers refusing to photograph same-sex weddings should be prosecuted for civil rights violations.

3. Christian colleges that refuse to consider hiring as faculty individuals in same-sex marriages should be sanctioned by our government for civil rights violations.
4. Trends in theologically conservative thought pose a serious threat to the well-being of gays and lesbians in our society.
5. Cultural and legal trends on same-sex marriage pose a serious threat to religious liberty in our society.

Table 9: Religion and Civil Society

One-Way ANOVA						Effects After Controls [†]					
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η^2	F(df)	P	η_p^2
Photog. has Right to Refuse	RCS	112	4.14	a, b	1.69	79.2 (2,634)	<.001	.200	49 (2,608)	<.001	.138
	EPS	269	4.99	b, c	1.28						
	MPS	254	3.29	a, c	1.73						
Prosecute Such Photog.	RCS	113	1.99	a, b ¹	1.17	39.0 (2,636)	<.001	.110	22 (2,611)	<.001	.066
	EPS	271	1.44	b, c	.87						
	MPS	253	2.29	a, c ¹	1.30						
Sanction Christian College	RCS	113	2.45	a, b ²	1.60	94.9 (2,633)	<.001	.231	63 (2,608)	<.001	.171
	EPS	270	1.33	b, c	.91						
	MPS	251	2.97	a, c ²	1.66						
Conserv. Theology Harmful	RCS	112	3.67	a, b	1.79	107 (2,641)	<.001	.251	48 (2,615)	<.001	.135
	EPS	271	2.48	b, c	1.39						
	MPS	259	4.39	a, c	1.51						
Threat to Religious Liberty	RCS	112	2.92	a, b	1.96	176 (2,639)	<.001	.355	93 (2,614)	<.001	.232
	EPS	269	4.70	b, c	1.56						
	MPS	259	2.06	a, c	1.57						

Likert scale from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 6 = "strongly agree"

a = Significantly different from EPS ($p < 0.001$)

b = Significantly different from MPS ($p < 0.001$)

c = Significantly different from RCS ($p < 0.001$)

¹ = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.05$)

² = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.01$)

[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

Faculty from all traditions diverge at statistically significant levels on each item, with effect sizes ranging from medium, for item 2, to large for the others. A majority in all traditions express support for wedding photographers having a right to refuse to photograph same-sex weddings should they disapprove, ranging from 51.6 percent for MPS faculty to 70.5 percent for RCS faculty and 88.1 percent for EPS faculty.²¹ Again, only 15.1 percent of MPS faculty believe such wedding photographers should be prosecuted for civil rights violations, compared with 11.5 percent of RCS faculty and 4.4 percent of EPS faculty. When the case is that of a Christian college with requirements that its faculty conform to its core

²¹ The questionnaire had six response categories ranging from 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 6 = "Strongly Agree." For purposes here, responses are collapsed into two, Disagree or Agree.

understandings of legitimate marriage, the numbers change somewhat. In this case 37.1 percent of MPS faculty would support government sanction against such schools for civil rights violation, with 23.9 percent of RCS faculty and only 3.7 percent of EPS faculty. These differences may be related to the fact that, unlike most Roman Catholic and mainline Protestant colleges, evangelical Protestant colleges and universities usually expect all faculty to exemplify the religious commitments of the school. In any case, it is worth noting that seminary faculty, in general, express relatively high levels of support for religious liberty protections.

On the matter of whether theologically conservative views harm gays and lesbians, 76.4 percent of MPS faculty agree, 58.9 percent of RCS faculty, and only 22.5 percent of EPS faculty. Those from communities where theologically conservative views are least present are most likely to attribute harm to such views, but overall numbers in each tradition are nonetheless high.

There are significant differences in the extent to which faculty in the various traditions perceive religious liberty to be under threat in the developing legal and cultural environment, with the largest effect size for this item. Only 17.8 percent of MPS faculty perceive a serious threat as being posed, with 37.5 percent of RCS faculty doing so, and fully 82.2 percent of EPS faculty. Differing perceptions of threat doubtless reflect, in part, the religious standpoints of respondents. Those whose commitments are most disapproved by emerging legal standards are perhaps naturally more concerned about adverse repercussions.

Extent to Which Same-Sex Sexuality and Marriage is a Prioritized Focus

Sometimes religious conservatives are said to devote obsessive attention to homosexuality (e.g. DeRogatis, 2015: 1, 8). Alternatively, given the history of LGBT engagement by mainline Protestant clergy (White 2015) and the presence of sexuality-related centers at MPS²² but not in EPS and RCS, one might reasonably assume that MPS liberals invest more energy on the topic. Thus, the survey asked three questions intended to measure the extent to which faculty and theological schools across traditions prioritize this topic.

First, the survey asked faculty to name the course where they spent the most time addressing same-sex sexuality/LGBT realities²³ and asked them to estimate

²² Examples include Boston University School of Theology's Social Justice Institute: Poverty, Race and Sexuality, Chicago Theological Seminary's LGBTQ Religious Studies Center, Claremont School of Theology's Center for Sexuality and Christian Life, Pacific School of Religion's Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies in Religion and Ministry, and Vanderbilt University Divinity School's Carpenter Program in Religion, Gender, and Sexuality.

²³ Respondents listed 408 course titles in which they most addressed same-sex sexuality. Nearly a third (29 percent) were focused on scripture, with "New Testament Introduction" and "Old Testament Introduction" frequently mentioned. Others mentioned a course on a specific book or section of the Bible, such as "Romans" or "The Pentateuch." Some of the biblically focused courses

the number of hours spent on the topic in this course. Second, the survey asked faculty to rate the extent to which their own writings have focused on this topic. Third, respondents were asked, “As evidenced by the organized activities of your graduate school of theology, its curricular and co-curricular offerings, and the personal and scholarly commitments of its faculty and student leaders—rate the extent to which same-sex sexuality/LGBT realities is a prioritized concern or focus at your school.” Table 10 shows the results.

were thematic, as with “Gender and Sexuality in the Pauline Letters” or “Social Justice through the Lens of the Hebrew Bible.” Over a fifth featured theology, such as “Systematic Theology,” “Survey of Doctrine,” “Introduction to Public Theology,” “Theologies of Liberation,” “Theological Anthropology,” “Queer Theology,” and “Theology of Romantic Love.” Roughly 12 percent focused on ethics, with titles like “Christian Ethics” or “Christian Sexual Ethics.” A tenth focused on pastoral care, with titles such as “Introduction to Pastoral Care” or “Pastoral Care with LGBTQ People.” Over 5 percent of listed courses featured counseling, such as “Gender Issues in Counseling” or “Counseling and Sexuality.” A similar number focused on women or gender, with titles like “Global Feminist Theologies,” “Genders in the World of the Bible,” “History of Church and Gender,” and “Womanist Theology.” Roughly 4 percent featured courses on marriage and family with titles like “Christian Marriage,” “Marriage and Sexuality,” “Family Ministry,” and “Churches and Contemporary Families.” Another 4 percent featured history, with titles like “History of Christianity” and “Modern Church History.” A similar number seemed oriented towards preparation for ordination within a specific denomination, with titles such as “Preparation for Ordination,” “Baptist Polity,” “Moravian Polity,” “United Methodist Polity,” and “History and Polity of the United Church of Christ.” Some addressed the topic in preaching courses with titles like “Preaching and Social Justice” or “Preaching on Contemporary Issues.” Some listed courses featuring “Youth Ministry,” “Liturgy,” “Spiritual Formation,” and “Church in Society.” Other course titles included “Weddings and Funerals,” “Dead Sea Scrolls,” “Pastor and the Law,” and “Dietrich Bonhoeffer Seminar.”

Table 10: Extent to Which Faculty and Seminary Focus on the Topic of Same-Sex Sexuality

One-Way ANOVA							Effects After Controls [†]				
		N	Mean	Tukey	SD	F(df)	P	η ²	F(df)	P	η _p ²
Class Hours by Faculty	RCS	113	1.5	b	2.7	12.5 (2,621)	<.001	.039	6.3 (2,597)	<.01	.021
	EPS	262	2.1	b	5.3						
	MPS	249	4.6	a, c	8.7						
Faculty Publications	RCS	114	1.38	b ¹	1.03	8.7 (2,647)	<.001	.040	4.6 (2,620)	<.05	.015
	EPS	272	1.36	b	.87						
	MPS	262	1.58	a, c ¹	.92						
Seminary Focus on SS Sex R	RCS	117	2.38	b	1.07	90.8 (2,652)	<.001	.198	75 (2,626)	<.001	.192
	EPS	272	2.58	b	1.01						
	MPS	266	3.59	a, c	1.11						

For Publications, Likert scale response options were from 1 = “not at all” to 4 = “very much.”
 For Seminary - Overall Focus, Likert scale response options were from 1 = “very low focus” to 5 = “very high focus.”
 a = Significantly different from EPS ($p < 0.001$)
 b = Significantly different from MPS ($p < 0.001$)
 c = Significantly different from RCS ($p < 0.001$)
¹ = Significant at the lower threshold of ($p < 0.05$)
[†] = Controls were for sex, age, ordination, faculty rank, and size of institution.

There is variability across traditions in the extent that faculty prioritize this topic in their classroom teaching and writing. MPS faculty devoted more class hours (4.6) on average than EPS (2.1) or RCS faculty (1.5), with the median RCS faculty member devoting ten minutes to the topic, the median EPS faculty member devoting thirty minutes, and the median MPS faculty member two hours. EPS and RCS did not differ at significant levels from each other, but MPS class time was significantly higher than EPS and RCS. Similarly, MPS faculty were more likely to report addressing the topic in their publications, with EPS and RCS not differing significantly from each other.

Additional publication evidence was also examined. Respondents were asked to list examples of required readings in their courses that addressed the topic of same-sex sexuality. Looking only at assigned authors listed by at least three respondents, only six respondents listed authors that were faculty at RCS institutions, seventeen listed EPS faculty authors, and eighty-two listed MPS faculty authors.²⁴ That is, MPS faculty were far more likely to have authored

²⁴ Assigned MPS faculty authors, listed in order by frequency of mention, included Robert Gagnon, Richard Hays, James Nelson, Patrick Cheng, Dan Via, Marvin Ellison, Ken Stone, David Gushee, Carter Heyward, James Brownson, and Robert Shore-Goss. Assigned EPS faculty authors, again listed by frequency, included Wesley Hill, James Frame, and William Webb. Assigned RCS faculty authors included Lisa Sowle Cahill and Gerald Coleman. From “other” theological institutions, such as Yale or Harvard, regularly cited theological authors included Dale B. Martin, Margaret Farley, Mark Jordan, and Marcella Althaus-Reid. Of course, many assigned readings were authored by

assigned readings than either RCS or EPS faculty. Even the most widely assigned authors defending conservative positions (Robert Gagnon and Richard Hays) were MPS faculty.

Finally, on the assessment of the extent to which their seminary overall focused on this topic, the three traditions again differed, and with a large effect size. MPS prioritize a campus-wide focus on Same-Sex Sexuality and LGBT Realities at a significantly higher level than either RCS or EPS, which do not differ significantly from each other. In short, on all measures, it seems clear that MPS and their faculty devote significantly more time and energy to the topic than do RCS or EPS institutions and faculty.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It is difficult to predict how religious divides over sex and marriage will play out in the next few years within each religious tradition, and between religious traditions and the politico-legal institutions of U.S. society, and with what outcomes. But several things can be said from this research.

First, while there has been a dramatic increase in support for same-sex marriage in America's religious communities (including its theological schools), predictions based on an extrapolation of trends into the future require caution. Trends in one population (MPS) are not necessarily predictive of what will happen in other populations (EPS or RCS) that have divergent approaches to the authority of the Bible or the Roman Catholic Magisterium. Nor does the data support the idea that changing views simply reflect a historically inevitable triumph of science over traditional religion. While MPS respondents are more inclined than EPS to claim the authority of science for their views, and more inclined than either EPS or RCS to affirm a "born that way" viewpoint, it is not because they focus more attention on the science of the matter than EPS or RCS, or because science necessarily supports such a view,²⁵ but rather because of the utility of such an appeal for a specific moral vision (see Brewer 2008; Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2005, 2008, 2013; Lewis 2009; Suhay and Jayaratne 2013). Furthermore, predictions of inevitable futures are sometimes based on misconstruals of data. Measures of people's willingness to allow legal same-sex marriage should not be construed as indicators of full moral and religious approval. Of those within each tradition that support legal same-sex marriage, a significant proportion nonetheless simultaneously disapprove of such marriages religiously, ranging from 9 percent of

people not teaching in theological schools, including, again by frequency of mention, Mark Yarhouse, Judith Butler, Andrew Marin, Kelly Brown Douglas, Stanton Jones, Jenell Paris, Mona West, Michel Foucault, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and Matthew Vines.

²⁵ It does not. See, for example, Jordan-Young's (2010) critical review of hundreds of research reports on hormones, hardwiring, and brain organization in relationship to sex and gender.

the MPS respondents that support legal same-sex marriage, to 41 percent of the RCS respondents that do, to 71 percent of the EPS respondents who do. That is, a significant proportion of those willing to allow legal same-sex marriage do so as an expression of commitment to pluralist structures where others are given freedom to live out alternative visions of the good rather than because this position is their own vision of the good, and not because they wish government to sanction anyone who declines to align with this vision of the good. Future research must better distinguish between full moral approval for same-sex marriage and the willingness to legally allow a practice that, on moral or religious grounds, is personally disapproved. And for respondents who fully approve of such marriages, research should differentiate whether or not such respondents desire government to sanction individuals and religious institutions that will not align with and support such practices. A minority of seminary faculty support this stronger position.

Second, an unanticipated finding is that the actual contours of competing theological ethical paradigms of sex and marriage diverge at more profound levels than researchers commonly recognize. The questionnaire wording had assumed similar understandings of marriage by Christians of different traditions, understandings that would differ primarily by whether or not they included or excluded in marriage those with same-sex attractions. But when assigned class readings on sexual ethics written by seminary faculty were consulted, what became clear is that entirely divergent ethical paradigms of sex and marriage are often present. On one side is a paradigm that is countercultural by standards of modern American culture, a marital monogamy paradigm where the only condition under which sexual relations are ever approved is when they occur within the context of monogamous male-female marriage. On the other side is a theological ethic of sexuality that defends “marriage equality,” but not usually within the framework of a parallel insistence that sexual relations occur only within monogamous marriage. That is, in such theological writings, sexually exclusive monogamous marriage is commonly framed as one legitimate discretionary option within a variety of other sexual arrangements and practices that may also be practiced in ethically approved ways. In short, further research is needed to consider fully the contours of such competing ethical paradigms and their relative prevalence in various religious communities.

And of course, the social impacts of such competing paradigms also merit study. How do such divergent sexual ethics impact membership and/or religious vitality, or patterns related to the next generation. One respondent complained, for example, that the survey failed to focus on marriage’s central function in procreation and social reproduction, and that within male-female monogamous marriage, resultant offspring, apart from unexpected tragedies, have their biological mother and biological father also serving as social mother and father. By contrast, same-sex marriages, if they are to have protected equal rights to marriage’s role in

social reproduction, will necessarily require, at least under current science, that children legally be separated from at least one biological parent. New and expanded frontiers in third-party reproduction involving sperm or egg donation and surrogacy will be natural byproducts of such a demand for “marriage equality.” That is, divergent models have potentially divergent outcomes to be examined through research.

Third, recent legal decisions potentially affecting the “free exercise” of religion are changing America’s religious ecology with consequences yet to be determined, a concern expressed by RCS and especially EPS faculty (as well as by *Obergefell*’s four dissenting Justices). In some respects, *Obergefell v. Hodges* has similarities to the 1983 Supreme Court decision *Bob Jones University v. United States*, which ruled that religious justifications could not be used to violate the rights of racial minorities. In effect, the *Bob Jones* decision differentiated good religion from bad in the eyes of the government, providing conditions under which the government could disregard its normal constitutionally articulated commitment to religious neutrality, and Bob Jones University lost its tax-exempt status. And yet the *Bob Jones* decision was not experienced by religious America as a significant threat for the simple reason that America’s mainstream Christian traditions (Roman Catholic, evangelical Protestant, mainline Protestant, and black Protestant) rather uniformly agreed that Bob Jones’s stance constituted “bad religion” and lacked biblical warrant. By contrast, *Obergefell* drew a line between good religion and bad, not by framing a small outlier as bad but rather the majority of American religious institutions. Furthermore, the notion that people come in naturally-occurring biological types (races) that must be prevented from mixing is a modern idea found nowhere in the Bible. Thus, even Christian communities committed fully to the authority of scripture or the Magisterium found that the repudiation of such racial and eugenicist ideologies created no inherent difficulties for them in their commitment to scripture or Magisterium. By contrast, from earliest Christian history, church leaders uniformly understood scripture to teach that marriage is normatively between a woman and a man who practice sexual exclusivity, and that all other sexual relationships, including same-sex sexual activities, are sinful.

In short, it is difficult to predict how all this change will play out over time, and whether political and legal compromises might result in a religious ecology compatible with the continued flourishing of religious institutions whose sexual and marital ethics diverge from the ethics of contemporary mainstream culture. In the case of *Roe v. Wade*, for example, other laws soon stipulated that a woman’s right to an abortion did not entail the requirement that any particular person or institution (medical doctor, hospital, tax-payer) cooperate in the performance of abortions. Citizens were granted rights to act in religiously disapproved ways but without requiring religious parties to endorse or support that action. Whether or not

parallel legal compromises emerge in America in relation to same-sex marriage will have significant implications for America's religious ecology.

Fourth, it is reasonable to predict that a significant proportion of religious America will continue in the foreseeable future to understand only male-female marriage as meriting their full moral and religious approval. On the eve of *Obergefell*, over two-thirds of American seminarians were studying in institutions with faculty where the primary religiously endorsed paradigm of marriage was male-female only. Furthermore, in the survey, faculty views on same-sex marriage within each tradition did not correlate with age. Young faculty were not more likely to approve of same-sex marriage than older faculty. In addition, mainline Protestantism, the religious tradition most supportive of same-sex marriage, has shrinking membership, weaker strength of religious affiliation, and seminaries whose total enrollment "has fallen by nearly 25% over the past decade" (Lovett 2017). By contrast, evangelical Protestantism, the tradition whose seminary faculty most uniformly insist on the sole religious legitimacy of male-female marriage, has the largest and most religiously committed membership and the majority of America's seminarians. The eighteen largest seminaries in America, and twenty-three out of the largest twenty-five, are EPS.²⁶

Fifth, despite the strong presence of traditional Christian understandings of marriage in EPS (and to a somewhat lesser extent RCS), the likely continued impact of this presence is difficult to predict for a variety of reasons, such as the changing legal environment, emerging internal disagreements within each tradition, and the relatively low levels of prioritized scholarly focus on the topic by theological conservatives. MPS faculty have devoted significantly more energy and attention to the subject of same-sex sexuality and marriage, from a stronger and better-funded scholarly base, and with greater impact on public conversations. The fact that per capita MPS faculty have won ATS-administered Luce Awards at sixteen times the rate of EPS faculty, despite the EPS having the largest and most numerous seminaries in the ATS, suggests a high level of EPS marginalization from elite theological scholarship and the institutions that administer such scholarship. EPS faculty authors, of course, sometimes have wide audiences within evangelical circles. But they are less inclined to focus on same-sex sexuality and marriage than MPS, and when they do are more likely to frame the discussion as an internal appeal to tradition-specific authority (i.e., scripture) rather than to engage a broad audience in public conversation. Of course, as with abortion, where sustained substantive engagement by theological conservatives largely emerged only after *Roe v Wade*—and with significant impact—it is possible that parallel patterns of engagement will emerge in response to *Obergefell*.

²⁶ If measured by FTE rather than head count, the twelve largest theological schools, and eighteen of the twenty largest, are EPS. Numbers are again from the ATS "2015–2016 Annual Data Tables – Table 1.2 Significant Institutional Characteristics of Each Member School."

Seminaries as educational institutions, and their faculty as educators, are strategically positioned to influence America's future religious leaders. Future research should track the range of standpoints and understandings articulated by such faculty and other religious elites, the social movements that emerge in the shadow of *Obergefell*, and their consequences for religion, civil society, marriage, and social reproduction in America.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Gary. 2012. "An Opening in the Congregational Closet? Boundary-Bridging Culture and Membership Privileges for Gays and Lesbians in Christian Religious Congregations." *Social Problems* 59: 177–206.
- Adler, Gary, Catherine Hoegeman, A. Joseph West. 2014. "Congregational Political Activity and Same-Sex Marriage: Social Movement Theory and Evidence for Contextual Influence." *The Sociological Quarterly* 55: 555–86.
- Baunach, Dawn Michelle. 2012. "Changing Same-Sex Marriage Attitudes in America from 1988 through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76: 364–78.
- Bean, Lydia, and Brandon C. Martinez. 2014. "Evangelical Ambivalence Toward Gays and Lesbians." *Sociology of Religion* 75: 395–417.
- Bearman, Peter, and Hannah Brückner. 2002. "Opposite-Sex Twins and Adolescent Same-Sex Attraction." *American Journal of Sociology* 107: 1179–205.
- Brewer, Paul. R. 2008. *Value War: Public Opinion and the Politics of Gay Rights*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Brittain, Christopher Craig, and Andrew McKinnon. 2011. "Homosexuality and the Construction of 'Anglican Orthodoxy': The Symbolic Politics of the Anglican Communion." *Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review* 72: 351–73.
- Burdette, Amy M., Christopher G. Ellison, and Terrence D. Hill. 2005. "Conservative Protestantism and Tolerance Toward Homosexuals: An Examination of Potential Mechanisms." *Sociological Inquiry* 75: 177–96.
- Cadge, Wendy. 2002. "Vital Conflicts: The Mainline Denominations Debate Homosexuality." In *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*, edited by Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans, 265–86. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cadge, Wendy, Heather Day, and Christopher Wildeman. 2007. "Bridging the Denomination-Congregation Divide: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Congregations Respond to Homosexuality." *Review of Religious Research* 48: 245–59.
- Cadge, Wendy, Jennifer Girouard, Laura R. Olson, and Madison Lylerohr. 2012. "Uncertainty in Clergy's Perspectives on Homosexuality: A Research Note." *Review of Religious Research* 54: 371–87.
- Cadge, Wendy, Laura R. Olson, and Christopher Wildeman. 2008. "How Denominational Resources Influence Debate about Homosexuality in Mainline Protestant Congregations." *Sociology of Religion* 69: 187–207.

- Cadge, Wendy, and Christopher Wildeman. 2008. "Facilitators and Advocates: How Mainline Protestant Clergy Respond to Homosexuality." *Sociological Perspectives* 51: 587–603.
- Carroll, Jackson, Barbara Wheeler, Daniel Aleshire, and Penny Marler. 1997. *Being There: Culture and Formation in Two Theological Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chaves, Mark, and Shawna L. Anderson. 2014. "Changing American Congregations: Findings from the Third Wave of the National Congregations Study." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53(4): 676–86.
- Cheng, Patrick. 2011. *Radical Love: Introduction to Queer Theology*. New York: Seabury.
- Clark, J. Michael. 1990. *A Defiant Celebration: Theological Ethics and Gay Sexuality*. Garland, TX: Tanglewood Press.
- Cozzens, Donald B. 2000. *The Changing Face of the Priesthood: A Reflection on the Priest's Crisis of Soul*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Cozzens, Donald B. 2014. "Gay Ministry at the Crossroads: The Plight of Gay Clergy in the Catholic Church." In *More Than a Monologue: Sexual Diversity and the Catholic Church*, Vol. 1: *Voices of Our Time*, edited by Christine Firer Hinze and J. Patrick Hornbeck II, 81–90. New York: Fordham University Press.
- DeRogatis, Amy. 2015. *Saving Sex: Sexuality and Salvation in American Evangelicalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dillon, Michele. 2014. "Asynchrony in Attitudes Toward Abortion and Gay Rights: The Challenge to Values Alignment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53: 1–16.
- Djupe, Paul, Laura R. Olson, Christopher P. Gilbert. 2006. "Whether to Adopt Statements on Homosexuality in Two Denominations: A Research Note." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 45: 609–21.
- Ellison, Marvin M. 2012. *Making Love Just: Sexual Ethics for Perplexing Times*. Lanham, MA: Fortress Press.
- Felson, Jacob. 2011. "The Effect of Religious Background on Sexual Orientation." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 7: 2–33.
- Finke, Roger, and Kevin D. Dougherty. 2002. "The Effects of Professional Training: The Social and Religious Capital Acquired in Seminaries." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41(1): 103–20.
- Francis, Pope. 2016. *Amoris Laetitia: On Love in the Family*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor.
- Gagnon, John H., and William Simon. 2005. *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality*, 2nd Edition. Chicago: Aldine Books.
- Gaines, N. Susan, and James C. Garand. 2010. "Morality, Equality, or Locality: Analyzing the Determinants of Support for Same-Sex Marriage." *Political Research Quarterly* 63: 553–67.
- Goss, Robert. 2004. "Proleptic Sexual Love: God's Promiscuity Reflected in Christian Polyamory." *Theology & Sexuality* 11(1): 52–63.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 2004. *Priests: A Calling in Crisis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Mark R. Joslyn. 2005. "Attributions and the Regulation of Marriage: Considering the Parallels Between Race and Homosexuality." *Political Science and Politics* 38: 233–39.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Mark R. Joslyn. 2008. "Beliefs About the Origins of Homosexuality and Support for Gay Rights: An Empirical Test of Attribution Theory." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72: 291–310.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Mark R. Joslyn. 2013. "Politicizing Biology: Social Movements, Parties, and the Case of Homosexuality." *The Social Science Journal* 50: 603–15.
- Haldeman, Scott. 2007. "A Queer Fidelity: Reinventing Christian Marriage." *Theology & Sexuality* 13(2): 137–52.
- Hunt, Mary E. 1991. *Fierce Tenderness: A Feminist Theology of Friendship*. New York: Crossroad.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1987. "Religious Elites in Advanced Industrial Society." *Society for Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29: 360–74.
- Jennings, Theodore W., Jr. 2013. *An Ethic of Queer Sex: Principles and Improvisations*. Chicago: Exploration Press.
- John Jay College Research Team. 2004. *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States, 1950–2002*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Jones, Jeffrey M. 2013. "Same-Sex Marriage Support Solidifies above 50% in the U.S." Gallup. Available at <http://www.gallup.com/poll/162398/sex-marriage-support-solidifies-above.aspx>.
- Jordan-Young, Rebecca M. 2010. *Brainstorm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, Gregory B. 2009. "Does Believing Homosexuality is Innate Increase Support for Gay Rights?" *The Policy Studies Journal* 37(4): 669–93.
- Lovett, Ian. 2017. "Seminaries Reflect Struggles of Mainline Churches: Storied Institutions are Shutting Their Doors as Enrollment Shrinks." *Wall Street Journal* August 10.
- McNeill, John J. 1988. *Taking a Chance on God: Liberating Theology for Gays, Lesbians, and Their Lovers, Families, and Friends*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Merino, Stephen M. 2013. "Contact with Gays and Lesbians and Same-Sex Marriage Support: The Moderating Role of Social Context." *Social Science Research* 42: 1156–66.
- Moon, Dawne. 2005. "Discourse, Interaction, and Testimony: The Making of Selves in the U.S. Protestant Dispute over Homosexuality." *Theory and Society* 34: 551–77.
- Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. (2015).
- Ogland, Curtis, and John Bartkowski. 2014. Biblical Literalism and Sexual Morality in Comparative Perspective: Testing the Transposability of a Conservative Religious Schema. *Sociology of Religion* 75(1): 3–24.
- Olson, Daniel, and Jackson Carroll. 1992. "Religiously Based Politics: Religious Elites and the Public." *Social Forces* 70: 765–86.
- Olson, Laura R., and Wendy Cadge. 2002. "Talking about Homosexuality: The Views of Mainline Protestant Clergy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41: 153–67.

- Olson, Laura R., Wendy Cadge, and James T. Harrison. 2006. "Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 87: 340–60.
- Ott, Kate M., and Amanda J. Winters. 2011. "Sex and the Seminary: Preparing Ministers for Sexual Health and Justice." *American Journal of Sexuality Education* 6: 55–74.
- Perry, Samuel L. 2013. "Multiracial Church Attendance and Support for Same-Sex Romantic and Family Relationships." *Sociological Inquiry* 83: 259–85.
- Perry, Samuel L. 2015. "Bible Beliefs, Conservative Religious Identity, and Same-Sex Marriage Support: Examining Main and Moderating Effects." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54(4): 792–813.
- Perry, Samuel L., and Andrew L. Whitehead. 2016. "Religion and Public Opinion Toward Same-Sex Relations, Marriage, and Adoption: Does the Type of Practice Matter?" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 55(3): 637–51.
- Pew Research Center. 2015a. "America's Changing Religious Landscape." Available at <http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/05/RLS-08-26-full-report.pdf>.
- Pew Research Center. 2015b. "Changing Attitudes on Gay Marriage." Available at <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/07/29/graphics-slideshow-changing-attitudes-on-gay-marriage/>.
- Pew Research Center. 2015c. "Support for Same-Sex Marriage at Record High, But Key Segments Remain Opposed." Available at <http://www.people-press.org/2015/06/08/support-for-same-sex-marriage-at-record-high-but-key-segments-remain-opposed/>
- Rudy, Kathy. 1997. *Sex and the Church: Gender, Homosexuality, and the Transformation of Christian Ethics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schnabel, Landon. 2016. "Gender and Homosexuality Attitudes across Religious Groups from the 1970s to 2014: Similarity, Distinction, and Adaptation." *Social Science Research* 55: 31–47.
- Schwadel, Philip. 2013. "Changes in Americans' Strength of Religious Affiliation, 1974–2010." *Sociology of Religion* 74: 107–28.
- Sherkat, Darren E., Melissa Powell-Williams, Gregory Maddox, and Kylan Mattias de Vries. 2011. "Religion, Politics, and Support for Same-Sex Marriage in the United States, 1988–2008." *Social Science Research* 40: 167–80.
- Simon, William, and John Gagnon. 2003. "Sexual Scripts: Origins, Influences, and Changes." *Qualitative Sociology* 26(4): 491–97.
- Sipe, A.W. Richard. 2003. *Celibacy in Crisis: A Secret World Revisited*, Revised Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Steenland, 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.
- Stephens, Darryl W., and Patricia Beattie Jung. 2015. "A Comprehensive, Holistic, and Integrated Approach to Professional Sexual Ethics in Theological Education." *Theological Education* 50(1): 53–68.
- Stuart, Elizabeth. 1999. "The Kindness of Strangers: The Body as a Site of Hospitality." In *Theology and the Body: Gender, Text and Ideology*, edited by Robert Hannaford and J'annine Jobling, 62–83. Herefordshire, UK: Gracewing.

- Stuart, Elizabeth. 2003. *Gay and Lesbian Theologies: Repetitions with Critical Difference*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Suhay, Elizabeth, and Toby Epstein Jayaratne. 2013. "Does Biology Justify Ideology? The Politics of Genetic Attribution." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77(2): 497–521.
- Sullins, D. Paul. 2010. "American Catholics and Same-Sex 'Marriage.'" *The Catholic Social Science Review* 15: 97–123.
- Tan, Sharon M., 2012. "Theological Diversity in a Liberal Seminary: United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities." *Theological Education* 47(1): 111–18.
- Thomas, Jeremy N., and Daniel V.A. Olson. 2012a. "Beyond the Culture War: Managing Sexual Relationships Inside a Congregation of Gay Evangelicals." *Review of Religious Research* 54: 349–70.
- Thomas, Jeremy N., and Daniel V.A. Olson. 2012b. "Evangelical Elites' Changing Responses to Homosexuality 1960–2009." *Sociology of Religion* 73: 239–72.
- Thomas, Jeremy N., and Andrew L. Whitehead. 2015. "Evangelical Elites' Anti-Homosexuality Narratives as a Resistance Strategy Against Attribution Effects." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54: 345–62.
- Todd, Nathan R., and Katherine S. Ong. 2012. "Political and Theological Orientation as Moderators for the Association Between Religious Attendance and Attitudes Toward Gay Marriage for White Christians." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 4: 56–70.
- Turner, Yolanda, and William Stayton. 2014. "The Twenty-First Century Challenges to Sexuality and Religion." *Journal of Religion and Health* 53: 483–97.
- Uecker, Jeremy E., and Glenn Lucke. 2011. Protestant Clergy and the Culture Wars: An Empirical Test of Hunter's Thesis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50(4): 692–706.
- Wellman, James K. 1999. "Introduction: The Debate over Homosexual Ordination: Subcultural Identity Theory in American Religious Organizations." *Review of Religious Research* 41: 184–206.
- White, Heather R. 2015. *Reforming Sodom: Protestants and the Rise of Gay Rights*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Whitehead, Andrew L. 2010. "Sacred Rites and Civil Rights: Religion's Effect on Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Unions and the Perceived Cause of Homosexuality." *Social Science Quarterly* 91: 63–79.
- Whitehead, Andrew L. 2013. "Religious Organizations and Homosexuality: The Acceptance of Gays and Lesbians in American Congregations." *Review of Religious Research* 55: 297–317.
- Whitehead, Andrew L., and Joseph O. Baker. 2012. "Homosexuality, Religion, and Science: Moral Authority and the Persistence of Negative Attitudes." *Sociological Inquiry* 82: 487–509.
- Whitehead, Andrew L., and Samuel L. Perry. 2014. "Religion and Support for Adoption by Same-Sex Couples: The Relative Effects of Religious Tradition, Practices, and Beliefs." *Journal of Family Issues* 37(6): 1–25.
- Wilson, Nancy. 1995. *Our Tribe: Queer Folks, God, Jesus, and the Bible*. San Francisco: Harper.

- Woodberry, Robert D., Jerry Z. Park, Lyman Kellstedt, with Mark Regnerus and Brian Steensland. 2012. "The Measure of American Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Measurement Considerations." *Social Forces* 91: 65–73.
- Woodford, Michael R., N. Eugene Walls, and Denise L. Levy. 2012. "Religion and Endorsement of Same-Sex Marriage: The Role of Syncretism Between Denominational Teachings about Homosexuality and Personal Religious Beliefs." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 8(4): 2–29.

Appendix A: ATS-Accredited Theological Schools Categorized

RELTRAD provides a list identifying every Protestant denomination as either evangelical, mainline, or black Protestant (Steenland et. al. 2000). Wherever Steenland did not list a denominational group, I used the updated listing employed by the Pew Research Center (2015a: 103–11). While not every theological school is affiliated with a denomination, a majority are. In this paper, whenever a school is affiliated with a denomination, I simply coded the school the same way its denomination is coded in RELTRAD. In a few cases this meant that schools were coded as mainline Protestant even though by other criteria they might have been coded as evangelical. Thus, Northern Baptist is an official seminary of the American Baptist Churches, USA, a mainline Protestant denomination. And yet it self-identifies as evangelical theologically, with the President of Northern Baptist a member of the Fellowship of Evangelical Seminary Presidents. Nonetheless, for purposes of this project, I coded it as specified by its denominational affiliation in RELTRAD.

On the other hand, for schools that are interdenominational or nondenominational, I moved to secondary criteria of self-identification and affiliation. Thus, for example, the Presidents of Asbury, Beeson, Denver, Fuller, and Gordon-Conwell are all members of the Fellowship of Evangelical Seminary Presidents. Their websites clearly identify them as evangelical. Others recognize them as such, and so I coded them accordingly.

Some theological seminaries founded as mainline Protestant seminaries have severed earlier denominational ties. If such schools clearly position themselves either as no longer necessarily Protestant (such as GTU, Yale) or necessarily Christian (Hartford, Harvard, University of Chicago), then I simply coded these schools as “other or mixed.” If they appear to retain a strong mainline Protestant identity (such as Union Theological Seminary), then they were coded as mainline Protestant. If they lack a formal denominational tie and seem to align explicitly with both mainliners and evangelicals (such as New York Theological Seminary), then I considered them mixed.

Schools that are Unitarian (Meadville Lombard, Starr King) or Eastern Orthodox (Byzantine Catholic, Holy Cross, St. Tikhon’s, St. Valdimir’s) are coded as “other.”

RELTRAD codes historically black Protestant denominations separately from either mainline or evangelical, and thus it would normally make sense to code historically black seminaries in their own group. But since there are only six historically black seminaries (Hood, Howard, ITC, Payne, Samuel Dewitt, Shaw), and since I was unable to get a large enough pool of faculty-respondent contact information from these schools to make a separate analysis of respondent data for this group possible, I do not treat them separately here but simply coded them in

with the residual category of “other or mixed.” For purposes of this paper, the final category of “other or mixed” includes quite disparate theological schools, and thus this article provides limited information on respondents from this category, with the center of analysis being a comparison of Roman Catholic, mainline Protestant, and evangelical Protestant seminaries.

This list has been circulated to a variety of seminary faculty across traditions, as well as to staff at the Association of Theological Schools, for input. Any errors that remain are simply my own. In any case, the data in Table 1 of the paper is directly based on the following categorized listing.

Roman Catholic Seminaries		
Aquinas Institute of Theology Athenaeum of Ohio	Loyola Marymount U. Department of Theological Studies	St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry
Barry University Department of Theology and Philosophy	Mount Angel Seminary	St. Charles Borromeo Seminary
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry	Mount Saint Mary's Seminary	St. John Vianney Theological Seminary
Catholic Theological Union	Notre Dame Seminary	St. John's Seminary (CA)
Catholic U. of America School of Theo and Religious Studies	Oblate School of Theology	St. John's Seminary (MA)
Christ The King Seminary	Pontifical College Josephinum	St. John's University School of Theology - Seminary
Dominican House of Studies	Pope St. John XXIII National Seminary	St. Joseph's Seminary
Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology	Sacred Heart Major Seminary	St. Mary's Seminary and University
Dominican Study Center of the Caribbean	Sacred Heart Seminary and School of Theology	St. Patrick's Seminary and University
Franciscan School of Theology	Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of Theology	St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary
Immaculate Conception Seminary	Saint Meinrad School of Theology	University of Notre Dame Department of Theology
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University	Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity	University of St. Mary of the Lake Mundelein Seminary
Kenrick-Glennon Seminary	Saint Vincent Seminary	University of St. Thomas School of Theology
	Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry	
	SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary	

 Evangelical Protestant Seminaries

Abilene Christian University	George W. Truett Theological Seminary of Baylor U.	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
Alliance Theological Seminary	Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary	Phoenix Seminary
Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary	Puritan Reformed Seminary
Anderson University School of Theology	Grace Theological Seminary	Redeemer Theological Seminary
Asbury Theological Seminary	Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone U.	Reformed Episcopal Seminary
Ashland Theological Seminary	Harding School of Theology	Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Assemblies of God Theological Seminary	Hazelpip School of Theology	Reformed Theological Seminary
Azusa Pacific Seminary	HMS Richards Divinity School Division of Grad. Studies	Regent University School of Divinity
Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary	Houston Graduate School of Theology	Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Beeson Divinity School of Samford University	Inter-American Adventist Theological Seminary	Shepherd University School of Theology
Bethel Seminary of Bethel University	International Theological Seminary	Sioux Falls Seminary
Biblical Theological Seminary	John Leland Center for Theological Studies	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Calvin Theological Seminary	Knox Theological Seminary	Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Carolina Graduate School of Divinity	Lincoln Christian Seminary	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Chapman Seminary	Logos Evangelical Seminary	Talbot School of Theology
China Evangelical Seminary North America	Memphis Theological Seminary	The Seattle School of Theology and Psychology
Cincinnati Bible Seminary	Mid-America Reformed Seminary	Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
Columbia International University Seminary & School of Ministry	Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Concordia Seminary (MO)	Moody Theological Seminary	Urshan Graduate School of Theology
Concordia Theological Seminary (IN)	Multnomah Biblical Seminary	Wesley Biblical Seminary
Covenant Theological Seminary	Nazarene Theological Seminary	Wesley Seminary at Indiana Wesleyan University
Dallas Theological Seminary	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary	Western Seminary
Denver Seminary	North Park Theological Seminary	Westminster Theological Seminary
Eastern Mennonite Seminary	Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan C	Westminster Theological Seminary in California
Emmanuel Christian Seminary	Oral Roberts University	Winebrenner Theological Seminary
Erskine Theological Seminary	College of Theology and Ministry	World Mission University
Evangelical Theological Seminary		
Fresno Pacific Biblical Seminary		
Fuller Theological Seminary		
George Fox Evangelical Seminary		

 Mainline Protestant Seminaries

American Baptist Seminary of the West	Episcopal Divinity School	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
Andover Newton Theological School	Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico	Pacific School of Religion
Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary	Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary	Palmer Theological Seminary
Baptist Seminary of Kentucky	General Theological Seminary	Perkins School of Theology
Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond	Iiff School of Theology	Phillips Theological Seminary
Berkeley Divinity School	James and Carolyn McAfee School of Theology	Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
Bethany Theological Seminary	Lancaster Theological Seminary	Princeton Theological Seminary
Bexley Hall Seabury-Western Theol Seminary Fed, Inc.	Lexington Theological Seminary	Saint Paul School of Theology
Boston University School of Theology	Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary	San Francisco Theological Seminary
Brite Divinity School	Luther Seminary	Seminary of the Southwest
Campbell University Divinity School	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago	Trinity Lutheran Seminary
Candler School of Theology of Emory University	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg	Union Presbyterian Seminary
Central Baptist Theological Seminary (Kansas)	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia	Union Theological Seminary
Chicago Theological Seminary	Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary	United Theological Seminary (OH)
Christian Theological Seminary	M. Christopher White School of Divinity	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Church Divinity School of the Pacific	McCormick Theological Seminary	University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Claremont School of Theology	Methodist Theological School in Ohio	University of the South School of Theology
Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School	Moravian Theological Seminary	Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Columbia Theological Seminary	Nashotah House	Virginia Theological Seminary
Drew University Theological School	New Brunswick Theological Seminary	Wake Forest University School of Divinity
Duke University Divinity School	Northern Baptist Theological Seminary	Wartburg Theological Seminary
Earlham School of Religion		Wesley Theological Seminary
Ecumenical Theological Seminary		Western Theological Seminary
Eden Theological Seminary		

 “Other” or Mixed Seminaries

Byzantine Catholic Seminary of SS. Cyril and Methodius	Interdenominational Theological Center	Shaw University Divinity School
Graduate Theological Union	Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology	St. Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary
Hartford Seminary	Meadville Lombard Theological School	St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary
Harvard University Divinity School	New York Theological Seminary	Starr King School for the Ministry
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology	Payne Theological Seminary	University of Chicago Divinity School
Hood Theological Seminary	Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology	Yale University Divinity School
Howard University School of Divinity		

Appendix B: Faculty Luce Awards (USA Only): 1994-95 through 2017-18²⁸

<i>Roman Catholic</i>	Luce Awards
University of Notre Dame Department of Theology	14
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University	3
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry	2
Loyola Marymount University Department of Theological Studies	1
Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity	1
St. John's University School of Theology - Seminary	1
St. Mary's Seminary and University	1
<i>Evangelical Protestant</i>	Luce Awards
Emmanuel Christian Seminary	1
Fuller Theological Seminary	1
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary	1
Pentecostal Theological Seminary	1
Reformed Theological Seminary	1
Regent University School of Divinity	1
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School	1
Westminster Theological Seminary in California	1
<i>Mainline Protestant</i>	Luce Awards
Duke University Divinity School	14
Candler School of Theology of Emory University	10
Union Theological Seminary	7
Andover Newton Theological School	5
Columbia Theological Seminary	5
Perkins School of Theology	4
Princeton Theological Seminary	4
Vanderbilt University Divinity School	4
Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary	4
Boston University School of Theology	2
Brite Divinity School	2
Church Divinity School of the Pacific	2
Drew University Theological School	2
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago	2

²⁸ This data set was compiled from information provided here: <http://www.ats.edu/resources/faculty/henry-luce-iii-fellowships>. Current seminary names are listed, although in some cases the school name differed at the time of the award.

Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary	1
Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond	1
Christian Theological Seminary	1
Claremont School of Theology	1
Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School	1
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary	1
Methodist Theological School in Ohio	1
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary	1
San Francisco Theological Seminary	1
Union Presbyterian Seminary	1
University of Dubuque Theological Seminary	1
<hr/>	
<i>Other/Mixed</i>	Luce Awards
<hr/>	
Harvard University Divinity School	17
Yale University Divinity School	14
University of Chicago Divinity School	6
Interdenominational Theological Center	2
Graduate Theological Union	1
Hartford Seminary	1
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology	1
Howard University School of Divinity	1
Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology	1
<hr/>	

Appendix C: Response Rate

Response rate matters, of course, primarily as a proxy for nonresponse bias. Since it was possible to compare our sample with the total ATS faculty on several variables, we can compare the distribution of our sample with the total population distribution. Appendix Table 1 shows the distribution of faculty by the size of the institution in which they teach (measured in terms of total student enrollment), comparing survey respondents with all ATS faculty.²⁹

Appendix Table 1: Size of Institution in Which Average Faculty Member Teaches

	Roman Catholic		Evangelical Protestant		Mainline Protestant		Other/Mixed	
	Mean & SD	Sum	Mean & SD	Sum	Mean & SD	Sum	Mean & SD	Sum
Total ATS Faculty	2.315 (.823)	808	4.742 (1.612)	2,059	3.094 (1.086)	1,288	3.126 (.967)	348
Survey Respondents	2.698 (.935)	117	4.695 (1.328)	273	3.273 (1.067)	267	3.925 (1.357)	106

Enrollment: 1 < 75; 2 = 76-150; 3 = 151-300; 4 = 301-500; 5 = 501-1000; 6 > 1000

As the table makes clear, faculty members at EPS teach in the largest institutions, followed by MPS and then RCS. Survey respondents would seem to be fairly representative of their category across the entire ATS faculty in terms of the size of their institutions.³⁰

In Appendix Table 2 we compare our survey respondents with all ATS faculty, and selectively with our survey recipients, in terms of gender, faculty rank, and religious tradition.

²⁹ Since the survey asked for enrollment ranges for the school, I recoded ATS data for each school’s size into the same enrollment ranges and calculated in terms of average faculty member within the tradition.

³⁰ The exception here is the “other/mixed” category. As we explain below, some EPS and MPS respondents appear to have erroneously coded their institution as “other/mixed,” thus creating a disparity in this category.

Appendix Table 2: Comparison of Respondents with All ATS Faculty

	ATS Faculty (N = 4,503)	Survey Recipients (N = 2,376)	Survey Respondents (N = 764)
Gender			
Female	24%	----	26%
Faculty Rank			
Professor	44%	----	47%
Associate Professor	27%	----	29%
Assistant Professor	20%	----	17%
Other	9%	----	7%
Religious Tradition			
Roman Catholic	17.9%	18.4%	15.3%
Evangelical Protestant	45.7%	39.3%	35.7%
Mainline Protestant	28.6%	33.2%	34.9%
Other/Mixed	7.7%	9.2%	14%

The percentage of female respondents, and of respondents at various faculty ranks, is close to their percentage for all ATS faculty. That is, by gender, rank, and institution size we appear to have a representative sample.

Our goal with religious traditions was not to survey each group in precise proportion to their percentage of the total population but rather to get representative samples from each tradition allowing for meaningful comparison. Thus, when looking at survey recipients as compared to all ATS faculty, we under-sampled EPS faculty, oversampled MPS faculty, and sampled RCS faculty in close relation to their percentage in the entire population. In comparing respondents with survey recipients, however, it is clear that MPS faculty responded at highest rates and RCS at lowest. The response rate for RCS faculty was 26.8 percent. The response rate from EPS faculty was above 29.7 percent and from MPS faculty above 32.1 percent. We cannot calculate these last two rates precisely since ambiguous survey responses from some Protestant school faculty preclude us from identifying them clearly as either EPS or MPS. This obstacle explains the elevated percentage of respondents included in the “other/mixed” category.³¹

³¹ Because of confidentiality assurances given, we did not ask about named schools in our survey, and thus were not able to use direct information about schools to determine categorization, as we did with the ATS data. Instead we asked respondents to indicate whether their seminary/graduate

In personal emails from faculty who chose not to fill out the questionnaire, the most frequent explanation was that this subject was not one that they addressed in their teaching or felt knowledgeable about, so it is probable that faculty more engaged with the topic were more likely to respond to the survey than those less engaged. We nonetheless believe our data gives us an adequate basis for comparing the three populations in view.

school of theology is most closely associated with a church or churches that are a) Roman Catholic, b) members of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), c) members of the National Council of Churches (NCC), d) members both of the NAE and NCC equally, or e) other—please specify. Those who clicked “other” or “both” sometimes named a specific denomination that was actually, based both on the stated question and on RELTRAD, either MPS or EPS. In such situations we recoded based on the relevant information.