Citation: Coley, Jonathan S. 2017. "Reconciling Religion and LGBT Rights: Christian Universities, Theological Orientations, and LGBT Inclusion." *Social Currents* 4(1): 87-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496516651639>

RECONCILING RELIGION AND LGBT RIGHTS: CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES, THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS, AND LGBT INCLUSION

Jonathan S. Coley

Monmouth College

jcoley@monmouthcollege.edu

ABSTRACT

Why do some Christian colleges and universities approve LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies while others resist them? Scholars are beginning to develop models to explain LGBT inclusion in schools, but they have undertheorized the role of religion in facilitating or impeding LGBT inclusion. In this article, I draw from literature on religion and the "culture wars," especially insights on religions' *theological orientations*, to explain Christian colleges and universities' inclusion of LGBT students. I show that *communal orientations* – theological emphases on social justice – strongly predict the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at Christian colleges and universities. By contrast, *individualist orientations* – theological emphases on personal piety – impede the adoption of such groups and policies. Importantly, I find

little support for alternative explanations of Christian colleges and universities' inclusion of LGBT students that focus on liberal or conservative teachings on same-sex relationships. Beyond bridging literatures on the political sociology of LGBT rights and religion and the culture wars, the article supports an emerging theoretical framework for understanding the role of religion in a wide range of social justice debates.

Keywords: religion, sexualities, social movements, education, culture wars, LGBT rights

RECONCILING RELIGION AND LGBT RIGHTS: CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES, THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS, AND LGBT INCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Given rapid advances by the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) movement in the United States, Christians are increasingly grappling with questions about the morality of same-sex relationships and the inclusion of LGBT individuals as members and clergy (Fuist, Stoll, and Kniss 2012). While most Christian denominations continue to condemn same-sex relationships, and while public opinion polling shows that most Christians continue to disapprove of same-sex marriage (Public Religion Research Institute 2014), several mainline Protestant denominations have recently decided to accept LGBT members and allow clergy to officiate same-sex weddings (Human Rights Campaign 2015). Furthermore, the Roman Catholic Church has changed its tone, if not its teachings, on LGBT issues (Donadio 2013).

The increasing openness of some Christians to LGBT rights is especially apparent in the changes taking place at Christian colleges and universities across the U.S. In line with rapid demographic changes that have made young people (ages 18-29) highly supportive of LGBT rights (Public Religion Research Institute 2014), students at a growing number of religiously-affiliated schools have petitioned administrators to recognize LGBT groups and adopt non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation (e.g., Coley 2014; McEntarfer 2011). While some schools continue to oppose

such groups and policies, an increasing number of Christian colleges and universities have now approved them.

Why do some Christian colleges and universities in the U.S. support LGBT groups and inclusive non-discrimination policies while other Christian colleges and universities resist them? Scholarship on LGBT-inclusive schools has shown that schools' institutional characteristics, student body characteristics, and socio-political contexts play a role in the adoption of LGBT groups (Fetner and Kush 2008; Fine 2012; Kane 2013a). However, scholarly literature on the adoption of inclusive non-discrimination statements is sparse. Furthermore, scholars have said little about the potential role of religion in facilitating or impeding the spread of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, other than to point out that religious schools are less inclusive of LGBT students – a finding that does little to explain variation among religious schools.

The large literature on religion and the “culture wars” would seem to offer insights into Christian colleges and universities' adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements (e.g., Wuthnow 1988, 1989). This literature suggests that the *liberal* or *conservative teachings* of Christian colleges and universities' associated religious traditions might explain schools' positions on LGBT rights – specifically, Christian colleges and universities associated with religious traditions that approve of same-sex relationships might be expected to support LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, while Christian schools associated with religious traditions that view same-sex relationships as “sinful” would be expected to resist them. While such an answer is intuitive, I find that most Christian colleges and universities that support LGBT

groups and non-discrimination policies are associated with religious traditions that view same-sex relationships as “sinful.”

In this article, I focus on issues surrounding LGBT inclusion at Christian colleges and universities as a way to both enlarge scholars’ understanding on LGBT-inclusive schools and reconsider the role of religion in the “culture wars.” To theorize why some Christian colleges and universities support LGBT rights while other Christian schools resist them, I turn to recent insights on *individualist* and *communal theological orientations* (e.g., Kniss 2003; Fuist et al. 2012). Some religious traditions have historically exhibited individualist orientations, focusing most of their teachings on personal piety and morality. Other religious traditions exhibit communal orientations; though not neglecting issues of personal piety and morality, they tend to emphasize social justice. These individualist and communal orientations might explain variations in Christian colleges and universities’ support for LGBT rights, such that Christian colleges and universities associated with religious traditions that exhibit communal orientations will support LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation, even when controlling for these religious traditions’ teachings on the morality of same-sex relationships. I assess this explanation by analyzing a unique database of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies across Christian colleges and universities in the U.S. I find significant support for the role of individualist and communal theological orientations, especially as measured by a school’s religious affiliation and the interaction between a school’s religious affiliation and its percent of religion majors, in the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements at Christian colleges

and universities. I find much less support for the idea that liberal or conservative teachings on same-sex relationships explain schools' inclusion of LGBT students.

The article makes several contributions. First, the article bridges literatures on (a) the political sociology of LGBT rights (especially research on LGBT-inclusive schools) and (b) religion and the “culture wars,” literatures that have remained oddly separate despite the salience of religion in debates over LGBT rights. Specifically, I demonstrate the crucial role of religion in the adoption of LGBT groups and inclusive non-discrimination statements in schools, and I show how the case of LGBT rights complicates existing understandings of the role of religion in social change. Second, I make an empirical contribution by analyzing unique data on the presence of LGBT groups and inclusive non-discrimination statements in schools, contributing the first study of LGBT group presence at colleges and universities beyond a single state and the first study of inclusive non-discrimination statements in U.S. schools. Third, I find support for an emerging theoretical framework on theological orientations that might be generalized to a wide range of social justice debates (beyond LGBT rights) taking place in a wide range of settings (beyond Christian schools). Finally, for those seeking to make their campuses more inclusive of LGBT students, I identify stakeholders (religion and theology students, administrators, persons of faith in surrounding communities) whom students may need to mobilize or convince in that process. I expand on these contributions below, but first I review research on LGBT-inclusive schools and the “culture wars,” derive hypotheses for Christian colleges and universities' inclusion of LGBT students, discuss my data and analytic approach, and present my findings.

PREVIOUS LITERATURE ON SCHOOL APPROVAL OF LGBT GROUPS AND NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Although Americans increasingly express support for LGBT civil rights, tolerance for certain informal privileges, such as the ability to be public about one's sexuality, continues to lag behind support for formal civil rights (Long, Loehr, and Miller 2014). Indeed, on secular and religious campuses alike, LGBT students continue to face problems such as bullying and harassment in schools (e.g., Rankin et al. 2011). Furthermore, students at religious universities often lack the formal rights enjoyed by students at secular schools. Specifically, many Christian colleges and universities have obtained formal waivers from non-discrimination laws (Anderson 2015) and have implemented formal bans on "homosexual acts" (Barton 2014: ch. 3; Coley 2014).

In an effort to challenge anti-LGBT sentiments and behaviors, and in an attempt to overturn policies that discriminate against LGBT people, students have petitioned schools across the U.S. to approve LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation (Fetner and Kush 2008; Kane 2013a; Miceli 2005). Past studies show that LGBT groups have a positive impact on students' health, academic achievement, and safety (e.g., Heck, Flentje, and Cochran 2011; Toomey et al. 2011; Walls, Kane, and Wisneski 2010); non-discrimination policies not only protect students' right to form such groups, but also add a layer of protection from discrimination and harassment on campuses. Given the potential for LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements to foster more inclusive environments, it would seem important to understand

why schools adopt such groups and policies in the first place, especially on Christian campuses where LGBT students are arguably most vulnerable. Surprisingly, few scholars have examined the characteristics of LGBT-inclusive schools, but articles by Fetner and Kush (2008) on the emergence of Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) in U.S. high schools, Fine (2012) on the presence of LGBT resource centers in U.S. colleges and universities, and Kane (2013a) on the presence of GSAs at North Carolina colleges and universities offer a few plausible explanations that may extend to the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at Christian colleges and universities.

Institutional characteristics. One explanation for schools' inclusion of LGBT students centers on characteristics of schools themselves. Drawing on resource mobilization theory in social movement studies, studies argue that "communities with more resources—including economic assets, human resources, knowledge, and allies—will be more successful at creating organizations" (Kane 2013a, 834). For example, scholars have argued that schools with higher endowments will be more likely to approve LGBT groups because they have more financial resources to support them (Kane 2013a). Similarly, scholars have argued that more selective schools will be more likely to adopt LGBT groups, in part because they draw liberal faculty and thus potentially attract more allies (Kane 2013a). In her test of this theory, Kane (2013a) demonstrates the positive, significant impact of school endowment and selectivity in the approval of GSAs. Puzzlingly, however, Fine (2012) shows that selectivity is negatively correlated with LGBT centers, and endowment is not a significant predictor of LGBT centers.

Student body characteristics. Another explanation suggests that student body characteristics are associated with LGBT inclusion in schools. Drawing again on resource mobilization theory, researchers have theorized that schools with larger student bodies (i.e., schools with more human resources), schools with fewer male students or students of color (i.e., given trends in public opinion polling, schools with a greater number of allies), and schools with fewer low-income students (i.e., schools with more financial resources) will be more likely to approve LGBT groups. This explanation is partially supported by past studies: Fetner and Kush (2008) and Fine (2012) find that student body size is positively correlated with adoption of GSAs or LGBT centers. Furthermore, Fetner and Kush (2008) and Kane (2013a) find that the number of students eligible for free lunches or the number of students receiving loans is negatively correlated with adoption of GSAs. However, these studies find either no effect or inconsistent effects for the racial and gender composition of student bodies on adoption of GSAs or LGBT centers.

Socio-political context. A final theory suggests that the social and political context in which schools are embedded affects the adoption of LGBT groups. Drawing especially on political opportunity theory in social movement studies, which suggests that movements for social change are more likely to succeed in contexts that are favorable to their cause, scholars have argued that presence in liberal states, presence in the non-south, and presence in non-rural areas will be associated with approval of LGBT groups, because residents in these areas tend to express higher approval of LGBT rights. Some support exists for this theory: Fetner and Kush (2008) find that high schools in states with non-discrimination statements and high schools outside the south or rural areas are more

likely to adopt GSAs. Similarly, Fine (2012) finds that colleges in states that voted for John Kerry and that are located outside the south are more likely to have LGBT centers. However, neither Fine (2012) nor Kane (2013a) finds any support for the role of location in a suburban or urban area in their studies of LGBT groups or centers at colleges.

Summary and critique. Drawing especially from resource mobilization and political opportunity theories, past studies identify a range of institutional, student body, and socio-political characteristics associated with LGBT-inclusive schools, and I include nearly all of those variables in this study. I expect, with regard to institutional characteristics, that schools with higher endowments and lower acceptance rates will be more supportive of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies. I also expect, in line with theorizing on student body characteristics, that schools with more students, fewer men, fewer minorities, and fewer students on loans will tend to be more supportive of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies. Finally, with regard to socio-political context, I expect that schools in Democratic-leaning states, non-southern states, and non-rural areas will be more likely to adopt LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies.

However, while these theories of LGBT-inclusive schools would seem to explain some of the variation in LGBT groups at Christian colleges and universities, none of these studies specifically assess the adoption of non-discrimination policies, meaning that tests of the potential effects of institutional, student body, and socio-political characteristics on the adoption of non-discrimination policies are still necessary. Furthermore, studies are surprisingly weak in explaining the possible role of religion in school adoption of LGBT-inclusive policies – a salient “cultural” factor in debates over

LGBT rights. Fetner and Kush (2008) and Fine (2012) do not include any variables related to religion in their studies. Kane (2013a) does include a variable for religious vs. nonreligious affiliation and finds that religious affiliation is negatively correlated with adoption of LGBT groups, but this variable does not help explain variation in the adoption of LGBT groups among religious schools. I thus now consider potential insights from the broader literature on religion and the “culture wars.”

THEORIZING THE ROLE OF RELIGION IN SCHOOL APPROVAL OF LGBT GROUPS AND NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

Although past literature has failed to interrogate the role of religion in school approval of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, literature on religion and the “culture wars” provides potential insights into why some Christian colleges and universities might be inclusive of LGBT students while others are not. Explaining divisions both between and within religious groups over a full range of social issues (including LGBT rights), scholars most commonly point to *conservative* and *liberal* religious beliefs. For example, Wuthnow (1988, 1989) argues that Christians in the U.S. who hold conservative religious beliefs (evangelicals, fundamentalists, and traditionalists) – those who express a belief in the authority of church leaders and/or scriptures – are more likely to oppose abortion rights, no-fault divorce laws, and LGBT rights and thus align with the Republican Party. Christians who hold liberal religious beliefs – those who adhere to a modernist reading of the scriptures – tend to espouse progressive social beliefs and align with the Democratic Party (see also Hunter’s [1991] discussion of orthodox and progressive camps).

A large body of research certainly supports the idea that Christians are divided along conservative and liberal lines, including through close alignment with the conservative political party (the Republican Party) and, to a lesser extent, the liberal political party (the Democratic Party) in the U.S. For example, Wilcox (1991) recounts the “Moral Majority” campaign launched by many “religious right” groups (especially evangelicals) in the late 1970s through the 1980s to promote Republican candidates who supported traditional views of family life. Focusing on LGBT rights, Fetner (2008) discusses the alliance between “religious right” groups and Republicans to support ballot initiatives that would roll back non-discrimination ordinances in the 1970s and 1980s.

Although these scholarly accounts of conservative and liberal divides within religion correspond to the conventional wisdom of a split between conservatives and liberals in the U.S. more broadly, some scholars have recently questioned whether persons of faith can be so easily placed into liberal and conservative camps. For example, Kniss (2003) urges attention to *individualist* and *communal* theological orientations within religion.¹ Some religious traditions adopt individualist orientations, believing that churches should focus on reforming individuals, such as by opposing practices (including homosexuality) that threaten their moral purity. Other religious traditions exhibit communal orientations, holding that churches should focus on reforming wider communities, including by bringing about a more socially and economically just society.

While not all studies employ this language of individualist and communal orientations, and while few studies link such orientations to positions on LGBT rights specifically, many studies do support the idea that religions’ emphases on personal piety

versus social justice predict their stances on various social debates. In an early article on the role of religion in civil rights debates, for example, Marx (1967) shows that African-Americans in individualist denominations, which seek to “solace the individual” and “divert concern away from efforts at collective social change,” were unlikely to support nonviolent protests in support of civil rights (67). However, individuals in denominations that followed a “social gospel” (or communal) tradition, which focus not only on what Martin Luther King, Jr., called the “souls of men” but also “the social conditions that cripple them” (quoted in Marx 1978:71), often supported civil rights protests. More recent research on the black church has distinguished between individualist or “priestly” functions of religion (such as attendance to “spiritual/religious needs of members”) and communal or “prophetic” functions of religion (such as the promotion of community empowerment), showing that black churches specializing in communal functions are more involved in providing social services than black churches specializing in individualist functions (Barnes 2004). Finally, Emerson and Smith (2000) argue that an individualist theology leads U.S. evangelicals to combine their socially conservative beliefs with an opposition to policies addressing economic and racial inequalities, although Bean (2014) adds that in countries with more communalistic and solidaristic cultures like Canada, evangelicals combine their social conservatism with support for redistributive social policies.

Social movement research also suggests a strong link between communal orientations and support for social justice. Specifically, social movement scholarship has documented strong support for social movements among communal religious traditions,

including black Protestant churches and colleges (e.g., work on the civil rights movement by Isaac et al. 2012; Morris 1986; Williams 2002), mainline Protestant denominations (e.g., work on LGBT movements by White 2015 and on peace and economic justice movements by Snarr 2011; Wood 2002; Wuthnow and Evans 2002), and the Catholic Church (e.g., other work on peace and economic justice movements by Smith 1991; Nepstad 2004; Palacios 2007). In comparison, mobilization within individualist religious traditions, such as evangelical Protestant denominations, has mostly been limited to issues of personal piety (e.g., Williams 2002; Williams and Blackburn 1996).

To acknowledge that individualist and communal orientations divide religious groups is not to argue that conservative or liberal readings of scriptures do not also matter. However, it does call into question the presupposition that religious traditions guided by conservative or liberal teachings on scriptures will necessarily seek to impose those teachings on their wider communities. Rather, thinking about how conservative versus liberal teachings intersect with individualist versus communal orientations makes it possible to imagine how those who read scriptures as condemning certain moral practices might still tolerate those practices in their wider communities in the interest of ensuring universal “rights.” There is evidence to support such a phenomenon; for example, denominations such as the United Methodist Church have adopted resolutions advocating for the Employment Non-Discrimination Act even as they condemn same-sex relationships as “sinful” (Human Rights Campaign 2015).

In this study, I advance the notion that individualist or communal orientations of various religious traditions, rather than conservative or liberal teachings on LGBT issues,

will explain Christian colleges and universities' adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies. Specifically, while many Christian colleges and universities are affiliated with religious traditions that condemn homosexuality (e.g., black Protestant schools, Catholic schools, and some mainline Protestant schools), I expect that certain traditions' history of social justice teachings will lead schools to support the rights of all students, LGBT students included. Conversely, other Christian colleges and universities' association with religious traditions that have historically focused on individual morality (e.g., evangelical Protestant schools and non-denominational schools) will lead them to oppose LGBT rights. Importantly, I measure schools' theological orientations at the institutional, student body, and socio-political levels, such that I not only extend previous literature on LGBT groups in schools, but I also provide theoretical robustness checks for the arguments in this article.

Religion and institutional characteristics. I first examine whether formal affiliation with individualist or communal religious traditions is associated with the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at Christian colleges and universities. In many cases, denominations not only provide money to fund Christian colleges and universities' operations, but also place their members on these schools' boards of trust; thus, they often exert substantial influence on the policies of these schools. Given the theory that religious traditions with individualist orientations will be less receptive to LGBT rights, I expect that schools belonging to such traditions will be less inclusive of LGBT students:

Hypothesis 1. Affiliation with religious traditions exhibiting individualist orientations will be negatively associated with the existence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation.

Religion and student body characteristics. I next assess the possibility that the percent of religion and theology majors at a school is linked to the presence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at Christian colleges and universities. Students actively participate in campus debates over LGBT rights by voicing their opinions in student newspapers and voting on student groups and campus policies through their student governments (e.g., Coley 2014). When campuses are home to high percentages of religion and theology majors, campus debates may be skewed against LGBT rights, perhaps because students in religion and theology majors are less exposed to social justice issues, and/or perhaps because colleges specializing in religious and theological studies (e.g., “Bible colleges”) are more likely to be associated with individualist traditions that shelter students from worldly concerns (e.g., Ringenberg 2006, ch. 5). I thus provide the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a. A higher percent of religion and theology majors will be negatively associated with the existence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation.

To explicitly test the idea that that schools with high percentages of religion majors will oppose LGBT inclusion particularly because of their frequent affiliation with individualist religious traditions that shelter students from worldly concerns, I include an interaction term containing both affiliation with an individualist religious tradition and

percent of religion students, which I expect to be negatively associated with the presence of LGBT groups and inclusive non-discrimination policies:

Hypothesis 2b. The interaction between affiliation with religious traditions exhibiting individualist theological orientations and the percent of religion and theology majors will be negatively associated with the existence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation.

Religion and socio-political context. Finally, I assess whether the religious composition of a Christian college or university's state is linked to the presence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies. Christian colleges and universities (all of which are private) rely on financial support from residents and churches in their communities; residents also contribute to debates over LGBT rights on Christian campuses by voicing their opinions in the media (e.g., Barton 2014; Coley 2014). The religious composition of a state may also have an indirect effect on campuses' inclusivity of LGBT students, because students looking to form an LGBT group will often consider how welcoming the surrounding community is toward LGBT students. Thus, a higher percent of state residents belonging to individualist religious traditions might indicate religious campuses' opposition to LGBT rights. I thus propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3. A higher percent of state residents who are members of religious traditions exhibiting individualist orientations will be negatively associated with the existence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation.

DATA AND METHODS

Population of Interest

To examine Christian colleges and universities' inclusion of LGBT students, I generated a list of Christian colleges and universities in the U.S. using the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS 2014).² I adopted an inclusive definition of "Christian," comprising any sects or denominations that self-identify as Christian and/or emerged out of Christian theological traditions. Importantly, the list of Christian colleges and universities includes only those schools that currently maintain religious ties; it does not include colleges and universities that historically associated themselves with Christian denominations but have since broken off their ties. The list is also limited to those schools that offer undergraduate programs and thus excludes schools that only provide post-graduate degrees (e.g., in divinity or medicine). The final list includes 682 schools.

Dependent Variables

To assess the degree to which Christian colleges and universities are inclusive of LGBT students, I employ two dependent variables: (1) the presence of LGBT groups and (2) the presence of non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation. For the first dependent variable, I gathered data on which Christian colleges and universities had officially recognized LGBT groups as of summer 2013. Specifically, I visited each school's website, located their student organizations page, and identified GSAs or other clubs related to sexual identity. If an LGBT group was not listed on the student

organizations page, I conducted searches on Google using the school's name and then search terms such as "Gay-Straight Alliance," "Gay," and "LGBT." If these searches brought me to documentation that a school had an officially-recognized LGBT group, I recorded a "1" for the variable; if these searches yielded no positive evidence that a school had an officially recognized Gay-Straight Alliance, I recorded a "0." Overall, 307 of the 682 schools (about 45%) contained officially-recognized LGBT groups.

For my second dependent variable, I gathered data on which Christian colleges and universities had adopted non-discrimination statements inclusive of "sexual orientation" (or related terms such as "sexual preference"). Specifically, in each school's most recent student handbook, I searched for terms such as "discrimination," "non-discrimination," and "sexual." If a non-discrimination statement was not included in the student handbook, or if the non-discrimination statements were not inclusive of "sexual orientation," I conducted searches on Google using the schools' names and the aforementioned terms, which often brought me to admissions pages that listed the schools' non-discrimination policies. If I found evidence that the school had a non-discrimination statement inclusive of "sexual orientation," I recorded a "1"; otherwise, I recorded a "0." Overall, 375 of the 682 schools (about 55%) contained non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation.³

Independent Variables

To measure religious characteristics of Christian colleges and universities that might predict LGBT inclusion, I first include an institutional context variable indicating the

individualist or communal orientation of each school's associated religious tradition. To construct this variable, I first obtained information on religious affiliation from IPEDS (2014). I then coded these data according to classifications by Fuist et al. (2012). These authors label black Protestant denominations (e.g., National Baptist Convention and African Methodist Episcopal Church), mainline Protestant denominations (e.g., Disciples of Christ, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Presbyterian Church USA, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist Church), and the Roman Catholic Church as exhibiting communal orientations. By contrast, they consider evangelical Protestant denominations (e.g., Assemblies of God, Churches of Christ, Church of the Nazarene, Presbyterian Church in America, and Southern Baptist Convention) to possess individualist orientations. The Fuist et al. (2012) study does not explicitly consider non-denominational Protestant churches, but I code these as also exhibiting individualist orientations, as their doctrines generally align with evangelical Protestant denominations.

I next include a variable capturing a religious aspect of each school's student body – specifically, the percent of religion majors on campus. I constructed this variable by dividing the total number of religion and theology majors by the total number of degrees conferred during the 2012-2013 academic year at each school, using information from each college's listing on IPEDS (2014).⁴

Finally, to capture a religious aspect of a school's socio-political context, I include a variable indicating the percent of residents in each state that belong to individualist or communal churches. Specifically, I obtained information on a school's

location from IPEDS (2014) before gathering corresponding state-level church membership data from the ASARB's Association of Religious Data Archives (2015). These archives report the number of residents belonging to "Evangelical Protestant" (including non-denominational) churches – a category that overlaps with the individualist category – that I then divided by the total state population.

The variables listed above allow me to test the theory that individualist or communal orientations predict schools' opposition to or support of LGBT groups and inclusive non-discrimination policies. However, to measure an important alternative explanation – that conservative versus liberal teachings predict schools' opposition to or support of LGBT rights – I include a variable indicating whether each school's associated religious tradition considers same-sex relationships to be "sinful," drawing on information from the Human Rights Campaign's (2015) faith statement database. Schools affiliated with religious traditions that consider same-sex relationships to be "sinful" were coded as "conservative" ("1"), and schools affiliated with religious traditions that do not consider same-sex relationships to be "sinful" were coded as "liberal" ("0").

Control Variables

I also include control variables at the institutional, student body, and socio-political levels, as contained in past studies on LGBT groups in schools (Fetner and Kush 2008; Fine 2012; Kane 2013a). For measures of each school's institutional context, I include variables on school selectivity and endowment, drawing on information on the IPEDS (2014) website about the percent of students accepted to the school during the 2012-2013

admissions cycle, as well as information from FindTheBest (2014) on endowment per student (IPEDS does not provide data on endowment).

For measures of student body characteristics, I include variables for the number of students at the school, the percent of non-white students at the school, the percent of women at the school, and the percent of students on loans. Each of these variables draws on IPEDS' (2014) data from the 2012-2013 school year, with the exception of the percent of students on loans, which is based on data from the 2011-2012 school year (the most current year available).

Finally, for measures of each school's socio-political context, I include a variable on a state's percent vote for President Obama in the 2012 election cycle, as well as a dichotomous variable indicating each school's location in the south vs. non-south (using the U.S. Bureau of the Census' classification of southern states). Finally, I draw on IPEDS' (2014) classifications on the type of area in which a school is located for a dichotomous variable on rurality.

Analytic Strategy

To assess predictors of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at Christian colleges and universities, I provide both descriptive statistics and results from multivariate logistic regressions. The descriptive statistics compare schools with LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies to schools without such groups or policies in terms of each of the independent variables related to theological orientations (but not holding any other variables constant). I indicate statistically significant differences

between schools with LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies and schools without such groups and policies using chi-square tests (for tests of proportions) and t-tests (for tests of means). The multivariate logistic regression analyses provide the logged odds of a Christian college or university having an LGBT group and a non-discrimination policy inclusive of sexual orientation. I standardized the variables in the logistic regression analyses, such that the coefficients measure the change in predicted probabilities associated with a one-standard deviation change in the predictor variables. Furthermore, because intraclass correlation (ICC) coefficients indicate that a significant proportion of the total variance in LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies is explained by clustering within religious traditions (but not states), I employ cluster robust standard errors (by religious tradition).⁵

RESULTS

Bivariate Analyses

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics comparing schools with LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies to schools without such groups and policies. The results show clear patterns in terms of schools' association with individualist religious traditions. Specifically, whereas most schools without LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies are associated with individualist religious traditions, only a small minority of schools that approve LGBT groups (under 5%) or non-discrimination policies (around 7%) are affiliated with individualist religious traditions. These findings support Hypothesis 1. The results also reveal clear patterns in terms of the percent of religious

majors at a school. Whereas a significant minority of students at schools without LGBT groups (around 21%) and non-discrimination statements (around 24%) major in religion or theology, fewer than 2% of students at schools that have approved LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements major in religion or theology, supporting Hypothesis 2a (Hypothesis 2b is not assessed in this table). Finally, schools without LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements are located in states with a higher percent of adherents to individualist religious traditions (21-22%) compared to schools with such groups and policies (16-18%), providing support for Hypothesis 3.

-- Table 1 Here --

Logistic Regression Analyses

Table 2 displays the results of the logistic regression analyses for the presence of LGBT groups. Model 1 represents a base model that excludes the primary religion variables of interest; the measure of model fit (Nagelkerke) is around 0.31. The remaining models introduce the religion variables seriatim. Model 2 shows that affiliation with an individualist religious tradition significantly and negatively impacts the presence of LGBT groups, in line with Hypothesis 1. Furthermore, Model 3 shows that the percent of religion and theology majors at a school is significantly and negatively associated with the presence of LGBT groups, providing support for Hypothesis 2a, and Model 4 shows that the interaction between affiliation with an individualist religious traditions and the percent of religion and theology majors at a school is significantly and negatively associated with the presence of LGBT groups, providing support for Hypothesis 2b. The

interaction from Model 4 is modeled in Figure 1, showing that while a higher percentage of religious and theological studies majors positively impacts the presence of LGBT groups at universities affiliated with communal religious traditions, a higher percentage of religious and theological studies majors negatively affects the approval of LGBT groups at universities associated with individualistic religious traditions. The models containing these religion variables improve substantially on the base model, growing the Nagelkerke measure to 0.57 in Model 2 and Model 3 and to 0.65 in Model 4.

-- Table 2 Here --

-- Figure 1 Here --

Not all of the religion variables provide such improvements in explanatory power. For example, while model 5 shows that the percent of state adherents in individualist religious traditions is significantly and negatively associated with the presence of LGBT groups, this variable only slightly improves upon the base model (0.33 versus the initial 0.3), although it remains significant in the combined model. Importantly, model 6 includes a measure for an alternative explanation that conservative stances on same-sex relationships predict the presence of LGBT groups, but the variable only slightly improves on the base model (to 0.34 from 0.3) and is not significant in the combined model. Still, the fit for the combined model (Model 7) containing all of the religion variables is substantial, with the Nagelkerke indicator approaching 0.66.

Many of the control variables were also significant in Table 2, and for ease of reference I refer only to the combined model. Model 7 shows that schools with higher endowments, more students, fewer non-white students, fewer women, and more students

on loans are more supportive of LGBT groups. Furthermore, the state vote for Obama and location in a non-rural area are both positively and significantly related to the presence of LGBT groups. These findings are mostly consistent with previous literature (Fetner and Kush 2008; Fine 2012; Kane 2013a), with the exception of the findings on women and student loans.⁶ However, some variables that were significant predictors of LGBT groups in past studies are not significant here, most notably a school's selectivity.

Table 3 provides results from logistic regression analyses of non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation. Model 2 shows that affiliation with an individualist religious tradition is significantly and negatively associated with a non-discrimination policy inclusive of sexual orientation, further supporting Hypothesis 1. Furthermore, the variable for the percent of religion majors at a school and the term that interacts affiliation with an individualist religious tradition with the percent of religion and theology majors at a school are both significant and negatively associated with this non-discrimination policy in Models 3 and 4, providing more support for Hypotheses 2a and 2b. Figure 2 models the interaction from Model 4 and illustrates how the impact of religion and theology majors on non-discrimination policy adoption is contingent on a school's affiliation with an individualist or communal religious tradition. Specifically, while a high percent of religion and theology majors is positively associated with non-discrimination policies at schools affiliated with communal religious traditions, it is negatively associated with non-discrimination policies at schools associated with individualist religious traditions.

-- Table 3 Here --

-- Figure 2 Here --

Model 5 shows that a higher percent of state residents belonging to individualist religious traditions is negatively associated with the presence of non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation, in line with Hypothesis 3, but the “value-added” in terms of model fit is low, and this variable drops in significance in the combined model. Finally, while Model 6 shows that affiliation with religious traditions that have conservative stances on same-sex relationship negatively affects the adoption of non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation (an alternative explanation), that variable is not significant in the combined model. Overall, though, the inclusion of all of the religion variables in Model 7 significantly boosts the overall model fit (from 0.19 in the base model to 0.61 in the combined model).

Compared to the models for LGBT group presence, control variables related to other institutional, student body, and socio-political characteristics that might explain non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation are not as robust to the various specifications provided in Table 3. In fact, with the exception of student body size, all control variables that were significant in the combined model in Table 2 are reduced to insignificance in Model 7 of Table 3. This suggests that past studies’ explanations of LGBT groups may not be as easily portable to the study of non-discrimination policies. Although LGBT groups require some level of “buy-in” from students, inclusive non-discrimination policies can often be implemented by administrators alone, and thus understanding the proportion of women students, non-white students, and students on loans at a school may not be as crucial to explaining the adoption of non-discrimination

policies. Similarly, although LGBT students may sometimes consider whether members of a surrounding community are comfortable with their presence before they form an LGBT group, considerations related to community comfort or safety may be less important in decisions to adopt non-discrimination policies.

DISCUSSION

Why are some Christian colleges and universities more receptive to LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies than others? Some of the results are consistent with past literature on approval of LGBT groups in schools (Fetner and Kush 2008; Fine 2012; Kane 2013a): Christian colleges and universities with higher endowments, larger student bodies, fewer non-white students, presence in Democratic-leaning states, and presence in non-rural areas are more open to LGBT groups. However, few of the factors identified in past studies are linked to Christian colleges and universities' adoption of non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation. Furthermore, past studies on LGBT-inclusive schools mostly assume that religion is a barrier to LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, leaving us without an understanding of why some Christian schools are open to such groups and policies while others are not.

Building on recent insights on religion and the “culture wars,” especially insights on religions' theological orientations (e.g., Kniss 2003; Fuist et al. 2012), I provide strong evidence to support the theory that the individualist orientations of certain religious traditions impede the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, while the communal orientations of other religious traditions facilitate the approval of these

groups and policies. For example, I show that schools associated with individualist traditions are less supportive of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies than schools affiliated with communal traditions. Furthermore, I show that the percent of religion majors at the school is a significant, negative predictor of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation. However, this effect of the percent of religion majors on LGBT inclusion is contingent on a school's religious affiliation; while a high percentage of religion majors is negatively associated with LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies at schools affiliated with individualist traditions, a high percentage of religion majors can be positively associated with LGBT inclusion when schools are affiliated with communal traditions. Finally, I find limited evidence that a state's percent of adherents to individualist traditions negatively impacts the approval of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies.

One might wonder why an important alternative explanation – that conservative versus liberal teachings on the morality of same-sex relationships predict the presence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements – ultimately found little support. For help, it is worth considering statistics on those colleges and universities affiliated with communal traditions that nevertheless view same-sex relationships as “sinful.” The United Methodist Church, a communal denomination that condemns same-sex relationships, is affiliated with 84 of the 682 schools in my sample, and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation can be found at 79 (or 94%) of them. Similarly, the Roman Catholic Church, a religious group that has a well-developed body of social justice teachings (e.g., liberation theology) but that maintains conservative

stances on sexuality, is affiliated with 189 of the 682 schools, and non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation have been adopted at 145 (or 77%) of them. This includes all 28 Jesuit colleges and universities but is certainly not limited to them.

Finally, only 10 schools in the sample actively affiliate with historically black denominations, and half of them support non-discrimination policies inclusive of sexual orientation. Together, these denominations are associated with the majority (229 of 375) of Christian colleges and universities with non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation. As I argue again, it is not liberal teachings on same-sex relationships but rather certain religious traditions' communal orientations that best explain schools' support for LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements.

Indeed, the individualist versus communal divide may extend to the very heart of these universities' missions. Christian schools associated with individualist religious traditions are much more likely to see themselves as serving students who actively identify as Christians, and thus most have no qualms about excluding students who do not actively agree with their beliefs. Christian schools associated with communal traditions, on the other hand, generally view themselves as serving broader communities; while they are generally no less religious in the sense that most will have a chapel, hire campus ministers, require students to take one or more religion classes, and/or actively promote their religious identification, they carry no expectation that their students (or even faculty) will actively identify as Christian. Thus, schools associated with communal traditions are much more willing to support LGBT groups and adopt non-discrimination statements even if their associated religious traditions condemn same-sex relationships.

CONCLUSION

As attitudes toward LGBT people rapidly change, Christians across the U.S. are increasingly reconsidering their stances on LGBT rights. Past studies have examined Christian congregations' increasing openness to LGBT members (Adler 2012; Kane 2013b), but this study is one of the first to examine Christian colleges and universities' inclusion of LGBT students. In showing that, contrary to common perceptions, the majority of Christian colleges and universities have adopted non-discrimination statements inclusive of sexual orientation, and just under half of Christian colleges and universities have approved LGBT groups, this article provides new evidence into the LGBT movement's inroads into religious communities.

The article makes several contributions to existing scholarly literature and points to directions for future research. For example, this article contributes to the broader literature on religion and social change, especially religion and the "culture wars." Scholarly and popular wisdom suggest that religious debates over LGBT rights can be explained by liberal and conservative divides. Building on recent insights from Kniss (2003), I argue instead that positions on LGBT rights are best understood when one also takes into account religious traditions' individualist and communal theological orientations. This perspective adds nuance to traditional understandings of the "culture wars," showing that religions that have developed a language of "rights" may choose to extend those rights even to those with whom they disagree. Future research might consider how individualist versus communal orientations explain LGBT inclusion in

other religious domains – for example, in places of worship. Furthermore, research might examine the role of individualist versus communal orientations in other social and cultural debates. Most other social issues are subject to the same give-and-take between views on specific moral issues and general concerns for social justice. For example, on the issue of abortion, U.S. political history is rife with examples of Christian (especially Catholic) politicians who believe that abortion is wrong but still support its legalization, primarily out of a concern for women's rights. Similarly, although Catholic leaders have been outspoken against divorce, the Catholic Church has been increasingly willing to accept divorced Christians as members, in part due to their overarching concern for social justice (Goodstein and Povoledo 2015). This article suggests that, to fully understand the role of religion in a changing world, scholars should incorporate religions' theological orientations into their explanations of social change.

This article also contributes to literature on LGBT-inclusive schools. Past studies that predict the presence of LGBT groups at the college level are still quite rare (Kane 2013a; Fine 2012), and scholars have not examined the presence of non-discrimination policies in U.S. schools. Furthermore, previous studies have seldom interrogated the role of religion in the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination statements. By analyzing the presence of both LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies, and by demonstrating the importance of religion to LGBT inclusion, this study provides an empirical and theoretical extension to previous studies of LGBT-inclusive schools. However, while I draw on data on the presence of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies as indicators of LGBT inclusivity, these data tell only part of the story of the

“campus climate” for LGBT students at Christian colleges and universities. Future research might examine outcomes such as hate crime statistics or student perceptions of LGBT inclusion. Also, while this analysis deployed several variables related to individualist versus communal orientations, future research might further interrogate the role of religion in schools’ inclusion of LGBT students, including the role of students’ religious attitudes and practices. Finally, although the casual ordering of most of the religion variables can be assumed, this article ultimately relies on cross-sectional data, so it is limited in its ability to establish causality. Future research might benefit from longitudinal analyses of the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies.

Finally, this article holds important implications for the broader literature on the political sociology of LGBT rights, because the adoption of LGBT groups and non-discrimination policies in schools can be considered a case of LGBT-inclusive organizational change more generally. For example, literature on LGBT-inclusive policies within U.S. corporations similarly shows how the characteristics of employees, corporations themselves, and the broader context predict the adoption of domestic partner benefits and non-discrimination policies (e.g., Raeburn 2004). However, this literature often ignores the crucial cultural fabric of “religion,” as manifested in employee commitments, corporate identities, and socio-political environments, other than to posit the religious right as an opponent of LGBT-inclusive organizational change. Future research would benefit from a nuanced analysis of the role of religion in LGBT-inclusive organizational change, including in corporations, non-profits, and secular schools.

ENDNOTES

---

¹ I use the terms “individualist” and “communal” rather than related terms such as “libertarian” and “communitarian,” because those latter terms generally conflate a focus on individuals vs. communities with conservative vs. liberal social beliefs (see Davis and Robinson 2012). Specifically, the term libertarian often implies that those who are focused on the plights of individuals also hold liberal social beliefs, and the term communitarian implies that those who are focused on reforming wider communities also hold conservative social beliefs, whereas I wish to avoid these assumptions.

² I focus on schools’ inclusion of LGBT students because LGBT groups are generally meant for students, not faculty and staff. However, my analyses of schools’ adoption of non-discrimination protections, which generally apply to all people at a school, also hold strong implications for schools’ inclusion of LGBT staff and faculty.

³ I also gathered data on non-discrimination statements inclusive of “gender identity”; however, few school policies contained such language (n=70). I do not present results on the presence of these policies, but my supplementary analyses are available on request.

⁴ I used a combined measure for religious studies majors and theology majors because IPEDS (2014) combines the data for some schools and because the more individualist and conservative schools in the dataset often treat religious studies as theological studies.

---

⁵ As a robustness check, I also estimated multilevel models with colleges nested within denominations. The models, not shown here but available on request, produced estimates substantively similar to those in the results that follow.

⁶ The finding that a higher percent of students on loans positively impacts LGBT student group presence may be partially explained by the higher tuitions found at the larger, more selective schools that tend to be more inclusive of LGBT students and, conversely, the lower tuitions found at the smaller schools that focus on religious and theological studies and tend to discriminate against LGBT students (see discussion by Ellis 2011). Some of these latter schools also opt out of the federal loan system completely.

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.
- Anderson, Nick. 2015, Dec. 18. "Religious Colleges Get Exemptions to Anti-Bias Law; Critics Denounce 'Hidden Discrimination' against LGBT Students." *Washington Post*.
- Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies (ASARB). 2015. "U.S. Congregational Memberships: Reports." Accessed June 20, 2015 (<http://www.thearda.com/rcms2010/>).
- Barnes, Sandra L. 2004. "Priestly and Prophetic Influences on Black Church Social Services." *Social Problems* 51(2): 202-221.
- Barton, Bernadette C. 2014. *Pray the Gay Away: The Extraordinary Lives of Bible Belt Gays*. New York: NYU Press.
- Bean, Lydia. 2014. "Compassionate Conservatives? Evangelicals, Economic Conservatism, and National Identity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53(1): 164-186.
- Coley, Jonathan S. 2014. "Social Movements and Bridge Building: Religious and Sexual Identity Conflicts." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* 37: 125-151.
- Davis, Nancy J., and Robert V. Robinson. 2012. *Claiming Society for God: Religious Movements and Social Welfare*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Donadio, Rachel. 2013, July 29. "On Gay Priests, Pope Francis Asks, 'Who Am I to Judge?'" *New York Times*.
- Ellis, Blake. 2011. "Want Cheaper Tuition? Find Religion." *CNN Money*. Accessed January 6, 2016 (http://money.cnn.com/2011/11/28/pf/christian_colleges/).
- Emerson, Michael O., and Christian Smith. 2000. *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fetner, Tina. 2008. *How the Religious Right Shaped Lesbian and Gay Activism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fetner, Tina, and Kristin Kush. 2008. "Gay-Straight Alliances in High Schools: Social Predictors of Early Adoption." *Youth & Society* 40(1): 114-130.
- Fine, Leigh E. 2012. "The Context of Creating Space: Assessing the Likelihood of College LGBT Center Presence." *Journal of College Student Development* 53(2): 285-299.
- FindTheBest. 2014. "Best College Comparison." Accessed November 16, 2014 (<http://colleges.findthebest.com>).
- Fuist, Todd N., Laurie Cooper 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.
- Goodstein, Laurie, and Elisabetta Povoledo. 2015, Oct. 24. "Amid Splits, Catholic Bishops Crack Open Door on Divorce." *New York Times*.
- Heck, Nicholas C., A. Flentje, and Bryan N. Cochran. 2011. "Offsetting Risks: High

- School Gay-Straight Alliances and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Youth.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 26(2): 161-174.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2015. “Faith Positions.” Accessed June 20, 2015 (<http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/faith-positions>).
- Hunter, James D. 1991. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). 2014. “College Navigator.” U.S. Department of Education. Accessed November 16, 2014 (<http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>).
- Isaac, Larry W., Daniel B. Cornfield, Dennis C. Dickerson, James M. Lawson, Jr., and Jonathan S. Coley. 2012. “Movement Schools and Dialogical Diffusion of Nonviolent Praxis: Nashville Workshops in the Southern Civil Rights Movement.” *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* 34: 155-184.
- Kane, Melinda D. 2013a. “Finding ‘Safe’ Campuses: Predicting the Presence of LGBT Student Groups at North Carolina Colleges and Universities.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 60: 828-852.
- _____. 2013b. “LGBT Religious Activism: Predicting State Variations in the Number of Metropolitan Community Churches, 1974-2000.” *Sociological Forum* 28(1): 135-158.
- Kniss, Fred. 2003. “Mapping the Moral Order: Depicting the Terrain of Religious Conflict and Change.” Pp. 331-347 in Dillon, Michele (ed.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Long, Doan, Annalise Loehr, and Lisa R. Miller. 2014. "Formal Rights and Informal Privileges for Same-Sex Couples: Evidence from a National Survey Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 79(6): 1172-1195.
- Marx, Gary T. 1967. "Religion: Opiate or Inspiration of Civil Rights Militancy Among Negroes?" *American Sociological Review* 32(1): 64-72.
- McEntarfer, Heather Killelea. 2011. "'Not Going Away': Approaches Used by Students, Faculty, and Staff Members to Create Gay-Straight Alliances at Three Religiously Affiliated Universities." *Journal of LGBT Youth* 8(4): 309-331.
- Miceli, Melinda. 2005. *Standing Out, Standing Together: The Social and Political Impact of Gay-Straight Alliances*. New York: Routledge.
- Morris, Aldon. 1986. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: The Free Press.
- Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. 2004. *Convictions of the Soul: Religion, Culture, and Agency in the Central America Solidarity Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Palacios, Joseph M. 2007. *The Catholic Social Imagination: Activism and the Just Society in Mexico and the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Public Religion Research Institute. 2014. "A Shifting Landscape: A Decade of Change in American Attitudes about Same-Sex Marriage and LGBT issues." Accessed November 16, 2014 (<http://publicreligion.org/research/2014/02/2014-lgbt-survey/>).
- Raeburn, Nicole C. 2004. *Changing Corporate America from Inside Out: Lesbian and*

- Gay Workplace Rights*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rankin, Sue, Warren J. Blumenfeld, Genevieve N. Weber, and Somjen Frazer. 2011. "2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People." *Campus Pride*. Accessed January 8, 2016 (<http://www.campuspride.org/wp-content/uploads/campuspride2010lgbtreportsummary.pdf>).
- Ringenberg, William C. 2006. *The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Smith, Christian. 1991. *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Snarr, C. Melissa. 2011. *All You That Labor: Religion and Ethics in the Living Wage Movement*. New York: NYU Press.
- Toomey, Russell B., Caitlin Ryan, Rafael M. Diaz, and Stephen T. Russell. 2011. "High School Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) and Young Adult Well-Being: An Examination of GSA Presence, Participation, and Perceived Effectiveness." *Applied Developmental Science* 15(4): 175-185.
- Walls, N. Eugene, Sarah B. Kane, and Hope Wisneski. 2010. "Gay-Straight Alliances and School Experiences of Sexual Minority Youth." *Youth & Society* 41(3): 307-332.
- White, Heather R. 2015. *Reforming Sodom: Protestants and the Rise of Gay Rights*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilcox, Clyde. 1991. *God's Warriors: The Christian Right in Twentieth-Century America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Williams, Rhys H., and Jeffrey Blackburn. 1996. "Many are Called but Few Obey: Ideological Commitment and Activism in Operation Rescue." Pp. 167-188 in Smith, Christian (ed.), *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social Movement Activism*. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, Rhys H. 2002. "From the 'Beloved Community' to 'Family Values': Religious Language, Symbolic Repertoires, and Democratic Cultures." Pp. 247-265 in Meyer, David, Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robnett (eds.), *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wood, Richard L. 2002. *Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1989. *The Struggle for America's Soul: Evangelicals, Liberals, and Secularism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wuthnow, Robert, and John H. Evans. 2002. *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for LGBT Groups and Non-Discrimination Policies at Christian Universities

	All	LGBT Groups		Non-Discrimination Policy	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
% Affiliated with Religious Traditions with Individualist Orientations	36.22	4.56	62.13***	6.67	72.31***
% Religion Majors (mean)	11.84	1.05	20.68***	1.85	24.05***
% State Adherents of Individualist Religious Traditions (mean)	19.80	16.60	22.41***	18.06	21.91***

N=682; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 2. Logistic Regression Models for LGBT Groups at Christian Universities

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>	
	(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)	
<u>Religion Variables</u>														
Affiliation with Individualist Religious Tradition			-3.572	***			-6.048	***					-6.024	***
			0.393				1.610						1.721	
% Religion Majors					-11.531	***	-6.923	***					-7.003	***
					2.094		1.550						1.592	
Affiliation with Individualist Religious Tradition x % Religion Majors							-8.510	*					-8.764	*
							3.853						3.939	
% State Adherents of Individualist Religious Traditions									-0.607	***			-0.396	*
									0.155				0.178	
Affiliation with Conservative Religious Tradition											-1.148	*	-0.267	
											0.568		0.400	
<u>Student Body Characteristics</u>														
Number of Students	0.503		0.552	***	0.289		0.417	*	0.557	**	0.524	*	0.461	**
	0.259		0.163		0.213		0.211		0.202		0.258		0.148	
% Minorities	-0.273	*	-0.507	***	-0.489	**	-0.588	***	-0.251	*	-0.249	**	-0.553	**
	0.107		0.142		0.171		0.184		0.104		0.095		0.180	
% Women	0.395	*	0.048		-0.217		-0.245		0.381	*	0.387	**	-0.251	*
	0.164		0.134		0.115		0.139		0.165		0.149		0.128	
% Student Loans	0.476	***	0.453	***	0.378	*	0.337	*	0.475	***	0.413	***	0.317	*
	0.116		0.113		0.152		0.151		0.117		0.121		0.158	
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>														
Endowment (FTE)	1.306	**	0.767	**	1.154	**	0.959	***	1.334	**	1.092	*	0.942	***
	0.492		0.293		0.336		0.210		0.490		0.494		0.228	
% Acceptance	-0.015		0.046		0.059		0.035		-0.019		0.025		0.039	
	0.148		0.229		0.227		0.266		0.158		0.152		0.263	
<u>Contextual Characteristics</u>														
% State Vote for Obama	0.376	***	0.418	***	0.501	***	0.531	***	0.084		0.393	***	0.342	*
	0.087		0.090		0.124		0.140		0.099		0.096		0.138	
Non-South	0.309		-0.124		0.073		-0.196		-0.245		0.295		-0.538	
	0.339		0.224		0.348		0.233		0.397		0.353		0.349	
Non-Rural	0.389		0.716	**	0.921	***	1.004	**	0.378		0.566		1.052	**
	0.256		0.247		0.262		0.328		0.248		0.309		0.348	
<u>Constant</u>	-0.657		0.222		-5.152	***	-2.647	**	-0.318		0.133		-2.602	*
	0.511		0.405		1.104		0.885		0.533		0.411		1.085	
Chi-Square	177.45	***	377.23	***	375.97	***	454.96	***	190.14	***	199.51	***	459.02	***
Nagelkerke	0.306		0.568		0.567		0.651		0.325		0.339		0.655	

Note: N=682; standardized coefficients with standard errors clustered by denomination; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models for Non-Discrimination Statements with Sexual Orientation at Christian Universities

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>b</i>	
	(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)		(se)	
<u>Religion Variables</u>														
Affiliation with Individualist Religious Tradition			-3.504	***			-4.031	***					-3.842	***
			0.327				0.578						0.606	
% Religion Majors					-3.198	*	-0.818						-0.832	
					1.491		0.540						0.581	
Affiliation with Individualist Religious Tradition x % Religion Majors							-3.172	*					-3.071	*
							1.334						1.293	
% State Adherents of Individualist Religious Traditions									-0.449	***			-0.098	
									0.133				0.191	
Affiliation with Conservative Religious Tradition											-0.694	**	-0.680	
											0.224		0.468	
<u>Student Body Characteristics</u>														
Number of Students	0.340		0.366	**	0.087		0.238		0.389	*	0.378		0.268	*
	0.205		0.141		0.120		0.122		0.188		0.208		0.126	
% Minorities	0.182		0.107		0.173		0.110		0.204		0.228		0.151	
	0.137		0.143		0.138		0.151		0.138		0.129		0.147	
% Women	0.517	***	0.164		0.030		-0.036		0.501	***	0.515	***	-0.025	
	0.131		0.149		0.091		0.090		0.133		0.124		0.091	
% Student Loans	0.400	***	0.332	***	0.236		0.239	*	0.399	***	0.327	**	0.214	
	0.106		0.097		0.123		0.111		0.102		0.112		0.116	
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>														
Endowment (FTE)	0.698		0.194		0.401		0.125		0.702		0.445		0.073	
	0.482		0.227		0.335		0.215		0.486		0.398		0.217	
% Acceptance	-0.025		0.062		0.096		0.092		-0.034		0.026		0.118	
	0.063		0.133		0.078		0.132		0.065		0.063		0.132	
<u>Contextual Characteristics</u>														
% State Vote for Obama	0.212	**	0.257	*	0.298	***	0.310	**	-0.015		0.241	**	0.270	
	0.081		0.104		0.079		0.107		0.093		0.081		0.148	
Non-South	0.148		-0.466		0.059		-0.473		-0.268		0.964		-0.545	
	0.337		0.267		0.357		0.282		0.403		0.320		0.329	
Non-Rural	-0.125		-0.078		0.101		0.034		-0.140		0.727		0.125	
	0.191		0.150		0.163		0.163		0.183		0.174		0.162	
<u>Constant</u>	0.254		1.727	***	-0.710		1.411	***	0.524	*	0.166		1.205	**
	0.458		0.255		0.684		0.317		0.476		0.520		0.427	
Chi-Squared	106.54	***	371.78	***	236.69	***	406.83	***	114.39	***	155.89	***	412.00	***
Nagelkerke	0.193		0.562		0.392		0.601		0.207		0.273		0.607	

Note: N=682; standardized coefficients with standard errors clustered by denomination; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

Figure 1. Interaction Effects between Theological Orientation and % Religion Majors on LGBT Group Presence

Figure 2. Interaction Effects between Theological Orientation and % Religion Majors on Inclusive Non-Discrimination Policy Adoption