

NORTH CAROLINIANS AND AMENDMENT ONE: RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND
INDIVIDUAL VOTING PRACTICES

by

Joy K. King

October, 2017

Director of Thesis: Melinda Kane, Ph.D.

Major Department: Sociology

In 2012, North Carolina residents passed the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban, which made same-sex marriage illegal at the state constitution level. The goal of this study is to use an integrated sociological perspective to examine the micro-level individual factors that impacted North Carolinians' voting behavior on Amendment One, which caused the macro-level structural changes to the state constitution. For this study, special emphasis is placed on the role of religion on North Carolinians' voting behaviors. Using data from the Sociological/Sustainable Tourism Survey, logistic regression analyses are conducted to evaluate the importance of resident's age, gender, race, level of education, and urban or rural residence on their votes or intended votes on Amendment One within the context of religious attendance and religious affiliation. Results indicate that religious attendance, religious affiliation, gender, race, and level of education are significant predictive factors on North Carolinians' votes or intended votes on Amendment One.

NORTH CAROLINIANS AND AMENDMENT ONE: RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND
INDIVIDUAL VOTING PRACTICES

A Thesis

Presented To the Faculty of the Department of Sociology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Sociology

by

Joy L. King

October, 2017

© Joy L. King, 2017

NORTH CAROLINIANS AND AMENDMENT ONE: RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND
INDIVIDUAL VOTING PRACTICES

by

Joy L. King

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF
THESIS: _____

Melinda Kane, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____

Bob Edwards, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____

Kennetta Perry, Ph.D.

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIOLOGY: _____

Bob Edwards, Ph.D.

DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL: _____

Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Same-Sex Marriage Bans	3
Theoretical Background	7
Theoretical Basis for Individual Level Analysis	10
Religious Attendance	12
Religious Affiliation	13
Other Socio-demographic Factors	15
Age	15
Gender	16
Race	17
Education	18
Urban/Rural	19
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	22
Data	22
Measures	23
Dependent Variable	23
Religious Attendance	24
Religious Affiliation	24
Sociodemographic Variables	25
Age and Gender	26
Race	26
Education	27
Urban/Rural	27
Analysis Plan	27
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	32
Descriptive Statistics	32

Bivariate Correlation Analyses	36
Binary Logistic Regression Analyses	39
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION.....	54
Religious Attendance and Religious Attendance.....	54
Demographic Variables	55
Age.....	55
Gender.....	56
Education	57
Race	57
Residence	58
Mediated and Moderated Relationships.....	60
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	62
REFERENCES	65
APPENDIX: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD EXEMPTION CERTIFICATION ...	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Hypotheses..... 20

Table 2. Religious Traditions by Denomination..... 30

Table 3. Counties of Residency 31

Table 4. Sample Characteristics..... 47

Table 5. Bivariate Correlations for Voters..... 50

Table 6. Bivariate Correlations for Intended Voters..... 51

Table 7. Estimated Effects of Religious attendance, Religious Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race,
and Residence on Vote/Intended Vote for Amendment One..... 52

Table 8. Estimated Effects of Religious attendance, Religious Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race,
Residence, and Interactions on Vote/Intended Vote for Amendment One..... 53

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

On February 23, 2011, Senators Forrester, Tillman, and Soucek introduced Senate Bill 106 to the North Carolina General Assembly. This bill was entitled, “An Act to Amend the Constitution to Provide Marriage between a Man and a Woman is the Only Domestic Legal Union that shall be Valid or Recognized in this State.” In short, the bill was referred to as the Defense of Marriage Act by the General Assembly and the proposed referendum was introduced to the public as Amendment One. Having just gained control of the General Assembly, the Republican controlled state legislature fast-tracked the issue to be put in front of the voters during the 2012 presidential primary.¹ On May 8, 2012, the amendment passed, with 61 percent of the votes, amending the North Carolina constitution to prohibit the legal recognition of any relationships other than different sex marriage.² While North Carolina was not the first state to amend its constitution to limit marriage rights, and was actually quite late in passing a same-sex marriage ban, it represented a clear setback in the movement for marriage equality and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) rights within the United States. The Amendment One/Defense of Marriage Act also provides a unique opportunity to investigate voting behavior at the individual level regarding bans against same-sex marriage.

¹ Republicans had not held control of both houses of the North Carolina General Assembly since 1898.

² On October 10, 2014, the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban was overturned by a federal judge, who ruled in agreement with the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals that a ban against same-sex marriage is unconstitutional (Nation Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) 2015).

To date, research on same-sex marriage bans can be divided into two general types. First, there are studies that examine individuals' attitudes regarding anti-marriage equality bans, which may, or may not, be connected to actual behavior. Second, there are studies that evaluate aggregate voter behavior, at the state or county level, using electoral and similarly aggregated census track data. However, there are no studies which actually ask individuals about their voting behavior on marriage bans. This study does exactly that. The goal of the study is to understand the individual-level factors that predict North Carolina residents' voting behavior on the Amendment One marriage ban with specific emphasis placed on the potential role of religion. To the author's knowledge, this study represents the first examination of individual-level voting on a same-sex marriage ban utilizing voter feedback, instead of public opinion data or attitude polling information. This study also does not rely upon aggregate electoral ballot outcome statistics as the primary unit of analysis, but rather utilizes residents' actual reported experiences. This allows for a more nuanced understanding of voting behavior by going beyond what is obtained from state- and county-level examinations to explore individual variations. Understanding referenda voter behavior is important, especially in cases such as this, where voters engage in activity which targets the rights of a minority group. The study serves to expand the literature on the factors and processes which contribute to the passage of policies that affect the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) community.

This study begins with a brief review of the North Carolina Amendment One constitutional referendum. I then provide an overview of same-sex marriage bans in the United States and outline the current state of the literature on state- and county-level variability in amendment outcomes. I also discuss religious participation, a factor that is highly associated with attitudes toward homosexuality and LGBT issues, examining both the importance of

denominational affiliation and religious attendance. Within this context, the study will examine the relationship between individuals' religious participation and their votes for (or against) Amendment One. I will use an integrative sociological perspective to understand the individual-level demographic factors that impact voting practices on Amendment One, which led to the North Carolina state constitution being amended to ban same-sex marriage. The theoretical framework for the study will also integrate literature across research on LGBT issues, social psychology, political psychology, and political science to link religious participation with voter behavior. I will then outline several hypotheses regarding the relationship between North Carolinians' voting behavior on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban, religion, and various control variables. Next, I will provide a description of the methodology undertaken, followed by the results of the study. I then will include a discussion of the findings and conclude with final remarks.

Same-sex Marriage Bans

On June 26, 2015, The United States Supreme Court ruled that state-level bans against same-sex marriage were unconstitutional, thus making it legal for same-sex couples to wed across all the states (National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) 2015). Same-sex marriage is still a political hot topic in the U.S., even with the historic 2015 ruling. Prior to 2012, 30 states changed their constitutions to ban same-sex marriage, with over 95 percent of bans put to vote being approved since the late 1990s (Bowser 2012). In the early 2010s, the political landscape changed and several Supreme Court rulings impacted the state of same-sex marriage (Lambda Legal 2013; NCSL 2013) and several states began to grant marriage licenses to same-sex couples for the first time.

On June 26, 2013, Section 3 of the 1996 federal Defense of Marriage Act, which defines marriage as a union between one man and one woman, was struck down as unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court (Lambda Legal 2013). This allowed for same-sex couples residing in states with marriage equality laws to gain federal benefits. However, the section of DOMA that allowed states to refuse to recognize same-sex marriages performed in other states was unchallenged and as a result still stood (Lambda Legal 2013). Similarly, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that California's Proposition 8 same-sex marriage ban was unenforceable, as the sponsors of the ban had no legal authorization to appeal the original finding that the ban was unconstitutional (Lambda Legal 2013). This decision allowed for same-sex marriage to recommence in the state of California. Several states then reconsidered their stances on the legal recognition of same-sex marriage. In 2013, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Delaware, Minnesota, and Hawaii passed legislation allowing same-sex marriage (NCSL 2014). Similarly, 2014 was equally important regarding the state of same-sex marriage in the United States, and North Carolina in particular.

On October 6, 2014, the Supreme Court denied the request to review lower court rulings from the 4th, 7th, and 10th U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals that overturned same-sex marriage bans in Indiana, Oklahoma, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin, an act which legalized same-sex marriage in these states (Pew 2015; NCSL 2014). Following the decision of the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, North Carolina District Court Judge Max O. Cogburn, Jr. ruled the state's same-sex marriage ban unconstitutional thus, officially overturning the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban, which legally allowed same-sex couple in North Carolina the right to wed (NCSL 2015). In November 2014, The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld same-sex marriage bans in Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee (NSCL 2015). However, by the beginning of

2015, same-sex marriage was legally recognized in over 35 states (NCSL 2015). At that time, states that banned same-sex marriage could legally refuse to recognize same-sex marriages performed in other states. This would change with the U.S. Supreme Court's five-to-four ruling that state bans against same-sex marriage are unconstitutional and struck down DOMA entirely (Pew Research Center 2015).

Both the states and the federal government were clearly grappling with the issue of marriage equality and the tide of events that turned toward support for same-sex marriage over time. North Carolina provides a theoretically interesting case, as it passed a ban prohibiting same-sex marriage at the point in which national trends were becoming more supportive of marriage equality. In this regard, North Carolina is a unique case, as the majority of other legal actions since the enactment of the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage ban had been in support of marriage equality at the state level. As a state located firmly in the Bible belt, North Carolina is often hailed as the most politically progressive state in the South (Guillory 2012). However, the adoption of prohibitions against same-sex marriage within this state during the national shift toward equality highlights a discontinuity between public perception and political practices.

North Carolina was late in considering a constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage because of a combination of procedural difficulty and party control of the legislature. North Carolina implemented a legal statute prohibiting same-sex marriage in 1996 following the establishment of the Federal Defense of Marriage Act. Numerous attempts to amend the North Carolina constitution to include prohibitions against same-sex marriage were made after that. In fact, the Session Laws of North Carolina court records indicate that bills banning same-sex marriage at the constitutional level were introduced to the General Assembly on more than ten

separate occasions between the years of 2004 and 2011.³ However, acting parties were unable to meet the requirements associated with amending the constitution.⁴ Each attempt was unsuccessful given that the sponsors of the bill were unable to gain the majority vote among members of the General Assembly to get the initiative placed on the electoral ballot. The bill was finally able to be placed on the ballot when the Republican-led General Assembly considered the initiative, thus gaining majority vote support from the North Carolina Senate and House of Representatives.

When the same-sex marriage ban was placed on the North Carolina ballot, two camps mobilized, one side organized in support of the initiative and the other in opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment. The North Carolina Family Policy Council, a conservative organization, served as a lead group in campaigning in support of the anti-marriage equality referenda. This organization, and many similar organizations, framed same-sex marriage as immoral based upon biblical teaching, as a threat to traditional marriage, and as a vehicle to assist in the downfall of society (ElHage 2011). In contrast, the advocacy group Equality NC (ENC), and others, worked to protect the civil rights of members of the LGBT community and stop the harmful legislative initiative. Equality NC framed marriage equality as a primary civil right for both same-sex and opposite-sex couples (ENC 2012). Further, this organization and other rights groups argued that the proposed amendment was redundant given that same-sex marriage was already outlawed in North Carolina. Through the mobilization campaigns of both sides, the proposed amendment was fairly well known throughout the state (Dodge 2013). Each

³ Not all states require legislative action to place initiatives on the ballot. Some states allow citizens to place potential constitutional amendments directly on the ballot (Lupia et al. 2010).

⁴ Further discussion about constitutional procedures is examined below.

side worked to disseminate its message to citizens statewide in an attempt to sway voters toward their specific goals for the North Carolina State Constitution. It appears that conservative organizations were more adept at galvanizing voters given that their preferred ballot outcome aligned with their cause. In 2012, North Carolinians voted in favor of the bill and thus amended the constitution to prohibit marriage between same-sex couples.⁵

Theoretical Background

While there is an expansive research base that highlights the macro-level factors associated with the adoption of same-sex marriage bans, the goal of this study is to examine the individual-level factors that impact North Carolina residents' votes on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. The study looks at demographic factors associated with residents' votes on same-sex marriage bans. Before describing in detail the theoretical basis for my examination of the individual-level predictors of voting patterns on Amendment One, I will discuss the existing literature that examines same-sex marriage bans with macro-level aggregate data.

An integrative sociological perspective reciprocally links the micro-level processes and macro-level structures that form society. At the macro-level, research on same-sex marriage bans has evaluated electoral ballot outcomes at both the state and county level. The literature indicates that geographic variations in support for marriage were based on structural differences

⁵ It should be noted that the bill was passed during a primary election rather than the general election. Research indicates that different times in the election cycle are marked by variation in voter participation. Specifically, the general election is associated with high voter turnout as compared to the primary election (Reilly and Walker 2010). However, Anzia (2011) suggests that when dominant interest groups have high stakes in a primary election, their member turnout is high and can sway the ballot toward their cause.

across regions including how politics works, the strength of interest groups, the religious backgrounds of the constituents, as well as the attitudes held by constituents.

First, the adoption of same-sex marriage bans varied with regard to the ease of the constitutional process, as mentioned above (Hume 2011; Lewis 2003; Lewis and Jacobsmeier 2012; Lupia et al. 2010). Lupia and colleagues (2010) identified three different procedural processes that states employ to amend the constitution. States either allowed constituents to place initiatives directly on the ballot or required that initiatives originate in legislature (Lupia et al. 2010). In states that the legislature initiated constitutional change, procedures were classified based on whether a simple majority vote was required to place an amendment to ballot or whether there were additional complex procedures that had to be completed (Lupia et al. 2012). States that allowed citizens to directly participate in establishing ballot initiatives without legislative input were more likely to adopt a constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage, because it was procedurally easier.

Research indicates that the presence of interest groups impacted the adoption of anti-marriage equality bans as well. States that had Family Research Council organizations were more likely to establish restrictive policies that affect the LGBT community, especially when these organizations had substantial access to resources and funding (Scheitle and Hahn 2011, Soule 2004). By contrast, the increased presence of LGBT interest groups was associated with opposition to same-sex marriage bans among the public (Barclay and Fisher 2003; Lewis and Oh 2008).

In addition to legislative procedure and interest group presence, cultural factors such as dominant religious culture, political party control, citizen ideology, and rurality also influenced adoption of same-sex marriages bans (McVeigh and Diaz 2009; Hines 2011; Haider-Markel

2007). Dominant religious presence, as measured by the denomination with the highest percentage of denomination adherents, at the structural macro-level had significant implications for anti-marriage equality legislature (Matland, Tatalovich and Wendell 2011; McVeigh and Diaz 2009; Scheitle and Hahn 2011). Specifically, McVeigh and Diaz (2009) found that counties with higher percentages of Evangelical Protestant church adherents were more likely to vote in support of same-sex marriage bans and counties with higher percentages of Catholic church adherents were less likely to vote in support of bans. Research indicated that geographic locations that had a dominant evangelical religious presence were significantly more likely to adopt same-sex marriage bans as compared to areas that did not have a dominant evangelical presence (Dyck and Pearson-Merkowitz 2012; Fleischmann and Moyer 2009; Lewis 2011; Lewis and Oh 2008; Scheitle and Hahn 2011). Citizen ideology was also found to play an important role in the adoption of same-sex marriage bans. Scholars suggest that citizen ideology is often driven by dominant religious culture and in return citizen ideology determines political party control. Specifically, areas where citizens endorse conservative ideologies, as expressed through public opinion research, were significantly more likely to support anti-marriage equality bans as compared to locations where citizens embraced liberal ideologies (Lewis and Jacobsmeier 2012, Lewis and Oh 2008; Scheitle and Hahn 2011; Soule 2004). Rurality also impacted the implementation of same-sex marriage legislation, with areas that were more rural being more likely to adopt same-sex marriage bans in compared to more urban locations (Burnett and Salka 2009; Lewis 2008; Lewis 2011; Scheitle and Hahn 2011).

Aggregated data on factors that predict the adoption of sex same marriage provide important insight as to the state and county level contextual factors that lead to macro-level change. However, this information does not provide a nuanced understanding of individual level

factors associated with support for same-sex marriage bans. I now transition to explore the micro-level factors that impact individuals' support for these bans.

Theoretical Basis for Individual Level Analysis

The study looks at why residents vote the way that they do on same-sex marriage bans. I am particularly interested in the role of religion and utilized research examining the impact of religious factors on individuals' attitudes and behaviors within the context of voter choice.

Unlike most studies, the current study does not rely on aggregated data, such as electoral ballot outcomes or public opinion polls, (Burnett and Salka 2009; Salka and Burnett 2012; Dyck and Pearson-Merkowitz 2009; Fleischman and Moyer 2009; Matland and Totalvich 2011; McVeigh and Diaz 2009). I also extend the field of research on individual-level factors associated with voting behavior on same-sex marriage bans by utilizing a more inclusive sample, comprised of voters and intended voters. As a result, I have the advantage of capturing people who did not vote, in a way that electoral polls cannot. This allowed me to gain a better understanding of the stances of a wider sample of North Carolina's general population on the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban.

This study also offers an in-depth understanding of the predictors that account for variation in support for an anti-marriage equality ban in a southern state that is considered progressive and a leader of the "New South" (Brunn, Webster, and Archer 2011; Guillory 2012). While North Carolina is hailed as a more liberal southern state, polls indicated the more than 50 percent of the residents are very religious with the leading religious traditions being conservative evangelical (ARDA 2013; Newton 2012). It is likely that progress in the movement for marriage equality in North Carolina was stymied due to residents' religious foundations.

Religion serves to direct individuals to those aspects of life that are considered to be most valued and sacred (Corbett and Corbett 1999). Scholars note that values and attitudes are disseminated by religious institutions through the process of socialization. Religious beliefs often influence individuals' attitudes toward morally appropriate behavioral choices regarding lifestyle practices (Cohen, Shariff, and Hill 2008). Corbett and Corbett (1999) relate that beliefs and lifestyle stand at the intersection between religion and public policy. Collectively, these attitudes reflect public opinion, which has been consistently shown to impact political policy (Corbett and Corbett 1999; Shapiro 2011; Yang 1998). While religion in the United States varies with regard to breadth and depth across geographic location, dominant religious ideology stills plays a significant role in civic policy (Krosnick, Visser, and Hard 2010). Putnam and Campbell (2010) provide that increased religious attendance facilitates salient relationships with religious settings and these relationships guide individuals' attitudes toward issues like same-sex marriage and political behavior. Fowler, Olsen, Hertzke, and Den Durk (2013) also provide that there are several ways in which religion influences policy. Given the integral role that religion plays in the lives of Americans, it is likely that individuals elect government officials that subscribe to their same religious ideals (Fowler et al. 2013). In addition to having support from individual constituents, elected officials may also be backed by faith-based initiatives and lobbying groups (Putnam and Campbell 2010, Soule 2004). Many of these religious organizations shape proposed legislation and supply resources to support in campaigning for their desired outcomes. Within this system, religion affects political candidate selection, proposed legislation, campaign lobbying and funding, and initiative outcomes (Fowler et al. 2013).

Religion is a multifaceted and complex social phenomenon, yet two specific elements have been shown to be important predictors of the kinds of individual-level behaviors examined here: religious attendance and religious affiliation. I turn to reviewing relevant literature on religious attendance and religious affiliation next.

Religious attendance. Religious attendance is often measured as attendance at religious services and is a well-established positive predictor of happiness and well-being (Abdel-Khalek 2012). Research consistently indicates that religious attendance significantly impacts individuals' values, attitudes, and behaviors (Fowler et al. 2013). This is especially the case regarding issues related to homosexuality, LGBT rights, and same-sex marriage (Walls 2010). Specifically, individuals who attend religious services more frequently are more likely to have increased negative attitudes toward homosexuality and support prohibitions against same-sex marriage. Moreover, the Gallup polls (2012) found that 70 percent of respondents who attend religious services on a weekly basis were opposed to the legal recognition of same-sex marriage while 70 percent of respondents who seldom or never attend were in favor.

Empirical studies also indicate a strong relationship between religious attendance and attitudes towards same-sex marriage. In a meta-analysis investigating the impact of religious attendance on attitudes to same-sex marriage, Whitley (2009) found that religious attendance was associated with less support for marriage equality. Church attendance negatively predicted support for same-sex marriage, wherein individuals who have increased church attendance are less supportive of marriage equality (Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006; Sanchez, Nock, and Wright 2008; Sherkat, Powell-Williams, Maddox, and de Vries 2011; Todd and Ong 2012; Tranby and Zulkowski 2012). Egan, Persily, and Wallsten (2008) also found that individuals who reported attending religious services almost weekly or weekly are at least twice as likely to

disagree with the statement that same-sex couples should be allowed to marry as compared to those who reported attending religious services less often. Within this context, I predict that respondents who report attending religious services at least once a week or more will be more likely to report voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban.

Religious affiliation. While religious attendance, in general, is associated with opposition to marriage equality, there are significant denominational variations in views toward same-sex sexuality and LGBT rights. The General Social Survey (2010), a national representative survey, documents variation in attitudes across religious traditions on the issue of same-sex marriage. In response to the statement, “Homosexual couples should have the right to marry one another,” approximately 56 percent of Protestant respondents reported that they either disagree or strongly disagree. Thirty-five percent of Catholic respondents and approximately 15 percent of Jewish respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that same-sex couples should be able to marry, while 20 and 38 percent of respondents identifying as “none” or “other” respectively on religious affiliation strongly disagree or disagree. These findings suggest that individuals’ opinions on marriage equality appear to be shaped by the particular religious traditions with which they affiliate.

The variation in denominations’ stances on homosexuality and same-sex marriage is largely associated with the ideological foundation held by a specific denomination. For instance, religious denominations that subscribe to biblical literalism consider sacred text to be absolute truth (Wald, Button, and Rienzo 1996). From this standpoint, homosexual behavior and same-sex marriage go against these traditions’ moral beliefs and values. These traditions are generally conservative or fundamentalist (Whitehead and Baker 2012). Empirical studies have consistently found conservative and fundamentalist denominations to be the least supportive

groups for marriage equality across religious traditions (Egan et al. 2008; Hines 2011; Sherkat, de Vries, and Creek 2010; Whitehead and Baker 2012).

Outside of conservative and fundamentalist denominations, attitudes towards same-sex marriage vary. For instance, research suggests that there are several religious denominations that are gay affirming (Lewis and Oh 2008; Olson et al. 2006; Sherkat et al. 2010; Sherkat et al. 2011). These traditions are more likely to have public stances accepting or affirming marriage equality, allow for LGBT individuals to participate as clergy and serve as members in the religious congregation (Adler 2012). They are also more likely to have LGBT social movement organizations and interest groups (Fuist, Stroll, and Kniss 2012). Interestingly, the Catholic Church does not support same-sex marriage (Pew 2012). However, there is a gap between the Church's stance and the attitudes that actual parishioners hold on the subject. Specifically, research suggests that individuals who identify as Catholic are more supportive of LGBT rights and the legal recognition of same-sex relationships than conservative and fundamentalist Protestant traditions (Finlay and Walther 2003; Lewis and Oh 2008; Olson et al. 2006; Sherkat et al. 2011). Further, studies indicate that individuals belonging to Jewish, liberal Protestant, non-Christian religious groups or having no religious affiliation tend to significantly be more supportive of marriage equality (Finlay and Walther 2003; Lewis and Oh 2008; Olson et al. 2006; Sherkat et al. 2011). As a result, I predict that residents belonging to conservative and fundamentalist religious groups will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban. I also predict that individuals belonging to Jewish, liberal Protestant, non-Christian religious groups or having no religious affiliation will be less likely to vote in support of Amendment One.

It should also be noted that religious attendance and religious denomination overlap. Many studies indicate that within a denomination, the more religious an individual is the more likely they are to support bans against same-sex marriage (Egan, Persily, and Wallstein 2008; Olson et al. 2006; Sherkat et al. 2011; Todd and Ong 2011). To this end, I hypothesize that among members of conservative Protestant denominations those who attend religious services more regularly will have a higher probability of voting in support of Amendment One as compared to those members who attend services less frequently.

Other Socio-demographic Factors

Research examining attitudes toward homosexuality, LGBT issues, same-sex marriage, and religion often utilize public opinion polls to understand key variables of interest (Sherkat et al. 2011). These studies provide valuable insight as to the individual-level factors that shape attitudes toward LGBT rights as well as marriage equality. They also point to the salient background factors that should impact electoral support for bans against same-sex marriage. For the current study, I examine five sociodemographic variables within the context of residents' votes on Amendment One, beyond their religious participation: age, gender, race, education level, and urban/rural county residence. [See to Table 1 for an overview of the research hypotheses.]

Age. With regard to age, studies find that older individuals are generally less supportive of LGBT rights and are more likely to oppose same-sex marriage (Becker 2012; Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006; Sherkat, De Vries, and Creek 2010; Sherkat et al. 2011). Scholars provide that social change driven by the LGBT rights movement has increased attitudes of support for marriage equality in younger generations (Valelly 2012; Sherkat, De Vries, and Creek 2010). It is not that individuals are more likely to oppose same-sex marriage as they age, but rather the era

in which individuals are born predicts support for marriage equality. For instance, individuals born during an era when homosexuality was a closeted topic and completely stigmatized are more likely to oppose same-sex marriage as compared to those born during periods of increased visibility of same-sex partnerships and LGBT acceptance. Therefore, I predict that older individuals will be more likely to vote for the same-sex marriage ban as compared to younger individuals.

The literature suggests that religious attendance mediates the relationship between age and attitudes toward marriage equality (Putnam and Campbell 2010). Polls indicate that older individuals report attending religious services more often than their younger counterparts. Specifically, 48 percent of individuals 65 years of age and older reported attending religious services at least once a week, while 27 percent of individuals between the age of 18 and 29 reported attending religious services at least once a week (Pew 2014). It is likely that increased rates of religious attendance contribute to opposition toward same-sex marriage among older individuals. To this end, I hypothesize that religious attendance will be a proxy for age.

Gender. Studies consistently indicate that gender also plays a significant role in acceptance of homosexuality and support for same-sex marriage (Brumbaugh et al. 2008; Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2008; Lewis 2003; Moskowitz, Rieger, and Roloff 2010; Whitehead 2012). Herek (2002) found that women expressed more tolerant attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex relationships as compared to men. Sherkat and colleagues (2011) also found that women are significantly more supportive of marriage rights for same-sex couples than men. Herek (2007) relates that homosexuality is highly stigmatized given that it is perceived as a violation of socially proscribed gender roles. Men may consider homosexuality and same-sex practices as a threat to one's masculinity. Within this context, opposition to homosexuality and

same-sex marriage among men may be a form of protection of their masculinity against perceived threats. In contrast, women are not susceptible to this threat and are able to be more open toward same-sex marriage. Research also suggests that the impact of gender expectations associated with femininity are much more relaxed for women as compared to the impact of implications for masculinity in men. Women may also be more supportive of LGBT rights and issue given their social history of marginalization and the political fight for gender equality. Within this context, the probability of voting in support of the marriage ban should be higher among men as compared to women.

The literature also suggests that religious attendance moderates the relationship between gender and attitudes toward marriage equality. Specifically, men who report higher levels of religious attendance are significantly more likely to oppose same-sex marriage as compared to women who report higher levels of religious attendance (Patrick 2012; Whitley 2012). For men, it seems that religious attendance may have a more salient impact in shaping views toward same-sex marriage and homosexuality, as compared to women. In exploring the relationship between religious attendance, gender, and voting behavior on the same-sex marriage ban, I hypothesize that religious attendance will moderate the relationship between gender and voting behavior. The impact of religious attendance on voting behavior will be stronger for men as compared to women, in that men who report higher rates of religious attendance will have a higher probability of voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to women who report higher rates of religious attendance.

Race. In contrast, the literature has been inconsistent regarding racial differences in attitudes toward same-sex marriage. Research on racial differences in attitudes toward same-sex relations and LGBT issues largely examine variation between White Americans and African

Americans (Herek 2002). Some scholars have found that African Americans are more supportive of bans against same-sex marriage as compared to their White counterparts. However, others argue that racial differences in attitudes toward same-sex marriage are actually an artifact produced by religious factors rather than race per se. Many studies indicate that African Americans are more likely to identify as conservative Protestant and have significantly higher rates of religious participation as compared to Whites (Olson, Cadge and Harrison 2006; Sherkat et al. 2010). Block and Seltzer (2012) also found that religion is more salient in the lives of African Americans and holds more influence on their worldviews and beliefs. When Sherkat et al. (2010) controlled for conservative Protestant religious affiliation and religious attendance in a logistic regression predicting support for same-sex marriage, race was no longer statistically significant. In general, I predict that Black residents will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to White residents. However, once I control for religious attendance and religious affiliation, I predict that racial differences among Black and White residents will not be statistically significant.

Education. With regard to education, findings indicate that increased education is associated with support for same-sex marriage (Baunch 2012, Sherkat et al. 2011). Education provides individuals with greater exposure to diverse practices. Higher education increases cognitive flexibility and encourages support for civil liberties (Schwartz 2010). Within this context, individuals with higher levels of education are able to consider controversial topics, such as same-sex marriage, from varied perspectives and form their own opinions. As a result, individuals whose educational attainment does not include a college-degree should be more likely to vote in support for the same-sex marriage ban as compared to those with a college-degree (For Amendment One).

Urban/Rural. Finally, research indicates that individuals residing in rural areas are more supportive of same-sex bans in relation to individuals residing in urban areas (Sherkat et al., 2010). Contact with members of the LGBT community is more likely in urban areas as compared to rural locations. Scholars also speculate that increased exposure to diversity fosters tolerance in urban dwellers. During the referendum, the urban/rural divide was very evident at the county level in North Carolina, where the only counties where the majority of residents who voted against the amendment were located in urban locations, including the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill Triangle Area, Asheville, and Charlotte. Hence, individuals residing in rural counties should be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to those residing in urban counties.

Table 1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (Religious attendance):

Residents who report attending religious services at least once a week or more will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 2 (Religious Affiliation):

Residents belonging to conservative Protestant religious denominations will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to residents not belonging to conservative Protestant denominations (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 3(Age):

Older residents will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to younger residents (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 4 (Gender):

Men will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to women (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 5 (Race):

Black residents will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to White residents (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 6 (Education):

Residents whose educational attainment does not include a college-degree will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to those a college-degree (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 7 (Rural Residents):

Residents residing in rural counties will be more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to those residing in urban counties (For Amendment One).

Hypothesis 8 (Religious attendance, and Religious Affiliation Mediate Racial Differences):

When controlling for religious attendance and religious affiliation, racial differences among Black and White residents will not be statistically significant.

Table 1. Hypotheses - Continued

Hypothesis 9 (Interaction between Religious Attendance and Religious Affiliation):

Among residents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations, those who attend religious services more regularly will be more likely to support Amendment One as compared to those who attend less frequently.

Hypothesis 10 (Age Controlling for Religious Attendance):

Religious attendance will mediate the relationship between age and voting outcome on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban.

Hypothesis 11 (Gender Controlling for Religious Attendance):

Religious attendance will moderate the relationship between gender and voting outcome on the same-sex marriage ban.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Data

The dataset for this study is derived from the Sociological/Sustainable Tourism Survey that was conducted by the Community Research Lab (CRL) at East Carolina University. Prior to data collection, the research survey was submitted to the University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) and deemed exempt from review on May 11, 2012 (UMCIRB 12-000968). The aim of the survey was to gather data about current issues from North Carolina residents. The survey interview instrument consisted of 32 questions covering a range of topics, including travel, tourism, public policy, and voting behavior. This telephone-based project utilized a random sample of residents with listed landline telephones across North Carolina, contacting potential respondents from mid-May 2012 to late June 2012. The random sample was equally weighted across rural and urban counties. Telephone calls for the 10-minute survey interview were made by a group of twelve highly trained undergraduate and graduate students from 5:00pm to 9:00pm Sunday through Thursday. The project had an overall response rate of 19 percent and an overall co-operation rate of 36 percent, with the final dataset including 845 surveys.⁶

It should be noted that reliance on landline call lists in research studies poses limitations for sampling. Specifically, landline call lists exclude individuals that rely solely on cell phones and individuals in this latter category consist of a different demographic than landline phone users. Cell-phone-only individuals are more likely to be young adults, individuals who rent

⁶ The response rate represents the ratio of completed survey interviews over the number of phone calls in the sample, while the cooperation rate represents the ratio of completed survey interviews over the number of phone calls with people who were spoken with over the telephone.

housing (rather than own homes), as well as poor individuals who depend on cell phones for economic reasons (Kempf and Remington 2007). This issue is particularly salient for the current study considering that approximately 17 percent of North Carolinians live under the poverty line and more than 30 percent of the population is between the age of 18 and 35 (U.S. Census 2010). Given that the current sample relies solely on data collected from residents owning landline telephones, it is not representative of all North Carolinians, but rather landline-owning North Carolinians. For instance, the respondents are disproportionately female and disproportionately older. As such, the findings of the study will be considered within this context. For a full review of issues related to telephone surveys restricted to landline phone users see Kempf and Remington (2007).

Measures

Dependent variable. The dependent variable used for the study is participants' self-reported votes or intended votes on North Carolina's Amendment One, which proposed to add language to the North Carolina Constitution defining marriage as solely between a man and a woman. Specifically, participants were asked how they voted on the amendment, with their responses coded as: 1) for it, 2) against it, 3) don't know, 4) did not vote on the amendment, and 5) refused to answer. Individuals who reported that they did not vote on the amendment were asked how they would have voted on the Amendment if they had voted. These participants' responses were coded using the same metric used for actual voters, with "did not vote on the amendment" omitted. The current study only includes respondents that identified their vote on the amendment or their intended vote; those without an opinion were omitted. For the analyses, the responses regarding vote on the amendment are recoded into a dichotomous variable (0 = voted, or intended to vote, against it, 1 = voted, or intended to vote, for it).

Religious attendance. The primary independent variables for the study are religious service attendance and religious affiliation. In accordance with Block and Seltzer (2012), religious attendance is measured using participants' reported religious service attendance (0 = never, 1 = less than once a week, 2 = once a week, 3 = more than once a week). This operationalization was selected in order to examine how frequency of religious participation, in the form of attendance of religious service, predicts voting behavior.

Religious affiliation. To capture religious affiliation, respondents were asked to identify their religion, including denomination. These affiliations were clustered into six general categories: Conservative Protestant, Gay Affirming Protestant, Other Protestant, Catholic, Other Religion, and Non-religious.⁷ This conceptualization follows Wald, Button, and Rienzo's (1996) measure of conservative religious traditions, which considers a denomination's position on the morality of homosexuality and same-sex relationships. Following this convention, Assemblies of God, Seventh Day Adventist, Baptist (Conservative, Free Will, General Conference, and Southern Baptist Convention) Christian and Missionary, Christian Reformed, United Church of Christ, Church of God, Latter Day Saints, Lutheran (Missouri and Wisconsin Synods), Pentecostal, Presbyterian Church in America, and Salvation Army denominations represented the conservative religious denominations. The Gay Affirming Protestant denomination's religious affiliation category includes Protestant denominations that publicly affirmed the LGBT

⁷ It should be noted that an alternative operationalization for the religious affiliation variable was tested, which included Evangelical Protestant/Fundamentalist, Black Protestant, Other Protestant, Catholic, Other religious affiliation, and No religion categories. The Conservative Protestant operationalization was selected because it was very similar to the operationalization noted above and it provided the ability to examine Gay Affirming religious denominations.

community by performing same-sex marriage/recognition ceremonies and allowing the ordination of open lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals prior to the Amendment One legislative initiative. This category includes the Episcopal Church, The Presbyterian Church USA, Unitarian-Universalist Church, United Church of Christ, Quakers, Friends, and Society of Friends. The Other Protestant denomination religious affiliation category represents respondents who are affiliated with Protestant denominations that fall outside of the conservative Protestant and Gay Affirming Protestant denominations. The Catholic religious affiliation category represents respondents that self-identified as Catholic or Roman Catholic. The Other Religious affiliation category represents respondents who identified as Baha'i, Buddhist, Christian Scientist, Hindu, Jewish, Lorian, or Muslim. The No Religious affiliation category is comprised of respondents that identified as being agnostic or being affiliated with no religious denomination. [See Table 2. for a breakdown of the Religious Affiliation variable.]

I found in the analyses below that it did not matter how the remaining religious tradition denominations were broken down; all of the categories were always significantly less likely to vote for the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban as compared to the conservative Protestant tradition. This was irrespective as to whether the group was non-religious, Gay Affirming Protestant, Catholic, other Protestant, or other religious tradition. Within this context, I decided to collapse religious tradition into a dichotomous variable. Therefore, for the final analyses religious affiliation was further truncated into a Conservative religious tradition dichotomous variable representing membership to a conservative religious tradition or not (0 = Other, 1 = Conservative Religious Tradition).

Sociodemographic Variables

Age and gender. The current study includes the following five sociodemographic variables: age, gender, race, education level, and urban/rural county residence. The age variable is a continuous variable that represents the age of the respondents in years at the time that the survey was completed. Recent public opinion polls suggest that support for same-sex marriage bans is significantly weaker among younger individuals as compared to older individuals (General Social Survey 2010). Gender, which is captured with a dichotomous variable (Male = 0, Female = 1), also has implications for attitudes toward LGBT issues and same-sex marriage. Research consistently indicates that men are significantly more supportive of bans against same-sex marriage as compared to women (Becker 2012; Brumbaugh et al. 2008; Dyck and Pearson-Merkowitz 2012; Haider-Markel 1999; Sherkat, de Vries, and Creek 2010).

Race. Similarly to gender, I operationalized race as a dichotomous variable (Non-Black = 0, Black = 1).⁸ However, the literature regarding the impact of race on attitudes toward same-sex marriage has been inconsistent. While some scholars suggest that blacks are significantly more likely to support same-sex marriage bans in relation to whites (Lewis and Gossett 2008; Salka and Burnett 2012; Sherkat et al. 2011), others report that religiosity moderates the relationship between race and support for same-sex marriage (Block and Seltzer 2012; Brumbaugh et al. 2008; Lewis and Gossett 2008; Sherkat et al. 2011). For instance, Block and Seltzer's (2012) survey of Californians' attitudes toward the Proposition 8 same-sex marriage

⁸ Hispanic and Asian respondents are not analyzed separately because their numbers were scant and represented less than 2 percent of the sample. Analyses were also run with the race variable conceptualized as Non-White = 0 and White = 1 to examine alternative conceptualizations of the variable. There were no differences in the results of the analyses across conceptualizations of this variable.

ban found that when controlling for religiosity there was no statistically significant difference between blacks' and whites' support for the proposed ban.

Education. Adopting the conventions set by Block and Seltzer (2012), I operationalized education as whether respondents had attained a college degree or not (0 = non-college, 1 = 4-Year College Degree), as the literature indicate that individuals with a college degree are significantly less supportive of same-sex marriage bans while being more supportive of LGBT rights as compared to individuals without a college degree (Dyck and Pearson- Merkowitz 2011; McVeigh and Diaz 2009; Sherkat et al. 2011).

Urban/Rural. Finally, previous research on voting behavior and same-sex marriage bans finds that residents from rural areas are more likely to support bans against same-sex marriage than residents in urban areas (Dyck and Pearson-Merkowitz 2011; McVeigh and Diaz 2009; Soule 2004). Therefore, a dichotomous variable identifying whether the respondent lives in an urban or rural area was included in the analyses (0 = rural residency, 1 = urban residency). This variable was generated from data provided with the landline telephone numbers included in the random sample. North Carolina has a total of 100 counties, of which 15 are urban and 85 are rural. [See Table 3 for a breakdown of the Urban/Rural variable.]

Analysis Plan

A series of bivariate correlation analyses were conducted to assess the relationships between the variables. Binary logistic regression was used to evaluate the relationship between individuals' vote on the Amendment One and their religious participation, religious affiliation, and sociodemographic factors. This statistical analytic technique is most appropriate when a dichotomous dependent outcome variable is regressed across a series of independent variables (Pampel 2000). Binary logistic regression is required because the dichotomous dependent

variable violates the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity associated with linear regression (Pampel 2000).

In Table 7, the first model for the regression analyses includes respondents' religious affiliations and religious attendance in order to evaluate the unique contribution of religious factors on North Carolinians' amendment votes. Next, the age, gender, education, race, and rural or urban residency control variables were added to the model in order to evaluate their effect on the relationship between religion and respondents' vote on Amendment One. The third and fourth models will examine the impact of religious affiliation, religiosity, and race on votes for Amendment One. The race variable will be run separately in model three, in order to ascertain its unique effect on respondents' vote on Amendment One, and the final model will include the religious affiliation, religious attendance, and race variables.⁹

⁹ Separate regression analyses were run for voters and intended voters, as well as a combined model with both voters and intended voters. The regression model that included only intended voters predicted respondents' vote for Amendment One very poorly. The inability to predict the variables associated with vote on the same-sex marriage ban for intended voters could be associated with a number of factors. First, the small sample size associated with the model may have provided insufficient power for the analyses (N = 139). The fact that what people say they are going to do is not associated with what they actually do might have impacted the model's ability to predict respondents' vote on Amendment One or there may be some other unknown factor. The decision to combine voters and intended voters for the final analyses was made to increase the sample size and statistical power. The descriptive statistics for both groups were also similar, and including intended voters with actual voters did not change the regression model for voters very much. The results for the separate regression models for voters and intended voters are available upon request. Therefore, the final results reflect the regression model, predicting variables associated with vote on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban for both voters and intended voters.

In Table 8, moderation and mediation relationships were examined between religious attendance, age, gender, and vote on Amendment One. The first, second, and third models examined whether the interaction between religious attendance and religious denomination moderates the relationship between religious attendance, religious affiliation, and vote on Amendment One. The fourth and fifth models examined whether age mediates the relationship between religious attendance and vote on Amendment One. The fourth model included age alone, while the fifth model included age and religious attendance in order to examine whether age was a proxy for religious attendance. Finally, the first and second and sixth models examined whether the interaction between gender and religious attendance moderates the relationship between religious attendance, religious affiliation, and vote on Amendment One.

Table 2. Religious Traditions by Denomination

Conservative Protestant			
Assemblies of God	American Baptist	Free Will Baptist	Missionary Baptist
Southern Baptist	Other Baptist	Christian and Missionary	Christian Churches and Churches of Christ
Churches of God	Missouri of Synod	Wisconsin Synod	Pentecostal (including Holiness)
Churches of Christ	Presbyterian Church in America	Seventh Day Adventist	Baptist and Pentecostal
Community Baptist			
Gay Affirming Protestant			
Episcopal Church	Presbyterian, USA	Quakers, Friends, Society of Friends	Unitarian-Universalist
United Church of Christ			
Other Protestant			
Catholic			
Catholic	Roman Catholic		
Other Religious Traditions			
Baha'i	Buddhism	Christian Scientist	Hinduism
Judaism	Lorian	Islam	
No Religious Affiliation			
Agnostic	Non Religious		

Table 3. Counties of Residency

Urban Counties	Rural Counties				
Alamance	Alleghany	Anson	Ashe	Avery	Beaufort
Buncombe	Bertie	Bladen	Brunswick	Burke	Caldwell
Cabarrus	Camden	Carteret	Caswell	Chatham	Cherokee
Catawba	Chowan	Clay	Cleveland	Columbus	Craven
Cumberland	Currituck	Dare	Davie	Duplin	Edgecombe
Davidson	Franklin	Gates	Graham	Granville	Greene
Durham	Halifax	Harnett	Haywood	Henderson	Hertford
Forsyth	Hoke	Hyde	Iredell	Jackson	Johnston
Gaston	Jones	Lee	Lenoir	Lincoln	Mcdowell
Guilford	Macon	Madison	Martin	Mitchell	Montgomery
Mecklenburg	Moore	Nash	Northhampton	Onslow	Pamlico
New Hanover	Pasquotank	Pender	Perquimans	Person	Pitt
Orange	Polk	Randolph	Richmond	Robeson	Rockingham
Rowan	Rutherford	Sampson	Scotland	Stanly	Stokes
Wake	Surry	Swain	Transylvania	Tyrrell	Union
	Vance	Warren	Washington	Watauga	Wilkes
	Wilson	Yadkin	Yancey		

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for North Carolina residents, the full sample, actual voters, intended voters, and respondents from whom we lack information on their Amendment votes (i.e., they refused to answer how voted or they did not know how they voted on the Amendment). Table 5 presents the correlation matrix for voters, while Table 6 presents the correlation matrix for intended voters. Table 7 presents the results of the regression analyses, including both voters and intended voters, as well as the results of the mediation model for race. Table 8 presents the results of the moderation and mediation analyses including age, gender, religious attendance, and religious affiliation.

The descriptive statistics table provides insight into how well the data in the current sample are representative of North Carolina's general population. The descriptives can also be used as a basis for comparing voters, intended voters, and respondents whose information regarding their vote on Amendment One is unknown. This comparison allows for a better understanding of how the subsamples can be combined.

I compared the current sample demographics to that of the North Carolina's population (Columns 1 and 2) and find several differences. First, actual voters were more likely to vote in support of Amendment One compared to the respondents in the study (61.1% versus 51.4%). Next, there is substantial variation in religious affiliations between the general population and the current sample.¹⁰ For instance, there is a lower proportion of Gay Affirming Protestant

¹⁰ The religious affiliation data for North Carolina residents were calculated using data from the 2010 U.S. Religious Census: Religious Congregation & Membership Study (RCMS) (Grammich, et al. 2012). The proportion of North

respondents (8.1% versus 23%) in the current sample as compared to the North Carolina general population. By contrast, the proportion of respondents affiliated with Protestant denominations that are neither Conservative nor Gay Affirming (29.3% versus 13%), as well as the proportion of respondents affiliated with other religious denominations (2.1% versus less than .005%) are higher in the current sample in comparison to North Carolina's general population. However, representation of Conservative Protestant respondents (43.1% versus 42.15%) and Catholic respondents in the current study are very similar to the proportion of Conservative Protestant and Catholic respondents in the North Carolina general population.

With respect to the control variables, I highlight differences between the current sample and North Carolina's general population. The average age of respondents in the sample (57.8 years versus 48.7 years) is older as compared to the general population. There is also a higher proportion of female respondents in the current sample (33.4% versus 48.7%) as compared to the general population. There are fewer Black or African American respondents in the sample (13.4% versus 21.5%) with more respondents of other racial and ethnic background as compared to the general population. There are also more college graduates (46.7% versus 26.5%) and urban residents (54.5% versus 49.5%) in the sample as compared to the North Carolina as a whole.

Carolina residents affiliated with Conservative Protestant, Gay Affirming Protestant, Other Protestant, Catholic, and Other religious denomination represent the percentage of each group out of all of residents who adhere to a religious denomination. By contrast, the percentage of North Carolina residents with no religious affiliation reflects the percentage of all survey sample residents that are not affiliated with any religious denomination. These calculations are different from the way religious affiliation is calculated for the sample, as the religious affiliation data for sample reflect the percentage of respondents affiliated with a specific affiliation category out of all of the respondents.

While there are several differences between the current sample and North Carolina's general population, I argue that these differences do not signify a unique problem with this survey. Rather the differences reflect issues that are inherent to telephone surveys in general. Research indicates that telephone survey samples often have an underrepresentation of men, minorities, and younger adult respondents and an overrepresentation of college educated respondents, as well as respondents who reside in urban locations as compared to the general population (Kempf and Remington 2007; Lee, Brick, Brown et al. 2010). While I would like the current sample to better match the demographic characteristics of the North Carolina general population, this issue is not unique to my sample, but an issue inherent in telephone survey research, as mentioned of pages 23 and 24.

Next, I examine the variation across the subsets of the sample in order to determine the degree to which the subsets are similar and can be combined for analyses. In comparing actual voters, intended voters, and respondents for which no voting information is available, I highlight several similarities and differences. The proportion of respondents who reported supporting the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban was slightly higher for actual voters as compared to intended voters (52.2% versus 47.5%). While the majority of actual voters voted in support of the ban, the majority of intended voters opposed the ban. This finding suggests that if all eligible voters had participated in the election, the outcome might have been different. Specifically, if those respondents who intended to vote actually did participate in the election, the proportion of residents voting in opposition to the same-sex marriage ban would have increased.

With regard to religious attendance, intended voters (31.4%) were more likely to report never attending church services as compared to actual voters (17.2 %) and respondents for which no voting information is available (24.8%). While actual voters (42.1 % and 20.7%,

respectively) were more likely to report attending church service once a week and more than once a week as compared to intended voters (31.4% and 11.6%, respectively) and respondents for which voting information is unknown (34.4% and 12.0%, respectively).

Next, I examine the variation between the respondent categories (actual voters, intended voters, and respondents for which voting information is unknown) across the religious affiliations, age, gender, race, level of education, and residence. With regard to religious affiliation, the proportion of non-Christian and non-religious respondents is largely the same across actual voters (10.6%) and intended voters (12.6%). Thus, the variation that does exist between actual and intended voters for religious affiliation is the different groupings of Christian denominations. Actual voters and intended voters are similar in age, being that these respondents are older middle-aged individuals (59.3 years and 52.8 years, respectively). There are also similar proportions of African American or Black respondents across actual voters (13.1%) and intended voters (14.5%). However, the same cannot be said for respondents for which voting information is unknown. This subsample has a significantly higher proportion of African American or Black respondents (26.1%), as compared to actual and intended voters. There are differences with regard to gender, level of education, and location of residents across actual voters, intended voters, and respondents for whom no voting information is available. Specifically, respondents for which voting information is unknown had higher proportions of male respondents and respondents without a four-year college degree as compared to actual and intended voters.

This information suggests that combining the actual voters and intended voters makes the most sense. First, while the actual voters and intended voters have variation across the demographic factors, they are similar by and large. Next, combining these subsamples increases

the sample size, therefore strengthening the statistical power associated with the multivariate analyses. The inclusion of intended voters with actual voters provides a more nuanced understanding of voter behavior for those who do not actually participate in the ballot. Further, it is also necessary to eliminate the respondents for which voter information is unknown, as information for the key outcome variable of the study is unknown for these respondents.

Bivariate Correlation Analyses

In order to assess which factors are associated with voting behavior on Amendment One, bivariate correlation analyses were conducted. The analyses were conducted separately for voters and intended voters in order to examine potential group differences, further investigating whether it makes sense to combine the subgroups into one multivariate analysis. These analyses found significant bivariate relationships between the dependent variable, votes on Amendment One, and several independent variables - at least for actual voters. Among respondents that reported they voted, their votes on the same-sex marriage ban are associated with religious attendance, religious affiliation, age, and education. Self-reports of more frequent religious participation are positively associated with votes in support of Amendment One (or for the same-sex marriage ban) (Pearson's $R = .26$; $p = .000$). With regard to religious affiliation, respondents that reported being members of conservative denominations (Pearson's $R = .31$; $p = .000$) are more likely to report voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban than other respondents. However, respondents affiliated with Gay Affirming (Pearson's $R = -.09$; $p = .046$), Catholic (Pearson's $R = -.11$; $p = .013$), other religious traditions (Pearson's $R = -.10$; $p = .036$), and no religious tradition (Pearson's $R = -.29$; $p = .000$) are less likely to report voting in support of Amendment One as compared to other respondents. Older respondents are more likely to report voting in support of Amendment One as compared to younger respondents (Pearson's $R = .11$; p

= .022), while respondents with a four-year college degree are less likely to report voting in support of the ban as compared to those without a four-year college degree (Pearson's $R = -.21$; $p = .000$). These findings support my predictions regarding the impact of religious attendance, denomination, age, and education on support for Amendment One.

The remaining independent variables — gender, racial or ethnic background, and rural residency — are not significantly associated with votes on Amendment One at the bivariate level. These findings contradict my earlier predictions stating that being male, African American, and residing in a rural area would be associated with support for the same-sex marriage ban.

I also examined correlations among my key independent variables to understand the relationship between the variables at the univariate level. Religious attendance and religious affiliation were significantly correlated with one another among actual voters. Specifically, respondents affiliated with conservative religious denominations (Pearson's $R = .17$; $p = .000$) are more likely to report increased rates of religious participation, while members of other religious traditions are more likely to report lower rates of religious participation (Pearson's $R = -.12$; $p = .011$). There are no statistically significant relationships between religious attendance and religious affiliation for respondents with no religious affiliation and those affiliated with Gay Affirming, other Protestant, and Catholic traditions. These findings serve as a potential basis for understanding the relationship between respondents' reported religious attendance, religious affiliation, and votes on the same-sex marriage ban. Individuals affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations may vote in support of same-sex marriage bans not simply due to the content of the messages related to LGBT issues associated with those denominations. Instead, the driving factor in voting behavior among individuals affiliated with conservative Protestant

denominations may be the frequency with which affiliates hear negative messages about same-sex relationships. Corbitt and Corbitt (1998) argue that individuals affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations exhibit higher rates of participation in religious activities and form many strong social ties within their religious communities. Research also indicates that conservative Protestant denominations promote values and attitudes that can be considered homophobic and relegate individuals identifying as LGBT to a stigmatized minority group (Finaly & Walther, 2003; Sherkat, Powell-Williams, Maddox, & de Vries; 2011). It is likely that increased exposure to messages that condemn same-sex practices as immoral and stronger social ties associated with the arenas in which these messages are expressed serves to foster increased support for the same-sex marriage ban among respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations (Putnam and Campbell 2010). The impact of the interaction religious attendance and religious denomination on voting behavior is further explored at the multivariate level below (see Table 8).

Further, with regard to religious attendance, there is a significant relationship between religious participation and race and ethnicity. Black respondents are more likely to report higher rates of religious participation as compared to respondents of other ethnic and racial backgrounds (Pearson's $R = .13$; $p = .008$). These findings provide preliminary evidence for my prediction regarding religious attendance mediating the impact of race and ethnicity on vote for the amendment.

The responses of intended voters are harder to predict, as fewer of the independent variables are associated with their intended votes on Amendment One. This suggests that there is a potential disconnect between what respondents report they intend to do and how they actually behave. Only one independent variable is associated with Amendment One votes

among intended voters: affiliation with conservative religious traditions. Specifically, among intended voters, those that belong to conservative religious denominations are more likely to report that they would have voted in support of the ban (Pearson's $R = .25$; $p = .003$). No other independent variables are significantly correlated with the dependent variable for intended voters.

A further look at respondents that only reported their intended votes provides further support for combining voters and intended voters at the multivariate level. Among respondents that intended to vote, religious attendance was only associated with race or ethnicity, with Black respondents reporting increased rates of religious attendance as compared to respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds (Pearson's $R = .26$; $p = .005$). In combining the voter and intended voter subsamples, I capture a more nuanced understanding of the general population with respect to residence support for the constitutional amendment. Combining these subsamples also improves the robustness of the multivariate analyses and as a result the relationships among the outcome variable are better understood.¹¹

Binary Logistic Regression Analyses

I conducted binary logistic regression to evaluate the factors associated with residents' vote on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. Table 7 and 8 present the unstandardized coefficients and the standard errors, which are in parentheses, for the analyses. The unstandardized coefficient represents the logit or natural log of the odds of voting in support of the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. An easier way to interpret the results of the

¹¹ The correlation matrix for the combined voter and intended voter subsamples is available upon request.

regression model includes transforming the logit to the predicted probability, which describes the strength of the relationship between the individual predictor variable (religious attendance) and the predicted event (voting for the same-sex marriage ban). For a subset of relationships, I will present the predicted probabilities, as they are a more straightforward way to explain the relationships in substantive terms (Pampel 2000). The predicted probability is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Predicted Probability} = \frac{e^{a+bX}}{1 + e^{a+bX}}$$

where “a” is the intercept, “b” is the unstandardized beta coefficient and “X” is the value coded for the group of interest (Pampel 2000).

Predictor variables in the first model include religious attendance and the dummy-coded variable for the conservative Protestant religious affiliation.¹² The results of the regression indicate the current model predicts statistically significantly more variance than the intercept alone (improved model fit on the regression line). The coefficient for religious attendance is both statistically significant and positive (Model 1). This indicates that respondents who report attending religious service more frequently are more likely to report voting in support of the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. For example, holding all other factors constant, the predicted probability of respondents who reported never attending religious services voting for

¹² The religious denomination categories were collapsed to create a dichotomous variable capturing Conservative religious traditions versus All other traditions and the Non-religious. This conceptualization of religious denomination was used because respondents from all denominational groups were less like to vote in support of the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban as compared to the Conservative religious traditions, suggesting that substantive variation in vote on the amendment is between conservative anti-gay traditions and all other traditions.

the amendment is 37 percent¹³ whereas the predicted probability of those who reported attending religious services more than once a week is 71 percent. For the religious affiliation dummy variable, the coefficient is also statistically significant and positive (Model 1). Among respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations, the predicted probability of voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban is 69 percent, whereas the predicted probability for respondents with other affiliations is 48 percent. These findings are consistent with Hypotheses 1 and 2, as self-reported religious attendance increases the likelihood of respondents voting for Amendment One and affiliation with a Conservative religious tradition is associated with increased support for the same-sex marriage ban.

The second model includes age, gender, race and ethnicity, education, and urban residence as control variables to determine whether the religious variables maintain their significant relationships with Amendment One votes when alternative factors are considered. With the inclusion of the control variables to the model, the religious variables remain significant (Model 2). In addition, as hypothesized, gender, race, and education are statistically significant in the model, though the direction of the effects did not always match the hypothesis predictions.

The coefficient for gender is negative, which indicates that women are less likely to support the same-sex marriage ban than men. Specifically, the predictive probability of voting in

¹³ The following is the calculation for the predicted probability for respondents who report never attending religious services and voting in support of Amendment One. In this equation, the other variables are held constant at their respective mean values.

$$\text{Predicted Probability} = \frac{e^{-.76+.48(0)+.89(.43)+-.58(.66)+-.57(.13)+-.39(.46)+-.19(.54)}}{1 + e^{-.76+.48(0)+.89(.43)+-.58(.66)+-.57(.13)+-.39(.46)+-.19(.54)}}$$

support of the same-sex marriage ban is 52 percent for women and 66 percent for men. This finding may be attributed to the fact that for men support for same-sex relationships could serve as a threat to their masculinity, whereas, women do not have this problem and are gender-typed as accepting nurturers (Herek 2007). Women also have a history marred with oppression and subjugation, which would make them more sensitive to civil rights issues and more inclined to protect the rights of others (Sherkat et al. 2011).

The regression coefficient for race and ethnicity is also significant, but negative, indicating that Black respondents are less likely to report supporting the ban, which contradicts my original hypothesis. The predicted probability for Black or African American respondents is 45 percent with regard to supporting the same-sex marriage ban, whereas the predicted probability for respondents from other racial and ethnic groups is 59 percent. The fact that African Americans are less supportive of Amendment One may be attributed to the campaign efforts of the North Carolina National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The head of the NC NAACP, Rev. Dr. William J. Barber II, publicly called for the African American community to consider the ban an attempt to write discrimination into the State Constitution and discouraged voter support for the ban based on the fact that it could be considered a civil rights violation (Brock 2012).

The coefficient for education is negative, which indicates that respondents with a 4-year college degree are less likely to report supporting the same-sex marriage ban in comparison to respondents without a 4-year college degree. Specifically, the predictive probability of supporting the same-sex marriage ban is 50 percent for college graduates and 60 percent for respondents without a 4-year college degree. This finding is likely attributed to the fact that individuals who attend college are exposed to diverse lifestyles in an environment that

encourages tolerance (Schwartz 2010). Further, individuals who obtain a 4-year college degree are trained to critically examine issues that are presented to inform their own opinions regarding said issues.

Contrary to my predictions, age and location of residence were not associated with support for the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban, when considered in the context of the other factors. This suggests that there is no statistical difference in votes on the amendment between younger respondents and older respondents or between those who reside in urban counties as compared to rural counties at the multivariate level. However, at the bivariate level there is a significant relationship between respondents' age and their vote on Amendment One, with older age being associated with voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban. Therefore, the relationship between age and voting behavior appears to diminish within the context of other factors, such as religious attendance and religious denomination. The lack of relationship between respondents' place of residence and their voting behavior likely indicates that the impact of residential location is diminishing with regard to voting on same-sex marriage bans.

Model 3 and Model 4 test the relationship between race, religious attendance and religious affiliation. The results of these analyses indicate that religious attendance and religious affiliation mediate the relationship between race and support for Amendment One, but not in the way originally predicted. Specifically, when race was in the model alone, no racial differences were found with regard to vote on the amendment, where as I originally predicted that Black or African American respondents would be more likely to vote in support of the ban as compared to respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds (Model 3). I also predicted that there would not be any differences based on race on vote for Amendment One when controlling for religious factors. However, in the model which included race and controlled for religious attendance and

religious affiliation, racial differences emerged for vote on Amendment One, in which Black respondents were less supportive of the ban (Model 4). To this end, religion does mediate the relationship between race and voting behavior; however, not in the way that I predicted. The regression coefficient for race is statistically significant and negative. However, when holding religious attendance and religious denomination constant, respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds were more likely to report support for Amendment one as compared to Black or African American respondents when controlling for religious factors.

Table 8 presents the results of the mediation and moderation analyses related to age, gender, religious attendance, and religious affiliation. In Hypothesis 9, I predicted that the interaction¹⁴ between the religious factors will impact the relationship between religious denomination, religious attendance, and vote on Amendment One. Specifically, I predicted that respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denomination who attend religious services more often will be more likely to support the same-sex marriage ban as compared to respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations who attend religious services less often. To test this hypothesis, I included religious attendance and religious affiliation in Model 1, while the control variables were included in Model 2, and Model 3 included the interaction term for religious attendance and religious affiliation. The interaction term is statistically significant and negative. This demonstrates that religious attendance and religious affiliation are working

¹⁴ Interaction effects between religious attendance and gender, as well as interaction effects between religious attendance and age, were explored. However, the interaction terms in the models were not statistically significant. This suggests that the effect of gender and the effect of age are not conditioned by religious attendance. Similarly, the effect of religious attendance on vote on Amendment One is not influenced by respondents' age or gender. Therefore, I do not present the results here.

together to influence voting behavior on Amendment One. Comparing conservative Protestant respondents across levels of religious attendance illustrates the significant combined impact that religious attendance and denomination has on respondents' voting behavior. Specifically, the predicted probability of supporting Amendment One for conservative Protestant respondents who report never attending church is 51 percent, and 67 percent for those who report attending church service less than once a week, respectively. However, for conservative Protestant respondents who report attending religious service once a week the predicted probability of supporting the same-sex marriage ban is 79 percent. By contrast, the predicted probability of supporting Amendment One among conservative Protestant respondents who report attending religious services more than once a week is 88 percent. This indicates that the effect of respondents' religious affiliation on their support for Amendment One is shaped by their religious attendance.

In Hypothesis 10, I predicted that religious attendance would mediate the relationship between age and vote on the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. I specifically predicted that older respondents would be more likely to vote for the amendment as compared to younger respondents. However, I did not attribute this effect to the respondents' age, but to the higher levels of religious attendance in the older. As a result, when controlling for religious attendance, the impact of age on voting behavior should be diminished. To test this hypothesis, in Model 4, I included age in the regression model alone, and in Model 5 included religious attendance and age. The results indicated that there was no shift in the impact of age after controlling for religious attendance, in that older respondents are more likely to vote in support of Amendment One as compared to younger respondents even after controlling for religious attendance. Thus, age and religious attendance do not serve as proxies for one another.

In Hypothesis 11, I predicted that religious attendance would moderate the relationship between gender and vote on the same-sex marriage ban. Specifically, I predicted that men are more likely to vote in support of Amendment One as compared to women. This gender difference reflects the fact that religion has a stronger impact on support for same-sex marriage among men as compared to women. Specifically, higher rates of religious attendance will translate to increase support for Amendment One among men. To test this hypothesis, I included religious attendance and religious affiliation in Model 1, while the control variables were included in Model 2, and Model 8 included the control variables and the interaction term for religious attendance and gender. The results indicated that the impact of gender is not shaped by religious attendance. Therefore, there is no statistically significant interaction between religious attendance and gender on respondents' support for Amendment One.

Table 4. Sample Characteristics					
Variable	North Carolina ¹⁵	Total Sample	Actual Voters	Intended Voters	DN/F
Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban¹⁶					
Voted, or intended to vote, for it	61.1%	51.4%	52.5%	47.5%	--
Voted, or intended to vote, against it	38.9%	48.6%	47.5%	52.5%	--
Religious Attendance					
Never	--	20.3%	17.2%	31.4%	24.8%
Less than once a week	--	21.2%	20.0%	25.6%	28.8%
Once a week	--	39.7%	42.1%	31.4%	34.4%
More than once a week	--	18.7%	20.7%	11.6%	12.0%

¹⁵ The data used for the North Carolina general population are from the 2010 U.S. Census and the North Carolina General Assembly.

¹⁶ The data for vote on the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage ban for the North Carolina general population are from the North Carolina General Assembly. This information does not reflect all of North Carolina residents' attitudes about the same-sex marriage ban, but rather provides information on the preferences on the North Carolina Residents that voted on Amendment One.

Table 4. Sample Characteristics - Continued

Variable	North Carolina ¹¹⁷	Total Sample	Actual Voters	Intended Voters	DN/F
Religious Affiliation¹⁸					
Conservative Protestant	42.15%	43.1%	44.5%	38.5%	48.2%
Gay Affirming Protestant	23.13%	8.1%	9.0%	5.2%	4.4%
Other Protestant	13.02%	29.3%	28.7%	31.1%	27.7%
Catholic	8.67%	8.4%	7.2%	12.6%	8.8%
Other religious affiliation	.00089%	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%	.7%
No religious affiliation	52%	9.0%	8.5%	10.4%	10.2%

¹⁷ The data used for the North Carolina general population are from the 2010 U.S. Census and the North Carolina General Assembly.

¹⁸ The religious affiliation data for North Carolina residents were calculated using data from the 2010 U.S. Religious Census: Religious Congregation & Membership Study. The proportion of North Carolina residents affiliated with Conservative anti-gay Protestant, Pro-gay Protestant, Other Protestant, Catholic, and Other religious denomination represent the percentage of each group out of all of residents who adhere to a religious denomination. By contrast, the percentage of North Carolina residents with no religious affiliation reflects exact percentage of all American residents that are not affiliated with any religious denomination.

Table 4. Sample Characteristics – Continued

Variable	North Carolina¹⁹	Total Sample	Actual Voters	Intended Voters	DN/F
Age²⁰	M: 46.3	M: 57.8 SD: 15.5	M: 59.3 SD: 14.8	M: 52.8 SD: 16.7	M: 58.6 SD: 16.7
		R: 18-94	R: 19-94	R: 18-90	R: 20-102
Gender					
Male	48.7%	33.4%	36.2%	23.7%	37.5%
Female	51.3%	66.6%	63.8%	76.3%	62.5%
Race					
Black	21.5%	13.4%	13.1%	14.5%	26.1%
Non-Black	78.5%	86.6%	86.9%	85.5%	73.9%
Education Level					
Non-College	73.5%	53.3%	50.4%	62.8%	66.4%
4-year College Degree	26.5%	46.7%	49.4%	37.2%	33.6%
County Residence					
Rural	50.5%	45.6%	44.0%	51.1%	50.3%
Urban	49.5%	54.5%	56.0%	48.9%	49.7%
Sample Size	9,535,471	617	478	139	125

¹⁹ The data used for the North Carolina general population are from the 2010 U.S. Census and the North Carolina General Assembly.

²⁰ The mean age of North Carolina residents reflects the average age of residents 18 years of age and older based on 2010 U.S. Census data. The mean age was calculated by multiplying the number of residents at each age interval from 18 to 110, by their age and summing the product. Finally, the product was divided by the number of North Carolina residents 18 years of age and older and multiplied by 100.

Table 5. Bivariate Correlations for Voters

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Amendment One Vote	1.00												
2. Religious Attendance	0.26***	1.00											
3. Conservative gay Protestant	0.31***	0.17***	1.00										
4. Gay Affirming Protestant	-0.09*	-0.03	-0.30***	1.00									
5. Other Protestant	-0.002	-0.06	-0.57***	-0.20***	1.00								
6. Catholic	-0.11*	-0.09	-0.025***	-0.90	-0.18***	1.00							
7. Other Religious Traditions	-0.10*	-0.12*	-0.13**	-0.05	-0.09*	-0.04	1.00						
8. Non-religious	-0.29***	-0.09	-0.27***	-0.10*	-0.14**	-0.09	-0.05	1.00					
9. Age	0.11*	0.09	0.01	0.05	0.03	-0.024	0.07	-0.13**	1.00				
10. Gender	-0.06	0.06	0.003	-0.03	0.03	0.05	-0.01	-0.06	-0.03	1.00			
11. Black or African American	-0.01	0.13**	0.09*	-0.1.*	0.08	-0.08	-0.06	-0.07	-0.06	0.05	1.00		
12. 4-Year College Degree	-0.21***	-0.9	-0.21***	0.04	0.12**	0.07	0.03	0.05	-0.13**	0.01	-0.10*	1.00	
13. Residence	-0.07	-0.002	-0.12*	0.03	0.02	0.10*	0.01	0.04	-0.003	-0.02	0.02	0.10*	1.00

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 6. Bivariate Correlations for Intended Voters

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Amendment One Vote	1.00												
2. Religious Attendance	0.15	1.00											
3. Conservative gay Protestant	0.25**	0.12	1.00										
4. Gay Affirming Protestant	-0.09	-0.16	-0.19*	1.00									
5. Other Protestant	-0.09	-0.08	-0.53***	-0.16	1.00								
6. Catholic	-0.14	0.05	-0.30***	-0.09	-0.26**	1.00							
7. Other Religious Traditions	-0.06	-0.04	-0.12	-0.04	-0.10	-0.06	1.00						
8. Non-religious	-0.08	b	-0.27**	-0.08	-0.23**	-0.13	-0.05	1.00					
9. Age	0.13	-0.17	0.13	0.11	-0.03	-0.10	-0.06	-0.10	1.00				
10. Gender	-0.08	0.10	0.08	0.05	-0.002	0.05	-0.03	-0.21*	0.08	1.00			
11. Black or African American	-0.06	0.26***	0.01	-0.004	0.08	-0.10	0.08	-0.08	-0.22*	0.08	1.00		
12. 4-Year College Degree	0.02	0.12	-0.41***	0.10	0.13	0.20*	-0.01	0.17*	-0.23**	-0.15	-0.02	1.00	
13. Residence	-0.08	-0.05	-0.18*	-0.03	0.07	0.13	0.13	0.01	0.16	-0.05	-0.19*	0.02	1.00

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$. b. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

Table 7. Estimated Effects of Religious Attendance, Religious Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race, and Residence on Vote/Intended Vote for Amendment One (Bivariate Logistic Regression, N = 525)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Religious Attendance	.42*** (.09)	.48*** (.09)	--	.46*** (.10)
Religious Affiliation				
Conservative Protestant	.97*** (.19)	.89*** (.20)	--	.97*** (.19)
Age	--	.01 (.01)	--	--
Gender (Male)				
Female	--	-.58** (.21)	--	--
Race (Other Race or Ethnicity)				
African American	--	-.57* (.27)	-.26 (.25)	-.59* (.26)
Education (Less than 4-Year College Degree)				
4-Year College Degree	--	-.39* (.19)	--	--
Residence (Urban)				
Rural	--	-.19 (.19)	--	--
Intercept	-.87***	-.76	.26	-.85***
Nagelkerke Adjusted R^2	.10	.14	.002	.11

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$

Table 8. Estimated Effects of Religious Attendance, Religious Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race, Residence, and Interactions on Vote/Intended Vote for Amendment One (Bivariate Logistic Regression)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Religious Attendance	.42*** (.09)	.48*** (.09)	.65*** (.13)	--	.49*** (.10)	.23 (.17)
Religious Affiliation						
Conservative Protestant	.97*** (.19)	.89*** (.20)	1.53** (.38)	--	--	.91*** (.20)
Age	--	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.01* (.01)	.01* (.01)	.01 (.01)
Gender (Male)						
Female	--	-.58** (.21)	-.61** (.21)	--	--	1.12** ** (.38)
Race (Other Race or Ethnicity)						
African American	--	-.57* (.27)	-.62* (.27)	--	--	-.60* (.27)
Education (Less than 4-Year College Degree)						
4-Year College Degree	--	-.39* (.19)	-.39* (.20)	--	--	-.42* (.20)
Residence (Urban)						
Rural	--	-.19 (.19)	-.18 (.19)	--	--	-.17 (.19)
Attendance X Affiliation	--	--	-.40* (.20)	--	--	-- --
Religious Attendance X Gender	--	--		--	--	.36 (.21)
Intercept	- .87***	-.76	-.99*	-.52	- 1.2***	-.35
Nagelkerke Adjusted R^2	.13	.18	.19	.01	.09	.19
N	525	525	525	546	546	525

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

On May 4th 2012, North Carolina residents passed the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban, which made same-sex marriage illegal at the state constitution level. The goal of the current study is to contribute the field of literature by examining the micro-level individual factors that impacted North Carolinians' voting behavior on Amendment One and facilitated the macro-level structural changes that occurred as a result of the amendment being added to the state constitution. This is one of the only, if not the only, study to use actual and intended voter feedback as compared to public opinion data or polling information to examine voter behavior on same-sex marriage bans. This provides the unique opportunity to examine voter behavior and intended behavior within the context of salient and recent legislative action. Specifically, this study examines the factors that impacted North Carolinian's vote on the Amendment, focusing on the distinct influence on religious affiliation and religious attendance have on voter behavior.

Religious Affiliation and Religious Attendance

The results of the study provide conclusive evidence that religious affiliation and attendance both impacted North Carolina residents' votes on Amendment One. First, residents who belong to conservative Protestant religious denominations are more likely to support the ban against same-sex marriage as compared to residents who are not affiliated with conservative Protestant religious denominations. Additionally, residents who attend religious services at least once a week are more likely to vote in support of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to residents who frequent religious services less often. These findings confirm the literature, addressing the role of religious factors in the outcome of same-sex marriage legislation, which utilizes public opinion polls and data, as well as polling information (Olson, Cadge, and Harrison

2006; Perry and Whitehead 2016; Sanchez, Nock, and Wright 2008; Sherkat, Powell-Williams, Maddox, and de Vries 2011; Todd and Ong 2012; Tranby and Zulkowski 2012).

Demographic Variables

Several demographic variables are also examined to identify how they impact the relationship between the religious variables and residents' vote on Amendment One. These variables include the residents' age, gender, racial background, educational attainment, and their place of residence (urban versus rural). Several of the hypotheses associated with these variables are confirmed through statistical analyses; however, there are also unanticipated findings. All of the findings are discussed below, beginning with residents' age.

Age. For this study, the relation between residents' ages and their votes on the same-sex marriage ban is very unexpected. Contrary to my hypothesis, residents' ages do not predict support for the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban among North Carolinians. This finding suggests that age may no longer be as influential as previously believed with regard to individuals' votes on legislation associated with gay rights and the LGBT community. It seems that we may be entering an era where age differences related to attitudes and beliefs about marriage equality are becoming less salient when it comes to actual voting practices. Specifically, younger individuals and older individuals no longer differ in their support for same-sex marriage ban, once alternative factors are considered. This finding confirms Pew (2014) research findings that indicate support for same-sex marriage has increased across both younger and older generations. It should be noted that respondents' ages are statistically significantly associated with their support for Amendment One at the bivariate level. Older respondents are more likely to support the same-sex marriage ban, as compared to younger respondents.

However, when controlling other factors, the relationship between age and support for Amendment One is no longer significant. These findings suggest that there is a more nuanced relationship between respondents' ages and their support for the ban. It appears that any differences by respondents' ages on support for the ban are driven by alternative factors like religion.

Gender. While the residents' ages are not predictive of support for the same-sex marriage ban among North Carolinians, gender is a salient factor in regard to residents' support for the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban. As hypothesized, men are more likely to vote in support the Amendment One same-sex marriage ban as compared to women once other factors are considered. This finding bolsters recent Pew (2014) polling results that women are more supportive of marriage equality as compared to men and suggests that the gender gap associated with support for marriage equality is present in North Carolinians. This gender gap is likely attributed to several factors. A primary factor associated with the gender difference in voting behavior on Amendment One among North Carolinians is likely the hetero-normative gender roles prescribed to men that form the foundation of American masculinity. For men, the act of voting in support of same-sex marriage may have negative consequences for one's perceived masculinity (Herek 2007, Herek 2010; Moskowitz, Rieger, and Roloff 2010). The threat to one's masculinity may prove to hold more weight than one's actual beliefs regarding bestowing equal right to same-sex couples. In this context, potential social consequences may influence the voting behavior of men, whereas the threat of said consequences is not an issue for women. Moreover, women may be more inclined to vote in support of rights for same-sex couples given the historical context of the oppression experienced by women within this country.

Education. The results of this study also indicate that residents' level of education is an important predictive factor when considering North Carolinians' support for Amendment One. Specifically, respondents who report having earned less than a four-year college degree are more likely to support the same-sex marriage ban as compared to respondents who did attain a four-year degree. This finding is consistent with previous literature examining the factors that impact voting behavior on same-sex ban legislation (Baunch 2012; Perry and Whitehead 2016; Sherkat et al. 2011). It is likely that respondents who attained a four-year degree were exposed to greater diversity in life practices that is associated with college and university life (Kozloski 2010). Perhaps, increased exposure to diverse lifestyles in an environment that fosters critical thinking also facilitates tolerance and acceptance among respondents that have a four-year degree. Within this context, it is likely that increased tolerance and acceptance of diverse lifestyles translated to decreased support for the same-sex marriage ban among college-educated North Carolina residents.

Race. The results regarding respondents' racial or ethnic backgrounds and their support for the same-sex marriage ban are contrary to what was originally hypothesized. I originally predicted that Black or African American respondents would be more likely to support Amendment One as compared to respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. In actuality, the results indicate that Black or African American respondents are less likely to support Amendment One as compared to respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. This is an extremely important finding, as much of the literature suggests that Blacks are less accepting of same-sex relationships and marriage (Pew 2014). In fact, some researchers go as far as to conclude that the passage of California's Proposition 8 same-sex marriage ban was driven by the Black community (Abrajano 2010).

The fact that Black respondents are less likely to support the same-sex marriage ban may lie in two distinctive characteristics associated with the Black community. The first of these characteristics is reflected in the past legislation that banned slaves from marrying each other and later laws that prohibited interracial marriage. These historical marriage prohibitions and other restrictive Jim Crow-era laws likely foster reluctance among Black residents regarding enacting marriage prohibitions into the State Constitution (Chapman, Leib, and Webster 2007). Next, the fact that a greater proportion of Blacks self-identify as members of the LGBT community as compared to Whites also likely increases support for same-sex marriage among Black respondents (Gates and Newport 2012). Given that a higher proportion of Blacks are out as members of the LGBT community means that members of the Black community have increased exposure to other LGBT people and same-sex relationships. Specifically, it could be this increased exposure to same-sex relationships that makes acceptance of same-sex marriage more prevalent among Black respondents.

Residence. In contrast, there is no difference in support for Amendment One between respondents residing in urban counties and those residing in rural counties. This finding contradicts the public opinion and polling literature on same-sex marriage bans (Sherkat et al., 2010). The fact that respondents' location of residence does not impact support for Amendment One is likely associated with two factors. First, the general increase of support for same-sex marriage among Americans in the past decade may very well translate into a decrease in the gap between urban and rural residents. For instance, Pew Research polling (2014) indicates that there has been a steady increase of support for same-sex marriage among Americans across domains of generational cohort, religious affiliation, political party, racial background, and gender. Next, differences in exposure to diverse lifestyles among urban and rural residents have

likely diminished in the current digital age, in which media access is ever present. Specifically, the significant increase in positively portrayed LGBT characters in mainstream media across domains of television, radio, music, movies, and the internet provides exposure to LGBT issues, such as the legalization of same-sex marriage, that are not dependent on physical location (Lee and Hicks 2011; and GLAAD 2014).

A key finding presented in this study relates to the relationship between respondents' religious affiliation, religious attendance, racial and ethnic background, and their support for the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban. Religion mediates the relationship between respondents' racial and ethnic background and their support for Amendment One. Specifically, outside of the context of religious factors, there are no racial or ethnic differences associated with support for the ban. However, when religion is considered, Black or African American respondents are less supportive of Amendment One as compared to respondents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. This finding contradicts much of the literature on the role of race and religion on support for same-sex marriage (Baunach 2012; Sherkat et al. 2010; Sherkat et al. 2011). Interestingly, literature cites the increased importance of religion in the Black community as the primary factor driving opposition to same-sex marriage among Blacks (Hine 2011). For the current study, this hypothesis does not hold true. Specifically, Black or African American respondents are less supportive of the same-sex marriage ban as compared to respondents of other racial or ethnic backgrounds, once controlling for religion.

The fact that religion mediates the relationship between race and support for Amendment One in the current study may potentially be attributed to a unique campaign that took place in North Carolina associated to the amendment. The North Carolina NAACP firmly campaigned against Amendment One, with the Chair of this organization, Rev. Dr. William J. Barber II,

holding public forums about the ban in churches across the state. The NAACP also launched an extensive media campaign that cited Amendment One as an insult to the civil rights movement and ploy to create division between Black and gay North Carolinians (North Carolina National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) 2012). As mentioned previously, the campaign urged Black voters to consider the ban from the standpoint of a civil rights issue rather than a moral beliefs issue (Brock 2012).

Mediated and Moderated Relationships

The results regarding the interaction between religious attendance and religious denomination on respondents' vote on Amendment One are consistent with what was originally predicted. Specifically, among respondents who belong to conservative Protestant denominations, as the level of reported religious attendance increases, so too does the likelihood of voting in support of the same-sex marriage ban. This finding is likely due to increased exposure to ideological teaching that homosexuality is a biblical sin across conservative Protestant denominations (Perry and Whitehead 2016). As a result, respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations who attend religious services more frequently are more likely to internalize negative messages about homosexuality and same-sex marriage. In the presence of a ballot aimed at banning same-sex marriage, respondents affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations who attend religious services more often may vote to ban same-sex marriage, as a way to fight against a perceived threat that undermines their value system.

Finally, the results of this study did not support two key hypotheses. First, respondents' reported level of religious attendance did not mediate the relationship between their ages and vote on Amendment One. I originally hypothesized that the relationship between respondents'

ages and vote on the same-sex marriage ban are tied to variations in religious attendance across the respondents' ages. However, this relationship is not driven by religion. There is more likely a generational affect, wherein older respondents supported the ban because of their generation rather than their religion (Becker 2012). Next, respondents' reported level of religious attendance did not moderate the relationship between respondents' gender and vote on the amendment. Men are more likely to support the ban, not because of their participation in religious service, but rather because of their lack of support for marriage equality (Moskowitz, Rieger, and Roloff 2010; Wellman and McCoy 2014). It should be noted that these statistically nonsignificant findings are likely attributed to the sample characteristics associated with the use of telephone survey that only contacted landline owners. Specifically, the fact that the sample was disproportionately female and disproportionately older might have impacted these findings.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Since the passage of the North Carolina Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage Ban in 2012, the political and social landscape has undergone substantial changes regarding the issue of same-sex marriage and gay rights. While Amendment One was overturned in 2014 and same-sex marriage bans were deemed unconstitutional at the federal level in 2015 by the U.S. Supreme Court, opposition to same-sex marriage and gay rights still exist. This is particularly the case for southern states, including North Carolina. For instance, in Kentucky, the county clerk, Kim Davies, decided to serve time in jail rather than sign marriage certificates for same-sex couples following the Supreme Court's verdict (Nicks 2015). Further, the Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice, Judge Roy S. Moore, was suspended after instructing fellow judges to defy the Supreme Court's legalization of same-sex marriage (Robertson 2016). Recently, North Carolina's General Assembly passed House Bill 2 (HB2), which reversed the city of Charlotte's ordinance that expanded legal protections for members of the LGBT community (Gordon, Price, and Peralta 2016). The passage of HB2, or the Bathroom Bill, on the surface prevents transgender people from using government-run bathrooms that match their gender identity (Gordon, Price, and Peralta 2016). However, this bill made it illegal for cities to expand upon laws pertaining to workforce discrimination, public accommodations, and the like (Gordon, Price, and Peralta 2016). While the North Carolina State Constitution lists classes of citizens who are protected against discrimination, it does not include protection against discrimination based upon citizens' sexual orientation (Gordon, Price, and Peralta 2016). Within this context, since North Carolinians do not have legal protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation, those who experience discrimination must take said cases to the federal Supreme Court level as legal recourse. These events are confusing as North Carolina is often considered progressive among the southern states and states within the "Bible Belt" (Guillory 2012). The

oppressive legislative action, which impacted the rights of marginalized groups, is contradictory to the state's progressive image.

The current study, which examines North Carolinians' religious participation and religious denomination in relation to their vote or intended vote on the Amendment One Same-Sex Marriage ban, highlights important demographic factors associated with the passage of the ban. Specifically, residents' rate of religious attendance and their religious denomination play a strong role in their support for Amendment One. Residents who attended church more often and were affiliated with conservative Protestant denominations were more likely to support Amendment One. Older residents, men, non-Black residents, and residents with lower educational attainment were also more likely to support Amendment One.

In considering LGBT rights and issues on a national level, it seems that with the federal legalization of same-sex marriage, the successful passage of other laws promoting discrimination against members of the LGBT community has increased. Scholars suggest that the recent political victories associated with LGBT rights are related to an outgrowth of counterproductive political backlash (Keck 2009). This seems to distinctly be the case with regard to the passage of North Carolina's HB2, as the bill was proposed as a counterattack to the city of Charlotte's adoption of legal protections to prevent against discrimination based on sexual orientation (Gordon, Price, and Peralta 2016).

In the current political climate, it seems that a new realm of discriminatory legislation, including religious freedom acts and bathroom bills, is aimed at limiting the rights of members of the LGBT community. The findings from this study may lend themselves well to understanding the adoption of these new laws. Future studies should consider the degree to which the factors

associated with residents' vote on same-sex marriage bans overlap with their support for other anti-gay legislation.

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(2): 177-206.
- Anzia, Sarah F. 2011. "Election Timing and the Electoral Influence of Interest Groups." *The Journal of Politics* 73: 412-427. doi:10.1017/S0022381611000028.
- Association of Religion Data Archives (ARDA). "Same-Sex Marriage." Retrieved June 26, 2013 (http://www.thearda.com/quickstats/qs_117.asp).
- Baunach, Dawn M. 2012. "Changing Same-Sex Marriage Attitudes in America from 1988 through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(2):364-378.
- Becker, Amy B. 2012. "Determinants of Public Support for Same-Sex Marriage: Generational Cohorts, Social Contact, and Shifting Attitudes." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 24(4):524-533.
- Block Jr, Ray and Richard Seltzer. 2012. "Understanding the Complex Influence of Religiosity on the Race Gap in Support for Proposition 8." *Review of European Studies* 4(4):84-94.
- Bramlett, Brittany H. 2012. "The Cross-Pressures of Religion and Contact with Gays and Lesbians, and their Impact on Same-Sex Marriage Opinion." *Politics & Policy* 40(1):13-42.
- Brock, Roslyn M. 2012. "Remarks from NAACP Press Conference on Marriage Equality." National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Retrieved November 1, 2016. (<https://donate.naACP.org/press/entry/remarks-from-naACP-press-conference-on-resolution-supporting-marriage-equal>).
- Brumbaugh, Stacey M., Laura A. Sanchez, Steven L. Nock and James D. Wright. 2008. "Attitudes Toward Gay Marriage in States Undergoing Marriage Law Transformation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(2):345-359.
- Burnett, Raymond C. and William M. Salka. 2009. "Determinants of Electoral Support for Anti-Gay Marriage Constitutional Amendments: An Examination of 2006 Votes on Ballot Measures in the States." *Journal of Homosexuality* 56(8):1071-1082.
- Bowser, Jennie D. 2012. "Social Issues Score Big: December 2012". *State Legislatures Magazine*, Retrieved June 15, 2013. (<http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/elections/social-issues-score-big-december-2012.aspx>).
- Cross, Ruth M. 2005. "Exploring Attitudes: The Case for Q Methodology." *Health Education Research* 20(2):206-213.

- Dugan, Kimberly B. 2004. "Strategy and 'Spin': Opposing Movement Frames in an Anti-Gay Voter Initiative." *Sociological Focus* 37(3):213-233 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20832236>).
- Dyck, Joshua J., and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2012. "The Conspiracy of Silence Context and Voting on Gay Marriage Ballot Measures." *Political Research Quarterly* 65(4):745-757.
- Egan, Patrick J., Nathaniel Persily, and Kevin Wallsten. 2008. "Gay Rights." *Public Opinion and Constitutional Controversy*: 234-266.
- ElHage, Alysse. 2011. "Countering the Deception: Responding to Allegations about the Marriage Protection Amendment." *North Carolina Family Policy Counsel*, pp. 1.
- Equality North Carolina (ENC). 2012. "The Truth About the Discriminatory, Job-Killing, Harmful, Family-Unfriendly, Divisive, Anti-LGBT Marriage Amendment."
- Finlay, Barbara and Carol S. Walther. 2003. "The Relation of Religious Affiliation, Service Attendance, and Other Factors to Homophobic Attitudes among University Students." *Review of Religious Research* 44(4):370-393 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3512216>).
- Fuist, Todd N., Laurie C. Stoll and Fred Kniss. 2012. "Beyond the Liberal-Conservative Divide: Assessing the Relationship between Religious Denominations and their Associated LGBT Organizations." *Qualitative Sociology* 35(1):65-87.
- GLAAD. 2014. "GLAAD – Where We Are on TV – 2014." Retrieved November 23, 2014 (<https://www.glaad.org/whereweareontv14>).
- Gordon, Michael, Mark S. Price, and Katie Peralta. 2016. "Understanding HB2: North Carolina's newest law solidifies state's role in defining discrimination." *The Charlotte Observer*, Retrieved September 1, 2016. (<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/politics-government/article68401147.html>).
- Guillory, Ferrel. 2012. "The South in Red and Purple: Southernized Republicans, Diverse Democrats." *Southern Cultures* 18(3):6-24.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 1999. "Morality Policy and Individual-Level Political Behavior; The Case of Legislative Voting on Lesbian and Gay Issues." *Policy Studies Journal* 27(4): 735-749.
- 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(2): 291-310.
- Herek, Gregory M. 2002. "Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Bisexual Men and Women in the United States." *Journal of Sex Research* 39:264-274.

- , 2006. "Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Relationships in the United States: A Social Science Perspective." *American Psychologist* 61(6):607-621.
- , 2007. "Confronting Sexual Stigma and Prejudice: Theory and Practice." *Journal of Social Issues* 63(4):905-925.
- , 2007. "Science, Public Policy, and Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Relationships." *American Psychologist* 62(7):713-715.
- , 2009. "Sexual Stigma and Sexual Prejudice in the United States: A Conceptual Framework." Pp. 65-111 in "*Contemporary Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identities*." Springer New York.
- Hines, Mark C. 2011. "Race, Religion, and the Voting Gap: An Analysis of Voter Choice on Same-Sex Marriage State Ballot Initiatives." Georgetown University.
- Hirsch-Hoefler, Sivan, Daphna Canetti, and Ami Pedahzur. 2010. "Two of a Kind? Voting Motivations for Populist Radical Right and Religious Fundamentalist Parties." *Electoral Studies* 29(4):678-690.
- Hume, Robert J. 2011. "Comparing Institutional and Policy Explanations for the Adoption of State Constitutional Amendments the Case of Same-Sex Marriage." *American Politics Research* 39(6):1097-1126.
- Johnson, Tyler. 2012. "Equality, Morality, and the Impact of Media Framing: Explaining Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage and Civil Unions." *Politics & Policy* 40(6):1053-1080.
- Kane, Melinda D. 2013. "LGBT Religious Activism: Predicting State Variations in the Number of Metropolitan Community Churches, 1974–2000." *Sociological Forum* 28(1): 135-158.
- Keck, Thomas M. 2009. "Beyond Backlash: Assessing the Impact of Judicial Decisions on LGBT Rights." *Law & Society Review* 43(1):151-186. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00370.x.
- Kempf, Angela M. and Patrick L. Remington. 2007. "New Challenges for Telephone Survey Research in the Twenty-First Century." *Annual Review of Public Health* 28:113-126.
- Kozloski, Michael J. 2010. "Homosexual Moral Acceptance and Social Tolerance: Are the Effects of Education Changing?" *Journal of Homosexuality* 57(10):1370-1383.
- Krosnick, Jon A., Penny S. Visser, and Joshua Harder. 2010. "The Psychological Underpinnings of Political Behavior." in *Handbook of Social Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi: 10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy002034.

- Lambda Legal. 2013. "After DOMA: What It Means for You; The Supreme Court Ruling on the Defense of Marriage Act: What it Means." Retrieved June 26, 2013 (<http://www.lambdalegal.org/publications/after-doma-summary>).
- Lambda Legal. 2012. "Marriage for Same-Sex Couples in California." Retrieved June 28, 2013 (<http://www.lambdalegal.org/publications/california-marriage-faq>).
- Lee, Tien-Tsung and Gary R. Hicks. 2011. "An Analysis of Factors Affecting Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage: Do the Media Matter?" *Journal of Homosexuality* 58(10):1391. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2011.614906.
- Lewis, Daniel and Matthew Jacobsmeier. 2012. "Testing Policy Responsiveness with Dynamic MRP Estimates: Direct Democracy and Gay Rights in the US." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association
- Lewis, Gregory B. 2005. "Same-Sex Marriage and the 2004 Presidential Election." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38(2):195-199.
- Lewis, Gregory B. and Seong S. Oh. 2008. "Public Opinion and State Action on Same-Sex Marriage." *State & Local Government Review*:42-53.
- Lewis, Gregory B. and Charles W. Gossett. 2008. "Changing Public Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage: The Case of California." *Politics & Policy* 36(1):4-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-1346.2007.00092.x.
- Loftus, Jeni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, 1973 to 1998." *American Sociological Review* 66(5):762-782.
- Lublin, David. 2005. "The Strengthening of Party and Decline of Religion in Explaining Congressional Voting Behavior on Gay and Lesbian Issues." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(02):241-245.
- Lupia, Arthur, Yanna Krupnikov, Adam S. Levine, Spencer Piston, and Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar. 2010. "Why State Constitutions Differ in their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage." *The Journal of Politics* 72(4):1222-1235.
- McAndrew, Siobhan and David Voas. 2011. *Measuring Religiosity Using Surveys: Survey Question Bank Topic Overview 4*.
- McKenzie, Brian D. and Stella M. Rouse. 2013. "Shades of Faith: Religious Foundations of Political Attitudes among African Americans, Latinos, and Whites." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(1):218-235.
- McVeigh, Rory and Maria-Elena D. Diaz. 2009. "Voting to Ban Same-Sex Marriage: Interests, Values, and Communities." *American Sociological Review* 74(6):891-915. doi: 10.1177/000312240907400603.

- Moskowitz, David A., Gerulf Rieger and Michael E. Roloff. 2010. "Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage." *Journal of Homosexuality* 57(2):325-336.
- National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). 2013. "Defining Marriage: Defense of Marriage Acts and Same-Sex Marriage Laws." Retrieved May 29, 2013. (<http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/human-services/same-sex-marriage-overview.aspx>).
- National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). 2014. "Same-Sex Marriage Laws." Retrieved May 30, 2014. (<http://www.ncsl.org/research/human-services/same-sex-marriage-laws.aspx>).
- Newton, David E. 2010. *Same-Sex Marriage: A Reference Handbook*. Abc-Clio Incorporated.
- Nicks, Denver. 2016. "How Kentucky Clerk Kim Davis Is Still Objecting to Same-Sex Marriage." *Time*, Retrieved November 9, 2016. (<http://time.com/4044279/kentucky-clerk-defiant-marriage/>).
- Olson, Laura R., Wendy Cadge and James T. Harrison. 2006. "Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 87(2):340-360. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2006.00384.x.
- Pampel, Fred C. 2000. *Logistic Regression: A Primer*. Sage. Thousand Oaks, California.
- Pew Research Center. 2012. *Religious Groups' Official Positions on Same-Sex Marriage*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved June 5, 2013. (<http://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/07/religious-groups-official-positions-on-same-sex-marriage/>).
- . 2014. *2014 U.S. Religious Landscape Study*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 28, 2016. (<http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>).
- . 2015. *Same-Sex Marriage, State by State*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved November 28, 2016. (<http://www.pewforum.org/2015/06/26/same-sex-marriage-state-by-state/>).
- 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?: RELIGION AND SAME-SEX PRACTICES." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 55(3):637-651.
- Pickler, Jennifer A. 2009. "Factors Contributing to Increased Support for State Constitutional Amendments Banning Same-Sex Marriage within the Fifty United States." Texas State University.
- Robertson, Campbell. 2016. "Roy Moore, Alabama Chief Justice, Suspended Over Gay Marriage Order." New York: *New York Times* (Online), Retrieved September 30, 2016. (<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/01/us/roy-moore-alabama-chief-justice.html?partner=bloomberg>).

- Rutchick, Abraham M. 2010. "Deus Ex Machina: The Influence of Polling Place on Voting Behavior." *Political Psychology* 31(2):209-225.
- Saad, Lydia. 2013. "In U.S., 52% Back Law to Legalize Gay Marriage in 50 States." Gallup Politics, July 29. Retrieved August 1, 2013 (<http://www.gallup.com/poll/163730/back-law-legalize-gay-marriage-states.aspx>)
- Salka, William M. and Raymond C. Burnett. 2012. "Determinants of Electoral Support for Anti-Gay Marriage Constitutional Amendments: An Examination of Ballot Issues in California and Florida." *Sexuality & Culture* 16(1):59-75.
- Scheitle, Christopher P. and Bryanna B. Hahn. 2011. "From the Pews to Policy: Specifying Evangelical Protestantism's Influence on States' Sexual Orientation Policies." *Social Forces* 89(3):913-933.
- Schwartz, Shalom H., Gian V. Caprara and Michele Vecchione. 2010. "Basic Personal Values, Core Political Values, and Voting: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Political Psychology* 31.3 (2010): 421-452. Basic Personal Values, Core Political Values, and Voting: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Political Psychology* 31(3):421-452.
- Sherkat, Darren E., Kylan M. De Vries and Stacia Creek. 2010. "Race, Religion, and Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage*." *Social Science Quarterly* 91(1):80-98. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00682.x.
- Sherkat, Darren E., Melissa Powell-Williams, Gregory Maddox, and Kylan M. de Vries. 2011. "Religion, Politics, and Support for Same-Sex Marriage in the United States, 1988–2008." *Social Science Research* 40(1):167-180. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.009.
- Smith, Daniel A., Matthew DeSantis, and Jason Kassel. 2006. "Same-Sex Marriage Ballot Measures and the 2004 Presidential Election." *State & Local Government Review*:78-91.
- Soule, Sarah A. 2004. "Going to the Chapel? Same-sex Marriage Bans in the United States, 1973-2000." *Social Problems* 51(4): 453-477.
- Swank, Eric, Breanne Fahs, and David M. Frost. 2013. "Region, Social Identities, and Disclosure Practices as Predictors of Heterosexist Discrimination Against Sexual Minorities in the United States." *Sociological Inquiry* 83(2):238-258. doi: 10.1111/soin.12004.
- 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(1):56.
- Tranby, Eric and Samatha E. Zulkowski. 2012. "Religion as Cultural Power: The Role of Religion in Influencing Americans' Symbolic Boundaries Around Gender and Sexuality." *Sociology Compass* 6(11):870-882.

- Wald, Kenneth D., James W. Button, and Barbara A. Rienzo. 1996. "The Politics of Gay Rights in American Communities: Explaining Antidiscrimination Ordinances and Policies." *American Journal of Political Science*:1152-1178.
- Wellman, Joseph D. and Shannon McCoy. 2014. "Walking the Straight and Narrow: Examining the Role of Traditional Gender Norms in Sexual Prejudice." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 15(2):181-190. doi: 10.1037/a0031943.
- 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(1):63 (<http://search.proquest.com/docview/880198610?accountid=10639>).
- Whitehead, Andrew L., and Joseph O. Baker. 2012. "Homosexuality, Religion, and Science: Moral Authority and the Persistence of Negative Attitudes." *Sociological Inquiry* 82(4): 487-509.
- Wolff, Joshua R., Heather L. Himes, Ellen M. Kwon, and Richard A. Bollinger. 2012. "Evangelical Christian College Students and Attitudes Toward Gay Rights: A California University Sample." *Journal of LGBT Youth* 9(3):200-224.
- Woodhead, Linda. 2011. "Five Concepts of Religion." *International Review of Sociology—Revue Internationale De Sociologie* 21(1):121-143.
- Yang, Alan S. 1997. "The Polls--Trends." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(3):477-507 (<http://search.proquest.com/docview/214745763?accountid=10639>).
- , 1997. "Trends: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(3):477-507 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2749583>).

APPENDIX: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD EXEMPTION CERTIFICATION

From: Van Willigen, Marieke
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2012 12:38 PM
To: Powers, Rebecca; Edwards, Bob; Wilson, Ken; Kane, Melinda; Pearce, Susan
Subject: FW: Study Correspondence Letter
We're a go from the IRB.
Marieke

From: umcirb@ecu.edu [mailto:umcirb@ecu.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2012 12:37 PM
To: Van Willigen, Marieke
Subject: IRB: Study Correspondence Letter



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
4N-70 Brody Medical Sciences Building · Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 · Fax 252-744-2284 · www.ecu.edu/irb

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: [Marieke Van Willigen](#)
CC:
Date: 5/11/2012
Re: [UMCIRB 12-000968](#)
2012 Sociology/Sustainable Tourism Survey

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 5/11/2012. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category #2.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession. This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days. The UMCIRB office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period. The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418
IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418 IRB00004973
East Carolina U IRB #4 (Behavioral/SS Summer) IORG0000418

From: Van Willigen, Marieke
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2012 7:24 PM
To: Pearce, Susan

