

Citation: Coley, Jonathan S. 2018. “Qualitative Comparative Analyses of Pathways to Participation.” Supplement C for *Gay on God’s Campus: Mobilizing for LGBT Equality at Christian Colleges and Universities*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. Accessed at <http://jonathancoley.com/book>

Supplement C

Qualitative Comparative Analyses of Pathways to Participation

To interrogate the pathways that my respondents followed into LGBT groups, I employed a method known as qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) (Ragin 1987), which allows practitioners to identify multiple combinations of conditions that can lead to any given outcome(s) of interest, making this an ideal method for understanding differences among activist group participants. For the purposes of my QCAs, I employed three different “outcome variables”: (a) joining an activist group while holding a salient “activist” identity; (b) joining an activist group while holding a salient “religious” identity; or (c) joining an activist group while holding a salient “sexual identity” and/or “gender identity.”¹ This allowed me to conduct separate QCA analyses for participants possessing each of these three identities of interest and thus more effectively compare pathways followed by politicized participants with those followed by religious and LGBT participants. Guided by the past literature discussed in text, I also employ five “explanatory variables” related to the characteristics of individuals either prior to their coming to college (socialization into the values of the movement by family, schools, or churches; prior participation in an activist group) or at the time they joined the movement (attitudinal affinity with the group; the presence of work or family responsibilities that might affect

biographical availability; personal ties to other people in the movement). I further define these outcome and explanatory variables in table C.1.

-- Table C.1 About Here --

Following standard QCA minimization procedures (Ragin 1987), I then arrived at my results. Note that, when a variable is capitalized, the presence of a certain condition is necessary for students to join activist groups; conversely, when a variable appears in lowercase, the absence of a certain condition is necessary for students to join LGBT groups. When a variable is completely missing from a particular pathway, that means that the presence or absence of that variable is irrelevant to a student's decision to join an LGBT group. Multiple variables sometimes combine to produce a certain outcome, and those variables are conjoined by an asterisk (which is read as "and"); similarly, multiple combinations of variables can also lead to a certain outcome, and those "equations" are listed on separate lines and linked by the plus sign (which is read as "or").

Table C.2 identifies a single combination of attributes that persons holding salient politicized identities possess. Specifically, the single combination of conditions—"SOCIALIZATION*PRIOR*AFFINITY"—indicates that all "politicized participants" join LGBT groups because they have been socialized by families, schools, and/or churches that support LGBT rights and because they have previously participated in activist groups and because they personally support LGBT rights.

-- Table C.2 About Here --

Table C.3 indicates three possible combinations of conditions contributing to LGBT activist group participation among students holding salient religious identities. All three combinations include the lowercased variables "socialization*prior," indicating that the absence of these variables is necessary for religious participants to join LGBT activist groups—that is,

none of the religious participants have been socialized into LGBT-friendly worldviews and none of the religious participants previously participated in activist groups. However, the models do diverge in terms of characteristics of religious participants at the time of micromobilization. By the time they arrived at their respective colleges and universities, the religious participants following the first pathway listed in the table had come to agree with the cause of LGBT rights, in spite of lacking personal ties and being “biographically unavailable.” However, religious participants following the second and third pathways listed in the table did not necessarily agree with the values and goals of their LGBT group at the time that they joined. Rather, they began participating because they were directly recruited by another member of the LGBT group and/or because they happened to be biographically available.

-- Table C.3 About Here --

Table C.4 identifies four combinations of conditions that led to the participation of LGBT participants. Socialization into values conducive to activist group participation was necessary for LGBT participants following the first two pathways listed in the table, while the remaining two pathways contain participants whose lack of socialization was necessary or otherwise not relevant to their participation. Despite these differences prior to micromobilization, LGBT students following all four of the pathways exhibited attitudinal affinity with the LGBT rights movement by the time they joined their LGBT groups. Furthermore, the presence of pre-existing social ties was not necessary for any of these participants to join an LGBT group, and indeed an absence of pre-existing ties to the LGBT group was necessary for actual participation in two of the four pathways of LGBT participants. Similarly, biographical availability was not necessary for any LGBT participants to join an LGBT group, but the absence of biographical availability was necessary for LGBT participants who had followed two of the four pathways.

-- Table C.4 About Here --

References

Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Table C.1. Variable Definitions and Descriptive Statistics

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Proportion</u>
<u>Outcome</u>		
Activist identity	Respondent reported identifying as an “activist” at the time of joining the group AND either did not identify as a “person of faith” or LGBT at the time of joining the group or indicated that the “activist identity” was most salient (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.31
Value identity	Respondent reported identifying as a “person of faith” at the time of joining the group AND either did not identify as an “activist” or LGBT at the time of joining the group or indicated that their “value identity” was most salient (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.14
Solidary identity	Respondent reported identifying as LGBT at the time of joining the group AND either did not identify as an “activist” or “person of faith” at the time of joining the group or indicated that their “solidary identity” was most salient (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.55
<u>Explanatory</u>		
Socialization	Respondent was raised by parents supportive of LGBT rights OR attended a school supportive of LGBT students OR attended a church supportive of LGBT members (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.69
Prior activism	Respondent indicated prior involvement in any activist organization (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.62
Affinity	Respondent indicated support for LGBT rights (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.91
Availability	Respondent reported an absence of family responsibilities (defined as being married, raising children, or caring for a sick family member) AND an absence of work responsibilities (defined as paid part-time or full-time work) (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.45
Ties	Respondent reported knowing someone in the LGBT group (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.34

Table C.2. Qualitative Comparative Analysis Paths of Participants with Salient “Political” Identities

<u>Model</u>	<u>Proportion</u>
SOCIALIZATION*PRIOR*AFFINITY	1.00

Note: Capitalized variables imply that the presence of a condition is necessary to explain an outcome; lowercase variables imply that the absence of condition is necessary to explain an outcome; the absence of a variable implies that the presence or absence of that condition is not necessary to explain an outcome.

Table C.3. Qualitative Comparative Analysis Paths of Participants with Salient “Religious” Identities

<u>Model</u>	<u>Proportion</u>
socialization*prior*AFFINITY*ties*availability +	0.22
socialization*prior*affinity*TIES +	0.44
socialization*prior*TIES*AVAILABILITY	0.33

(Common configuration: socialization*prior)

Note: Capitalized variables imply that the presence of a condition is necessary to explain an outcome; lowercase variables imply that the absence of condition is necessary to explain an outcome; the absence of a variable implies that the presence or absence of that condition is not necessary to explain an outcome.

Table C.4. Qualitative Comparative Analysis Paths of Participants with Salient “LGBT” Identities

<u>Model</u>	<u>Proportion</u>
SOCIALIZATION*AFFINITY*ties +	0.42
SOCIALIZATION*AFFINITY*availability +	0.11
socialization*prior*AFFINITY	0.22
AFFINITY*ties*availability +	0.25
(Common configuration: AFFINITY)	

Note: Capitalized variables imply that the presence of a condition is necessary to explain an outcome; lowercase variables imply that the absence of condition is necessary to explain an outcome; the absence of a variable implies that the presence or absence of that condition is not necessary to explain an outcome.