

Constitutionally Defining Marriage in a Non-Presidential Election Year: A Study of the Vote in Two States

JOHN DAVID RAUSCH JR., *West Texas A&M University*

ABSTRACT: *In 2004, voters in thirteen states approved amendments to their state constitutions defining marriage as involving one man and one woman. The process of states adding marriage definition amendments to their constitutions continued with voters in two states considering the issue in 2005. This paper examines the political context of the voting outcomes in those two states, Kansas and Texas. It analyzes the influence of religion on the county-level votes for the marriage definition amendments, controlling for various political, demographic, and socioeconomic variables. The analysis reveals that while religious affiliation was an important fact in the political environment, the relationship between support for marriage definition and the 2004 Republican presidential vote was more important. The analysis also exhibits evidence that counties with large African-American populations strongly supported marriage definition amendments.*

Constitutionally Defining Marriage in a Non-Presidential Election Year: A Study of the Vote in Two States

Same-sex marriage became legal in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on May 17, 2004, the result of a judicial decision. Reacting to that event and what many believed to be a movement toward allowing same-sex marriage in other states, voters in 13 states approved marriage definition amendments to their state constitutions in 2004.¹ The process of adding marriage definition amendments to states constitutions slowed slightly in 2005 with voters in only two states, Kansas and Texas, considering such amendments.

Using a method similar to the method used by Morgan and Meier (1980) in their study of voting on moral issues in Oklahoma, this paper examines the voting patterns on the question of marriage definition in the two states that considered the issue in 2005, seeking to build on research on the 13 states that voted in 2004 (Rausch, 2005). Morgan and Meier used multiple regression analysis to study the county-level vote on several ballot questions. Their dependent variable was the percentage of each county's voters supporting the question. They used a number of independent variables including rural isolation, socioeconomic status, liquor consumption, and three categories of religion. They found that support for referenda on liberalizing liquor and gambling laws was found in Oklahoma counties with high socioeconomic status, a larger percentage of Catholics, and smaller per-

centages of both fundamentalist and other Protestants (Morgan & Meier, 1980; Satterthwaite, 2005a). Despite the relative simplicity of the method and the level at which the data are aggregated, Morgan and Meier's findings have been cited numerous times, especially on questions related to issues of morality (see Gibson, 2004; Haider-Markel & Meier, 1996; LeDuc & Pammett, 1995; Oldmixon, 2002; Satterthwaite, 2005a, 2005b; Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996; Wilcox & Jelen, 1990).

Several hypotheses emerge to explain support for marriage definition state questions. One hypothesis posits that votes on marriage definition were determined by religious affiliation. Public opinion research demonstrates that religion has an influence on opinions about homosexuality (Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Cotten-Huston & Waite, 2000; Finlay & Walther, 2003; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Roof & McKinney, 1987), although Cadge, Olson, and Harrison (2005) show that religious affiliation may not specifically affect opinion on allowing same-sex marriages.

A second hypothesis considers the role of political party in the vote on marriage definition amendments. A growing body of research (Campbell & Monson, 2005; Donovan, et al., 2005; Hillygus & Shields, 2005; Smith, DeSantis, & Kassel, 2005) links the success of President George W. Bush's re-election campaign with the state-level votes on marriage definition. This line of research supports the public opinion data that emerged out of the 2004 presidential election indicating that voters chose President Bush largely because he reflected their posi-

tions on moral issues, including gay marriage. The challenge, recognized by Smith, DeSantis, and Kassel (2005), lies in identifying the number of Democratic and Republican party identifiers at the county-level, especially in states that do not register voters by party. Rausch (2005) found that the best predictor of county-level support for marriage definition amendments in the 2004 votes was a measure of political party support based on the percentage of a county's vote for the Republican candidate in the 2004 presidential election.

A third hypothesis considers the urban and rural populations in a state. Voters in rural areas are more likely to vote in support of marriage definition amendments while those in urban areas would oppose the measures (Haeberle, 1996; Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996). There has been little research on locality as a factor in voter outcomes on marriage definition amendments, except that some research includes "rural and urban" as variables (see, for example, Smith, DeSantis, & Kassel, 2005). Examining Ohio and Michigan, Smith, DeSantis, and Kassel (2005) find that rural counties were significantly more likely to support the marriage definition measure in Ohio in 2004.

Using data collected from a variety of sources, the present research assesses the alternative hypotheses while testing for other explanations of support for state constitutional amendments defining marriage. Data were collected on each of 358 counties in Kansas (105 counties) and Texas (253 counties²). The two states have different political cultures allowing for some control over political tradition.

History and Politics of Marriage Definition

The campaigns to add a definition of marriage to the Kansas and Texas constitutions were a continuation of a process that reached its high point in 2004 (see Rausch, 2005). Amending state constitutions have been dramatic points in a decades-long conflict over the ability of same-sex couples to obtain marriage licenses (Barclay & Fisher, 2003; Cadge, Olson, & Harrison, 2005). In 1970, the first gay male couple applied for a marriage license from Hennepin County, Minnesota. After the county clerk denied their application, they sued in state court. The Minnesota Supreme Court held that the men had no federal due process or equal protection right to marry (*Baker v. Nelson*, 1971). A number of same-sex couples tried to obtain marriage licenses during the 1970s and 1980s and failed in court (Dupuis, 2002).

Gay marriage entered the national political agenda in the early 1990s when the Hawaii Supreme Court ruled that the state's ban on granting same-sex couples marriage licenses violated the equal protection clause found in the Hawaii Constitution (*Baehr v. Lewin*, 1993). This decision was upheld by a Hawaii appeals court in 1996. During the period between the two decisions, same-sex marriage opponents organized. The opponents were able to persuade the Hawaii Legislature to propose a state constitutional amendment that was ratified by 69% of the state's voters in November 1998. In 1996, while several states were debating same-sex marriage, Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) defining marriage as an institution between a man and woman. The legislation prohibited federal recognition of same-sex marriages and permitted each state to ignore same-sex marriages performed in other states. President Bill Clinton signed the bill that was followed by similar legislation in a number of states.

The next legal action occurred in Vermont in 1999. The Vermont Supreme Court ruled that limiting marriage to opposite-sex couples violated the Vermont Constitution's "Common Benefits Clause" (*Baker v. State*, 1999). The decision forced the Vermont Legislature to develop a way for benefits and protections to be applied to same-sex couples. In 2000, the legislature passed a "civil unions" law, granting to same-sex couples "all the same benefits, protections and responsibilities under law, whether they derive from statute, administrative or court rule, policy, common law or any other source of civil law, as are granted to spouses in marriage." This was the first legislative measure to provide the benefits and protections of marriage without the label of "marriage."

Same-sex couples received additional support for their ability to obtain marriage licenses with the 2003 Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court ruling *Goodridge v. Department of Public Health* (2003). The court ruled "the marriage ban does not meet the rational basis test for either due process or equal protection." The first same-sex marriage licenses were granted in Massachusetts on May 14, 2004, over the objection of Governor Mitt Romney, a Republican.

Reacting to these court rulings and events like San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom's granting of marriage licenses in his city in February 2004, conservative groups increased their efforts to amend state constitutions to prohibit same-sex marriage. Voters in thirteen states approved these amendments in 2004. Litigation has been filed in a number of these states seeking to overturn the

amendments. In 2005, voters in Kansas and Texas also approved constitutional amendments defining marriage.³ The present research assesses the political context of the voting outcomes on these referenda.

The Amendments in Kansas and Texas

The constitutional amendments decided by voters in Kansas and Texas in 2005 were quite similar. The Kansas amendment defines marriage as the union of a man and a woman and denies “the rights and incidents” of marriage to any other relationship, such as civil unions and domestic partnerships. Numerous observers indicated that the amendment was one of the more severe to be considered in any state since it banned civil unions as well as same-sex marriages. The proposal passed the Kansas House and Senate with the required two-thirds majority. It did not need the signature of Democratic Governor Kathleen Sebelius. Governor Sebelius questioned the need for a constitutional amendment defining marriage since Kansas enacted a Defense of Marriage Act in 1996.⁴ The amendment was approved with 70% of the voters supporting it on April 5, 2005.⁵

In Texas, voters considered the marriage definition amendment along with a relatively short list of constitutional changes on November 5, 2005. The amendment, which was approved by a two-thirds majority in the Texas House and the Texas Senate, defined marriage as the union of one man with one woman and prohibited the state or any political subdivision from creating or recognizing “any legal status identical to or similar to marriage.”⁶ Governor Rick Perry, a Republican, took the unusual and constitutionally unnecessary step of signing the bill at an “evangelical school,” Calvary Christian Academy, in Fort Worth.⁷ Groups opposed to the measure were able to fund a fairly strong campaign to defeat the amendment. The opponents’ tactics included calling voters to suggest that the amendment actually would abolish marriage.⁸ The amendment was approved with the support of 75% of the voters.⁹

Method

Data to test the hypotheses that the way voters in Kansas and Texas voted on marriage definition referenda was guided by religious affiliation, by political party, or by residence in rural areas, were collected from a variety of sources. This study employs aggregate data collected

at the county level. While individual-level data collected by a survey would be preferable to county-level data, the level of aggregation I have chosen is more practical for a study that includes a number of states. County-level data are useful for examining the political, economic, and social environment in which voters made their decisions on referenda (Giles, 1977; Hero, 1998; Key, 1950; Morgan & Meier, 1980; Oliver & Mendelberg, 2000; Rausch, 1994; Satterthwaite, 2005a, 2005b; Smith, DeSantis, & Kassel, 2005; Tolbert & Hero, 2001).

Election return data were collected from the Kansas and Texas Secretaries of State. The data on religion were compiled from the Glenmary Research Center’s *Religious Congregations and Membership in the United States, 2000* (Jones, 2002). Demographic data are from the United States Census.

Measures

Support for Marriage Definition Amendment

The dependent variable, support for the marriage definition amendment, is measured by the percentage of voters in each of the 358 counties who cast a ballot in favor of the marriage definition amendment. While the statewide votes on the question appear to have little variation, the county-level data exhibit greater variation. The highest percentage of “Yes” votes was 95.41 in Martin County, Texas. Floyd County, Texas, was a close second with 95.37%. The strongest support for marriage definition in Kansas was the 91.15% of the voters in Wichita County who favored the amendment. The lowest support was 37.12% in Douglas County, Kansas. Only 40.06% of the voters in Travis County, Texas supported the amendment. The mean county vote was 84.77% with a standard deviation of 8.12%. Using Census data available at www.gaydemographics.org, no statistically significant relationship was found between the number of same-sex couples in a county and its level of support for marriage definition, as suggested by Overby and Barth (2002).

Religion

Data were collected on the proportions of county residents affiliated with different religions. Although religion has been involved in American political life for a long time, social scientists have only seriously researched the role of religion in politics for about the past quarter century (Jelen, 1998; Satterthwaite, 2005a, 2005b; Wald, Silverman, & Fridy, 2005). Jelen (1998) reviews much of the literature that specifically examines the role of religion in political behavior. For example, the Catholic

Church has worked in coalition with other groups to enact restrictions on abortion at the state level (Day, 1992; O'Hara, 1992). Religious conservatives became actively involved in the Republican Party in the late 1970s and early 1980s to advocate their positions on a number of social issues (Guth, 1983; Oldfield, 1996). Interestingly, it was during the period when religious conservatives began to strongly participate in politics that social science experienced a growth in interest in the role of religion in American politics. Recent research has found that religious affiliation played a role in the results of the marriage definition amendment votes (Cadge, Olson, & Harrison, 2005; Campbell & Monson, 2005; Satterthwaite, 2005b; Smith, DeSantis, & Kassel, 2005). Religious groups were well organized in both Kansas and Texas to support the amendments.

The present research incorporates three variables for religious affiliation: evangelical Protestants; mainline Protestants; and Catholics. Using data from the Glenmary Research Center (Jones, 2002), the proportion of county residents who are *Evangelical Protestants* was calculated using the "List of Religious Bodies" found at the American Religion Data Archive website.¹⁰ The percentages ranged from a high of 96.9 to a low of zero. The mean was 31.34% with a standard deviation of 18.43%. In Kansas, the range was from 2.9% to 41.8% with a mean of 17.17% (standard deviation = 8.10%). In Texas, the range was from zero to 96.9% with a mean of 37.1% (standard deviation = 18.33%).

It is expected that counties with greater percentages of evangelical Protestants will exhibit greater support for the marriage definition amendments (see Satterthwaite, 2005b). In fact, the percentage of evangelical Protestants in a county could be considered the key independent variable.

A similar procedure was used to calculate the percentage of *Mainline Protestants*. The range among all counties was from zero to 56.9% with a mean of 15.07% and a standard deviation of 10.85%. Kansas exhibited a range from 6.1% to 56.9% with a mean of 26.23% and a standard deviation of 10.90%. In Texas, the range was from zero to 49.0% with a mean of 10.46% and a standard deviation of 6.69%.

Because mainline Protestants tend to be more liberal on social issues (see Fowler, Hertzke, Olson, & Den Dulk, 2004), mainline Protestant counties are expected to exhibit lower support for the amendments. In fact, the United Church of Christ voted in July 2005 to affirm equal marriage rights for couples regardless of gender.¹¹ Interestingly, Satterthwaite (2005b) finds that mainline

Protestant population is positively associated with vote for marriage definition, at least in Oklahoma.

The percentage of *Catholics* in each county was determined using the Glenmary data. Only the category labeled "Catholic" was included in this classification. The percentage of Catholics ranged from zero to 94.7%. The mean was 17.01% with a standard deviation of 15.10%. In Kansas, the range was from .9% to 53.5% with a mean of 15.41% and a standard deviation of 9.28%. The Texas counties ranged from zero to 94.7% with a mean of 17.67% and a standard deviation of 16.91%. Counties with greater populations of Catholics are expected to show more support for marriage definition. For example, the Catholic Bishops of Texas issued a statement, "Marriage did not originate from either the Church or state, but from God. Therefore, we believe neither Church nor state has the right to alter the nature and structure of marriage."¹²

Political Party Affiliation

The second hypothesis examined here holds that counties with differing proportions of party identifiers will exhibit different levels of voting on the marriage definition amendments. The challenge is defining party affiliation. The present research measures party affiliation as the "2004 Republican Presidential Vote."

The mean county Republican vote for president in the 2004 election was 70.47% with a standard deviation of 11.43%. The county that provided the most support to President Bush was Ochiltree County, Texas, at 91.97%. The president received the lowest support from the voters in Zavala County, Texas, with 24.92%.

Voters in Rural Areas

The independent variable tapping the effect of residence in rural areas is the percentage of county residents who live in rural areas according to the United States Bureau of the Census.¹³ For simplicity, this research uses "percent rural"; therefore, the remainder of the county population can be considered urban. It is expected that counties with a greater percentage of rural population will exhibit more support for the marriage definition amendments.

Control Variables

Additional independent variables are entered into the analysis as controls. They are the percentage of each county's population with a high school diploma, each county's median age, and the median household income in each county. The percentage of each county's popula-

Table 1. Correlations.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1) % Yes on Marriage Definition Amendment	1									
(2) % Evangelical Protestant	.600 (p=.000)	1								
(3) % Catholic	-.133 (p=.012)	-.418 (p=.000)	1							
(4) % Mainline Protestant	-.111 (p=.036)	-.242 (p=.000)	-.139 (p=.000)	1						
(5) % Rural	.259 (p=.000)	.113 (p=.032)	-.182 (p=.001)	.313 (p=.000)	1					
(6) % 2004 Gop Presidential Vote	.476 (p=.000)	-.337 (p=.000)	-.411 (p=.000)	.373 (p=.000)	.320 (p=.000)	1				
(7) % Hs Graduate	.225 (p=.000)	.104 (p=.050)	-.326 (p=.000)	.306 (p=.000)	.443 (p=.000)	.205 (p=.000)	1			
(8) Median Age	.196 (p=.586)	.165 (p=.002)	-.284 (p=.000)	.461 (p=.000)	.627 (p=.000)	.376 (p=.000)	.564 (p=.000)	1		
(9) Median Income	-.268 (p=.000)	-.346 (p=.000)	-.227 (p=.000)	.068 (p=.198)	-.200 (p=.000)	.197 (p=.000)	-.161 (p=.000)	-.137 (p=.010)	1	
(10) % African-American	.107 (p=.042)	.185 (p=.000)	-.227 (p=.000)	-.342 (p=.000)	-.204 (p=.000)	-.288 (p=.000)	.044 (p=.000)	-.200 (p=.000)	.023 (p=.667)	1

tion who are African-American also is included in the analysis.

A Concern about Hispanic Residents and Voters

The present research does not include a measure of Hispanic residents. This is done for several reasons. First, Census data is unable to distinguish between Hispanic residents who are American citizens over 18 years of age and those who are not. Knowing who is an American citizen and eligible to vote is particularly important since this research examines voting behavior. Second, a correlation analysis shows that the percent of a county's population claiming to be Hispanic is relatively strongly correlated with the Catholic percent, a Pearson's r of .633 ($p=.000$). In considering the question examined at the individual level, the national election day exit polls conducted by Edison Media Research/Mitofsky International find that the view held by Hispanic/Latino voters on the question of whether gay and lesbian couples should be allowed to marry is not much different from the view held by White Anglo voters. Of the 2,421 White voters, 26% state that gay and lesbian couples should be allowed to legally marry while 26.6% of the 267 Hispanic/Latino voters hold that opinion. About 35% of White voters believe that gay and lesbian couples should have no legal recognition in marriage. Hispanic/Latino support for this position is slightly higher at 38.2%. The data reveal that African-Americans more strongly support the position that gay and lesbian couples should not be allowed to marry (National Election Pool, 2005).

Analysis and Findings

The present research examines the political context in which voters in Kansas and Texas in 2005 approved state constitutional amendments defining marriage by prohibiting same-sex marriage. In order to allay concerns about multicollinearity and to determine if there are any potential relationships, a correlation matrix was calculated for all of the variables. This matrix is presented as Table 1.

Table 1 presents few surprises. The percentage of a county's population affiliated with an evangelical Protestant denomination is strongly correlated with the percentage of the county's voters who supported a marriage definition amendment. Rural counties also showed greater support for the amendments. The marriage amendment vote is significantly correlated with the 2004 Republican presidential vote. A surprise is the correlation between vote on the amendment and the Catholic

population. The negative correlation on the Catholic population is intriguing, suggesting that counties with larger Catholic populations show less support for the marriage definition amendments. Of course, since this research uses aggregate data, it is difficult to argue that Catholics voted against the amendments without raising the specter of the ecological fallacy. The reader also should remember that of the counties examined in this research, in only two were amendment supporters on the minority side of the vote.

The GOP vote for President in 2004 is correlated with a number of variables but not at levels to cause concern.

Multiple regression analyses were run to produce several models. The first one is presented in Table 2. This model includes all 358 counties across both states. The variables included in the first model were: percent of evangelical Protestants in the county, the percent of mainline Protestants, percent Catholic, percent rural population, the percent of voters who supported the Republican presidential candidate in 2004, the percent of county residents who graduated from high school, the median age, the median income, and the percent African-American population. The first model explains a respectable amount of the variance in the dependent variable ($R^2=.624$) and the model is significant.

The model clearly indicates that there is a strong relationship between the 2004 Republican presidential vote and the strength of support for the marriage definition amendments, measured by voting. The other important variable is the size of the evangelical Protestant population. Counties with more people who affiliate with evangelical Protestant denominations voted at higher rates for the marriage definition amendments. Counties with large Catholic populations also supported the amendments. In counties with larger mainline Protestant populations, support for the amendments was weaker. Age was the only variable that did not significantly contribute to the model. The model is similar to the findings reported by Rausch (2005) in his study of the thirteen states that considered marriage definition amendments in 2004.

Regression analyses were conducted on the Kansas counties and the Texas counties separately. These models are presented in Table 3. The model produced on the Kansas data appears to have less explanatory power with an R^2 of .598 ($adj. R^2=.560$). In Kansas, counties that supported President George W. Bush in his 2004 reelection at higher levels also were more supportive of marriage definition. Few of the other variables seemed

Table 2. OLS Regression of County Vote on Marriage Definition Amendments Across Both States.

	Beta	<i>p</i>
Evngelical Protestant	.380	.0001
Catholic	.303	.0001
Mainline Protestant	-.168	.001
Rural	.113	.010
2004 GOP Presidential Vote	.600	.0001
High School Graduate	.155	.0001
Median Income	-.203	.0001
Median Age	-.062	.221
African-American	.227	.0001

$R^2=.624$
Adj. R^2=.615
p=.0001

Table 3. OLS Regression of County Vote on Marriage Definition Amendments (Kansas and Texas Analyzed Separately).

	Kansas		Texas	
	Beta	<i>p</i>	Beta	<i>p</i>
Evangelical Protestant	.157	.044	.265	.001
Catholic	.163	.023	.211	.0001
Mainline Protestant	.048	.622	-.024	.594
Rural	.171	.076	.064	.202
2004 GOP Presidential Vote	.599	.0001	.611	.0001
High School Graduate	.218	.016	.335	.0001
Median Income	.009	.907	-.256	.0001
Median Age	-.021	.848	-.159	.006
African-American	.122	.157	.140	.004
	$R^2=.598$		$R^2=.642$	
	<i>Adj. R^2=.624</i>		<i>Adj. R^2=.628</i>	
	<i>p=.0001</i>		<i>p=.0001</i>	
	<i>N=105</i>		<i>N=253</i>	

to have an effect on the county-level vote for marriage definition in Kansas. One of the challenges could be the smaller number of counties in Kansas (105) compared to Texas.

In the Texas model, we see that counties that were supportive of President Bush at high levels also were more supportive of the marriage definition amendment. Interestingly, counties with a larger percentage of

high school graduates also supported the amendment at higher levels. Counties with older residents appear to be less supportive of the amendment, an important finding because older residents are more likely to vote. The same pattern is seen in counties with higher median incomes. The Texas model predicts the variance in the vote for the marriage definition amendment better than the Kansas model ($R^2=.642$; *adj. R^2=.628*).

Discussion

The present research seeks to understand the political context in which voters approved marriage definition amendments in Kansas and Texas in 2005. It also builds upon previous research examining the thirteen states that considered similar amendments in 2004 (Rausch, 2005). Three hypotheses were tested. The first suggests that counties with large evangelical Protestant populations would strongly support marriage definition amendments. The second hypothesis posits that counties that voted strongly in support of the Republican presidential candidate in 2004 also would exhibit higher levels of support for marriage definition. Finally, the third hypothesis indicates that rural populations would be more supportive of such amendments.

The findings presented here suggest that there is a strong association between 2004 presidential vote and the vote on the constitutional amendments. Counties in which a large percentage of voters supported the Republican in 2004 also demonstrated stronger support for marriage definition in 2005. This association is similar to that found in the earlier research (Rausch, 2005) even though the votes in Kansas and Texas were not held at the same time as the presidential election. Evangelical Protestant population also contributed to county vote as did the amount of rural population.

The findings presented in this paper come with caveats. The data collected for this study are aggregate in nature. Examining aggregate data always raises a concern about the ecological fallacy. A second caveat revolves around the fact that the amendment received less than 50% of the vote in only two counties, one each in Kansas and Texas. The findings presented here only address the strength of support for state constitutional amendments on marriage definition.

Despite the caveats, this research presents a model of county-level voting outcomes in a political context. The next important step in the research will be to examine individual-level data available on voters who were

asked to decide the issue of marriage definition. The election day exit polls conducted in 2004, and available from The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, may be mined to provide such individual-level data. Voters in a number of states were asked to amend their state constitutions in November 2006, providing additional cases to analyze and test the models that have been built with the data from 2004 and 2005.

JOHN DAVID RAUSCH JR. is the TEEL BIVINS PROFESSOR of political science.

Notes

1. Elizabeth Mehren, "More Backlash than Bliss 1 Year After Marriage Law," *Los Angeles Times*, 17 May 2005, p. A1.
2. Texas actually is divided into 254 counties. Loving County, sometimes referred to as "America's Emptiest County," has been removed from this analysis because of its sparse population. See Ralph Blumenthal, "1 Café, 1 Gas Station and 2 Roads: America's Emptiest County," *New York Times*, 25 February 2006, p. A11.
3. For a summary of recent state activity on same-sex marriage, see Kavan Peterson, "Washington Gay Marriage Ruling Looms," Stateline.org, <http://www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=136&languageId=1&contentId=20695> (last accessed on April 25, 2006).
4. Brian MacQuarrie, "Kansas Set to Vote on Gay Marriage Ban," *Boston Globe*, 4 April 2005, p. A3.
5. Suzanne Perez Tobias, Joe Rodriguez, and Steve Painter, "Kansas Vote for Constitutional Amendment Banning Gay Marriage," *Wichita Eagle*, 6 April 2005.
6. R.G. Ratcliffe, "Same-Sex Marriage Ban Going to Voters," *Houston Chronicle*, 22 May 2005, p. A1.
7. Ralph Blumenthal, "Texas Governor Draws Criticism for a Bill-Signing Event at an Evangelical School," *New York Times*, 6 June 2005, p. A12.
8. W. Gardner Selby, "Former Austin Minister on Your Answering Machine," *Austin American-Statesman*, 27 October 2005.
9. Rebeca Chapa, "Gay Marriage Ban Rolls," *San Antonio Express-News*, 9 November 2005, p. 1A.
10. http://www.thearda.com/mapsReports/RCMS_Notes.asp. According to the American Religion Data Archive, their classification scheme was derived from Steensland, et al. (2000). When denominations were not included in the Steensland, et al., classification, the religious bodies were classified based on Melton (1999) and Mead & Hill (1995).
11. Shaila Dewan, "United Church of Christ Backs Same-Sex Marriage," *New York Times*, 4 July 2005, p. 10A.
12. Tara Dooley and Kristen Mack, "Religion, Politics Collide over Prop. 2," *Houston Chronicle*, 5 November 2005.
13. The Census Bureau's classification of "rural" consists of all territory, population, and housing units located outside of "urbanized areas" and "urbanized clusters." Urbanized areas and urbanized clusters are core census block groups or blocks that have a population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile and the surrounding census blocks that have an overall density of at least 500 people per square mile. The rural component contains both place and non-place territory. Geographic entities, such as census tracts, counties, metropolitan areas, and the territory outside metropolitan areas, often are "split" between urban and rural territory, and the population and housing units they contain often are partly classified as urban and partly classified as rural.

References

- Baehr v. Lewin*, 852 P.2d 44 (Haw. 1993).
- Baker v. Nelson*, 291 Minn. 310, 314–315, 191 N.W.2d 185, 187, (1971).
- Baker v. State*, 744 A.2d 864 (Vt. 1999).
- Barclay, S. & Fisher, S. (2003). The states and differing impetus for divergent paths on same-sex marriage, 1990-2001. *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(3), 331–352.
- Cadge, W., Olson, L. R., & Harrison, J. (2005). *Religion and public opinion about same-sex marriage: A systematic examination*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Washington, DC.
- Campbell, D. E. & Monson, J. Q. (2005). *The case of Bush's reelection: Did gay marriage do it?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Cochran, J. K. & Beeghly, L. (1991). The influence of religion on attitudes toward nonmarital sexuality: A preliminary assessment of reference group theory. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(1), 45–62.
- Cotten-Huston, A. & Waite, B. M. (2000). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions." *Journal of Homosexuality*, 38(3), 117–133.
- Day, C. (1992). Abortion and religious coalitions: The case of Louisiana. In T.A. Byrnes & M.C. Segers, (Eds.), *The Catholic Church and the Politics of Abortion: A View from the States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Donovan, T., Tolbert, C., Smith, D. A., & Parry, J. (2005). *Did gay marriage elect George W. Bush*. Paper presented at the 5th Annual State Politics and Policy Conference, East Lansing, MI.
- Dupuis, M. (2002). *Same-sex marriage, legal mobilization, & the politics of rights*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Finlay, B. & Walther, C. S. (2003). The relation of religious affiliation, service attendance, and other factors to homophobic attitudes among university students. *Review of Religious Research*, 44(4), 370–393.
- Fowler, R. B., Hertzke, A. D., Olson, L. R., & Den Dulk, K. R. (2004). *Religion and politics in America: Faith, culture, and strategic choices*, 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gibson, M. T. (2004). Culture wars in state education policy: A look at the relative treatment of evolutionary theory in state science standards. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(5), 1129–1149.
- Giles, M. (1977). Percent black and racial hostility: An old assumption reexamined. *Social Science Quarterly*, 58(3), 412–417.
- Glenn, N. D. & Weaver, C. N. (1979). Attitudes toward premarital, extramarital, and homosexual relations in the U.S. in the 1970s. *Journal of Sex Research*, 15(2), 108–118.
- Goodridge v. Department of Public Health*, 798 N. E.2d. 941 (Mass. 2003).
- Guth, J. L. (1983). The new Christian right. In Liebman, R.C. & Wuthnow, R. (Eds.), *The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation*. New York: Aldine.
- Haeberle, S. H. (1996). Gay men and lesbians in city hall. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77, 190–197.
- Haider-Markel, D. P. & Meier, K. J. (1996). The politics of gay and lesbian rights: Expanding the scope of the conflict. *Journal of Politics*, 58(2), 332–349.
- Hero, R. (1998). *Faces of Inequality: Social Diversity in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hillygus, D. S. & Shields, T. G. (2005). Moral issues and voter decision making in the 2004 presidential election. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 38(2), 201–208.
- Jelen, T. G. (1998). Research in religion and mass political behavior in the United States: Looking both ways after two decades of scholarship. *American Politics Quarterly*, 26(1), 110–134.
- Jones, D. E. (2002). *Religious Congregations & Membership in the United States, 2000*. Nashville, TN: Glenmary Research Center.
- Key, V. O. (1950). *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- LeDuc, L. & Pammett, J. H. (1995). Referendum voting: Attitudes and behaviour in the 1992 constitutional referendum. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 28,(1) 3–33.
- Lewis, G. B. (2005). Same-sex marriage and the 2004 presidential election. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 38(2), 195–199.
- Mead, F. S. & Hill, S. S. (1995). *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, 10th ed. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Melton, J. G. (1999). *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 6th ed. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Morgan, D. R., & Meier, K. J. (1980). Politics and morality: The effect of religion on referenda Voting. *Social Science Quarterly*, 61(1), 144–148.
- National Election Pool. (2005). *National Election Pool Election Exit Polls, 2004* [computer file]. Roper Center version 2. New York, NY: Edison Media Research /Mitofsky International [producer], 2004. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research [distributor].
- O'Hara, T. J. (1992). The abortion control act of 1989: The Pennsylvania Catholics. In Byrnes, T. A. & Segers, M. C. (Eds.), *The Catholic Church and the Politics of Abortion: A View from the States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Oldfield, D. (1996). *The Right and the Righteous: The Christian Right Confronts the Republican Party*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Oldmixon, E. A. (2002). Culture wars in the congressional theater: How the U.S. House of Representatives legislates morality, 1993–1998. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83(3), 453–477.
- Oliver, E. & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the environmental determinants of white racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(3), 574–589.
- Overby, L. M. & Barth, J. (2002). Contact, community context, and public attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Polity*, 34(4), 433–456.
- Rausch, J. D. (2005). Morality or locality?: The political context of marriage definition. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- Roof, W. C. & McKinney, W. (1987). *Mainline American Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Satterthwaite, S. (2005a). Faster horses, older whiskey, and more money: An analysis of religious influence on referenda voting. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 44(1), 105–112.
- Satterthwaite, S. (2005b). *Cashing in on sin? you bet: Assessing the impact of religion on state ballot questions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, New Orleans.
- Smith, D. A., DeSantis, M., & Kassel, J. (2005). *Was Rove right? Evangelicals and the impact of gay marriage in the 2004 election*. Paper presented at the 5th Annual State Politics and Policy Conference, East Lansing, MI.
- Steensland, B., Park, J. Z., Regnerus, M. D., Robinson, L. D., Wilcox, W. B., & Woodberry, R. D. (2000). The measure of American religion: Toward improving the state of the art. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 291–318.
- Tolbert, C. J. & Hero, R. (2001). Facing diversity: Racial/ethnic context and social policy change. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(3), 571–604.
- Wald, K. D., Button, J. W., & Rienzo, B. A. (1996). The politics of gay rights in American communities: Explaining antidiscrimination ordinances and policies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(4), 1152–1178.
- Wald, K. D., Silverman, A. L., & Fridy, K. D. (2005). Making sense of religion in political life. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 121–143.
- Wilcox, C. & Jelen, T. (1990). Evangelicals and political tolerance. *American Politics Quarterly*, 18(1), 25–46.