

CLERGY ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY

by



Inge Kirchhoff

A thesis

presented to the University of Manitoba

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in the

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-47945-0

CLERGY ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY

BY

INGE KIRCHHOFF

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

© 1988

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A most sincere thank you to my thesis committee:

Dr. John B. Bond, Jr., Dr. Raymond F. Currie, and especially Dr. Nancy Kingsbury, for their support, encouragement, and inspiration.

Thank you also to the ordained clergy of the Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, United, and Lutheran Churches in Winnipeg who participated in the study.

This study was supported by a grant from Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine attitudes of Christian clergy toward homosexuality. The subjects were 263 ordained clergy of the five major Christian denominations in Winnipeg: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, Lutheran, and United Church. Data were collected by mailed questionnaires. The United Church clergy were significantly more tolerant toward homosexuality and significantly more approving of ordaining homosexuals than were the clergy of the other four denominations. The Mennonite clergy were significantly less tolerant and significantly less approving of ordaining homosexuals than the other denominations. Tolerance toward homosexuality was positively related to: (a) agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation; (b) approval of ordaining homosexuals; and (c) modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference. Tolerance toward homosexuality was inversely related to religious orthodoxy and to agreement with homosexual behaviour being morally wrong. Tolerance differed according to preferred means of ministering to homosexuals. Approval of ordaining homosexuals was inversely related to religious orthodoxy. Non-parish clergy did not differ from parish clergy in tolerance toward homosexuality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study	5
Operational Definitions	5
Strengths and Limitations of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Theoretical Considerations	8
Attitudes Within the Christian Church	12
Attitudes and Position in the Church	16
Attitudes and Orthodoxy	17
Attitudes and Sex-role Preference	18
A Moral and a Justice View of Homosexuality	23
Ministry to Homosexuals	25
Ordination of Homosexuals	29
Other Influences on Attitudes	
Toward Homosexuality	35
Summary	36
III. METHODS OF PROCEDURE	37
Subjects	37
Data Collection	37
Research Instruments and Measures	39
Independent Variables	43
Dependent Variables	43
Hypotheses	44
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	47
Sample	47
Data Analysis	47
Test of Hypotheses	52
Discussion	69

	Page
CHAPTER	
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	84
Summary	84
Conclusion	85
REFERENCES	89
APPENDICES	
A. Cover Letter, Request for Results, Follow-up Postcard	99
B. Questionnaire	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Response of Clergy by Denomination	38
2. Demographic Information by Denomination	48
3. Description of Sample in Numbers and Percentages According to Responses to Homosexuality Items	49
4. Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics of Measures	53
5. Percentage of Agreement with Items on HATH Scale	54
6. Descriptive Statistics on HATH Scale for Denominations	56
7. Denominational Differences in Tolerance (HATH) Analysis of Variance	57
8. Scheffe's Test of Group Means and Differences on HATH	58
9. Descriptive Statistics on Orthodoxy Scale for Denominations	60
10. Observed Frequencies of Choice of Ministry by Ranking on HATH	62
11. Non-parish and Parish Clergy Differences in Tolerance (HATH). Analysis of Variance	63
12. Comparison of Denominations on Approval of Ordination of Homosexuals	64
13. Pair-wise Comparisons of Denominations on Approval of Ordination of Homosexuals	66
14. Descriptions of Clergy Who are the Most and the Least Tolerant Toward Homosexuality	86

Chapter I

Introduction

In July 1987, the government of Manitoba passed the Manitoba Human Rights Code, which includes a prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The Code offers specific protection from discrimination in employment, rental housing, public services, and purchase of property. Manitoba follows Quebec, Ontario, and Yukon in prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. As society at large tries to come to terms with the issue of homosexuality, churches are being pressured to look at their own roles in this regard. The 1987-88 pamphlet of the Winnipeg Council on Homosexuality and Religion noted that religious institutions in the United States and Canada have made statements supporting the civil rights of homosexual persons, but they have made little effort to achieve those rights. Within the pamphlet the following statement was made: "The influence of religious institutions within society has for centuries been used repressively against homosexually-oriented men and women" (p.5).

A common assumption is that Christianity is a cause of intolerance toward homosexuals. This assumption was refuted at length by Boswell (1980) in his major work, Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Boswell argued that religious beliefs may be used to cloak or incorporate intolerance. Harrison (1977) concluded that the perspectives on sex in general and homosexuality in particular

which are most often cited as guides for contemporary behaviour are not distinctively Christian but are derivatives of the common culture. Similarly, Scanzoni & Mollenkott (1978) pointed out that in many instances, what seems to be the voice of God is actually the voice of socialization. Many people, including those within the church as well as those with little or no relationship to a church, assume that homosexuality is contrary to the teaching of the Bible and the will of God. The specific Bible passages that refer to homosexuality tend to treat the subject negatively. Yet, when one examines the sociological and historical context in which these passages were written, and the incidents to which they were referring, the relevance for our society is questionable.

Our current knowledge and understanding of homosexuality varies significantly from that of Biblical times. Homosexuality as a psychosexual orientation is not dealt with in the Bible. Statements about the subject are references to certain types of homosexual acts (Buck, 1983; Nelson, 1978; Parke-Taylor, 1986). To Biblical writers, homosexual behaviour was seen as a willful and conscious perversion of an individual's true heterosexual nature (Buck, 1983; Nelson, 1978). Nelson noted that in the Old Testament passages that condemn homosexual acts, the pervasive theme was cultic defilement and idolatry. Nelson questioned why the cultic injunctions against homosexual acts are held valid today, but most other parts of the Holiness Code are deemed irrelevant. According to Boswell (1980), the

early Christian Church did not appear to have opposed homosexual behaviour. Those who objected to physical expression of homosexual feelings generally did so on the basis of considerations unrelated to the teachings of Jesus or his early followers. Buck and Nelson pointed out that there is no record of Jesus ever having said anything on the subject of homosexuality.

The question of homosexuality presents a profound dilemma for churches. This was evidenced by the struggles of various church bodies as they dealt with the question of admitting the United Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches to the U.S.A. National Council of Churches (Gros, 1983; Lyles, 1983). It is further evidenced by the divisiveness within different church bodies as they seek to come to terms with the problem of how best to minister to homosexuals, and more significantly, with the question of ordaining homosexuals. Therefore, it is important at this time to examine the attitudes of major church bodies toward homosexuality. One way to accomplish this is to question the clergy regarding their attitudes.

Though church bodies may make official statements on homosexuality, a more critical concern is how homosexuals are dealt with by the clergy with whom they come in contact. McNeill (1976) wrote that logically by their calling and profession, the clergy should be the persons to whom homosexuals could turn with complete confidence. Pruyser (1976), in discussing the general question of why people turn to clergy, concluded that individuals want their problems

sized up and tackled within a definite frame of reference. They want their tradition to speak to them. They want to gain some insight from their faith to clarify their predicament, and to see some criteria of their faith applied to themselves.

The ways in which clergy advise homosexuals, and/or the referrals that clergy make, will be determined by their attitudes toward homosexuality. Clergy, particularly those serving parishes, are also in a position to counsel the families and friends of homosexuals. Thus, the attitudes of clergy may influence how homosexuals are treated by their significant others.

The messages received by homosexuals from their clergy during counselling sessions or through worship experiences may be negative or positive. In order to affirm their Christian faith, homosexuals may believe they have to deny their sexuality or avoid any sexual intimacy, or they may learn that homosexuality is acceptable. Negative situations, as well as real and feared discrimination within the church and society, clearly have a detrimental effect on the mental health of homosexuals, their friends, and their families. It becomes important, therefore, to begin to understand the attitudes of clergy toward homosexuality, and the bases of these attitudes.

Because clergy are in leadership positions within their respective congregations and denominations, their attitudes toward homosexuality as expounded through sermons, Bible studies, various classes, and personal interactions influence the attitudes of lay

people within the church. In addition, because clergy are often considered leaders in the community, and because people outside the church may look to religious leaders for guidance on what they consider to be moral issues, clergy attitudes affect the attitudes of society at large.

Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine clergy attitudes toward homosexuality in Winnipeg's five major Christian denominations: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, United Church, and Lutheran. The following research question was addressed in the study: To what extent are the following variables associated with attitudes toward homosexuality: (a) denomination, (b) position in the church, (c) sex-role preference, (d) orthodoxy, (e) type of ministry to homosexuals, and (f) the extent to which homosexuality is viewed as a moral issue or a justice issue? The degree of approval for ordaining homosexuals was examined and related to: (a) tolerance toward homosexuality, (b) orthodoxy, and (c) denomination.

Operational Definitions

Attitude toward homosexuality. This variable is an indication of how tolerant individuals are of homosexuals and homosexuality. It was measured by the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuality (HATH) Scale (Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980).

Orthodoxy. This variable refers to theological position, including fundamentalist and neo-orthodox beliefs. It was measured by the Orthodoxy Scale (Driedger, Currie, & Linden, 1983).

Sex-role preference. This variable is the evaluation of and reactions to the sexual stratification system and to gender-linked division of labour within society. It was measured by the Sex-Role Preference Inventory (Scanzoni, 1980).

Moral view of homosexuality. This variable refers to an individual's perception of the rightness or wrongness of homosexual behaviour. Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "Homosexual behaviour is morally wrong." Those who believe that sexual expression between individuals should be restricted to heterosexual relationships were expected to agree with this statement.

Justice view of homosexuality. This variable refers to social, personal, and/or legal discrimination against persons based on their sexual orientation. Respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "There should be no discrimination in society on the basis of sexual orientation."

Ministry to homosexuals. This variable indicates whether respondents would help homosexuals to: (a) change their homosexuality, (b) accept their homosexuality, (c) accept their homosexuality but discourage them from homosexual behaviour, or (d) explore what is best for them.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

A major strength of the study is that it is a simultaneous examination of several relevant variables that have independently been shown to be related to attitudes toward homosexuality. Because homosexuality is a sensitive subject area, particularly among clergy, the anonymity of questionnaires as opposed to interviews contributed to the strength of the research. The primary limitation of the study was that the target population was that of a specific geographic urban area. Appropriate caution should be taken in the generalization of results.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

Theoretical Considerations

According to social exchange theory (Nye, 1979), humans avoid costly and seek rewarding statuses, relationships, interactions, and feeling states to the end that their profits are maximized, or losses minimized. Rewards include all things physical, social, and psychological that an individual would choose in the absence of added costs. Costs include the things an individual dislikes as well as rewards foregone. The most profitable outcome is the one that provides the best relationship of rewards to costs. In deciding whether an alternative offers a better outcome, its effect on future outcomes are also taken into account.

Another aspect to be considered is the costs and rewards that are relevant to the group to which an individual belongs. In the present study, the salient groups for the respondents included the particular congregation served by the individual, the denomination to which he/she belonged, and clergy in general.

On the basis of social exchange theory, it was expected that the attitudes of clergy toward homosexuality could be attributed to their individual perceptions of costs and rewards. In effect, if an individual is tolerant towards homosexuality, it would be because the rewards of being tolerant outweigh the costs of being tolerant and/or

the costs of being intolerant outweigh the rewards of being intolerant. Conversely, if an individual is intolerant towards homosexuality, it would be because the rewards of being intolerant outweigh the costs of being intolerant and/or the costs of being tolerant outweigh the rewards of being tolerant. The rewards and costs considered would be those affecting the individual and also his/her relevant groups.

The individual's perception of rewards and costs may be influenced by the following factors: (a) denomination, (b) position in the church, (c) sex-role preference, (d) orthodoxy, (e) the extent to which homosexuality is considered a moral and a justice issue, and (f) beliefs about appropriate ministry to homosexuals. Similarly, perception of rewards and costs may influence decisions about whether homosexuals should be helped to accept or change their sexual orientation and whether or not they should be allowed to be ordained.

The rewards to some Christian clergy of being tolerant toward homosexuality could include feeling that they are following the example of Jesus in accepting, caring for, and ministering to the oppressed in society. The costs of being tolerant may include being in opposition to the position taken by many others in their respective denominations. Being in opposition could result in losing credibility with the congregation s/he is serving, or losing the respect of his/her church body and thus threatening present and/or future employment. The rewards of being intolerant could be to avoid the

just mentioned risk. The cost of being intolerant could be to fail to minister to a segment of the population. The extent to which these various factors would be considered rewards or costs would depend on an individual's perception of the entire issue of homosexuality and his/her own value system.

For example, some Christian clergy are convinced that the Bible is clear and unequivocal in condemning homosexuality, and that God's intention for all people is heterosexual marriage and procreation. To these clergy, the rewards of being intolerant toward homosexuality may include feeling that they are obeying the Word of God. It may be rewarding to them to perform a ministry that would seek to change homosexuals' sexual orientation, or at least persuade them to be celibate. To this group, the cost of tolerance might include undermining the values of marriage and family and the entire moral structure of church and society. The rewards of tolerance and the costs of intolerance would in many cases be negligible to this group of clergy.

In 1983, one of the largest United Methodist churches in the western United States called for the resignation of their bishop unless he changed his stance in regard to homosexuals. The congregation was reacting to the position the bishop had taken in publicly defending the rights of gay people in the church. Another congregation declared it would secede from the United Methodist Church

is homosexuality was not condemned by the conference that the bishop headed ("Bishop Asked to Resign," 1983).

McNeill (1976), a Roman Catholic priest, in referring to his own experience, wrote that after having an article on homosexuality published, he received notice from his Jesuit superiors that Father General had written from Rome ordering McNeill not to publish anything in the popular press and not to address homosexual groups. Elsewhere McNeill (1976) pointed out that the National Federation of Priests' Council had noted that individual priests and ministers working with homosexuals usually encounter social and psychological stigma as a result of their work. McNeill (1987) was in the process of being expelled from the Jesuit order for refusing to give up his ministerial work with gay people.

It is clear that there are costs and rewards associated with favourable and unfavourable clergy attitudes toward homosexuality. However, it is the individual clergy's perceptions that ultimately determine what is defined as costs and/or rewards.

The following literature review examines the views of writers who have dealt with the issue of homosexuality and in most cases, how it relates to religion and/or the church. The writers are not necessarily representative of particular denominations, nor are they necessarily theologians. They do, however, espouse views that can be found throughout the Christian Church.

Attitudes Within the Christian Church

Although there are exceptions, attitudes within Christian churches toward homosexuality have tended to be negative. According to McNeill (1976), the following major theses have traditionally dominated the thinking of moral theologians concerning homosexuality: (a) the homosexual condition and, subsequently, all homosexual activity is contrary to the will of God; (b) the presence of homosexuals in the human community is a menace to that community, especially a threat to the values of the family; and (c) the love that unites two homosexuals in a sexual union is a sinful love that separates them from the love of God and places them in danger of eternal damnation.

Karl Barth (1961), a major Protestant theologian, described homosexuality as a "physical, psychological and social sickness, a phenomenon of perversion, decadence and decay, which can emerge when man refuses to admit the validity of the divine command" (p.213). According to Barth, the command of God shows irrefutably that men and women can only be genuinely human through relationships with persons of the other sex.

Helmut Thielicke (1964), a Protestant theologian, in The Ethics of Sex, took a position on homosexuality that has been described as "qualified acceptance." Thielicke stated that the fundamental order of creation and the created determination of the two sexes make it appear justifiable to speak of homosexuality as a "perversion."

Homosexuality is equated with abnormal personality structure, disease, suffering, and pain, which likewise are generally understood in the Bible as being contrary to God's will in creation. Although he stated that homosexuals must be willing to be treated or healed if possible, Thielicke also recognized that for the great majority of homosexuals, change is not possible. He advised those not able to practice abstinence to structure their sexual relationships in an ethically responsible way.

In Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986), the homosexual condition was described as an objective disorder. The letter stated that homosexual activity prevents an individual's fulfillment and happiness by acting contrary to the creative wisdom of God. Nugent (1984) stated that no official Roman Catholic document has ever argued for the possibility of the church's accepting homosexual expressions under any circumstance. However, he pointed out that theologians, pastors, and educators in the United States approach the issue of homosexuality differently than do their Roman counterparts. Those in the United States seem more open to the possibility that there is a need to rethink their positions on homosexuality in light of current Biblical and empirical research, whereas in Roman theological circles, even the mention of such a possibility is considered heretical.

The three major Lutheran Church bodies in the U.S.A. (Missouri Synod, American Lutheran Church, and Lutheran Church in America), in their respective statements on homosexuality made in the 70's, differed from each other only slightly in their approach to the issue (Batchelor, 1980). In the Missouri Synod statement, homophile behaviour is described as intrinsically sinful. A view toward ministering the forgiveness of Christ to sinners who are penitent is urged. Similarly, in the statement of the American Lutheran Church, homosexual behaviour is described as a sin, a form of idolatry, a breaking of the natural order, and a contradiction to the new life in Christ. According to the statement of the Lutheran Church in American, homosexuality is viewed Biblically as a departure from the heterosexual structure of God's creation. Although portions of their statements deal negatively with homosexuality, both the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America statements affirm the rights of homosexuals to civil liberties and justice. In a survey of Lutherans (Lutheran Churches, 1985), 51% of clergy indicated that homosexual relationships are always wrong.

In 1978, the House of Bishops of the Anglican Church of Canada issued a statement emphasizing the need for pastoral concern for the homosexual. They affirmed that homosexual persons are entitled to equal protection under the law with all other Canadian citizens (Reed, 1986).

Results of a Gallup Poll conducted in the United States in 1977 (Gallup, 1978) indicated that Catholics tend to be more tolerant toward homosexuality than do Protestants. For example, more Catholics than Protestants agreed that: (a) homosexuals should be hired as clergy (39% vs. 31%), (b) homosexuals should have equal rights in terms of job (58% vs. 52%), (c) homosexual relations between consenting adults should be legal (44% vs. 38%) and (d) homosexuals can be good Christians or Jews (66% vs. 45%).

Maret (1984) in a study of undergraduate students found that fundamentalists showed more disapproval of homosexuals than did nonfundamentalists. In a study of pastors concerning their approval of more freedom for homosexuals, 45% expressed approval (Wuthnow, 1979). The proportion ranged from 91% among Unitarians to 45% among Presbyterians, 36% among Lutherans, 33% among Catholics, and 22% among Reformed.

In a more general study, Driedger (1974) used a sample of Winnipeg clergy to examine the positions of denominations on social issues. In that study, the United Church and Anglican clergy scored consistently lower than the total group average on social control factors and consistently higher on social liberty factors. The Roman Catholics and Mennonites ranked intermediately while Lutherans tended to rank below the group average for both social control and liberty.

Attitudes and Position in the Church

In a study of United Presbyterian Church clergy, it was found that national church executives were more liberal than ordained ministers in their views on homosexuality (Hiltner, 1980). Hammond and Mitchell (1973) compared parish and campus clergy and found that the campus clergy were more liberal in their attitudes toward labour unions and the United Nations, more critical of their denomination, and more favourable toward ecumenical affairs than parish clergy. Hoge (1976), in a review of causes of conflict within Protestant churches, found some slight support for the thesis that clergy who have chosen to work in non-parish positions are more liberal than parish clergy.

In studies by Hadden (1970) of ministerial participation in civil rights protests, activist clergy were primarily denominational administrators, seminary faculty, and chaplains. However, these studies showed that clergy who participated in demonstrations did not differ from clergy who did not participate, in terms of attitudes or theology, but apparently only in their freedom to participate. Stark and Glock (1973) noted the vulnerability of parish clergy to lay rebellion, particularly in churches where the laity are the pastors' employers. This vulnerability may explain their reluctance to participate. The same vulnerability could also discourage parish clergy from exhibiting liberal attitudes toward an issue as controversial as homosexuality.

Attitudes and Orthodoxy

Several researchers have examined the relationship between theological positions and views on social issues. In a study of Winnipeg clergy from several denominations, Driedger (1974) found that doctrinal conservatives emphasized the need for control of personal morality, whereas doctrinal liberals favoured civil liberties and minority rights. Driedger speculated that those individuals whose other-worldly commitment and doctrinal orthodoxy make them more closed to secular alternatives are less committed to working with human needs. The demands of the severe God of the absolutist tend to carry over into noncompassionate dealings with others. Because of the need to emphasize authority, compassion becomes secondary. The doctrinal liberals, on the other hand, favour liberation of the individual in order to allow the goodness of the person to emerge. Because authority is not absolute, the liberal is more free to support humanity. According to Driedger, the doctrinal index seemed to differentiate attitudes toward social issues better than did denominational groupings.

Jeffries and Tygart (1974) studied clergy from several denominations and found that, although in most instances denomination was a significant independent predictor of opinions on social issues, the association was weak in the areas of civil liberties and social legislation. They measured theological liberalism-conservatism, and found theological position to be the strongest predictor of clergy opinions on social issues. Similarly, Blaikie (1976) noted that most

studies that have focussed on the relationship between theological orientation and clergy views and actions, have claimed that theological orientation is the best predictor of the position that clergy take.

Wagenaar and Bartos (1977) examined the relationship between religious orthodoxy and attitudes toward homosexuality. They sampled clergy from four denominations ranked in the following ascending order of orthodoxy: Methodist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran. The results indicated a moderately negative relationship between orthodoxy and acceptance of homosexuality. In a study of pastoral counsellors, Hochstein (1986) found that counsellors who had high homophobia scores were more likely to report being conservative within their denomination than were those with lower scores. Two studies using students (Larsen, Cate, & Reed, 1983; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980) also had results indicating a negative relationship between orthodoxy and tolerant attitudes toward homosexuality.

Attitudes and Sex-Role Preference

The Christian Church has traditionally been a patriarchal institution. Although there have been notable attempts in some church bodies to diminish the patriarchal structure, it is still a significant factor. In the Roman Catholic Church, only men can be ordained to the priesthood. It is only recently that many Protestant Churches have begun to allow the ordination of women and some still do not.

The traditional Christian discourse on sexual ethics tends to emphasize heterosexual marriage or celibacy as the only two appropriate options for Christians. There has been and still is a common perception and/or interpretation of the Bible (especially of Genesis) that heterosexual marriage is the God-intended norm for humankind. The rationale frequently given is the necessity of protecting the structure by which the young of our culture and community are to be reared and nurtured.

Mollenkott (1987) questioned that the nuclear family is the norm in present society, pointing out that such families comprise only a fraction of American households. She suggested that sexual relationships should not be evaluated on the basis of their object or legal sanctions, but rather on the basis of their relational quality. Mollenkott further noted that specifically Christian marriage liturgies did not appear until the ninth century, and the Catholic Church did not absolutely require a marriage liturgy until the latter part of the sixteenth century.

Jennings (1980) discussed the issue of marriage and sexuality in terms of the principle of natural law. As it applies to homosexuality, the argument is this: "sexuality belongs to the law of nature, but it is ordered towards a particular purpose, namely the procreation of children" (p.214). Sexuality that does not have this end in view violates that order. Homosexuality is thus a perversion of the natural order and, therefore, of the law of God. This position

is of major importance in Roman Catholic moral theology, but according to Jennings, it is also used at times by Protestants. Christianity in American Protestantism has been linked closely with the preservation of family life, and on this basis homosexuality is understood as a clear violation of the ideal of family life. However, Jennings asserted that this "family centredness" of American Christianity cannot be justified theologically.

In examining historical factors relating to homosexual practices, Bailey (1975) noted there are only a few allusions to lesbianism in theology and ecclesiastical legislation prior to the Reformation; and it is ignored by both medieval and modern law. Bailey questioned why homosexual acts committed by men have been penalized so heavily and savagely, whereas such acts have been virtually disregarded when committed by women. In Bailey's opinion, this discrepancy suggests that at certain points there is a significant connection between traditional Western views of homosexuality and homosexual practices on the one hand, and of women and marriage on the other. He further wrote:

It might be well for us frankly to face the fact that the rationalization of sexual prejudices, animated by false notions of sexual privilege, has played no inconsiderable part in forming the tradition which we have inherited, and probably controls opinion and policy today in the matter of homosexuality to a greater extent than is commonly realized.

(p.162)

Following a similar line, Nelson (1982) argued that male homosexuality appears to threaten normal masculine gender identity. It questions the dominance-submission patterns of a patriarchal society. Unconsciously the heterosexual male seems to fear that an acceptance of male homosexuality in others would allow the risk of himself becoming womanized, losing his power, and becoming the same sort of sex object into which he has made women.

A variety of instruments were employed in several studies to determine the association between individuals' attitudes toward homosexuality and their views on the roles of men and women in society. A frequent finding has been that individuals who hold negative attitudes toward homosexuals tend to show a preference for maintaining traditional sex roles. Minnigerode (1976) found a positive correlation between anti-homosexual attitudes and nonfeminist attitudes. In a study of male subjects by Krulewitz and Nash (1980), those subjects with the most traditional sex-role attitudes were found to be the most rejecting of homosexuals. Henley and Pincus (1978) also found a strong positive correlation between negative, stereotyped attitudes toward women and negative attitudes toward homosexuals.

Similarly, support was found for the notion that those individuals who support equality between the sexes are less negative toward homosexuality (MacDonald & Games, 1974; MacDonald, Huggins,

Young, & Swanson, 1973). Liebllich and Friedman (1985) had similar results with a sample of Israeli and American students in Jerusalem.

Other researchers approached the relationship between sex-role attitudes and attitudes toward homosexuality somewhat differently, but reached much the same conclusions. Dunbar, Brown, and Amoroso (1973) found a strong tendency for persons with antihomosexual attitudes to hold firm sex stereotypes around traits, hobbies, and professions. In another study, respondents were questioned about the desirability of children conforming to their respective sex roles (Irwin & Thompson, 1977). Results indicated that those who believed such behaviour to be unimportant were more tolerant of homosexuals' rights than were those who stressed the importance of children's gender-role identity.

On the basis of their findings, MacDonald and Games (1974) and MacDonald et al. (1973) suggested that the relationship between traditional sex-role attitudes and negative attitudes toward homosexuals is due to the need to maintain a clear and traditional distinction between the sexes. Storms (1978) questioned that notion and reported research results that indicated attitudes against homosexuals are more evident than are attitudes against femininity in males. Krulewitz and Nash (1980) concluded that lack of tolerance for sex-role confusion is only part of the answer. They suggested that persons with more liberal sex-role attitudes are more accepting of homosexuality, not only because they tolerate nonstereotypic sex

roles, but also because they tend to hold values that make them more accepting of all differences.

Contrary to the findings above, Weinberger and Millham (1979) found that support for equal treatment and rights for women was unrelated to attitudes toward homosexuality. Smith (1971) in an exploratory study, found that persons with a negative attitude toward homosexuals did not seem to be rigid about appropriate sex-role behaviour for men and women. Overall, although the evidence is not conclusive, it appears that individuals who hold traditional views regarding the roles of men and women in society tend to have negative attitudes toward homosexuality.

A Moral and a Justice View of Homosexuality

Thielicke (1964) described homosexuality as primarily an ethical question as opposed to a concern of criminal law. More recently, the question has not been so much whether homosexuality is an ethical or legal issue, but the extent to which it is a moral or justice issue. In this context, justice refers to civil rights and liberties. Garbe (1985), a United Church minister, in an article dealing with the justice-morality question, wrote that homosexuality was a moral issue, because it is clear that the Bible uniformly opposes homosexual practice. Garbe viewed homosexuality as part of the fall of humanity from the created order and intention of God.

In a survey of Presbyterian pastors (cited in Wuthnow, 1979) 48% agreed that homosexual activity is a sin. Kauffman and Harder (1975)

surveyed Mennonite attitudes and reported that 86% indicated that homosexual acts were always wrong. The Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986) pointed out that a person engaging in homosexual behaviour acts immorally, because it is only in the marital relationship that the use of the sexual faculty can be morally good. The document just barely deals with the justice issue. It deplores crimes against homosexuals but warns against reacting to such crimes by claiming that the homosexual condition is not disordered. The document warns of dire consequences "when such a claim is made and when homosexual activity is consequently condoned, or when civil legislation is introduced to protect behaviour to which no one has any conceivable right..." (p.7).

Bibby (1987) compared the responses of committed members of various Canadian denominations to questions relating to moral and justice issues of homosexuality. The following percentages indicated that two adults of the same gender having sexual relations was always or almost always wrong: (a) Roman Catholic, 86%, (b) United Church, 79%, (c) Anglican, 87%, (d) Lutheran, 90%, and (e) Conservative Protestants (a group including Mennonites), 95%. The following percentages agreed that homosexuals are entitled to the same rights as other Canadians: (a) Roman Catholic, 79%, (b) United Church, 72%, (c) Anglican, 85%, (d) Lutheran, 63%, and (e) Conservative Protestants, 46%. Frerichs (1985), a United Church minister, argued that

homosexuality is a justice issue, because many homosexuals fear for their jobs, homes, and family relationships if they were to "come out."

Irwin and Thompson (1977) examined the association between the index of tolerance of the rights of homosexuals and the "rightness" or "wrongness" or homosexual acts. They concluded from their results that many people separate their moral censure of homosexuality from their attitudes about the civil rights of homosexuals. Wagenaar and Bartos (1977) noted that clergy often encounter the dilemma of whether or not to distinguish between what is right from a religious standpoint and what is right from a civil standpoint. They found that the more willing clergy are to separate their moral and civil views, the more accepting they are of homosexuality.

Ministry to Homosexuals

There is a wide divergence in opinion as to how homosexual individuals should be ministered to in the church. One extreme position is that practising homosexuals should be denied baptism, marriage, membership, and other ministries of the church because these are privileges of those recognized as followers of Christ (McKain, 1979). Similarly, Martin and Martin (1981) insisted that homosexuals must renounce their sins, including their homosexual lifestyles in order to be received as church members. Change of sexual orientation was advocated by Kantzer (1983) and Strong (1980). In the study of Presbyterian pastors referred to earlier (cited by

Wuthnow, 1979), 52% of pastors agreed that homosexuals should be dealt with as sick people who need to be cured. Only 24% thought that the church should accept practicing homosexuals into church membership without any restrictions. A study on sexuality mandated by two Mennonite Church bodies (Human Sexuality in the Christian Life, 1985), noted that the traditional response of the Christian Church, including the Mennonite Church, has been to suggest change in orientation and if that proves impossible, abstinence in sexual relations.

The Vatican Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics of 1975 (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, 1976) stated that homosexuals who are judged to be incurable must be treated with understanding and sustained in the hope of overcoming their personal difficulties and their inabilities to fit into society. Homosexual acts were viewed as intrinsically disordered and in no case could they be approved. The Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986) encouraged the bishops to provide pastoral care in full accord with the teaching of the church. They are warned, however, that departure from the church's teaching or silence about it in an effort to provide pastoral care is neither caring nor pastoral. The admonition to conform to the church's teaching occurs repeatedly throughout the document. The Report on Homosexuality from the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, 1973 (Coleman,

1980), represents the Evangelical approach. This report calls on homosexuals to cease from practising homosexual acts and to seek sexual reorientation. The solution offered for homosexual problems was religious conversion.

A more tolerant point of view is that homosexuals can be accepted and affirmed as individuals without the church's approval of homosexuality (Browning, 1979; Jones, 1986). Thieliicke (1964) stated that in dealing with homosexuals, the sympathetic pastor is confronted with the question of how homosexuals in their actual situation can achieve the optimal ethical potential of sexual self-realization. Although this statement sounds sympathetic, Thieliicke insisted that Christian pastoral care has to be concerned primarily with helping the individuals sublimate their homosexual urges. Don Sjoberg, Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, commented on the issue of homosexuality in an interview. Although he described homosexuality as not being normative and a departure from the created order, he urged understanding: "We accept people where they are. It's a pastoral responsibility to minister to these persons, and we do not want to lay a guilt trip on anyone" (Friesen, 1986, p.15).

Another position on the question of ministry is that the prime mission of the church to individual homosexuals is to help them love and accept themselves. The church should affirm that God loves and accepts them by showing them that the human beings who form the church

and preach the Word of love, do love and accept them as they are (Fink, 1973). Similarly, McNeill (1987) wrote that the only healthy and holy Christian response to a homosexual orientation is to learn to accept it and live it out in a way that is consonant with Christian values. Several writers (Guinan, 1983; Jennings, 1980; Scanzoni & Mollenkott, 1978; Shelp & Sunderland, 1985) have pointed out that Jesus in his ministry identified with isolated and outcast individuals. These writers saw homosexuals as fitting into that category in our society. Way (1977), in discussing ministry to homosexuals, argued for this pastoral imperative: "We are to be present with, bring grace to, not throw stones at other persons of whatever category" (p.128). In other words, a homosexual person should not be treated as "evil" by definition, or as a "thing" defined solely by his/her sexuality.

The Mennonite study on sexuality supported a comparable view in stating that if the church should err, it should be in the direction of caring for and loving homosexual persons. They should be regarded as fellow human beings for whom Christ died and to whom is owed the obligation of Christian love (Human Sexuality in the Christian Life, 1985).

When dealing with the issue of homosexuals in the church, the question of celibacy is often raised. Although some would consider it a necessary requirement for church membership and involvement, celibacy becomes more of a concern when ordination is being considered. Thielicke (1964) believed celibacy is based upon a special calling and

is an act of free will. Nelson (1982) viewed celibacy as an option to be honoured when voluntarily chosen for positive reasons. It should be chosen because it best expresses an individual's own sense of integrity or vocational commitments. Smith (1978), in a similar vein, noted that celibacy is a gift that comes to some but questioned whether celibacy should be a requirement for salvation of homosexuals. Maguire (1983) also commented that for heterosexuals in the Roman Catholic Church, celibacy is a gifted feat that symbolizes the special, generous presence of God's power. He stated that according to Catholic theology, celibacy for homosexuals is just a way of life and the least that they can do. McNeill (1976) argued that the Roman Catholic Church's insistence that homosexuals be celibate tends to encourage promiscuity and humanly destructive and depersonalized sexual activity. The individual can confess and receive absolution for occasional promiscuity. However, being in a permanent love relationship would be considered a "state of sin" and absolution would be denied. Views of how best to minister to homosexuals cover a spectrum from insisting that sexual orientation be changed to total acceptance and affirmation of the individual.

Ordination of Homosexuals

The question of ordination of homosexuals is one of the most difficult for churches and clergy. It is difficult enough for many just to accept homosexuals, but acceptance can be handled by "hating

the sin, and loving the sinner." However, to approve ordination of homosexuals would in effect condone "the sin."

According to Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 1980), homosexuality itself is not considered a mental disorder. Hiltner (1980) wrote that in the past, as long as most psychiatrists regarded a homosexual orientation either as sickness or as evidence of a need for psychiatric therapy, the churches could assure themselves that they were exercising pastoral care of their homosexual clergy by recommending or requiring psychiatric treatment. The net effect of the efforts of that era was to enable the churches to continue avoiding the homosexual orientation question in the false conviction that psychiatrists could produce a heterosexual orientation if the persons were sufficiently cooperative in their therapeutic work. Hiltner was of the opinion that there are many signs that homosexuality as an orientation will be increasingly acknowledged by the churches. That means understanding that the condition, whatever its causes, is here to stay and that persons of such orientation must be considered as they are. However willing churches may be to go along with this position in general, there will still be serious reservations among some about ordaining homosexuals.

Barnhouse (1976) stated that homosexuality is not a normal alternative lifestyle but a failure in human adaptation. Homosexual practice does not lead toward the true goals of human sexuality.

According to Barnhouse, the implications for ordination are that no homosexual should be ordained who believes and proclaims that homosexuality is normal and entirely acceptable. Although Barnhouse pointed out that, "homosexuality cannot be in and of itself disqualifying ... the particular configuration of homosexual adaptation in the candidate should be carefully examined to avoid accepting those persons whose serious immaturities are not appropriately confined" (p.131).

To Hogman (1985), the question of whether or not to ordain homosexuals is related to the appropriate lifestyle for a Christian and for a leader of the Christian community in Canada at this time. The issue is accountability. A minister is accountable to the community for public conduct. The implication is that any sort of homosexual activity would be unacceptable for a minister. Similarly, Kirkley (1984) in discussing standards for ministry in the United Methodist Church, argued that the question is not one of tolerance or intolerance but a matter of what the church expects of its clergy. Individuals are not automatically entitled to being "set apart" for ordained ministry, and the church makes special demands of those who seek that office. Kirkley contends that fidelity in marriage and celibacy in singleness is the pattern of morality that should be followed. The House of Bishops of the Anglican Church of Canada, in 1979, stated that following traditional Catholic practice, persons of

homosexual orientation may be ordained to the priesthood. At the same time, there was an insistence on abstinence from homosexual practice (Creighton, 1986). Bishop H.W. Chilstrom of the newly formed Evangelical Lutheran Church in America wrote in a recent Pastoral Letter (March 20, 1988) that although the predecessor churches had no official policy, there had grown up the following practice: "Persons of known homosexual orientation were told that they could not be ordained or be retained on the roster of ordained ministers unless they refrained from homosexual practice."

Garbe (1985) wrote that to ordain practising or potentially practising homosexuals would amount to blessing the homosexual lifestyle, which would, in effect, support what God forbids. Garbe would consider the possibility of ordaining a person with homosexual feelings who recognizes that these feelings are not a gift from God to be celebrated and acted out in a homosexual lifestyle. Garbe would welcome the ordination of a "healed homosexual."

The Standing Commission on Human Affairs and Health (Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 1979) concluded that "avowed" homosexual persons should be welcomed into the church. However, the consensus of the members was that homosexual persons are neither competent and qualified to be ordained nor to be seen as an authentic alternative sexual model. In the Presbyterian study (cited by Wuthnow, 1979), less than ten percent of pastors thought homosexuals

should be admitted to the ranks of clergy. Only seven percent felt that the church should accept practising homosexuals into the clergy without any restrictions.

A Greek Orthodox bishop of Toronto was reported to have commented that ordination of a homosexual horrified and disgusted him and any homosexual priest discovered in his diocese would immediately be defrocked (Early, 1977). Evangelist Billy Graham was quoted during a 1975 visit to Europe as saying that ordination of homosexuals would be acceptable if they "turned away from their sins" (Early, 1977).

Clearly, there is considerable opposition within churches to the ordination of homosexuals, but some more permissive positions are also evident. A report from the Episcopal Diocese of Ohio (Screening Task Force of the Commission on Ministry, 1976) indicated that sexual orientation should not be among the criteria for selecting candidates for ordination. Similarly, the Executive Council of the United Church of Christ (United States) recommended "that in the instance of considering a stated homosexual candidacy for ordination, the issue should not be his/her homosexuality, but rather the candidate's total view of human sexuality and his/her understanding of the morality of its use" (Nelson, 1978, p.207).

Ellen Barrett (1978), a homosexual Episcopal priest, took a similar position when she stated that the issue is not the individual's sexuality, but how she/he uses it. The Division of Ministry Personnel and Education of the United Church of Canada

recommended that the General Council approve the following resolution:

...that sexual orientation, in and of itself should not be a factor in determining membership in the Order of Ministry of the United Church of Canada, and that homosexual orientation, in and of itself should not be a factor in determining a person's eligibility for membership in the Order of Ministry of the United Church of Canada. (United Church of Canada, 1984, p.214)

The General Council did not approve the resolution but recommended that the matter be studied further. The recommendation included the guidance that the present candidature process does not mention sexual orientation of candidates who apply for admission to the order of ministry. It was further noted that it would be inappropriate to ask about sexual orientation of those in the candidature process, or of those in the call/appointment/settlement process (United Church of Canada, 1984).

For some people in the church, there is a reluctance to accept ministers who make a public issue of their homosexuality and a greater tolerance when they do not make their homosexuality publicly known (Early, 1977; Hiltner, 1980). Scanzoni & Mollenkott (1978) stated that Ellen Barrett had commented privately that Christians seem willing enough to ordain into the ministry homosexuals who feel guilty, furtive, and ashamed about their homosexuality, but seem outraged at the prospect of ordaining those who fully accept their sexual

orientation and are open about it. According to Barrett, the effect is to proclaim that neurotic homosexuals make acceptable priests while healthy homosexuals do not.

The question of ordaining homosexuals remains an unsettled issue for Christian Churches. If they say, "No," to otherwise qualified candidates when it is well known that there are many unavowed homosexual persons in the ministry, the charge can be made of concealment and hypocrisy. But to simply say, "Yes," comes close to accepting the philosophy that sex is purely a private affair (Hiltner, 1980).

Other Influences on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

In addition to the factors already discussed, there are others which may influence attitudes toward homosexuality. Several researchers found women to be more tolerant of homosexuality than were men (Dressler, 1979; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Hong, 1984; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980; Minnigerode, 1976). However, others have reported results that indicate no gender differences (Henley & Pincus, 1978; Irwin & Thompson, 1979; Weinberger & Millham, 1979). Age has been found to be related to attitudes, with younger individuals tending to be more accepting and tolerant of homosexuals than are older individuals (Gallup, 1978; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Hong, 1984; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Wagenaar & Bartos, 1977). In a survey conducted by Gallup (1978), single individuals were found to be more tolerant of homosexuals than were those who were married.

Summary

Attitudes toward homosexuality within the Christian Church in general and among their clergy in particular, have tended to be at best cautious and at worst negative. Such attitudes are more a result of cultural influences than of theological reflections.

In this study, the attitudes of clergy towards homosexuality are expected to be influenced by: (a) denomination, (b) degree of religious orthodoxy, (c) position in the church, and (d) sex-role preference. Attitudes may also be influenced by demographic factors including (a) age, (b) gender, and (c) marital status.

Attitudes toward homosexuality are in turn expected to influence (a) the type of ministry to homosexuals, (b) the degree to which homosexuality is viewed as a moral and a justice issue, and (c) views of ordination of homosexuals.

As homosexuality becomes more and more a social and political issue, Christian Churches and their clergy are having to deal with it. With legislatures including sexual orientation within the human rights they protect, churches cannot avoid becoming involved. There does not appear to be clear agreement within churches or among clergy as to how best to minister to homosexuals or whether or not homosexuals should be ordained.

Chapter III

Methods of Procedure

Subjects

Subjects were ordained clergy of the following Christian Churches in Winnipeg: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, United, and Lutheran. According to the 1981 Canada Census church membership information (Statistics Canada, 1983), these are the five largest Christian denominations in Winnipeg. A total of 468 questionnaires were mailed out. Two were returned as non-deliverable. One was returned because the respondent was deceased. One of the returns was deemed ineligible because the respondent was not ordained. Of the 464 remaining questionnaires mailed, a total of 263 usable returns were received, representing 56.7 percent of the targeted clergy. Table 1 indicates the response rate for each denomination. The low response rate from the Roman Catholic clergy may have been due in part to that denomination having an official position on homosexuality that is negative (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986). Given that position, there may be less inclination for the clergy to grapple with the issue and therefore less interest in participating in the study.

Data Collection

Data were collected by a mailed questionnaire (Appendix B). Dillman's (1978) recommendations were followed in designing the

Table 1

Response of Clergy by Denomination

Denomination	Total no. of questionnaires	Number of respondents	% of response for denomination	% of response of total returns
Roman Catholic	148	57	38.5	21.7
Mennonite	105	63	60.0	24.0
Anglican	79	42	53.1	16.0
United	74	48	64.9	18.3
Lutheran	58	37	63.8	14.1
Non-defined		16		6.1
Total	464	263	56.7	

questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix A). Because homosexuality is a socially sensitive subject, particularly within churches, the clergy were assured of anonymity. They were advised to mail under separate cover their request for a summary of the study results (Appendix A). Further, they were encouraged to omit any demographic question that might violate their anonymity.

Dillman's (1978) major implementation strategies were employed in the mail-out procedures: (a) addresses on envelopes were hand-typed; (b) cover letters were individually signed; and (c) printed, post-paid return envelopes were included with the questionnaire. A follow-up mailing consisting of a printed and individually signed postcard reminder (Appendix A) was sent to the entire original sample. Due to financial restraints and an impending postal strike, a third mailing was not implemented.

Research Instruments and Measures

The Heterosexual Attitude Toward Homosexuality (HATH) Scale. This scale (Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980) was used to measure tolerance towards homosexuality (Appendix B, Section II). The 20-item Likert-type scale contained five response categories from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with corresponding weights ranging from one to five. The scale consisted of 10 positively keyed and 10 negatively keyed items. A participant's attitude score was the sum of the weights of the 20 items (after reversing the weights for negative

items). The higher the score, the more tolerant the respondent's attitude. The possible range of scores was 20 to 100. In previous studies (Larsen, Cate, & Reed, 1983), split-half reliability had been found to be .92. In terms of validity, the scale discriminated between the sexes, academic majors, high and low church attenders, highly and lowly religious individuals, and high and low authoritarians. In the present study, the internal reliability of the scale as determined by Cronbach's alpha was .96.

Orthodoxy Scale. This scale, developed by Currie (Driedger, Currie, & Linden, 1983) was used to measure the degree of orthodoxy of respondents' religious beliefs (Appendix B, Section VI). The scale was revised by Currie for the present study. Some of the original items were omitted. In others, the wording was changed for the sake of clarity. As used in the present study, the scale consisted of nine theological statements that dealt with fundamentalist and neo-orthodox beliefs. It included a five point Likert-type response range from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Scores on each item range from one to five. Scores on items 2, 4, 6, and 7 were reversed. Scores were summed to produce a total score. The possible range of scores was nine to 45. The higher the total score on this scale, the more orthodox or fundamentalist the respondent's theological position. The internal reliability of the scale as determined by Cronbach's alpha was .85.

Sex-Role Preference Inventory. This scale (Scanzoni, 1980) was used to measure sex-role preference (Appendix B, Sections IX-XII). It is a five point Likert-type scale with response categories ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Scores on each item range from zero to four. The 24-item inventory provides a measure of attitudes on the roles of mothers, fathers, husbands, and wives within marriages. Scores on the following items were reversed: IX - 4, 5, 7; X - 1, 2, 3; XI - 4, 5; XII - 2, 4. The total combined score from all items indicates the degree of modern, as opposed to traditional, sex-role preference. The possible range of scores was zero to 96. Internal reliability of the scale as determined by Cronbach's alpha was .72.

Other questions relating to homosexuality. Several questions generated specifically for this study were included and interpreted independently (Appendix B). Items dealt with the following areas: (a) moral view of homosexuality was measured by the extent of agreement with the statement: "Homosexual behaviour is morally wrong" (Section III, Item 4); (b) Justice view of homosexuality was measured by the extent of agreement with the statement: "There should be no discrimination in society on the basis of sexual orientation" (Section III, Item 5); (c) Approval of ordination of homosexuals was measured by the extent of agreement with the statement: "Candidates seeking ordination who meet all the necessary requirements of my church body, but have indicated that their sexual orientation is homosexual, should

be ordained" (Section V, Item I). Each of these items employed a five-point Likert-type response, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Scores on each item ranged from one to five; the higher the score, the more sympathetic the response toward homosexuality. Ministry to homosexuals was determined by a multiple choice question in which respondents chose one of four means of ministering to homosexuals (a) help them to accept their homosexuality; (b) help them to change their homosexuality; (c) help them to accept their homosexuality, but discourage them from homosexual behaviour; or (d) help them to explore what is best for them. (Section IV, Item 2). Other questions were included that investigated respondents': (a) experience with homosexuals (Section I); (b) beliefs about the cause of homosexuality (Section II, Item 2); (c) beliefs about homosexuals changing their sexual behaviour and orientation (Section III, Items 6, 7); (d) beliefs about homosexuals being active in the church (Section III, Item 8; Section IV, Item 1); (e) beliefs about the appropriateness of religious ceremonies celebrating homosexual unions and respondents' willingness to perform such ceremonies (Section V, Items 2, 3).

Demographics. The following demographic information was collected in Section XIII: (a) denomination (Item 1), (b) gender (Item 2), (c) age (Item 3), (d) marital status (Item 4), (e) years since ordination (Item 5), and (f) position in the church (Item 6).

Independent Variables

Denomination. This variable includes the following Christian Churches: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, United and Lutheran (Section XIII, Item 1).

Orthodoxy. This variable is an indication of respondents' theological perspective. It was measured by the orthodoxy scale that taps fundamentalist and neo-orthodox beliefs (Section VI).

Position in the church. This variable indicates whether or not the clergy are working in a parish. Non-parish positions were further defined as chaplaincy, academic, administration, or retired (Section XIII, Item 6).

Sex-Role preference. This variable is an evaluation of and reactions to the sexual stratification system and to gender-linked division of labour in society. It was measured by the Sex-Role Preference Inventory (Sections IX-XII).

Tolerance towards homosexuality. This variable is an indication of the degree of tolerance towards homosexuality. It was measured by the HATH Scale (Section II).

Dependent Variables

Tolerance towards homosexuality. This variable is in some instances also a dependent variable.

Approval of ordination of homosexuals. This variable is an indication of the degree to which respondents agreed with the statement: "Candidates seeking ordination who meet all the necessary

requirements of my church body, but have indicated that their sexual orientation is homosexual, should be ordained" (Section V, Item 1).

Moral view of homosexuality. This variable is an indication of respondents' perception of the rightness or wrongness of homosexual behaviour as measured by the extent of agreement with the statement: "Homosexual behaviour is morally wrong" (Section III, Item 4).

Justice view of homosexuality. This variable refers to respondents' view of discrimination based on sexual orientation as measured by the extent of agreement with the statement: "There should be no discrimination in society on the basis of sexual orientation" (Section III, Item 5).

Ministry to homosexuals. This variable indicates how respondents would choose to minister to homosexuals: (a) help them to accept their homosexuality; (b) help them to change their homosexuality; (c) help them to accept their homosexuality, but discourage them from homosexual behaviour; or (d) help them to explore what is best for them.

Hypotheses

In this study the following hypotheses were tested:

The five denominations will differ in the degree of:

1. tolerance toward homosexuality
2. approval of ordaining homosexuals

The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality will be positively related to:

3. the extent of agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation
4. the degree of approval of ordaining homosexuals
5. modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference

The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality will be inversely related to:

6. the degree of orthodoxy
7. the degree to which homosexual behaviour is considered morally wrong
8. The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality will differ according to the preferred means of ministering to homosexuals. The clergy who would help homosexuals to change their homosexuality will be the least tolerant. Those who would help them to accept their homosexuality will be the most tolerant.
9. Non-parish clergy will be more tolerant toward homosexuality than parish clergy.
10. There will be an inverse relationship between the degree of orthodoxy and the degree of approval of ordaining homosexuals.

Summary: The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality will be affected by denomination, sex-role preference, orthodoxy, and position in the church. Tolerance will affect the degree to which homosexuality is viewed as a moral issue and a justice issue; preferred means of ministering to homosexuals; and the degree of approval of ordination of homosexuals. Approval of ordination of homosexuals will be affected by denomination and orthodoxy.

Chapter IV

Results and Discussion

Sample

The sample was comprised of the following ordained clergy: 57 (21.7%) Roman Catholic, 63 (24.0%) Mennonite, 42 (16.0%) Anglican, 48 (18.3%) United Church, 37 (14.1%) Lutheran, and 16 (6.1%) of unspecified denomination. There were 247 (93.9%) males, 12 (4.6%) females, and 4 (1.5%) who did not indicate gender. The mean age was in the 45 to 49 year old range. Marital status was as follows: 62 (23.6%) never married, 189 (71.9%) now married, and 12 (4.6%) separated, divorced, widowed, or no status indicated. Years since ordination ranged from one to 57 with a mean of 21 years. Regarding current employment 131 (49.8%) worked in a parish, 127 (48.3%) were in positions other than parish, and 5 (1.9%) did not designate employment. See Table 2 for demographic information by denominational groups. Table 3 describes the sample in terms of responses related to homosexuality.

Data Analysis

A one-way analysis of variance was computed to determine if there were differences among the five denominations in their tolerance toward homosexuality. Scheffe's a posteriori contrast test was used to determine pair-wise differences. In addition, because orthodoxy was significantly related to tolerance, an analysis of variance comparing denominations on tolerance, but using orthodoxy as a

Table 2

Demographic Information by Denomination

Denomination	Gender		Age Mean	Marital Status			Employment ^a		Ordination Mean Years
	M	F		S	M	Oth.	Parish	Other	
Roman Catholic	57	0	45-49	57	0	0	24	27	23.6
Mennonite	62	1	45-49	1	60	2	23	26	18.8
Anglican	40	2	50-54	1	38	3	25	7	21.4
United Church	41	6	45-49	0	46	2	31	10	20.6
Lutheran	34	3	45-49	1	35	0	20	15	20.7

Note: The totals vary due to missing data.

^aEmployment does not include retirees.

Table 3

Description of Sample in Numbers and Percentages According to
Responses to Homosexuality Items

Questionnaire items	<u>n</u>	%
1. Had thought about homosexuality:		
(a) not at all or very little	11	4.2
(b) some	64	24.3
(c) quite a bit	109	41.1
(d) a great deal	73	27.8
2. Personally knew 5 or fewer individuals who were known publicly to be homosexual	170	64.6
3. Personally knew no individuals who were known publicly to be homosexual	55	20.9
4. Had ministered in some way to homosexuals	190	72.2
5. Had knowingly given communion to individuals known publicly to be homosexual and were sexually active	88	35.8
6. Had refused to give communion to individuals known publicly to be homosexual and were sexually active	06	2.3

(Continued)

Table 3 continued...

Questionnaire items	<u>n</u>	%
The following numbers and percentages indicate those who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the items.		
7. Homosexual behaviour is morally wrong	127	48.3
8. There should be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation	159	60.5
9. Homosexuals could be led by God's grace to change their:		
(a) sexual behaviour	159	60.5
(b) sexual orientation	66	23.1
10. To be active in the church, homosexuals should refrain from homosexual activities and relationships	125	47.6
11. Homosexuals should be ordained	106	40.3
12. (a) It would be appropriate to have religious ceremonies celebrating the union and commitment of 2 homosexuals to each other	51	19.3
(b) Would be willing to perform such a religious ceremony	45	17.1

covariate, was computed. A one-way analysis of variance was used to compare parish and non-parish clergy on tolerance toward homosexuality.

Nonparametric tests were used in the analyses of variables in which the sample was not normally distributed. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was used to compare denominations on their degree of approval of ordaining homosexuals. The Mann-Whitney test was used in pair-wise comparisons of groups.

The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was computed to determine the significance of the following relationships: (a) tolerance toward homosexuality and agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation; (b) tolerance toward homosexuality and approval of ordination; (c) tolerance toward homosexuality and modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference; (d) tolerance toward homosexuality and orthodoxy; and (e) tolerance toward homosexuality and agreeing that homosexual behaviour is morally wrong.

Respondents were grouped according to how they would minister to homosexuals. Each group was sub-divided into low, medium, or high according to scores on the HATH scale. The low sub-groups included those who had scored in the first or lowest quartile, with scores of 52 or lower. Similarly, the high sub-groups included those who had scored in the fourth or highest quartile with scores of 82 or higher. The medium sub-groups included those in the second and third quartiles with scores between 52 and 82. The chi-square test was then computed

to determine if there were significant differences among the four ministry groups in tolerance toward homosexuality. An additional chi-square test was done to determine the significance of the difference in tolerance between those who would help homosexuals to accept their homosexuality and those who would help them to change.

Test of Hypotheses

A correlation matrix (Spearman's rank order correlation coefficients) of measures used and the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.

Tolerance toward homosexuality. (H_1) Table 5 is an indication of respondents' agreement with individual items on the HATH scale. The descriptive statistics for each denomination on this scale are found in Table 6. Table 7 presents the one-way analysis of variance of denominational differences on the HATH scale. As predicted in H_1 , the results indicated that the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality differed significantly among the five denominations ($F[4,196] = 20.43$; $p < .001$). Using Scheffe's a posteriori contrast test, the United Church clergy were found to be significantly more tolerant ($p < .05$) than were those of the other four denominations. The Mennonite clergy were significantly less tolerant than those of the other denominations ($p < .05$). Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran clergy were not found to differ significantly (see Table 8). The analysis of variance using tolerance and orthodoxy as covariates indicated that there were significant denominational differences in tolerance even when effects

Table 4

Correlation Matrix (r_s) and Descriptive Statistics of Measures

	1	2	3	4	5	\bar{M}	S.D.	Range
1. Homosexual behaviour morally wrong						2.75	1.32	1-5
2. Not discriminate/ sexual orientation	-.5951 (n243)					2.41	1.20	1-5
3. Approval of ordination	-.7542 (n232)	.6452 (n229)				2.84	1.47	1-5
4. HATH	-.8503 (n205)	.7581 (n205)	.8746 (n193)			67.76	18.37	28-100
5. Orthodoxy	.6033 (n182)	-.4813 (n182)	-.6043 (n175)	-.6419 (n158)		19.78	6.51	9-40
6. Sex-role preference	-.6090 (n213)	.5420 (n214)	.6724 (n200)	.7170 (n188)	-.5671 (168)	60.81	14.14	23-96

Note: All correlations were significant at $p < .0001$.

Table 5

Percentage of Agreement with Items on HATH Scale

HATH items	%
1. I enjoy the company of homosexuals	41.5
2. It would be beneficial to society to recognize homosexuality as normal	31.4
3. Homosexuals should not be allowed to work with children	31.8
4. Homosexuality is immoral	43.0
5. Homosexuality is a mental disorder	16.6
6. All homosexual bars should be closed down	23.6
7. Homosexuals are mistreated in our society	73.6
8. Homosexuals should be given social equality	66.4
9. Homosexuals are a viable part of our society	67.2
10. Homosexuals should have equal opportunity for employment	82.0
11. There is no reason to restrict the places where homosexuals work	62.1
12. Homosexuals should be free to date whomever they want	64.3
13. Homosexuality is a sin	44.0
14. Homosexuals do need psychological treatment	44.2

(Continued)

Table 5 continued...

HATH items	%
15. Homosexuality endangers the institution of the family	44.3
16. Homosexuals should be accepted completely into our society	55.4
17. Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession	24.6
18. Those in favour of homosexuality tend to be homosexuals themselves	8.3
19. There should be no restrictions on homosexuality	15.9
20. I avoid homosexuals whenever possible	11.2

Note: Percentages include those who agreed and strongly agreed.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics on HATH Scale for Denominations

Denomination	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	S.D.	Range
Roman Catholic	44	66.98	15.60	33-94
Mennonite	49	54.88	16.50	28-93
Anglican	33	68.76	16.13	39-98
United	41	83.93	11.70	45-100
Lutheran	34	71.24	16.28	45-100
Total	209	67.76	18.37	28-100

Note: The higher the score, the greater the tolerance.

Table 7

Denominational Differences in Tolerance (HATH). Analysis of Variance

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	4	19209.05	4802.26	20.43*
Within Groups	196	46081.20	235.11	
Total	200	65290.25		

* $p < .001$

Table 8

Scheffe's Test of Group Means and Differences on HATH

Denomination		R C	Menn	Angl	U C
	<u>M</u>				
Roman Catholic	66.98				
Mennonite	54.88	12.10*			
Anglican	68.76	1.78	13.88*		
United	83.93	16.95*	29.05*	15.17*	
Lutheran	71.24	4.26	16.24*	2.48	12.69*

Note: *Denotes pairs significantly different at the .05 level.

due to orthodoxy were removed ($F[4,147] = 8.15; p < .0001$). The descriptive statistics for each denomination on the Orthodoxy scale are found in Table 9.

As expected, tolerance toward homosexuality was significantly related to the following variables: (a) agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation; (b) approval of ordination; (c) modern attitudes regarding sex-role preferences; (d) orthodoxy; and (e) agreement with homosexual behaviour being morally wrong. Spearman's rank order correlation coefficients for those relationships are included in the correlation matrix (see Table 4).

(H₃) Tolerance was positively related to agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation ($r_s = .7581, p < .0001$).

(H₄) Tolerance was positively related to approval of ordination ($r_s = .8746, p < .0001$). (H₅) Tolerance was also positively related to modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference ($r_s = .7170, p < .0001$).

(H₆) An inverse relationship was found between tolerance and orthodoxy ($r_s = -.6419, p < .0001$). Tolerance was also inversely related to agreement with homosexual behaviour being morally wrong ($r_s = -.8503, p < .0001$).

(H₈) In examining tolerance toward homosexuality of groups defined by how they would minister to homosexuals, the results were as predicted. The groups and their respective mean scores on the HATH scale were as follows: (a) helping homosexuals to accept their homosexuality ("Accept"; $M = 83.15$); (b) helping homosexuals to change

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics on Orthodoxy Scale for Denominations

Denomination	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	S.D.	Range
Roman Catholic	44	17.48	4.53	09-30
Mennonite	39	25.13	7.80	11-40
Anglican	33	18.94	4.73	09-31
United	39	16.13	3.53	10-24
Lutheran	27	20.15	5.90	10-36

Note: The higher the score, the greater the degree of orthodoxy.

their homosexuality ("Change"; $\underline{M}=44.44$); (c) helping homosexuals to accept their homosexuality, but discouraging them from homosexual behaviour ("Discourage"; $\underline{M}=57.43$); or (d) helping homosexuals to explore what is best for them ("Explore"; $\underline{M}=77.20$). The results from the chi-square test (Table 10) indicated that there were significant differences in tolerance towards homosexuality among the four groups ($\chi^2[6]=113.06$, $p<.0001$). Those who would help homosexuals change were the least tolerant and those who would help them accept their homosexuality were the most tolerant. Consistent with the hypothesis the difference between those two groups was significant ($\chi^2[2]=29.43$, $p<.01$).

(H_9) Non-parish clergy ($\underline{M}=69.69$) were found to be slightly more tolerant than parish clergy ($\underline{M}=67.75$) toward homosexuality. Contrary to expectations, the one-way analysis of variance (Table 11) indicated that the difference between the two groups was not significant ($F[1,176]=.50$, $p=.481$).

Approval of ordination of homosexuals. (H_2) As predicted, the results of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks indicated that the five denominations differed in their degree of approval of ordaining homosexuals. Significant differences were found among the denominations in the extent to which they agreed that candidates seeking ordination who meet all the necessary requirements of their respective church bodies, but have indicated a homosexual orientation should be ordained ($H[4]=64.92$, $p<.0001$); see Table 12.

Table 10

Observed Frequencies of Choice of Ministry by Ranking on HATH

Ministry	Low	Medium	High	Total
Accept	2	2	9	13
Change	28	4	0	32
Discourage	13	29	0	42
Explore	8	60	41	109
Total	51	95	50	196

$$\chi^2 (6) = 113.06, p < .0001$$

Table 11

Non-parish and Parish Clergy Differences in Tolerance (HATH).

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	4	158.74	158.74	0.50*
Within Groups	176	56201.72	319.33	

*p = .481

Table 12

Comparison of Denominations on Approval of Ordination of
Homosexuals

Denomination	<u>n</u>	Rank Sum	K-W Stat.
Roman Catholic	47	5416.5	64.92*
Mennonite	57	3829.0	
Anglican	40	4474.0	
United	47	7870.5	
Lutheran	34	3825.0	

*p<.0001

The results of the Mann-Whitney test to determine pair-wise differences in approval of ordination are presented in Table 13. The United Church clergy were significantly more approving than were the other four denominations. The Mennonite clergy were significantly less approving than were the other denominations. Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran clergy did not differ significantly in approval of ordination of homosexuals.

(H₁₀) The expected inverse relationship between the degree of orthodoxy and approval of ordination of homosexuals was confirmed by the results of the Spearman rank order correlation ($r_s = -.6043$, $p .0001$); see Table 4.

Summary. Hypothesis 1 - The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality was found to differ significantly among the five denominations. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2 - The degree of approval of ordination of homosexuals was found to differ significantly among the five denominations. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 3 - A significant positive relationship was found between the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and the extent of agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 4 - A significant positive relationship was found between the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and approval of ordination of homosexuals. The hypothesis was supported.

Table 13

Pair-wise Comparisons of Denominations on Approval of Ordination
of Homosexuals

Denomination	n	Rank Sum	M-W Stat.
United	47	2311.0	
Lutheran	34	1010.0	1183.0*
Roman Catholic	47	3090.0	
Mennonite	57	2370.0	1962.0*
Roman Catholic	47	2106.5	
Anglican	40	1721.5	978.5
Roman Catholic	47	1657.0	
United	47	2808.0	529.0*
Roman Catholic	47	1947.0	
Lutheran	34	1374.0	819.0
Mennonite	57	2287.0	
Anglican	40	2466.0	634.0*
Mennonite	57	1899.5	
United	47	3560.0	264.5*

(Continued)

Table 13 continued...

Denomination	n	Rank Sum	M-W Stat.
Mennonite	57	2231.5	
Lutheran	34	1954.5	578.5*
Anglican	40	1253.0	
United	47	2575.0	433.0*
Anglican	40	1493.5	
Lutheran	34	1281.5	673.5

* $p < .001$

Hypothesis 5 - A significant positive relationship was found between the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and the degree of modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 6 - A significant inverse relationship was found between the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and the degree of orthodoxy. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 7- A significant inverse relationship was found between the degree of tolerance toward homosexuality and the degree to which homosexual behaviour is considered morally wrong. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 8 - The degree of tolerance toward homosexuality was found to differ significantly according to the preferred means of ministering to homosexuals. The clergy who would prefer to help homosexuals to change their homosexuality were found to be the least tolerant. Those who would prefer to help them to accept their homosexuality were the most tolerant. These two groups were found to differ significantly in tolerance toward homosexuality. The hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 9 - Non-parish clergy were not found to be more tolerant of homosexuals than were parish clergy. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 10 - A significant inverse relationship was found between the degree of orthodoxy and approval of ordination of homosexuals. The hypothesis was supported.

Discussion

The results will be discussed within the context of social exchange theory, which states that humans avoid costly statuses, relationships, interactions, and feeling states and seek rewarding ones, to the end that their profits are maximized, or losses minimized. Costs and rewards may be external or internal. For the sake of clarity, costs and rewards will be discussed as they apply to specific variables. However, the decisions and choices made by individuals could be influenced by all or some of the variables to varying degrees. The results will also be related to previous research and writings where applicable.

Orthodoxy. The results, which indicate that the more orthodox or fundamentalist clergy are the less tolerant they are toward homosexuality, support earlier findings that theological orientation is a good predictor of clergy views and actions (Blaikie, 1976; Driedger, 1974; Jeffries and Tygart, 1974). The present results also support Hochstein's (1986) findings that pastoral counsellors who had high homophobia scores were more likely to report being more conservative within their denominations than were those with lower scores.

The relationship between orthodoxy or fundamentalism and intolerance toward homosexuality may be partly explained by the fundamentalists' tendency to interpret the Bible literally and to regard it as the final authority on moral issues. Although many others would argue that to understand Biblical texts, consideration must be given to the context in which they were written, fundamentalists would disagree. Others believe that the Biblical passages that deal with homosexuality do not address the issue as we understand it today. Again, fundamentalists would disagree. Because the Biblical passages related to homosexuality treat the subject negatively, fundamentalists believe that homosexuality is contrary to the Word of God, and is therefore wrong. This belief is indicated by the finding in the present study that the more orthodox or fundamentalist the clergy are, the more they agree that homosexual behaviour is morally wrong.

It becomes likely then that, to the fundamentalists, the cost of tolerance towards homosexuality would be to be unfaithful to God, to disobey God's Word, and to encourage sinfulness. A reward of being tolerant may be to be able to demonstrate Christian love and acceptance. However, in most cases the rewards would be outweighed by the costs as perceived by the fundamentalists, resulting in the intolerance expressed in this study.

Those who scored low on orthodoxy or fundamentalism would tend to be liberal or neo-orthodox in their theological position. This group,

rather than looking to the Bible for pronouncements on moral issues, would more likely look at Biblical themes such as grace, justice, and inclusivity. Tolerance towards homosexuality would be consistent with those themes and therefore rewarding to these people. Costs might include the discomfort that comes with taking a minority position.

Approval of ordination is related to orthodoxy. The more orthodox or fundamentalist the clergy are, the less they agree that homosexuals should be ordained. As has been indicated, fundamentalists view homosexuality as being morally wrong and contrary to the Word of God. The cost of ordaining homosexuals would be even greater than tolerating them. To ordain is to "set apart" for a particular kind of leadership in the church. The cost of ordaining homosexuals would be to strongly condone what God clearly forbids. There would be no rewards to the fundamentalists in ordaining homosexuals.

To the liberals, the rewards of ordaining homosexuals would again be to be consistent with the Biblical themes stated above. Costs, in addition to taking a minority position, might also include concern for the ordained homosexual persons who might not be accepted by congregations.

Moral or justice view of homosexuality. The less tolerant the clergy are toward homosexuality, the more likely they are to agree that homosexual behaviour is morally wrong. To those who believe that homosexual behaviour is morally wrong, the cost of tolerance would be

to encourage immoral behaviour and sinfulness and thus weaken the moral fibre of society. There would also be the risk of exposing others to the immorality of homosexuality. Because it would be inconsistent to be tolerant of what is morally wrong, there would be no rewards to this group in being tolerant toward homosexuality. The rewards of intolerance would be to uphold what is morally right and there would be no cost in being intolerant.

The more tolerant the clergy are, the more likely they are to agree that there should be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. To those who view homosexuality as a justice issue, there would be no cost of being tolerant. Rewards of tolerance might include taking a stand against injustice, affirming the worth and integrity of individuals, and increasing the potential for a more just society. The cost of intolerance would be to perpetuate injustice and there would be no reward of intolerance.

The relationship between the two variables that emphasize, respectively, a moral and a justice view should be noted. Irwin and Thompson (1977) concluded that many people separate their moral censure of homosexuality from their attitudes about the civil rights of homosexuals. Wagenaar and Bartos (1977) found that the more willing clergy were to separate their moral and civil views, the more accepting they were of homosexuals. In the present study, on the one hand, respondents had the opportunity to agree or disagree that homosexual behaviour is morally wrong, and on the other hand, to agree

or disagree that there should be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Results indicate that the more the clergy agree that homosexuality is morally wrong, the less likely they are to agree that there should be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Thus, respondents tend to view homosexuality either as a moral issue or as a justice issue. When viewed as a moral issue, homosexuality is seen as a problem within the individual homosexual person. S/He is responsible. The solution is that s/he must change. When homosexuality is viewed as a justice issue, the problem is located in society. Society is responsible for the discrimination and injustices experienced by the homosexual person. The solution is that society must change.

Denominations. As expected, there are significant differences among the five denominations in the tolerance of their clergy toward homosexuality. The United Church clergy are the most tolerant and the Mennonites are the least tolerant. Theologically, the Mennonites tend to be fundamentalists. Therefore, the discussion above regarding orthodoxy and tolerance would apply to them. However, as results in the present study indicate, denominational differences in tolerance cannot be attributed solely to differences in orthodoxy.

The result that United Church clergy are the most tolerant is consistent with Driedger's (1974) Winnipeg denominational study, which found that the United Church clergy ranked lower than the total group average on social control factors and higher on social liberty

factors. The findings in the present study that the United Church and Mennonite clergy are respectively the most and the least tolerant towards homosexuality of the five denominations are similar to one aspect of Bibby's (1987) study of a national sample of church members from several denominations. In response to a question regarding sexual relations between two adults of the same gender, committed church members of the United Church were the most tolerant and Conservative Protestants (a group including Mennonites) were the least tolerant. However, in the same study, in response to a question dealing with the rights of homosexuals, the ranking of the denominations differed from the above. The Conservative Protestant members were again the least tolerant, but the Anglicans were the most tolerant. Whereas the present study was carried out in 1987 with a sample of clergy from a specific geographic area, Bibby's study was carried out in 1985 with a national sample of church members. These difference may partly account for the discrepancy between the results of Bibby's study and the present one.

The tolerance of the United Church clergy may be partly explained by this denomination's recent push to study the homosexuality issue. In 1984, the General Council mandated that the whole church be given the opportunity to participate in continuing study of issues concerning sexual orientations, lifestyles, and ministry. Subsequently, machinery was set in place to carry out such studies with November, 1987 being the deadline for receipt of responses

(United Church of Canada, 1988). That push to study the issue may have encouraged the United Church clergy to become more knowledgeable about homosexuality. Although it cannot be assumed that studying the issue necessarily leads to tolerance, it may have provided the opportunity for the clergy to deal with information regarding stereotypes and to come to terms with their own fears and misgivings about the subject. That, in turn, may have led to tolerance costing less in personal terms than would otherwise have been the case.

The United Church's traditional concern about social justice issues may also explain the degree of tolerance evidenced by their clergy in this study. That concern for social justice is reflected in the present study by 93.6% of the United Church clergy agreeing or strongly agreeing that there should be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. To the United Church clergy, the rewards of being tolerant might include being consistent with that denomination's theological position on social justice and confirming that the church is all inclusive and accepting. The cost of being tolerant would be to face opposition from those who do not agree with the position. Indications are that for the United Church clergy in this study, the rewards of being tolerant outweigh the costs of being tolerant.

Although Mennonites are also concerned about social justice, they tend to view homosexuality as a moral issue, which may partly account for the lack of tolerance exhibited by their clergy. In this study, 79.4% of the Mennonites agree to strongly agree that homosexual

behaviour is morally wrong. That result is similar to the findings of Kauffman and Harder's (1975) survey of Mennonites in which 86% agreed that homosexual acts were always wrong. Therefore, the costs and rewards to the Mennonites of tolerance and intolerance towards homosexuality would include those already ascribed to the people who view homosexuality as a moral issue. The costs and rewards would also include those ascribed to fundamentalists. In addition, there would be the cost of being in opposition to the majority position of colleagues and others in the denomination.

The tendency of the United Church and Mennonite clergy to view homosexuality respectively as a justice or a moral issue, is supported by the finding in the present study regarding causation. Sixty-three percent of the United Church clergy believe that homosexuality is a genetic condition or potentiality. Seventy-four percent of the Mennonites believe that homosexuality is caused by postnatal environment or is a freely chosen way of life.

Ordination of homosexuals. In this study, 40.3% of the clergy agree or strongly agree that candidates seeking ordination who meet all the necessary requirements of their church body, but have indicated that their sexual orientation is homosexual, should be ordained. The denominations differ significantly in their approval of ordaining homosexuals. The denominational differences follow the same pattern as that for tolerance toward homosexuality. The United Church clergy are the most approving and the Mennonites are the least

approving. It is to be expected that the denomination that is the most tolerant toward homosexuality would also be the most approving of ordaining homosexuals and that the least tolerant would be the least approving. This expectation is supported by the positive relationship between tolerance and approval of ordaining homosexuals.

There appears to be considerable support among the United Church clergy for the recommendation made to their denomination regarding ordination in the report Toward a Christian Understanding of Sexual Orientations, Lifestyles and Ministry (United Church of Canada, 1988).

The report recommended that:

That the 32nd General Council, its Divisions, and the members and Courts of the United Church of Canada affirm that sexual orientation in and of itself is not a barrier to participation in all aspects of the life and ministry of the Church, including the order of ministry. (p.4)

In the present study, 87% of the United Church clergy agree or strongly agree that homosexuals should be ordained. To the United Church clergy, the rewards of approving ordination could be to be consistent with the concern for social justice and inclusivity. The costs of approving ordination may include a concern that many congregations would not be willing to accept homosexual persons as their clergy. Further, some congregations may lose confidence in those clergy who approve of ordaining homosexuals.

Sixteen percent of the Mennonites agree or strongly agree that homosexuals should be ordained and 56% strongly disagree. These percentages reflect this denomination's intolerance toward homosexuality. The percentages may also reflect the tendency to stress the moral aspect of the issue. Morality is a factor in intolerance but would be even more of a factor when considering ordination of homosexuals. Because the clergy are leaders in the church, many people believe that the clergy must lead morally exemplary lives. There is support for this view in the findings that deal with the privileges that the clergy would accord publicly known homosexuals in congregations. They are much more likely to allow the privileges that involve passive participation (i.e., membership, being baptized, and receiving holy communion). They are less likely to allow the privileges that include a leadership function (i.e., serving holy communion or holding elected office). This tendency is true of the sample in general and the Mennonites in particular. The cost to the Mennonites of approving ordination of homosexuals would include sanctioning what is morally wrong thus undermining their entire moral system and theology. There would be no rewards of such approval.

Ministry to homosexuals. The results of this study indicate that the degree of tolerance clergy feel toward homosexuality affects how they would choose to minister to homosexuals. For example, those who would minister by helping homosexuals to change their homosexuality have the least tolerant attitudes towards homosexuality. This group's

choice of how to minister reflects the moral attitude discussed earlier. They locate the problem in the homosexual person. The solution is for that person to change, and their ministry to that person is to help bring about that change.

The clergy who would help homosexuals accept their homosexuality are the most tolerant. This group would probably tend to view whatever difficulty the homosexual person is having with his/her sexual orientation as being due to the attitudes of society. Therefore, the focus would be on helping the individual accept his or her homosexuality despite the negative attitudes encountered.

The response chosen by most of the clergy as to how they would minister is to help homosexuals explore what is best for them. This response might have been chosen because it is socially desirable and allows respondents to avoid having to come to terms with the issues of change or acceptance of orientation. However, the fact that the clergy who choose that response are second only to the "acceptance group" in tolerance would seem to indicate that a significant number of the "explore group" are genuinely concerned about how they could best minister to homosexuals.

A less tolerant group were the clergy who would help homosexuals accept their homosexuality but would discourage them from homosexual behaviour. These are people who would make a sharp distinction between homosexual orientation and homosexual behaviour and would advocate celibacy for homosexuals. They would probably espouse the philosophy, "hate the sin, but love the sinner."

Position in the church. Contrary to what had been expected, clergy in non-parish positions were not more tolerant towards homosexuality than were their parish counterparts. The expectation had been based on the assumption that, because parish clergy are to some degree responsible to their parishes, the cost to them of tolerance would outweigh the rewards, whereas to non-parish clergy, the rewards of tolerance would outweigh the costs. The anticipated cost to the parish clergy included being in opposition to parishioners and to a significant faction within their denomination, which might lead to the further cost of jeopardizing present and future employment in the church. Anticipated rewards included being able to minister, by caring and accepting homosexual individuals.

The anticipated rewards to the non-parish clergy included taking leadership, by following Jesus' example in dealing with a socially and theologically contentious issue. It was thought that they would have more freedom to do that because they were not so likely to be responsible to a specific, small geographic group such as a parish. Anticipated costs including being in opposition to a considerable segment of their particular denomination.

The present findings are contrary to Hiltner's (1980) report that in the United Presbyterian Church, national church executives were more liberal than ordained ministers in their views on homosexuality. The difference in the results in the present study from those reported by Hiltner may be because: (a) the present study included five

denominations instead of one; and (b) the non-parish clergy in the present study included chaplains (institutional and campus), academics, and administrators at various levels of the church hierarchy and not just church executives.

According to Hammond and Mitchell (1973) campus clergy had more liberal attitudes generally than parish pastors. The present study, by virtue of being restricted to one city, would at best have a very small number of campus clergy, with the exact number being unknown due to the concern for anonymity. Hoge (1976) had also demonstrated that Protestant non-parish clergy were more liberal than parish clergy, but only to a slight extent.

In the present study, the two denominations which were the least tolerant, the Mennonites and Roman Catholics account for 29.9% and 31.0%, respectively, of all non-parish clergy. Consequently, these numbers may contribute to the overall lack of differences between parish and non-parish clergy. Although there may be differences between parish and non-parish clergy within denominations, the overall effect may be diminished by most of the non-parish clergy belonging to the two least tolerant denominations.

The anonymity of responses in the present study may also contribute to the lack of differences in tolerance between the two groups. Parish clergy may have been more tolerant in their responses than they would have been if they had to justify their position to their parishioners. That speculation is supported by Hadden's (1970)

studies of clergy who did or did not participate in civil rights protests. The differences in that instance between parish and non-parish clergy were not in terms of attitudes but in terms of how free they felt they were to participate. Parish clergy in the present study could feel confident that their parishioners would never know how they had responded. There would, therefore, be no external costs associated with clergy taking a position that was more tolerant than that of their parishioners. It is possible that there could have been internal rewards associated with being tolerant in a way that they would not have chosen to be publicly.

Sex-role preference. The finding in the present study, that the more modern that clergy are regarding sex-role preference, the more tolerant they are towards homosexuality, has considerable support in studies of the general population (Henley & Pincus, 1978; Krulewitz & Nash, 1980; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Minnigerode, 1976). Bailey (1975) noted that homosexual acts committed by men have traditionally been heavily penalized, yet have almost been disregarded when committed by women. Bailey made the connection between the traditional view of women as inferior to men and negative attitudes towards homosexuality. The speculation is that when a man commits homosexual acts, he is like a woman and thus negatively valued. For men who hold traditional views regarding sex-role preference, the costs of being tolerant would outweigh the rewards. Because this is

more of an issue for men than for women, the fact that 93.9% of the present sample are men may have contributed to the strength of the relationship between sex-role preference and tolerance towards homosexuality. In addition, the costs of tolerance to the traditionalists would include upsetting the established order of creation. Those who hold a modern view of sex-roles tend to define roles according to individual needs and resources, as opposed to traditional expectations. Being tolerant towards homosexuals is consistent with that perspective and so therefore the rewards would outweigh the costs of being tolerant.

A contributing factor to the present finding may be the point made by Krulewitz and Nash (1980) that persons with more liberal sex-role attitudes are more accepting of homosexuality. This is the case not only because they tolerate non-stereotypic sex roles, but also because they tend to hold values that make them more accepting of all differences.

Chapter V

Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to examine clergy attitudes toward homosexuality. The subjects were the ordained clergy of Winnipeg's five major Christian denominations: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Anglican, United Church, and Lutheran.

Summary

The denominations differ in their tolerance toward homosexuality and in their approval of ordaining homosexuals. The United Church clergy are significantly more tolerant toward homosexuality and significantly more approving of ordaining homosexuals than are the clergy of the other four denominations. The Mennonite clergy are significantly less tolerant toward homosexuality and significantly less approving of ordaining homosexuals than those of the other four denominations. Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran clergy do not differ significantly from each other on these two measures.

Tolerance toward homosexuality is positively related to: (a) agreement with not discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation; (b) approval of ordaining homosexuals; and (c) modern attitudes regarding sex-role preference. Tolerance toward homosexuality is inversely related to religious orthodoxy and to agreement with homosexual behaviour being morally wrong.

Tolerance towards homosexuality differs according to the preferred means of ministering to homosexuals. The clergy who would prefer to help homosexuals accept their homosexuality are the most tolerant. This group is followed in descending order by those who would: (a) help them to explore what is best for them; (b) help them to accept their homosexuality, but discourage them from homosexual behaviour; and (c) help them to change their homosexuality. The two extreme groups, that is, those who would help homosexuals accept their homosexuality and those who would help them change it, differ significantly in tolerance.

Non-parish clergy do not differ from parish clergy in tolerance towards homosexuality. Approval of ordaining homosexuals is inversely related to religious orthodoxy.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it is possible to tentatively describe the clergy who are the most and the least tolerant towards homosexuality. The descriptions are respectively outlined in Table 14.

Of the five denominations, the United Church clergy were the most tolerant. Clearly, there are tolerant clergy within the other denominations as well, but not to the same extent. The implication here would seem to be that homosexual persons who wish to "come out" and be actively involved in their congregations cannot assume that they will be supported, or in some cases even tolerated, by their

Table 14

Descriptions of Clergy Who are the Most and the Least Tolerant
Toward Homosexuality

	Most Tolerant	Least Tolerant
Denomination	United Church	Mennonite
No discrimination on basis of orientation	agree	disagree
Homosexual behaviour morally wrong	disagree	agree
Orthodoxy	low	high
Ordain homosexuals	agree	disagree
Ministry to homosexuals	accept orientation	change orientation
Sex-role preference	modern	traditional

clergy. Further, declared homosexual persons who feel called to the ordained ministry in the four denominations other than the United Church, will probably face opposition from a considerable segment of the clergy.

An important factor is whether homosexuality is viewed as a moral or a justice issue. The justice issue of homosexuality has recently been addressed by legislation in some provinces, including Manitoba. It is possible that the Human Rights Code which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation may gradually persuade some clergy who presently hold a moral view of homosexuality to adopt more of a justice view. The results of the present study tend to suggest that those clergy might become more tolerant towards homosexuality. However, since cause and effect has not been established, it remains to be seen if in fact that will be the outcome.

Possibilities for future research in the area of clergy attitudes towards homosexuality include sampling the homosexual population regarding their experiences with congregations and clergy. A follow-up study in five years might be conducted with Winnipeg clergy to determine whether attitudes towards homosexuality have changed.

Another possibility would be to repeat the present study on a national basis with more denominations. Such a study would allow for a broader generalization of the results and also allow for regional comparisons. It would also be possible to do a study that included

clergy and laity, thus permitting a comparison of clergy and lay attitudes within each of the denominations sampled. Because the present study was restricted to a particular geographic area and to five specific Christian denominations, appropriate caution should be exercised in the generalization of results.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). Diagnostic and statistics manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Bailey, D.S. (1975). Homosexuality and the western Christian tradition. Hamden, CT: Archon Books.
- Barnhouse, R.T. (1976). Homosexuality. Anglican Theological Review Supplementary Series, 6, 107-134.
- Barrett, E.M. (1978). Gay people and moral theology. In L. Crew (Ed.), The gay academic. (pp. 329-334). Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Barth, K. (1961). The doctrine of creation. In G.W. Bromley & T.G. Torrance (Eds.), A.T. MacKay, T.H.L. Parker, H. Knight, & H.A. Kennedy (Trans.), Church dogmatics (Vol. III, no. 4). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Batchelor, E. (1980). Homosexuality and ethics. New York: The Pilgrim Press.
- Bishop asked to resign. (1983). The Christian Century, 100(6), 176.
- Bibby, R.W. (1987). Fragmented gods: The poverty and potential of religion in Canada. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.
- Blaikie, W.H. (1976). The use of "denomination" in sociological explanation: The case of the position of clergy on social issues. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15(1), 79-86.

- Boswell, J. (1980). Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Browning, D.S. (1979). Homosexuality, theology, the social sciences and the church. Encounter, 40(3), 223-243.
- Buck, I. (1983). Homosexuality: A subject that needs rethinking. Unpublished paper.
- Coleman, P. (1980). Christian attitudes to homosexuality. London: SPCK.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. (1986). Letter to the bishops of the Catholic Church on the pastoral case of homosexual persons. Vatican City.
- Creighton, P. (1986). Issues of social justice: Homosexuality and gay people. In J. Reed (Ed.), A study resource on human sexuality: Approaches to sexuality and Christian theology (pp. 97-126). Toronto: Anglican Book Centre.
- Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dressler, J. (1979). Study of law student attitudes regarding the rights of gay people to be teachers. Journal of Homosexuality, 4(4), 315-329.
- Driedger, L. (1974). Doctrinal belief: A major factor in the differential perception of social issues. The Sociological Quarterly, 15, 66-80.

- Driedger, L., Currie, R., & Linden, R. (1983). Dualistic and wholistic views of God the the world: Consequences for social action. Review of Religious Research, 24(3), 225-244.
- Dunbar, J., Brown, M., & Amoroso, D.M. (1973). Some correlates of attitudes toward homosexuality. The Journal of Social Psychology, 89, 271-279.
- Early, T. (1977). The struggle in the denominations: Shall gays be ordained? Christianity and Crisis, 37(9,10), 118-122.
- Fink, P.E. (1973). Homosexuality: A pastoral hypothesis. Commonweal, 98(5), 107-112.
- Frerichs, E. (1985). Homosexuality: I believe it's a justice issue. Mandate, 16(2), 3-5.
- Friesen, R. (1986). Profile of a president. Canada Lutheran, 1(1), 13-15.
- Gallup, G. (1978). The gallup poll: Public opinion 1972-1977. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.
- Garbe, R. (1985). Homosexuality: I believe it's a moral issue. Mandate, 16(2), 6-9.
- Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1979). Attitudes toward premarital, extramarital, and homosexual relations in the U.S. in the 1970's. The Journal of Sex Research, 15(2), 108-118.
- Gros, J. (1983). A gay church in the NCC? Christianity and Crisis, 43(7), 167-171.

- Guinan, M.D. (1983). Homosexuals: A Christian pastoral response now. In R. Nugent (Ed.), A challenge to love: Gay and lesbian Catholics in the church (pp. 67-77). New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Hadden, J.K. (1970). The gathering storm in the churches. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc.
- Hammon, P.E., & Mitchell, R.E. (1973). Segmentation of radicalism: The case of the protestant campus minister. In C.Y. Glock (Ed.), Religion in sociological perspective: Essays in the empirical study of religion (pp. 136-148). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc.
- Harrison, J. (1977). The dynamics of sexual anxiety. Christianity and Crisis, 37(9,10), 136-139.
- Henley, N.M., & Pincus, F. (1978). Interrelationship of sexist, racist, and antihomosexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 42, 83-90.
- Hiltner, S. (1980). Homosexuality and the churches. In J. Marmor (Ed.), Homosexual behavior: A modern reappraisal (pp. 219-213). New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Hochstein, L.M. (1986). Pastoral counsellors: Their attitudes towards gay and lesbian clients. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 40(2), 158-165.

- Hoge, D.R. (1976). Division in the Protestant house.
Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.
- Hogman, J. (1985). Homosexuality, sexual ethics and ordination.
Touchstone, 3(2), 4-14.
- Hong, S.M. (1984). Australian attitudes towards homosexuality:
A comparison with college students. The Journal of Psychology,
117, 89-95.
- Human sexuality in the Christian life. (1985). Scottdale, PA:
Mennonite Publishing House.
- Irwin, P., & Thompson, N. (1977). Acceptance of the rights of
homosexuals: A social profile. Journal of Homosexuality,
3(2), 107-121.
- Jeffries, V., & Tygart, C. (1974). The influence of theology,
denomination, and values upon the positions of clergy on social
issues. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13,
309-324.
- Jennings, T.W. (1980). Homosexuality and Christian faith: A
theological reflection. In E. Batchelor (Ed.), Homosexuality
and ethics (pp. 211-221). New York: The Pilgrim Press.
- Jones, H.K. (1966). Toward a Christian understanding of the
homosexual. New York: Association Press.
- Kantzer, K.S. (1983). Homosexuals in the church. Christianity
Today, 27(8), 8-9.

- Kauffman, J.H., & Harder, L. (1975). *Anabaptists four centuries later*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Kirdley, C.F. (1984). Fidelity in marriage...celibacy in singleness. Christianity and Crisis, 44(8), 186-188.
- Krulewitz, J.E., & Nash, J.E. (1980). Effects of sex role attitude and similarity on men's rejection of male homosexuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38(1), 67-74.
- Larsen, K.S., Cate, R., & Reed, M. (1983). Anti-black attitudes, religious orthodoxy, permissiveness, and sexual information: A study of the attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality. The Journal of Sex Research, 19(2), 105-118.
- Larsen, K.S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals towards homosexuality: A Likert-type scale and construct validity. The Journal of Sex Research, 16(3), 245-257.
- Liebllich, A., & Friedman, G. (1985). Attitudes toward male and female homosexuality and sex-role stereotypes in Israeli and American students. Sex Roles, 12(5/6), 561-570.
- Lutheran churches welcome gays. (1985). The Lutheran, 23(18), 20.
- Lyles, J.C. (1983). Not to decide. The Christian Century, 100(36), 1099-1100.

- MacDonald, A.P., & Games, R.G. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. Journal of Homosexuality, 1(1), 9-27.
- MacDonald, A.P., Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40(1), 161.
- Maguire, D. (1983). The morality of homosexual marriage. In R. Nugent (Ed.), A challenge to love: Gay and lesbian Catholics in the church (pp. 118-134). New York: The Crossroad Publishing Co.
- Maret, S.M. (1984). Attitudes of fundamentalists toward homosexuality. Psychological Reports, 55, 205-206.
- Martin, E.D., & Martin, R.K. (1981). Developmental and ethical issues in homosexuality: Pastoral implications. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 9(1), 58-68.
- McKain, W.H. (1979). Ministry and homosexuality. In C.W. Keyson (Ed.), What you should know about homosexuality (pp. 181-225). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- McNeill, J.J. (1976). The church and the homosexual. Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel.
- McNeill, J.J. (1987). Homosexuality: Challenging the church to grow. The Christian Century, 104(8), 242-246.

- Minnigerode, F.A. (1976). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Feminist attitudes and sexual conservatism. Sex Roles, 2(4), 347-352.
- Mollenkott, V.R. (1987). Goddling. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Nelson, J.A. (1978). Embodiment: An approach to sexuality and Christian theology. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Nelson, J.B. (1982). Religious and moral issues in working with homosexual clients. Journal of Homosexuality, 7(2/3), 163-175.
- Nugent, R. (1984). Homosexuality and the Vatican. The Christian Century, 10(101), 487-489.
- Nye, F.I. (1979). Choice, exchange, and the family. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye & I.L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (pp. 1-41). New York: The Free Press.
- Parke-Taylor, G. (1986). The Bible, Christian tradition, and sexuality. In J. Reed (Ed.), A study resource on human sexuality: Approaches to sexuality and Christian theology (pp. 27-42). Toronto: Anglican Book Centre.
- Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1979). Report of Standing Commission on Human Affairs and Health. New York: The Commission.
- Pruyser, P.W. (1976). The minister as diagnostician. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

- Reed, J. (1986). The study of sexuality in the context of recent Lambeth Conferences. In J. Reed (Ed.), A study resource on Human sexuality: Approaches to sexuality and Christian theology (pp. 55-65). Toronto: Anglican Book Centre.
- Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. (1976). Declaration on certain questions concerning sexual ethics. Catholic Mind, 74(1302), 52-64.
- Scanzoni, J. (1980). Contemporary marriage types. Journal of Family Issues, 1, 125-140.
- Scanzoni, L., & Mollenkot, V.R. (1978). Is the homosexual my neighbor? San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Screening Task Force of the Commission on Ministry. (1976). Report. Episcopal Diocese of Ohio.
- Shelp, E.E., & Sunderland, R.H. (1985). Aids and the church. The Christian Century, 102(27), 797-800.
- Smith D.C. (1978). Presbyterians on homosexuality: Studying others, finding self. Christianity and Crisis, 38, 22-27.
- Smith, K.T. (1971). Homophobia: A tentative personality profile. Psychological Reports, 29, 1091-1094.
- Stark, R., & Glock, C.Y. (1973). Prejudice and the churches. In C.Y. Glock (Ed.), Religion in sociological perspective: Essays in the empirical study of religion (pp. 88-101). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.

- Statistics Canada. (1983). Population: Religion, 92-912.
Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Storms, M.D. (1978). Attitudes toward homosexuality and femininity in men. Journal of Homosexuality, 3(3), 257-263.
- Strong, S.R. (1980). Christian counselling with homosexuals. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 8(4), 279-287.
- Thielicke, H. (1964). The ethics of sex. (J.W. Doberstein, Trans.) New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- United Church of Canada. (1984). Proceedings of the Thirtieth General Council, Morden, Manitoba, August 6-17.
- United Church of Canada. (1988). Toward a Christian understanding of sexual orientations, lifestyles and ministry.
- Wagenaar, T.C., & Bartos, P.E. (1977). Orthodoxy and attitudes of clergyman towards homosexuality and abortion. Review of Religious Research, 18(2), 114-125.
- Way, P. (1977). Homosexual counselling as a learning ministry. Christianity and Crisis, 37(9,10), 123-131.
- Weinberger, L.E., & Millham, J. (1979). Attitudinal homophobia and support of traditional sex roles. Journal of Homosexuality, 4(3), 237-246.
- Wuthnow, R. (1979). The current moral climate: What pastors think. Theology Today, 36(2), 239-250.

APPENDIX A

Cover Letter

Request for Results

Postcard Follow-up



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Department of Family Studies

Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
(204) 474-9225

The issue of homosexuality is gaining considerable prominence in society. For many people, the way churches deal with this issue is significant. Therefore, it is important at this time to investigate the attitudes of clergy toward homosexuality.

The enclosed questionnaire includes questions pertaining to homosexuality as well as questions that deal with other areas that may be related to attitudes toward homosexuality. The questionnaire, which takes about 20 minutes or less to complete, is being sent to all ordained clergy of several Christian denominations in Winnipeg. The research is being conducted in the Department of Family Studies at the University of Manitoba.

We invite you to participate in this study by filling in the questionnaire and mailing it in the enclosed preaddressed, postage-paid return envelope as soon as possible. We recognize that the issue of homosexuality and one's response to it are more clear for some than for others, but it is extremely important to the credibility of this study that as many clergy as possible respond.

As a participant in this study, you are assured of complete anonymity. Please do not put your name, initials, or other identifying information on the questionnaire or return envelope. If you think that because of your particular status in your church body, one of the demographic questions on page 9 might identify you, please feel free to omit the question.

In order to obtain the most accurate results, it is important that the questionnaire be answered as fully as possible. We would appreciate your answering all the questions, but where that is not possible, please answer as many as you can.

The data will be analyzed only in terms of group results. If you would like a summary of the results, please fill in and return the enclosed form. It should be mailed in a separate envelope to avoid identifying it with your questionnaire.

If you have any questions about the study, please call Inge Kirchhoff, Department of Family Studies: 474-9225.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Inge Kirchhoff
Master's Student, Department of Family Studies

Dr. N. Kingsbury
Assistant Professor, Department of Family Studies

Please send me a summary of the results of the study on Clergy
Attitudes Toward Homosexuality.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Mail to: Inge Kirchhoff
Department of Family Studies
Faculty of Human Ecology
The University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2



FACULTY OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Department of Family Studies

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Last week, a questionnaire concerning clergy attitudes toward a prominent social issue, was mailed to the clergy of several Christian denominations in Winnipeg.

If you have already completed and returned yours, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. It is extremely important that your response be included in the study in order that the results may accurately reflect the attitudes of Winnipeg clergy.

If by chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please call me at 474-9225 and another will be mailed to you.

Sincerely,

Inge Kirchhoff

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Department of Family Studies

Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
(204) 474-9225

CLERGY ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY

This survey is being conducted to learn about current clergy attitudes toward an increasingly prominent issue.

Please note that in this questionnaire, homosexual refers to both males and females.

To ensure that your responses will be completely anonymous, please do not put your name, initials, or other information that would personally identify you, on this questionnaire or the envelope.

We are asking for your own beliefs and attitudes. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space in the margin. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

We would appreciate your answering all the questions. However, if that is not possible, please answer as many as you can. We would like you to return the questionnaire, even if it is incomplete.

1

I. Please answer the following questions in the manner indicated:

1. According to your best estimate, what percentage of the national membership of your church do you think is homosexual? ____ %
2. Again, according to your own best estimate, what percentage of the local congregation that you serve/belong to, do you think is homosexual? ____ %
3. Prior to receiving this questionnaire, how much had you thought about the issue of homosexuality in our society? (circle number)
 - 1 NOT AT ALL
 - 2 VERY LITTLE
 - 3 SOME
 - 4 QUITE A BIT
 - 5 A GREAT DEAL
4. Have you ever dealt pastorally with, or in any way ministered to individuals, whom you know consider themselves to be homosexual? (circle number)
 - 1 YES
 - 2 NO
5. How many individuals do you know personally who are known publicly to be homosexual? ____
6. Have you knowingly given communion to individuals who are known publicly to be homosexual and are sexually active? (circle number)
 - 1 YES
 - 2 NO
7. Have you given communion to individuals whom you know consider themselves to be homosexual (even if this is not known publicly) and who are sexually active? (circle number)
 - 1 YES
 - 2 NO
8. Have you refused to give communion to individuals who are known publicly to be homosexual and are sexually active? (circle number)
 - 1 YES
 - 2 NO
9. Have you refused to give communion to individuals whom you know consider themselves to be homosexual (even if this is not known publicly) and who are sexually active? (circle number)
 - 1 YES
 - 2 NO

2

II. Please read the following statements carefully. Circle the letter(s) on the right, indicating your beliefs about each statement.

	STRONGLY SA	AGREE A	UNDECIDED U	DISAGREE D	STRONGLY SD
1. I enjoy the company of homosexuals.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. It would be beneficial to society to recognize homosexuality as normal.SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Homosexuals should not be allowed to work with children.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Homosexuality is immoral.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Homosexuality is a mental disorder.SA	A	U	D	SD
6. All homosexual bars should be closed down.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Homosexuals are mistreated in our society.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Homosexuals should be given social equality.SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Homosexuals are a viable part of our society.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Homosexuals should have equal opportunity for employment.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. There is no reason to restrict the places where homosexuals work.SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Homosexuals should be free to date whomever they want.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Homosexuality is a sin.SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Homosexuals do need psychological treatment.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. Homosexuality endangers the institution of the family.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. Homosexuals should be accepted completely into our society.SA	A	U	D	SD
17. Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. Those in favour of homosexuality tend to be homosexuals themselves.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. There should be no restrictions on homosexuality.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. I avoid homosexuals whenever possible.	SA	A	U	D	SD

3

III. Please circle the letter(s) on the right that best describe your belief about each of the following statements.

- | | STRONGLY AGREE
SA | AGREE
A | UNCERTAIN
U | DISAGREE
D | STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD |
|--|----------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 1. A number of theories have been put forth to explain sexual orientation. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following theories about homosexuality. | | | | | |
| a. Homosexuality is an inherited, genetic condition. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| b. Homosexuality is a genetic tendency or potentiality. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| c. Homosexuality is caused by a hormonal imbalance. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| d. Homosexuality is caused by fetal environment. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| e. Homosexuality is caused by postnatal environment, socialization, and upbringing. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| f. Homosexuality is a way of life that an individual freely chooses. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| g. Other (please specify) _____ | | | | | |
| 2. Of the <u>above</u> explanations, please indicate the <u>one</u> that you personally believe best explains the cause of homosexuality. (Simply circle the letter in front of the statement) | | | | | |
| 3. Homosexual activity prevents an individual's fulfillment and happiness by acting contrary to the creative wisdom of God. SA A U D SD | | | | | |
| 4. Homosexual behavior is morally wrong. SA A U D SD | | | | | |
| 5. There should be no discrimination in society on the basis of sexual orientation. SA A U D SD | | | | | |
| 6. If homosexuals really wanted to, they could be led by God's grace to change their sexual behavior.SA A U D SD | | | | | |
| 7. If homosexuals really wanted to, they could be led by God's grace to change their sexual orientation.SA A U D SD | | | | | |
| 8. If homosexuals want to be active in the church, they should refrain from homosexual activities and relationships.SA A U D SD | | | | | |

4

- IV. 1. Regarding the participation of publicly known and sexually active homosexuals in congregations, do you think the following privileges should be allowed or denied? (Please check [✓] the appropriate column for each item in the list)

ALLOWED	UNCERTAIN	DENIED	
_____	_____	_____	MEMBERSHIP
_____	_____	_____	BEING BAPTIZED
_____	_____	_____	RECEIVING HOLY COMMUNION
_____	_____	_____	SERVING HOLY COMMUNION
_____	_____	_____	TEACHING CHILDREN IN SUNDAY SCHOOL
_____	_____	_____	WORKING WITH ADOLESCENTS IN YOUTH GROUPS
_____	_____	_____	LEADING ADULT BIBLE STUDY
_____	_____	_____	HOLDING ELECTED OFFICE IN THE CONGREGATION
_____	_____	_____	OTHER (please specify) _____

2. If homosexual persons were to seek help from you concerning their homosexuality, which one of the following would you be most likely to do? (circle number)

- 1 HELP THEM TO ACCEPT THEIR HOMOSEXUALITY
- 2 HELP THEM TO CHANGE THEIR HOMOSEXUALITY
- 3 HELP THEM TO ACCEPT THEIR HOMOSEXUALITY, BUT DISCOURAGE THEM FROM HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR
- 4 HELP THEM TO EXPLORE WHAT IS BEST FOR THEM
- 5 DON'T KNOW

- V. Please circle the letter(s) on the right that best describe your belief about each of the following statements.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
SA	A	U	D	SD

1. Candidates seeking ordination who meet all the necessary requirements of my church body, but have indicated that their sexual orientation is homosexual,
 - a. should be ordained. SA A U D SD
 - b. should be ordained only if they intend to refrain from homosexual activities and relationships. SA A U D SD
2. It would be appropriate to have religious ceremonies celebrating the union and commitment of two homosexuals to each other. SA A U D SD
3. I would be willing to perform a religious ceremony celebrating the union and commitment of two homosexuals to each other. . SA A U D SD

5

VI. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements regarding religious beliefs, by circling the appropriate letter(s) on the right.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
SA	A	U	D	SD

Please read both of the following two statements about miracles and then answer each one.

1. All miracles actually happened as the Bible says they did and therefore should be believed. SA A U D SD
2. All miracles may not have happened exactly as the Bible says, but these reports are true in the sense that they speak about God's love and action in the world. SA A U D SD

Please read both of the following two statements about creation and then answer each one.

3. God created the world and all living things in six days. SA A U D SD
4. Although creation may not have taken place in six days, nevertheless, the creation story reveals that the universe has a divine plan and is fulfilling a divine purpose. SA A U D SD
5. The Bible is the inerrant Word of God, the only trustworthy guide for faith and life. SA A U D SD
6. It is better to keep in the church those who seriously disagree with our faith than to break fellowship with them. SA A U D SD
7. While Jesus is divine, in His humanity He had to struggle to discover who He really was. SA A U D SD
8. All persons who die not having accepted Christ as Saviour will spend eternity in hellfire. SA A U D SD
9. Doubts about faith are really a sign that someone is not as good a religious person as s/he should be. SA A U D SD

6

VII. Admittedly, there are difficulties associated with describing oneself in terms of broad theological positions. However, within the following categories, which of the following best describes your theological position? (circle number)

- 1 FUNDAMENTALIST
- 2 CONSERVATIVE
- 3 NEO-ORTHODOX
- 4 LIBERAL
- 5 OTHER (please specify) _____

VIII. The following statements have to do with one's religious life. Please circle the letter(s) on the right to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

- | | STRONGLY AGREE | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE | STRONGLY DISAGREE |
|---|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 1. Worldly events cannot affect the eternal truths of my religion. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. I find my everyday experiences severely test my religious convictions. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to my world. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. My religious development has emerged out of my growing sense of personal identity. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. God wasn't very important for me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. The "me" of a few years back would be surprised at my present religious stance. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers. | .SA | A | U | D | SD |

The next four sections are statements about the roles of men and women. Note that "work" refers to paid employment. Please answer all of the questions, indicating the extent of your agreement or disagreement by circling the letter(s) on the right.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	MIXED FEELINGS	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
SA	A	MF	D	SD

IX. The following statements apply to a mother.

1. A mother should realize that her greatest rewards and satisfaction in life come through her children. . . . SA A MF D SD
2. A mother of preschool children should work only if the family really needs the money a whole lot. . . . SA A MF D SD
3. A working mother should give up her job whenever it makes a hardship for her children. . . . SA A MF D SD
4. There should be more day care centres and nursery schools so that more mothers of preschool children could work. . . SA A MF D SD
5. If being a mother isn't enough, she should get a job. . . . SA A MF D SD
6. A mother of preschool children shouldn't work because it isn't good for the child.SA A MF D SD
7. A mother with preschoolers should be able to work as many hours per week as their father. SA A MF D SD

X. The following statements apply to a husband.

1. If her job sometimes requires his wife to be away from home, this should not bother him. SA A MF D SD
2. If his wife makes more money than he does, this should not bother him. SA A MF D SD
3. If his wife works, he should share equally in household chores such as cooking, cleaning, and washing. . . . SA A MF D SD
4. A married man's chief responsibility should be his job. . . .SA A MF D SD
5. The husband should be the head of the family. SA A MF D SD

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	MIXED FEELINGS	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
SA	A	MF	D	SD

XI. The following statements apply to a wife.

1. A wife's most important task in life should be taking care of her husband. SA A MF D SD
2. A working wife should not try to get ahead in the same way that a man does. SA A MF D SD
3. A working wife should give up her job whenever it inconveniences her husband. SA A MF D SD
4. Having a job herself should be just as important as encouraging her husband in his job. SA A MF D SD
5. She should be able to make long-range plans for her occupation, in the same way that her husband does for his. SA A MF D SD

XII. The following statements apply to a father.

1. The father should be the main financial support of his children.SA A MF D SD
2. The father should spend as much time as the mother in looking after the daily needs of his children. SA A MF D SD
3. The father has more of a responsibility than the mother to discipline the children. SA A MF D SD
4. If he wants to, the father should be able to quit working and be a full time parent. SA A MF D SD
5. The father has more of a responsibility than the mother to set an example to his sons about how to provide for the family. SA A MF D SD
6. The father has more of a responsibility than the mother to set an example to his sons of how to work hard and get ahead in the world. SA A MF D SD
7. The father has more of a responsibility than the mother to make and enforce rules for the children. SA A MF D SD

9

XIII. Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Your church denomination _____
2. Your sex. (circle number)
 - 1 MALE
 - 2 FEMALE
2. Your present age. (circle number)

1 20 - 24	6 45 - 49
2 25 - 29	7 50 - 54
3 30 - 34	8 55 - 59
4 35 - 39	9 60 - 64
5 40 - 44	10 65 OR ABOVE
4. Your present marital status. (circle number)
 - 1 SINGLE - NEVER MARRIED
 - 2 NOW MARRIED
 - 3 SEPARATED
 - 4 DIVORCED
 - 5 WIDOWED
5. Years since ordination _____
6. Your current employment. (circle the number of the response that best describes the majority of your employment activities)
 - 1 WORKING IN A PARISH
 - 2 OTHER THAN PARISH (circle number below)
 - 3 CHAPLAINCY
 - 4 ACADEMIC
 - 5 ADMINISTRATION IN THE CHURCH AT LARGE (ie. synod, diocese, conference, national, etc.)
 - 6 RETIRED (go to question 7.)
 - 7 OTHER (please indicate) _____
7. If retired within the last 5 years, please indicate your employment prior to retirement. (circle number)
 - 1 WORKING IN A PARISH
 - 2 OTHER THAN PARISH (circle number below)
 - 3 CHAPLAINCY
 - 4 ACADEMIC
 - 5 ADMINISTRATION IN THE CHURCH AT LARGE
 - 7 OTHER (please indicate) _____

Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding the subject of homosexuality, or regarding this questionnaire? If so, please use this space (and the back cover, if needed) for that purpose.

Thank you. Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of the results, please fill in and return the enclosed form. It should be mailed in a separate envelope to avoid identifying it with your questionnaire.