

Citation: Coley, Jonathan S. 2018. “Multivariate Analyses of Activist Commitment.”

Supplement D 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 D

Multivariate Analyses of Activist Commitment

As an additional way of assessing whether a correspondence between a participant’s most salient identity and an organization’s group ethos produces commitment, I provide results from ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic multivariate regression analyses, using as the two dependent variables (a) the number of hours that a respondent participated in a group per week and (b) whether a respondent undertook leadership responsibilities in the group. The primary independent variable of interest is the identity–ethos correspondence; if the respondent was a politicized participant who was a member of a direct action group or a religious participant who was a member of an educational group or an LGBT participant who was a member of a solidarity group, I coded that respondent as a “1” for that variable; otherwise, I recorded a “0.” I also constructed a number of variables inspired by past studies of commitment (expectations of collective benefits, biographical availability, group meetings) or that I believed might otherwise impact respondents’ commitment to organizations (race—because white people are in the majority at these campuses, nonwhite people may not feel fully included in these organizations and thus be less likely to commit; sex—given tendencies for men to dominate social groups, women may be less likely to commit; sexual identity—because these organizations all advance LGBT rights, non-LGBT people may be less likely to commit; the existence of multiple LGBT

organizations at a school—multiple LGBT organizations may compete for members’ attention, thus lowering their commitment levels; and the presence of an inclusive nondiscrimination policy at a school—this indication of political opportunity may encourage students to become more committed). I provide variable definitions and descriptive statistics in table D.1.

-- Table D.1 About Here --

Table D.2 provides an OLS regression analysis where the number of hours a respondent reported participating in an LGBT group during their most recent year is the dependent variable. As table D.2 shows, the variable for identity–ethos correspondence is the only significant predictor of hours spent in the LGBT group. Specifically, when one’s most salient identity corresponds with a group’s ethos, one devotes more hours each week to that group.

-- Table D.2 About Here --

Table D.3 shows provides a logistic regression analysis where a respondent’s leadership status in the group is the dependent variable. (I use a logistic regression model because the dependent variable is binary.) Again, the identity–ethos correspondence variable is similarly a highly significant predictor of undertaking leadership responsibilities in a group, although note that the variable indicating whether one belongs to a sexual minority is also a significant predictor.

-- Table D.3 About Here --

Overall, these analyses provide further evidence that commitment to LGBT activism is contingent on the correspondence between a participant’s most salient identity and an LGBT organization’s dominant group ethos.

Table D.1. Variable Definitions and Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Definition	Mean	Proportion
Dependent			
Hours of participation per week	Respondent's report of the average number of hours per week that he/she participated in an organization during the most recent year he/she was in the organization	4.32	
Leadership position in group	Respondent reported that he/she held an official leadership position in the group OR (if in a nonhierarchical group) that he/she took on more responsibilities than other members (Yes = 1, No = 0)		0.60
Independent			
Identity–ethos correspondence	A politicized participant was a member of a direct action group OR a religious participant was a member of an educational group OR an LGBT participant was a member of a solidarity group (Yes = 1, No = 0)		0.66
Expectations of collective benefits	Respondent reported belief that group would achieve his/her stated goals (Yes = 2, Maybe/Mixed = 1, No = 0)		1.28
Biographical 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

Race	Respondent's self-identification (White =1, Non-white = 0)	0.85
Sex	Respondent's self-identification (Male = 1, Female=0)	0.54
Sexual identity	Respondent's self-identification (LGB = 1, Straight = 0)	0.77
Group meetings	Whether the respondent's primary group held regular meetings (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.68
Multiple organizations	Whether multiple LGBT organizations exist at a school at the time the respondent attended the school (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.42
School with inclusive nondiscrimination policy	Whether the respondent's school had a nondiscrimination statement inclusive of sexual orientation AND/OR gender identity at the time the respondent attended the school (Yes = 1, No = 0)	0.34

Table D.2. OLS Regression Model of Hours Participating in LGBT Groups at Christian Universities

Variable	Model 1 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Identity–ethos correspondence	2.7132* (1.1309)
Expectations of collective benefits	-0.3305 (0.8363)
Biographical availability	-1.9499 (1.1423)
Race (white)	1.7575 (1.2707)
Sex (male)	0.8439 (0.9411)
Sexual identity (LGB)	1.7860 (1.2871)
Group meetings	-0.1253 (1.6274)
Multiple organizations	0.4901 (1.4330)
School with inclusive nondiscrimination policy	-0.0921 (1.4330)
<u>Constant</u>	0.4173 (2.0987)
R-square	0.1919

Note: $N = 65$. Standardized coefficients provided; $*p < .05$ (two-tailed tests).

Table D.3. Logistic Regression Model of Leadership Responsibilities in LGBT Groups at Christian Universities

Variable	Model 1 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Identity–ethos correspondence	3.5857** (1.1545)
Expectations of collective benefits	0.5610 (0.6249)
Biographical availability	0.4955 (0.8335)
Race (white)	-2.4877 (1.7300)
Sex (male)	0.3712 (0.6866)
Sexual identity (LGB)	2.8346* (1.2414)
Group meetings	-0.4787 (1.2587)
Multiple organizations	-0.6780 (1.2339)
School with inclusive nondiscrimination policy	-1.0496 (1.0693)
<u>Constant</u>	-1.4264 (1.8894)
Chi-square	25.7375**
Nagelkerke	0.4529

Note: $N = 65$. Standardized coefficients provided; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests).